Waikato Regional Council
Council Agenda

Date: Thursday, 27 June, 2019
Time: 9:00 am
Location: Council Chamber
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street
Hamilton East

Members: Cr Livingston - Chairman
Cr T Mahuta - Deputy Chair
Cr J Hayman
Cr J Hennebry
Cr K Hodge
Cr S Husband
Cr S Kneebone
Cr F Lichtwark
Cr D Minogue
Cr B Quayle
Cr R Rimmington
Cr Simcock
Cr Vercoe
Cr K White

Notice of Meeting:
I hereby give notice that an ordinary Meeting of the Council will be held as detailed above.

VRJ Payne
Chief Executive Officer
1. **Apologies**

   Apologies received from Cr Mahuta.

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

4. **Confirmation of Minutes**

   4.1 **Council Minutes - 30 May 2019**

   Minutes of the meeting of Council held 30 May 2019.

   Link [here](#)

5. **Committees Reporting to Council**

   5.1 **Waikato Plan Leadership Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee held 20 May 2019.

   5.2 **Hauraki Gulf Forum**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Hauraki Gulf Forum held 20 May 2019.

   Link [here](#)

   5.3 **Extra-ordinary Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee**

   Report to provide background information to assist council to consider the recommendations of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee arising from the extra-ordinary meeting.

   Minutes of the extra-ordinary meeting of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held 29 May 2019.

   5.4 **Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee held 7 June 2019.

   5.5 **Integrated Catchment Management Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Integrated Catchment Management Committee held 11 June 2019.

   5.6 **CE Employment and Remuneration Committee - May 2019**

   Minutes of the meeting of the CE Employment and Remuneration Committee held 21 May 2019.
6. **Ordinary Business**

6.1 **Health and Safety Council Report - May 2019**

Report on the monthly health and safety council dashboard and any other topics regarding health and safety of relevance to council.

6.2 **Adoption of the 2019 2020 Annual Plan**

Report to present the 2019/20 Annual Plan to council for adoption.

Draft report can be viewed [here](#).

6.3 **Rate setting report - 2019-2020**

Report to enable Council to set rates for the 2019/20 financial year.

6.4 **Council position on matters to be considered at the Local Government NZ 2019 AGM**

Report to seek confirmation of council's position on the proposed remits submitted by other councils, and on the proposed rule changes for consideration at the Local Government NZ 2019 Annual General Meeting.

6.5 **Waikato Progress Indicators**

Report to inform about the recently completed annual update of the “Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato”, including the WPI scorecard and indicator report cards. The report highlights how the WPI links to council work programmes and external initiatives.
7. **Resolution to Exclude the Public**

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting set out below on the grounds that the public conduct of those parts of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (the Act).

The particular interests protected by section 6 or 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

**Report title: Council Minutes – 30 May 2019**

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

- Protect information where the making available of the information
  - i. would disclose a trade secret; or
  - ii. would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (section 7(2)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Act)

- In the case only of an application for a resource consent, or water conservation order, or a requirement for a designation or heritage order, under the Resource Management Act 1991, to avoid serious offence to Tikanga Māori, or to avoid the disclosure of the location of waahi tapu (section 7(2)(ba) of the Act)

- Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information
  - i. would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied (section 7(2)(c)(i) of the Act); or
  - ii. would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest (section 7(2)(c)(ii) of the Act)

- Avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public (section 7(2)(e) of the Act)

- Maintain legal professional privilege (section 7(2)(g) of the Act)

- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (section 7(2)(h) of the Act)

- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (section 7(2)(i) of the Act)

- Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage (section 7(2)(j) of the Act)
Report title: Integrated Catchment Management Committee

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)
- Protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (section 7(2)(b)(ii) of the Act)
- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (section 7(2)(i) of the Act)
- Avoid prejudice to the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial (section 6(a) of the Act)

Report title: Approval of Sale Agreement for 319 Grey Street

- Protect information where the making available of the information
  i. would disclose a trade secret; or
  ii. would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (section 7(2)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Act)
- Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information -
  i. would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied (section 7(2)(c)(i) of the Act); or
  ii. would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest (section 7(2)(c)(ii) of the Act)
- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (section 7(2)(h) of the Act)
- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (section 7(2)(i) of the Act)

Report title: CE Employment and Remuneration Committee – 21 May

Report title: CE Employment and Remuneration Committee – 5 June

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

8. Public Excluded Section
8.1 Council Minutes - 30 May 2019
8.2 Integrated Catchment Management Committee
8.3 Approval of Sale Agreement for 319 Grey Street, Hamilton East
8.4 CE Employment and Remuneration Committee - May 2019
8.5 CE Employment and Remuneration Committee - June 2019
## Decision of Waikato Plan Leadership Committee

Meeting date: 20 May 2019

### Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4. Confirmation of Minutes from the Previous Meeting</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLC19/13&lt;br&gt;THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee held on Monday 25 March 2019 be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5. Strategic Workshop 25 March 2019 – Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLC19/14&lt;br&gt;1. THAT the report ‘Strategic Workshop 25 March 2019 – Next Steps’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the priorities listed below are included in the Priority Action list for the draft refreshed Waikato Plan as either additional priorities, or part of the existing priorities:&lt;br&gt;a. Climate change&lt;br&gt;b. Waikato - Aspiring to sustainable development (economically, culturally, socially and environmentally).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 6. Waikato District Health Board Mental Health presentation</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLC19/15&lt;br&gt;1. THAT the report ‘Waikato District Health Board Mental Health presentation’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee acknowledges that the Waikato Plan has a role in supporting regional mental health initiatives, providing an important integrating and connecting forum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THAT, by the end of July 2019, as part of determining where the Waikato Plan can best support the Mental Health/Hau Ora initiative, that a Hau Ora Wellbeing Working Group is established, and that a workshop is convened to:&lt;br&gt;a. scope potential projects for consideration for bringing back to the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee, where the projects will be focussed on making a change within a specific community; and&lt;br&gt;b. understand more fully possible funding streams, including the existing DHB funding source that was brought to Members’ attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 7. Membership update of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLC19/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item 8. Priority Actions update**

WPLC19/17

1. THAT the report ‘Priority actions update’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.

2. THAT a project approach that includes both a project sponsor and champion group is utilised.

3. THAT Cr Adams is confirmed as the project sponsor for the Youth and Employment Project with a champion group including T Papesch and P Rawiri from the Committee and Mayor Baxter (from the Mayors’ Taskforce for Jobs).

**Item 9. Te Waka: Anga Whakamua Waikato (Waikato Moving Forward) update**

WPLC19/18

1. THAT the report ‘Te Waka: Anga Whakamua Waikato (Waikato Moving Forward) update’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be deferred.

2. THAT a written report is provided by Te Waka to the Committee in future.

**Item 10. Waikato Plan advocacy**

WPLC19/19

THAT item 10 ‘Waikato Plan advocacy’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be deferred to the next meeting due to current meeting time constraints.

**Item 11. Waikato Plan achievements**

WPLC19/20

THAT the item 11 ‘Waikato Plan achievements’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be deferred to the next meeting due to current meeting time constraints.

Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no matters for recommendation from the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Regional Council

Waikato Plan Leadership Committee

MINUTES

Date: Monday, 20 May, 2019, 10:00 am
Location: Council Chamber
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street, Hamilton East

Members Present: Dr B Gatenby - Co-Chair (Business/Community Representative)
 R Schaafhausen - Co-Chair (Waikato-Tainui)
 W Maag - Deputy Co-Chair (Maniapoto)
 Cr A Livingston (Waikato Regional Council)
 Mayor A King (Hamilton City Council)
 L Ieremia (Business/Community Representative)
 V Eparaima (Raukawa Charitable Trust)

Non-Voting Members Present: T Papesch - non-voting (Ministry of Social Development)
 P Rawiri - non-voting (Ministry of Education)
 R I’Anson – non-voting (New Zealand Transport Agency)

Others Present: V Payne (Chief Executive Waikato Regional Council)
 T May (Waikato Regional Council Director Science and Strategy)
 G Ion (Chief Executive Waikato District Council)
 P Mahood
 S McLeay (Democracy Advisor Waikato Regional Council)
1. **Call to Order and Apologies**

   The meeting was opened at 10.15am. Apologies were received from Mayor B Hanna, E Berryman-Kamp, Cr T Adams, Mayor A Sanson and D Fisher.

   **WPLC19/11**  
   Moved by: W Maag  
   Seconded by: L Ieremia

   **RESOLVED**

   THAT the apologies of Mayor B Hanna, E Berryman-Kamp, Cr T Adams, Mayor S Sanson and D Fisher be accepted.

   The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   **WPLC19/12**  
   Moved by: W Maag  
   Seconded by: Cr A Livingston

   **RESOLVED**

   THAT the agenda of the meeting as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

   The motion was put and carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

   There were no disclosures of interest.

4. **Confirmation of Minutes from the Previous Meeting**

   Minutes from the previous meeting of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee. It was noted that the minutes were placed on the agenda for information, and that as the Committee was a Committee of Council, the minutes of the meeting were confirmed by Council. One of the updates provided to the Committee as part of item 9 of the meeting of 25 March 2019, had not been recorded. A request was made that the update be provided in the minutes of this meeting as follows:

   *The outcome of the Committee's support in 2018 for the joint initiative to address drug issues and specifically methamphetamine use, was not yet known. However, the Police and Waikato DHB continued to work together with a focus on supporting drug users and prosecuting drug dealers.*
RESOLVED

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee held on Monday 25 March 2019 be received.

The motion was put and carried

5. Strategic Workshop 25 March 2019 – Next Steps

Report to summarise the Waikato Plan Joint Leadership Committee and Chief Executive Advisory Group workshop held on 25 March 2019, and provide the opportunity to discuss the next steps. The report was presented by Waikato Regional Council, Waikato Plan Business Owner (E McKenzie-Norton). The following was noted:

- The notes in Appendix A on pages 14-16 of the agenda were taken at the March workshop to record a brainstorming session. The notes were a record of the comments made by those present at the workshop. Statements recorded were not endorsed positions of the Committee, and did not present the views of the Committee. A comment made in the Attachment in regard to Waikato Regional Council’s Plan Change 1, was accepted as the perception of a workshop participant, it was not a statement of fact.

- The priorities that were agreed from the Strategic Workshop were Sustainable Development Goals project, and Climate Change. These would join the already identified priorities of Mental Health, Youth and Employment, and the Regional Housing Initiative.

- There would be a refresh of the Waikato Plan in June 2020 which would incorporate priorities commencing July 2019. The refresh of the Waikato Plan would look to abridge the existing Plan and would be re-framed to align with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. The other priorities identified at the Strategic Workshop as ‘One Region. One voice. Many stories’, ‘empowering and enabling local communities’ and working together as the ‘Waikato Region’ were already embedded in the Waikato Plan.

- In general, members expressed satisfaction with the suggested priorities.

- It was suggested that a further half day workshop would be held to flesh out the priorities. That would provide an opportunity for members to understand the interconnectedness of Plan priorities.
RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

1. THAT the report ‘Strategic Workshop 25 March 2019 – Next Steps’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.

2. THAT the priorities listed below are included in the Priority Action list for the draft refreshed Waikato Plan as either additional priorities, or part of the existing priorities:
   a. Climate change
   b. Waikato - Aspiring to sustainable development (economically, culturally, socially and environmentally).

   The motion was put and carried

6. **Waikato District Health Board Mental Health presentation**

   Report to receive a presentation from Waikato District Health Board on mental health. The report was presented by Waikato DHB Executive Director Mental Health and Addiction Services (V Aitken), Director Clinical Services (R Tapsell), Programme Manager (G O’Brien), Chair Iwi Māori Council (T Thompson-Evans) and Director Funding and Provider Relationships (P Grady). The following was noted:

   - Mental illness remained a key issue that needed to be addressed in order for the region to have healthy and vibrant communities. There was a higher incidence of mental illness including substance abuse in Māori. Māori were more likely to access services for the first time with a severe and enduring illness, and service access was a particular concern for Māori.

   - There was a large unmet need impacting on the mental wellbeing of the region, not just in the area of mental health and addiction services, but across all areas of social need. Waikato DHB wanted to engage with the wider public sector to turn the statistics around.

   - Those who presented noted that the Committee was a strong vehicle for cross-organisational collaboration. This was important given the majority of work was required outside the DHB's jurisdiction, in areas such as housing and employment.

   - Plans for change would need to be broken down into small projects focusing on communities with the greatest need first.

   - Regionally there was a lack of emergency housing and accommodation for single people with mental illness.

   - Waikato DHB’s Mental Health and Addiction Service had had a very successful stand at the last Fieldays. It would be useful to establish why the initiative had been so successful in achieving community engagement and capitalising on this going forward.
There was a need to ensure that wellbeing was a priority alongside economic development, heightening the need to connect with the Te Waka programme.

It was asked that the presentation given today be circulated to Members.

RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

1. THAT the report ‘Waikato District Health Board Mental Health presentation’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.

2. THAT the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee acknowledges that the Waikato Plan has a role in supporting regional mental health initiatives, providing an important integrating and connecting forum.

3. THAT, by the end of July 2019, as part of determining where the Waikato Plan can best support the Mental Health/Hau Ora initiative, that a Hau Ora Wellbeing Working Group is established, and that a workshop is convened to:

   a. scope potential projects for consideration for bringing back to the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee, where the projects will be focussed on making a change within a specific community; and

   b. understand more fully possible funding streams, including the existing DHB funding source that was brought to Members’ attention.

The motion was put and carried

7. Membership update of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee

Report to provide an update on membership and the process for selecting members for the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee. The report was presented by Waikato Regional Council Director Science and Strategy (T May). The following was noted:

• There was a vacancy in membership for Waikato DHB resulting from the replacement of the DHB’s Board with a Commissioner. A letter was being drafted to invite the newly appointed Commissioner to fill the vacancy.

• The DHB’s prior representative P Mahood was thanked for her valuable contribution to the Committee.

• The representative for Education, P Rawiri was welcomed.
RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

THAT the report ‘Membership update of the Waikato Plan Leadership Committee’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

8. Priority Actions update

Report to provide an update on the progress against priority actions. The report was presented by Waikato Regional Council Strategy Manager (E McKenzie-Norton) and, in relation to the Regional Housing Initiative, Principal Advisor (J Bromley); Chief Executive DV Bryant Trust (L Cumberpatch), Waikato Plan Implementation Advisor (K Tremaine) and a contracted consultant (L Brame). In regard to the Regional Housing Initiative work, the following was noted:

- The Waikato Region Housing initiative was a cross sector group working together to achieve joined up action across the region.

- There was a growing housing need in the region, this was the result, in part, of a lack of social housing. The situation was exacerbated by house pricing moving faster than wages. Māori was over-represented in the area of housing need.

- It had been established that currently there was a shortfall of 8,000 houses in the region. Very targeted actions were required, with reasonable timeframes to ensure outcomes were achieved.

- As a result of this Waikato Plan project, good baseline data was now available across sectors. Members noted that a more detailed communications plan would be useful when the report came back to the Committee for confirmation prior to release.

- A request was made that young people were included in the youth and employment project group. The member representing the Ministry of Social Development (T Papesch) could provide the name of a suitable person. There would be a full update on the Waikato Wellbeing Sustainable Development Goal at the next meeting. The DHB was the preferred sponsor to champion the Mental Health group. The Co-Chairs would act as sponsors until a DHB member was appointed so that progress could be made in the meantime.

WPLC19/17

Moved by: W Maag
Seconded by: Cr A Livingston

RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

1. THAT the report ‘Priority actions update’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be received.
2. THAT a project approach that includes both a project sponsor and champion group is utilised.

3. THAT Cr Adams is confirmed as the project sponsor for the Youth and Employment Project with a champion group including T Papesch and P Rawiri from the Committee and Mayor Baxter (from the Mayors’ Taskforce for Jobs).

The motion was put and carried

9. Te Waka: Anga Whakamua Waikato (Waikato Moving Forward) update

The Te Waka Chair was unable to attend to deliver the verbal update.

WPLC19/18
Moved by: W Maag
Seconded by: Dr B Gatenby

RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

1. THAT the report ‘Te Waka: Anga Whakamua Waikato (Waikato Moving Forward) update’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be deferred.

2. THAT a written report is provided by Te Waka to the Committee in future.

The motion was put and carried

10. Waikato Plan advocacy

Report to provide an update on advocacy associated with the Waikato Plan.

WPLC19/19
Moved by: R Schaafhausen
Seconded by: Cr A Livingston

RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

THAT item 10 ‘Waikato Plan advocacy’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be deferred to the next meeting due to current meeting time constraints.

The motion was put and carried

11. Waikato Plan achievements

Report to provide a proposed process for communicating the achievements of the Waikato Plan.
WPLC19/20

Moved by: R Schaafhausen
Seconded by: Cr A Livingston

RESOLVED (SECTION A: FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

THAT the item 11 ‘Waikato Plan achievements’ (Waikato Plan Leadership Committee 20 May 2019) be deferred to the next meeting due to current meeting time constraints.

The motion was put and carried

The meeting was closed at 1.05pm.
Report to Council

Date: 19 June 2019

Author: Anne McLeod, Section Manager – Taupō/Upper Waikato

Authoriser: Neville Williams, Director - Community and Services

Subject: Transition Principles - Clarification Sought by Waikato Regional Council

Section: A (For information)

Purpose

1. This report is to provide background information to assist council to consider the recommendations of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee (LTPPJC) arising from the committee’s extraordinary meeting held on 29 May 2019.

Executive Summary

2. The LTPPJC has considered the clarifications sought by Waikato Regional Council (WRC) and Taupo District Council (TDC) on the proposed transition principles and has confirmed that the preference for a co-governance model with the current partners – Taupo District Council, Waikato Regional Council, Tūwharetoa Maori Trust Board, and the Crown – does not preclude alternative governance arrangements in future.

3. In addition, the LTPPJC has also recommended that the proposed transition principles could be strengthened by the addition of a principle relating to periodic reviews of the governance model.

Staff Recommendation:

That the report “Transition Principles - Clarification Sought by Waikato Regional Council” (Doc #14487314 dated 19 June 2019) be received.

Background

4. The Deed of Variation to the Lake Taupō Protection Project included a clause requiring that the parties to the agreement, through the joint committee, develop a set of agreed principles for the transition of the Lake Taupō Protection Trust’s nitrogen reduction agreements. These principles were to be approved by the councils (WRC and TDC) by 30 June 2019.

5. At the respective council meetings on 30 April 2019, the WRC and TDC considered the proposed transition principles for the Lake Taupō Protection Project, recommended by the LTPPJC.

6. The councils decided to leave the recommendation to adopt the transition principles lying on the table and wrote to the LTPPJC seeking clarification that the following draft transition principle did not preclude alternative governance arrangements in the future:

---

1 The revised set of Proposed Transition Principles is provided in Attachment 2 to this report.
Proposed Principle

Preference for a co-governance model with the current partners – Taupo District Council, Waikato Regional Council, Tūwharetoa Maori Trust Board, and the Crown.

7. A copy of the letter sent by WRC and TDC to the LTPPJJC is attached to this report (refer attachment one).

8. The clarification sought was to confirm that if, at some time in future, any governance partner wishes to change their participation, or a new governance partner is identified, such changes can be accommodated.

9. WRC and TDC sought to ensure that their current obligations were satisfied, including Treaty settlement legislative obligations. Where there were overlapping areas of interest in the Taupo catchment, WRC and TDC wished to ensure that these were addressed and managed appropriately by all parties concerned to ensure effective and efficient use of resources and to avoid duplication of representation, committees and other such structures.

Response from LTPPJJC

10. The LTPPJJC held an extraordinary meeting on 29 May 2019.

11. Members confirmed that in drafting the proposed principles the LTPPJJC were deliberate in the use of the term ‘preference’ to allow changes from the listed parties if circumstances necessitated a change.

12. To provide more explicit direction in that regard, the LTPPJJC considered that it would be beneficial to add a further transition principle that required periodic reviews of the ongoing governance model for the project. On that basis the LTPPJJC recommended that the proposed transition principles be amended to include a new principle as follows (proposed addition in red underline):

Who?
- Preference for a co-governance model with the current partners – Taupō District Council, Waikato Regional Council, Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board, and the Crown.
- Periodic reviews (three yearly, or sooner if required) of the governance model to ensure flexibility, adaptiveness and effectiveness on an ongoing basis.

Conclusion

Noting the clarifications provided by the LTPPJJC and the addition of a new principle, council can adopt the amended transition principle in accordance with clause 2.1.A of the Deed of Variation to the Lake Taupō Protection Project.

Attachments

1. Letter from Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council to the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee Re: Transition Principles (Doc #14216886 dated 17 May 2019)
2. Proposed Transition Principles
Tangonui Kingi  
Chair  
Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee  
C/- Waikato Regional Council 

Tēnā koe Tangonui 

**Proposed Transition Principles**

Thank you for the work you and your committee members have undertaken to prepare the transition principles for the Lake Taupō Protection Project.

Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council received the proposed principles at their respective meetings on 30 April 2019. After deliberation the councils decided to leave the joint committee’s recommendation lying on the table and write to the committee with respect to the first principle which was:

*Preference for a co-governance model with the current partners – Taupō District Council, Waikato Regional Council, Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board, and the Crown.*

First, the councils acknowledge that much of the strength of the project is as a consequence of the effectiveness of the current partnership. This is supported by the various reviews that have been undertaken of the project and its structure.

Specifically, the councils seek clarification from the joint committee that:

i. the preference for a co-governance model with the current partners does not preclude alternative arrangements in the future.

ii. when applying the principles and recommending a future governance structure for the project, provision will be made for regular reviews of the model to ensure that it is appropriate for the needs of the catchment and takes into account any changes in local relationships.

Thank you again for the work you and your committee have achieved, not only in relation to the principles but also for the ongoing governance of the project.

Ngā mihi 

Vaughan Payne  
Chief Executive  
Waikato Regional Council 

Gareth Green  
Chief Executive  
Taupō District Council 

cc Topia Rameka, CEO, Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board
Lake Taupō Protection Project
Principles for Future Governance and Management

Who?
- Preference for a co-governance model with the current partners – Taupō District Council, Waikato Regional Council, Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board, and the Crown.
- Periodic reviews (three yearly, or sooner if required) of the governance model to ensure flexibility, adaptiveness and effectiveness on an ongoing basis.

What?
- The model adopted will provide:
  - Oversight and enhancement of all aspects of lake water quality
  - Long term protection and good management of the public investment.
  - Formal and long term oversight of the obligations and accountabilities of all parties to the project
  - An ability to build on the knowledge, experience and lessons learned from the project.

How?
- Delivery of the project will ensure:
  - The continuation of the independent, commercial management of the nitrogen reduction agreements.
  - Strong, ongoing connection with the community and landowners in the Taupō Waters catchment.
  - Continuation of methods that promote innovation.
# Decision of Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee

Meeting date: 29 May 2019

## Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4 – Transition Principles – Clarification sought by Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LTJC19/16**

1. That the report “Transition Principles – Clarification sought by Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council” (Doc#14297698 dated 17 May 2019) be received.

2. That the letter to the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee from Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council (Doc # 14216886 dated 17 May 2019) titled the Proposed Transition Principles be received.

3. That the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee confirm for Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council that the draft transition principles do not preclude other entities’ participation as a result of any future review of the project partnership membership.

## Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4 – Transition Principles – Clarification sought by Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LTJC19/16**

4. That the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee recommend to the councils that the proposed transition principles be amended to include a new principle as follows:

   a. Periodic reviews (three yearly, or sooner if required) of the governance model to ensure flexibility, adaptiveness and effectiveness on an ongoing basis.
Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee

Extraordinary Meeting

OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, 29 May, 2019, 10:30 am
Location: Council Chambers
Taupō District Council Offices
107 Heuheu Street
TAUPŌ

Members Present: T Kingi - Chair (Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board)
Cr K White (Waikato Regional Council)
Cr R Jollands (Taupō District Council)
Cr J Williamson (Taupō District Council)
M Nepia (Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board)
L-K Petersen (Crown Representative - Ministry for Primary Industries) – via telephone

Ministry of the Environment Staff
T Bennetts (Principal Analyst) – via telephone

Waikato Regional Staff:
N Williams (Director – Community and Services)
A McLeod (Manager – Upper Waikato/Taupō)

Lake Taupō Protection Trust:
C Stent (Trustee)
M Peck (Manager)

Taupō District Council Staff:
D Tahau (Head of Community, Culture and Heritage) – via telephone
T Wood (Policy Advisor)
S James (Democratic Services Advisor)

Chair Kingi opened the meeting with a karakia and welcomed all present at the meeting and the three individuals joining the meeting via telephone.

1. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from members Cr K Hodge, and M Workman and T Rameka, CEO of the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board.

**LTJC19/15**

**Moved by:** Cr R Jollands
**Seconded by:** Cr K White
RESOLVED

THAT the apologies of members Cr K Hodge (Waikato Regional Council) and M Workman (Crown Representative - Ministry for the Environment) and T Rameka (Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board) be received.

The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

Members confirmed the agenda of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee as the business for the meeting.

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

There were no disclosures of interest noted.

4. **Transition Principles - Clarification Sought by Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council**

The report from the Officials Working Party to assist the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee (LTTPJC) respond to Waikato Regional Council (WRC) and Taupō District Council's (TDC) letter requesting clarification of one of the transition principles proposed by the Joint Committee was taken as read.

The Manager – Upper Waikato / Taupō (A McLeod) summarised the report and outlined the four recommendations. In answer to a question she confirmed that the proposed provision for reviews sooner than three yearly was a ‘catch all’.

In supporting the recommendations, members agreed that early and open conversations between the parties would support effective and efficient decision-making going forward, particularly in light of the changes ahead for both iwi and the councils.

LTJC19/16

*Moved by:* Cr R Jollands  
*Seconded by:* Cr K White

**RESOLVED (SECTION A):**

1. That the report “Transition Principles - Clarification Sought by Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council” (Doc #14297698 dated 17 May 2019) be received.

2. That the letter to the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee from Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council (Doc #14216886 dated 17 May 2019) titled the Proposed Transition Principles be received.

3. That the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee confirm for Waikato Regional Council and Taupō District Council that the draft transition principles do not preclude other entities’ participation as a result of any future review of the project partnership membership.
4. That the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee recommend to the councils that the proposed transition principles be amended to include a new principle as follows:

   o Periodic reviews (three yearly, or sooner if required) of the governance model to ensure flexibility, adaptiveness and effectiveness on an ongoing basis.

The motion was put and carried.

The meeting closed at 10.54am.
## Decision of Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee

Meeting date: 7 June 2019

### Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting – 15 March 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the minutes of the previous meeting of the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee dated 15 March 2019 be received and accepted as a true and accurate record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item 6 – Hamilton Public Transport Update</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee endorse the implementation of phase 1 of the Targeted Mode Shift/Youth Concession approach as discussed at its meeting on 7 June 2019, being to enable free concession for youth (yet to be defined) over a one year trial period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the report Hamilton Public Transport Update (Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee 7 June 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Regional Council
Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee

OPEN MINUTES

Date: Friday, 7 June, 2019, 10:08 am
Location: Council Chamber
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street, Hamilton East

Members Present: Cr R Rimmington - Chair (Waikato Regional Council)
Cr D Macpherson - Deputy Chair (Waikato Regional Council)
Cr J Hennebry (Waikato Regional Council)
Cr L Tooman (Hamilton City Council)
Cr G Webber (Waipa District Council)
Cr D Fulton (Waikato District Council)
M Flynn (Access and Mobility Representative)

Staff Present: J Becker (Chief Financial Officer)
L Van Veen (Democracy Advisor)
1. **Terms of Reference**

2. **Apologies**

   Apologies for lateness were received from Cr D Macpherson.

   **HPTJC19/06**
   **Moved by:** Cr R Rimmington
   **Seconded by:** Cr J Hennebry

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A):**

   THAT the apologies of Cr D Macpherson (Hamilton City Council) for lateness be accepted.

   The motion was put and carried

3. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   Members agreed to confirm the agenda.

   Cr D Macpherson arrived at 10.15am.

   **HPTJC19/07**
   **Moved by:** Cr L Tooman
   **Seconded by:** Cr J Hennebry

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A):**

   THAT the agenda of the meeting of the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee of 7 June 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

   The motion was put and carried

4. **Disclosures of Interest**

   There were no disclosures of interest.

5. **Minutes of Previous Meeting - 15 March 2019**

   The minutes from the meeting of the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee dated 15 March 2019 to be received and taken as a true and accurate record.

   It was also noted that the reference to "Go Bus drivers" within the "patronage update" section of the previous meeting agenda was incorrect. This reference should have been noted as "industrial action".

   **HPTJC19/08**
   **Moved by:** Cr L Tooman
   **Seconded by:** Cr J Hennebry

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A):**

   THAT the minutes of the previous meeting of the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee dated 15 March 2019 be received and accepted as a true and accurate record.
6. Hamilton Public Transport Update

Report to provide the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee with information on matters relevant to the implementation and monitoring of the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28.

The Manager Public Transport (A Wilson) presented the report and presentation doc# 14432231.

With respect to the "Implementation Priorities" update, the following points were noted:

- Confirmation of funding from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to support a number of the priority initiatives was still outstanding. Staff advised that this was an issue nationally.
- A member highlighted the importance of the trial ride-share service for newly developed suburbs. It was noted that the layout of these suburbs made bus access difficult and that the trial ride-share would be a good solution. There was concern that a delay in implementing this initiative would result in a lower uptake of public transport options by those residing in these areas. Staff advised that delay was due to the NZTA national funding issue and undertook to submit a joint letter from Waikato Regional Council and Hamilton City Council.

With respect to the "New Electronic Ticketing System" update, the following points were noted:

- In response to a member’s concern regarding the delay in go-live timeframes, staff assured the committee that the system was of the highest quality and that delays had resulted from the logistics of amalgamation across eight different councils. Staff confirmed that they were confident that the new system would provide the desired functionality across all users once testing had been completed, but that further testing was needed to ensure a successful rollout.
- Staff highlighted the effects of the delay of the new ticketing system on the planned disestablishment of the CBD shuttle and also the implementation of the $1 CBD fare zone, which had been planned to coincide with the original go-live date of the new ticketing system. Staff proposed new options for roll out of these initiatives. Members requested that a decision on the way forward be delayed until the next committee meeting, when staff would be able to provide more clarity to members on the go live date of the new ticketing system.
- In response to a member’s query about whether budgets could accommodate the delays, staff assured members that this was not an issue.

With respect to the "Employment Relations Act Changes" update, the following points were noted:

- Members agreed that the changes to the Employment Relations Act (the Act) were necessary but raised concern regarding the ability to fund the required actions, particularly in light of the lack of funding clarity from NZTA. Members highlighted that peak services should not be cut to accommodate funding constraints and that the new living wage needed to be taken into account. Staff undertook to circulate the central
government Memorandum of Understanding which set out expectations regarding the outcomes that needed to be achieved over the transitional period to May 2020.

- A member advised that the Rotokauri transport hub had been finalised by Hamilton City Council with a targeted completion date of May/June 2020 and that it would include a rest area for bus drivers. It was noted that the rest facilities at the hub would greatly assist with the scheduling of rest and meal breaks for bus drivers. Staff undertook to review the programme and provide an update to members at the next committee meeting.

With respect to the "Patronage Update", the following points were noted:

- A member requested more data which illustrated the trend over time for the uptake of bus services. Staff undertook to provide this at the next committee meeting.
- In response to a member’s question regarding whether increased April/May usage was the result of the new Comet service being launched, staff advised that, while the Comet was a contributor, this was not the sole driver for patronage increases.
- Staff advised that they were confident that the Huntly service changes implemented between January to May would resolve identified issues and that patronage numbers would rise going forward as a result.

With respect to the "NZTA Targeted Enhanced Funding Assistance Rates" update, the following points were noted:

- Staff advised that NZTA had signalled there would be no Targeted Enhanced Funding Assistance Rates (TEFAR) made available for public transport activities and also for improvement activities not already approved. Staff provided members with a list of projects which relied on NZTA funding, and the current status of these.
- Members expressed concern that lack of funding from NZTA to support city service extensions and reliability improvements posed a huge risk to patronage growth. It was noted that campaigning for lost funding needed to be carried out to raise awareness of the long term adverse effects.
- Staff advised that the Waipa Service Review Business Case was well advanced.
- Members queried whether Waipa services could include the airport. Staff noted that this could be accommodated, however it would involve trade-offs.
- Staff advised that NZTA were taking action to resolve the omission of the Mass Transit Plan (the Plan) from their list of priority projects for funding. Due to the critical importance of the project for long term planning, action to progress the project would be undertaken irrespective of provision from NZTA for funding. The reporting line for monitoring progress of the Plan was yet to be determined. Reporting through Future Proof was being considered.
- Membership of NZTA on the committee was discussed in light of recent staff changes. Staff undertook to contact NZTA to determine appropriate membership and attendance at committee meetings.

With respect to the "Draft Service Change Programme" update, the following points were noted:

- Staff presented on the indicative draft service change programme and advised that it needed re-prioritising. As the list was made up of Hamilton related initiatives, a member undertook to take this to the upcoming Access Hamilton Task Force meeting for
discussion and re-prioritizing. Connection between Waipa urban areas and Hamilton would also be included in these conversations.

With respect to the "Comet" update, the following points were noted:

- In response to a member’s request for data illustrating where patronage uptake of the Comet service was occurring, staff confirmed that this information was available and undertook to provide this to the committee.
- Members were impressed with the rapid patronage uptake of the service and suggested that services like this be extended across the city, including connection with the airport.
- Staff highlighted the continued increase in patronage uptake of the Orbiter service and signalled that improvements to this service should be considered going forward to ensure continued growth.
- Staff advised that work to investigate implementation of the east-west cross city route had begun and that this may be incorporated into the ERA changes.
- Members raised concern regarding the ability to maintain and enhance services in light of NZTA funding challenges, particularly given the reliance on these funds to deliver on planned initiatives.

With respect to the "CBD Fare Zone" update, the following points were noted:

- A member advised that improved communications regarding the comet service within the hospital area were needed, however this should be held off and worked into the CBD Fare Zone communications, in line with the roll out of the new ticketing system.

With respect to the "Fare Changes" update, the following points were noted:

- Staff highlighted that the zone based fare calculations under the new fare system would result in some fares increasing, whilst some will decrease, due to charges being based on the number of zones travelled as opposed to distance. Fare changes to satellite areas would not occur until the new ticketing system had been fully implemented.

