

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chambers, Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 10.00am on Wednesday 29 June 2011

MEMBERS: Cr PR Buckley (Chairman), Cr Al Armstrong, Cr NW Barker, Cr LB Burdett, Cr SP Friar, Cr ST Kneebone, Cr PM Legg, Cr LA Livingston, Cr RM Rimmington, Cr PA Southgate, Cr TM Stark.

STAFF: Chief Executive (RF Laing), Deputy Chief Executive (C Crickett), Group Manager Finance (M Garrett), Group Manager River and Catchment Services (DS Fowlds), Group Manager Resource Use (C McLay), Group Manager Corporate Services (J Stewart), Group Manager Transport and Policy (V Payne), Council Secretary (D Snape)

APOLOGIES: Cr J Hennebry,

Accepted

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 1)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Friar seconded.

WRC11/122

THAT the agenda of the meeting of the Waikato Regional Council of 29 June 2011, as circulated with the addition of previously circulated late items:

- **Item 4.10 – Minutes of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee 23 June 2011.**
- **Item 6.1 – Home of Cycling reports**
 - **Consultation and Additional Information requirements (doc#1995934)**
 - **Appendix A – additional information required to support consultation on Home of Cycling Velodrome Proposal (doc#1997310)**
 - **Appendix B – Home of Cycling – funding options (doc#1991376)**
 - **Appendix C – Home of Cycling proposal – consultation procedure and estimated costs (doc#1993734)**
 - **Appendix D – Part 6 LGA 2002 – Planning, decision-making, and accountability (doc#1997960)**
- **Item 6.6.1 – Rate Setting report (doc#1809889)**

be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/122)

Disclosures of Interest

(Agenda Item 2)

Cr Kneebone declared a conflict of interest through family membership in the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee and will abstain from discussion and voting at items 4.10 and 8.5 of the agenda.

Confirmation of Minutes**Minutes - Council Meeting – 26 May 2011**

File: 03 04 02 (Agenda Item #3.1)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Armstrong seconded.

WRC11/123 **THAT the Minutes of the Council Meeting of 26 May 2011 be approved as a true and correct record.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/123)

Minutes – Extraordinary Council Meeting – 9 June 2011

File: 03 04 02 (Agenda Item #3.2)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Stark seconded.

WRC11/123.1 **THAT the Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting of 9 June 2011 be approved as a true and correct record.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/123.1)

Committees Reporting to Council**Minutes – Draft Annual Plan 2011/2012 Hearings Committee**

File: 03 04 02, 01 11 00 (Agenda Item #4.1, 4.2)

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Livingston seconded.

WRC11/124 **THAT the Minutes of the Hearings of the Draft Annual Plan 2011/2012 Hearings Committee of 16-18 May 2011 be received and approved as a true and correct record.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/124)

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Stark seconded.

WRC11/124.1 **THAT the Minutes of the Deliberations of the Draft Annual Plan 2011/2012 Hearings Committee of 1 June 2011 be received and approved as a true and correct record.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/124.1)

**Minutes – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No 6 –
Water Allocation Appeals Hearing Committee – 7 June 2011**

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item #4.2) Docs#1987933

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Friar seconded.

WRC11/125

THAT the report of the Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No 6 – Water Allocation Appeals Hearing Committee held 7 June 2011 be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/125)

Cr Southgate presented the following report to Council of the Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No 6 – Water Allocation Appeals Hearing Committee dated 7 June 2011.

Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No.6 – Water Allocation Appeals Committee

Report of the Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No.6 – Water Allocation Appeals Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Mangawhero Room, Waikato Regional Council office, 6 Marlborough Place, Hamilton at 10.30am on Tuesday 7 June 2011.

MEMBERS: Commissioner CD Arcus (Chair)
Councillors SP Friar and PA Southgate.

IN ATTENDANCE: Staff:
Group Manager Policy and Transport (V Payne), Senior Policy Advisor (B McAuliffe), Programme Manager, Policy Legal Processes and Support (N Rye), Planning Consultant via telephone conferencing (R van Voorthuysen) and Committee Administrator (D Thurlow).

APOLOGIES:

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 1)

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Friar seconded

V6RP11/1.0 **THAT the agenda of the Proposed Variation No.6 – Water Allocation Appeals Committee for 7 June 2011 as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (V6RP11/1.0).

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Resolution to Exclude the Public

(Agenda Item 2)

CD Arcus moved/Cr Southgate seconded

V6RP11/2.0 **THAT in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS9202:2003 Appendix A & B (P40/42) and Section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the following part/s of the proceedings 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 No.	Item Name and general subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
3.	Variation No. 6 Water Allocation – Report to November 2010 Appeals Committee	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7, and Right of appeal as per S48(2)(a)(i)	S48(1)(a) and S48(1)(d)
4.	Variation No. 6 Freshwater National Policy Statement Version	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7, and Right of appeal as per S48(2)(a)(i)	S48(1)(a) and S48(1)(d)

This recommendation 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 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item No.	Reason/s for withholding official information	Section/s
3 & 4	Legal privilege Conduct of negotiations Right of appeal	s7 (g) s7 (i) s48 (2) (a) (i)

The motion was put and carried (V6RP11/2.0).

CD Arcus moved/Cr Southgate seconded

V6RP11/2.1 THAT in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS9202:2003, (Incorporating Amendment No 1) Clause 2.16.4 and the Local Government Official Information Act 1987, Section 48(5) and (6) that with respect to Items 3 and 4 that, Planning Consultant R van Voorthuysen remain in the public excluded session because of his knowledge and expertise on these items.

The motion was put and carried (V6RP11/2.1).

Return to public meeting at 11.30am.

It was reported back from the Public Excluded section of the meeting that the Appeals Committee provided guidance to staff and discussed the legal process relating to the appeals.

Meeting closed at 11.31am.

* * * * *

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011

Item 4.2 Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No 6 – Water Allocation Appeals Committee – 7 June 2011

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Friar seconded.

- WRC11/125.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No 6 – Water Allocation Appeals Hearing Committee held 7 June 2011 be noted.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/125.1)

Minutes – Catchment Services Committee – 8 June 2011

File: 03 04 08 (Agenda Item #4.3) Docs#1986242

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Legg seconded.

- WRC11/126 THAT the report of the Catchment Services Committee held 8 June 2011 be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/126)

Cr Kneebone presented the following report to Council of the Catchment Services Committee dated 8 June 2011.

CATCHMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE

Report of the Catchment Services Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chamber, Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 10:00 am on Tuesday 8 June 2011.

PRESENT: Councillors ST Kneebone (Chair), Al Armstrong, PM Legg, TM Stark, and SP Friar
G Baker, R Hicks, M Lumsden, G McBride and R McGuire

IN ATTENDANCE Councillors LA Livingston, PA Southgate and NW Barker

STAFF: Group Manager River and Catchment Services (DS Fowlds), Division Manager Business Process (RCS) (BA Peploe), Division Manager Catchment Management (RCS) (D Speirs), Operations Manager Rivers and Drainage (G Russell), Committee Administrator (DG Atkinson)

APOLOGIES A Bridson, Councillor Buckley

Confirmed

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 1)

Cr Stark Moved/R Hicks Seconded

CAT11/27 **THAT the agenda of the Catchment Services Committee of 8 June 2011 as circulated be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/27)

Disclosures of Interest

(Agenda Item 2)

There were no disclosures of interest.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)

Drainage Advisory Subcommittee Appointments

File: 03 04 08 (Agenda Item 3)

R McGuire Moved/Chair Seconded

CAT11/28 **THAT the report “Drainage Advisory Subcommittee Appointments” (Doc #1977334 dated 17 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/28)

The purpose of this item presented by Operations Manager Rivers and Drainage (G Russell) was for the Committee to recommend to Council appointments to Drainage Advisory Subcommittees for the term ending 30 January 2014. During the presentation the Committee noted or discussed:

Report of the Catchment Services Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 2

- Virtually all representatives from the previous term had returned for reappointment and there had been very little level of challenge.
- Mr. A McLachlan who had been Chair of the Waikato North Drainage Advisory Subcommittee in the previous term had passed away subsequent to the agenda being mailed to members. Further nominations would have to be called for the Rotokauri and Ohote Subdivision. Members paid tribute to the contribution and length of service Mr McLachlan had given to progressing land drainage.
- The matter was raised as to what relationship there was/should be between Drainage Subcommittees and Liaison Subcommittees. There appeared to generally be a consensus view that while there is no desire for Liaison Subcommittees to be involved in the drainage role there is a need for Liaison Subcommittees to have greater awareness of drainage activities and aspirations through appropriate communication and liaison. However this needs to be achieved without unnecessary duplication. It was agreed that DS Fowlds (Group Manager Rivers and Catchment Services) would arrange a meeting with the Chair and Liaison Subcommittee Chairs R Hicks, M Lumsden, G McBride and R. McGuire with the intent of progressing this issue.
- The shallow Lakes programme is now domiciled within RCS and achieving closer alignment with other river and catchment activities.
- The view was expressed that Council should consider renaming the Franklin Waikato Drainage Advisory Subcommittee “North Waikato Drainage Advisory Subcommittee”. There was significant support for this proposal to be put before the first meeting of the Subcommittee.

R McGuire Moved/M Lumsden Seconded

CAT11/28.1

Recommended That Council initiate a discussion with the Franklin Waikato Drainage Advisory Subcommittee to ascertain support for renaming the Subcommittee North Waikato Drainage Advisory Subcommittee or similar.

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/28.1)

R McGuire Moved/Chair Seconded

CAT11/28.2

Recommended That Council approve appointments to Drainage Advisory Subcommittees for the term ending 30 June as detailed below.

<u>Aka Aka Otatau</u>	<u>Thames Valley</u>
Campbell Shuker	Steve Lunjevich
Tony Volz	Stuart Steverson
Syd Goodwright	Steve Hannah
John Keary	Rex Butterworth
Ray Litchfield	Peter Le Heron
Tony Walters	Rodney McIntyre
Barrie Smith	Wayne Gore
	Ian Coombe
<u>Waikato Central</u>	Anthony Arnet
Melville Bain	
Rod Wise	<u>Franklin Waikato</u>
Raye McQuoid	Bryce Finlayson

John Fransen	Mathew Dean
Kerry Amon	Murray Twining
Ray Smith	Alf Harwood
Maurice Steffert	Ashley Thomas
Noel Smith	Frank Greene
Robert Mourits	Mike Peters
Paul Williams	Bruce Darby
Ross Karl	Trevor Simpson
	Peter Scott

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/28.2)

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Status Report – Zone Management Plans

File: 03 04 08 (Agenda Item 4)

Chair Moved/Cr Armstrong Seconded

CAT11/29 That the report “Status Report – Zone management Plans” (Doc#1977059 dated 27 May 2011) be received.

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/29)

During the presentation of this item by Division Manager Business Process (RCS) (B Peplow) the Committee noted:

- Final copies of the Lower Waikato and Waihou Piako Zone Plans will shortly be available.
- Coromandel and Waipa Zone plans are expected to be adopted by the Catchment Services Committee in August.
- A report on the Queensland Floods in the context of what can be applied to the Waikato Region was requested by the Committee at the February 2011 meeting. The report will be completed when the outcomes of the Official inquiry into the floods is released.

Comprehensive Consents

File: 75 40 01 (Agenda Item 5)

Chair Moved/G McBride Seconded

CAT11/30 THAT the report “River and catchment Services Group – Comprehensive Consent Update (Doc #1982874 dated 27 May 2011) be received

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/30)

This item which provided an update on the comprehensive consent process currently underway for the Waihou, Piako, Lower Waikato, Central and Waipa Zones (including Drainage Areas) was presented by Division Manager Catchment Management (RCS) (D Speirs). During the presentation the Committee noted:

Report of the Catchment Services Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 3Waihou Applications

Twenty submissions were received to applications publicly notified in November 2010. Staff have worked with the submitters and significantly reduced the issues. A hearing held 17-19 May 2011 has been adjourned while the commissioners seek additional information on storm response conditions. A decision is expected within two weeks.

Three Zones (Waipa, Central and Lower Waikato)

Twelve submissions were received to applications publicly notified in November 2010. The applications include Waikato Regional Council administered drainage districts within the zones. Staff have worked with the submitters and significantly reduced the issues. The Hearing has been deferred as the Waihou decision may resolve a number of issues relating to the applications. The draft staff report recommends granting with conditions.

Piako Application

Five submissions were received to applications publicly notified in November 2010. Staff have worked with the submitters and significantly reduced the issues. The Hearing has been deferred (now planned for July 2011) as the Waihou decision may resolve a number of issues relating to the applications. The draft staff report recommends granting with conditions.

Coromandel (Two Areas)

Applications lodged, submissions received, staff working with submitters.

Where to Next

Comprehensive consents in other zones (West Coast, Upper Waikato and Taupo) are unnecessary at this stage.

Compliance costs and capacity requirements are being scoped for the Long Term Plan.