With respect to the "Targeted Mode Shift/Youth Concession" update, the following points were noted:

- Staff highlighted potential for the youth concession to reduce school traffic significantly, however further testing was needed to confirm this.
- With lack of clarity from NZTA on access to TEFAR funding, it was noted that an alternative funding approach for implementation of the youth concession was needed. Staff recommended a phased implementation approach.
- In response to a member’s query regarding how “policing” of concession cards occurred at present, staff advised that fare inspectors carried out this work and that there were no major historical breaches of use.
- Staff had provided data for roll out of the youth concession within Hamilton only but assured members that they could provide data for implementation out to satellite areas if requested.
- Members discussed the criteria for "youth". It was noted that this would differ from that applied to "child" concessions.
Members agreed that a phased approach was the best option for implementation of the youth concession initiative, and committed to taking the recommendation back to Hamilton City Council for endorsement, highlighting that transfer of budget would be needed in support. Waikato Regional Council staff assured members that a transfer of funds within its budgets would not be an issue and did not require full council approval. Phase 1 of the approach involved a free concession for youth over a one year trial period. Free travel could be undertaken on weekends only. The data from this trial could then be used to support the business case to further implement the youth concession initiative.

Pending approval of the required budget transfer by Hamilton City Council, staff undertook to progress the implementation of the weekend concession by 1 July 2019. Staff confirmed that as a minimum persons 15 and under would eligible and were aiming to enable free travel for youth (people 18 an under) from the outset but this was dependant on technical capabilities of the current ticketing system.

HPTJC19/09

Moved by: Cr R Rimmington
Seconded by: Cr J Hennebry

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

THAT the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee endorse the implementation of phase 1 of the Targeted Mode Shift/Youth Concession approach as discussed at its meeting on 7 June 2019, being to enable free concession for youth (yet to be defined) over a one year trial period.

The motion was put and carried

With respect to the "Disability Concession" update, the following points were noted:

- The disability concession is to be rolled out with the new ticketing system which was now due for release in late October.
- Members discussed implementation of the concession ahead of the go live date for the new ticketing system. It was noted that there would be a loss of revenue should this occur and that it would need to satisfy auditing standards with respect to qualifying passengers.
- A member raised concern that a delay in the implementation of the concession would breach the original commitment to the disability community and that action should be taken to attempt to meet this commitment. Staff undertook to investigate implementing earlier than the ticketing system roll out through use of alternative methods. They also committed to provide their findings to members to the Access Hamilton taskforce for consideration.
- In response to a member’s question regarding whether the new ticketing system will enable diagnostics of where the disability concession was being used, staff advised it would.
- Staff advised that a training programme for those who would qualify for the concession and also for bus drivers would be implemented as part of the concession roll out. It was emphasized that bus drivers were not expected to "police" the use of concession cards and that their training would be focused more on bus access matters.
- In response to a member’s query regarding how many people would be eligible for the concession within the region, staff advised that this would include approximately 3,000 currently eligible under the total mobility scheme plus those who could now qualify under
the extended criteria. Staff undertook to circulate the disability concession criteria to committee members.

With respect to the "City Public Transport Infrastructure" update, the following points were noted:

- Staff provided a summary of the matters outlined with the agenda package.

With respect to the "District Services" update, the following points were noted:

- Staff provided a summary of the matters outlined with the agenda package.
- A member noted appetite for utilisation of rail for connecting between Hamilton and surrounding towns; including Morrinsville, Huntly and Te Awamutu. Staff advised that the Metro Spatial Plan made note of this and it was tagged for further investigation and work.

HPTJC19/10
Moved by: Cr R Rimmington
Seconded by: Cr J Hennebry

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

THAT the report Hamilton Public Transport Update (Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee 7 June 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

Meeting closed at 12.30pm

_________________________
Chair
## Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5 – Confirmation of Minutes</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THAT the Minutes of the Integrated Catchment Management Meeting of 10 April 2019 be approved as a true and correct record noting the correction to the Committee name (Central Waikato) within resolution ICM19/41.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 6 - Issues/Actions from Integrated Catchment Management Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THAT the report 'Issues/Actions from Integrated Catchment Management Meetings' (Doc #13573283 dated 30 May 2019) be received for information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 7 - Integrated Catchment Management Groups of Activities Financial Status Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THAT the report 'Integrated Catchment Management Groups of Activities Financial Status Report' (dated 27 May 2019) be received for information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 8 - Flood campaign update</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THAT the report 'Flood Campaign update' (dated 30 May 2019) be received for information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 9 – Update on Regional Infrastructure Fish Passage Strategy - &quot;Pathways to the Sea&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THAT the report 'Update on Regional Infrastructure Fish Passage Strategy - “Pathways to the Sea”’ (dated 29 May 2019) be received for information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 11.1 – Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee 12 April 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the minutes of the Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee held on 12 April 2019 be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the minutes be noted; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 11.2 Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee 10 May 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the minutes of the Aka Aka Otaua Land Drainage Subcommittee held on 10 May 2019 be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the minutes be noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11.3 Lake Taupo Catchment Committee 10 May 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the minutes of the Lake Taupo Catchment Committee held on 10 May 2019 be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Item 11.4 Central Waikato Catchment Committee 10 May 2019 |
| ICM19/58 |
| 1. THAT the minutes of the Central Waikato Catchment Committee held on 10 May 2019 be received; |
| 2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted; |

| Item 11.5 West Coast Catchment Committee 23 May 2019 |
| ICM19/59 |
| 1. THAT the minutes of the West Coast Catchment Committee held on 23 May 2019 be received; and |
| 2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted. |

| Item 11.6 Upper Waikato Catchment Committee 24 May 2019 |
| ICM19/62 |
| 1. THAT the minutes of the Upper Waikato Catchment Committee held on 24 May 2019 be received; and |
| 2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the minutes be noted; and |

| Item 11.7 Lower Waikato Catchment Committee 29 May 2019 |
| ICM19/64 |
| 1. THAT the following recommendations shall ‘lie on the table’ until the new triennium when the incoming Council considers its governance/Committee structure and associated Terms of Reference. |
| (i) THAT to better manage the Committee workload and information flow, the meeting frequency for the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee be changed to two-monthly. |
| (ii) THAT a Subcommittee of the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee be established to investigate the options for, and processes required to achieve the eradication of Koi carp. |
| (iii) THAT a multi stakeholder Whangamarino and Waikare catchments Working Group be established to co-ordinate and work through all the issues and develop the Action Plan required following the completion and adoption of the Catchment Management Plan. |

| ICM19/65 |
| 1. THAT The minutes of the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee held on 29 May 2019 be received; and |
| 2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted. |

| Item 10. Koi carp herpes virus update |

That the report ‘Koi carp herpes virus update’ (Integrated Catchment Management Committee 11 June 2019) be received and that D Speirs, Department of Conservation, Director Operations, Hauraki-Waikato-Taranaki region be thanked for his verbal update.

Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 11.1 – Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee 12 April 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the following recommendation contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Matters Arising From Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT Messrs Powell and Toohey be requested to ascertain the reasons why the berm and buffer bank of the Holmes canal cannot be maintained to a reasonable and safe standard for report to a future meeting of the Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 11.3 Lake Taupo Catchment Committee 10 May 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14: Taupo - Zone Status Report to 31 March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT the Tauranga Taupo budget is allocated a further $65,000 from operational reserves to address maintenance requirements around the Kiko and Maniapoto Bend spillways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 11.4 Central Waikato Catchment Committee 10 May 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM19/58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Central Waikato Zone Status Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT the draft reserve fund policy to be presented at the August 2019 meeting considers both the Drainage Committee and Catchment Committee’s current policies and practices to ensure consistency, where relevant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Te Awa O Katapaki Stream Erosion Remediation Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee endorse the payment of $99,500 from the funds reserve for the scoping and design work associated with the Te Awa O Katapaki Erosion Remediation project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee endorse, in principle, the portion of $432,564 from the Central Zone Reserves fund noting that this will be confirmed subject to the:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 2019/20 annual plan discussions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doc # 12741356
(b) Confirmation that the design meets the aspect requirements for the whole catchment; and
(c) The Central Waikato Zone operational reserve policy.

**Item 11: Hamilton Halo Project Phase 2**
(i) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee supports this presentation being published on the Council’s website.
(ii) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee requests that the information on the five trees that the birds feed on be published on the Council’s website.

**Item 11.5 West Coast Catchment Committee 23 May 2019**

**ICM19/60**

1. THAT Council advocate to the Minister of Biosecurity that the National Pest Pet Trade Accord is progressed as a matter of urgency and that the Red Eared Slider Turtle be included as a priority for risk assessment and subsequent ban from sale.

**ICM19/61**

2. THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:

   **Item 6: Issues and Actions Report May 2019**
   THAT the work and consultative process to review whitebait management, currently being undertaken by the Department of Conservation with the aims:
   (i) to have healthy whitebait populations;
   (ii) to restore whitebait habitat in all areas with declining populations; and
   (iii) to have a long-term sustainable whitebait fishery;
   be supported and promoted by Waikato Regional Council.

**Item 11.7 Lower Waikato Catchment Committee 29 May 2019**

**ICM19/63**

- THAT all future meetings of the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee commence at 9.30am.

**Item 10. Koi carp herpes virus update**

**ICM19/67**

1. That a joint communication paper be prepared and released by the Department of Conservation and Waikato Regional Council to let affected communities and the wider public know what is happening, what steps are being taken to progress the koi carp problem and who are the ‘go to’ contact people for further information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Tuesday, 11 June 2019, 10:05am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401 Grey Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Present:**
- Cr S Husband - Joint-Chair Integrated Catchment Management Committee North
- Cr S Kneebone - Joint-Chair Integrated Catchment Management Committee South
- Cr D Minogue (Waikato Regional Council)
- Cr K Hodge (Waikato Regional Council)
- Cr A Livingston - ex-officio (Waikato Regional Council)
- S Strang (Chair - Upper Waikato Catchment Committee)
- K Holmes (Chair - Lower Waikato Catchment Committee)
- W Maag (Chair - West Coast Catchments Committee)
- R Barton (Chair - Waipa Catchment Committee)
- C Buchanan (Deputy Chair - Waihou-Piako Catchment Committee)
- J Sanford (Chair - Coromandel Catchment Committee)

**Staff Present:**
- C Crickett (Director Integrated Catchment Management)
- G Ryan (Manager Business and Technical Services)
- P Whaley (Manager Integrated Catchment Services)
- A Munro (Manager Hauraki/Coromandel Catchments)
- A McLeod (Manager Lake Taupo/Upper Waikato Catchments)
- B Toohey (Manager Lower Waikato/Waipa/West Coast Catchments)
- M Poole (Democracy Advisor)
- L Van Veen (Democracy Advisor)
1. Terms of Reference

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cr F Lichtwark (on leave of absence) and Cr J Hayman, Cr K White, S Yerex (Chair - Lake Taupo Catchment Committee), N Haines (Deputy Chair - Lake Taupo Catchment Committee), M Moana-Tuwhangai (Chair - Central Waikato Catchment Committee), B Hicks (Deputy Chair - Central Waikato Catchment Committee) and R Hicks (Chair - Waihou-Piako Catchment Committee) for absence.

ICM19/48

Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr A Livingston

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

THAT the apologies of Cr F Lichtwark, Cr J Hayman, Cr K White, S Yerex, N Haines, M Moana-Tuwhangai, B Hicks and R Hicks be accepted.

The motion was put and carried

3. Confirmation of Agenda

Members approved the agenda as circulated. The Chair noted that with respect to Item 10 - Koi carp herpes virus update, David Speirs, Director Operations, Hauraki-Waikato-Taranaki region, Department of Conservation will be available to attend the meeting at 12 noon to provide an update to the Committee.

ICM19/49

Moved by: Cr A Livingston
Seconded by: Cr K Hodge

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

THAT the agenda for the meeting of the 11 June 2019 Integrated Catchment Management Committee, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

The motion was put and carried

4. Disclosures of Interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

5. Confirmation of Minutes

Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting (Item 5.1)

Minutes of the previous Integrated Catchment Management Committee (ICMC) meeting held on 10 April 2019; and Extract from the Council meeting held on 30 April 2019.

The minutes were accepted with a correction to the Committee name in Item 12.12, Resolution No. 1 to read Central Waikato Catchment Committee.
Moved by: Cr S Husband
Seconded by: Cr K Hodge

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
THAT the Minutes of the Integrated Catchment Management Meeting of 10 April 2019 be approved as a true and correct record noting the correction to the Committee name (Central Waikato) within resolution ICM19/41.

The motion was put and carried

6. Issues/Actions from Integrated Catchment Management Meetings

The Director, Integrated Catchment Management (C Crickett) presented the Issues and Actions update report and requested that it be taken as read.

During questions, responses and related discussion the following was noted:
- while the meeting was held on 13 May (as requested) regarding the consent condition review regulatory process, further meetings are likely. Given this it was queried why the status is shown as ‘completed’. Advised that the ‘matters arising’ specific action requested has been undertaken/completed. Acknowledged that discussions on the issues involved may be ongoing.
- while the dam safety findings have been reported to the relevant Catchment Committees, further discussions are required about the costs associated with the works identified and the ability to pay. Given this it was queried why the status is shown as ‘completed’. As noted for the previous query, the ‘matters arising’ specific action requested has been undertaken/completed.
- Director undertook to review the colours/ coding to provide greater clarity
- the Lower Waikato dam safety findings/costs reported ($280,000) cover works required to operate and maintain those assets. Acknowledged that further reporting and discussions regarding further capital investment will be needed via the relevant Catchment Committees including information on cost benefit analyses which would be reported through to ICMC. No works will be undertaken without budget allocation/agreement. This is a work programme with its status shown as “in progress” and the cost/works implications will report into the next Long Term Plan process.
- The meeting planned for 10 June 2019 between Council and Resource Directorate/Integrated Catchment Management staff and the Mill company regarding the Mill Drainage discharges was cancelled, with no further update/s available at this time. The agenda papers were circulated before the meeting cancellation was known, so the action will be amended from ‘completed’ to ‘in progress’/ongoing.

Moved by: Cr D Minogue
Seconded by: Cr K Hodge

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
THAT the report 'Issues/Actions from Integrated Catchment Management Meetings' (Doc #13573283 dated 30 May 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

7. **Integrated Catchment Management Groups of Activities Financial Status Report**

Presented by the Manager Business and Technical Services (G Ryan) to report on the financial status of programmes and activities that fall within the scope of the Committee for the 2018/2019 financial year to 30 April 2019.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:

- in general, the year to date variances outlined on the graph (*page 39*) relate to phasing of expenditure over the financial year, with the following Zone specific variances:
  - Waipa Zone: favourable variance primarily due to the transfer of a portion of budget and associated expenditure from operational to capital
  - Lower Waikato Zone: main channel works expected to be ten percent underspent at year end, noting that a number of projects and activities are programmed for the May/June 2019 period.
  - Coromandel Zone: unfavourable due to decisions taken to draw down operational reserve (in surplus) to accelerate some work programme activities within this zone.
  - Waihou-Piako: operational unfavourable and capital favourable due to the transfer of costs associated with the Pauls Wharf Floodgate from capital to operational.

- biosecurity activities, currently shown as ‘unfavourable is due to a phasing variance between works being completed and then invoiced to and payment received from Ministry of Primary Industries.

- Important to have financial information available as soon as practicable following the month/period end to support prompt and informed decision-making where needed to optimise work programme activity expenditure within overall Zone funds.

- acknowledged that it is a challenge to align the accounting and financial reporting cycles/timeframes with the Catchment Zone Committees/Integrated Catchment Management Committee/Council meeting timing/frequency; and the need to consider external members’ and Councillors’ availability; and where possible avoid other conflicting commitments that are within Council’s control. Advised that these issues/considerations will be passed on to Democracy Services to ‘factor in’ when preparing the next governance meeting schedule for the new Council for the period November 2019 to December 2020.

- it has been a “productive year” for the capital (renewal of existing assets) work programme; together with three new flood protection asset projects Pungaraehu Canal erosion protection (Lower Waikato), Muggeridges Pump Station (Piako) and Kirikiri Stream bridge upgrade (Waihou), plus unplanned but essential works in Waihou-Piako to replace two pumps.

**ICM19/52**

**Moved by:** K Holmes  
**Seconded by:** Cr S Kneebone

**RESOLVED (SECTION A):**
THAT the report 'Integrated Catchment Management Groups of Activities Financial Status Report' (dated 27 May 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

8. **Flood campaign update**

The Manager Business and Technical Services (G Ryan) provided an update on the “Come High Water” flood campaign, noting that the campaign was launched late April and culminates at Fieldays 2019 with an interactive flood protection display and staff available to answer questions/provide information. There has been good public engagement (over 45,000 people across the region via social media), and positive feedback received.

Arising out of questions and responses the following points were noted:
- that the campaign has coincided with a very long dry period of weather.
- the value of having billboards in strategic locations had previously been discussed, has this been actioned or is it part of the ‘next steps’? Staff undertook to follow-up

The Senior Regional Hazards Advisor (R Leifting) provided an overview with supporting PowerPoint presentation of the Hazards Portal, what it looks like and what data/information it contains, noting that this tool is relevant to the flood campaign and will be ‘on display’ as part of the Council Fieldays site. Using the tabs and ‘drilling down’ into the layers of data the information is portrayed on maps (zoom in/out). Hazard risk examples presented included river flooding/land susceptible to flooding (Meremere and Thames), tsunami (Whitianga), and coastal inundation (Mokau and Kaiaua). The data comes from a range of sources including Council, territorial authorities and some national data. Work is underway at present to obtain feedback from stakeholders on the portal and finalise it to go public by the end of June 2019.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion, the following points were noted:
- Cr D Minogue requested clarification on Council’s policy on seawalls. He referred to a consent for a rock wall/groyne at Flaxmill Bay (Thames Coromandel District Council area). The request sits within the portfolio/scope of Strategy & Policy and Integrated Catchment Management staff will refer the matter to that Directorate/Committee for a response.
- staff have been working with Thames Coromandel District Council for some time on a range of coastal flooding and/or protection related issues. In general terms asset protection is the responsibility of the asset owner; a private asset equals private responsibility. In the Kaiaua area Hauraki District Council is working with that community on the response to sea level flood risk and the Council Regional Coastal Plan is also relevant. At present specific requests/situations are dealt with on a case by case basis.
- requested that the Catchment Committees be included as ‘target audiences’ for the hazard portal and that they be provided with the link as soon as it ‘goes live’. Staff agreed to undertake this action.
RESOLVED (SECTION A):
THAT the report 'Flood Campaign update' (dated 30 May 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

9. Update on Regional Infrastructure Fish Passage Strategy - "Pathways to the Sea"

The Principal Advisor Integrated Catchment Management (K Neilson) provided an overview of the project plan for the Regional Infrastructure Fish Passage Strategy (RIFPS - Pathways to the Sea) and an update on progress to date, noting that:
- as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, Council resolved to fund the Fish Passage business case to the level of 50 percent of the three year cost from Council’s Investment Fund (up to $750,000), to be matched by co-funding partners.
- to date more than $650,000 has been secured from co-funding partners including five (5) other local authorities.
- the drivers for the development of the strategy (by December 2021) are to meet current and likely future legislative obligations and policy directives to provide safe passage for native fish.
- the project to develop the Strategy has been broken into six work streams, as set out in the precirculated report (pages 47/48, clause 9). The work programme is underway, and staff will provide updates at milestone progress points.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:
- work stream No. 4 – Research and Development includes work being undertaken in partnership with the Waikato-Tainui College.
- support the objective of having fish friendly pumps, however if this is already in the Resource Management Act why has it not already been progressed/done; and concerns as to who will bear the costs of any works/upgrades identified as being required to flood and drainage infrastructure?
- clarification is being sought in relation to permitted activity status around fish passage requirements in the Regional Plan.
- the Conservation Act review includes a focus on fish passage and there are also relevant fishery regulations.
- concern expressed that the costs involved are making farming in affected areas unaffordable, it is critical to get national funding/support and to take a long-term approach. Sourcing funds to cover the costs that arise is not just a Council issue, there needs to be a national approach and discussion between all Regional Councils to look at options, innovations and solutions.
- Council approved the initial funding for this project from the Investment Fund. Council will need to consider if the current funding policy is fit for purpose when considering the source(s) for any additional funding contributions through the next Long Term Plan process.
- with respect to work stream No.’s 3 and 4, the Lower Waikato and Waihou-Piako Zones can provide considerable knowledge, practical experience and history regarding the use of pumping infrastructure. Pumps from overseas do not necessarily operate to suit New Zealand specific conditions. Knowledge has been built over many years about what
actually works and/or what modifications and improvements have had to be made. Need
to engage with people with the ‘on the ground’ knowledge and experience and local iwi.
- need to ensure that providing native fish passage does not also provide passage for pest
fish species e.g. koi carp. Clarified that the project is scoped to address downstream fish
passage, currently impeded by council’s infrastructure.
- cost benefit analyses will be a part of the Research and Development modifications and
new innovations work streams. Also need to consider the infrastructure efficiency and
cost effectiveness factors.
- the work stream No. 2 stakeholder engagement and communications needs to involve
genuine consultation and wide engagement. Need to specify that Catchment Committees
are key stakeholders and include ratepayers who pay targeted flood protection rates.

ICM19/54

Moved by: W Maag
Seconded by: C Buchanan

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
THAT the report ‘Update on Regional Infrastructure Fish Passage Strategy - “Pathways to
the Sea”’ (dated 29 May 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

The Committee agreed to change the order of items to consider Agenda Item 11 - Catchment
Committee Meetings before Agenda Item 10 - Koi carp herpes virus update, noting the Chair’s advice
in Confirmation of Agenda that David Speirs (DoC) is unable to attend the meeting until 12 noon.

11. Catchment Committee Meetings

11.1 Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee 12 April 2019

The minutes of the Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee meeting of 12
April 2019 were taken as read.

ICM19/55

Moved by: Cr S Husband
Seconded by: K Holmes

RESOLVED (SECTION A):  
1. THAT the minutes of the Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee held on 12
April 2019 be received; and
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the minutes be noted; and

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):
3. THAT the following recommendation contained in Section B of the minutes be
endorsed:
   Item 4: Matters Arising From Minutes
THAT Messrs Powell and Toohey be requested to ascertain the reasons why the berm and buffer bank of the Holmes canal cannot be maintained to a reasonable and safe standard for report to a future meeting of the Committee.

The motion was put and carried

11.2 Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee 10 May 2019

The minutes of Aka Aka Otaua Drainage Advisory Subcommittee meeting of 10 May 2019 were taken as read.

ICM19/56

Moved by: Cr S Husband
Seconded by: K Holmes

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
1. THAT the minutes of the Aka Aka Otaua Land Drainage Subcommittee held on 10 May 2019 be received; and
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the minutes be noted.

The motion was put and carried

11.3 Lake Taupo Catchment Committee 10 May 2019

The minutes of Lake Taupo Catchment Committee meeting of 10 May 2019 were taken as read.

ICM19/57

Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr S Husband

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
1. THAT the minutes of the Lake Taupo Catchment Committee held on 10 May 2019 be received; and
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted; and

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):
3. THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:

Item 14: Taupo - Zone Status Report to 31 March 2019
 THAT the Tauranga Taupo budget is allocated a further $65,000 from operational reserves to address maintenance requirements around the Kiko and Maniapoto Bend spillways.

The motion was put and carried

11.4 Central Waikato Catchment Committee 10 May 2019

The minutes of Central Waikato Catchment Committee meeting of 10 May 2019 were taken as read.
ICM19/58

Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr S Husband

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
1. THAT the minutes of the Central Waikato Catchment Committee held on 10 May 2019 be received;
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted; and

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):
3. THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:
   
   Item 8: Central Waikato Zone Status Report
   THAT the draft reserve fund policy to be presented at the August 2019 meeting considers both the Drainage Committee and Catchment Committee’s current policies and practices to ensure consistency, where relevant.

   Item 10: Te Awa O Katapaki Stream Erosion Remediation Project
   (i) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee endorse the payment of $99,500 from the funds reserve for the scoping and design work associated with the Te Awa O Katapaki Erosion Remediation project.
   (ii) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee endorse, in principle, the portion of $432,564 from the Central Zone Reserves fund noting that this will be confirmed subject to the:
       (a) 2019/20 annual plan discussions;
       (b) Confirmation that the design meets the aspect requirements for the whole catchment; and
       (c) The Central Waikato Zone operational reserve policy.

   Item 11: Hamilton Halo Project Phase 2
   (i) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee supports this presentation being published on the Council’s website.
   (ii) THAT the Central Waikato Catchment Committee requests that the information on the five trees that the birds feed on be published on the Council’s website.

The motion was put and carried
11.5 West Coast Catchment Committee 23 May 2019

W Maag spoke to the minutes of West Coast Catchment Committee meeting of 23 May 2019 and highlighted the following issues with recommendations to Integrated Catchment Management Committee/Council for action:

- the pest status of the Red Eared Slider Turtle; and
- the reduction in the number of whitebait, with more information needed from the Department of Conservation.

In response and arising out of discussion it was noted that:

- with respect to the Red Eared Slider Turtle, the proposed recommendation is unlikely to achieve the outcome sought as a regional action will not stop sales and distribution elsewhere, and associated mobility across boundaries. Advised that a better approach would be to raise the issue of the expected Red Eared Slider Turtle pest species risks with the Ministry for Primary Industries to progress matters via the National Pest Pet Trade Accord at a national level with the pet trade industry. Proposed that the recommendation be amended to report and advocate this issue to the Minister of Biosecurity for action. Council can also review the pest status of this species in the next review of the Regional Pest Management Plan.

- Requested that the information provided as part of the Regional Pest Management Plan Annual Report on the Red Eared Slider Turtle be circulated to all Catchment Committee members.

ICM19/59

Moved by: W Maag
Seconded by: J Sanford

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

1. THAT the minutes of the West Coast Catchment Committee held on 23 May 2019 be received; and
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted.

The motion was put and carried

ICM19/60

Moved by: W Maag
Seconded by: K Holmes

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):

THAT Council advocate to the Minister of Biosecurity that the National Pest Pet Trade Accord is progressed as a matter of urgency and that the Red Eared Slider Turtle be included as a priority for risk assessment and subsequent ban from sale.

The motion was put and carried
Moved by: W Maag  
Seconded by: J Sanford

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):  
THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:  
Item 6: Issues and Actions Report May 2019  
THAT the work and consultative process to review whitebait management, currently being undertaken by the Department of Conservation with the aims:  
(i) to have healthy whitebait populations;  
(ii) to restore whitebait habitat in all areas with declining populations; and  
(iii) to have a long-term sustainable whitebait fishery;  
be supported and promoted by Waikato Regional Council.

The motion was put and carried

11.6 Upper Waikato Catchment Committee 24 May 2019

S Strang spoke to the minutes of Upper Waikato Catchment Committee meeting of 24 May 2019 noting in particular the staff presentation on the new Council storm water management guidelines; and that a recent field trip had been held to view progress being made as part of the Whirinaki Catchment Project.

ICM19/62

Moved by: S Strang  
Seconded by: Cr S Husband

RESOLVED (SECTION A):  
1. THAT the minutes of the Upper Waikato Catchment Committee held on 24 May 2019 be received; and  
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the minutes be noted; and

The motion was put and carried

11.7 Lower Waikato Catchment Committee 29 May 2019

K Holmes spoke to the minutes of Lower Waikato Catchment Committee meeting of 29 May 2019 noting in particular the self-review strategy and Committee focus discussion/process being undertaken and the recommendations to Integrated Catchment Management Committee/Council.

Arising out of questions, responses and discussion the following points were noted:  
- with respect to a 10am meeting start time, this timing factored in travel and venue set up for staff, travel for Councillors and Committee members, and the completion of any attendees’ early morning commitments.  
- given that the Committee’s strategy and focus process is not yet completed, it was queried whether the recommendations about meeting frequency should be
held over in the interim. Additional meetings will involve additional costs - time, resources and participation, understood to be circa $18,000 per meeting.

- the Lower Waikato Zone has a significant workload and budget; and in addition to the catchment works and flood protection aspects there are a number of long-standing and ongoing issues to deal with including koi carp and the Whangamarino that are complex and involve multiple parties.

- acknowledged that the Committee has some big challenges to work through in relation to the flood protection infrastructure costs and the increased demand for catchment works/associate costs, and therefore rating and affordability issues for people within the Zone.

- need to make real progress on and resolve the legacy issues, so that the focus can be on the core business.

- while the issues and concerns being raised were acknowledged and appreciated, it was expressed that these matters are unlikely to be addressed simply by having additional meetings. The Committee may wish to consider what other steps and actions could be taken to enable the Committee to operate more effectively. Is it about better communication and ensuring that the Committee has been provided with timely and targeted information to make robust decisions, and having a ‘higher level’ focus versus a ‘micro’ detail approach? More reports and meetings may not necessarily result in more work “on the ground” being carried out on time/to budget to achieve the Committee’s objective.

- holding more frequent meetings will impact on Councillors, members and staff workloads. Need to consider the availability impacts on external members and the staff resourcing implications.

- the current Council triennium concludes in October and the new/incoming Council will determine its governance/Committee structure and associated Terms of Reference for the 2019/2022 triennium. The conclusions of the strategy and Committee focus discussions could usefully inform the new Council’s governance structure process.

- views expressed that supporting an increase in meeting frequency now would be premature for the reasons already outlined.

- with respect to the Lower Waikato committee proposal to establish a koi carp Subcommittee, views expressed that this would be an additional parallel process to the efforts already underway. The Department of Conservation and Council are already actively working on this pest fish issue (refer Item 10 - Koi carp herpes virus update) with a number of other parties. The koi carp issue is long standing with no quick fixes available; and it is acknowledged that for people in the Lower Waikato Zone this apparent lack of ‘on the ground’ action/results is frustrating. Opportunity to improve communication with the Committee/Zone; ensure that local knowledge and expertise is sourced and to provide ongoing timely progress reports/status updates of the various initiatives.

- a collaborative approach between all parties will be more efficient and cost effective, noting that good communication and information sharing is vital. View expressed that the recommendation will not support this approach or enhance the process already in place and the initiatives being worked on.
- view expressed that for some of the same reasons as outlined above around communication, triennium timing and the multiple party nature of the issues, the Whangamarino and Waikare Catchments Working Group recommendation should also be held over for the new/incoming Council to determine the best approach.

ICM19/63

Moved by: Cr D Minogue
Seconded by: K Holmes

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):
THAT the following recommendations contained in Section B of the minutes be endorsed:

THAT all future meetings of the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee commence at 9.30am.

The motion was put and carried

ICM19/64

Moved by: Cr D Minogue
Seconded by: Cr A Livingston

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
THAT the following recommendations shall ‘lie on the table’ until the new triennium when the incoming Council considers its governance/Committee structure and associated Terms of Reference.

(i) THAT to better manage the Committee workload and information flow, the meeting frequency for the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee be changed to two-monthly.

(ii) THAT a Subcommittee of the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee be established to investigate the options for, and processes required to achieve the eradication of Koi carp.

(iii) THAT a multi stakeholder Whangamarino and Waikare catchments Working Group be established to co-ordinate and work through all the issues and develop the Action Plan required following the completion and adoption of the Catchment Management Plan.

The motion was put and carried on a show of hands (8 votes in support/3 votes against)

Out of meeting 12.13pm K Holmes, W Maag

ICM19/65
Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr S Husband

RESOLVED (SECTION A):
1. THAT The minutes of the Lower Waikato Catchment Committee held on 29 May 2019 be received; and
2. THAT the decisions in Section A of the report be noted.

The motion was put and carried

Staff were asked to provide an informal update on the Auckland Ministry of Primary Industries Fruit Fly response.
The Manager Integrated Catchment Services (P Whaley) advised that MPI had approached Councils for staff assistance as part of the national biosecurity response.

The seconded staff member Biosecurity Officer, Andrew McConnell, outlined his role and responsibilities as a Movement Control Manager during the Fruit Fly response.

Out of meeting 12.15pm Cr A Livingston, Cr S Kneebone
The Chair briefly adjourned the meeting due to the temporary lack of a quorum.
Return to meeting K Holmes 12.17pm

Staff noted that the Ministry of Primary Industries still hasn’t found/confirmed whether there is a breeding population and are continuing to work through that process/those investigations.

Return to meeting W Maag, Cr S Kneebone, Cr A Livingston 12.18pm
With the quorum requirements now satisfied, the Chair resumed the formal meeting.

10. Koi carp herpes virus update

The Manager of Integrated Catchment Services (P Whaley) requested that the written report be taken as read, with a verbal update regarding the status of Department of Conservation investigations into the efficacy of the koi carp herpes virus to be provided by David Speirs, Department of Conservation, Director Operations, Hauraki-Waikato-Taranaki Region. The Chair welcomed D Speirs to the meeting.
D Speirs advised that:
- he has had several recent requests for briefings on freshwater pest fish and that the Department of Conservation is currently rebuilding its capacity and capability in this focus area.
- The Department of Conservation has made a funding commitment to match the Council $60,000 per annum for three years for the Aquatic Pest Co-ordinator (North Island) position which will be managed through the Department of Conservation’s Hamilton office. Implementation of the koi carp Management Plan will be managed through the Co-ordinator position.
- need to confirm the current status and identify what is/is not being done in the koi carp ‘space’; what projects/work streams are active or in abeyance such as surveillance. Confirm the range of “tools” available and what Research and Development work is underway or planned.
- The Department of Conservation is partnering the Australian research regarding the herpes virus as a potential ‘tool’. Currently have a series of questions about the virus e.g. will it work on the koi carp in New Zealand as they are a different species and the costs involved. Even if identified as being suitable it will not be the total answer, rather one part of the solution. There is also a full statutory process to go through to get the virus assessed and approved for use in New Zealand, should that be deemed useful to pursue.
- The Department of Conservation and Council have a willingness to look at all realistic and viable control options that are sustainable in the longer term. Proposals including barrier traps and harvesting are already on the table and there has been of lot of interest from external parties.