In discussion subsequent to the presentation some Committee members expressed a view of dissatisfaction with the comprehensive consent process regarding progress and the perception that some submitters appeared to be getting preferential treatment through negotiating directly with staff. Staff responded by noting negotiations with submitters had removed objection to a number of issues and reduced potential compliance costs significantly. Staff also noted the consents in consideration were for larger scale works and that consents were already in place to authorise 80-90% of the routine works undertaken by RCS. Staff re-iterated that should hearings be necessary the Liaison Subcommittee Chairs, as submitters, would be involved and provided the opportunity to be heard on all issues. Staff undertook to liaise more closely and regularly with Zone Subcommittee Chairs.

Councillor Southgate in meeting at 10.56am

Tui Mine Project – Phase Two Implementation

File: Z23 S503 01 (Agenda Item 6)

Chair Moved/G Baker Seconded

CAT11/31

THAT the report ‘Tui Mine Remediation Project – Phase 2 Implementation’ (Doc# 1983456 dated 27 May 2011) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/31)

The purpose of this item presented by G Basheer (Project Manager) was to advise Council of progress made on the Tui Mine Remediation Project and the implementation processes and timeframes for Phase 2 of the project. During the presentation the Committee noted:

Background

The Tui Mine Remediation Project was established in 2007. Governance and Steering Groups established had representation from Ministry for Environment, Waikato Regional Council, Department of Conservation, Matamata Piako District Council and local iwi. The Waikato Regional Council is responsible for managing the project.

Phase 1 (largely underground works) is substantially complete at a cost of \$5.5M. Phase 2 funding of \$16.2M has recently been approved. The tendering process for Phase 2 is underway.

Phase 2 Implementation

Updating and sign off by the Governance Group and Council is required of key foundation agreements (MOU and Deed of Funding). The contract process will include:

- Registrations of interest and short listing
- Request for tenders (underway)
- Tender evaluation
- Tender negotiations
- Tender acceptance and awarding of contract

G Baker Moved/Cr Legg Seconded

CAT11/31.1 THAT the Committee notes the processes and timeframes for the procurement of contractors to implement Phase 2 of the Tui Mine Remediation Project.

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/31.1)

Councillor Barker in meeting at 11.20am

Safe and Resilient Communities Outcome

File: 03 04 08 (Agenda Item 7)

Chair Moved/G Baker Seconded

CAT11/32 THAT the report “Safe and resilient Communities Outcome 2010/11 – Progress Report to 30 April 2011” (Doc #1979054 dated 27 May 2011) be received.

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/32)

The purpose of this item which was presented jointly by B Peplow (Division Manager Business process (RCS), Division Manager Catchment Management (RCS) and A Munro (CDEM Manager) was to provide a status report for the Resilient Communities Outcome to April 2011. The report covered the three activity areas of Catchment Management, Resilient Development, and Community Safety.

Report of the Catchment Services Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 5

Aka Aka/Otaua Land Drainage Subcommittee

File: 03 02 04 (Agenda Item 8)

Chair Moved/G Baker Seconded

- CAT11/33 **That the report of the Aka Aka/Otaua Land Drainage Subcommittee meeting held on Friday 13 May 2011 be received and the recommendations (decisions) contained therein be approved.**

The motion was put and carried (CAT11/33)

Meeting closed 11.50 pm

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011

Item 4.3 Report of the Catchment Services Committee – 8 June 2011

* * * * *

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Legg seconded.

- WRC11/126.1 **THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Catchment Services Committee held 8 June 2011 be noted and the recommendations contained in Section B be adopted.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/126.1)

Minutes – Regional Pest Management Committee – 8 June 2011

File: 03 04 07 (Agenda Item#4.4) Docs#1988406

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Barker seconded.

- WRC11/127 **THAT the report of the Regional Pest Management Committee held 8 June 2011 be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/127)

Cr Burdett presented the following report to Council of the Regional Pest Management Committee dated 8 June 2011.

REGIONAL PEST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Report of the Regional Pest Management Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chamber, Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 1.00pm on Wednesday 8 June 2011.

- MEMBERS:** Cr LB Burdett (Chair), Cr SP Friar (ex-officio), Cr ST Kneebone, Cr LA Livingston (Deputy Chair), Cr RM Rimmington and DE Wright (Chairperson of North Zone Pest Management Subcommittee).
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Cr AL Armstrong, Cr NW Barker, Cr J Hennebry, Cr PA Southgate, and Cr TM Stark.
- STAFF:** Group Manager Biosecurity-Heritage (JH Simmons) and Committee Secretary (D Thurlow).
- APOLOGIES:** Cr PR Buckley and C Dunstan (Chairperson of South Zone Pest Management Subcommittee) for absence.

Accepted

Confirmation of Agenda

Agenda Item 1

Cr Rimmington moved/DE Wright seconded

- RPC11/16.0 **THAT the agenda of the Regional Pest Management Committee of Wednesday 8 June 2011 be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/16.0)

Disclosures of Interest

Agenda Item 2

There were no disclosures of interest.

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Minutes of the North Zone Pest Management Subcommittee – 3 May 2011

Agenda Item 3 (Doc # 1967525)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

- RPC11/17.0 **THAT the minutes of the North Zone Pest Management Subcommittee held on 3 May 2011 (Doc # 1967525) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/17.0).

Report of the Regional Pest Management Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 2

During questions, answers and related discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

The Chairperson advised the Committee that the North Zone Pest Management Subcommittee meeting had a great turn out and was dynamic. The minutes provide detail about Subcommittee members' views about the future of the Pest Management Subcommittees.

The Group Manager provided some background information on the Subcommittee's resolution on page 8 of the minutes in respect to yellow flag iris.

Minutes of the South Zone Pest Management Subcommittee – 5 May 2011

Agenda Item 4 (Doc # 1971624)

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Livingston seconded

RPC11/18.0 THAT the minutes of the South Zone Pest Management Subcommittee held on 5 May 2011 (Doc # 1971624) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/18.0).

During questions, answers and related discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

Given the lack of attendance at this meeting the Secretary undertook to advise Subcommittee members of their meetings a month in advance.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)**Future of Pest Management Subcommittees**

Agenda Item 5 (Doc # 1978177)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

RPC11/19.0 THAT the report 'Future of Pest Management Subcommittees' (Doc # 1978177) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/19.0)

Group Manager Biosecurity Heritage, J Simmons, introduced this item noting:

- The term of the existing Pest Management Subcommittees has come to an end.
- At this stage, Council has not resolved to renew the tenure of the Subcommittees.
- This report has been prepared for this Committee to consider the future of the Pest Management Subcommittees.
- Community engagement and commitment is essential for biosecurity activities.
- The report sets out a number of options for discussion.
- An option includes the amalgamation of the Pest Management Subcommittees into the River and Catchment Services Subcommittees.

Report of the Regional Pest Management Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 3

During questions, answers and related discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

Cr Burdett

- The Pest Management Subcommittees have been hugely valuable.
- An issue for consideration is that there is no representation from territorial local authorities or iwi on these Subcommittees.
- The idea of amalgamating the Subcommittees with River and Catchment Services has been around for a number of years.
- The preferred option would be to incorporate the operational management of pest management into the Catchment Liaison Subcommittees and at the same time set up a reference group.
- The option chosen has to be cost neutral and has to include representation from territorial authorities and iwi.

Cr Livingston

- If the pest management operations are amalgamated into the Catchment Liaison Subcommittees Council needs to consider the impacts that this may have on the Catchment Liaison Subcommittees.

Cr Stark

- Members of the Catchment Liaison Subcommittees are concerned that by incorporating the Catchment Liaison and Pest Management Subcommittees together that it may be a distraction to the issues of the Catchment Liaison Subcommittees, but on the other hand may add benefit.
- Concern that if the Pest Management Subcommittees were to be amalgamated that the meetings would be high jacked by the issue of 1080.

Cr Rimmington

- Supported that any option needs to include the views of the community at a grass roots level.

Cr Hennebry

- It is important that new members are provided with an adequate induction upon appointment.

Cr Friar

- In joining the two functions together, given their complexities, meetings could prove to be problematic in terms of length.
- Pest management operations are flavoured by the 1080 debate.
- The manner in which the Pest Management Subcommittees are utilised could be revamped.

D Wright

- The Subcommittees have provided good educational opportunities for members.

Report of the Regional Pest Management Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 4

- In terms of community engagement it would be hard to go past the Pest Management Subcommittees.
- The preferred option would be to see the Pest Management Subcommittees continue but that they are reduced down to one.

Cr Armstrong

- Linkages from the grass roots need to feed back into Council.
- Preferred option is to have a forum made up of people with expertise.

Cr Kneebone

- 1080 is not an issue for the Pest Management Subcommittees.
- Territorial authority involvement in pest management issues is essential.
- If the subcommittees were to be amalgamated, the model is workable and cost neutral.
- There are plenty of opportunities to improve the current model.
- It was suggested that a working group be formed to look at both models.

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Livingston seconded

RPC11/19.1 THAT a working group be established comprising Councillors L Livingston, L Burdett, S Kneebone and member DE Wright to review the options for the future of the community liaison Pest Management Subcommittees.

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/19.1)

The Group Manager Biosecurity-Heritage undertook to write to existing members thanking them for their work on the Subcommittees, advising that Council is in the process of reviewing the structure of these Subcommittees and asking members if they would like to remain on the Subcommittee should they be continued.

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Biosecurity Science Strategy Briefing

Agenda Item 6 (Doc # 1978979)

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Livingston seconded

RPC11/20.0 THAT the report 'Biosecurity Science Strategy Briefing' (Doc # 1978979) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/20.0)

Dr DE Wright updated the Committee on progress with the national Biosecurity Science Strategy implementation and evaluation since its inception in 2007.

During questions, answers and related discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

It was suggested that an item for the Local Government Conference could include a briefing on the Biosecurity Science Strategy.

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

- RPC11/20.1 **THAT Dr DE Wright be thanked for his presentation, and also his contribution on the North Zone Pest Management Subcommittee and the Regional Pest Management Committee.**

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/20.1)

Biological Control Update – Waikato Region Releases

Agenda Item 6 (Doc # 1960988)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

- RPC11/21.0 **THAT the report 'Biological Control Update – Waikato Region Releases' (Doc # 1960988) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/21.0).

Group Manager Biosecurity-Heritage, J Simmons, introduced Jane and Tony Lorimer from the New Zealand Beekeepers Council.

J and T Lorimer updated the Committee on Bee Week and the ongoing need to highlight the value of bees and beekeeping in New Zealand.

During questions, answers and related discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

Australia has additional bee diseases to New Zealand. Therefore New Zealand does not import any bee products from Australia due to the risk of contaminating our industry.

Do you see the manuka honey yield as being a long term sustainable industry that New Zealand could specialise in? There is room for some marginal areas in New Zealand to be replanted in manuka enabling an increase in yield.

All honey does have an antibacterial activity, but some manuka honey has additional antibacterial activity. Honey that is labelled and rated UMF (unique manuka factor) has an assurance that it has the additional antibacterial activity that can be used for medicinal purposes.

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Burdett seconded

- RPC11/21.1 **THAT J and T Lorimer from the New Zealand Beekeepers Council be thanked for their informative and interesting presentation.**

The motion was put and carried (RPC11/21.1).

Meeting closed at 3.00pm

* * * * *

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011

Item 4.4 Report of the Regional Pest Management Committee – 8 June 2011

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/127.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Regional Pest Management Committee held 8 June 2011 be noted and the recommendations contained in Section B be adopted.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/127.1)

Cr Burdett noted that a copy of the presentation slides from the New Zealand Beekeepers Council will be circulated to all Councillors.

Minutes – Policy and Strategy Committee – 9 June 2011

File: 03 04 15 (Agenda Item #4.5) Docs#1987648

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/128 THAT the report of the Policy and Strategy Committee held 9 June 2011 be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/128)

Cr Southgate presented the following report to Council of the Policy Committee dated 9 June 2011.

POLICY AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chambers, Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 10am on Thursday, 9 June 2011.

MEMBERS: Cr PA Southgate (Chair), Cr AI Armstrong, Cr NW Barker, Cr PR Buckley, Cr LB Burdett, Cr SP Friar, Cr J Hennebry, Cr ST Kneebone, Cr PM Legg, Cr LA Livingston, Cr RM Rimmington, Cr TM Stark.

STAFF: Deputy Chief Executive Officer (C Crickett), Group Manager, Policy and Transport (VRJ Payne), Committee Administrator (M Ahipene)

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 1)

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Buckley seconded

PC11/26 **THAT subject to item 6 (Variation 6 – Water Allocation) being considered as the last item before the lunch break and item 14 (Proposed National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry), being transferred to be considered following item 9 (Strategic Development Update), the agenda of the Policy and Strategy Committee of 9 June 2011 as circulated be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/26)

Disclosures of Interest

(Agenda Item 2)

There were no disclosures of interest noted.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)

NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation

File: 22 11 06 (Agenda Item 3) Doc: 1977418

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Burdett seconded

PC11/27 **THAT the report “NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation” (Doc 1977418 dated 17 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/27)

The Programme Manager, Policy and Transport (B Dickie) spoke to the report which outlined the recently gazetted National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation (NPS: REG) and identified the potential implications.

The NPS: REG was now in force to guide local authority decision-making in relation to the use of natural resources and the policies contained within would need to be translated through the proposed Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and then into regional and district plans.