Arising out of questions, responses and associated discussion the following points were noted:
- there has been discussion with the Minister of Conservation regarding the iwi initiative for koi carp removal from Lake Waikare. The feasibility strategy for that application is still on the table, with some additional work needed to refine the proposal.
- concern expressed that given the size, scale and complexity of the koi carp issue one staff resource (the Co-ordinator role) will not be able to get across all the aspects of the problem in the time available, let alone work on solutions.
- the Co-ordinator position will have a strategic focus, not an ‘on the ground’ actions role. A key outcome will be to deliver the koi carp Strategy which will identify what will be required to support/action that strategic approach over the next 10 to 20 years.
- the biology of the species is reasonably well known. They are long lived, have no natural predators in NZ, breed prolifically and we know when and how they spawn. In some places they comprise 80 percent plus of the biomass and crowd out all other species.
- concerns expressed that there is a risk that this strategic approach, without any visible ‘on the ground’ initiatives, actions or trials being undertaken, will result in desk-top outcomes only and no actual contribution to containing/controlling or reducing the quantity or spread of the species.
- committee member asked if there were opportunities to undertake some small scale projects or for the community to see or participate in events that raise awareness of the problem? One member thought the Motukaraka system could be ‘isolated’ and a collaborative stakeholder project could be undertaken; another suggested supporting
regular bow hunter/fishing events in various locations. Acknowledged that they do involve some resource and are not going to make a material difference to the overall problem, but these kinds of actions can provide benefits such as increasing public awareness, education and communication opportunities and reassure people that ‘things are happening’ albeit mostly focussed on a comprehensive strategic response which is not visible to the public.

- need to take a measured approach and not invest in projects and actions that are not viable. Some small scale efforts e.g. cages/traps have been successful, but not able to be scaled up and are not economically viable and/or sustainable. In future there may need to be ‘social’ decisions made whereby a particular control method that ‘works’ is supported via rates, or other ongoing funding contributions.
- need to ensure that we learn from past mistakes and successes. Potentially some comparisons with the rabbit/calici virus experience, noting the additional risks when operating in an aquatic environment.
- research is ongoing to try and develop a water sample test that can detect if koi carp are present in a waterway. If successful this would be a far more resource, time and cost effective method of detection than physical surveillance.
- view expressed that the largest sediment contribution to waterways is from upper catchment land management practices/erosion and the best approach to this issue is via the current catchment management works programmes. Acknowledged that in the lower reaches where koi carp are present they will be exacerbating the sediment issues by damaging the banks and re-suspending sediment.
- the current contractor is routinely in the Lower Waikato area and could be available to provide advice and support for the Lower Waikato and Waihou-Piako Zones if that was requested/helpful.
- important to have education to ensure that people know that any transfer of koi carp from one waterway to another is an offence and the penalties for doing this. It would be a national disaster if the species spreads beyond its current locations.

ICM19/66

Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr S Husband

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

That the report ‘Koi carp herpes virus update’ (Integrated Catchment Management Committee 11 June 2019) be received and that D Speirs, Department of Conservation, Director Operations, Hauraki-Waikato-Taranaki region be thanked for his verbal update.

The motion was put and carried

ICM19/67

Moved by: Cr A Livingston
Seconded by: C Buchanan

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):
That a joint communication paper be prepared and released by the Department of Conservation and Waikato Regional Council to let affected communities and the wider public know what is happening, what steps are being taken to progress the koi carp problem and who are the ‘go to’ contact people for further information.

The motion was put and carried

12. Resolutions to Exclude the Public

ICM19/68

Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr S Husband

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

THAT the public be excluded from the following part/s of the meeting:

The general subject of each 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Good reason to withhold exists 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest 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:

Confirmation of Public Excluded Minutes of previous (10 April 2019) Integrated Catchment Management Committee meeting and extract from Public Excluded minutes from the 30 April 2019 Council meeting

- To avoid prejudice to the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation and detection of offences and the right to a fair trial (S6(a));
- To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons [S7(2)(a)];
- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (Section 7(2)(i)); and
- To protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (S7(2)(b)(ii)).
Public Excluded Issues/Actions from Integrated Catchment Management Meetings:

- To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons [S7(2)(a)]; and
- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (Section 7(2)(i)).

The motion was put and carried

The meeting returned to open session at 1.00pm

The meeting closed at 1.00pm
**Decision of CE Employment and Remuneration Committee**

**Meeting date: 21 May 2019**

Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4. Management of flood protection asset renewal programme</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the report 'Management of flood protection asset renewal programme' (Chief Executive Employment and Remuneration Committee 21 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5. Continuous improvement update - May 2019</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the report 'Continuous improvement update - May 2019' (Chief Executive Employment and Remuneration Committee 21 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Regional Council
CE Employment and Remuneration Committee

OPEN MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 21 May, 2019, 9:30 am
Location: Council Chamber
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street, Hamilton East

Members Present: Cr A Livingston - Chairman
Cr R Simcock
Cr J Hennebry
Cr H Vercoe

Staff Present: V Payne - Chief Executive Officer
Sarah McLeay - Democracy Advisor

Others Present P Loof - Loof Consulting
1. **Call to Order and Apologies**

The meeting opened at 9.32am.

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

CEERC19/17

Moved by: Cr A Livingston  
Seconded by: Cr R Simcock

SECTION A: UNDER DELEGATIONS FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL

RESOLVED

THAT the agenda of the meeting of the Chief Executive Employment and Remuneration Committee of 21 May 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business of the meeting.

The motion was put and carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

There were no disclosures of interest.

4. **Management of flood protection asset renewal programme**

Report to provide an overview of the approach used to develop and manage the annual work programme to renew flood protection assets. The report was presented by the Chief Executive (V Payne). The following was noted:

- There was no unallocated part of the budget. The operational budget was used during the year to cover contingencies.
- It was suggested that contracts would be better let in September rather than January so that work was undertaken sooner and in better weather.

CEERC19/18

Moved by: Cr H Vercoe  
Seconded by: Cr R Simcock

RESOLVED

THAT the report 'Management of flood protection asset renewal programme' (Chief Executive Employment and Remuneration Committee 21 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried
5. **Continuous improvement update - May 2019**

Report to provide an update on continuous improvement activities. The report was presented by the Chief Executive (V Payne). The following was noted:

- Significant improvements had been made.
- Additional staff time had been required to implement some improvements, and some had been implemented as part of business as usual time allocations.
- The ratepayer was the ultimate beneficiary of the resulting efficiencies.
- Staff were happier and more engaged when they had efficient and effective work tools.

**CEERC19/19**

*Moved by:* Cr A Livingston  
*Seconded by:* Cr R Simcock

**RESOLVED**

THAT the report 'Continuous improvement update - May 2019' (Chief Executive Employment and Remuneration Committee 21 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

6. **Resolution to exclude the public**

**CEERC19/20**

*Moved by:* Cr A Livingston  
*Seconded by:* Cr R Simcock

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting:

The general subject of each 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

**Item Name: 7.1 People Strategy**

**Item Name: 7.2 CE Key Performance Indicators 2019/2020.**

Good reason to withhold exists under section 7.

That the public conduct of the relevant parts 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 section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by
section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant parts of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a))

THAT Paul Loof of Loof Consulting be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of his knowledge of item 7.1 People Strategy and item 7.2 CE Key Performance Indicators 2019/2020. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matters to be discussed, is relevant because he is the contracted advisor to Waikato Regional Council.

The motion was put and carried

The meeting moved into closed session at 9.58am.

The meeting returned to open session at 11.08am and was closed at 11.09am.
## Decision of CE Employment and Remuneration Committee

Meeting date: 5 June 2019

Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2. Confirmation of Agenda</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEERC19/25

THAT the agenda of the meeting of the CE Employment and Remuneration Committee of 5 June 2019, as circulated, noting the changes to the order of business being:

- Item 6.1 2018/19 CE performance measure results as at 20 May 2019
- Item 6.2 Chief Executive Self Assessment FY 18/19
- Item 6.4 Update on 'Be our Best Initiative.'
- Item 6.3 Chief Executive annual performance and remuneration review for FY19.

and noting deferral of:

- Item 4 Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019
- Item 5 Customer Strategy Implementation - FY 2019/2020

be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 6.4 Update on &quot;Be our Best Initiative&quot;</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report and presentation “Update on ‘Be Our Best Initiative’ (Doc #14289386 dated 29 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waikato Regional Council

#### CE Employment and Remuneration Committee

**OPEN MINUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Wednesday, 5 June, 2019, 9:00 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401 Grey Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Present:**
- Cr A Livingston - Chairman
- Cr R Simcock
- Cr J Hennebry
- Cr H Vercoe

**Others Present:**
- P Loof – Loof Consulting

**Staff Present:**
- V Payne - Chief Executive Officer
- J Cox - Team Leader Democracy Services
1. **Call to Order and Apologies**

   The meeting was opened at 9.00am. Apologies were received from Cr Hennebry for lateness, and Cr Livingston for early departure.

   CEERC19/ CEERC19/24
   
   **Moved by:** Cr R Simcock  
   **Seconded by:** Cr H Vercoe

   **THAT the apologies of Cr Hennebry (for lateness), and Cr Livingston (for early departure) be accepted.**

   The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   Noting the Chair’s early departure the member agreed to rearrange the agenda to consider the items in the following order:

   - Item 6.1 2018/19 CE performance measure results as at 20 May 2019
   - Item 6.2 Chief Executive Self Assessment FY 18/19
   - Item 6.4 Update on 'Be our Best Initiative.
   - Item 6.3 Chief Executive annual performance and remuneration review for FY19.

   The meeting agreed to defer to another meeting:

   - Item 4 Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019
   - Item 5 Customer Strategy Implementation - FY 2019/2020

   Cr J Hennebry joined the meeting at 9:02 am.

   CEERC19/25
   
   **Moved by:** Cr R Simcock  
   **Seconded by:** Cr A Livingston

   **THAT the agenda of the meeting of the CE Employment and Remuneration Committee of 5 June 2019, as circulated, noting the changes to the order of business being:**

   - Item 6.1 2018/19 CE performance measure results as at 20 May 2019
   - Item 6.2 Chief Executive Self Assessment FY 18/19
   - Item 6.4 Update on 'Be our Best Initiative.
   - Item 6.3 Chief Executive annual performance and remuneration review for FY19.

   and noting deferral of:

   - Item 4 Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019
• Item 5 Customer Strategy Implementation - FY 2019/2020

be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

The motion was put and carried

6. Public Excluded Items

The meeting moved to Public Excluded at 9.05am.

CEERC19/26

Moved by: Cr A Livingston
Seconded by: Cr J Hennebry

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting:

Item 6.1: 2018/19 CE performance measure results as at 20 May 2019

Item 6.2: Chief Executive Self-Assessment FY18/19

The general subject of each 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Item 6.1: 2018/19 CE performance measure results as at 20 May 2019

Item 6.2: Chief Executive Self-Assessment FY18/19

Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7.

That the public conduct of the relevant parts 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest 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 6.1: 2018/19 CE performance measure results as at 20 May 2019

• Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (Section 7(2)(a)).

Item 6.2: Chief Executive Self-Assessment FY18/19

• Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (Section 7(2)(a)).

THAT P Loof of Loof Consulting be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of his knowledge of the Chief Executive’s performance. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matters to be discussed, is relevant
to that matter because he is an expert in the matters at hand and is a expert consultant to Council.

The motion was put and carried

The meeting returned to open section at 10.05am.

6.4 Update on "Be our Best Initiative"

Presentation to provide an update to the committee on council's progress with its "Be our Best Initiative", which was implemented to improve organisational culture.

Cr Livingston out of the meeting at 10.05.

The Chief Executive (V Payne), Manager People and Capabilities (N Ollington) and Neil McGregor of Human Synergistics provided a presentation to the meeting.

The results of the 2017 and 2019 Be our Best Initiative survey were compared and explained to members.

During questions, answers and related discussion the following was noted:

- a member noted the survey related to judgement type metrics and questioned whether consideration had been given to behavioural metrics or customer metrics. In response members were advised that council needed something measurable to make sure it was on the right track and the responses were averages. There would be teams that were high performing and others that were more passive/defensive, and issues in particular parts of the organisation that might need a nudge.

- from the results members were advised that council was not changing because it was undertaking the measures, it was what was happening in between the surveys that had made the difference in the work place.

- the simplicity of the concept was that leadership drives performance, which drives culture, which drives result. It was not that there was extra work for managers or staff, just a different way of doing what they do, it was not appropriate to be task oriented, you have to take people with you on the journey.

- no one turns up to work to do a bad job and the programme was not about weeding out individuals doing a bad job, but to create an environment for people to perform and enjoy their roles.

- whether it is with councillors or ratepayers, staff will not always have a positive experience. It was important to give strength and resilience for staff to be able to manage their reactions to situations they are faced with. It was about management being there for staff and ensuring that when things got too difficult, intervening and supporting them, perhaps working with the Chair to manage situations.
a member noted that staff worked for council and not individual councillors and there was an impact on staff with continued requests for information that had already been supplied.

Mr Loof proposed the introduction of the culture programme for councillors to provide further skills to members to support them working with staff to get results. A review of boards occurs in the private sector. It could be an opportunity for members to see that by being constructive they were more likely to get what they wanted, rather than an adversarial model. Support like this was something every team should receive regardless of the role they were in.

Mr Payne acknowledged Mr Ollington and his team within People and Capabilities, and Neil McGregor and the team from Human Synergistics for the work that had been undertaken with the organisation to achieve the results that had been shown so far.

CEERC19/31
Moved by: Cr R Simcock
Seconded by: Cr J Hennebry

That the report and presentation “Update on ‘Be Our Best Initiative’ (Doc #14289386 dated 29 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

Public Excluded Items

The meeting moved to Public Excluded at 9.05am.

CEERC19/32
Moved by: Cr H Vercoe
Seconded by: Cr R Simcock

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting:

Item 6.3: Chief Executive annual performance and remuneration review for FY 19

The general subject of each 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Item 6.3: Chief Executive annual performance and remuneration review for FY 19

Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7.

That the public conduct of the relevant parts 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) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest 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 6.3:** Chief Executive annual performance and remuneration review for FY 19

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (Section 7(2)(a)).

THAT P Loof of Loof Consulting be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of his knowledge of the Chief Executive's performance. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matters to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because he is an expert in the matters at hand and is a expert consultant to Council.

The motion was put and carried

The meeting returned to open section at 11.14am.

The meeting closed at 11.14am
Report to Council

Date: 12 June 2019

Author: Nick Ollington, Manager People and Capability

Authoriser: Neville Williams, Director - Community and Services
            Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive

Subject: Health and Safety Council Report – May 2019

Purpose
1. To report on the monthly health and safety council dashboard and any other topics regarding health and safety of relevance to council.

Executive Summary
2. There were a total of 21 incidents reported in May. Of this number, 13 were events and 8 were near misses.

3. There was one lost time injury recorded for May, however the entry does not meet the definition of a lost time injury and the record will be amended.

4. There were no notifications to WorkSafe in May.

5. There was 1 event against the vehicle use critical risk, and 1 event against the aggressive people/public risk in May 2019.

6. Events held in the pending file for greater than one week increased slightly; 11.68% in April and 12.37% in May.

Staff Recommendation:


Background
7. The health and safety dashboard is reported to council each month. It is designed to enable council to exercise due diligence with regard to health and safety governance and provides a general summary of health and safety risk and activities within council. Additionally, from time to time other topics regarding health and safety of relevance for council will also be included.

Responses to requests for information/questions from council
8. Te Aroha Fire Alarm Activation – a smoke detector alarm activation occurred at Te Aroha Depot on 15 May 2019. ADT followed the escalation instructions to contact the key holders. The Matamata-Piako fire service responded, however, the activation turned out to be a false alarm. As a result of the incident, a post event review showed that contact information for the fire service required updating. This has now been completed.

9. Duty of Care – a legal opinion has been commissioned to clarify the duty of care required to ensure the safety of councillors as they undertake their duties as an elected member of council.
10. **Health monitoring of contractors** – where a contractor (PCBU) undertakes work that has the potential to affect the health of its employees, the PCBU is required, under the Health and Safety at Work Act and associated regulations, to undertake health monitoring. All SHE pre-qualified contractors are asked to show evidence of health monitoring within their safety management plans where there is a risk of exposure to substances that could harm the health of them or their employees. Waikato Regional Council has a robust process in place to check that contractors are fulfilling such obligations.

**Written Report – Dashboard for May 2019**

12. **Lost Time Injuries (LTI)** – There was one LTI recorded, however, however the entry does not meet the definition of a lost time injury and the record will be amended

13. **Report to WorkSafe** – There were no reports to WorkSafe in May.

14. **Critical Risks** – The dashboard provides a table showing the organisational critical risks, the raw (pre control), and residual (post control) risk scoring, and the date that the risk was last reviewed. There were 2 reports against critical risks in May; 1 against the vehicle use critical risk and 1 against the aggressive people/public risk.

15. **Health and Safety Summary Chart (pyramid)** – In May there were 4 ‘no treatment’ reports, 2 medical treatment reports and 1 first aid treatment. The 4 no treatment reports were categorised as 1 event of poisoning, 2 of strains and 1 of bruising. The 2 medical events were 1 strain and 1 report of bruising. The first aid treatment was for a foreign body (wood splinter).

16. **Near Miss Events versus All Other Events** – Near-miss reporting continues to fluctuate. There were 8 near miss reports in May.

17. **Sick Leave Taken** – The sick leave chart has been improved to include data from 2017 to enable year on year comparison. After a sustained downward trend in sick leave throughout 2018 and early 2019, in May the sick leave hours absence have increased compared to May 2018. The general trend of diminished use of sick leave is indicated in the rolling average for the year of 4.6 hours per employee, within the targeted benchmark range of 3.0 to 5.0.

18. **Pending Events** – The events pending greater than 1 week has increased slightly from 11.68% in April to 12.37% in May. Figures show an ongoing reduction in the number of incidents remaining in ‘pending’ over the last 2 years.

19. **Event Corrective Actions (excl. Near Miss Corrective Actions)** – In May there were a total of 13 events reported, of which 9 corrective actions were assigned, and 6 completed. No corrective actions are overdue for completion.

20. **Near Miss Corrective Actions** – In May there were 8 near miss reports; of the 8 near misses, 2 corrective actions have been assigned, and completed. No corrective actions are overdue for completion.

21. **Health and Safety Training FYTD** – A range of organisational health and safety training is available and advertised on the workforce development calendar. There is a focus on managers attending accident investigation training, and in additional eighteen staff have been selected to attend a Mini Incident Causation Methodology (MICAMS) training session on the 1 August 2019.

22. **Audits FYTD** - The ‘overlapping duties of health and safety-systems’ (contractor management) recommendations have been assigned to responsible owners.

**Attachments**

Appendix 1 - Doc #14395015 Council Dashboard – May 2019
Loss Time Injuries
There was 1 lost time injury for May 2019

Critical Risk Events
There was one Vehicle event against the vehicle use critical risk; WRC vehicle was hit at an intersection. Vehicle damage but no injury. There was one report of verbal abuse by a member of the public.

Organisational Critical Risks – Critical risks with a residual score of ‘High’

Risks are reviewed at least annually or after a system / process change, or after a critical event.

Critical and High Risks (those with a risk score of 10 or higher)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Body Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2607</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Poisoning</td>
<td>Headache following exposure to unknown chemical fumes</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2608</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>Foreign body</td>
<td>Wood splinter under finger nail</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2609</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Muscular strain, lower back, buttocks as a result of lifting weights at gym</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Turned ankle and fell</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2612</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Bruising</td>
<td>Hit top of head when standing back up after bending over</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2626</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Bruising</td>
<td>Bruised hand from being caught between Polaris and trailer</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2627</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Lower back pain</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and Safety Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Body Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Poisoning</td>
<td>Headache following exposure to unknown chemical fumes</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>Foreign body</td>
<td>Wood splinter under finger nail</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Muscular strain, lower back, buttocks as a result of lifting weights at gym</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Turned ankle and fell</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Bruising</td>
<td>Hit top of head when standing back up after bending over</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Bruising</td>
<td>Bruised hand from being caught between Polaris and trailer</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Lower back pain</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and Safety Summary

Org wide - Near Miss Events vs All Other Events

Near miss summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Event Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2656</td>
<td>Activity/task</td>
<td>Found large wasp nest</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2610</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Wrong screw used</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2614</td>
<td>Vehicle (public)</td>
<td>Riding bike – almost hit</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2616</td>
<td>Equipment/technical</td>
<td>Item fell - missing foot</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2618</td>
<td>Vehicle (contractor)</td>
<td>Slide down hill – no damage</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2630</td>
<td>Activity/task</td>
<td>Nearly slipped on wet leaves (public footpath)</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2631</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Car in front stopped abruptly, causing WRC to brake sudden</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2632</td>
<td>Vehicle (accident)</td>
<td>Observed traffic incident</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other events summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Event Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2615</td>
<td>Vehicle / traffic accident</td>
<td>Vehicle damage. No injuries</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2619</td>
<td>Verbal assault (unknown)</td>
<td>Member of public in Grey Street</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2620</td>
<td>Activity (physical)</td>
<td>Gorse spike in finger</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2622</td>
<td>Activity/task</td>
<td>Strained lower back</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2624</td>
<td>Access/egress</td>
<td>Fire door - hard to open</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628</td>
<td>Facility/building</td>
<td>Fire alarm activation</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sick Leave

- In May, sick leave increased to 6.5, which is higher than the hours recorded in May 2018 (5.5).
- The rolling average for the YTD is 4.6, within the benchmark range of 3.0 to 5.0.
- The data excludes sick leave donated, sick leave credited from the sick leave bank and sick leave taken as a recreation or wellness day.

Pending Events for > 1 week (%)

- Events pending >1 week have increased from 11.68% in April to 12.37% in May.
- Figures show a reduction in the number of incidents remaining in the pending section, over the last 2 years.

Event Corrective Actions
(excl. Near Miss Corrective Actions)

- In May 2019, a total of 13 events (excluding near misses) reported. Refer to red line in previous graph.
- Of the 13 events, 9 corrective actions have been assigned, of which 6 are completed and 3 are underway.

Near Miss Corrective Actions

- In May 2019, a total of 8 near misses were reported. Refer to green line in above graph.
- Of the 8 near misses 2 corrective actions have been assigned and completed.

Health & Safety Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident Investigation (managers)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Conflict and Awareness</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Wardens</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>2018/19 Training – ongoing as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid Training</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2018/19 Training – ongoing as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vault training for Managers, Team Leaders and Supervisors</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>1:1 Skype training with HR Systems &amp; Reporting Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vault training for Business Support staff</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>1:1 Skype training with HR Systems &amp; Reporting Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal / External Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Section/ Audit</th>
<th>Audit Classification</th>
<th>Date of audit</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
<th>Completed Actions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td>ICM and RUD</td>
<td>Overlapping duties of health and safety - systems review (contractor management)</td>
<td>15 August 2018</td>
<td>1 medium 3 low</td>
<td>September 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions loaded into Vault and underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to Council

Date: 3 June 2019
Author: Nicole Hubbard, Manager, Corporate Planning
Authoriser: Janine Becker, Chief Financial Officer
Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive
Subject: Adoption of the 2019/20 Annual Plan

Purpose
1. To present the 2019/20 Annual Plan to council for adoption.

Executive Summary
2. Council needs to adopt an annual plan in the years between a Long Term Plan (LTP).
3. After a starting point of a proposed increase in rates revenue to existing ratepayers of 8.8 per cent, the final increase in rates revenue from current ratepayers was reduced to 7.5 per cent. This comprises 4.5 per cent of all property rates and 11.2 per cent of targeted rates.

Staff Recommendation:
1. That the report Adoption of 2019/20 Annual Plan (Doc #14368881 dated 28 May 2019) be received, and
2. That, pursuant to section 100 of the Local Government Act 2002, the council resolves that the 2019/20 Annual Plan budget is financially prudent, and
3. That council adopt, pursuant to section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002, the 2019/20 Annual Plan including the annual Funding Impact Statement pursuant to clause 20 of schedule 10 of the Local Government Act 2002 and pending any minor proofing and design changes.

Background
4. An annual plan sets out council’s work programme and budget for the year ahead. It is prepared in the years between each LTP and outlines any changes from the LTP.
5. The review of the proposed 2019/20 budget commenced in September 2018. The starting point for the budget review was the pre-inflation LTP budget for the 2019/20 financial year. The proposed LTP budget for 2019/20 contained an increase in rates revenue from current ratepayers of 8.8 per cent.
6. Council meetings were held in December 2018 and March 2019 to approve the budget and address key matters that arose during annual plan discussions. At the December meeting, council also resolved that it would not formally consult on the 2019/20 Annual Plan given there were no significant or material differences from what was proposed in the 2018-2028 LTP.
7. The CE’s submission to the draft annual plan budget was presented and approved in May 2019 and resulted in an increase in rates revenue from existing ratepayers of 7.5 per cent. This assumed growth from new properties across the region of 1.8 per cent.
8. It is acknowledged that the actual impact to ratepayers will vary depending on the value and location of a property, and the services it receives from the council. A summary of rating impacts is included in the Annual Plan document. Using the following link [www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/ratescalculator](http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/ratescalculator), ratepayers will be able to find rates information specific to their property via council’s website from 1 July 2019 following the setting of rates at the June 2019 council meeting.

**Financial prudence**

9. The 2018 – 2028 LTP projected an operating deficit for the 2019/20 financial year of $4.26 million, reflecting the following matters:
   a. The council’s decision to spread the funding of depreciation expense in the Lower Waikato, Waihou and Piako catchment zones over the first three years of the LTP, to manage the affordability of rates increases for these communities.
   b. The council’s decision not to fully fund depreciation of the new regional ticketing solution for public transport. It is assumed that any replacement system will receive part funding from NZTA.
   c. The council’s contribution to the proposed Waikato Regional Theatre, which will be funded by borrowings.
   d. Funding from the investment equalisation reserve for agreed programmes of work.

10. In adopting the LTP in June 2018, the council resolved that this unbalanced budget was financially prudent, having taken account of the reasons for this budget position.

11. The annual plan budget results in an operating deficit of $6.609 million reflecting the impact of the same matters as included in the LTP. These matters were reported to council as part of the December 2018 council meeting, at which time it was resolved that this was financially prudent. A final resolution with respect to this matter is sought from council as part of the adoption of the annual plan.

**Document layout**

12. The 2019/20 Annual Plan document layout is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Section 1 - Introduction | • Chair and CE message  
|                       | • About the region  
|                       | • Our priorities                                                      |
| Section 2 - Groups of activities | • Includes information on the activities, key highlights and priorities for 2019/20 and performance measures |
| Section 3 - Finances   | • Financials                                                            |

**Post adoption**

13. The 2019/20 Annual Plan will be available on the Waikato Regional Council website from 28 June 2019. Printed copies will be available from late June and will be distributed to those on the Annual Plan mailing list by the end of July.

**Assessment of Significance**

14. Having regard to the decision making provisions in the Local Government Act 2002 and council’s Significance and Engagement Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is considered to have a high degree of significance.

**Conclusion**

15. Council must adopt the 2019/20 Annual Plan by 30 June 2019 in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002. Following adoption copies of the annual plan will be available on council’s website and hard copies will be sent to those on the annual plan mailing list.
Report to Council

Date: 10 June 2019

Author: Janine Becker, Chief Financial Officer

Authoriser: Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive

Subject: Rate Setting Report – 2019/20

Purpose

1. To enable Council to set rates for the 2019/20 financial year.

2. Included in the report is a series of rating resolutions for the purpose of setting the rates for the 2019/20 year. These resolutions relate to the:

   General rate
   Uniform Annual General Charge
   Waihou / Piako Scheme Rates
   Waikato-Waipa (Watershed) Zone Rates
   Drainage rates
   Coromandel Zone rates
   West Coast rate
   Biosecurity rate
   Public Transport rate
   Stock Truck Effluent rate
   Natural Heritage rate
   Permitted Activity Monitoring rate
   Civil Defence and Emergency Management rate
   Regional Services rate

Background


4. The Capital Value of the region used for the General Rate calculation for the 2019/20 year is $161.681 billion.

5. The number of rateable rating units used for the Uniform Annual General Charge calculation for the 2019/20 year is 203,622.

Setting of Rates for the 2019/20 Financial Year

6. The following resolutions allow the council to set rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, on rateable rating units in the region for the financial year commencing on 1 July 2019 and ending on 30 June 2020.

   a) GENERAL RATE

7. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $40,640,000 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of every rating unit within the Waikato region.
8. **Recommended that** pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 the Council resolves:
   i. That a general rate be set as a differential rate in the Dollar for all rateable land within the region; and
   ii. That the rateable value of land for the general rate shall be the equalised capital value of the land; and
   iii. That the basis for differentiating the capital values of properties is the location of the land, determined by the relevant local authority boundary.

9. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 13(2)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council hereby sets a general rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (A) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on the capital value of every rating unit within the Waikato region.

   **Schedule (A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Rate $1 per $1 CV (GST inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>0.00003679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamata-Piako</td>
<td>0.000023430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otorohanga</td>
<td>0.000027777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>0.000025103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Waikato</td>
<td>0.000023756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>0.000028417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames-Coromandel</td>
<td>0.000025356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>0.000025249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangai</td>
<td>0.000027635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitomo</td>
<td>0.000023657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauraki</td>
<td>0.000023590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **b) UNIFORM ANNUAL GENERAL CHARGE**

10. For the 2019/20 year the amount of the Uniform Annual General Charge revenue required is $17,155,000 (GST incl.).

11. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 15(1)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council hereby sets a uniform annual general charge of $84.23 (GST incl.) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on every rating unit within the Waikato region.

   **c) TARGETED RATES ON A DIFFERENTIAL BASIS**

12. The targeted rates for the following activities are set under section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and are assessed on a differential basis.

   i. **Waihou / Piako Scheme Rate**

   The recommended rate is based on the budget approved by Council in its Annual Plan 2019/20.

13. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purposes of providing for the payment of its share of the costs of the Waihou / Piako Scheme works and incidental expenses, hereby sets the targeted rates on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (B) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on every rating unit within the Waihou Piako zone.
Schedule (B)

14. Local Protection – Piako River Scheme Maintenance
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $3,741,829 (GST incl.) and is based on the land area or capital value of all properties within the Piako River scheme boundary.

Piako classifications

15. Local Protection – Waihou Valley Scheme Maintenance
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $5,578,952 (GST incl.) and is based on the land value or capital value of all properties within the Waihou Valley scheme boundary.

Waihou Classifications

16. Waihou/Piako Scheme Catchment Rate
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $3,274,869 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the Waihou and Piako zone boundaries.

ii. Waikato-Waipa (Watershed) Rate

17. Recommended that pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purposes of funding flood protection, soil conservation, catchment oversight and river management work in the Waikato-Waipa, hereby sets a targeted rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (C), Schedule (D) and Schedule (E) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on all rateable property within the Waikato River Catchment separate rating area (as defined on Project Watershed Boundary Map - WRC plan number 1007), on the rating system as listed for each rate.

18. Greater Waikato Catchment Differential
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $3,865,771 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.
19. A Greater Waikato Catchment differential as set out in Schedule (C), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the capital value of every rating unit within the Waikato and Waipa Catchments, including their tributaries (as defined on Project Watershed Boundary Map – WRC Plan Number 1007). The rate is set on a differential basis according to the location of the land (being the relevant local authority boundaries).

**Schedule (C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST Inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Waikato catchment differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hamilton city</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00002801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waipa district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00004125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waikato district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00033653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Otorohanga district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00004440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hauraki district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00005998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Matamata-Plaico district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00003628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Waikato district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00003574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waitomo district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00004362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taupo district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00004486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rotorua district</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00008233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor differential Urban</td>
<td>land value</td>
<td>0.00004238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor differential Rural</td>
<td>land value</td>
<td>0.00004238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor differential - Hydro</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00061999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. **Contributor Differential**

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $2,587,147 (GST incl.) and is based on the land value of all properties within the catchment boundary except those identified in the differential classification as being hydro properties.

A Contributor differential of $0.00004236 Dollar per Dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the land value of every rating unit within the Waikato and Waipa Catchments, including their tributaries (as defined on Project Watershed Boundary Map – WRC Plan Number 1007) except those identified in the differential classification as being hydro properties.

21. **Contributor and Beneficiary Differential - Hydro**

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $637,916 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties identified as being hydro classification within the catchment boundary.

A Contributor differential - hydro of $0.00061099 Dollar per Dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the capital value of every rating unit identified as being hydro classification within the Waikato and Waipa Catchments, including their tributaries (as defined on Project Watershed Boundary Map – WRC Plan Number 1007).

22. **Management Zone Differential**

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $4,897,034 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the management zone boundary.

A separate Management Zone differential as set out in Schedule (D), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the capital value of every rating unit identified within the management zone (as defined on Project Watershed Management Zone Map – WRC Plan Number 1008). The rate is set on a differential basis according to the location of the land (being the relevant local authority boundaries).
23. River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit Differential
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $2,802,365 (GST incl.) and is based on a differential basis of land area, capital value or per rating unit.

A separate River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit differential as set out in Schedule (E), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020.