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 2

A table was presented which summarised the relationship between specific policies of the NPS: REG and the proposed RPS.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The Proposed RPS, not only aligned with the requirements of the NPS: REG, but gave effect thereto.
- The NPS: REG recognised that the RPS may have pre-empted the requirements and that in such a circumstance, regional and district plans were required to make changes to give effect to the RPS within 24 months of the date at which the NPS: REG took effect (14 May 2011).

The Committee was satisfied that the proposed RPS already gave effect to the NPS: REG. The relationship between the NPS: REG and the proposed RPS would be communicated to Territorial Authorities within the region and if a challenge to the position arose, a request would be made to the Minister for the Environment for a certificate or letter of compliance.

Cr Barker moved/Cr Rimmington seconded

- PC11/27.1
- 1 **THAT Council is satisfied that the proposed RPS (2010) gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Renewable Electricity Generation as required by s62(3) (RMA).**
 - 2 **THAT in the event that the above recommendation (1) is challenged by a third party, the chair send a letter to the Minister for the Environment requesting that he or his officials confirm the proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement (2010) gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation in terms of Policy H2(a).**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/27.1)

Update – National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management

File: 22 00 00 (Agenda Item 4) Doc: 1979263

Cr Barker moved/Cr Buckley seconded

- PC11/28
- THAT the report “Update – National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management” (Doc 1979263 dated 20 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/28)

The Programme Manager, Policy and Transport (B Dickie) spoke to the report which outlined the recently gazetted National Policy Statement for Freshwater management (NPS: Fw) and identified the potential implications.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The NPS: Fw required all regions to implement all policies as promptly as reasonable in the circumstances.
- Council’s future water related work programme was already focussed on the implementation of the proposed RPS within the framework created by treaty settlement legislation.

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 3

- The NPS: Fw reinforced the regional council role with respect to water management and recognised that the primary policy instrument was the regional plan.
- Additional work would be needed with respect to allocation, building on the present Variation 6 work.
- The proposed RPS anticipated the matters contained within the NPS: Fw, however, it was highly unlikely that Council could fully develop and implement the required policies and methods by 31 December 2014.
- An alternative option for consideration required up front scoping and the development of time bound annual implementation targets to be developed within 18 months once the NPS: Fw had come into force.
- The newly formed Land and Water Sub-Committee would consider the region's response to the NPS: Fw.

The Committee supported the development of a progressive approach to implementation of the NPS: Fw.

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Rimmington seconded the following motion:

- 1 That the Land and Water Sub-Committee oversee the process for the progressive implementation of the NPS: Freshwater and report back to the Policy Committee on progress.
- 2 That the implementation of the NPS: Freshwater recognises that the Waikato Regional Council and iwi will work together on the process for the Regional Plan review.
- 3 That in the first instance, Policy and Strategy Committee direct staff to work with iwi to co-design a plan review process for the Waikato River catchment that seeks to care for the land and water bodies through a Plan Change.
- 4 That staff effort be in accordance with the relevant sections of the Waikato-Tainui Settlement Act (2010), and the Nga Wai o Maniapoto (Waipa River) Bill and the flagship goal contained in WRC's strategic direction of working together with iwi in good faith and a spirit of cooperation.

Cr Buckley moved and Cr Burdett seconded the following amendment:

- PC11/28.1
- 1 **THAT the Land and Water Sub-Committee oversee the process for the progressive implementation of the NPS: Freshwater across the region and report back to the Policy Committee on progress.**
 - 2 **THAT the implementation of the NPS: Freshwater recognises that the Waikato Regional Council and iwi will work together on the process for the Regional Plan review.**
 - 3 **THAT in the first instance, the Policy and Strategy Committee direct staff to work with iwi to co-design a plan review process for the Waikato River catchment that seeks to care for the land and water bodies through a Plan Change.**
 - 4 **THAT staff effort be in accordance with the relevant sections of the Waikato-Tainui Settlement Act (2010), and the Nga Wai o Maniapoto (Waipa River) Bill and the flagship goal contained in WRC's strategic direction of working together with iwi in good faith and a spirit of cooperation.**

The amendment became the substantive motion.

The motion was put and carried (PC11/28.1)

The use of Ministerial Call-In for Hearing Submissions to the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement

File: 22 10 30 (Agenda Item 5) Doc: 1980599

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Legg seconded

- PC11/29 **THAT the report “The use of Ministerial Call-In for Hearing Submissions to the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement” (Doc 1980599 dated 24 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/29)

Senior Policy Advisor, Policy and Transport (M Kettle) spoke to the report which presented a legal opinion as to whether the “call in” procedures were able to be applied to the proposed RPS, noting that a legal opinion had been sought in response to a request from iwi representatives.

The legal opinion confirmed that the provisions of the Resource Management Act (RMA) that related to ‘calling in’ a matter of national significance could not be applied to the proposed RPS.

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Barker seconded

- PC11/29.1 **THAT the legal opinion on the ability to use the call-in procedures of the RMA is shared with the iwi authorities of the Waikato Region.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/29.1)

Receive the draft Local Area Blueprints

File: 22 09 50 (Agenda Item 7) Doc: 1979062

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

- PC11/30 **THAT the report “Receive the draft Local Area Blueprints” (Doc 1979030 dated 27 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/30)

The Policy Advisor, Policy and Transport (U Lehr) spoke to the report which presented the draft Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint: Local Area Blueprints (LABs) and sought consideration as to the implementation thereof.

It was noted that the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint Political Steering Group (PSG) had endorsed the LABs and recommended that each of the project partners¹ do the same. However, Thames-Coromandel District Council (TCDC) had decided not to endorse the draft LABs based on the risk to commit to the medium and long term aspirational actions.

Council therefore had to consider whether it should be congruent with TCDC’s decision or with the recommendation of the PSG.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

¹ Thames-Coromandel District Council, Waikato Regional Council, Department of Conservation and Hauraki Whaanui.

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 5

- The LABs represented a significant amount of work by the project partners and the community and it was important that the value of the work was not lost.
- The development of LABs resulted in a good set of technical information from which the Council would benefit.
- The District-wide Blueprint had been adopted by all four project partners.
- The proposed RPS had included the key aspects of the District-wide Blueprint.

The Committee noted TCDC's decision not to adopt the LABs and agreed that Council's approach should be consistent therewith. The Committee acknowledged staff for their work towards the development of the LABs.

Cr Friar moved/Cr Buckley seconded

- PC11/30.1
1. **THAT the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 have been complied with to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with the provisions of section 79 of the Act and determines that it does not require further information prior to making a decision on this matter.**
 2. **THAT Council will use the Local Area Blueprints, amongst other information, to inform its review of the Regional Plan, Regional Coastal Plan and 2012 Ten Year Plan.**
 3. **THAT the proposals detailed in the Local Area Blueprints are indicative only and may be changed as a result of the prioritisation and decision-making processes that Council will need to follow under the Resource Management Act 1991 and Local Government Act 2002.**
 4. **THAT there is a range of other information, including community plans, technical reports and community views that will need to be considered as part of the process of developing the 2012 Ten Year Plan and the upcoming review of the Waikato Regional Plan and Regional Coastal Plan.**
 5. **THAT wording on page 4 of the Draft Local Area Blueprints is changed to read: *"For any of the actions and strategies identified within the LAB there will be further opportunities for community input before they can be implemented. For example, any actions that have a financial implication will become part of processes under the Long Term Plan for TCDC and WRC which include submissions and hearings. Similarly, for actions that may be implemented through TCDC's District Plan and WRC Regional and Coastal Plan, there will be public submissions and hearings processes. These additional consultation steps will provide for community views to assist in any further refinement or prioritisation of LAB actions/strategies and in overall decision-making"*.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/30.1)

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)**Transport Policy Update**

File: 03 04 11 (Agenda Item 8) Doc: 1983490

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

PC11/31 **THAT the report “Transport Policy Update” (Doc 1983490 dated 30 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/31)

The Programme Manager, Policy and Transport (B McMaster) presented the report which provided an update on current regional transport policy projects.

Strategic Development Update

File: 20 00 01 (Agenda Item 9) Doc: 1978537

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Livingston seconded

PC11/32 **THAT the report “Strategic Development Update” (Doc 1978537 dated 19 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/32)

The Programme Manager, Policy and Transport (K Mayes) presented the report which provided an update on strategic development work being undertaken.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)**Proposed National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry**

File: 22 02 83 (Agenda Item 14) Doc: 1981798

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Rimmington seconded

PC11/33 **THAT the report “Proposed National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry” (Doc 1981798 dated 25 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/33)

The Programme Manager, Policy and Transport (K Mayes) presented the report which sought direction on feedback to MfE on the revised Proposed National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES).

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The proposed NES had implications for the management and consenting regime of existing forest. It would also be a factor in influencing where afforestation may occur and the possibility of obtaining environmental and economic co-benefits of forestry.
- The revised NES was flawed in almost every respect and the rationale had not been proven.
- None of the issues raised by Council within the feedback previously provided (October 2010) had been adequately dealt with.

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 7

The Committee endorsed the feedback presented and given that none of the issues raised by Council had been adequately dealt with, requested that a Council delegation be tasked with presenting its comments to Ministers. The Chairman (Cr P Buckley) undertook to select an appropriate delegation and report back to Council.

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Barker seconded

- PC11/33.1
1. **THAT the Committee endorse the Preliminary Comments on the Proposed National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (Doc: 1987405 dated 8 June 2011) as recommended subject to the feedback provided.**
 2. **THAT an appropriate delegation personally presents the Preliminary Comments to the appropriate Ministers.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/33.1)

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)**Resolution to Exclude the Public****Cr Burdett moved/Cr Buckley seconded**

- PC11/34
- THAT in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS902:2003 Appendix A & B (P40/42) and Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the following part/s of the proceedings 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 No.	Item Name and general subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
6	Variation No. 6 – Water Allocation	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7, and Right of appeal as per S48(2)(a)(i)	S48(1)(a) and S48(1)(d)

This recommendation 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 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item No.	Reason/s for withholding official information	Section/s
6	Legal privilege Conduct of negotiations Right of appeal	s7 (g) s7 (i) s48 (2) (a) (i)

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 8

Recommended that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS9202:2003, Clause 2.16.4 and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, Section 48(5), that Mr Doug Arcus (Chairman of the Proposed Variation No.6 Water Allocation Appeals Committee) remain in the public excluded session because of his technical and expert knowledge of the matter for discussion.

The motion was put and carried (PC11/34)

Return to open meeting 12.45pm.

Meeting adjourned at 12.45pm.

Meeting resumed at 1.30pm.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)

Terms of reference for Land and Water Quality Subcommittee

File: 23 05 12 (Agenda Item 10) Doc: 1980350

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Legg seconded

PC11/36 **THAT: the report “Terms of reference for Land and Water Quality Subcommittee” (Doc 1980350 dated 23 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/36)

The Senior Policy Analyst, Policy and Transport (J Young) presented the report which summarised the steps taken to date on Council’s decision to create a subcommittee reporting to the Policy and Strategy Committee, noting that the Committee had been tasked with the development of the Land and Water Quality subcommittee, ‘Terms of Reference’. Staff had produced a draft for the Committees consideration.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The Land and Water Road Map for Sustainable Agriculture should be further developed through the subcommittee.

The Committee requested amendments thereto and agreed to the final form of the land and Water Quality subcommittee, ‘Terms of Reference’.

Cr Barker moved/Cr Livingston seconded

PC11/36.1 **1 THAT the Policy and Strategy Committee agree the final form of the draft terms of reference contained in Appendix 1 to the report “Terms of reference for Land and Water Quality Subcommittee” (Doc 1980350 dated 23 May 2011).**

2 THAT the Policy and Strategy Committee recommend to Council approval of the final version of the terms of reference for the Land and Water Quality Subcommittee.

The motion was put and carried (PC11/36.1)

Appendix 1: Draft Terms of Reference for Land and Water Quality Subcommittee**Land and Water Quality Subcommittee**

- REPORTING TO:** Policy and Strategy Committee
- CONSTITUTION:** 6 persons appointed by the Waikato Regional Council comprising the following membership: the elected members for Taupo, South Waikato-Rotorua, Central Waikato, Matamata- Piako and one member from each of Hamilton and Waipa-King Country constituencies.
- MEETING FREQUENCY:** Monthly (following Policy and Strategy Committee) or as required
- OBJECTIVE:** To oversee the development of plans relating to land and water quality

SCOPE OF ACTIVITY:

1. Inform strategic responses to increasing pressures on water quality within the region, prioritising catchments to ensure consistency with the Regional Policy Statement direction.
2. Participate in and support stakeholder engagement processes including the development of stakeholder engagement plans.
3. Facilitate constructive local and central government engagement.
4. Inform Council responses to relevant National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards including any National Policy Statement on Freshwater.
5. Ensure alignment across the Council to assist any separate joint working parties including those necessary for the development of integrated river plans and catchment zone plans.
6. Provide guidance to staff on the development of land and water quality responses as required by settlement legislation with particular regard to the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River Catchment.
7. Guide implementation of the Land and Water Road Map for Sustainable Agriculture.
8. Report to the Policy and Strategy Committee.

POWER TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL:

1. To report matters to the Policy and Strategy Committee for its recommendation to Council.

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)**Thailand Exchange**

File: 20 03 96 (Agenda Item 11) Doc: 1980374

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Kneebone seconded

PC11/37 **THAT: the report “Thailand Exchange” (Doc 1980374 dated 23 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/37)

The Programme Manager, Resource Information (P Singleton) and the Programme Manager, Resource Use (N Hayward), presented the report which provided an update on the recent scoping visit to Thailand as part of an Asian Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Network (AECEN) partnership between Thailand and New Zealand.

Cr Southgate acknowledged, N Hayward and P Singleton for their participation in the programme, which involved a four day scoping visit to Thailand coordinated by AECEN, funded by USAID and managed by MfE.

A delegation from Thailand was to visit the Waikato in mid June to learn more of what Council was achieving in regards to both water quality and community participation.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)**Review of Dangerous Dam Policy 2011**

File: 70 00 11 (Agenda Item 12) Doc: 1979838

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Stark seconded

PC11/38 **THAT the report “Review of Dangerous Dam Policy 2011” (Doc 1979838 dated 23 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/38)

The Programme Manager, Resource Use (H Keane) presented the report which sought approval to review the Dangerous Dams Policy 2006.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The review of the Dangerous Dams Policy was to be undertaken at intervals of not more than five years (as required by the Building Act 2004).
- Council had adopted the Dangerous Dams Policy in 2006 and the review of such policy was currently due, which would include undertaking a Special Consultative procedure.
- The Department of Building and Housing Regulations for the Dam Safety Scheme was due by 1 July 2012.
- It was likely that a further review of the Dangerous Dam policy would be required within the next five year period as a result of those regulations, which would incur additional costs.

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 10

The Committee endorsed that the review be undertaken however, noted its intention to seek the Ministers approval to delay the review pending the release of the regulations.

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Hennebry seconded

- PC11/38.1 **THAT the review of the Dangerous Dam Policy be undertaken while raising the matter with the Minister requesting a delay of the review, pending the release of the Dam Safety Regulations.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/38.1)

Navigation Safety Bylaw – Timing of Review

File: 56 50 14 (Agenda Item 13) Doc: 1973085

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Buckley seconded

- PC11/39 **THAT the report “Navigation Safety Bylaw – Timing of Review” (Doc 1973085 dated 10 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/39)

The Programme Manager, Resource Use (N Botherway) presented the report which sought approval to delay the review of the Navigation Safety Bylaw until 2012.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The current Navigation Safety Bylaw was approved in 2009 and there was no requirement to review the current Bylaw until 2018/2019.
- Staff however, did not consider that the Bylaw would remain ‘robust’ for that period of time. Equally, a review period of only three years (as previously suggested), was too frequent.

The Committee agreed that based on balancing the costs, the time involved, increasing future pressures and conflicts on waterways, future review of the Bylaw should be undertaken on a 5-6 year cycle.

Cr Friar moved/Cr Burdett seconded

- PC11/39.1 **1 THAT the review of the current Navigation Safety Bylaw is delayed and re-scheduled to commence in April 2012.**
- 2 THAT future review of the Navigation Safety Bylaw be undertaken on a 5-6 year cycle.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/39.1)

Land and Water Road Map for Sustainable Agriculture

File: 17 02 66 (Agenda Item 15) Doc: 1983264

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Burdett seconded

- PC11/40 **THAT the report “Land and Water Road Map for Sustainable Agriculture” (Doc 1983264 dated 27 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/40)

Report of the Policy and Strategy Committee – 8 June 2011 – page 11

The Programme Manager, Resource Use (A Campbell), presented the report, noting that the Land and Water Road Map for Sustainable Agriculture (Road Map) provided a framework for further planning of Council's responses to agriculture. Confirmation was sought as to how Council intended to further development and implement the Road Map.

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Legg seconded

- PC11/40.1 THAT the Land and Water Road Map for Sustainable Agriculture be adopted in principle and that its implementation be further developed through the Land and Water Subcommittee.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/40.1)

Submission to Maaori Affairs Select Committee regarding Nga Wai o Maniapoto (Waipa River) Bill

File: 01 19 80 (Agenda Item 16) Doc: 1985539

Cr Barker moved/Cr Rimmington seconded

- PC11/41 THAT the report "Submission to Maaori Affairs Select Committee regarding Nga Wai o Maniapoto (Waipa River) Bill" (Doc 1985539 dated 31 May 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/41)

The Deputy Chief Executive Officer (C Cricket) presented the report which sought retrospective approval from Council, on a submission to the Maaori Affairs Select Committee on the Nga Wai o Maniapoto Settlement Bill.

Submissions to the Maaori Affairs Select Committee closed on 2 June 2011 and due to the short timeframe, staff had not been able to seek Council's prior approval.

The Bill, associated Regulatory Impact Statement and submission had been circulated. Given that the Committee's endorsement of the Submission was a recommendation, further commentary thereon could be provided at the Council meeting (on 29 June 2011) if required.

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Burdett seconded

- PC11/41.1 THAT the Submission to Maaori Affairs Select Committee regarding Nga Wai o Maniapoto (Waipa River) Bill (Doc 1985539 dated 31 May 2011) be adopted.**

The motion was put and carried (PC11/41.1)

Meeting closed 2.45pm.

* * * * *

Cr Southgate highlighted the following points:

- The newly established Land and Water Subcommittee will meet for the first time next month and will report back to the Policy and Strategy Committee.
- A presentation to the Minister is planned regarding the proposed NES for plantation forests.
- The Thai visit went extremely well and the Councillors involved were commended.

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/128.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Policy and Strategy Committee held 9 June 2011 be noted and the recommendations contained in Section B be adopted.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/128.1)

Minutes - Environment Committee – 10 June 2011

File: 03 04 16 (Agenda Item #4.6) Docs#1990698

Cr Armstrong moved/Cr Stark seconded.

WRC11/129 THAT the report of the Environment Committee held be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/129)

Cr Armstrong presented the following report to Council of the Environment Committee dated 10 June 2011.

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Report of the meeting of the Environment Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chambers, Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 10.07 am on Friday 10 June 2011.

- MEMBERS:** Cr J Hennebry (Chair), Cr Al Armstrong, Cr PR Buckley, Cr SP Friar, and Cr TM Stark.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Cr NW Barker, Cr LB Burdett, Cr ST Kneebone, Cr L Livingston, and Cr PA Southgate.
- STAFF:** Acting Group Manager Resource Information (D Noiton) and Committee Administrator (D Thurlow).
- APOLOGIES:** Cr PR Buckley for lateness, Cr P Legg for absence, and Cr SP Friar for early departure.

Accepted

Confirmation of Agenda

Agenda Item 1

Cr Stark moved/Cr Armstrong seconded

- EC11/11.0 **THAT the agenda of the Environment Committee of 10 June 2011 be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (EC11/11.0).

Disclosures of Interest

Agenda Item 2

There were no disclosures of interest.

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Dairy Farm Systems

Agenda Item 3 (Doc # 1983880)

Cr Hennebry moved/Cr Armstrong seconded

- EC11/12.0 **THAT the report 'Dairy Farm Systems' dated 30 May 2011 (Docs # 1983880) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (EC11/12.0).

Acting Group Manager Resource Information, D Noiton, introduced Dr B Thorrold, Strategy and Investment Leader of Dairy New Zealand.

Dr Thorrold presented information to the Committee on 'dairy farm systems'.

Report of the Environment Committee 10 June 2011 – page 2

During discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

Farmers have a connection with the land they farm which motivates them to be farmers.

The trend over time has been for farmers to purchase feed for dry cows and/or feed for cows for autumn. This has been driven by economically priced feed and a desire by farmers to feed their cows well.

Milk prices and feed prices are closely linked therefore balance themselves out economically.

The risks associated with the weather have pushed farmers to try to gain more control over their farms due to a lack of confidence in the climate.

At an industry level over capitalising puts pressure on the cost of production and as competitors in the market it is essential to keep production costs down.

Cr Friar left the meeting at 10.30am.

The industry wants farmers to have a resource efficiency drive. Every farm is required to have a nutrient management plan. In order for farmers to have resource efficiency about it is essential to help farmers understand what the benchmarks are for their region, soil types and an outline of what 'efficient' looks like and what 'in-efficient' looks like.

A whole farm assessment is the process that is gone through to get to a whole farm plan. The plan outlines what is going to be done and the assessment is where at the farm is at, what are the issues, what are the opportunities, and where does the farm want to be?

An estimated 25% of farmers are aware and appreciate the benefits of the whole farm planning.

The approach the industry takes for water quality is to define the issues, engage with people up front to get buy in to a solution.

Animal welfare issues are generally driven by people breakdowns. The industry has a confidential network that assists farmers with animal welfare issues.

The benefits of shelter for animals are currently being researched.

Effectiveness of Dicyandiamide in the Waikato Region

Agenda Item 4 (Doc # 1982805)

Cr Stark moved/Cr Hennebry seconded

EC11/12.0

THAT the report 'Effectiveness of Dicyandiamide in the Waikato Region' (Doc #1982805) dated 26 May 2011 be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (EC11/12.0).

Acting Group Manager Resource Information, D Noiton, introduced Dr Stewart Ledgard, from AgResearch.

Dr Ledgard provided the Committee with an overview of dicyandiamide and how it could potentially improve New Zealand's water quality and farm productivity by inhibiting the effects of nitrogen leaching.

During discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

The two commercial methods of distributing dicyandiamide include spraying and broadcasting of a granular product.

Post application of dicyandiamide extreme weather conditions can be an issue for the effectiveness of the product.

Does the cost of nitrogen affect the economic benefit? Most of the estimates in terms of its reduction have been related to reducing the losses from the urine patch rather than from the fertiliser.

The cost of fertiliser nitrogen has an impact on how much it will be used.

Beachcare Annual Report 2009/2010

Agenda Item 5 (Doc # 1976255)

Cr Hennebry moved/Cr Stark seconded

EC11/13.0

THAT the report 'Beachcare Annual Report 2009/10' dated 24 May 2011 (Docs # 1976255) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (EC11/13.0).

S Stephens, Beachcare Co-ordinator outlined the Waikato Beachcare programme for the 2009/10 financial year.

During discussion the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

There is a lot of anecdotal evidence around the relationship with the restoration of sand dunes and increased biodiversity values.

In order to grow the Beachcare project additional contractor funding is required. Any further budget cuts would lower the levels of service that staff can provide to this project. In 2009 staff presented a cost benefit analysis of the project to Council outlining the costs and the benefits. For every dollar Council puts in there are five dollars of regional benefits. More money is required for contracted services and Council needs to look at more creative ways to obtain funding for plants.

In the lead up to the Long Term Plan discussions, the Committee requested that it have a further analysis of the funding for the Beachcare project along with projected costs at different levels of services to ensure that this project does not go backwards.

Waste Minimisation and Business Sustainability

Agenda Item 6 (Doc # 1974211)

Cr Stark moved/Cr Armstrong seconded

EC11/14.0 THAT the report 'Waste Minimisation and Business Sustainability' dated 11 May 2011 (Docs #1974211) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (EC11/14.0).

B Smith and M Tyler, Waste Minimisation Facilitators updated the Committee on the current activities and proposed future directions of Council's waste minimisation and business sustainability activities.

Cr Buckley arrived at the meeting at 12.15pm.

The Wai Challenge

Agenda Item 7 (Doc # 1980203)

Cr Armstrong moved/Cr Buckley seconded

EC11/15.0 THAT the report 'The Wai Challenge' dated 19 May 2011 (Docs #1980203) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried (EC11/15.0).

A Soanes, Enviro Schools Facilitator outlined the 'Wai Challenge' and how it contributes to creating a future community that has an understanding of environmental stewardship. The Wai Challenge has been developed to support schools to look closely at water near their community. This includes domestic water use, waterways, streams and rivers, water use in rural and urban settings and also global issues around water.

The meeting closed at 12.37pm.

* * * * *

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011

Item 4.6 Report of the Environment Committee – 10 June 2011

Arising from discussion it was noted that:

- The Beachcare co-ordinator was commended.
- A report to the LTP detailing projected costs and options for funding Beachcare projects has been requested.

Cr Armstrong moved/Cr Stark seconded.

WRC11/129.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Environment Committee held 10 June 2011 be noted.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/129.1)

Minutes - Regulatory Committee Meeting – 10 June 2011

File: 03 04 05 (Agenda Item #4.7) Docs#1988322

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/130 THAT the report of the Regulatory Committee held 10 June 2011 be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/130)

Cr Livingston presented the following report to Council of the Regulatory Committee dated 10 June 2011.

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Report of the Regulatory Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chambers, Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 1.05pm on Friday, 10 June 2011.

MEMBERS: Cr LA Livingston (Chair), Cr NW Barker, Cr LB Burdett, Cr TM Stark,
Ex-officio: Cr PR Buckley (1.15pm - 2.50pm)

STAFF: Group Manager - Resource Use (C McLay), Division Manager, Consented Sites (B Sinclair), Division Manager, Compliance and Education (R Dragten), Committee Administrator (M Ahipene)

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr AL Armstrong, Cr J Hennebry, Cr ST Kneebone, Cr PA Southgate

APOLOGIES: Cr Friar (on other council business)

Accepted

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 1)

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Stark seconded

RC11/22 **THAT subject to the addition of the item “Section 128 Review; King Country Energy, Kuratau Hydro” (Doc #1986941 dated 3 June 2011), pre-circulated within the statutory timeframes prescribed by NZ Standing Orders, the agenda of the Regulatory Committee of 10 June 2011 as circulated be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (RC11/22)

Disclosures of Interest

(Agenda Item 2)

There were no disclosures of interest noted.