Schedule (E)

24. Main Channel - Waikato
Total Revenue to be raised $142,149 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waipa district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waipa district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waikato district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Otorohanga district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waitomo district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hamilton city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waipa management zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waipa district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waikato district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Otorohanga district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waitomo district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hamilton city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Waikato management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zone differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waikato district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Matamata-Piako district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hauraki district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hamilton city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Waikato management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zone differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hamilton city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waipa district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waikato district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Waikato management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zone differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Otorohanga district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Waikato district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taupo district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rotorua district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waipa district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Matamata-Piako district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Taupo management zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taupo district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Factor used</th>
<th>Rate in the $1 per $1 of value (GST inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00004759</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00003185</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00002720</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00002487</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00003991</td>
<td>capital value</td>
<td>0.00005638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. **Main Channel - Mangawara**  
Total Revenue to be raised $28,019 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6A</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCSECD</td>
<td>4.0278</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>2.8194</td>
<td>1.6111</td>
<td>1.0069</td>
<td>0.6042</td>
<td>0.4028</td>
<td>0.2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. **Community Works - Waikato**  
Total Revenue to be raised $238,536 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. **Community Works - Mangawara**  
Total Revenue to be raised $45,872 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6A</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCSECD</td>
<td>6.6070</td>
<td>5.2156</td>
<td>4.6249</td>
<td>2.6428</td>
<td>1.6517</td>
<td>0.9910</td>
<td>0.6607</td>
<td>0.3304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. **Local Protection Works – Meremere West**  
Total Revenue to be raised $22,441 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/MW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECB</td>
<td>156.1798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. **Local Protection Works – Meremere**  
Total Revenue to be raised $84,537 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>5/MM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECB</td>
<td>200.3665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. **Local Protection Works – Churchill**  
Total Revenue to be raised $86,213 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECB</td>
<td>119.4013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. **Local Protection Works – Island Block**  
Total Revenue to be raised $41,321 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>2/IB</th>
<th>2/IB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECB</td>
<td>335.3343</td>
<td>111.7779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. **Local Protection Works – Orchard Road**  
Total Revenue to be raised $26,922 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECB</td>
<td>1067.2332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. **Local Protection Works – Swan**  
Total Revenue to be raised $47,954 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/SWAN</th>
<th>6/SWAN</th>
<th>7/SWAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>89.6263</td>
<td>40.3111</td>
<td>32.5839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. **Local Protection Works – Vrsalijkos**  
Total Revenue to be raised $14,062 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>2/V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>273.1765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. **Local Protection Works – Waikare**  
Total Revenue to be raised $93,050 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>83.3482</td>
<td>75.0134</td>
<td>70.8460</td>
<td>37.5067</td>
<td>31.3393</td>
<td>16.6696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. **Local Protection Works – Kimihia**  
Total Revenue to be raised $17,541 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1/KH</th>
<th>3/KH</th>
<th>4/KH</th>
<th>8/KH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>94.2946</td>
<td>84.8652</td>
<td>80.1505</td>
<td>37.7179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. **Local Protection Works – Huntly West**  
Total Revenue to be raised $223,566 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1/WW</th>
<th>7/WW</th>
<th>8/WW</th>
<th>12/WW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>71.2634</td>
<td>32.0685</td>
<td>28.5053</td>
<td>7.1264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. **Local Protection Works – Ruawaro**  
Total Revenue to be raised $60,893 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/RUA</th>
<th>5/RUA</th>
<th>12/RUA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>265.8834</td>
<td>91.8406</td>
<td>31.2804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. **Local Protection Works – Waahi**  
Total Revenue to be raised $13,702 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>10/WAA</th>
<th>12/WAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>41.5401</td>
<td>16.6161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. **Local Protection Works – Tickles**  
Total Revenue to be raised $15,684 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1/TIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC B</td>
<td>679.6901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. **Local Protection Works – Te Kohanga**  
Total Revenue to be raised $48,999 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1/TK</th>
<th>4/TK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>71.1325</td>
<td>60.4626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. **Local Protection Works – Onewhero West**  
Total Revenue to be raised 28,056 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/OW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>178.7635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. **Local Protection Works – Tuakau**  
Total Revenue to be raised $22,246 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/TU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>166.4378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. **Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Compartment 1**  
Total Revenue to be raised $6,812 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/MG1</th>
<th>4/MG1</th>
<th>7/MG1</th>
<th>8/MG1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>60.6484</td>
<td>32.1080</td>
<td>28.5404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. **Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Compartment 2**  
Total Revenue to be raised $34,664 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/MG2</th>
<th>4/MG2</th>
<th>7/MG2</th>
<th>8/MG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>190.2498</td>
<td>179.6694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. **Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Compartment 3**  
Total Revenue to be raised $67,125 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/MG3</th>
<th>4/MG3</th>
<th>7/MG3</th>
<th>8/MG3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>141.4810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. **Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Compartment 4**  
Total Revenue to be raised $81,953 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/MG4</th>
<th>4/MG4</th>
<th>7/MG4</th>
<th>8/MG4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>195.2414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. **Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Compartment 5**  
Total Revenue to be raised $9,818 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/MG5</th>
<th>4/MG5</th>
<th>7/MG5</th>
<th>8/MG5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSEC8</td>
<td>385.7233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. **Local Protection Works – Motukaraka**  
Total Revenue to be raised $96,958 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>2/MK</th>
<th>3/MK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>67.9760</td>
<td>64.3982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. **Local Protection Works – Bell Road**
Total Revenue to be raised $79,401 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>5/BEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>452.1064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. **Local Protection Works – Waller**
Total Revenue to be raised $14,768 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>556.7934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. **Local Protection Works – Parish Polder**
Total Revenue to be raised $25,952 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>283.2188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. **Local Protection Works – Orton**
Total Revenue to be raised $39,096 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>4/OR</th>
<th>5/OR</th>
<th>6/OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>233.0936</td>
<td>191.9593</td>
<td>150.8254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. **Local Protection Works – Locke**
Total Revenue to be raised $5,609 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>3/LCK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>257.2453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. **Local Protection Works – Mercer West Southern**
Total Revenue to be raised $5,266 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>7/MWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>51.9925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. **Local Protection Works – Mercer West Morrisons**
Total Revenue to be raised $16,198 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>8/MWM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSECBC</td>
<td>109.7691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. **Local Protection Works – Mercer West Morrisons Capital**
Total Revenue to be raised $30,892 (GST incl.)
58. **Local Protection Works – Deroles**
   Total Revenue to be raised $22,604 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

59. **Local Protection Works – Deroles Capital**
   Total Revenue to be raised $51,995 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

60. **Local Protection Works – Aka Aka**
   Total Revenue to be raised $17,989 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

61. **Local Protection Works – Aka Aka**
   Total Revenue to be raised $58,561 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

62. **Local Protection Works – Mangawara**
   Total Revenue to be raised $272,140 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

63. **Local Protection Works – Whangamaire**
   Total Revenue to be raised $19,641 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

64. **Local Protection Works – Kawa**
   Total Revenue to be raised $3,024 (GST incl.)
   Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare
65. Local Protection Works – Tongariro
Total Revenue to be raised $140,703 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT</td>
<td>0.00080085</td>
<td>0.00048051</td>
<td>0.00032034</td>
<td>0.00028030</td>
<td>0.00016017</td>
<td>0.00008009</td>
<td>0.00004004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. Local Protection Works – Tongariro Capital
Total Revenue to be raised $84,833 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT</td>
<td>0.00048285</td>
<td>0.00028971</td>
<td>0.00019314</td>
<td>0.00016900</td>
<td>0.00009657</td>
<td>0.00004829</td>
<td>0.00002414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. Local Protection Works – Tauranga-Taupo
Total Revenue to be raised $68,450 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3/A</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT</td>
<td>0.00082419</td>
<td>0.00065935</td>
<td>0.00028847</td>
<td>0.00020050</td>
<td>0.00020370</td>
<td>0.00008242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Local Protection Works – Tauranga-Taupo Capital
Total Revenue to be raised $61,057 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>1/C</th>
<th>2/C</th>
<th>3/C</th>
<th>3/A/C</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT</td>
<td>0.00073157</td>
<td>0.00058814</td>
<td>0.00025731</td>
<td>0.00018379</td>
<td>0.00020585</td>
<td>0.00007352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. Hurstville Township Rate
Total Revenue to be raised $132,927 (GST incl.)
Rated on fixed rate per rating unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>47.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. Otorohanga Rate
Total Revenue to be raised $52,145(GST incl.)
Rated on fixed rate per rating unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST incl.)</th>
<th>39.72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otorohanga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Drainage Rates

71. The Drainage rates recommended below reflect the work programmes and rate revenue requirements contained in the Annual Plan 2019/20.

72. Recommended that pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purposes of providing for the payment of costs of the drainage works within the Thames Valley, Waikato Central, Aka Aka and Franklin Waikato District drainage areas, hereby sets targeted rates on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (F) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on every rating unit within each of the listed drainage areas, on the rating system as listed for each rate.
Schedule (F)

73. Thames Valley Drainage Area
Total Revenue to be raised $650,612 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area — Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huiahuia</td>
<td>129.0163</td>
<td>12.9016</td>
<td>10.3121</td>
<td>6.4508</td>
<td>3.2254</td>
<td>1.9352</td>
<td>0.6451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakura</td>
<td>105.9427</td>
<td>10.5942</td>
<td>8.4754</td>
<td>5.2571</td>
<td>2.6448</td>
<td>1.5991</td>
<td>0.5991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakaroa</td>
<td>20.9576</td>
<td>16.5558</td>
<td>10.3477</td>
<td>5.1737</td>
<td>3.1042</td>
<td>1.0347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitoa</td>
<td>16.9720</td>
<td>8.7776</td>
<td>5.4860</td>
<td>2.7430</td>
<td>1.6548</td>
<td>0.5486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihou</td>
<td>17.0300</td>
<td>13.6249</td>
<td>8.3180</td>
<td>4.2575</td>
<td>2.5545</td>
<td>0.8535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elstow</td>
<td>196.2337</td>
<td>19.6233</td>
<td>15.6977</td>
<td>9.1117</td>
<td>4.9007</td>
<td>0.9912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahunui</td>
<td>18.1411</td>
<td>14.5129</td>
<td>9.0705</td>
<td>4.5385</td>
<td>2.7211</td>
<td>0.9071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atikope pumping</td>
<td>36.9067</td>
<td>29.5270</td>
<td>18.4554</td>
<td>9.2272</td>
<td>5.5363</td>
<td>1.8545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahunui pumping</td>
<td>65.4365</td>
<td>52.3490</td>
<td>32.7180</td>
<td>16.3591</td>
<td>9.1854</td>
<td>3.2718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovers East</td>
<td>164.4237</td>
<td>131.5385</td>
<td>82.2121</td>
<td>41.0359</td>
<td>24.6633</td>
<td>8.2212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksford</td>
<td>6.8253</td>
<td>5.4903</td>
<td>3.4227</td>
<td>1.7063</td>
<td>1.0218</td>
<td>0.3413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamata Urban</td>
<td>130.5975</td>
<td>144.4220</td>
<td>99.2638</td>
<td>45.1301</td>
<td>27.1630</td>
<td>9.0264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. Waikato Central Drainage Area
Total Revenue to be raised $1,011,943 (GST incl.)
Rated on Area — Rates assessed on Dollar per hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotokarua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.5867</td>
<td>6.7189</td>
<td>6.8400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hautapu</td>
<td>258.9687</td>
<td>25.9687</td>
<td>17.7775</td>
<td>12.6832</td>
<td>6.3491</td>
<td>3.8095</td>
<td>1.2698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencourt</td>
<td>473.8415</td>
<td>47.3841</td>
<td>33.1693</td>
<td>23.6921</td>
<td>9.4794</td>
<td>7.1076</td>
<td>2.3923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohaupo-Ngaringo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.5667</td>
<td>9.4064</td>
<td>6.7814</td>
<td>3.3909</td>
<td>2.7212</td>
<td>0.7362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfield maintenance</td>
<td>211.0119</td>
<td>21.0119</td>
<td>17.4759</td>
<td>11.0306</td>
<td>5.2583</td>
<td>3.4952</td>
<td>1.1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfield pumping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241.3167</td>
<td>133.2375</td>
<td>122.1583</td>
<td>61.0793</td>
<td>36.6475</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komokorau 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.5291</td>
<td>13.6704</td>
<td>9.7645</td>
<td>5.8587</td>
<td>2.9294</td>
<td>0.9785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komokorau 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.3170</td>
<td>24.0585</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mangawara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6795</td>
<td>3.5757</td>
<td>2.8398</td>
<td>1.1359</td>
<td>0.5154</td>
<td>0.3480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mangawara</td>
<td>130.0505</td>
<td>13.0505</td>
<td>9.1061</td>
<td>6.3045</td>
<td>2.6018</td>
<td>1.9514</td>
<td>0.7805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautei</td>
<td>180.4003</td>
<td>18.4003</td>
<td>12.9780</td>
<td>5.2700</td>
<td>5.7080</td>
<td>2.7810</td>
<td>1.1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upotata</td>
<td>246.1250</td>
<td>24.6125</td>
<td>17.2290</td>
<td>12.0664</td>
<td>4.9226</td>
<td>3.0915</td>
<td>1.4768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawarawhia</td>
<td>439.7293</td>
<td>43.9729</td>
<td>36.7807</td>
<td>22.9880</td>
<td>11.4940</td>
<td>6.0946</td>
<td>2.2988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangawai</td>
<td>317.9316</td>
<td>31.7931</td>
<td>22.5241</td>
<td>13.8958</td>
<td>6.3538</td>
<td>4.7687</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>2,230.3788</td>
<td>446.0727</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>223.0385</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.2008</td>
<td>65.4087</td>
<td>48.3630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopoho</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.1662</td>
<td>18.3967</td>
<td>9.3754</td>
<td>3.0582</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirikiriroa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.7860</td>
<td>20.8942</td>
<td>20.8942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koromatua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.7674</td>
<td>23.8399</td>
<td>5.9481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matangi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.0811</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawarawhia North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>263.9180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukeroro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0371</td>
<td>49.9747</td>
<td>37.5166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketaha</td>
<td>238.7907</td>
<td>33.8791</td>
<td>23.7153</td>
<td>16.0295</td>
<td>10.1637</td>
<td>5.0819</td>
<td>1.6939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kowhai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88.2665</td>
<td>66.1341</td>
<td>33.1112</td>
<td>22.0741</td>
<td>11.8371</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75. Aka Aka Drainage Area  
Total Revenue to be raised $225,630 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>fixed rate per hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aka Aka</td>
<td>$ 46.67 (GST incl.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. Franklin Waikato District Drainage Area  
Total Revenue to be raised $552,305 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Area – Rates assessed on Dollar per Hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST Inclusive)</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikato Commins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motukaraka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.407</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.646</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuakau Swamp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133.1428</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.5873</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangatawhiri Compartment 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.7240</td>
<td>9.5747</td>
<td>5.7448</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangatawhiri Compartment 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107.4491</td>
<td>71.6327</td>
<td>23.8776</td>
<td>14.3265</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangatawhiri Compartment 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.0720</td>
<td>19.3613</td>
<td>6.4604</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangatawhiri Compartment 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94.5930</td>
<td>55.3537</td>
<td>38.7960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.3549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangatawhiri Compartment 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.9525</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.0101</td>
<td>31.8097</td>
<td>22.4064</td>
<td>11.2082</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisons Swamp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kohanga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.5635</td>
<td>5.8545</td>
<td>2.9278</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95.0719</td>
<td>47.5390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onepoto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>142.3110</td>
<td>106.7333</td>
<td>71.1555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onekawa Downstream</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okowhau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116.1263</td>
<td>66.3882</td>
<td>31.1888</td>
<td>16.5713</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntly West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.7469</td>
<td>41.2486</td>
<td>16.4983</td>
<td>6.2578</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.4984</td>
<td>42.9344</td>
<td>17.5701</td>
<td>8.8004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horororo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85.3601</td>
<td>59.3538</td>
<td>23.8160</td>
<td>13.9033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austins</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99.6943</td>
<td>62.1189</td>
<td>24.5226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109.0157</td>
<td>78.2838</td>
<td>31.1172</td>
<td>15.0749</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guesta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.9617</td>
<td>38.6005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawaro Furniss</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.0322</td>
<td>39.3444</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawaro Central</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawaro North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.8996</td>
<td>49.0754</td>
<td>18.8473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinohia SIA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68.9626</td>
<td>34.9221</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinohia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70.7289</td>
<td>35.3786</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiriri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102.3266</td>
<td>85.2687</td>
<td>51.1733</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Block</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.1897</td>
<td>37.0801</td>
<td>18.5548</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99.0207</td>
<td>66.0072</td>
<td>33.0127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsalljoks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175.6595</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.6302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Road</td>
<td>808.2023</td>
<td>80.8202</td>
<td>56.3741</td>
<td>40.4101</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.1230</td>
<td>4.0311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill East</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160.2185</td>
<td>84.9542</td>
<td>63.7311</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meremere East</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.3236</td>
<td>48.2427</td>
<td>32.1554</td>
<td>16.0810</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangatu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.9728</td>
<td>59.5783</td>
<td>29.9852</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangawara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.6414</td>
<td>9.1362</td>
<td>7.3207</td>
<td>1.8155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puakepaia 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.3065</td>
<td>14.1533</td>
<td>7.0767</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puakepaia 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.1446</td>
<td>28.0720</td>
<td>14.6359</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawaro East</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruawaro West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.1273</td>
<td>29.3455</td>
<td>19.5637</td>
<td>9.7818</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawers Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikare Frost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.3812</td>
<td>23.1905</td>
<td>11.5952</td>
<td>5.8440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikare Ohiwai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80.8540</td>
<td>40.4274</td>
<td>20.0323</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikare Nikau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.5232</td>
<td>35.2094</td>
<td>28.3204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.1602</td>
<td>7.0589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikare Rangiriri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.1591</td>
<td>13.8723</td>
<td>4.6118</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikare West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.5368</td>
<td>22.7723</td>
<td>11.3862</td>
<td>5.6788</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikorea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.9610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) Rate

77. Recommended that pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purposes of funding flood protection, soil conservation, catchment oversight and river management work in the Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone),
hereby sets a targeted rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (G) and Schedule (H) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on all rateable property within the Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) separate rating area (as defined on Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) Map – based on Thames Coromandel District Council Area excluding those properties in the Waihou Valley Scheme), on the rating system listed for each rate.

Schedule (G)

78. Peninsula Catchment Differential – CV basis
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $797,472 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.

A Peninsula Catchment Capital Value basis differential of $0.00004402 Dollar per Dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the capital value of every rating unit within the Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) area based on Thames Coromandel District Council Area excluding those properties in the Waihou Valley Scheme.

79. Peninsula Catchment Differential – Per Property basis
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $797,472GST incl.) and is based on a uniform charge on every rating unit within the catchment boundary.

A Peninsula Catchment property basis differential of $33.74 Dollars per rating unit (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on a uniform basis on every rating unit within the Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) area based on Thames Coromandel District Council Area excluding those properties in the Waihou Valley Scheme.

80. River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit Differential
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $496,771 (GST incl.) and is based on a differential basis of capital value or per rating unit basis.

A separate River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit differential as set out in Schedule (H), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on all rateable property within the Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) area based on Thames Coromandel District Council Area excluding those properties in the Waihou Valley Scheme, on the rating system listed for each rate.

Schedule (H)

81. Local Protection Works – Te Puru
Total Revenue to be raised $51,322 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Puru</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. Local Protection Works – Te Puru Capital
Total Revenue to be raised $94,447 (GST incl.)
### 83. Local Protection Works – Waiomu - Pohue
Total Revenue to be raised $18,781 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiomu-Pohue</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>0.00018694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 84. Local Protection Works – Waiomu- Pohue Capital
Total Revenue to be raised $3,437 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiomu-Pohue</td>
<td>Capital Indirect</td>
<td>0.00003421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 85. Local Protection Works – Pohue Capital
Total Revenue to be raised $4,606 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pohue Channel capital</td>
<td>Capital channel 1</td>
<td>0.00050267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 86. Local Protection Works – Waiomu Capital
Total Revenue to be raised $9,143 (GST incl.)
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiomu channel capital</td>
<td>Capital channel 1</td>
<td>0.00060435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
87. **Local Protection Works – Waiomu Stopbank Capital**  
Total Revenue to be raised $2,672 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiomu stopbank capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stopbank 1</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00033183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stopbank 3</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00005530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88. **Local Protection Works – Graham’s Creek**  
Total Revenue to be raised $26,990 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham's Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Maintenance</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00004160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89. **Local Protection Works – Graham’s Creek - Capital**  
Total Revenue to be raised $31,801 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Capital</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00002470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Channel CH1</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00015799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stopbank SB2</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00010940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Channel CH2</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00004700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stopbank SB1</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00032820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90. **Local Protection Works – Tapu**  
Total Revenue to be raised $0 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. **Local Protection Works – Coromandel Township**  
Total Revenue to be raised $68,602 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00010812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. **Local Protection Works – Coromandel Township Capital**  
Total Revenue to be raised $28,156 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel township capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital channel 1</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.000241179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital channel 2</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.000026589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital channel 3</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.000102955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital indirect</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.000030882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
93. **Local Protection Works – Whangamata Harbour**  
Total Revenue to be raised $66,698 (GST incl.)  
Rated on a per rating unit basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whangamata Harbour</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>13.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94. **Local Protection Works – Tairua Harbour**  
Total Revenue to be raised $83,521 (GST incl.)  
Rated on a per rating unit basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tairua Harbour</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>18.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95. **Local Protection Works – Coromandel Retirement Village**  
Total Revenue to be raised $1,015 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel Retirement Village</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00008801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Capital Value $1 per $1</td>
<td>0.00008801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96. **Local Protection Works – Karaka Stream Capital**  
Total Revenue to be raised $5,575 (GST incl.)  
Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Factor Used</th>
<th>Rate ($) GST Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karaka Stream capital</td>
<td>Capital KL1</td>
<td>0.00039256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital KL2</td>
<td>0.00019628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital KL3</td>
<td>0.00006543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v. **West Coast Rate**

97. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purposes of funding flood protection, soil conservation, catchment oversight and river management work in the West Coast zone, hereby sets a targeted rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (I) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on all rateable property within the West Coast zone separate rating area (as defined on West Coast Map) on the rating system listed for each rate.

Schedule (I)

98. **West Coast Catchment Differential – CV basis**  
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $424,419 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.

A West Coast Catchment Capital Value basis differential of $0.00008315 Dollar per Dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the capital value of every rating unit within the West Coast zone area.

99. **West Coast Catchment Differential – Per Rating unit basis**
The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $424,419 (GST incl.) and is based on a uniform charge on every rating unit within the catchment boundary.

100. A West coast Catchment property basis differential of $62.17 Dollars per rating unit (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on a uniform basis on every rating unit within the West Coast zone area.

vi. Biosecurity Rate

101. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $8,817,392 (GST incl.).

102. Recommended that pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council hereby sets a biosecurity rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (J) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, on the capital value of every rating unit within the Waikato region.

103. Recommended that pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 the Council resolves:
   1. That a biosecurity rate be set as a differential rate in the Dollar for all rateable land within the region; and
   2. That the rateable value of land for the biosecurity rate shall be the equalised capital value of the land; and
   3. That the basis for differentiating the capital values of properties is the location of the land, determined by the relevant local authority boundary.

Schedule (J)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of benefit (GST inclusive)</th>
<th>Percentage of Region</th>
<th>Rate $1 per $1 CV (GST inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton City</td>
<td>24.42%</td>
<td>0.000055131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamata-Piako</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
<td>0.00003077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otorohanga</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>0.00005922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>0.00003540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Waikato</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>0.00005156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>0.00006170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames-Coromandel</td>
<td>12.72%</td>
<td>0.00005494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>17.51%</td>
<td>0.00005471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipa</td>
<td>11.88%</td>
<td>0.00005988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitomo</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>0.00005132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauraki</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>0.00005111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vii. Public Transport Rate

104. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $10,725,937 (GST incl.).

105. Recommended that pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, hereby sets a targeted Public Transport rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (K) for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on the capital value of every rating unit within Hamilton City.

106. Schedule (K)
   Rated on Capital Value – Rates assessed on Dollar per Dollar
viii. Stock Truck Effluent Rate

107. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $132,680 (GST incl.).

108. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, hereby sets a targeted Stock Truck Effluent rate for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 of $0.0000235 Dollar per Dollar (GST incl.) on the capital value of all rateable rating units 2 hectares and above within the Waikato region.

**d) TARGETED RATES ON A UNIFORM BASIS**

109. The following rates are set under Section 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and are assessed on a uniform basis.

i. **Natural Heritage Rate**

110. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $1,181,007 (GST incl.).

111. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council hereby sets a targeted Natural Heritage rate for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on a uniform basis of $5.80 (GST incl.) on every rating unit within the Waikato Region.

ii. **Permitted Activity Monitoring Rate**

112. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $1,751,082 (GST incl.).

113. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council hereby sets a targeted Permitted Activity Monitoring rate for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on a uniform basis of $69.62 (GST incl.) on every rating unit of two hectares or greater, within the Waikato Region.

iii. **Civil Defence and Emergency Management Rate**

114. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $2,163,788 (GST incl.).

115. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, hereby sets a targeted Civil Defence and Emergency Management rate for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on a uniform basis of $10.62 (GST incl.) on every rating unit within the Waikato Region.

iv. **Regional Services Rate**

116. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2019/20 is $822,130 (GST incl.).
117. **Recommended that** pursuant to Section 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, hereby sets a targeted Regional Services rate for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 on a uniform basis of $4.04 (GST incl.) on every rating unit within the Waikato Region.

118. **DUE DATES FOR PAYMENT OF RATES**

**Recommended that** a single invoice be sent in September 2019 with payment due 31 October 2019.

Where any payment is made by a ratepayer that is less than the amount now payable, the council will apply the payment firstly to any rates outstanding from previous rating years and then proportionately across all current year rates due.

119. **PENALTIES**

**Recommended that** pursuant to Sections 57 and 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002:

- those rates not paid by 30 June 2019 will attract a penalty of 10 per cent to the extent of non-payment on 4 July 2019 (being 5 working days from the date of the council resolution to assess the 2019/20 rates), and
- those 2019/20 rates not paid by 31 October 2019 will attract a penalty of 10 per cent to the extent of non-payment on 1 November 2019, and
- those prior year rates not paid will attract a further penalty of 10 per cent to the extent of non-payment on 6 January 2020.

Penalties will not be applied to accounts with an outstanding balance where an agreed arrangement to pay is in place.

120. **FINANCIAL CHARGES ON POSTPONED RATES**

**Recommended that** pursuant to Section 88 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, rates postponed under Section 87 will attract a yearly postponement fee of 1 per cent above the average 90 day bill rate on the outstanding yearly balance including interest charges from any previous years.

121. **PAYMENT OF RATES**

**Recommended that** Council accepts the following payment options:

- Direct Debit/Automatic Payment
- Cheque
- Internet/Phone Banking
- Credit card (via internet)
- Eftpos/Cheque/Cash Payment at NZ Post Shops
- Eftpos/Cheque/Cash Payment at Waikato Regional Council offices
- Eftpos/Cheque/Cash Payment at Hamilton City Council’s Hamilton office
Report to Council

Date: 4 June 2019

Author: Neville Williams – Director Community and Services

Authoriser: Vaughan Payne – Chief Executive

Subject: Council position on matters to be considered at the Local Government NZ 2019 AGM

Purpose
1. To seek confirmation of council’s position on the proposed remits submitted by other councils, and on the proposed rule changes for consideration at the Local Government NZ (LGNZ) 2019 Annual General Meeting.

Executive Summary
1. LGNZ invite member authorities to submit proposed remits for consideration at its Annual General Meeting. This year LGNZ have also proposed some changes to the LGNZ rules that will also be provided for consideration at the AGM.
2. Councillor Quayle is responsible for voting on behalf of the council. Council must consider the 24 proposed remit’s and the proposed changes and determine its support or otherwise.

Staff Recommendation:
1. THAT the report Council position on matters to be considered at the Local Government NZ 2019 AGM (Council meeting 27 June 2019) be received, and
2. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 1: Climate change – local government representation.
3. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 2: Ban on the sale of fireworks to the general public.
5. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 4: Prohibit parking on grass berms.
6. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 5: Short-term guest accommodation.
7. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 6: Nitrate in drinking water.
8. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 7: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987)
9. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 8: Weed control
10. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 9: Building defects claims
11. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 10: Social housing
12. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 11: Procurement
13. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 12: Single use polystyrene
14. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 13: Local Government Act 2002
15. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 14: Campground regulations
16. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 15: Living Wage
17. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 16: Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act
18. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 17: Greenhouse gases
19. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 18: Climate Change – funding policy framework
20. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 19: Road safety
21. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 20: Mobility scooter safety
22. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 21: Museums and galleries
23. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 22: Resource Management Act
24. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 23: Mayor decision to appoint Deputy Mayor
25. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed Remit 24: Beauty industry
26. THAT council [supports/does not support/abstains from the vote] on proposed rule changes to LGNZ.

Background
3. Every year, LGNZ invite member authorities to submit proposed remits for consideration at its Annual General Meeting. All proposed remits and accompanying information are screened and must meet the LGNZ Remit Policy. Twenty-four (24) proposed remits, summarised below, will be considered at the 2019 LGNZ Annual General Meeting in Wellington on 7 July 2019.

4. Council will be represented at the Annual General Meeting by three delegates and an observer, and the presiding delegate (Councillor Quayle) is responsible for voting on behalf of council.

Issue
5. Council must consider the 24 proposed remits and determine its support or otherwise.

Options and analysis
6. The proposed remits are summarised in the table below. The detailed information and research undertaken by each council is provided in the attached document (Attachment 1 - 2019 Annual General Meeting Remits).

### 1 Climate change – local government representation
**Remit:** That LGNZ calls on the Government to include local government representation (as determined by local government) at all levels of policy development, technical risk and resilience assessment, and data acquisition on climate change response policies – with an emphasis on climate adaptation: policy; legal; planning; and financial compensation regimes.

**Proposed by:** Auckland Council

**Supported by:** Zone One

**Staff recommendation:** Support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remit</th>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>Supported by</th>
<th>Staff recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Ban on the sale of fireworks to the general public</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ works with central government to introduce legislation to ban the sale of fireworks to the general public and end their private use.</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Metro Sector</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Traffic offences – red light running</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ request the Government to bring into line camera and officer-detected red light running offences with other traffic offences that incur demerit points.</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Metro Sector</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Prohibit parking on grass berms</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: To seek an amendment to clause 6.2 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004 to prohibit parking on urban berms.</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Metro Sector</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Short-term guest accommodation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ advocates for enabling legislation that would allow councils to require all guest accommodation providers to register with the council and that provides an efficient approach to imposing punitive action on operators who don’t comply.</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Metro Sector</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Nitrate in drinking water</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ recommend to the Government the funding of additional research into the effects of nitrates in drinking water on human health, and/or partner with international public health organisations to promote such research, in order to determine whether the current drinking water standard for nitrate is still appropriate for the protection of human health.</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Metro Sector</td>
<td>Support – not ing drinking water is not the focus for council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ initiates a review of Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987) (LGOIMA) request management nationally with a view to establishing clear and descriptive reporting for and by local authorities that will create a sector-wide picture of:&lt;br&gt;• Trends in the volume and nature of LGOIMA requests over time.&lt;br&gt;• Trends in users.&lt;br&gt;• The impacts of technology in terms of accessing information sought and the amount of information now held by local authorities (and able to be requested).&lt;br&gt;• The financial and resource impacts on local authorities in managing the LGOIMA function. That LGNZ use the data obtained to:&lt;br&gt;• Identify opportunities to streamline or simplify LGOIMA processes.&lt;br&gt;• Share best practice between local authorities.&lt;br&gt;• Assess the value of a common national local government framework of practice for LGOIMA requests.&lt;br&gt;• Identify opportunities to advocate for legislation changes on behalf of the sector (where these are indicated).</td>
<td>Hamilton City Council</td>
<td>Metro Sector</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Weed control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ encourages member councils to consider using environmentally friendly weed control methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Hamilton City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Metro Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 Building defects claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> LGNZ calls on central government to take action as recommended by the Law Commission in its 2014 report on “Liability of Multiple Defendants” to introduce a cap on the liability of councils in New Zealand in relation to building defects claims whilst joint and several liability applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Napier City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Zone Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Social housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ, in conjunction with central government, urgently focus on the development and implementation of a broader range of funding and financing tools in respect of community/social housing provision, than those which currently exist in the housing needs space. These should include funding to support the operation, upgrade and growth of council housing portfolios and, where a council chooses, access to Income Related Rents for eligible tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Napier City Council, Tauranga City Council and Wellington City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Zone Three, Metro Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 Procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ investigate the ability of the sector to collaborate in procuring open-source designs and plans for bulk infrastructure that are largely similar, with an initial approach to look at water and wastewater treatment facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> New Plymouth District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Central Hawkes Bay District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otorohanga District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Taranaki District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames-Coromandel District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 Single use polystyrene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ advocates to the Government to phase out single use polystyrene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Palmerston North City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Metro Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 Local Government Act 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ pursue an amendment to the Local Government Act 2002 to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Re-number sub-sections 181 (5) and (6) to sub-sections (6) and (7); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Introduce a new sub-section (5) to read: For all purposes the term “any work” in subsection 4 means any works constructed before xx Month 20xx; and includes any works that were wholly or partly in existence, or work on the construction of which commenced, before xx Month 20xx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Rangitikei District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Zone Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 Campground regulations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ request the Government to amend the Camping - Ground Regulations to allow councils to approve remote camp facilities on private property, subject to any such conditions as deemed required by a council, including the condition that any approved campground is x distance away from an existing campground, unless the existing campground operator agrees to waive this condition in writing.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Proposed by:</strong> Thames-Coromandel District Council&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported by:</strong> Dunedin City Council, Waikato District Council, New Plymouth District Council, Mackenzie District Council, Hamilton City Council&lt;br&gt;<strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 Living Wage</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: Wellington City Council asks that LGNZ members consider engaging with the Living Wage Aotearoa New Zealand Movement when developing policies on payment of the Living Wage.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Proposed by:</strong> Wellington City Council&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported by:</strong> Metro Sector&lt;br&gt;<strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: LGNZ, on behalf of its member councils ask for a review of the effectiveness of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 in reducing alcohol harm (e.g. price, advertising, purchase age and availability) and fully involve local government in that review.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Proposed by:</strong> Wellington City Council and Hastings District Council&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported by:</strong> Metro Sector&lt;br&gt;<strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17 Greenhouse gases</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: Wellington City Council asks that LGNZ members collectively adopt the position that government should revise the Resource Management Act 1991 to adequately consider the impact of greenhouse gases when making decisions under that law and to ensure that the Resource Management Act 1991 is consistent with the Zero Carbon Bill.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Proposed by:</strong> Wellington City Council&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported by:</strong> Metro Sector&lt;br&gt;<strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 Climate Change – funding policy framework</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: That LGNZ recommends to government that they establish an independent expert group to develop a new funding policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts as recommended by the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group (CCATWG). This new expert group would be supported by a secretariat and stakeholder advisory group.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Proposed by:</strong> Greater Wellington Regional Council&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported by:</strong> Regional Sector&lt;br&gt;<strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19 Road safety</strong>&lt;br&gt;Remit: 1. That LGNZ acknowledges that the New Zealand Transport Agency's (NZTA’s), Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (CoPTTM) is a comprehensive and robust document, and that NZTA ensures the CoPTTM system is regularly reviewed, refined and updated. However, in light of the recent road worker fatalities LGNZ requests NZTA, in partnership with Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs);&lt;br&gt;    a. Review afresh its Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (CoPTTM) to satisfy themselves that; i. The document provides sufficient guidelines and procedures to ensure approaching traffic are given every possible opportunity to become aware of the worksite ahead and to respond appropriately and in a timely manner.&lt;br&gt;    b. Review its CoPTTM Training System to ensure;&lt;br&gt;       i. Trainers are sufficiently qualified and adequately covering the training syllabus.&lt;br&gt;       ii. Site Traffic Management Supervisors (STMS’s) and Traffic Controllers (TC’s) are only certified when they can demonstrate competence in the application of CoPTTM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii. A robust refresher programme is in place to ensure those in charge of Traffic Management on worksites remain current in the required competencies.

c. Review its Site Auditing requirements to ensure the traffic management at worksites is independently audited at a sufficient frequency to ensure compliance, and that a significantly robust system is put in place to enable enforcement of compliance.