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Consent, Monitoring and Incident Statistics

File: 56 10 14 (Agenda Item 3) Doc: 1979642

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Stark seconded

RC11/23 **THAT the report “Consent, Monitoring and Incident Statistics” (Doc 1979642 dated 24 May 2011) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RC11/23)

Report of the Regulatory Committee 10 June 2011 – page 2

The Division Manager – Consented Sites (B Sinclair) spoke to the report which provided an overview of recent work within Council's Resource Use Group.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- Construction of Mighty River Power's geothermal plant - Nga Tamariki, was to begin the following month.
- A resource consent application from Genesis Energy relating to its Huntly Power Station was pending.

Water Take and Use: Consents and Monitoring Activity

File: 56 25 02 (Agenda Item 4) Doc: 1952648

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Barker seconded

RC11/24 **THAT the report "Water Take and Use: Consents and Monitoring Activity" (Doc 1952648 dated 20 May 2011) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RC11/24)

The Programme Manager, Water Allocation (M Davenport) spoke to the report which provided a summary of water take and use consent and monitoring activity undertaken within Council's Resource Use Group.

Cr Buckley in 1.15pm.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- Water take and use consent processing and monitoring had been strongly influenced by the policy and rules framework of Variation 6.
- Consent processing had become more complex and contentious due to the tight supply / demand balance.
- Future consents activity in that area would continue to be influenced by both the final form of Variation 6 and national initiatives and policies.

NPS Fresh Water

File: 56 10 06 (Agenda Item 5) Doc: 1980436

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Burdett seconded

RC11/25 **THAT the report "NPS Fresh Water" (Doc 1980436 dated 23 May 2011) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RC11/25)

The Programme Manager, Energy (M Brockelsby) spoke to the report which described the recently gazetted National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011 (NPS: Fw) and how it was likely to impact on Council's resource consent processing function.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- The NPS: Fw was to take effect on 1 July 2011.

Report of the Regulatory Committee 10 June 2011 – page 3

- Initial impacts on consent processes and decision making would be relatively minor. However, once Plans had been developed or amended, the impact on processing and decision making would be significant and may increase the complexity of work undertaken by Council's Resource Use Group.

Cr Buckley out 2.50pm.

Section 128 Review; King Country Energy, Kuratau Hydro

File: 60 32 12A (Agenda Item 5A) Doc: 1986941

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Buckley seconded

RC11/26 **THAT the report "Section 128 Review; King Country Energy, Kuratau Hydro" (Doc 1986641 dated 3 June 2011) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RC11/26)

The Programme Manager, Energy (M Brockelsby) spoke to report which sought a decision to authorise the (section 128) review of conditions for the resource consents that authorised the operation of the Kuratau Hydro Scheme.

Arising from questions, answers and related discussion, the following matters were noted:

- King Country Energy Ltd (the consent holder) operate the Kuratau Hydro Scheme, located on the Kuratau River.
- Resource consents were granted in 2002, the provisions of which allow for a review of conditions to be undertaken every five years.
- The Lake Taupo Erosion and Flood Strategy (the Strategy) identified the possible need for review of the consents to better inform investigations into erosion.
- The review of the conditions of the consents was required to determine the adequacy of monitoring conditions in light of the Strategy.

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Barker seconded

RC11/26.1 **THAT the notice of intention to review the conditions of resource consents 104921, 104922, 104923, 104924 and 104925 be served on King Country Energy Limited, as provided for in condition 15.1. The scope of the review is limited to amending, deleting or addition of monitoring conditions to require the consent holder to monitor the rate of sediment impoundment behind the dam; and/or monitor the rate of sediment discharge to the Lake Taupo; and/or monitor the rate of littoral drift along the Taupo lakeshore.**

The motion was put and carried (RC11/26.1)

Resolution to Exclude the Public

(Agenda Item 6)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Barker seconded

RC11/27 **THAT in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS902:2003 Appendix A & B (P40/42) and Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the following part/s of the proceedings 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 No.	Item Name and general subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
7	Update on Prosecutions	Conclusive reason to withhold exists under Section 6 Good reasons to withhold exist under Section 7	S48(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 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item No/s.	Reason/s for withholding official information	Section/s
7	Maintenance of the law and right to a fair trial	S6(a)
7	Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	S7(2)(a)
7	Legal privilege	S7(g)

The motion was put and carried (RC11/27)

Return to Open meeting 3.03pm

Meeting closed 3.04pm.

* * * *

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011
Item 4.7 Report of the Regulatory Committee – 10 June 2011

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/130.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Regulatory Committee held 10 June 2011 be noted.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/130.1)

Minutes – Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 3 June 2011

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item #4.8) Docs#1989647

Cr Friar moved/Cr Legg seconded.

WRC11/131 THAT the report of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group held 3 June 2011 be received and the decisions noted.

Cr Friar presented the following report to Council of the Waikato Civil Emergency Management Group dated 3 June 2011.

WAIKATO CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, held in the Council Chambers, Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 1.00 pm on Monday 13 June 2011.

MEMBERS:

Waikato Regional Council
Cr S Friar
Hamilton City Council
Cr PM Mahood
Hauraki District Council
Mayor JP Tregidga
Matamata Piako District Council
Mayor H Vercoe (Chairman)
Otorohanga District Council
Cr D Pilkington
South Waikato District Council
Mayor N Sinclair
Taupo District Council
Cr M Downard
Waikato District Council
Cr N Smith
Waipa District Council
Cr D Finn
Waitomo District Council
Mayor B Hanna

IN ATTENDANCE:

Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management
S Vowles

STAFF

Hauraki District Council
L Cavers

Waikato Regional Council
Group Manager River and Catchment Services, DS Fowlds,
Manager, Emergency Management Officer (A Munro), Committee
Administrator (D Snape)

APOLOGIES

Thames Coromandel District Council
Mayor G Leach and Cr P French for absence

Waipa District Council
Cr D Finn for lateness

Accepted

CD11/13 **Confirmation of Agenda**
(Agenda Item 1)

Cr Downard moved/ Cr Smith seconded

THAT the agenda of the Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group of 13 June 2011 be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

The motion was put and carried (CD11/13)

CD11/14 **Minutes of Previous Meeting – 18 April 2011**
File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 2) Docs# 1955364

Mayor Sinclair moved/ Cr Mahood seconded.

THAT the Minutes of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee meeting of 18 April 2011 be received and approved as a true and correct record.

The motion was put and carried (CD11/14)

CD11/15 **Minutes of CEG meeting 6 May 2011**
File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 2) Docs# 1975538

Mayor Tregidga moved/ Mayor Hanna seconded.

THAT the Minutes of the CEG meeting of 6 May 2011 be received and decisions noted.

The motion was put and carried (CD11/15)

CD11/16 **2GP Review Update**
File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 3) Docs# 1985396

L Cavers presented the report and accompanying power point presentation (docs#1990936) to update the Joint Committee on the progress of the plan to this stage and the activities associated with the 2GP Review.

During questions, answers and discussion subsequent to or during the presentation the Joint Committee commented or noted that:

- The Plan was commended as being more enabling, less prescriptive and easy to read with an emphasis on collaborative approaches in terms of the provision of Civil Defence Emergency Management.
- Current best practice and also the Northland Plan were considered during redrafting of the Plan.
- The Plan sets high objectives and goals, to be put in place over the next five years.
- Once adopted, all parties are legally obliged to follow the Plan.

Report of CDEMG Joint Committee – 3 June 2011 – page 3

- Clarification of persons appointed to make local declarations (page 30) within all or part of a territorial authority, and the consultation process for Group declarations, was requested.
- The paragraph 'Alternative arrangements for local declaration....' (page 30) to be deleted
- Natural Hazards Forum to be re-labelled Regional Hazards Forum.
- St John's Ambulance representative to be included as a fifth bullet point on page 42.
- Any major changes to the Plan, subsequent to its adoption, as a result of changes to the Civil Defence Act would be required to go out for public consultation.
- CEG is tasked with implementing the Plan once it is adopted.
- A clause in respect of 'management and governance' is to be added to CDEM Organisational Readiness and Response (page 50).

Cr N Finn in at 2.00 pm

- The proposal to implement a Lifelines Co-ordinator was discussed and endorsed.
- The funding principles for training / activation for GEOC staff was clarified.

Mayor Sinclair moved/ Cr Downard seconded

CD11/16

THAT:

1. **the report '2GP Review Update (doc#1985396) be received for information, and that**
2. **the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee adopts the Draft CDEM Group Plan (2GP), with agreed amendments, for the purposes of public consultation.**

The motion was put and carried (CD11/16)

The Chairman congratulated the team who had contributed to the 2GP Review.

2GP Hearing Committee Appointment

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 4) Docs#1985232

Mayor Sinclair moved/ Cr Downard seconded

CD11/17

THAT:

1. **the report '2GP Hearing Committee Appointment' (Doc#1985232) be received for information, and that**
2. **the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee confirms the establishment of a Hearing Committee for the CDEM Group Plan (2GP) and confirms the membership as: Mayor Hugh Vercoe, Cr Simon Friar, Cr Pippa Mahood and Cr Dennis Finn, and that**
3. **The quorum for the meetings is to be 3 members.**

The motion was put and carried (CD11/17)

2010/11 Annual Work Programme and Budget Update report

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 5) Doc# 1985548

GEMO Manager, A Munro, presented the report updating the Joint Committee on key CDEM work activities, the resilient fund projects, emergency management information system (EMIS) and Controller Development Needs Analysis (DNA), along with an update on expenditure to date in respect to the annual budget (as at 30 April).

During questions, answers and discussion subsequent to the presentation the Joint Committee commented or noted:

- The \$60k overspend this year will be funded 50:50 between the Waikato regional Council and the territorial authorities.
- For subsequent years, WRC has agreed to fund any additional costs over and above additional costs for the year (not including any overrun).
- Differentiating of costs between the local and regional budget needs to be transparent and clearly presented to the Joint Committee.
- The TAs need information on what resources are held by each other.
- The Resilience funding has provision for gathering information on what staff each TA has, and to what level they are trained.
- As a Group, there is no baseline for training, as yet.
- The action plan encompasses the next five years and funding is set for Year 1 at \$470,000. Subsequent years' funding will be set according to the progress being made.

Cr Smith moved/ Cr Pilkington seconded

CD11/18 **THAT the report '2010/11 Annual Work Programme and Budget Update report' (doc#1985548) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (CD11/18)

CD11/19 **Ministry of CDEM Update**

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 6)

The representative from the Ministry of Civil Defence, S Vowles, advised that:

- An earthquake debrief for the Waikato region is in the pipeline, and John Hamilton may present this to the Joint Committee.
- Including the EOAs and other organisations in the debrief was suggested. Each TA is to instruct CEG how they would like this to be undertaken.
- EMIS training for the Waikato region is set for 13-15 September 2011. The CEG presentation is set for the 8 July 2011.
- S Vowles will be undertaking the monitoring of Auckland City in June/July, followed by Southland.
- The nomination dates for Ministry awards for Civil Defence are to be checked and reported back to Mayor Vercoe.

Cr Mahood moved/ Mayor Hanna seconded

THAT the verbal report from the Ministry of Civil Defence be received.

The motion was put and carried (CD11/19)

Items for next meeting – 13 June 2011

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 7)

Items noted were:

- 2GP Review Update
- Christchurch earthquake – lessons for the Waikato
- Quarterly work programme report

2011 Meeting Schedule

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 8)

The next CDEM group meetings were noted as

- 1.00 pm Monday 5 September, 2011 at Waikato Regional Council office
- 1.00pm Monday 28 November 2011 at Waikato Regional Council office.

Meeting closed 2.36pm

* * * * *

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011

Item 4.8 Report of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee – 3 June 2011

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/131)

Minutes – Regional Public Transport Committee – 17 June 2011

File: 03 04 21 (Agenda Item #4.9) Docs#1989518

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Rimmington seconded.

WRC11/132 THAT the report of the Regional Public Transport Committee held 17 June 2011 be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/132)

Cr Southgate presented the following report to Council of the Regional Public Transport Committee dated 17 June 2011.

REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Report of the Regional Public Transport Committee of the Waikato Regional Council held in the Council Chamber Waikato Regional Council office, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 10.00am on Friday 17 June 2011.