2. That LGNZ takes steps to remind its members of their duties with respect to their role as Road Controlling Authorities including; a. Appointing and sufficiently training and resourcing a Traffic Management Coordinator to ensure their obligations under the Health and Safety Work Act 2015, with respect to traffic management, are being met.

   b. Adequately resourcing and undertaking audits of road work sites to ensure compliance with CoPTTM.

**Proposed by:** Whakatāne District Council  
**Supported by:** Dunedin City Council  
Wairoa District Council  
Hamilton City Council  
Kawerau District Council  
Tauranga City Council  

**Staff recommendation:** Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>Mobility scooter safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ requests that government investigate the introduction of strengthened rules to govern the safe use of mobility scooters, particularly in relation to speed limits and registration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Whanganui District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Zone Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>Museums and galleries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That central government funding be made available on an annual basis for museums and galleries operated by territorial authorities with nationally significant collections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Whanganui District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Zone Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
<th>Resource Management Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That the selection of all independent commissioners for Resource Management Act hearings be centralised to improve independence and enhance the quality of decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Whanganui District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Zone Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>Mayor decision to appoint Deputy Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ request the Government to amend S.41A of the LGA2002 to give Mayors the same powers to appoint a deputy mayor as held by the Mayor of Auckland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Horowhenua District Council, Invercargill District Council and Whanganui District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported by:</strong> Provincial Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Abstain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24</th>
<th>Beauty industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remit:</strong> That LGNZ calls on the Government to develop and implement national guidelines, policy or regulations to achieve national consistency for the largely unregulated ‘health and beauty clinic’ industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed by:</strong> Whangarei District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Supported by:** Selwyn District Council  
Kawerau District Council  
Dunedin City Council  
Rangitikei District Council  
Far North District Council | |
| **Staff recommendation:** Abstain |
7. The proposed changes to the LGNZ rules are summarised in the table below. The full detail behind the changes are the attached documents (Attachment 2 – LGNZ Rules Review, Attachment 3 - Proposed Amendments to LGNZ Rules, Attachment 4 – Proposed Technical Changes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal One – Amendments to provide Te Maruata representation on National Council (including consequential amendments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reflect the increasing diversity of the local government family/whanau it is proposed that the Rules be amended to provide that the Chair of Te Maruata is a member of National Council, with full voting rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Two – Amendments to give effect to Auckland Council representation on National Council (including consequential amendments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is proposed that the Rules be amended to provide that Auckland Council has three seats on National Council, to be held by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mayor of Auckland (or an alternate member of the Auckland Council governing body appointed by the Mayor);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A member of the Auckland Council governing body; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A member of an Auckland Council local board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Three – Minor (administrative) substantive changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of minor administrative changes to the Rules are proposed, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusion of community board members in the definition of Elected Member;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ability for National Council to appoint individuals (with full speaking rights, but no voting rights) to the National Council to provide assistance to National Council because of their training, qualifications or experience; and to ensure diversity of representation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes to the definition of a quorum for the purpose of National Council meetings; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ability for National Council to pass a resolution without a meeting with the agreement of 75 per cent of all National Council members (as opposed to all National Council members, as currently required).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Four – Minor amendments to modernise and rationalise language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGNZ is proposing that a number of changes be made to modernise the Rules (eg to make provision for electronic notices and voting) and rationalise the language of the Rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Significance**

8. Having regard to the decision making provisions in the LGA 2002 and council’s Significance Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is not considered to have a high degree of significance.

**Policy Considerations**

9. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

**Conclusion**

10. It is recommended that council consider the 24 proposed remits and the proposed changes to the LGNZ rules and determine its support or otherwise.

**Attachments**

Attachment 1 - 2019 Annual General Meeting Remits
Attachment 2 – LGNZ Rules Review
Attachment 3 - Proposed Amendments to LGNZ Rules
2019 Annual General Meeting

Remits
Climate change – local government representation

Remit: That LGNZ calls on the Government to include local government representation (as determined by local government) at all levels of policy development, technical risk and resilience assessment, and data acquisition on climate change response policies – with an emphasis on climate adaptation: policy; legal; planning; and financial compensation regimes.

Proposed by: Auckland Council
Supported by: Zone One

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue
   a. Climate change action, impacts and related policy, risk, legal, planning and financial implications are borne most directly by local communities.
   b. As the structure and framework for a more cohesive New Zealand-wide approach emerges with the current government, it is critical that the country-wide context is informed directly by the local voice at a local council level so it is integrated appropriately into the wider context.
   c. Local government is likely to be responsible for implementing a range of central government climate change policies – it is therefore crucial that local government is represented in policy/technical design process to ensure it is fit for purpose at a local scale and able to be implemented cost-effectively in the local government system.

2. Background to its being raised
   a. Climate adaptation and mitigation approaches are being adopted across New Zealand, in some cases well in advance of a coherent national approach. As local councils make progress on strategy, policy, planning and direct initiatives, an opportunity exists to integrate learning, challenges or concerns into the wider national context.
   b. Some councils have pioneered new approaches with mana whenua, community engagement, evidence-building and research and cross-sector governance. Without a seat at the larger table, the lessons from these early adopters risk being lost in the national conversation/approach.
3. **New or confirming existing policy**

   This is a new policy.

4. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

   - The issue relates to LGNZ’s climate change work programme, particularly relating to the input/influence on the Zero Carbon Act and Independent Climate Commission, implementation of CCATWG recommendations, decision-making and risk, impacts assessment, and other elements.
   - A local seat at the larger New Zealand table would ensure a strong local voice for a range of workstreams.

5. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

   Aside from specific LGNZ workstreams relating to climate change (see above), central government has progressed consultation on the Zero Carbon Bill and Interim Climate Change Committee, has appointed a panel to produce a framework for national climate change risk assessment, and has announced a set of improvements to New Zealand’s emissions trading scheme. Likewise, a number of councils have progressed action plans and strategies to reduce emissions and prepare for climate impacts. Notably, New Zealand-wide emissions continue to rise and the serious risks associated with climate impacts continue to be better understood – an integrated local and national approach is very much needed in order to make any substantive progress on climate change in New Zealand.

6. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

   As described above, the Zero Carbon Act is the main relevant New Zealand legislation with accompanying frameworks, policies and schemes. A range of more local policies from the Auckland Unitary Plan to coastal policies need meticulous alignment and integration with the national approach in order for both to be most effective.

7. **Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone or Sector meeting**

   Zone 1 agreed on 1 March 2019 to support this remit.

8. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

   - It is recommended that LGNZ work with central government to advocate for these changes.
   - It is recommended that LGNZ engage directly with relevant ministers and ministries to ensure local government has an appropriate role in the National Climate Change Risk Assessment Framework, and all related and relevant work programmes.
Ban on the sale of fireworks to the general public

Remit: That LGNZ works with central government to introduce legislation to ban the sale of fireworks to the general public and end their private use.

Proposed by: Auckland Council
Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The following issues have been identified:

a. Community concern about the negative impacts of the ad-hoc private use of fireworks particularly around the deliberate and unintentional distress to people and animals and damage to property.

b. High demand for council and emergency services who receive a large number of complaints in relation to the use of fireworks.

c. The absence of regulatory powers to territorial authorities to ban the sale of fireworks by retailers to the general public.

2. Background to its being raised

a. The issue was raised during the review of the Auckland Council’s Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013 which prohibits setting off fireworks on public places.

b. During the review of this Bylaw, Auckland Council separately resolved to request the New Zealand Government to introduce legislation to ban the sale of fireworks to the general public and end their private use.

c. Reasons for the decision are stated in the ‘Nature of the issue’ and further details are in ‘What work or action on the issue has been done, and the outcome’.

3. New or confirming existing policy

This is a new policy.
4. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

This issue relates to LGNZ’s social issues portfolio which reflects working alongside central government to address social issues affecting community safety:

- Community safety is an issue of vital interest for councils as areas which are perceived to be “unsafe” are likely to experience lower levels of social cohesion and economic investment. When asked to rank issues that are most important to themselves and their communities’ safety is always one of the top.
- Framed in this way, prohibiting the private use and sale of fireworks through government legislation enhances community safety as a top priority for LGNZ. Furthermore, it also promotes social cohesion by enabling the use of public displays without the worries and danger of ad-hoc private use of fireworks.

5. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

The review of Auckland Council’s Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013 identified that a territorial authority has no regulatory powers to ban the retail sale of fireworks to the general public.

A territorial authority’s regulatory powers in relation to fireworks are limited to:

- Prohibiting fireworks from being set off on or from a public place.
- Addressing nuisance and safety issues that may arise from their use on other places (eg private property) and affect people in a public place.
- Addressing noise issues relating to fireworks being set off on other places.

Enforcement is also challenging and resource-intensive. Auckland Council (and potentially other territorial authorities) do not have capacity to respond to all complaints during peak times, and it is difficult to catch people in the act. There can also be health and safety risks for compliance staff.

A ban on the sale of fireworks through legislative reform would therefore be the most efficient and effective way of addressing issues identified in the ‘Nature of the issue’.

Any such ban would not prohibit public fireworks displays which enable a managed approach towards cultural celebrations that use fireworks throughout the year.

There is also a known level of public support for such a ban. Public feedback between October and December 2018 on the decision of Auckland Council to request a ban on the sale of fireworks was overwhelmingly supportive. Feedback to Auckland Council resolution was received from 7,997 people online. Feedback showed 89 per cent (7,041) in support and 10 per cent (837) opposed.
Key themes in support included:

- Concerns for the safety of people and animals (68 per cent).
- Concerns about the amount of noise (35 per cent).
- Concerns about stockpiling and use of fireworks after Guy Fawkes night (27 per cent).
- A preference for public fireworks displays only (23 per cent).

Key themes opposed, including from fireworks retailers, were:

- A ban would be excessively restrictive.
- In favour of more regulation on use instead of a ban.
- A ban would end a key part of kiwi culture and tradition.

Similar requests and petitions to ban the sale of fireworks to the general public have been delivered to the Government, including:

- An unsuccessful petition in 2015 with 32,000 signatures, including the SPCA, SAFE and the New Zealand Veterinarians Association.
- A recent petition in 2018 with nearly 18,000 signatures which was accepted on its behalf by Green Party animal welfare spokesperson Gareth Hughes.

A ban on the sale of fireworks would align New Zealand legislation to that of other comparative jurisdictions. For example, retail sale of fireworks to the general public is prohibited in every Australian jurisdiction (except the Northern Territories and Tasmania where strict restrictions on the sale and use are in place).

6. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

**Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001**

- Fireworks may be displayed for retail sale or sold by a retailer during the period beginning on 2 November and ending at the close of 5 November in each year.
- A person must be at least 18 years in order to purchase fireworks.

**WorkSafe**

- Regulates health and safety in a workplace and administers the regulations for storing fireworks in a workplace.
- Approve compliance certifiers who certify public/commercial displays.

**New Zealand Police**

- Enforce regulations around the sale of retail fireworks, including requirements around the sale period and age restrictions under the Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001.
- Address complaints about dangerous use of fireworks.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

- Responsible for providing information about the sale of retail fireworks.
- Responsible for approving certifiers to test and certify that retail fireworks are safe prior to being sold in New Zealand.
- Provides approval for hazardous substances, including fireworks and provide import certificates to allow fireworks to be brought into New Zealand and the requirements for labelling and packaging of fireworks.

Auckland Council

- Deals with complaints about noise from fireworks.
- Prohibits setting off fireworks from public places under its Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013.

New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)

- Responsible for enforcing Land Transport Rule 1 which covers fireworks being transported on the road.

7. Suggested course of action envisaged

We ask that LGNZ request the Government to include red light running with other traffic offences that incur demerit points.
3 Traffic offences – red light running

Remit: That LGNZ request the Government to bring into line camera and officer-detected red light running offences with other traffic offences that incur demerit points.

Proposed by: Auckland Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

1. Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

LGNZ strategic goals include a safe system for transport – increasingly free of death and serious injury. This proposal is directly working towards a safe road system, with an integrated approach across infrastructure, operation of the road network and enforcement.

The red-light-running-related crash-risk has increased in recent years (CAS) and additional prevention measures are required to reduce and eventually eliminate the social, financial and road trauma burden of these crashes.

Making use of safety cameras and demerit points would allow the intent of the law to be upheld without the need for significantly increased police presence, and is a cost effective way to ensure safety at high risk camera locations.

Demerit points are more effective than fines in deterring unsafe road user behaviour as the deterrent effect impacts equally across a wide range of road users.

We ask that LGNZ request the Government that red light running be included with other traffic offences that incur demerit points (currently absent from the list of similar offences that acquire points, although this was proposed in 2007).

All councils in New Zealand stand to benefit from reduced red-light running and cost-effective enforcement of safety using red light cameras which can operate more cheaply over wide areas. This will support councils to get strong safety results from their road safety camera programmes.

Demerit point systems (DPS) work through prevention, selection and correction mechanisms. A DPS can help increase compliance with stop signals, reducing the likelihood of exposure to non-survivable forces, and it can help reduce repeat offending among ‘loss of licence’ drivers who repeatedly make poor safety choices which may lead to a crash.
Applying demerit points to red-light-running offences would help make the whole penalty system more meaningful and fair, and better reflect the risk. It is expected that the costs would be minimal, mostly in the justice sector, however these too can be minimised with an educational approach.

2. **Background to its being raised**

   **Road safety crisis**

   Auckland, as the rest of New Zealand, has an increasing road toll. From 2014 to 2017 Auckland had an increase in deaths of 78 per cent. The rest of New Zealand had an increase of almost 30 per cent in that same period. Serious injuries have increased at similar rates in that time. This follows a long period of gradual reductions in road trauma. The previous methods for managing road safety are no longer working.

   A Vision Zero approach requires clear expectations and shared responsibility about safe behaviour at intersections, from road users and legislators and managers of the road system.

   Auckland Transport (AT) Independent Road Safety Business Improvement Review (BIR) recommends increasing penalties for camera offences for all drivers, alongside other recommendations for road safety sector partnerships.

   National Road Safety Strategy update is underway. It would help to have LGNZ support for changes like this being considered under the strategy.

3. **New or confirming existing policy**

   **Red light running or failing to stop at a red signal at intersections:**

   - Note that in this 2007 release for changes to the demerit system in 2010, proposed a fine of $50 and 25 demerit points for red light running.
     

   10 years of driver offence data:


   **Number of red light running offences for 2014-2018 five year period, all of New Zealand:**

   - Officer issued: 61,208 or $8.9 million in fines, no demerit points.
   - Camera issued: 14,904 or $2.2 million in fines, no demerit points.
4. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

The overall strategic focus of LGNZ includes leadership and delivery of change on the big issues confronting New Zealand communities, such as road safety, with a focus on best performance and value for communities. Safety cameras with reliable enforcement tick off a number of these requirements.

This proposal could support three of the five strategic policy priorities in the LGNZ Policy statement 2017-2019, although it does not fit under one alone:

- **Infrastructure**: LGNZ’s policy statement mentions a safe system for transport – increasingly free of death and serious injury (p6). This proposal is directly working towards a safe road system, including infrastructure, operation of the road network and enforcement.

- **Risk and resilience**: Also known as safe and sustainable transport, Vision Zero and this detailed change to road safety supports a risk-based approach to increasing safety in New Zealand communities. Collaboration between local and central government is necessary to achieve the safe system goal and treating no death or serious injury as acceptable for those communities.

- **Social issue – community safety**: LGNZ supports projects that strengthen confidence in the police and improve perceptions of safety. This proposal reflects the goal of responsive policing, and innovative solutions for dealing with social issues.

**Note on equity**

While demerit points provide a more equitable deterrent effect compared to fines and help dispel the myth of ‘revenue gathering’, an increase in the use of demerit points may still impact some low deprivation communities and create ‘transport poverty’ issues, particularly in areas with high sharing of vehicles. One way to manage this potential equity issue is to use the Swedish model for managing safety cameras where they are only switched on a proportion of the time and are well supported by local road safety education activities.

5. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

From Auckland Transport research report: *Auckland Red Light Camera Project: Final Evaluation Report, 2011*: “When red light cameras were trialled in Auckland between 2008 and 2010, there was a 43 per cent reduction in red-light running and an average 63 per cent decrease in crashes attributable to red light running.”

Conversations with AT and Policing Operations on demerits for safety camera infringements indicate that police are very supportive of demerit points for safety cameras.

Reasons include that demerits from safety cameras can be easily transferred to the driver involved in the infringement, which addresses concerns that vehicle owners who are not driving would be unfairly penalised.
Further conversations between AT and New Zealand Police indicate that red light running offences are an anomaly as they do not lead to demerit points. For comparison, failing to give way at a pedestrian crossing is 35 points, and ignoring the flashing red signal at rail crossings, 20 points.

The effect of demerit points on young drivers: incentives and disincentives can have an important impact on young, novice drivers’ behaviour, including demerit points as a concrete disincentive.

From OECD research report: Young Drivers: The Road to Safety 2006 by the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (EMCT), OECD publishing, France.

Comment on technology used for enforcement:

Existing cameras are more than capable of detecting offences, it is just the legal rules that are preventing this. However, it may be worth considering that new intelligent technology will potentially improve this process even further in future.

6. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

   To change the:

   The demerits points system comes from section 88 of the Land Transport Act and expressly excludes offences detected by camera enforcement (“vehicle surveillance equipment” as it is called in legislation).

   These sections of the Act are supported by reg 6 and schedule 2 of the Land Transport (Offences and Penalties) Regulations 1999.

7. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

   We ask that LGNZ request the Government to include red light running with other traffic offences that incur demerit points.
Prohibit parking on grass berms

Remit: To seek an amendment to clause 6.2 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004 to prohibit parking on urban berms.

Proposed by: Auckland Council
Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue
   Auckland Transport cannot enforce ‘parking on the grass berms’ without the request signage being in place.

2. Background to its being raised
   In 2015 Auckland Transport Parking Services received advice that the enforcement of motor vehicles parking on the berms of the roadway could not be lawfully carried out, without the requisite signage being in place to inform the driver that the activity is not permitted. After that advice, enforcement was restricted to roadways where signage is in place. A programme to install signage was undertaken on a risk priority basis from that time to present.

3. New or confirming existing policy
   Change in the existing legislative situation.

4. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme
   The overall strategic focus of LGNZ includes leadership and delivery of change on the big issues confronting New Zealand communities, such as road safety, with a focus on best performance and value for communities.
This proposal supports the Infrastructure strategic policy priorities in the LGNZ policy statement 2017-2019:

- Infrastructure: LGNZ policy statement mentions the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost (p6). This proposal is directly working towards a safe road system, including infrastructure that meets the increasing demands within a reasonable roading investment.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

- September 2015: AT legal team notified Parking Services and Ministry of Transport (MoT) of the issue.
- October 2015: Ministry responded stating it would be included in the next omnibus rule amendment.
- June 2016: AT was advised that the matter would not be progressed as a policy project would be needed. AT also informed that the matter was not in the 2016/17 programme but would be considered in the forward work programme.
- AT advised there would be workshops with local government to determine potential regulatory proposals in the 2017/18 programme. This did not happen.
- November 2016: AT’s Legal team wrote to the MoT again requesting for an update on when the workshops would take place.
- November 2016: MoT advised AT that they were currently co-ordinating proposals.

AT have not received an update on the issue since.

6. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

AT’s Traffic Bylaw 2012 prohibits parking on the grass within the Auckland urban traffic area. However, the combination of provisions in the Land Transport Act 1998, and the various rules made under it, mean that for AT to enforce this prohibition, we must first install prescribed signs every 100 metres on all grass road margins within the urban traffic area.

It should be noted that this is not just confined to Auckland, but is a nationwide issue, hence our multiple requests for the Ministry to consider the issue.

To note: The same requirements apply to beaches, meaning before AT can enforce a Council prohibition on parking on the beach, signage must first be installed every 100 metres along the beach.

Clearly, installing the required signage on all road margins and beaches is both aesthetically undesirable as well as prohibitively expensive.

Operational practice by AT parking services is to respond to calls for service and complaints from the public. This change is not to introduce a change in enforcement practices.
5

Short-term guest accommodation

Remit: That LGNZ advocates for enabling legislation that would allow councils to require all guest accommodation providers to register with the council and that provides an efficient approach to imposing punitive action on operators who don’t comply.

Proposed by: Christchurch City Council
Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The advent of online listing and payment platforms like Airbnb and HomeAway have helped grow a largely informal accommodation provider sector around the world on a huge scale. This is presenting challenges for local authorities around the world to adapt regulatory frameworks to effectively capture these new businesses.

The Airbnb market share in Christchurch has grown exponentially from June 2016 to December 2018.

- Rooms in owner-occupied homes listed grew from 58 in June 2016 to 1,496 in December 2018.
- Entire homes listed increased from 54 to 1,281 over the same period (+2,272 per cent).
- Airbnb’s share of all guest nights in Christchurch rose from 0.7 per cent in June 2016 to 24 per cent in December 2018.
- In the month of December 2018 there were an estimated 120,000 guest nights in Christchurch at Airbnb providers.

Councils generally have regulatory and rating requirements that guest accommodation providers are required to work within. District Plan rules protect residential amenity and coherence and many councils require business properties to pay a differential premium on general rates.

However, many informal short-term guest accommodation providers operate outside the applicable regulatory and rates frameworks. The nature of the activity makes finding properties being used for this activity problematic. Location information on the listing is vague and GPS coordinates scrambled. Hosts do not provide exact address information until a property is booked, and the platform providers won’t provide detailed location, booking frequency or contact details to councils, citing privacy obligations. In their view, the onus is on hosts to
confirm they meet relevant regulatory requirements. In short, we don’t know where they are and finding them is an expensive and resource-intensive exercise akin to playing whack-a-mole with a blind fold on.

This means the informal accommodation sector is able to capture competitive advantages vis-à-vis the formal sector by reducing compliance costs and risks. In popular residential neighbourhoods, high demand for this activity can reduce housing affordability, supply and choice and compromise the neighbourhood amenity.

Councils need to be able to require guest accommodation providers to register with them and to keep records of the frequency of use of residential homes for this purpose. This would enable councils to communicate better with providers, ensure regulatory and rating requirements are being met and enable a more productive relationship with platform providers.

Queenstown Lakes District Council proposed a registration approach through its District Plan review but withdrew that part of their proposal after seeking further legal advice. Christchurch City Council has also had legal advice to the effect that registration with the Council cannot be used as a condition for permitted activity status under the District Plan, particularly if that registration is contingent on compliance with other Acts (eg the Building Act, various fire safety regulations, etc). The closest thing to a form of registration that can be achieved under the RMA is to require a controlled resource consent which is still a relatively costly and onerous process for casual hosts.

2. Background to it being raised

Christchurch City Council has received numerous complaints and requests for action from representatives of the traditional accommodation sector – hotels, motels and campgrounds. They have asked for short-term rental accommodation to be brought into the same regulatory framework they are required to operate in.

There are other wider issues to consider such as impact on rental housing availability, impact on house prices and impact on type of development being delivered in response to this market.

Representatives from the Christchurch accommodation sector have raised the disparity in operating costs and regulation that are imposed on them and not the informal sector. They believe the effect of this is:

- Undermining the financial viability of the formal accommodation sector.
- Resulting in anti-social behaviour and negative amenity impacts in residential neighbourhoods.
- Creating a health and safety risk where small, casual operators are not required to meet the same standards that they are.
3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

**LGNZ Flagship Policy Project - Localism**

“Local government is calling for a shift in the way public decisions are made in New Zealand by seeking a commitment to localism. Instead of relying on central government to decide what is good for our communities it is time to empower councils and communities themselves to make such decisions. Strengthening self-government at the local level means putting people back in charge of politics and reinvigorating our democracy.”

Providing councils with the means to require accommodation providers to register will greatly assist them to work with their communities to develop approaches to regulating the short-term guest accommodation sector that best serves that particular community. For many councils it would enable a nuanced approach for each community to evolve under a district-wide policy.

4. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

Christchurch City Council is taking a four-pronged approach to creating a more workable regulatory and rating frameworks.

- Preliminary work is underway to consider changes to the District Plan. These will explore options including:
  - To differentiate between scales of the activity with a primarily residential or rural versus primarily commercial character (likely to be determined based on the number of days a year that a residential unit is used for this activity and whether or not it is also used for a residential purpose);
  - To enable short-term guest accommodation with a primarily residential or rural character in areas where it will have no or minimal effects on housing availability or affordability, residential amenity or character, and the recovery of the Central City; and
  - Restrict short-term guest accommodation in residential areas where it has a primarily commercial character.

- Consideration will be given to business rates approaches that align with any changes to District Plan rules. This may see a graduated approach to imposing business rates based on the level of activity and in line with District Plan compliance thresholds. This is an approach Auckland Council and Queenstown Lakes District Council are using.

- Consideration of a more proactive regulatory compliance approach once any changes to District Plan rules are introduced. The Council is currently responding to complaints related to guest accommodation activity but is not undertaking proactive enforcement due to the difficulty in identifying properties being used as guest accommodation and then enforcing zone rules.

- Advocating for enabling legislation that would allow councils to require all guest accommodation providers to register with the council and that provides an efficient approach to imposing punitive action on operators who don’t comply.
5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

Convene a working group of local government subject matter experts to prepare a prototype legislative solution to put to the Government to guide advice to MPs.

The solution should enable councils to require all accommodation providers to register and keep records of the frequency of their bookings and should enable councils to develop a regulatory and rating approach that best suits its situation and needs.

Examples of legislation that provide similar powers include:

- Class 4 and TAB Gambling Policies under the Gambling Act.
- Prostitution Bylaws under the Prostitution Reform Act.
- Freedom Camping Bylaws under the Freedom Camping Act.
Remit: That LGNZ recommend to the Government the funding of additional research into the effects of nitrates in drinking water on human health, and/or partner with international public health organisations to promote such research, in order to determine whether the current drinking water standard for nitrate is still appropriate for the protection of human health.

Proposed by: Christchurch City Council
Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Nitrates are one of the chemical contaminants in drinking water for which the Ministry of Health has set a maximum acceptable value (MAV) of 50 mg/L nitrate (equivalent to 11.3 mg/L nitrate-Nitrogen) for ‘short-term’ exposure. This level was determined to protect babies from methaemoglobinaemia (‘blue baby’ syndrome).

Some studies, in particular a recent Danish study, indicate a relationship between nitrates in drinking water and increased risk of adverse health effects, in particular colorectal cancer.

The well-publicised 2018 Danish study found that much lower levels of nitrate than that set in the New Zealand drinking water standards may increase the risk of colorectal cancer. The level of increased risk was small, but ‘significant’ even at levels as low as 0.87 mg/L nitrate-Nitrogen, which is more than an order of magnitude lower than the New Zealand drinking water standard.

Other studies looking at the relationship of nitrate in drinking water and possible adverse human health effects have in some instances been inconclusive or have found a relationship between nitrate in drinking water and colorectal cancer for specific sub-groups with additional risk factors (such as high red meat consumption), but not necessarily at the same level as the 2018 Danish study. The 2018 Danish study is notable because of its duration (between 1 January 1978 to 31 December 2011) and the size of the population studied (2.7 million Danish adults).

There does not appear to be a robust national system for monitoring and reporting nitrate in drinking water, nor a programme or system in place for considering whether the current drinking water standard for nitrate is still appropriate for protecting human health.
2. **Background to its being raised**

Dietary intake of nitrates include consumption of vegetables such as spinach, lettuce, beets and carrots, which contain significant amounts of nitrate, and processed meat, and to a lesser extent drinking water (when/where nitrate is present).

In the 2015 Environmental indicators Te taiao Aotearoa compiled by Ministry for the Environment and Statistics New Zealand, an overall trend of increasing levels of nitrate in groundwater was observed for the ten-year period 2005-2014 at monitored sites (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Nitrate levels in groundwater, 2005-2014](image)

Ministry for the Environment’s Our Fresh Water 2017 reports that 47 of 361 sites (13 per cent) did not meet the drinking water quality standard for nitrate at least once in the period between 2012 and 2014. The report doesn’t indicate whether any or all of these sites are sources of public water supplies.

3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

- One of LGNZ’s five strategic priorities concerns councils’ infrastructure including that for ‘Three Waters’: “Water is critical to the future health of New Zealanders and their economy and in a world facing water scarcity New Zealand’s water resources represent a significant economic advantage. Consequently, protecting the quality of water and ensuring it is used wisely is a matter of critical importance to local government and our communities. Water is also subject to a range of legislative and regulatory reforms, with the overall allocation framework under review and councils subject to national standards, such as drinking water standards.”

- Another of LGNZ’s strategic priorities is addressing environmental issues including the quality and quantity of New Zealand’s freshwater resources: “Water quality is, and will continue to be, one of the defining political issues for governments and councils over the foreseeable future …”
LGNZ’s Water 2050 project is also relevant. This project is described as: “A fit-for-purpose policy framework for the future (Water 2050) which considers freshwater quality and quantity: including standards, freshwater management, impacts on rural and urban areas, such as infrastructure requirements and associated funding, quantity issues including rights and allocation, and institutional frameworks for water governance.”

4. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

The City Council undertakes chemical sampling from approximately 20-25 bores each year as an additional risk management barrier for the provision of its public drinking water supply. This data is shared with Environment Canterbury. The monitoring programme analyses for a number of chemicals, with nitrate being only one of many contaminants analysed. The City Council maintains a database with the results of the chemical monitoring programme.

The extent of the issue with respect to understanding the extent of nitrates in drinking water and its associated human health implication is beyond the scope of the City Council’s resources to undertake.

5. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

To date no City Council drinking water well has exceeded the drinking water standard for nitrate.

Data from the last ten years of the City Council’s monitoring programme have shown that in about a third of the samples taken, results have met or exceeded the 0.87 mg/L level for which the 2018 Danish study found an increased risk of colorectal cancer (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Results below 0.87 mg/L</th>
<th>Results at/above 0.87 mg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of samples taken</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wells with 1 or more results</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration range</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 – 0.85</td>
<td>0.89 – 7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

Recommend that central government fund additional research into effects of nitrates in drinking water on human health and/or partner with international public health organisations to promote such research.

Recommend that central government work with regional and local governments to improve monitoring of nitrates in reticulated supplies as well as in the sources of drinking water, noting that in its 2017 report *Our Fresh Water 2017* the Ministry for the Environment has stated that they “have insufficient data to determine groundwater trends at most monitored sites” and that the Ministry of Health’s latest report on drinking water *Annual Report on Drinking water Quality 2016–2017* states that “chemical determinants are not regularly monitored in all supplies”.
Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987)

Remit: That LGNZ initiates a review of Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (1987) (LGOIMA) request management nationally with a view to establishing clear and descriptive reporting for and by local authorities that will create a sector-wide picture of:

- Trends in the volume and nature of LGOIMA requests over time.
- Trends in users.
- The impacts of technology in terms of accessing information sought and the amount of information now held by local authorities (and able to be requested).
- The financial and resource impacts on local authorities in managing the LGOIMA function.

That LGNZ use the data obtained to:

- Identify opportunities to streamline or simplify LGOIMA processes.
- Share best practice between local authorities.
- Assess the value of a common national local government framework of practice for LGOIMA requests.
- Identify opportunities to advocate for legislation changes on behalf of the sector (where these are indicated).

Proposed by: Hamilton City Council
Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

A comprehensive understanding of the current state of play in the sector is needed, as are metrics to measure LGOIMA activity nationally to identify opportunities for improvements and efficiencies for the benefit of local authorities and the public.

An appropriate response is needed to address the tension between transparency and accountability to the public and effective, cost-efficient use of council resources to respond to requests under LGOIMA.
Despite guidance provided by the Office of the Ombudsman, it is becoming harder for local authorities to traverse the range of requests made under LGOIMA with confidence that they are complying fully with the Act. Issues such as grounds for withholding information, charging for information or seeking extensions are becoming increasingly problematic as the scope and scale of complex requests grows.

2. **Background to its being raised**

Anecdotally, local authorities all around the country seem to be noticing:

- An increase in the volume of LGOIMA requests year on year;
- An increase in requests from media;
- An increase in serial requestors;
- An increase in referrals for legal advice to negotiate complex requests and the application of the Act;
- An increase in requests that could be described as vexatious; and
- Consequently, an increase in the costs of staff time in managing LGOIMA.

In seeking to comply with the legislation, local authorities share the Ombudsman’s view of the importance of public access to public information in a timely fashion in order to “enable more effective public participation in decision-making; and promote the accountability of members and officials; and so, enhance respect for the law and promote good local government” (s4 LGOIMA).

In many ways technology is making it easier to source, collate and share a far greater range of public information faster. At the same time the ubiquitous use of technology within local government has significantly increased the volume and forms of information an organisation generates and captures, with associated implications for researching, collating and then reviewing this information in response to LGOIMA requests.

**Current status:**

a. Understandably, the Ombudsman’s advice encourages local authorities to apply a very high threshold for withholding information and to take a generous view of what is in the public interest.

b. The scope of requests is becoming broader, more complex and covers longer time periods (to the point where some could be described as fishing expeditions). While local authorities can request refinements to scope, requestors do not always agree to do so or make only minimal changes.

c. There are costs associated with automated searches of systems, databases and email accounts, some of which should not or are not easily able to be passed on to requestors. Not undertaking automated searches increases the risk of pertinent information being omitted.
d. The Ombudsman’s guidance is very helpful in the main. However, Ombudsman’s guidelines take the view that a council will scope the request then make the decision whether to release the information then prepare the information for release. This often does not reflect the reality of dealing with a LGOIMA request especially large and complex requests. These components are interrelated and cannot be processed as entirely separate stages.

e. A small number of repeat requestors appear to be responsible for an increasingly disproportionate number of the total requests. Some are individuals, but a greater number are media and watchdog groups like the Taxpayers Union.

f. With an increasing amount of information requested, the review of documents, webpages, etc and redaction of text for reasons of privacy or outside-of-scope is significant and onerous.

g. Local authorities are failing to take a common approach to people and organisations that are making the same request across the sector.

h. An increasing number of LGOIMA requests are seeking property/property owner/license-holder information or other information more often than not to be used for marketing or other commercial ends. Yet local authorities are limited in their ability to recoup associated costs in providing this information, or in the case of standard operating procedures, protect their own intellectual property.

3. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

LGNZ has a work programme focused on improving the local government legal framework. This remit is consistent with that programme and seeks to focus attention on a particularly problematic part of the framework that is currently not being specifically addressed.

4. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

At a local level, Hamilton City Council has been working continuously over the last 18 months to refine our processes for dealing with LGOIMA requests. This work has ensured that relevant staff as well as the staff in the LGOIMA office and in the Communications Unit are aware of the procedures and requirements for dealing with LGOIMA requests under the Act, and options potentially available where the scope or the complexity of requests tests Council resources. Templates for responses and communications with staff regarding responses have been developed and are used or customised as necessary. We have also introduced a reporting framework so that we have visibility of requests over time and various component factors including time taken to prepare and respond to LGOIMAs. Opportunities for further enhancements relate to understanding and being able to reflect best practice sector-wide.
5. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987; Privacy Act 1993; Office of the Ombudsman Official Information legislation guides; Privacy Commissioner privacy principles.