- PRESENT:**
- Waikato Regional Council**
Cr PA Southgate (Chair), Cr RM Rimmington
 - Hamilton City sub region**
Cr DL Bell, Cr DG Macpherson
 - East Waikato sub region**
Cr J Barnes
 - North Waikato sub region**
Cr N Smith
 - South Waikato/Taupo/Rotorua sub region**
Cr B Hickling
 - Waipa/Waitomo/Otorohanga sub region**
L Hoverd
 - New Zealand Transport Agency representative**
A McKillop
 - Regional Transport Committee Access and Mobility representative**
G Pomeroy
- IN ATTENDANCE** Waikato Regional Council
Councillors NW Barker and TM Stark
- STAFF:** Group Manager Policy and Transport (V Payne), Programme Manager Land Transport Operations (E Swaris), Programme Manager Land Transport Policy (B McMaster), Committee Administrator (D Atkinson)
- APOLOGIES:** Cr M Westphal (Hamilton City Council)

Accepted

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 2)

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Barnes seconded

- RPTC11/27 **THAT the agenda of the Regional Public Transport Committee of Friday 17 June 2011 be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (RPTC11/27)

Disclosures of Interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

SECTION B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)**Approval of Draft Waikato Regional Public transport Plan 2011 - 2014**

File: 03 04 21 (Agenda Item 3)

A McKillop moved/Cr Hickling seconded

RPTC11/28 **That the report “Approval of Draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2011 - 2014 (Doc #1990004 dated 9 June 2011) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (RPTC11/28)

This item was presented by Corporate Planner (V Chopra) and B Mein (Consultant).

Draft Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2011 - 2014

It was agreed that the process to be followed would be for the Committee to work through the document identifying changes/areas to be amended. During this process the Committee agreed to changes and amendments as scheduled and defined in the table below and the immediately following items of “Definitions and Terminology” and “Summary Document”.

Section	Subject	Agreed Amendment
1.3 p8	Development process: RPTC	Refer to names & affiliations of RPTC members (include in Appendix)
1.5 p10	How to submit: hearing dates	Amend hearing dates to show correct dates as currently proposed
2.1 p12-13	Priority interventions	Clarify in text (p12) that interventions in scope/focus column of Table 2 are examples
3.3 & 3.4, p20-21	Satellite & rural services	Clarify definitions (include information from p38 in these sections); Ensure consistent definition of satellite and rural throughout document (and with RLTS) Amend Map 2 to show existing satellite services (include Te Aroha, exclude Pirongia)
3.6 p21-22	Community services	Check community services to/from Mangakino and amend Map 3, if required
3.8 p23-24	Patronage trends	Add context for patronage growth that has occurred, including key milestones, possibly bring last paragraph forward
4.4 p29	Fuel price	Note overall increasing trend in fuel prices; if possible, show relationship between fuel price and patronage; Amend text in final sentence to refer to growth “resulting from fuel price increases” and replace “will” with “may”
4.5 p29	Central government initiatives	Clarify that “static” funding results in real reduction; PTOM: amend final sentence to “It is the Governments intention...” instead of “it will result.”

Report of the Regional Public Transport Committee – 17 June 2011 – page 3

4.6 p30	Infrastructure	Final sentence: add <i>roading</i> design
4.7 p30	Funding	Strengthen references to Government/GPS focus on PT investment to assist congestion relief mainly strengthen reference to congestion in section 4.1
5.2 p32	PT objectives	Remove reference to Hamilton in Objective 3
5.5 p33	PT targets	Add new section to include reference to other PT targets in the RLTS (as listed in Appendix 2, p68); and cross-reference these to Table 12 in Monitoring section (p61)
6.1 p34	Integrated planning	Include reference to demand management initiatives, including carpooling
6.3 p35	Transport disadvantaged	Add reference to territorial authorities
6.4 p35	Serving new growth areas	Expand with options for innovative approaches to serving new growth areas
6.6 p36	Marketing	Broaden and strengthen this section to provide greater emphasis on the aim of growing patronage, including the need for public education, behavioural change, and promotional activities; and the need for an integrated approach to marketing across the region.
7.2.1 p38	Types of service	Amend Table 6 to correct reference to Coromandel summer services, and clarify rural description; add “initiatives” in the text above the table or possibly in the table to capture non-service approaches such as Hauraki coordinator
7.2.2 p39	Hamilton services	Policy P1 to highlight that P1 refers to minimum service levels: Text to cover that higher service levels can be provided according to demand and specific circumstances
7.2.2 p39	Hamilton services	Policy P2: remove third bullet (1/3 dwellings with code of compliance)
7.2.4 p42	School services	Actions A20 & A21: add schools to groups to liaise with
7.2.5 p42	Total mobility	Include text and amend action A25 that Council will work with territorial authorities to broaden the Total Mobility scheme, and implement NZTA Phases 1&2 where practicable; Add new action to encourage territorial authorities to fund local share
7.2.6 p42-43	Special events	Add new action to indicate preference for costs of PT services to be included in the price of event admission

Report of the Regional Public Transport Committee – 17 June 2011 – page 3

7.2.7 p43	Future rail services	Add text and add new Action to reflect inter-regional cooperation with Auckland
7.3.1 p44	Fare structure	Add reference to day saver and similar fare products in text.
7.3.2 p44-45	Farebox recovery	<p>Check calculations of current farebox recovery rate, and adjust policy on target if necessary to reflect lower current recovery rate. The following process was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff to review calculations and develop alternative scenario(s) for farebox recovery targets if required • Circulate this to Committee for comment next week: members to provide comments to Chair • Delegated authority for Chair to amend draft, taking account of Committee's views • If necessary, these amendments to be tabled at Council meeting on 29 June
7.3.3 p45-46	Fare concessions	<p>Add new action to regularly review concessions (eligibility, target groups and concession levels);</p> <p>Action A37: Change "Busit!" to generic term "integrated ticketing card"</p> <p>Action A38: Add 60+ concessions with details.</p>
7.4 p46-47	Vehicle specifications	<p>Action A42: remove "minimum"</p> <p>Action A43 and Policy P24: broaden reference to environmental features</p>
7.5 p47-48	Infrastructure	Include new action to investigate provision of facilities such as bike lock-ups
7.6 p48-49	Information and marketing	Amend A63 to make stronger reference to promotional campaigns
7.8 p51-52	Funding	Amend "Seek alternative funding sources" to "Explore.."; and expand supporting text to include "in conjunction with territorial authorities".
7.9 p53	Integrated planning	Action A79: replace "Waikato Expressway" with "strategic corridors"
8.3 p 59	Services to rural areas	Table 10: add reference to Tokoroa-Putaruru service
9.1 p61	Key performance indicators	Add a new column to Table 12 to show targets (where available); and include all PT targets from RLTS (as listed in Appendix 2, p67-68)
	Executive Summary	Farebox recovery section: remove "through fares"

Report of the Regional Public Transport Committee – 17 June 2011 – page 4Definitions and Terminology

Review Draft to ensure consistent definitions and use of terms throughout the document, including the following terms identified by the Committee:

- Satellite towns and satellite bus services
- Rural bus services
- Waikato region
- Stakeholders
- Senior citizens
- Access to “basic” or “essential” services

Summary Document

The following amendments to the Summary Document were agreed:

- Strengthen and reposition the funding challenge; and include reference in front page text.
- Remove “steadily” from description of patronage increase
- Add text to focus areas to summarise what the Plan proposes
- Review images to provide a more obvious public transport theme

Farebox Recovery

The decision relating to clause 7.3.2 pages 44-45 Farebox recovery was not unanimous. The document contained a starting figure of 32% but Programme Manager Land Transport Operations (E Swaris) advised he had received information (from NZTA) that the figure was actually 29%. There was reluctance expressed to signing off on the document without the starting position for this matter being completely and accurately defined due to the possible detrimental effects on future fare increases and patronage.

G Pomeroy Moved/R Rimmington Seconded

That the Draft Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2011-2014 (Doc #1966909) be received.

Recommended That

1. **The Draft Waikato Regional Transport Plan 2011-2014 (Doc #1966909) as amended and approved by this meeting be forwarded to the Waikato Regional Council with a recommendation of adoption for public consultation under the Local Government Act 2002.**
2. **The Chair of the Regional Public Transport Committee be delegated authority to approve any typographical, editorial or formatting changes required to the Draft Waikato Public Transport Plan 2011-2014 prior to its release for public consultation.**
3. **The Draft Summary of Proposal for public consultation under the Local Government Act 2002 as amended by this meeting be approved.**

The motion was put and carried (RPTC11/28.1)

Cr Macpherson recorded his vote against the resolution

Meeting closed at 12.56 pm

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011Item 4.9 Report of the Regional Public Transport Committee – 17 June 2011

Cr Southgate highlighted the following points:

- The implications of government funding caps around passenger transport are significant for future services.
- There will be a report on fare box recovery to the next Policy and Strategy Committee.

It was noted that adoption of the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan will be dealt with as a separate Council item later in the agenda.

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Rimmington seconded.

WRC11/132.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Regional Public Transport Committee held 17 June 2011 be noted.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/132.1)

Minutes – Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee – 23 June 2011

File: 03 02 20 (Agenda Item #4.10) Docs#1995061

Cr Kneebone took no part in the discussion or voting.

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

WRC11/133 THAT the report of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held 23 June 2011 be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/133)

Cr Buckley presented the following report to Council of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held 23 June 2011.

LAKE TAUPO PROTECTION PROJECT JOINT COMMITTEE

Report of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held in the Council Chambers, Taupo District Council offices, 72 Lake Terrace, Taupo at 10.05am on Thursday, 23 June 2011.

MEMBERS: **Environment Waikato (Waikato Regional Council)**
Cr PR Buckley (Chair)
Cr LB Burdett

Taupo District Council
Mayor Rick Cooper

Ministry for the Environment
M Pinckard

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
P Journeaux

Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board
I Kusabs

STAFF: **Environment Waikato (Waikato Regional Council)**
Lake Taupo Implementation Manager (N Hayward)
Committee Administrator (M Ahipene)

Taupo District Council
Deputy Chief Executive Officer (A McLeod)

Ministry for the Environment
Remediation Projects (M Wignall)

IN ATTENDANCE: **Lake Taupo Protection Trust**
Chairman (JT Kneebone)
Chief Executive Officer (G Fleming)
Secretary (MS Peck)
Trustee (S Yerex)
Trustee (M Barton)

APOLOGIES: G Asher (Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board) and Cr R Henderson
(Taupo District Council)

Accepted

I Kusabs opened the meeting with a karakia.

Meeting adjourned at 10.07am.

Meeting resumed at 10.40am.

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 2)

M Pinckard moved/P Journeaux seconded

- LTJC11/16 **THAT the agenda of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee of 23 June 2011 as circulated be confirmed as the business for the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/16)

Disclosures of Interest

(Agenda Item 3)

There were no disclosures of interest noted.

SECTION A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Minutes of Previous Meeting

File: 03 04 20 (Agenda Item 4) Doc: 1945665

Cr Burdett moved/I Kusabs seconded

- LTJC11/17 **THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held on 24 March 2011 are confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/17)

Matters Arising from Previous Meeting

(Agenda Item 5)

There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

Trustee Remuneration

File: 03 04 20 (Agenda Item 6) Doc: 1993757

Cr Burdett moved/P Journeaux seconded

- LTJC11/18 **THAT the report on 'Trustee Remuneration' (WRC Doc: 1993757 dated 14 June 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/18)

In accordance with the annual compliance requirements of the Trust Deed, the Lake Taupo Protection Trust (the Trust) had produced a report recommending the amount of remuneration to be paid to its Trustees for the 2011/12 financial year.

The Chairman (JT Kneebone) and Chief Executive Officer (G Fleming) spoke to the report which sought to retain the current level of remuneration.

Cr Burdett moved/I Kusabs seconded

- LTJC11/18.1 THAT the Trustees of the Lake Taupo Protection Trust be remunerated effective 1 July 2011 as follows:**
- a) Chairperson - \$27,200 base salary per annum plus \$200 for each meeting attended; and**
 - b) Members - \$12,500 base salary per annum plus \$200 for each meeting attended.**
 - c) Reimbursement of mileage incurred based on Inland Revenue guidelines.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/18.1)

Financial Matters: 2011/12 Budget and Financial Statements

File: 03 04 20 (Agenda Item 7) Doc: 1993753

P Journeaux moved/M Pinckard seconded

- LTJC11/19 THAT the report on 'Financial Matters: 2011/12 Budget and Financial Statements' (WRC Doc: 1993753 dated 15 June 2011) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/19)

In accordance with the annual compliance requirements of the Trust Deed, The Trust had produced a report which detailed its budget and financial statements for the 2011/12 year.

The Chairman (JT Kneebone) and Chief Executive Officer (G Fleming) spoke to the report which sought feedback prior to confirmation of the budget at the Trust Board's next meeting (on 27 June 2011).

During discussion the following was noted:

- \$100,000 had been allocated to complete benchmarking and the creation of individual Nitrogen Management Plans for each farm. The amount of such was significantly less than allowed for in the previous year, given that benchmarking was now, 97% complete.
- A component of the benchmarking work would include continued education, engagement and communication with landowners.
- Benchmarking would be complete within the following six months given that landowners were required to comply with the requirements of the recently 'signed off' Variation 5.
- Publication/communication of the recently signed of Variation 5 would reactivate public awareness.

Cr Burdett moved/M Pinckard seconded

- LTJC11/19.1 THAT the Lake Taupo Protection Trust, financial statements as at 30 April 2011 be received.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/19.1)

Change to multi-year appropriation

File: 03 04 20 (Agenda Item 8) Doc: 1974728

P Journeaux moved/I Kusabs seconded

- LTJC11/20 **THAT the report “Change to multi-year appropriation” (WRC Doc 1986382 dated 2 June 2011) be received for information.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/20)

A letter received from Mr Cameron Sherley, Ministry for the Environment (the Ministry), regarding Cabinet’s approval of a multi-year appropriation for the Lake Taupo Protection Project, had been circulated.