Hamilton City Council is very conscious of its responsibilities under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the Privacy Act 1993, and related guidance, and our processes comply with the relevant legislation.

This topic is also closely aligned with Hamilton City Council’s strategic imperative: ‘A Council that is Best in Business’.

6. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

LGNZ prioritises a national review of LGOIMA request management as part of its programme to continuously improve the local government legal environment.
Weed control

Remit: That LGNZ encourages member councils to consider using environmentally friendly weed control methods.

Proposed by: Hamilton City Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

There is mixed evidence of the risks associated with using chemical weed control as a method, particularly glyphosate-based, and lobby groups are actively pressuring councils to reduce use. Glyphosate is currently approved for use as a herbicide by New Zealand’s Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and most New Zealand councils use it, given it is a cost-effective, proven option for weed control. Most councils take an integrated approach to weed control, which includes the use of glyphosate-based products along with alternative methods.

2. Background to its being raised

In New Zealand, the use of chemicals including glyphosate is regulated by the EPA. A 2016 EPA review concluded that glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 as a carcinogen or mutagen.

Internationally, there is controversy surrounding the use of glyphosate. In 2004 a World Health Organisation (WHO) Group (the Joint Meeting on Pesticides Residues) determined that glyphosate does not pose a cancer risk to humans. In 2015, another WHO sub-group (the International Agency for Research on Cancer) classified glyphosate as ‘probably carcinogenic to humans’.

In August 2018 a California jury found Monsanto liable in a case linking the use of the company’s glyphosate-based weedkillers to cancer. In March 2019, a federal jury in America ruled that use of Monsanto’s glyphosate-based weedkiller was a ‘substantial factor’ in another user developing cancer. These cases have reinvigorated calls to ban the use of glyphosate in New Zealand and worldwide.
3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

LGNZ has an environmental work programme and the proposed remit is consistent with this focus on environmental issues that affect local government and local communities. The LGNZ programme does not specifically address the issue of non-chemical methods of weed control despite strong public interest.

4. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

At a local level, Hamilton City Council staff are currently actively looking at reducing chemical use in general and, more specifically, at alternative weed control methods. Our approach acknowledges the importance of keeping our community and staff safe and healthy. Staff are appropriately trained and required to wear the correct personal protective equipment (PPE) for the task.

Our investigation of non-chemical options has incorporated the following:

- In September 2018, we began trialling use of a steam machine for weed control. The equipment has a large carbon footprint (9 litres of fossil fuel per hour of operation) and requires more frequent application to achieve the same level of weed control.
- The use of a new mulch application machine has enabled sites to be mulched faster than traditional methods, which suppresses weeds for longer.
- We have trialled longer grass-cutting heights to reduce Onehunga weed in amenity areas. This has led to a reduction in selective herbicide application.
- We are working with Kiwicare to trial alternative weed control methods in Hamilton parks. Kiwicare has a wide range of alternatives, including an organic fatty acid-based product.

Our current operating approach includes continuous review of application equipment efficiency including use of air-induced spray nozzles droplet control, which results in less spray being required.

As a result of Hamilton City Council’s strategy to consider alternatives, one large herbicide sprayer was decommissioned from the council parks fleet in early 2019. This will lead to a reduction in glyphosate used.

Glyphosate is no longer used for weed control in our playground sites. It has been replaced with an organic spray alternative (this option is 30 per cent more expensive than using glyphosate).

Glyphosate use by Hamilton City Council is recorded on a dedicated webpage and a no-spray register is maintained. Residents can opt out of the council spraying programme and take responsibility themselves for weed control along property boundaries and street frontages.
5. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

   Hamilton City Council currently operates in compliance with national standards (New Zealand Standard 8409:2004 Code of Practice for the management of agrichemicals), the Waikato Regional Plan and Pest Management Plan and our own Herbicides Use Management Policy.

6. **Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting**

   Most councils take an integrated approach to weed control, which includes the use of glyphosate-based products along with alternative methods. Reports this year from Christchurch, where the City Council is phasing out use of glyphosate, indicates levels of service and maintenance appearance have been an issue, along with significant cost increases when glyphosate has been significantly reduced.

7. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

   LGNZ leads a commitment by local government to investigate and trial environmentally friendly alternatives to chemical weed control with results shared amongst member organisations.
Building defects claims

Remit: LGNZ calls on central government to take action as recommended by the Law Commission in its 2014 report on “Liability of Multiple Defendants” to introduce a cap on the liability of councils in New Zealand in relation to building defects claims whilst joint and several liability applies.

Proposed by: Napier City Council
Supported by: Zone Three

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

• In its report on joint and several liability issued in June 2014 (the Law Commission report) the Law Commission recommended that councils’ liability for defective building claims should be capped. Building consent authorities in New Zealand (councils) are disproportionately affected by defective building claims.

• The Government in its response to the Law Commission report directed the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) to further analyse the value and potential impact of the Law Commission’s recommendations, including capping liability of councils, and report back to their respective ministers.

• The MBIE website suggests that a Building (Liability) Amendment Bill would be consulted on in 2017 and final policy approval obtained from Cabinet. That Bill, according to the MBIE website, would be aimed to amend the Building Act 2004 to cap the liability of councils and protect consumers by introducing provisions driving greater uptake of home warranty protection. However no progress appears to have been made towards drafting or introducing this Bill into Parliament. At a recent rural and provincial local government meeting in Wellington, MBIE advised that no further action is being taken to progress any capping of council liability.

• This proposed remit is aimed to put pressure on MBIE and the Government to follow the Law Commission’s recommendation to limit (ideally by capping) councils’ liability in respect of defective building claims.
2. **Background to its being raised**

- Defective building claims are prevalent throughout New Zealand, both in large centres and small. They are not limited to “leaky building” claims. Claims which include allegations involving structural and fire defects are increasingly common, both for residential and commercial properties.

- The courts have held that councils will generally have a proportionate share of liability in defective building cases in the vicinity of 20 per cent. However, because councils are generally exposed to the full quantum of the claim, when other parties are absent (for example whereabouts unknown, deceased, company struck off) or insolvent (bankrupt or company liquidated), which is the rule, rather than the exception, the Council is left to cover the shortfall. The Law Commission report recognised that councils in New Zealand effectively act as insurers for homeowners, at the expense of ratepayers.

- Other liable parties such as developers, builders and architects can potentially reduce their exposure through insurance and wind up companies in the event of a large claim. Developers often set up a dedicated company for a particular development and then wind that company up following completion.

- Councils on the other hand can no longer access insurance for weathertightness defects (a “known risk”). They have no choice about whether to be involved in the design and construction of buildings, as they have a legislative role as building consent authorities in their districts. They make no profit from developments and cannot increase their fees to account for the level of risk. Yet they are often the main or sole solvent defendant in defective building claims (last person standing).

- The cost to ratepayers of the current joint and several liability system is significant, disproportionately so. This was recognised in the Law Commission report in 2014, but no substantive steps have been taken by central government to address the issue or implement the Law Commission’s recommendation that council liability should be capped.

3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

The current LGNZ Work Programme for housing includes an objective of the regulatory and competitive framework of continuing advocacy to government for alternatives to current liability arrangements. Clearly this remit fits squarely within and would assist to progress that objective.
4. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

- The Law Commission report was a result of concerns raised primarily by LGNZ and councils around New Zealand about the effect of joint and several liability in relation to the leaky homes crisis. Prior to release of the report, LGNZ and a number of councils around New Zealand, including Auckland Council, Christchurch City Council, Hamilton City Council, Hastings District Council, Queenstown Lakes District Council, Tararua District Council, Waipa District Council staff, Wellington City Council, as well as SOLGM and BOINZ all filed submissions advocating for a change to the status quo.

- The Law Commission report, as discussed in more detail above, recommended that councils’ liability be capped. It was understood from the Government’s response to the Law Commission report and from MBIE (both discussed above) that this recommendation was being progressed in a meaningful way. This was further supported by MBIE’s submission to the Law Commission prior to the release of the Law Commission report, in which it stated that:
  a. Provisions in the Building Amendment Act 2012 not yet in force, in particular the three new types of building consent limiting councils’ liability “are likely to be brought into force within a reasonable time after the Commission completes its review of joint and several liability”. MBIE stated that the Law Commission should take the impact of these changes into account in preparing its report. However, these provisions are still not in force.
  b. “The Government has instructed the Ministry to explore options for the consolidation of building consent authorities as part of the Housing Affordability agenda and ongoing reforms in the construction sector. Issues regarding the liability of a central regulator, as well as that of territorial authorities, will be fundamental concerns as consolidation options and other measures to increase productivity in the sector are explored”. This does not appear to have been progressed.

- It was only in the last month or so that MBIE has now advised that the recommendation that councils’ liability be capped would no longer be progressed.

7. Suggested course of action envisaged

We consider that LGNZ could form a joint working party with MBIE and the Ministry of Justice, and possibly the relevant Minister’s (Jenny Salesa’s) staff to explore limiting councils’ liability for building defects claims, including:

- Disclosing and considering the following information (whether by way of OIA requests and/or as part of a working group):
  o MBIE documents relating to its consideration of the Law Commission report and the reasons why it is no longer progressing the capping of council liability.
  o Ministry of Justice and Minister of Building and Housing’s documents relating to the Law Commission report and to proposed capping of council liability.
MBIE and Minister of Building and Housing’s documents relating to implementation of s 17 of the Building Amendment Act 2012.

- Drafting proposed amendments to the Building Act and/or a Building (Liability) Amendment Bill (this work may have been started by MBIE, so this task should await the outcome of the information gathering exercise above).

- Drafting content for a cabinet paper regarding the Law Commission’s recommendation that council liability for building defect claims be capped.
Remit: That LGNZ, in conjunction with central government, urgently focus on the development and implementation of a broader range of funding and financing tools in respect of community/social housing provision, than those which currently exist in the housing needs space. These should include funding to support the operation, upgrade and growth of council housing portfolios and, where a council chooses, access to Income Related Rents for eligible tenants.

Proposed by: Napier City Council, Tauranga City Council and Wellington City Council

Supported by: Zone Three
Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Napier City Council

Social housing, especially for older citizens, is a strategic issue.

New Zealand communities are facing an extremely serious housing affordability crisis that has resulted in the country having the highest rate of homelessness in the developed world. Current policy settings are failing to adequately address the issue.

Local government is the second largest provider of social housing in New Zealand, however, since 1991, successive governments have failed to adequately recognise the contribution we have and are making. Unfortunately, existing policy actively discriminates against councils meeting local housing needs resulting in a gradual reduction in the council owned social housing stock. With Housing New Zealand focussing its attention on fast growing urban areas, social housing needs in smaller communities are not being met.

The issue is becoming more serious as baby boomers retire – the current social housing is not designed to address the needs of this cohort – a role historically provided by councils with support from central government in the form of capital grants.

The issue has already become urgent for Aotearoa New Zealand and its communities.
Tauranga City Council

The western Bay of Plenty SmartGrowth partnership (Tauranga City Council, Western Bay of Plenty District Council, Bay of Plenty Regional Council and tangata whenua), has undertaken some preliminary research into the potential for government assisted bond raising for community/social housing providers using the Federal Government experience from Australia.

It has also identified the Australian rental housing provision tax incentive opportunities that the current Labour opposition has put forward. The partnership is aware of work being undertaken by Treasury in terms of raising the debt ceilings via amendments to the Local Government (Financial Reporting and Prudence) Regulations 2014. The SmartGrowth partnership would welcome the opportunity to work further with LGNZ and others to take a more “four well-beings” focus to the housing funding and financing toolkit than currently exists. This matter is becoming critical for all of the Upper North Island growth councils and other councils such as Queenstown.

Wellington City Council

Housing is an important contributor to the wellbeing of New Zealanders, and councils support the work of the Government to continue to grow and improve social housing provision in New Zealand.

Addressing housing demand and affordability related challenges are significant issues for local government. 62 (93 per cent) of New Zealand’s 67 local authorities reference some type of housing-related activity in their current Long Term Plans. As at November 2018, 60 local authorities (90 per cent) collectively own 12,881 housing units and 13 of those provide 50 per cent or more of the total social housing within their jurisdictions.

The social housing currently owned by local authorities equates to 16 per cent of the nationwide social housing stock, with the remaining 82 per cent largely owned by the Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) and Community Housing Providers (CHPs). While there is variation in housing eligibility policy settings at the local level, a significant proportion of tenants housed by local authorities have a similar profile to those housed by HNZC and CHPs.

To help address housing affordability for households on the lowest incomes, central government provides the Income Related Rent Subsidy (IRRS) for those with housing need and that meet policy eligibility criteria. Eligible households generally pay 25 per cent of their income on rent, and a government subsidy is paid to the housing provider for remaining portion of rent.

Despite housing a similar group of tenants, current IRRS policy settings mean HNZC and CHPs can access the subsidy for tenants but local authorities cannot.

This has created considerable inequity in the housing system and is placing pressure on a vulnerable population group in New Zealand. Tenants who would be eligible for IRRS, but who are housed by a local authority, generally have to pay a significantly higher amount of rent. With demand for HNZC public housing and social housing provided by Community Housing Providers outstripping supply in most areas, these households have very few housing options and are unable to access the Government support they would otherwise be eligible for.
The inability to access IRRS has also contributed to housing portfolio sustainability challenges for local authorities, who cannot access the additional funding through IRRS to help maintain their housing portfolios. This challenge has led to vulnerable tenants having to be charged unaffordable levels of rent, and the decline in the overall social housing stock levels owned by local authorities. This has occurred even as social housing demand has increased and housing affordability has become a more acute challenge for more households.

2. **Background to its being raised**

**Napier City Council**

Councils provide in excess of 10,000 housing units, making it a significant provider of community housing in New Zealand. Councils began providing community housing across the country, particularly for pensioners, in the 1960’s when central government encouraged them to do so through capital loan funding. In the 1980’s, this occurred once again and was applied to general community housing developments. Council’s rent setting formulas varied but all provided subsidised rents. While the housing stock was relatively new, the rental income maintained the homes, however, now decades on, and with housing at the end of life, significant investment is required. Income from rents has not been enough to fund renewals let alone growth to meet demand.

The Government introduced Income Related Rent subsidy (IRR) in 2000 for public housing tenants and it was later applied to registered Community Housing Providers. This mechanism allows tenants to pay an affordable rent in relation to their income, while the housing provider receives a ‘top up’ to the agreed market rent for each property under the scheme. In effect, housing providers receive market rent through this mechanism. Being able to generate market rental income is the most successful sustainable model for the provision of community housing. Providers receive an adequate income to cover the cost of providing housing, to fund future renewals and to raise capital for immediate asset management. Councils are excluded from receiving this subsidy, and so are their tenants.

**Wellington City Council**

Key objectives for councils that provide social housing generally include ensuring that their social housing tenants are well housed in quality homes, and that they pay an affordable level of rent. Balancing this objective with business sustainability continues to be a real challenge for many councils, and has contributed to some divesting their social housing portfolios. At the same time, demand for social housing has generally continued to increase and housing affordability is a more prominent issue, particularly for households on the lowest incomes.

Despite ongoing and repeated lobbying over a number of years from councils and LGNZ, and a commitment from the current government to reconsider IRRS policy settings, local authorities are still unable to access IRRS. This remit recognises the inequitable situation this has created for a significant number of vulnerable households, and the negative impact it has had on the overall supply of social housing owned by local authorities.
3. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

Napier City Council

This remit supports LGNZ’s Housing 2030 policy and programme, in particular the Social Housing and Affordable Housing workstreams. Housing 2030 is one of LGNZ’s four strategic projects. This remit reinforces and supports that initiative.

LGNZ recently hosted a Social Housing workshop with both local and central government agencies to discuss the issues and opportunities and the future role councils could play in the provision of social housing. There was agreement that a partnership approach that recognises local situations with a range of options for support from government (both funding and expertise) would be most suitable.

Wellington City Council

By working with central government, local authorities, and a range of other stakeholders, the current LGNZ housing work programme seeks to establish a central local government housing partnership and improve housing outcomes. The work programme includes three key focus areas: housing supply; social and community housing; and healthy homes.

As part of the ‘social and community housing’ focus area, LGNZ have already signalled an intention to work with government agencies to enable local authorities to access IRRS. This remit would however provide specific mandate from member councils on this point.

4. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

Napier City Council

As the proposer of this remit, Napier City Council, has undertaken an S17A Review of its own provision of community housing, with further investigation underway. In addition, both at a governance and management level, we have taken part in numerous conferences, symposiums and workshops on the matter in the last two years. We lead a local Cross Sector Group – Homelessness forum and take part in the Hawke’s Bay Housing Coalition. We have provided housing for our community for over five decades, supplying just under 400 retirement and low cost rental units in Napier.

Wellington City Council

Wellington City Council, along with a number of other councils and LGNZ have already made a number of formal submissions to central government regarding this issue. To date, central government has advised that no changes will be made to IRRS policy settings at this stage.
5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

**Napier City Council**

This remit supports, as a matter of urgency, the further investigation by central government and LGNZ of the opportunities identified at the workshop and any other mechanisms that would support councils provision of community housing in New Zealand.

It is designed to strengthen LGNZ’s advocacy and would provide a reason to approach the Government in the knowledge that local government as a whole is in support.

**Wellington City Council**

LGNZ, on behalf of member councils, would increase efforts to formally advocate for local authorities to be able to access Income Related Rent Subsidies for all eligible tenants that they house, with implementation within a two year timeframe.
Procurement

Remit: That LGNZ investigate the ability of the sector to collaborate in procuring open-source designs and plans for bulk infrastructure that are largely similar, with an initial approach to look at water and wastewater treatment facilities.

Proposed by: New Plymouth District Council
Supported by: Central Hawkes Bay District Council
Otorohanga District Council
South Taranaki District Council
Stratford District Council
Thames-Coromandel District Council
Waitomo District Council
Wellington City Council
Whanganui District Council

Background information and research

1. **Nature of the issue**

   At present, every local authority in New Zealand undertakes bespoke procurement for its own infrastructure despite there being little difference in the infrastructure provided. Each local authority then receives a slightly different product that largely achieves the same outcome.

2. **Background to its being raised**

   Local authorities often face similar challenges, albeit at different times. Local authorities often procure similar infrastructure that deal with the same inputs and outputs, but are bespoke products designed at significant cost.

   A good case example, and a useful starting point, is water and wastewater treatment plants. The Government’s Three Waters Reform programme received a report from Beca that identified the number of water treatment plants that are non-compliant with water standards. While not all of these plants will require replacement, some of them may do so.
The report identifies that 17 large plants (10,001+ people), 13 medium plants (5,001-10,000 people), 140 minor plants (501-5,000 people), 169 small plants (101-500 people) and 153 neighbourhood plants (25-100 people) are not compliant with standards. A similar story emerges with wastewater treatment plants.

At the same time, the sector is aware of the upcoming increase in renewals across water and wastewater treatment plants (including plants currently compliant with standards). There are a considerable number of plants coming near to the end of their useable lifespan in coming years. Often these plants have to be replaced with an entirely new plant so as to keep the existing plant operating during the replacement’s construction.

While there may be some local variation, new water and wastewater treatments plants being built in the future will either be large, medium or small. The increasingly prescriptive regulatory framework will invariably reduce scope for choices and options in plant design. All plants will need to meet the same output quality standards, and will require the same treatment processes (with some minor variations to reflect any local preferences or unique circumstances).

Local authority procurement is a ‘hot topic’ for the Office of the Auditor-General (OAG). The OAG have signalled a forthcoming report *Procurement workforce capacity and capability in local government* that will aim to encourage greater collaboration between local authorities. Similarly, there is a strong focus on procurement within central government, including all-of-government procurement in which local authorities can choose to be involved.

Local authorities should collaborate now to procure a number of standardised open-source options for water and wastewater treatment plants for the future. These would then be available to all local authorities to use when required, rather than having to go to the market for a new design. These would be tested and implementable designs – the risk of failure would be lower than a bespoke design. The processes used would need to be customisable (such as whether drinking water is fluoridated, or to address particular issues in incoming water). Scalability would, of course, be critical. Council procurement would be limited to build-only contracts.

A collaborative procurement process for standardised designs could lead to significant cost savings. Even a small saving of one or two per cent would result in millions of dollars of savings across the sector. Over time, there would be further consequent savings, such as not having to retrain staff when transferring between authorities or even the capacity for further collaboration through shared services.

If successful, the sector would be well-placed to look at other areas where collaborative procurement processes for standardised designs would be useful. These could include solid waste resource recovery and separation facilities, roading assets, or other significant assets.
3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

LGNZ has placed significant time and energy into the Three Water Reform programme. LGNZ’s position paper on these reforms notes strong support for improving the regulatory framework for drinking water. LGNZ oppose the mandatory aggregation of water assets.

This remit will also contribute to the LGNZ strategic policy priorities: Infrastructure; Risk and Resilience; Environmental; and Economic Development.

4. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

The Three Waters Reforms are likely to result in significant legislative reform that impacts on water and wastewater treatment plants.
Single use polystyrene

Remit: That LGNZ advocates to the Government to phase out single use polystyrene.

Proposed by: Palmerston North City Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Expanded polystyrene is bulky and does not break down. While some technologies exist to reduce the bulk of polystyrene prior to landfill, or to recycle it (for example, to make insulation material), these interventions offer only a partial solution to the prevalence of polystyrene. Single-use polystyrene (such as used in food containers) has further contamination issues, meaning that landfill remains the only means of disposal.

Palmerston North City Council’s own Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw 2016 prohibits the use of polystyrene or styrofoam containers or cups at events held on council land or with council funding. This has encouraged the use of more sustainable substitutes. However, while the council can control, to some small extent, the use of polystyrene and its disposal (for example, by refusing to collect it), in practice its influence is limited. This is because most of the supply of polystyrene originates outside of the city, and the Council has limited ability to ensure it doesn’t end up in the waste stream (for example, it can be inside rubbish bags).

2. Background to it being raised

Under section 23(1)(b) of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, the Government is empowered to ban or regulate certain problematic or wasteful products. This provision is currently being used to phase out single-use plastic shopping bags.

This remit proposal meets both LGNZ remit policy criteria. As with single-use plastic bags, the national regulation of single-use polystyrene products would be more effective in beginning to address their use in the first place, rather than being addressed (as at present) as a city-level waste issue.

Single-use polystyrene contributes significantly to landfill in New Zealand, and it is the view of the Palmerston North City Council that a nationwide ban would reduce the environmental impact of these products.
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Local Government Act 2002

Remit: That LGNZ pursue an amendment to the Local Government Act 2002 to:

a. Re-number sub-sections 181 (5) and (6) to sub-sections (6) and (7); and
b. Introduce a new sub-section (5) to read: For all purposes the term “any work” in subsection 4 means any works constructed before xx Month 20xx; and includes any works that were wholly or partly in existence, or work on the construction of which commenced, before xx Month 20xx.

Proposed by: Rangitikei District Council
Supported by: Zone Three

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Historic assumptions that there is statutory authority for the siting of Three Waters infrastructure on private land do not reflect the complete picture.

Questions arise:

- May an infrastructure asset owner notify further works on private land where the original works are not protected by written consent (or notification)?
- Does an infrastructure asset owner have authority to restrict a landowner’s ability to build over a non-protected asset?
- What is the potential cost to infrastructure asset owners to remedy the absence of enforceable authority?

2. Background to its being raised

An example in the Rangitikei – Hunterville urban and rural water schemes

a. The rural scheme was constructed in the 1970’s (government grant involved).
b. Construction was a collective project (county and scheme users).
c. The urban supply draws bulk (raw) water from the rural scheme.
d. Infrastructure is sited on numerous private landholdings.
e. Conscious decision that landowner consents not required (relied on “the Act”).
f. Urban supply treatment, storage, reticulation sited on one member’s land.
g. Land has changed hands (twice) since urban supply infrastructure developed.
h. Current owners seek renegotiation of access rights as well as compensation.
i. Council and owners negotiating (little progress after seven years).
j. Substantial costs to survey and register easement.

The issue is not unique to Rangitikei

a. Several local authorities from Waikato and Bay of Plenty to Otago have emailed to comment. All record similar experiences to Rangitikei’s, both historic and ongoing’. One noted that such incidents arise, on average, monthly.
b. All comments received have noted frustration at the potential costs to formalise previously ‘casual’ but cordial and workable arrangements with prior landowners.

The power to construct is constrained

• Local Government Act (2002) sections 181 (1) and (2) empower a local authority to construct Three Waters works on private land.
• Section 181 (3) specifies the local authority must not exercise the power to construct unless it has the prior written consent of the landowner (or it has followed the prescribed notification process).
• Similar provisions that existed in previous legislation were repealed by the 2002 Act.

Effect of the law

• The Act provides power to construct; it is the owner consent (or notification process) that provides the authority to enter private land to exercise its power to construct.
• A local authority cannot claim absolute right of access without evidence of owner consent or compliance with the notification requirements.
• The High Court considered the need for fresh consent from, or notice to, subsequent owners (Re Watercare Services Ltd [2018] NZHC 294 [1 March 2018]).

Other infrastructure owners

• The Electricity Act 1992, the Gas Act 1992, and the Telecommunications Act 2001 all provide retrospective authority for siting of infrastructure on private land.
• No record has been found of the rationale behind those retrospective authorities.
• The thread of these authorities could be brought into the Local Government Act.
3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

- Local Government Act (2002) section 181 (4) authorises entry to any work constructed under the Act or the corresponding provisions of a prior Act.
- The effect of the Court’s (Watercare) Declaration is to confirm that a local authority must have evidence of prior written consent (or notification) for the original works on that land.
Campground regulations

Remit: That LGNZ request the Government to amend the Camping - Ground Regulations to allow councils to approve remote camp facilities on private property, subject to any such conditions as deemed required by a council, including the condition that any approved campground is x distance away from an existing campground, unless the existing campground operator agrees to waive this condition in writing.

Proposed by: Thames-Coromandel District Council
Supported by: Dunedin City Council
              Waikato District Council
              New Plymouth District Council
              Mackenzie District Council
              Hamilton City Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Currently the ‘remote camp site’ definition means a camping ground: ‘in a national park, state forest, state forest park or public reserve or on Crown Land.’ As the provision is only for public land there is no opportunity to provide such an experience on private property.

2. Background to its being raised

Ratepayers, through their council, are having to provide areas for camping for increasing numbers of what are being called “freedom campers”, with associated increasing costs to ratepayers and community both regarding environmental and financial considerations.

Unfortunately for councils there is nothing for free, and to provide any public facilities there is a range of costs to provide and maintain the facilities including power, water, waste collection, maintenance, cleaning, and compliance monitoring and enforcement etc. Those costs are increasing.
Enforcement for compliance is increasingly problematic and costly and in addition, social media is sending the wrong messages for our communities who must contend with freedom campers in their area. The result is that prime beach front sites are being degraded through overuse, and abuse of sites available.

While reserve areas can be either managed or leased for a remote camp facility, councils are constrained by the lack of public land where a remote site can be established, particularly in more remote locations. Remote camps have far fewer regulatory requirements than usual campgrounds.

3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

There is work underway regarding freedom camping in New Zealand which is looking at a range of issues in relation to freedom camping.

The Responsible Camping Working Group comprises central and local government representatives, as well as other interested parties, and is currently looking at a number of matters, including the Camping Ground Regulations. A review of the Regulations was one of the recommendations of the Working Group and work is underway specifically on this.

4. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

The remit seeks an amendment of the Camping - Ground Regulations to broaden the definition of remote camp site to allow councils to authorise remote camp sites on private land, taking into account distance from existing campground facilities. A new definition would enable sites to be established where, for a modest fee, an operator would be able to provide basic facilities and recover some of the cost of provision and maintenance.

In addition the 2016 annual general meeting agreed to ask the Government to change to s14(3) of the Camping Ground Regulations 1985 (made under s120B of the Health Act 1956) to allow broader exemptions to the need for provision of camping facilities for those that wish to freedom camp in all areas and not just at “remote” camps; this is yet to be actioned but is being considered by the joint officials body.

5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

Amend the Campground Regulations definition for remote sites to allow councils to authorise remote camps on private land taking into account distance from existing campground facilities.

By providing sites where a modest fee is required, the operator provides the basic facilities at no cost to ratepayers or the environment.
15 Living Wage

Remit: Wellington City Council asks that LGNZ members consider engaging with the Living Wage Aotearoa New Zealand Movement when developing policies on payment of the Living Wage.

Proposed by: Wellington City Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

According to the Living Wage Movement Aotearoa New Zealand, “Over the last 30 years New Zealand has gone from one of the most equal countries in the developed world to one of the most unequal. Wages have stagnated while New Zealanders are working harder and longer than ever before. Growing poverty and inequality hurts us all; workers and their families, employers, business, the Government and society as a whole.”

The Living Wage Movement Aotearoa New Zealand was formed in 2012 to generate a conversation about working poverty in Aotearoa. It brings together community, union and faith based groups to campaign for a Living Wage.

The Living Wage is defined as: “The income necessary to provide workers and their families with the basic necessities of life. A living wage will enable workers to live with dignity and to participate as active citizens in society”. The Living Wage is an independently researched hourly rate based on the actual cost of living and is reviewed annually. The official 2019 New Zealand Living Wage is $21.15 and will come into effect on 1 September 2019.

Research from around the world shows that paying a Living Wage brings benefits to employers, to the community and most importantly to workers who need it the most.

2. Background to its being raised

The Living Wage Movement Aotearoa New Zealand has an accreditation system available to employers who meet the criteria to become a Living Wage Employer. In order to use this trade mark, employers must sign a license committing the organisation to paying no less than the Living Wage to directly employees and contracted workers, delivering services on a regular and ongoing basis.
This remit recognises that a number of local authorities across New Zealand are currently taking steps towards becoming Living Wage councils.

3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

LGNZ is committed to working alongside central government and iwi to address social issues in New Zealand’s communities, including disparity between social groups.

4. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

In September 2018, Wellington City Council became the first council in New Zealand to be accredited as a Living Wage Employer. This was the culmination of implementing a Living Wage and working with the Living Wage Movement Aotearoa New Zealand since 2013, in summary:

- Following a decision in 2013, from January 2014 the Council implemented a minimum wage rate of $18.40 for all fully trained directly employed staff.

- On 1 July 2014, WCC implemented its decision to introduce the Living Wage (at $18.40 per hour) for council and Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) staff.

- On 15 May 2015, the Council’s Governance, Finance and Planning Committee passed a resolution to increase the $18.40 rate to reflect annual inflation movement.

- On 28 October 2015, WCC extended the living wage (at $18.55 per hour) to security and core cleaning contractors.

- In July 2017, the Council implemented the New Zealand Living Wage ($20.20 at the time) for staff, CCOs and core contractors as they come up for renewal.

- In September 2018, WCC was accredited as a Living Wage employer.

5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

Member councils who are developing policies on payment of the Living Wage will consider engaging with the Living Wage Movement Aotearoa New Zealand to understand the criteria for becoming a Living Wage accredited employer.
Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act

Remit: LGNZ, on behalf of its member councils ask for a review of the effectiveness of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 in reducing alcohol harm (eg price, advertising, purchase age and availability) and fully involve local government in that review.

Proposed by: Wellington City Council and Hastings District Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Wellington City Council

The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act was introduced in 2012 and has not as yet been reviewed.

There is now considerable experience in how it is working in practice and it is timely that a review is undertaken to ensure it is meeting the outcomes that were sought when it was introduced and that any anomalies that have emerged from regulation under the Act are addressed.

Addressing anomalies: an example of such an anomaly that has become apparent is the definition of ‘grocery store’ in the Act, where a business is only a grocery store if its largest single sales group (by turnover) is a specified type of food/groceries. In hearings the focus is often more on the accounting statements of an applicant, rather than about alcohol effects.

An established operator for whom the highest turnover item was topping up Snapper cards ahead of groceries applied for a renewal of their licence. The Act requires the District Licensing Committee (DLC) to use turnover as the measure to define the type of business and there is no discretion allowed to the DLC. In effect the DLC had the choice of declining the liquor licence or saying they could only retain their liquor licence by stopping Snapper top ups. They were not a grocery store by definition as Snapper card top ups was the highest turnover item. The obvious decision was to stop the Snapper top ups, to meet the “grocery store” definition, and retain the liquor licence. The overall outcome of considering the safe and responsible sale, supply and consumption of alcohol; and the minimisation of harm was not achieved.
This is one of a range of issues. The District Licensing Committees all report each year to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority. This addresses the issues of the operation of the Act. After five years this now provides a considerable base of information that can be used in a wider review to improve the effectiveness of the Act.

Better regulation: The current regulations are tightly prescribed (eg setting maximum penalties or fees), leave little flexibility for local circumstances and have not been reviewed. The process of establishing local alcohol policies has also not been effective.

The Council developed a Provisional Local Alcohol Policy which was notified on January 21, 2014. Appeals were lodged by eight parties which were heard by the Authority over eight days between 20 October and 5 November 2014. The Authority released its decision on 20 January 2015 which asked the Council to reconsider elements of its PLAP. In 2016, the Council resolved that it should not at that time resubmit the PLAP to the Authority, and should instead continue to monitor alcohol-related data in Wellington, work with key stakeholders, and consider future Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) decisions on other PLAP appeals prior to determining if the Council requires a local alcohol policy.

This experience is not uncommon and it has been difficult to establish a comprehensive Local Alcohol Policy which was a key building block of the regulatory framework. As at November 2018 while 34 of the 67 territorial authorities have an adopted LAP, this only covers 28 per cent of the New Zealand population. The majority of New Zealand communities have not been able to achieve the level of community input that was envisaged under the Act. This process needs to be reviewed in light of the experience of how the Act is operating in practice.

2. Background to its being raised

Wellington City Council

This remit recognises that almost all local authorities across New Zealand are currently managing this issue through the licensing powers under the Act. They can bring practical experience of the operation of the Act and help enable communities to benefit from a review of the provisions of the Act.

Hastings District Council

Hawke’s Bay faces significant social challenges as demonstrated in the following statistics:

- 25 per cent of Hawke’s Bay 0-4 year olds live in a household receiving a main benefit (compared with 18 per cent nationally).
- 40 per cent of Hawke’s Bay tamariki Maori aged 0-4 years live in a household receiving a main benefit.
- 250 Hawke’s Bay children are in the care of Oranga Tamariki.
- Hawke’s Bay rates of violent crime continues to be higher that the New Zealand average and is twice the rate of New Zealand as a whole.
- There were 9,932 family violence investigations by the Eastern Police District in 2017.
• Suicide;
  o Is a major cause of premature, avoidable death in Hawke’s Bay.
  o From 2010 to 2015, suicide was the second highest reason for premature death for those aged 0 to 74 years.
  o Since 1 July 2018, 29 people have committed suicide in Hawke’s Bay.

• Drugs;
  o Synthetic substances are a serious concern for many whanau.
  o Fewer youth are smoking but more Hawke’s Bay adults smoke than nationally.

A contributing factor of these negative statistics is the significant problem that the Hawke’s Bay community has with alcohol consumption. For our region the issues manifested by alcohol consumption are a problem across the whole community including for young newly-born babies, infants and children, young people, adults and seniors across the generations. Local alcohol statistics are alarming and include:

• 29 per cent of Hawke’s Bay adults drink at harmful levels compared to 21 per cent nationally, and this rate is increasing over time.
• 41 per cent of young people aged 15-24 are drinking hazardous.
• Over half of young men are drinking hazardous.
• The number of 15 years and older hospitalisations wholly attributable to alcohol; see the below graph. Note, there is an increasing rate of people being admitted to hospital due to alcohol.

• Alcohol intoxication or a history of alcohol abuse are often associated with youth suicide.

The statistics relating to our alcohol harm impact negatively on other key community safety concerns including health issues; death and injury; violence; suicide; assault and anti-social behaviours. This is why addressing the harm of alcohol is such an important issue for our community to address.
The harm that alcohol causes across New Zealand is also a significant issue for the country and as with Hawke’s Bay the harm that alcohol causes within the community is pervasive. National statistics include:

- About four in five (79 per cent) of adults aged 15 years or more drank alcohol in the past year (in 2017/18).
- 21 per cent of New Zealand adults drink at harmful levels.
- In 2017/18, 25 per cent of adults aged 15 years or more who drank alcohol in the past year has a potentially hazardous drinking pattern, with men (32 per cent) more likely to drink hazardously than women (17 per cent).

At a local level there are some tools available to territorial authorities and their respective communities to combat alcohol harm. For example, Local Alcohol Policies (LAPs) are permitted in accordance with the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012. Unfortunately for many LAPs there are significant delays in these becoming operational due to long appeal processes.

There are typically commercial implications for businesses particularly supermarkets and these often result in appeals being lodged. Appeal processes have not allowed for more local input and influence by community members and groups, but have instead allowed larger companies, with more money and resources, to force councils to amend their LAP’s reducing the potential impact on harm minimisation.

Of course, local tools available to territorial authorities are also limited by what is permitted within our national laws. We consider that current statutes and their content are not strong enough and need to be strengthened so that alcohol harm within our communities can be more effectively addressed.

The most significant drivers of alcohol-related harm include:

- The low price of alcohol.
- Levels of physical availability.
- Alcohol advertising; promotion and sponsorship.
- The minimum legal purchase age (18).

Therefore this remit seeks a focus on effective national level strategies and interventions that prevent or minimise alcohol-related harm in regards to:

- Pricing and taxing (minimum unit pricing for alcohol).
- Regulating the physical availability.
- Raising the purchase age.
- Restrictions on marketing, advertising and sponsorship.
- Drink driving countermeasures.
- Treatment and early intervention services.
We consider that significant changes in national policy and law that address key issues pertaining to alcohol harm are needed to create significant impact on reducing the harm that alcohol causes both in Hawke’s Bay and New Zealand.

3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

**Wellington City Council**

LGNZ has a priority to work, in partnership with central government, for local areas to develop innovative and place-based approaches for dealing with social issues. While the operation of the Act is not directly listed as one of the social issues covered by the current work programme, the intent of the Act was to allow place-based approaches to the management of alcohol related harm.

**Hastings District Council**

This remit links to the social policy priority; community safety. Integrate policy positions from *Mobilising the Regions* including: integrated transport planning and decision-making models into the above.

4. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

**Wellington City Council**

We are actively involved. The Council was proactive in initiating the development of a Local Alcohol Policy. We administer licencing functions under the Act and the DLC reports each year to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority on its functions.

We have not directly progressed work on a review at this point as it requires central government leadership with the input of local authorities across New Zealand.

**Hastings District Council**

The Napier City and Hastings District Councils have a Joint Alcohol Strategy 2017-2022 (JAS) and have started to implement the JAS Action Plan with support from the JAS Reference Group (local stakeholder organisations that also contribute to this strategy). Some actions completed thus far include:

- Removal of alcohol advertising on bus shelters in Hastings and Napier;
- Funding obtained to identify and develop youth-driven alcohol harm prevention projects;
- Creation and distribution of an alcohol network newsletter (bi-monthly) to make the licensing process more accessible to the community;
- A move to notifying liquor licence applications online; and
- Funding obtained to create brand and resources for alcohol free events and alcohol free zones.
Hastings District and Napier City Councils have completed a Provisional Local Alcohol Policy that was notified in July 2016. The Provisional Local Alcohol Policy has been before ARLA as a result of appeals. A position has been negotiated with the appellants. That position has been considered by ARLA and will be notified to the original submitters once ARLA is satisfied with the final wording. If no one seeks to appeal the revised version it will become the adopted Local Alcohol Policy.

5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

**Wellington City Council**

That LGNZ would, on behalf of its member councils, form a working group to work with central agencies to review the effectiveness of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

**Hastings District Council**

- Actively monitor opportunities to submit to central government with respect to review of statutes and regulations that relate to alcohol.
- Prepare submissions to central government review processes that relate to the key drivers of alcohol harm as outlined in this remit.
- Write to and meet with the Minister of Justice and officials to promote changes to laws and regulations that will address the key drivers of alcohol harm.
- Create a national action plan to reduce harm caused by alcohol.
- Engage and support councils nationwide to implement strategies, policies and actions that are aimed at reducing alcohol-related harm. This could include delivering workshops; providing statistics and information on the harm alcohol causes and developing templates for policies and strategies that can be easily implemented.
Remit: Wellington City Council asks that LGNZ members collectively adopt the position that government should revise the Resource Management Act 1991 to adequately consider the impact of greenhouse gases when making decisions under that law and to ensure that the Resource Management Act 1991 is consistent with the Zero Carbon Bill.

Proposed by: Wellington City Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

The Act seeks to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while:

- Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
- Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and
- Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

Under the RMA, most decisions are decentralised to local and regional levels to enables public participation in decision-making.

The emissions trading scheme is a national framework. Because of this, there is a disconnection between decisions taken under the RMA and the emission of greenhouse gases. Emissions are not consistently contemplated when decisions are taken; there appears to be a gap, however the Council currently doesn’t have a formal position on this.

2. Background to its being raised

Wellington is proposing a substantial change in urban form and transportation in order to accommodate anticipated growth and to meet community expectations around carbon emissions. Planning for this growth has highlighted the regulatory gap described above.
3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

In planning for growth the Council is setting out to develop a future Wellington that is low carbon and resilient. Decisions will be taken under the RMA, yet the need to reduce carbon emissions is not currently a requirement under our key planning legislation.

4. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

The Council has developed a draft plan, Te Atakura – First to Zero, that would establish the Council’s advocacy position in favour of significantly boosted consideration of emissions in the RMA. This draft was released for consultation on 15 April 2019 and is to be considered for adoption on 22 June 2019.

5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

The Minister for the Environment is aware of the gap, and has publicly stated:

“The Government intends to undertake a comprehensive review of the resource management system (Stage 2), which is expected to begin this year.”

“Cabinet has already noted my intention to consider RMA changes relating to climate change (both mitigation and adaptation) within the scope of this review.”

Local government will have an opportunity to advocate for the inclusion of climate change effects through this process.

This remit asks councils to work together in engaging with government to amend the RMA to require decision makers to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Remit: That LGNZ recommends to government that they establish an independent expert group to develop a new funding policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts as recommended by the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group (CCATWG). This new expert group would be supported by a secretariat and stakeholder advisory group.

Proposed by: Greater Wellington Regional Council

Supported by: Regional Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

New Zealand will need a new funding policy framework to enable effective, efficient and equitable long-term adaptation to the many challenges posed by climate change. Any such framework must be comprehensive, fit for purpose, and facilitate flexible and dynamic responses.

While there is broad agreement that the current policy framework for climate change adaptation, and especially sea level rise, is inadequate, there has been little attention given to securing a consensus among the stakeholders on the core features of a new framework.

Some small initiatives have been taken by a few local councils and academics towards the formulation of a new framework.

There are a large number of separate, yet interconnected issues that require investigation in parallel or in sequence. It is very likely to take several years to formulate a new, well-designed policy framework, followed by the drafting and enactment of legislative reforms, before the process of implementation can begin. Given the amount of work that is involved and that climate change impacts are already making themselves felt, it is important that this process is started without further delay.
2. **Background to its being raised**

Sea level rise constitutes a particularly serious challenge due to irreversibility of the near-term impacts. Already many low-lying coastal communities around New Zealand are facing a growing threat to their homes and livelihoods, public infrastructure and private businesses. This and other impacts on human and natural systems related to more intense rainfall, heat, wind, and pathogens and disease vectors, will increase and become disruptive. They will increase the financial burden on the state at all levels and create inequities across society.

For further discussion of the issues and options for developing a new policy framework, from which the proposed remit was derived, see the discussion paper by Jonathan Boston (VUW) and Judy Lawrence (VUW), dated 4 February 2019.

3. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

A recent report by LGNZ found an estimated $14 billion of local government assets are at risk from climate change impacts. It has called on central government to create a ‘National Climate Change Adaptation Fund’. It has also recently published a legal opinion by Jack Hodder QC regarding the potential for local government to be litigated in relation to its actions or inaction in relation to climate change. A key risk raised by Mr Hodder’s report was the absence of national climate change adaptation guidance (or framework) in New Zealand, which in effect is leaving it to the courts to decide how to remedy climate change related harms. This will be an uncertain and inefficient means of doing so.

The Government has received the recommendations of the CCATWG, but is yet to act upon them. The CCATWG recommendation to the Government (quoted below) was to set up a specialist group to define funding arrangements for funding adaptation.

“We recommend that a specialist group of practitioners and experts undertake this action (formulate a new policy framework for adaptation funding). These should be drawn from central and local government, iwi/hapū, sectors such as banking, insurance, and infrastructure; and have expertise in climate change, planning and law, public finance, capital markets, infrastructure financing, and risk management. The group should be serviced by a secretariat with officials across relevant public sector and local government agencies and include significant public engagement.”

4. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

That LGNZ issue a news release explaining the content of the remit, and that they engage with central government directly (in face to face meetings) to discuss the setting up of an independent expert group to progress the development of a new funding policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts.
Remit:

1. That LGNZ acknowledges that the New Zealand Transport Agency's (NZTA's), Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (CoPTTM) is a comprehensive and robust document, and that NZTA ensures the CoPTTM system is regularly reviewed, refined and updated. However, in light of the recent road worker fatalities LGNZ requests NZTA, in partnership with Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs);
   a. Review afresh its Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (CoPTTM) to satisfy themselves that;
      i. The document provides sufficient guidelines and procedures to ensure approaching traffic are given every possible opportunity to become aware of the worksite ahead and to respond appropriately and in a timely manner.
   b. Review its CoPTTM Training System to ensure;
      i. Trainers are sufficiently qualified and adequately covering the training syllabus.
      ii. Site Traffic Management Supervisors (STMS's) and Traffic Controllers (TC's) are only certified when they can demonstrate competence in the application of CoPTTM.
      ii. A robust refresher programme is in place to ensure those in charge of Traffic Management on worksites remain current in the required competencies.
   c. Review its Site Auditing requirements to ensure the traffic management at worksites is independently audited at a sufficient frequency to ensure compliance, and that a significantly robust system is put in place to enable enforcement of compliance.

2. That LGNZ takes steps to remind its members of their duties with respect to their role as Road Controlling Authorities including;
   a. Appointing and sufficiently training and resourcing a Traffic Management Co-ordinator to ensure their obligations under the Health and Safety Work Act 2015, with respect to traffic management, are being met.
   b. Adequately resourcing and undertaking audits of road work sites to ensure compliance with CoPTTM.
Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Four road workers have been killed on New Zealand roads this calendar year, and we need to ask ourselves, are we doing all that we can to ensure those working on our roads are safe from harm.

There is an increasing level of public discontent with the level of discipline around traffic management being maintained on roadwork sites by contractors, particularly on unattended sites, where all too often the temporary traffic management on site does not seem appropriate, or to adequately inform motorists of the need for the restrictions, or is left in place for too long.

2. Background to its being raised

Frameworks for the safe management of roadworks have been in place for over two decades now, and during this time they have evolved and improved to keep up with the changing risks in the workplace environment.

The current framework is the New Zealand Transport Agency's Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management, fourth edition 2018 (CoPTTM).

This is a comprehensive document that applies a risk based approach to temporary traffic management, based on a road’s classification and intensity of use, and the nature of works required to be undertaken on the road.

It is closely aligned to the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, recognising the statutory duty of all those involved with activities on or adjacent to the road, to systematically identify any hazards, and if a hazard is identified, to take all reasonably practical steps to ensure no person is harmed.

It includes steps to eliminate risks to health and safety and if it is not reasonably practicable, to minimise risks to health and safety by implementing risk control measures in accordance with Health and Safety at Work (General risk and Workplace Management) Regulations 2015.
CoPTTM also includes a risk matrix to help determine what the appropriate temporary speed limit is that should be applied to a worksite, whether attended or unattended. It further contains procedures for undertaking safety audits and reviews of worksites, including the ability to close down worksites that are identified as unsafe following an audit. There are no financial penalties for non-compliance, although there are a range of other penalties that can be imposed, including the issue of a notice of non-conformance to individuals or companies, and a 'three strikes' system whereby the issue of three non-conformances within a 12 month period results in sanctions being imposed. These can include:

- Removal of any prequalification status.
- Reduction of quality scores assigned in tender evaluations.
- Forwarding of non-conformance to the appropriate standards organisation which may affect the company's ISO9000 registration.
- Denial of access to the road network for a period of time.
- Requirement for the company to have someone else provide their TTM.
- Staff retraining for CoPTTM warrants.

In principle there would seem to be sufficient processes in place to ensure that traffic management on road worksites was appropriate and adequately provided for the safety of workers on site, the general public, and passing traffic.

However, this year has seen four road workers killed whilst working on our roads.

There is also a growing level of discontent from motorists regarding the appropriateness of signs that are left out on unattended sites.

Often these signs are perceived to be (any combination of) unnecessary, poorly located, incorrectly advising the condition of the road ahead, having an inappropriate speed limit, or being left out too long.

3. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

Local Government New Zealand has five policies in place to help achieve their sector vision: Local democracy powering community and national success.

Policy priority one is Infrastructure, which focuses on water, transport and built infrastructure. The transport statement states that a national policy framework is needed to achieve five outcomes. One outcome is 'a safe system, increasingly free of death and serious injury'.

This remit is aligned to this priority outcome as it is focused on reducing safety risks, death and serious injury in locations where road works are being undertaken.
4. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

   The Whakatāne District Council has been working proactively with NZTA and its local contractors to review its own traffic management requirements, the level of compliance with those requirements, and the adequacy of its auditing processes and frequencies.

   There has been positive engagement with NZTA and the local contracting sector on this matter.

   The process has identified improvements that could be effected by both the Council and its contractors. A plan is being developed to socialise the outcomes with NZTA and other RCA’s, and this remit forms part of that plan.

   NZTA is also responding to the recent deaths by initiating immediate temporary changes to pertinent traffic management plans, and considering permanent changes through its standard CoPTTM review process.

   There is currently no national initiative to require local government RCA’s to review their practices in response to these deaths.

5. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

   • Support NZTA’s initiative to review CoPTTM in light of the recent fatalities.
   • Encourage NZTA to work closely with RCA’s to ensure the CoPTTM review also covers local road Temporary Traffic Management.
   • Strongly encourage RCA’s to work with NZTA, perhaps through the RCA Forum, on a review of local road Temporary Traffic Management.
   • Strongly encourage RCA’s to adopt with urgency, any local road CoPTTM Improvements that arise from the review.
Mobility scooter safety

Remit: That LGNZ requests that government investigate the introduction of strengthened rules to govern the safe use of mobility scooters, particularly in relation to speed limits and registration.

Proposed by: Whanganui District Council
Supported by: Zone Three

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The following issues have been identified:

a. There is no opportunity to enforce a speed limit for mobility scooters, despite the fact that the top speeds of these devices can reach 40kmh.

b. Mobility scooters are used too frequently on the road, even when a suitable footpath is available.

c. There is no requirement for a mobility scooter user to have a license or any previous driving experience.

d. There are no health related restrictions on who can operate a mobility scooter.

e. There is no ability to track mobility scooters as no registration or Warrant of Fitness (WoF) is required.

A supplementary issue is also acknowledged:

- There is no restriction in terms of who can use a mobility scooter. For example, in some states of Australia mobility scooters can only be used by a person with an injury, disability or medical condition which means they are unable to walk or have difficulty walking. People who do not have difficulty walking are not permitted to use them.

2. Background to its being raised

Establishing the number of injuries and fatalities involving mobility scooter users can be difficult to isolate and this has been identified as an issue nationwide. However, coronial data shows that at least 20 people have died while using mobility scooters in New Zealand.
Given the considerable lag between a death occurring and a coronial case on that death being closed, the actual number may be significantly higher. Notably NZTA reports that: “mobility scooters... have been involved with a number of fatalities (at least 20 in 2014-2015).”

For the period 2008-2012 the Ministry of Transport recorded eight fatalities and 141 injuries of mobility scooter users. NZTA records 12 fatalities, 19 serious injuries and 81 less serious injuries for the period 2009-2014. These figures do not include fatalities or injuries to persons other than the mobility scooter user.

It has been acknowledged by those working in this field that there have been a ‘surprising’ number of injury crashes involving mobility scooters over the last five years, including fatalities. More work on clarifying the extent of this problem is required and there has been general agreement nationwide from the region’s road safety co-ordinators, and other agencies such as NZTA and Age Concern, that mobility scooter safety is an emerging concern. This is the case throughout the country and is reiterated by both large and small centres, in urban areas and rural regions.

Some of the issues raised include:

- Mobility scooters being driven on the road, at speed, with low visibility (eg without a flag) and like a motor vehicle (as opposed to like a pedestrian as is required).
- No accountability around vulnerable elderly users, particularly those who have lost their licence. There is no established avenue to ascertain whether there are issues around dementia or other chronic conditions which could have an impact on their ability to use these safely.
- No accountability around the purchase of mobility scooters, both in terms of being fit for use and training for safe handling. This is particularly the case when they are bought off the internet, eg there is no opportunity to ensure that the right scooter has been purchased for the user’s level of ability and that they are shown how to drive it according to the regulations.
- No ongoing monitoring of use, particularly in the case of declining health.
- No restrictions on the speed that mobility scooters can reach or the size of mobility scooters. With an increase in larger model mobility scooters being imported, there is less room for scooters to pass one another, or to pass other pedestrians. This leads to a greater likelihood of one or more of the footpath users needing to use the road rather than the footpath. Larger mobility scooters also require larger areas to turn. Given the size of many footpaths in New Zealand, this increases the risk that the user will enter the roadway at an angle and roll the mobility scooter, resulting in serious injury or death.

Some centres have also identified an issue with the increasing prevalence and size of mobility scooters adding load to the footpaths. Furthermore, the contrast between New Zealand Post’s work on safety assurances with the use of Paxster vehicles on the footpath, and the lack of oversight over larger sized mobility scooters being used in a similar (but unmonitored) way has been drawn.
However, it is also important to note the significant role that mobility scooters play in granting senior people their independence. Any measures taken to address this remit’s concerns must balance this benefit with the need to ensure safety for users and other pedestrians.

3. **New or confirming existing policy**

The remit would strengthen existing central government policy. However, new legislation would be required to put in place an appropriate registration programme, both for mobility scooter users and for the mobility scooters.

4. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

Transport safety issues are not referred to specifically in the current LGNZ work programme. However, ensuring we have safe systems, increasingly free of death and serious injury and addressing the needs of an ageing population are each included under one of the five policy priorities (Infrastructure and Social, respectively).

5. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

This is an emerging issue and is acknowledged as such by those with an interest and involvement in road safety at both the local and regional level. Although discussions are underway about working with the Safe and Sustainable Association of Aotearoa/New Zealand (SASTA) and Trafinz on these concerns so that this can be addressed with the NZTA, it is understood that this work has not yet commenced.

The Marlborough Road Safety Mobility Scooter User Group has undertaken some useful research in this area. They have canvassed users in relation to training needs, safety, registration, injuries, facilities and the footpath network.

Although not all suggestions were supported, this survey did identify some relevant ideas and safety concerns, eg 71 per cent of respondents had seen a mobility scooter being used in an unsafe manner on the footpath or road, 19 per cent had been injured by a mobility scooter as a pedestrian and 78 per cent said that they or someone they knew had had a ‘near miss’.

Some ideas raised include focusing on licensing/registering drivers rather than the mobility scooters themselves, ensuring that any registration costs were low to ensure affordability, making mobility scooters easier to hear and introducing a speed limit.

6. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

NZTA has the responsibility, via government, for mobility scooters in New Zealand and has a booklet available, titled *Ready to Ride - Keeping safe on your mobility scooter*. This is based on section 11 of the Land Transport (Road Use) Rule 2004.
The following provisions exist – it is recommended that these be expanded upon and strengthened:

- **Speed limits:** Current New Zealand law says “A driver of a mobility device or wheeled recreational device on a footpath;
  a. Must operate the device in a careful and considerate manner; and
  b. Must not operate the device at a speed that constitutes a hazard to other footpath users.”

- **Road usage:** Current New Zealand law says;
  a. A driver must not drive a mobility device on any portion of a roadway if it is practicable to drive on a footpath.
  b. A pedestrian or driver of a mobility device or a wheeled recreational device using the roadway must remain as near as practicable to the edge of the roadway.

- **Monitoring and registration:** Current New Zealand law does not require users to have a driver licence or any form of medical approval to operate a mobility scooter and no warrant of fitness or registration is needed.

Further, current law does not require the use of any personal protective equipment such as helmets, despite these devices being capable of reaching similar speeds to mopeds and higher speeds than many bicycle users travel at.

This is particularly problematic given Canadian research that showed, of their sample group of mobility scooter users, 38 per cent had hearing impairments, 34 per cent had vision impairments, 19 per cent had memory impairments and 17 per cent had balance impairments. The study also found that 80 per cent of the mobility scooter users took four or more medications daily.

The *Ready to Ride* guidelines clearly spell out that mobility scooter users could be fined if they are found to be riding their scooter: “… carelessly, inconsiderately or at a dangerous speed. The fine may be higher if you do any of these things more than once.” Furthermore, if a mobility scooter user causes a crash where someone is killed or hurt then they could be charged with “careless or inconsiderate use of a motor vehicle”. This brings penalties ranging from a severe fine to a prison sentence. However, these do not provide clear definitions or rules to inform a user’s decisions.

7. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

**Speed limits**

It is recommended that the approach taken in some Australian States, including Victoria be adopted. This states that mobility scooters: “must have a maximum capable speed of 10km per hour on level ground and a maximum unladen mass of 110kg.”
Road usage

It is recommended that New Zealand Police be resourced to enforce the law. Local and regional councils throughout the country, as well as NZTA, road safety action groups and other key agencies, have highlighted serious concerns about mobility scooters riding on the road when a footpath is available, as well as riding on the road as if they are a motor vehicle.

Monitoring and registration

It is recommended that legislation is changed to require all mobility scooters to be registered and display a licence plate, with minimal or no cost imposed, to ensure compliance. It is further recommended that the legislation set a maximum power assisted speed and size for mobility scooters.
Museums and galleries

Remit: That central government funding be made available on an annual basis for museums and galleries operated by territorial authorities with nationally significant collections.

Proposed by: Whanganui District Council
Supported by: Zone Three

Background information and research

3. Nature of the issue

The following issues have been identified:

- There is currently no central government funding for daily operating costs for museums and galleries operated by territorial authorities.
- Public museums and galleries often house nationally significant collections and taonga but are supported largely by their local ratepayers, often from a limited funding pool.
- These facilities attract national and international visitors and service far more than the local area from which their funding is drawn.
- Local authorities are severely challenged to adequately support the annual running costs required for these key cultural facilities due to the financial impost on ratepayers.
- Support for the retention of these facilities in smaller regional centres, outside the larger cities, is important in terms of cultural accessibility and in keeping our provincial communities viable.

4. Background to its being raised

Regional museums and galleries are important to the cultural makeup of this country. They are recognised as critical hubs for communities and visitors and play a role that extends far beyond the display of images and artefacts:

- They occupy a dynamic position in our national cultural life, encouraging us to think about our place in the world.
- They stimulate discussion and debate. This enhances participation, creativity, community capacity and a sense of place.
They generate economic activity; they are a driver of tourism and create jobs and vibrancy.

They contribute to key aspects of our community and national cultural identity; the nature of our bicultural society and other multicultural influences means that museums and galleries will act as an increasingly important link in reflecting and understanding the diversity of our communities.

They build social cohesion, creativity and leisure opportunities. They contribute to civic development and provide a focal point for gathering and interaction; acting as a key social destination.

They foster enrichment. Arts and culture are ‘good for you’. Having access to events and exhibitions is important, and this might be even more so in provincial centres.

Despite this, there is limited funding available, particularly for operating costs. This raises concerns about the ongoing ability of territorial authorities to:

- Provide adequate, appropriate and safe storage methods. Climate control and professional and timely care or repair of our treasures requires adequate funding to ensure the longevity of many of our special collection items (for example, paintings or heritage artefacts such as Māori cloaks).
- Deliver the right display conditions. Without the right climate control, security and display methods, the public’s access to view these collections is severely limited. Instead of enhancing the visibility of, and connection to, our key collection pieces locally, nationally and internationally, this access is restricted by inadequate funds for exhibition. This is exacerbated by the limitations of funding at the local ratepayer level.
- Preserving our stories. The collections available at public museums and galleries are not only often nationally significant but also reveal important aspects of our local identity. They are an education resource (both formally through school programmes and informally) and are a drawcard for tourism. Maintaining these collections retains our storytelling abilities, supports our unique identities and contributes to economic and social development.

This is supported by the following background information:

- Some collections are over 100 years old and need specialised climate control and storage facilities. Paint, canvas, fabric and fibres have unique requirements to ensure their preservation and longevity. The cost of doing so is huge and is a burden that many local communities cannot sustain. However, despite this, they are solely responsible for this care.
- Some grants are available, on application, to deliver education programmes for school children. However, this funding is very limited and requires additional subsidisation by schools. As a result, not all children are gaining equitable access to our museums and galleries.
- Limited grants are also available, on application, for storage and building upgrades, as well as for one-off restoration projects. However, there are no regular, reliable funds available to meet the significant and necessary costs of just running these institutions.
• Currently only the Auckland War Memorial Museum and Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa receive an ongoing proportion of operating costs.

As an example, the Sarjeant Gallery in Whanganui has an annual operating budget of $2.285 million and the Whanganui Regional Museum a budget of $1.085 million. The value of their collections is $30 million across each institution, with their collections considered to be some of the best in New Zealand. Yet they are funded almost solely from the local Whanganui district ratepayer base. This is not sustainable if we are to make the most of New Zealand’s nationally significant collections and ensure their preservation for the future.

An example of public museums and art galleries currently operated by territorial authorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Permanent collection?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarjeant Gallery - Whanganui</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui Regional Museum</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Art Gallery</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei Art Museum</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tuhi Center for the Arts, Manukau City</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato Museum</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua Museum of Art &amp; History</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga Art Gallery</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatane Museum &amp; Art Gallery</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govett Brewster Gallery/Len Lye Centre – New Plymouth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Thompson Gallery – Stratford</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tairawhiti Museum – Gisborne</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawke’s Bay Museum and Art Gallery – Napier</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aratoi Wairarapa Museum of Art &amp; History – Masterton</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Gallery – Wellington</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Dowse – Lower Hutt</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Art Gallery – Blenheim</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suter Art Gallery – Nelson</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Art Gallery</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca – Centre for Contemporary Art – Christchurch</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigantighe Art Gallery – Timaru</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester Gallery – Oamaru</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin Public Art Gallery</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland Museum and Art Gallery – Invercargill</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Park Art Gallery – Invercargill</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Southland Gallery – Gore</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **New or confirming existing policy**

The remit would require a policy shift by central government to provide funding for operating costs based on a set of clear assessment criteria.

6. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

The LGNZ work programme includes tourism as a focus area and addresses concerns about funding in relation to key facilities and amenities:

“Without more equitable forms of funding there is a risk that visitors will lack the appropriate range of local amenities they need to have a positive experience.”

This is framed by the following statement:

“The visitor industry is now New Zealand’s largest export industry however the speed of its growth is putting many of New Zealand’s smaller communities under pressure. It is a problem created by the way in which councils are funded as new facilities will be paid for out of property taxes while visitor expenditure, in the form of increased GST and income tax, benefits central rather than local government.”

7. **What work or action on the issues has been done on it, and the outcome**

Although there was work completed on a central government funding model for the ‘national collection’ in the 1990’s (that being, the collection held by all public museums and galleries in New Zealand) this did not progress. The United Kingdom has a centrally funded system for museums and galleries.

8. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

- Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996.

9. **Suggest course of action envisaged**

That central government funding be made available on an annual basis for museums and galleries operated by territorial authorities with nationally significant collections.

This would be in the form of an annual allocation for operating costs based on specific criteria to ensure the maintenance, preservation and development of collections with relevance beyond the local setting. This would provide the surety of a reliable income stream and could be set to a specified limit, eg 10 per cent of annual operating costs.
Of particular interest would be those collections of national importance where the benefit of protection and enhancement would make a substantial contribution to New Zealand’s creative sector as well as our national cultural identity.

Priority funding would be given to museums and galleries which hold permanent New Zealand collections, rather than being solely exhibition galleries. Funding could also be based on the size and type of collection. This recognises the added burden of storage, care and maintenance for collections of a significant size and importance.
22 Resource Management Act

Remit: That the selection of all independent commissioners for Resource Management Act hearings be centralised to improve independence and enhance the quality of decisions.

Proposed by: Whanganui District Council

Supported by: Zone Three

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The following issues with the current system have been identified:

- There is potential for corruption and undue influence.
- There is limited ability for newer commissioners to obtain experience.
- There is opportunity for enhanced effectiveness and more robust decision-making.

2. Background to its being raised

The Resource Management Act (RMA) contains provisions for the appointment of independent commissioners to sit on panels to hear RMA matters, for example, resource consent applications, notices of requirement and District and Regional Plan Reviews, including plan changes (s39B).

Commissioners must be accredited to sit on RMA hearing panels and the Minister for the Environment must approve the qualification for accreditation. The certification process is called “Making Good Decisions” and is delivered on behalf of the Ministry.

The Ministry for the Environment (MfE) website sets out the areas covered by the accreditation and recertification processes and has a register of qualified commissioners.
Although this system provides opportunity, in theory, for panel composition based on a balanced range of factors to ensure impartiality and relevant breadth of experience – in practice this is not the case. Instead, selection can be influenced by:

- **Paid relationships.** For example, commissioners being held on retainer.
- **Manipulation of focus areas.** For example, panels being ‘stacked’ to increase the likelihood of support or sympathy for particular issues.
- **Existing connections.** For example, the same commissioners being selected by the same councils, leaving little room for newer certificate holders and leading to questions of true independence.

As a result, the current system is open to both real and perceived issues of fairness based on concerns about:

- The appropriateness of an ongoing financial arrangement for retained availability, as well as the ability of this relationship to really remain independent and impartial. For example, would an ‘unfavourable’ decision jeopardise the financial benefit for a commissioner in this position?
- A balance of experience and expertise on the panel when many of the same commissioners, with similar backgrounds (planners, lawyers, elected members) are used on a consistent basis.
- Missed opportunities to provide practical experience to a broader spread of certificate holders in a more even way (rather than the same familiar options being selected).
- The ability to achieve genuine impartiality when commissioners can be picked based on prior relationships and knowledge of their position (and therefore likely decisions) on particular issues.
- An absence of local and external collaboration on decisions – missing important opportunities to upskill lesser experienced commissioners and provide the right mix of local versus external perspectives to equally inform good decision-making.
- A lack of standardisation in fee structures throughout the country, potentially leading to ‘cherry-picking’ of hearings.
- Poor Māori representation on hearing panels in areas where co-management legislation does not yet apply.

There is also no process for receiving or addressing complaints about commissioner conduct.

### 3. New or confirming existing policy

The remit would require amendment to the RMA and the development of a centralised and independently managed appointment process to allocate commissioners in a systematic and fair manner. This would be supported by regulations which would set out the steps to be followed.
Such provisions are already contained in legislation such as the Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 (s 25 and s28).

4. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

The work programme notes that ‘major reform’ of the RMA is required. It does not, however, specifically relate to the recommendations of this remit.

5. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

No work has been undertaken specifically on this. However, the proposed model recommends use of the Victorian State Government approach: [https://www.planning.vic.gov.au/panels-and-committees/panels-and-committees](https://www.planning.vic.gov.au/panels-and-committees)

In addition, the New Zealand Environment Court uses a mixed model approach, with the Judge as chair and two or more court appointed commissioners. These commissioners have a varied background (across planning, ecology, landscape architecture, civil engineering, Tikanga Māori etc) and have all completed the “LEADR” mediation programme to assist the Court in mediated resolutions of court appeals. Many have also undertaken the “Making Good Decisions” programme.

6. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

That the selection of all accredited commissioners for RMA hearings be centralised and independently managed by the Ministry for the Environment.

The new process could follow the Victorian State Government example. In essence this involves making an initial hearing panel application online, followed by a formal letter of request. A panel is then appointed by the Minister (or a delegate) in accordance with the specific details of the particular issue, eg the complexity of the topic, the number of submissions received or the special expertise required. This enables administrative ‘filtering’ to sort panellists according to their suitability across a spectrum of hearing complexities. For example, smaller and less controversial issues would be resourced differently to more difficult topics. This would also ensure a tailored mix of expertise and backgrounds – enabling greater Māori representation, a balance of newer and more experienced commissioners and a spread of local and external knowledge.