The Chief Executive Officer (G Fleming) addressed the Committee noting that a set of criteria had been developed by the Ministry, in regards to the annual funding that the Trust received from the Crown. The Ministry sought the Joint Committee’s agreement therewith.

During discussion it was noted that the multi-year appropriation:

- was acceptable to the Trust,
- signalled the Crown’s commitment to the project,
- did not stipulate a maximum amount that could be drawn down within any given financial year, however, that the minimum period over which the entire amount could be drawn down was two years (clause e).

Cr Burdett moved/P Journeaux seconded

- LTJC11/20.1 **1. THAT the letter from the Mr Cameron Sherley – Ministry for the Environment (WRC Doc: 1974728 dated 6 May 2011) be received.**
- 2. THAT the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee hereby accepts the criteria for drawdown on the multi-year appropriation.**

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/20.1)

General Business

(Agenda Item 9)

There had been anecdotal evidence that the water clarity of Lake Taupo had recently improved. It was noted that seasonal or short term fluctuations in water quality and many other factors contributed to water clarity and it was impossible to quantify how much could be attributed to nitrogen reduction. However, Waikato Regional Council had an obligation to undertake monitoring in the future, to support the implementation of Variation 5 and the findings would indicate what effects/improvements had been made to water quality as a result.

Resolution to Exclude the Public

(Agenda Item 10)

I Kusabs moved/L Burdett seconded

- LTJC11/21 **THAT in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS902:2003 Appendix A & B (P40/42) and Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the following part/s of the proceedings 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 No.	Item Name and general subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
11	Correspondence received from Mr Tony Fenton	Good reasons to withhold exist under Section 7	S48(1)(a)
12	The Trust's Statement of Intent	Good reasons to withhold exist under Section 7	S48(1)(a)
13	Engagement Exercise Outline	Good reasons to withhold exist under Section 7	S48(1)(a)
14	Minutes of the public excluded section of the meeting held on 24 March 2011	Good reasons to withhold exist under Section 7	S48(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 whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item No.	Reason/s for withholding official information	Section/s
11, 12, 13 & 14	Prejudice commercial position	S7(b)(ii)

Recommended that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS9202:2003, Clause 2.16.4 and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, Section 48(5), that Trustees, Chief Executive Officer and Secretary of the Lake Taupo Protection Trust remain in the public excluded session because of their knowledge of the issues involved.

The motion was put and carried (LTJC11/21)

Return to Open meeting 11.40am.

Item Reported from Public Excluded

The Committee resolved that the decision and report with respect to **Item No. 12** "Statement of Intent for the 2011/12 year", be reported in Open Meeting.

I Kusabs closed the meeting with a karakia.

Meeting closed 11.42am

* * * * *

Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011

Item 4.8 Report of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee – 23 June 2011

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

WRC11/133.1 THAT the decisions contained in Section A of the report of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held 23 June 2011 be noted.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/133.1)

External Committee reports

(Agenda item 4.11)

Cr Kneebone advised that the Tb Free committee had received its monthly AHB report. The MOU is proceeding well. There is concern that 1080 warning signs were removed and relocated to a reserve in Taupo, presumably by the anti 1080 faction.

Cr Burdett attended a 1080 meeting recently and has extensive notes detailing misinformation and criticism of AHB.

Cr Livingston advised that she will be attending an upcoming meeting between DoC and central government.

Cr Burdett attended a meeting of the Tongariro River Forum which included discussion of the resource consent for gravel extraction where one appeal is waiting to be heard in the Environment Court.

Cr Friar attended a recent meeting of the Hauraki Gulf Forum, the main issue being the adoption of the State of the Environment report. Cr Friar noted his concerns at some views contained in the reports, which were to be dealt with by way of disclaimer. It was noted that the State of the Environment report was mostly prepared by forum management, without direct input from either Auckland Council or WRC. Also discussed was Spatial Planning and the statutory responsibilities of Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council. Chairman Buckley will be attending a meeting later in the week regarding the Upper North Island Agreement and will seek a formal resolution for the Councils to work together on such issues.

Cr Barker attended a recent landcare meeting and noted a willingness amongst the farming community to address issues.

Hearing Committee Reports in terms of the Resource Management Act 1991

File: 03 20 00

Okoroire Holdings Ltd

File: 61 53 12A (Agenda Item #5.1)

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

WRC11/134 THAT the report/decision of the Waikato Regional Council Hearing Commissioner in respect of the resource consent applications by Okoroire Holdings Ltd to discharge contaminants to air from a proposed chicken broiler farm at Okoroire be received for information.

IN THE MATTER OF	the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA)
AND	
IN THE MATTER OF	application by Okoroire Holdings Limited to discharge contaminants to air arising from the operation of a proposed meat chicken farm at 735 Okoroire Road, Okoroire.

REPORT OF THE WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL HEARING COMMITTEE

1 THE HEARING

1. In terms of the Waikato Regional Council's (WRC) resolution of 10 May 2011, a Hearing Committee comprising independent commissioner Robert van Voorthuysen held a hearing in the Town Hall, Tirau, for the purpose of enquiring into the application and the submission thereto.
2. The hearing commenced at 10.00am on Tuesday 24 May 2011 and was closed at 10.45am that same day.
3. I undertook a site visit immediately after the close of the hearing and I was accompanied by Mr Creswell, Mr Greaney and Ms Atchinson.
4. The application was limited notified and one submission in opposition was received. The single submitter had a narrowly defined concern and sought specific relief. I have therefore had regard to the requirements of section 113 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) when preparing this decision. In particular I note and have acted in accordance with section 113(3) which states:

"A decision prepared under subsection (1) may, -
(a) instead of repeating material, cross-refer to all or a part of -
(i) the assessment of environmental effects provided by the applicant concerned;
(ii) any report prepared under section 41 C, 42A, or 92; or
(b) adopt all or a part of the assessment or report, and cross-refer to the material accordingly."

2 THE APPLICATIONS

5. The application was well described in both the WRC's Consent Evaluation Report for Hearing (officer's report) prepared by Christin Atchinson and in the applicant's resource consent application documentation. I refer to the following from the officer's report:

"Tracy and Mark Creswell, on behalf of Okoroire Holdings Ltd, have applied for resource consent to authorise the discharge to air for the operation of a proposed meat chicken farm at 735 Okoroire Road, Okoroire, at or about map reference NZMS260 T15:575:592. The meat chicken farm will consists of six sheds which house up to 51,000 birds each.

Resource consent applications for the take and use of groundwater for bird drinking water and shed wash down will be applied for once a decision on this application has been made. A land use consent from South Waikato District Council was granted in March 2011 following a non-notified consent process."²

² Officer's report, page 1

7. The applicant sought a consent duration of 35 years.

3 SUBMISSIONS

8. The submitters, Mr and Mrs Greaney, were the only neighbouring property owners who did not provide written approval of the application. The WRC decided to limited notify the application to Mr and Mrs Greaney and that occurred on 28 February 2011. A submission was duly lodged and is summarised in the officer's report. I do not repeat that detail here, but note that I read the full submission which was included in the pre-circulated Hearing Agenda.

4 APPEARANCES

9. For the applicant I heard from:

- Mark and Tracey Creswell

10. For the submitter I heard from:

- Kevin and Annette Greaney

11. For the WRC I heard from:

- Christin Atchinson – Resource Officer On-Farm and Industry Programmes
- David Stagg – Programme Manager Industry Programme

12. In attendance was Mali Ahipene – WRC Hearing Administrator.

13. The written material tabled and presented by these parties is held on file at the WRC. I took my own notes of the verbal presentations and any answers to my questions. I do not intend to record that material in this decision. However, specific issues raised in the material are referred to as appropriate in the Evaluation section.

5 EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSAL

5.1 Consent category

14. The officer's report advised that discharge to air activities from the site requiring resource consent were a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 6.1.15.3 of the Waikato Regional Plan (WRP).³ Consequently, my discretion is limited to the items listed in Rule 6.1.15.3 (as set out on page 5 of the officer's report).

5.2 Statutory Considerations

15. Section 104 of the RMA is the principal provision that sets out the matters that I need to have regard to when determining the application. I note that the section 104 matters are subject to the purpose and principles of the RMA as set out in Part 2.

5.3 Consideration of effects on the environment

16. Section 113 of the Act directs me to consider the principal issues of contention and to state my main findings of fact in relation to those issues. As stated at the outset of this decision the issues of contention are narrow defined in this case.

³ Officer's report, page 4.

The sole submitter is concerned about potential adverse odour effects arising from the applicant's proposal. Mr and Mrs Greaney's odour concerns have three elements:

- Potential adverse effects on the submitter's proposed future subdivision
- Potential adverse effects on the submitter's place of work (their farm)
- Potential adverse effects on the submitter's dwelling

17. Before I address those three elements I note that Mr and Mrs Greaney's concerns were not based on personal experience⁴ or on expert technical advice⁵. Their opinions are those of lay people. While this does not denigrate their concerns, it is relevant to how much weight I assign to their evidence.

18. Now, dealing with the first element listed above, Mr and Mrs Greaney have indicated that they have future plans for a four lot subdivision of their property. This was shown in a plan attached to their written submission. At the hearing I confirmed that this was still the case. Pre-hearing discussions indicated that the Greaney's intended seeking resource consent for the subdivision in 5 to 7 years time.⁶ Ms Atchinson informed me that the Greaney's subdivision would require resource consent from the South Waikato District Council as a non-complying activity.

19. The case law on such matters is clear. It is not permissible in considering a resource consent application to have regard to an effect on a proposed activity or development that would require resource consent that has not been applied for.⁷ Therefore, the Greaney's future subdivision is not a relevant consideration in this case.

20. In terms of the second and third elements, the Greaney's property is located in a working rural environment. Some degree of adverse odour is to be expected in such an environment from time to time, although any odour should not be objectionable. In other words, in my view there is no requirement for there to be no chicken farm odour at the boundary of the applicant's property. However, any odour at that point should not be such that it would be considered objectionable by a reasonable person.

21. In cases such as this dealing with odour it is common to require separation distances between the odour source and nearby dwellings. Ms Atchinson documented recommended separation distances between chicken rearing sheds and residential dwellings.⁸ She selected the more conservative recommendation from the Victorian Code for Broiler Farms 2009. That Code recommended a separation distance of 594m for a chicken farm of the scale proposed by the applicant. In this case the Greaney's dwelling is located 740m from the applicant's proposed chicken rearing sheds.

22. I asked Mr Creswell if he had received any odour complaints in relation to his existing unit at Buckland Road which has a similar configuration to that proposed in this case. He advised that for the prior 13 years there had been no complaints, although one anonymous complaint had been received recently.

⁴ Mr Greaney advised me that neither he nor Mrs Greaney had any personal experience of chicken farm odours.

⁵ Mr Greaney advised that neither he nor Mrs Greaney had sought technical advice from an odour expert.

⁶ Officer's report, page 7

⁷ [Auckland RC v Living Earth Ltd \(2008\) 14 ELRNZ 305](#), [2009] NZRMA 22 (CA)

⁸ Table 2 on page 9 of the officer's report

Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited – page 4

23. I asked Ms Atchinson how the separation distances from the applicant's proposed chicken rearing sheds to neighbouring dwellings compared with other similar chicken farms in the region. Ms Atchinson advised that the applicant's proposed separation distances were better than average.
24. I also asked Mr Stagg about chicken farms such as that proposed by the applicant. Mr Stagg advised that there were around 40 such farms in the region and for the vast majority of them the Council received no odour complaints. Mr Stagg confirmed that the applicant's proposal incorporated state of the art odour control technology and practices.
25. Consequently, in light of the above discussion I therefore accept and concur Ms Atchinson's advice and conclusions as follows:

"As shown in Table 2 all of the recommended separation distances are provided for at the subject site. Mr Greaney, in his submission, sought a separation distance of at least 300 m to his property boundary. However, shifting the proposed location of the chicken sheds further to the south will move the proposed location of the chicken sheds closer to the McPhail dwelling to the south and recommended separation distances to this dwelling will no longer be met.

In my opinion, the location of the chicken sheds as proposed in the application is the most suitable location on-site as it satisfies all recommended separation distances.
"9

"The proposed meat chicken farm is likely to discharge a certain degree of odour. However, in my opinion, it is unlikely that odour emissions beyond the property boundary will be to the extent that they cause an objectionable effect due to the combination of proposed mitigation measures such as appropriate separation distances, three layered screen-planting / windbreak, current industry standard ventilation, feeder and drinker systems and the management of the farm in accordance with a comprehensive odour and dust management plan.

"The above conclusion also applies in relation to adverse effects to the property owned by Mr and Mrs Greaney. While it may be likely that a certain degree of odour may travel beyond the property boundary, I consider that the regularly used dwelling and cowshed is unlikely to experience offensive and objectionable odour due to their location upslope, outside the prevailing wind direction and outside recommended separation distances. Should odour occur just beyond the property boundary it is likely to be infrequent and in an area not often used by the property owners and as such I consider it unlikely to be objectionable.