In Victoria the pool of available commissioners is managed by an ‘Office of Planning Panels’ acting as a conduit between panels and interested parties to “ensure an independent and transparent process is upheld”. 
If MfE took this on it would also be expected to manage the contracts, oversee the effectiveness of the process, receive and adjudicate on any complaints about commissioner conduct and regulate the fee structure. It would also deliver administrative support for the process (although where hearings are cost recoverable from applicants then this would be managed accordingly). MfE could also maintain the register of accredited commissioners and chairs and ensure that it remained up to date, with sufficient information provided to ensure the effective appointment of panels.
Mayor decision to appoint Deputy Mayor

Remit: That LGNZ request the Government to amend S.41A of the LGA2002 to give Mayors the same powers to appoint a deputy mayor as held by the Mayor of Auckland.

Proposed by: Horowhenua District Council, Invercargill District Council and Whanganui District Council

Supported by: Provincial Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

   Since 2013 mayors have had the power to determine who their deputy mayor should be, however a mayor’s choice of deputy can be overturned by a majority vote of councillors. Not only has this caused confusion the fact that councils can over turn a mayor’s choice undermines the original intent of the legislation.

2. Background to its being raised

   The 2012 LGA 2002 Amendment Act introduced Section 41A which recognised mayors’ leadership role and gave mayors the authority to appoint their deputy as well as committee chairs. The select committee amended the original bill to provide councils with an ability to reverse a mayor’s decision. Not only did that change make a nonsense of the original intent it has also undermined the credibility of the legislation in the eyes of citizens who generally expect a mayor to be able to choose who their deputy will be, given the importance of that working relationship.

3. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

   The problems mayors face with implementation of section 41A is not currently on the LGNZ work programme.
4. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

The Government is re-drafting the Local Government Amendment Bill 2 which is expected to be given its second reading later this year. The Bill could provide a vehicle to amend S.41A in order to strengthen mayors’ ability to appoint their deputies without the risk of that decision being reversed.
Beauty industry

Remit: That LGNZ calls on the Government to develop and implement national guidelines, policy or regulations to achieve national consistency for the largely unregulated ‘health and beauty clinic’ industry.

Proposed by: Whangarei District Council
Supported by: Selwyn District Council
Kawerau District Council
Dunedin City Council
Rangitikei District Council
Far North District Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Over recent years, the ‘health and beauty clinic’ industry has seen tremendous growth and continues to expand rapidly. Unfortunately, there is no national legislation or guidance to regulate this industry.

The Health Act 1956 is currently the only legislative tool at the disposal of local authorities to deal with concerns and complaints. However, the powers under the Act are very limited, and do not relate specifically to quality and community safety.

Several councils have developed their own Bylaws to deal with the potential risks that this industry poses to its clientele, with varying degrees of success, but by large the industry remains unregulated. By contrast, national regulations to regulate the hairdressing industry have existed since the 1980’s. It is considered that the ‘health and beauty clinic’ industry faces much higher risks and challenges.

2. Background to its being raised

Nationally, as well as locally, Environmental Health Practitioners are dealing with an ever-increasing number of complaints about this industry and the fallout from botched procedures, as well as infections. Whilst, practitioners can address some of these concerns under the Health Act 1956, it is felt that specific legislation or guidance is the only way to regulate this industry and achieve national consistency.
In the absence of national legislation, territorial authorities such as the Whangarei District Council are unable to regulate the industry, except through the development of a specific Bylaw. The development of Bylaws is an expensive and time consuming process and the cost of that process and any complaint investigation, outside the Bylaw process, falls solely on ratepayers whilst creation of Bylaws can mitigate risk at local level, they do not result in national consistency.

3. **New or confirming existing policy**

New policy.

4. **How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme**

The issue aligns to the LGNZ Three Year Business Plan (2019/20 – 2021/22), that recognises quality and community safety as a key social issue, with social issues being one of the five big issues for New Zealand councils. Specifically, the commitment to “work alongside central government and iwi to address social issues and needs in our communities, including a rapidly growing and an ageing population, inequality, housing (including social housing) supply and quality and community safety.”

5. **What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome**

Aside from some council’s developing their own Bylaws, as far as the Whangarei District Council is aware, central government has no plan to develop legislation or guidance for this sector.

Notably, as New Zealand-wide complaints regarding the industry continue to rise and the serious risks associated with the industry continue to be better understood a national approach is needed to make any substantive progress on regulating the ‘health and beauty clinic’ industry in New Zealand.

6. **Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice**

As described above, the Health Act 1956 is currently the only legislative tool at the disposal of local authorities to deal with concerns and complaints. However, the powers under the Act are very limited, and do not relate specifically to quality and community safety.
7. **Suggested course of action envisaged**

That LGNZ calls on the Government to develop and implement national guidelines, policy or regulations to achieve national consistency for the largely unregulated ‘health and beauty clinic’ industry.

It is also suggested that LGNZ engage directly with relevant ministers and ministries to ensure local government has an appropriate role in the development of nationally consistent legislation or guidelines to address the challenges the industry brings.
Remits not going to AGM

The remit Screening Committee has referred the following remits to the National Council of LGNZ for action, rather than to the Annual General Meeting for consideration. The Remit Screening Committee’s role is to ensure that remits referred to the AGM are relevant, significant in nature and require agreement from the membership. In general, proposed remits that are already LGNZ policy, are already on the LGNZ work programme or technical in nature will be referred directly to the National Council for their action.

1. Earthquake strengthening – tax relief

Remit: That LGNZ lobby central government to provide tax relief for buildings owners for the compulsory earthquake strengthening of their buildings either by way of reinstating depreciation or some other tax relief for earthquake compliance costs.

Proposed by: Horowhenua District Council

Supported by: Zone Three

Recommendation: That the remit is referred to National Council for action

2. Benchmark Programme

Remit: That LGNZ investigate and implement an infrastructure delivery benchmark programme, including working with the Department of Internal Affairs to improve the Non-Financial Performance Measures Rules 2013 to be more meaningful measures of infrastructure service delivery.

Proposed by: New Plymouth District Council

Supported by: Central Hawkes Bay District Council; Otorohanga District Council; South Taranaki District Council; Stratford District Council; Thames-Coromandel District Council; Waitomo District Council; Wellington City Council; Whanganui District Council

Recommendation: That the remit is referred to the National Council for action
3. **On-line voting**

**Remit:** That LGNZ advocates to the Government for it to provide financial support for the Local Government on-line voting trial.

**Proposed by:** Palmerston North City Council

**Supported by:** Metro Sector

**Recommendation:** That the remit is referred to the National Council for action

4. **E-waste**

**Remit:** That LGNZ advocates to the Government to introduce a mandatory product stewardship programme for e-waste.

**Proposed by:** Palmerston North City Council

**Supported by:** Metro Sector

**Recommendation:** That the remit is referred to the National Council for action

5. **Tourism Industry Aotearoa**

**Remit:** That LGNZ actively consider the Tourism Industry Aotearoa Local Government Funding Model to Support Regional Tourism Growth.

**Proposed by:** Ruapehu District Council

**Supported by:** Palmerston North City Council; Horizons Regional Council; New Plymouth District Council; Rangitikei District Council; Stratford District Council

**Recommendation:** That the remit is referred to the National Council for action
Proposed amendments to the Rules

Since late 2018, LGNZ has consulted with members on options for changing the LGNZ Rules, at Zone and Sector meetings.

Attached are a number of proposed substantive and technical changes to the Rules, which are based on feedback from members. These proposed changes have been discussed with, and endorsed by, LGNZ’s Governance and Strategy Advisory Group (GSAG) and National Council.

The rationale for each of the proposed changes is set out in further detail below.

These proposed changes to LGNZ’s Rules will be discussed and voted on at LGNZ’s Annual General Meeting (AGM) on Sunday 7 July 2019. Although LGNZ’s Rules provide that LGNZ is only obliged to give members 10 working days’ notice of any proposed changes to the Rules, we are providing the proposed changes to councils early so as to allow proper consideration and discussion of the proposed changes by your council, ahead of the AGM.

Proposal One – Amendments to provide Te Maruata representation on National Council (including consequential amendments)

To reflect the increasing diversity of the local government family/whanau it is proposed that the Rules be amended to provide that the Chair of Te Maruata is a member of National Council, with full voting rights.

Te Maruata Roopu Whakahaere (Te Maruata) is a subcommittee of the National Council comprised of Māori elected members. Te Maruata was established in response to a remit passed at the 2008 LGNZ AGM. Its role is to promote increased representation of Māori as elected members of local government; to enhance Māori participation in local government processes; provide support for councils in building strong relationships with iwi, hapu and Māori groups; provide Māori input on development of future policies or legislation relating to local government; and foster and support a network of Māori elected members and staff of local government for the purpose of sharing information, challenges and aspirations relevant to kaupapa Māori.

Given Te Maruata’s importance, National Council resolved in 2018 that the Chair of Te Maruata would sit on National Council as a non-voting member. Feedback from members is that the time is now right for Te Maruata’s Chair to sit as a full member of National Council.

This proposed amendment to the Rules reflects a drive for greater diversity on National Council, the importance of local government engaging with Māori communities and the obligations that local government has to reflect the obligations of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Proposal 1 (attached) details a number of consequential, technical changes that will need to be made to the Rules if the substantive proposal to provide a seat on National Council for Te Maruata’s Chair is adopted.
Proposal Two – Amendments to give effect to Auckland Council representation on National Council (including consequential amendments)

It is proposed that the Rules be amended to provide that Auckland Council has three seats on National Council, to be held by:

- The Mayor of Auckland (or an alternate member of the Auckland Council governing body appointed by the Mayor);
- A member of the Auckland Council governing body; and
- A member of an Auckland Council local board.

These proposed amendments are designed to reflect the scale of Auckland (one-third of New Zealand’s population). They are also designed to bring the LGNZ Rules into line with Auckland Council’s current unique governance structure (i.e., a governing body and local boards). The current LGNZ Rules pre-date the establishment of Auckland Council and its current governance structures, which were introduced by legislation in 2010. LGNZ’s view is that its Rules should be consistent with those changes.

Local boards are a unique governance structure, providing governance at a local level within Auckland Council and enabling democratic decision-making by and on behalf of communities within the local board area. There are 21 local boards, comprising 149 elected members in total. Local board responsibilities include adopting local board plans, agreeing annual local board agreements that set annual budgets, and agreeing and overseeing annual work programmes. Currently, there is no provision for the representation of local board members on National Council. LGNZ’s view is that it is important that provision is made for the representation of this group of elected members on National Council.

As a result of these proposed changes to Auckland’s representation, Auckland Council would no longer be part of Zone 1; Zone 1 would be comprised of Far North region councils only. Zone 1 would be entitled to one seat on National Council.

To ensure that the representation of metropolitan New Zealand on National Council is not by Auckland Council alone, specific amendments are proposed to make it clear that three seats on National Council will be held by metropolitan councils other than Auckland Council.

Based on feedback from Zone meetings, it is also proposed that the Rules be amended to specifically provide that at least one of the three Metropolitan Sector representatives on National Council be from the South Island. This is designed to ensure that there is appropriate representation of metropolitan South Island on National Council.

Proposal 2 (attached) details a number of consequential, technical changes that will need to be made to the Rules if the substantive proposal to change the representation of Auckland Council on National Council is adopted.

Note that Proposals 1 and 2 will result in the membership of National Council increasing from 15 members to 18. Feedback from current National Council members is that a Council of this size for a membership-based body is workable, particularly given that the Rules give National Council the power to create an executive committee, or subcommittee structures, where that is considered appropriate.
Proposal Three – Minor (administrative) substantive changes

A number of minor administrative changes to the Rules are proposed, including:

- Inclusion of community board members in the definition of Elected Member;
- The ability for National Council to appoint individuals (with full speaking rights, but no voting rights) to the National Council to provide assistance to National Council because of their training, qualifications or experience; and to ensure diversity of representation;
- Changes to the definition of a quorum for the purpose of National Council meetings; and
- The ability for National Council to pass a resolution without a meeting with the agreement of 75 per cent of all National Council members (as opposed to all National Council members, as currently required).

These proposed amendments are designed to ensure that the Rules provide for all types of elected member, are consistent with the proposed substantive changes to the Rules, and to simplify National Council’s processes.

Proposal Four – Minor amendments to modernise and rationalise language

LGNZ is proposing that a number of changes be made to modernise the Rules (eg to make provision for electronic notices and voting), and rationalise the language of the Rules.

These changes are technical in nature, and do not result in any substantive changes to the Rules.

Next steps

As noted above, these proposed changes to the Rules will be discussed and voted on at LGNZ’s AGM on Sunday 7 July 2019. Members will receive copies of the proposed changes to the Rules as part of the formal AGM papers.

However, LGNZ is providing copies of the proposed changes in advance so that councils have plenty of time to consider the proposed changes. LGNZ encourages members to now discuss and debate the proposed changes to the Rules, ahead of the AGM.

As per Rule K4(b), each of the four proposed sets of changes to the Rules will require the support of a two-thirds majority of LGNZ’s members in order to pass. Therefore your council’s vote does matter and can make a difference.

If you would like LGNZ to visit your council to discuss the proposed changes to the Rules ahead of the AGM, please contact Malcolm Alexander or Grace Hall to arrange that – see below for contact details.
For further information on the proposed changes, or if you have any questions, please contact Malcolm Alexander, Chief Executive (malcolm.alexander@lgnz.co.nz) or Grace Hall, Senior Policy Advisor (grace.hall@lgnz.co.nz).
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES 2019

Proposal 1 - Minor (Administrative) Substantive Changes:

1. Rule A2: Delete paragraph (b) of the definition of “Elected Member” and substitute:
   
   "(b) A person holding office as a member of a local board within the district of a Member Authority; and
   
   (c) A person holding office as a member of a community board within the district of a Member Authority."

2. Rule E11A to E11C: Add the following after Rule E11:
   
   "E11A From time to time, the National Council may appoint to the National Council any person whom the National Council believes will assist the National Council in its deliberations because of that person’s training, qualifications or experience. Any such person is not required to be qualified to be a National Council member or an Elected Member. The National Council may discharge any such person from the National Council in like manner.

   E11B From time to time, the National Council may appoint to the National Council any person whom the National Council believes will ensure diversity of representation on National Council. Any such person must be an Elected Member. The National Council may discharge any such person from the National Council in like manner.

   E11C Any person appointed under Rules E11A or E11B shall have full speaking rights but no voting rights at National Council meetings.”

3. Rule E17: Delete the word “six” in both places it appears and substitute “a quorum”.

4. Rule E26: Delete the current wording and substitute:
   
   “At any meeting of the National Council, a quorum consists of:

   (a) half of the membership (President and members provided for in Rule E1) if the number of such members (including vacancies) is even; or

   (b) a majority of members (President and members provided for in Rule E1) if the number of such members (including vacancies) is odd.

5. Rule E29A: Delete the current wording and substitute:
   
   “The National Council may pass a resolution without a meeting held in accordance with Rules E20-E29, but only if the resolution is assented to by not less than 75% of the members of the National Council then in office and entitled to vote.”
Proposal 2 - Amendments to provide Te Maruata representation on the National Council (including consequential amendments):

Rule A2:

Amend the definition of “NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBER” by deleting the words “elected or appointed” and substituting “elected, appointed or assuming office”.

Insert after the definition of “SECTOR GROUP” the following:

“TE MARUATA” means the committee named Te Maruata Roopu Whakahaere established in response to the remit passed at the 2008 Annual Conference and any committee in substitution for that committee.”

Rule E1: Delete the opening words and paragraph (a) and substitute the following:

“E1 The National Council of LGNZ consists of the President and:

(a) The person for the time being holding office as the Chair of Te Maruata (or an alternate appointed in writing by that person);”

Rule E10: Delete the current wording and substitute:

“E10 Persons appointed to the National Council or who assume office as a member of National Council under Rules E1 to E9 assume office on the day that is eight weeks after the triennial local government elections are held, except that the person who assumes office as a member of National Council pursuant to Rule E1(a) assumes that office at such time that the Chair of Te Maruata is appointed at a hui organised by LGNZ for the purpose of Te Maruata appointment, and subject to Rules E12 to E16 all such persons serve in office until their successors have assumed office.”

Rule E15: After the reference to “the President” add the words “or the position occupied by the Chair of Te Maruata.”

Rule E15A: Add the following after Rule E15:

“E15A In the event of the position on National Council occupied by the Chair of Te Maruata becoming vacant, that position will be filled by the Deputy Chair of Te Maruata until such time that a replacement Te Maruata Chair is elected.”

Rule E16: Add after the reference to “Rule E15” “, or who assumes office under Rule E15A,”
Proposal 3 - Amendments to give effect to Auckland Council representation on the National Council (including consequential amendments):

Rule D1: Delete the second sentence and substitute the words “Each Member Authority (except Auckland Council) shall belong to one Zone, and no Member Authority shall belong to more than one Zone.”

Rule D2: Delete from the definition of “Zone One” in paragraph (a) the words “and the Auckland Council”.

Rule E1: Delete paragraphs (b) to (e) and substitute the following:

“(b) One person elected by each of Zones One, Two, Three, Four, Five and Six;

(c) Three persons elected by the Metropolitan Group –
   (i) at least one of whom is an elected member of a South Island Member Authority; and
   (ii) none of whom is an elected member of Auckland Council or any of its local boards;

(d) Two persons elected by the Regional Group;

(e) One person elected by each of the Provincial and Rural Groups;

(f) The Mayor of Auckland (or an alternate member of the Auckland Council governing body appointed in writing by the Mayor); and

(g) Two persons to represent Auckland as set out in Rule E1A.”

Add after Rule E1 the following:

“E1A AUCKLAND REPRESENTATION

The appointments referred to in Rule E1(g) must be:

(a) one person appointed by the Auckland Council, from members of the governing body (not being the Mayor, or the Mayor’s alternate under Rule E1(f)); and

(b) one person appointed by Auckland Council local boards, from elected members of the local boards.”
Proposal 4 – Minor Amendments to Modernise (e.g. electronic notices and voting) and rationalise language.

Please refer to the attached version of the Rules (Appendix X) with all proposed amendments shown in red.
Report to Council

Date: 4 June 2019

Author: Beat Huser, Principal Strategic Advisor Strategy

Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy
            Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive

Subject: Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato: 2019 update

Purpose
1. To inform about the recently completed annual update of the “Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato”, including the WPI scorecard and indicator report cards. The report highlights how the WPI links to council work programmes and external initiatives.

Executive Summary
2. The Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato are an online dashboard of 32 environmental, social and economic indicators. It provides a valuable tool for assessing the wellbeing of the region, including progress towards Waikato Regional Council’s Strategic Direction 2016-2019.

3. Results from the WPI monitoring programme are presented through:
   - An overall Scorecard (overview of the Waikato region’s progress towards wellbeing)
   - Benchmarking (comparisons with selected regions and New Zealand average)
   - Indicator Report Cards (results for each indicator, along with supporting information).

4. The five largest positive measured trends over the period 2007 to 2017-18 include:
   - Improved air quality
   - Increased road safety
   - Higher average incomes
   - Better educational attainment
   - Increase in building activity.

5. The five largest negative trends over this period include:
   - Poorer perceptions of community engagement
   - Less physical activity
   - Higher water use
   - More residential expansion onto versatile land
   - Lower levels of cultural respect.

6. Comparisons of the Waikato region with New Zealand average for specific key indicators show that the Waikato region is behind the national average on a range of economic, social and environmental wellbeing indicators, including crime, cultural respect, road safety, voter turnout, GDP, but also that the region has a relatively high percentage of Te Reo Māori speakers, high level of social connectedness (sense of community experienced), and above-average levels of employment rate and community pride.

7. The results of the WPI programme provide a robust basis for discussing regional challenges and opportunities and identifying priorities for closer collaboration and partnerships. It also provides a framework and evidence base to progress regional wellbeing (re-introduced into the Local Government
Act in 2019), and to work together with the Government on its wellbeing agenda. Further work is needed towards indicator improvements and alignment, better accessibility, presentation and communication of results and more consistent monitoring across New Zealand.

Staff Recommendation:
That the report ‘Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato: 2019 update’ (Doc # 14395701 dated 04 June 2019) be received.

Background
8. The Waikato Regional Council (the Council) in 2013 identified the need to develop a regional set of indicators, here referred to as the Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato, to comprehensively assess the state and trends of key economic, environmental and social aspects that together support the overall wellbeing of the Waikato region and its communities.

9. The WPI framework and indicators is aligned with Council’s Strategic Direction 2016 to 2019 and its mission: “to work together to build a Waikato region that has a healthy environment, a strong economy and vibrant communities”.

10. The WPI work has heightened relevance with Government’s direction to take a wider wellbeing approach to policy and decision-making, including the first Wellbeing Budget in May 2019, and with the re-introduction of wellbeing into the purpose statement for local government (Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Act 2019).

What is the ‘Waikato Progress Indicators’ (WPI)? programme?
11. WPI is a monitoring framework for assessing progress towards regional wellbeing. The monitoring framework consists of set of 32 indicators that together provide a balanced high-level picture about important economic, environmental and social/cultural aspects of the Waikato region. The first WPI report was published in December 2013 setting a benchmark to evaluate future changes and trends, although most indicators include historical data going back 10-15 years.

12. The 32 indicators are annually updated. This 2019 update tracks the present status and recent trends in the Waikato region over the last decade from about 2007 to the latest data available and highlights significant changes. It provides a snapshot of the Waikato region’s overall state of wellbeing and compares the Waikato with other regions, with New Zealand overall, and internationally. It is not a scorecard for Council’s performance, although some indicators reflect Council’s functions and responsibilities, and these are included in Council’s LTP/Annual Report.

WPI Results
13. The WPI scorecard (Figure 1) gives an overview of the Waikato region’s progress towards wellbeing since 2007.

---

14. Positive measured trends over the period 2007 to 2017-18 are, in declining order:

+ **Improved air quality** – decrease in annual exceedances per year of the regional quality guideline for particulate matter in air, from 20 in 2007 to just two (2) in 2018.

+ **Increased road safety** – long-run decrease in the social cost of road injury crashes from approximately $1,900 per capita in 2007 to a low of $923 in 2013, before rising to approximately $1,300 per capita in 2017 (all expressed in 2018 dollars).²

+ **Higher average incomes** – increase in real median weekly household income from $1,377 in 2007 (expressed in 2018 dollars) up to $1,678 in 2018.

+ **Better educational attainment** – increase in the percentage of school leavers with NCEA level 2 or above from 64 per cent in 2009 to 78 per cent in 2017.³

² Despite a significant improvement in road safety over the last decade, the Waikato region still has a higher cost of road crashes per person than the national average (see Table 1). This is influenced by the extent of open roads in the Waikato region, with around 57 per cent of the national total cost of road injury crashes relating to crashes that occur on open roads.

³ The level of educational attainment in the Waikato, while significantly improved in recent years, is still slightly below the national average (Figures 1 and 2).
Increase in building activity – increase in real value of new building consents issued per year from $1.4 billion in 2007 (expressed in 2018 dollars) to $1.7 billion in 2018.

Growth in regional GDP – increase in real regional GDP per capita from approximately $46,000 in 2007 (expressed in 2018 dollars) to over $51,000 in 2018.

Less crime – close to record low levels of recorded victimisations, but with a slight increase in recent years.

Improved perceptions of safety – increase in the percentage of people who report feeling safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark, from 60% in 2006 to 64% in 2018.

More recycling – increase in the percentage of people who said their household recycles ‘all/most of’ their waste, from approximately 66% in 2008 to 70% in 2012, and 77% in 2016.

More employment – the regional employment rate fell from 67% in 2007 to 63% in 2012 and has since recovered to 70% in December 2018.

Longer life expectancy – currently 79 years for males and 83 years for females. Gains in life expectancy since the mid-1980s can be attributed to better living standards and improved health care.

Note that two of the above positive trends (relating to air quality and road safety) directly reflect Council activities in these areas.

Negative trends over this period include, in declining order:

- Poorer perceptions of community engagement – decrease in the percentage of Waikato survey respondents who agreed that the public has an influence over the decisions their local Council makes (down from 62% in 2006 to 36% in 2018).
- Less physical activity – decrease in the percentage of Waikato survey respondents who report having been physically active on five or more of the past seven days (down from 61% in 2006 to 40% in 2018).
- Higher water use – increase in water allocation as a percent of total allocable water at the Waikato River mouth during the summer months from 67% in 2007 to 86% in 2018.
- More residential expansion onto versatile land – increase in residential use of versatile land in the Waikato region, from 13,727 hectares (ha) in 2008 to 17,287 ha in 2017. The greatest amount of subdivision has been occurring on land classed as having higher productive capabilities.
- Lower levels of cultural respect – decrease in the percentage of Waikato survey respondents who agree that New Zealand becoming home for an increasing number of people with different lifestyles and cultures from different countries makes their city/area a better place to live, from 51% in 2006 to 41% in 2018.
- Worse perceived health – decrease in the percentage of Waikato survey respondents who rate their overall health positively, from 90% in 2006 to 79% in 2018.
- Lower levels of community pride – decrease in the percentage of Waikato survey respondents who agree they feel a sense of pride in the way their local area looks and feels, from 70% in 2006 to 62% in 2018.
- Fewer Te Reo Māori speakers – decrease in the percentage of Waikato region residents who say that they speak Te Reo, from 6.4% in 2001 to 5.8% in 2006 and 5.3% in 2013.
- Less use of Public transport – decrease in public transport use per person from 9.1 boardings during 2007/08 to 8.5 in 2017/18.
- Lower levels of life satisfaction – decrease in the percentage of people who rated their overall quality of life positively, from 90% in 2006 to 87% in 2018.

Note that some of the above negative trends can be directly or indirectly influenced by Council’s current or planned activities (e.g. fresh water management/Plan Change 1 and Healthy Environment; active modes of transport to enhance physical activity; integrated catchment management and harbour catchment plans).

The 11 remaining indicators do not show a significant change between 2006-07 and 2017-18.

While increased allocation of water up to 100% of the total allocable water is not necessarily negative, the observed trend of increasing water use puts an increased pressure on our water resources. The more rapid increase of water use compared with the economy (GDP growth) in recent years indicates that water is being used less efficiently.
How does the Waikato compare with New Zealand?

19. Comparisons of the Waikato region with New Zealand average for specific key indicators are shown in Figure 2 using latest available data. In this diagram, the central circle represents national average wellbeing. Where a spoke extends outside the circle (green dot) it means regional wellbeing is better than the national average, and where it falls within the circle (red dot), wellbeing is worse than the national average.

20. The diagram shows that the Waikato region is:
   - behind the national average on a range of economic, social and environmental wellbeing indicators, including crime, cultural respect, road safety, voter turnout, GDP, recycling and educational attainment.
   - but also that the region has a relatively high percentage of Te Reo Māori speakers, high level of social connectedness (sense of community experienced), and above-average levels of community engagement (perception of public's influence on Council decision making), life satisfaction (overall quality of life), community pride and employment rate.

21. Of the other regional councils only Greater Wellington Regional Council\(^5\) has a similar comprehensive wellbeing scorecard. Most councils produce state of the environment reports or produce report cards on specific topics.

---

Figure 2  Comparison Waikato region with New Zealand (selected indicators only).

*Source: WPI Monitoring Programme database (Waikato Regional Council)*

*Note: Excludes indicators that do not have comparable regional or national results.*

How are we using the WPI?

22. The WPI programme is used through:
   - Providing an overall picture of progress in the Waikato region assessed through 32 key measures of economic, environmental and social/cultural aspects of wellbeing.
   - Identifying changes and trends of overall progress of economic, environmental and social/cultural wellbeing, as well as of individual key indicators in the Waikato region over at least the last ten years.

\(^5\) [https://www.gpiwellingtonregion.govt.nz/](https://www.gpiwellingtonregion.govt.nz/)
• Comparing and benchmarking the overall progress of economic, environmental and social/cultural wellbeing in the Waikato region with selected other regions, New Zealand and internationally.

• Regularly communicating the results through an annual update to Council, the Waikato Regional Council’s Annual Report, a dedicated section of the Council’s website and other media products (for example ‘Quality of Life’ infographics).

23. The results and various products of the WPI work programme (Scorecard, Indicator Report Cards, infographics, website) provide a robust basis for discussing regional challenges and opportunities, to identify priorities for action, to share quality information and to work together with our partners and create new strategic alliances.

24. Internally, the WPI is currently used for:
   • **Strategic Direction 2016-2019**: Providing a monitoring framework and baseline information to assist the tracking and evaluation of progress and review of Council’s strategic direction.
   • **Pre-election Report**: The WPI provides a comprehensive overview of how the Waikato region is doing.
   • **LTP 2018-2028 and Annual Report**: Selected WPI indicators are used as outcome measures for the LTP focussing on those measures that the Council has a direct role in influencing. This helps to identify areas where good progress is made as well as areas where there is a lack of progress and further efforts are required.
   • **Waikato Plan**: Providing a shared evidence-base to stimulate debate about current and emerging issues in a broad and integrated way, to facilitate a common understanding and to identify challenges and opportunities. The WPI presents a high-level framework and benchmark for tracking and reporting progress for the ‘Waikato Wellbeing Project’.
   • **Specific indicators** are also included as outcome-based performance measures in:
     o Waikato Economic Development Strategy (Te Waka)
     o Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045
     o Other strategies and plans.

25. External links include:
   • **Maatauranga Maori and associated indicators**: The WPI currently does not include specific cultural wellbeing measures (reflecting a general lack of cultural information and indicators). Staff are working together with relevant organisations and initiatives, e.g. the Waikato River Authority.
   • **Community Trusts and Foundations**: WPI staff are working closely with WEL Energy, Trust Waikato, the Momentum Waikato Community Foundation and others to share information that assists community funders to identify and address priority community needs (“what really matters”) and to demonstrate improved outcomes as a result of their investments.
   • **Waikato Wellbeing Project and Vital Signs**: One of the Waikato Plan priorities (Waikato Wellbeing Project) builds on the WPI by aligning regional issues and information with global needs and wellbeing measures (Sustainable Development Goals). The WPI also shares data with the Vital Signs initiative funded by Momentum Waikato.
   • **Hamilton City Council**: Eight of the 32 WPI indicators are based on information gathered by surveys (people’s perceptions). Since 2016, the Council has been partnering with HCC to participate in the two-yearly Quality of Life survey that also includes other cities and regions. Hamilton shares its survey sample with Waikato Regional Council’s survey sample (‘rest of the Waikato’) to give a regional picture of social wellbeing and quality of life in the Waikato.

---

6 https://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Community/Waikato-Progress-Indicators-Tupuranga-Waikato/
7 In 2015, under the guidance of the United Nations, all 193 member countries adopted a set of goals to target many of world’s most pressing issues. Referred to as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), these 17 goals and their 169 targets seek to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity by promoting inclusive, equitable, safe, and sustainable societies. The SDGs are widely adopted by business and corporates. www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/
- **Collaborative partnerships for the sharing of data and information:** The WPI website and database provides useful information for a variety of other organisations and stakeholders (territorial authorities, Waikato District Health Board, Ministry for the Environment (MFE), Statistics New Zealand (Statistics NZ), Non-Government organisations (NGOs) and community organisations). In turn, many of these organisations gather useful information that supports the WPI.

- **New Zealand Treasury and Statistics New Zealand:** Staff have been working with Treasury and Statistics NZ to develop a framework and a dashboard of indicators for Treasury’s Living Standards Framework, including exploring the feasibility of regional/local data, to support Government’s first Wellbeing Budget 2019. The WPI featured in Treasury’s Investment Statement 2018 ‘Investment for Wellbeing’ as a regional case study.9

- **Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) and the Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM):** In preparation for changes to the Local Government Act SOLGM has been working on a Well-being Indicator Framework to support the re-introduction of the four well-beings. The WPI has provided useful input and staff are part of an Expert Advisory Group. The purpose of this work is to provide the sector with a broader range of indicators for use at regional, district/city and community level to measure and report wellbeing.

**Where to next**

26. Planned WPI work for 2019/20 includes:

- Communication and stakeholder engagement, including sharing data and services with other agencies and the community, particularly community trusts/foundations, territorial authorities, district health boards, other regions and central government.
- Explore availability of local data (by district/city) and socio-demographic distributions (e.g. by age, income, gender, ethnicity). 10
- Continue linking more specific data and indicators to the WPI database (secondary indicators) that underpin the 32 high-level WPI indicators11 and to assist in telling stories about complex cross-cutting issues (e.g. economy/environment or environment/health).
- Data management: store and maintain data, confirm data providers and automate regular updates and reporting (next annual update planned in June 2020).
- Update WPI webpages and further develop interactive, user-friendly and easily understood web-based products (e.g. infographics, interactive web tools) to search, discover and download WPI results, and to bring the data alive by telling engaging stories.
- At the global level, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)12 adopted in 2015 by all the 193 UN member countries, provide a yardstick to evaluate, assess and measure progress. Work has started to map and align the WPI against the SDG targets and indicators.

**Conclusion**

27. The Council’s challenge is to develop a monitoring framework that presents complex issues clearly and understandably, underpinned by robust data to support policy review and development and to track progress with its strategic direction. The Council’s mission – to work together to build a Waikato region that has a healthy environment, a strong economy and vibrant communities – requires a comprehensive monitoring and reporting framework that evaluates the economic, environmental and social progress and wellbeing of our region. The results of the WPI programme provide a robust basis for discussing regional challenges and opportunities and identifying priorities for closer collaboration and partnerships.

---


10 Engaging with strategic regional partners will be a focus of this work, including Iwi/Waikato River Authority, Hamilton City/ District Councils, Waikato District Health Board, New Zealand Transport Agency, WEL Energy Trust, Momentum Waikato Community Foundation, Statistics NZ, Ministry for the Environment, The Treasury, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, business and sector groups, non-government organisations, etc.

11 For example, the WPI indicator ‘Educational Attainment’ measures the percentage of all school leavers with NCEA level of 2 or above. A breakdown of the total number by ethnicity, gender or by income may tell different stories.

28. In line with international trends, and Government’s focus on wellbeing, the Council recognises the need to shift the region’s policy focus from maximising economic outputs and material living standards (production and consumption measured as GDP) more towards improving human wellbeing and quality of life in a broader sense, and to maintain and restore our natural resources and the services they provide.

29. The WPI is a long term monitoring tool that includes partnering with other agencies and exploring strategic alliances and information sharing. The WPI provides a snapshot of the Waikato region’s current wellbeing and recent trends. It provides a benchmark and comparison of the Waikato region with other regions, with New Zealand and internationally. The value of such long term, consistent and robust datasets means that over time it will become easier to monitor changes to our wellbeing. While the results cannot always show what is driving these changes, it can help identify adverse trends at an early stage and where further analysis is required to help understand the changes and how we can address these.

Assessment of Significance

30. Having regard to the decision making provisions in the LGA 2002 and Councils Significance Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is not considered to have a high degree of significance.

Policy Considerations

31. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.