If a dwelling is constructed closer to the boundaries in the future and objectionable odour is experienced at the dwelling the consent holder will need to take steps to avoid this. Cost effective technological solutions are not known to exist at this time. However, they may be developed in the future (a technology review condition is recommended to identify these). Another option would be to reduce bird density/numbers possibly by conversion to free range."¹⁰

26. I also note that the applicant now intends to construct an earthen bund around two metres high on the northern and eastern sides of the chicken rearing shed area and that the proposed three layered screen planting will occur on top of that bund. This will provide enhanced odour mitigation.
27. On balance, having weighed the evidence, I find that the potential adverse effects of the applicant's proposal in terms of odour, subject to the imposition of the recommended conditions of consent, will be no more than minor.

⁹ Officer's report, page 10

¹⁰ Ibid, page 13

5.4 Duration

28. The applicant sought¹¹ a consent duration of 35 years and Ms Atchinson recommended 20 years for the reasons set out in her officers report.¹² Mr Creswell sought a longer duration as he considered that the life of the sheds was in excess of 40 years and any future adverse effects could be dealt with by way of the scheduled section 128 reviews of consent conditions.
29. I asked Ms Atchinson about her recommended duration of 20 years. She advised that whilst the nature and scale of the odour would likely remain unchanged over the life of the operation, the nature of the receiving environment and associated public perceptions might change in the future. She noted that in time it was expected that New Zealand might introduce its own code or guidelines for separation distances for chicken farms such as this one. She also advised that the range of typical consent durations for similar operations in the region was 10 to 20 years, with 20 years being granted for the better operations.
30. On balance I consider that Ms Atchinson's recommendation is appropriate and reasonable in the circumstances.

5.5 Planning Instruments

31. I understand the relevant planning instruments to be the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, the Proposed Regional Policy Statement and the WRP. The officer's report listed the relevant air quality management provisions from those documents and Ms Atchinson undertook an evaluation of the application against them.¹³ I adopt her evaluation but I do not repeat here for the sake of brevity.
32. I note that no other party undertook a planning analysis.

5.6 Section 105 of the RMA

33. As noted in the officer's report, section 105 of the RMA requires me to "have regard to the nature of the discharge and the sensitivity of the receiving environment, the applicant's reasons for the proposed choice and any possible alternative methods of discharge including into any other receiving environment."¹⁴ In this case I am satisfied that the applicant has chosen to site the proposed chicken rearing sheds in a location on their property that best minimises potential adverse odour effects on all neighbouring properties.

5.7 Part 2 of the RMA

34. Under s104(1) of the RMA my considerations are subject to Part 2.
35. I do not consider that any elements of section 6 are particularly relevant in this case. I find that section 7(c) (the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values) and section 7(f) (the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment) are relevant but that they have been addressed in my evaluation of potential effects on the environment in section 5.3 of this decision.

¹¹ In the hearing Mr Creswell mentioned a duration of 35 years but his application documents (page 4 of Form A) clearly show a duration of 25 years was sought.

¹² Officer's report, page 18

¹³ Ibid, pages 14 to 16

¹⁴ Ibid, page 16

6 DETERMINATION

36. Pursuant to the powers delegated to me by the Waikato Regional Council under section 34 of the Resource Management Act and having read the application documents, the officer's report, the submission received, and having listened to all of the evidence presented, and considered the various requirements of the Act, I am satisfied that:
- i. The potential adverse effects of the Okoroire Holdings Limited proposal to discharge contaminants to air arising from the operation of a meat chicken farm at 735 Okoroire Road, Okoroire are either minor or can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated by the imposition of conditions under section 108 of the Act.
 - ii. The effects of the proposed activities, when managed in accordance with those conditions, will not be inconsistent with the relevant policies of the Operative and Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statements and the Waikato Regional Plan.
 - iii. The activity is consistent with the Purpose and Principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.

7. CONDITIONS

37. A suite of conditions was recommended to me by Ms Atchinson. These were agreed to by the applicant except for the matter of consent duration. I have reviewed those conditions and find them to be appropriate in the circumstances. I am satisfied that they fall within the scope of the matters of discretion in Rule 6.1.15.3.

8. DECISION

38. That consent application 122390 be **granted** subject to the conditions set out in the attached resource consent schedule.

DATED this 25th day of May 2011

R van Voorthuysen (independent commissioner)

Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited – page 7

Resource Consent: 122390

File Number: 61 53 12A

Pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991, the Waikato Regional Council hereby grants consent to:

Okoroire Holdings Ltd
823 Buckland Road
RD 2
Matamata 3472

(hereinafter referred to as the Consent Holder)

Consent Type: Discharge permit

Consent Subtype: Discharge to air

Activity authorised: Discharge contaminants including odour and dust into air from buildings housing a meat chicken farm

Location: Okoroire Road - Tirau

Spatial Reference: NZTM 1847301 E 5797634 N

Consent Duration: Granted for a period expiring on 31 May 2031.

Subject to the conditions overleaf:

Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited – page 8**General**

1. The meat chicken facility comprising six sheds sited on the applicants' property (legally described as DP 27064 Lot 1, DPS 87626 Paiakamangaoatua 2B1 Pt 2A, DP 2706 PART 2A Paiakamangaoatua Whol 2B1 Paiakamangaoatua Whol Lot 1 DPS 87626 (South Waikato District)) with a total capacity of 306,000 birds during each rearing cycle shall be operated in accordance with:
 - (i) the application for this resource consent dated 17 January 2011, Waikato Regional Council document # 1903689, including the appendices and subsequent amendments and information submitted in support of the application; and
 - (ii) the "Management Plan for Okoroire Holdings" Waikato Regional Council document # 1903689 submitted on 17 January 2011 including any subsequent amendments or revisions necessary to improve the environmental performance of the facility; and
 - (iii) the resource consent conditions below which shall prevail should any inconsistencies between the application documentation, management plan and the conditions occur.
2. The consent holder shall, as a minimum, maintain separation distances of at least 100 metres between the outer external edge of any meat chicken shed and any neighbouring property boundary.
3. This consent shall lapse ten years after the date on which it was granted unless it has been given effect to before the end of that period (see Advice Note 8).

Odour and Dust

4. As a result of the operation of the meat chicken facility the discharge shall not result in odour that is objectionable to the extent that it causes an adverse effect at or beyond the boundary of the subject property.
5. As a result of the operation of the meat chicken facility there shall be no discharge of particulate matter that is objectionable to the extent that it causes an adverse effect at or beyond the boundary of the subject property.
6. The consent holder shall maintain a register to record all odour or dust complaints relating to the meat chicken facility received by the consent holder (whether such complaints are deemed by the Waikato Regional Council to be objectionable or not). The register shall be made available to the Waikato Regional Council on request, and shall record the following:
 - (i) the date, time and duration of the event;
 - (ii) the name and location of the complainant when the event was detected;
 - (iii) measures taken to verify the event;
 - (iv) the weather conditions and wind direction at the meat chicken sheds and age of the birds when the event allegedly occurred;
 - (v) the possible causes of the event; and
 - (vi) any corrective action taken by the consent holder in response to the complaint.

The consent holder shall advise the Waikato Regional Council within 24 hours of the receipt of any odour and/or dust complaints received by the consent holder regarding the meat chicken facility.

7. Should odour or dust emissions relating to the meat chicken facility cause an objectionable effect (as deemed so by the Waikato Regional Council) beyond the property boundary, the consent holder shall within five days of being advised of this objectionable effect by the Waikato Regional Council, provide a written report to the Waikato Regional Council specifying:
 - (i) the cause or likely cause of the event and any factors which influenced its severity;

Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited – page 9

- (ii) the nature and timing of any measures implemented by the consent holder to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects; and
- (iii) the steps to be taken in future to prevent recurrence of similar events.

Landscaping

8. Three layered screen planting in accordance with the landscaping plan submitted as Appendix C in support of this application, Waikato Regional Council document number 1920946, shall be completed by 31 August 2012.
9. The consent holder shall maintain the screen planting as specified in the landscape plan included in Waikato Regional Council document number 1920946, in an effective capacity at all times.
10. Should the meat chicken operation commence prior to 2017 the consent holder shall construct a windbreak along the entire length of the northern and eastern side of the meat chicken sheds.

Litter/Wash Water

11. Chicken litter removed from the meat chicken sheds shall not be stored outside on the subject property. Litter spilt outside the sheds during the clean out operations shall be removed on the day.
12. No chicken litter shall be disposed of on-site.
13. Wash water shall not enter surface water bodies at any time.
14. The consent holder shall ensure that the nitrogen loading of soils from the disposal of wash water does not exceed 150 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year (see advice note 9).

Management Plan

15. The consent holder shall provide to the Waikato Regional Council notice of any subsequent revisions or amendments to the “Management Plan for Okoroire Holdings” as referenced in condition 1(ii).

Note: The Waikato Regional Council reserves the right to make comment on amendments to the management plan.

16. The meat chicken facility shall at all times be operated in accordance with the Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Pty ‘Minimum Standard Procedures for COBB 550 Broilers’ manual 2009 or its successor.

Communication

17. The consent holder shall provide an annual opportunity to all immediate neighbouring property owners and neighbouring property owners and occupiers within a 800 metre radius of the meat chicken sheds to comment on odour or dust related effects.
18. Relating to condition 17 of this consent, the consent holder shall record by 31 May in each year of the consent:
 - (i) The date the opportunity was provided; and
 - (ii) To whom the opportunity was provided; and
 - (iii) How the opportunity was provided; and
 - (iv) The comments received.

The records shall be made available to the Waikato Regional Council on request.

Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited – page 10

Technology Review

19. The consent holder shall submit to the Waikato Regional Council a Technology Review Report by 31 March 2016, 2021 and 2026. The scope of the assessment should address, but is not limited to, the following:
- i) Details of any changes made to operations and the ventilation systems within each shed since the commencement of consent.
 - ii) A summary of any actual or potential effects of the discharge to air, irrespective of whether those effects are in accordance with the conditions of the consent.
 - iii) An analysis of current “Best Practice” associated with the design and operation of intensive meat chicken operations within the region, nationally and internationally;
 - iv) An outline of any significant technological changes and advances in relation to the control and treatment of discharges to air associated with intensive meat chicken operations, which may be available to address any residual adverse effects of the discharge.
 - v) An assessment of whether any such options or combination of options represent the Best Practicable Option to minimise the effects of the discharge to air and whether the consent holder intends to incorporate such changes.
 - vi) Information relating to the use, development and success of alternative techniques to address the control and treatment of discharges associated with intensive meat chicken operations nationally and internationally and their relevance and possible application to the existing situation.

Review

20. The Waikato Regional Council may in May 2016, 2021 and 2026 serve notice on the consent holder under section 128 (1) of the Resource Management Act 1991, of its intention to review the conditions of this resource consent for the following purposes:
- (i) if necessary and appropriate, to require the holder of this resource consent to adopt the best practicable option to remove or reduce adverse effects on the receiving air environment; and/or
 - (ii) to review the effectiveness of the conditions of this resource consent in avoiding or mitigating any adverse effects on the air quality of the locality from the exercise of this resource consent and if necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects by way of further or amended conditions.
21. The Waikato Regional Council may, within six months of receiving the Technology Review as required under condition 12, serve notice on the consent holder under s. 128(1)(a)(ii) and/or (iii) of the Resource Management Act 1991 of its intention to review the conditions of this consent to implement best practicable option identified in the report.

Note: Costs associated with any review of the conditions of this resource consent will be recovered from the consent holder in accordance with the provisions of section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Administration

22. The consent holder shall pay to the Waikato Regional Council any administrative charge fixed in accordance with section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991, or any charge prescribed in accordance with regulations made under section 360 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

*For and on behalf of the
Waikato Regional Council*

.....
Advice notes

Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited – page 11

Where a resource consent has been issued in relation to any type of construction (e.g. dam, bridge, jetty) this consent does not constitute authority to build and it may be necessary to apply for a Building Consent from the relevant territorial authority.

1. This resource consent does not give any right of access over private or public property. Arrangements for access must be made between the consent holder and the property owner.
2. This resource consent is transferable to another owner or occupier of the land concerned, upon application, on the same conditions and for the same use as originally granted (s.134-137 RMA).
3. The consent holder may apply to change the conditions of the resource consent under s.127 RMA.
4. The reasonable costs incurred by Waikato Regional Council arising from supervision and monitoring of this/these consents will be charged to the consent holder. This may include but not be limited to routine inspection of the site by Waikato Regional Council officers or agents, liaison with the consent holder, responding to complaints or enquiries relating to the site, and review and assessment of compliance with the conditions of consents.
5. Note that pursuant to s333 of the RMA 1991, enforcement officers may at all reasonable times go onto the property that is the subject of this consent, for the purpose of carrying out inspections, surveys, investigations, tests, measurements or taking samples.
6. If you intend to replace this consent upon its expiry, please note that an application for a new consent made at least 6 months prior to this consent's expiry gives you the right to continue exercising this consent after it expires in the event that your application is not processed prior to this consent's expiry.
7. If the consent is not given effect to by the specified date, then prior to the lapsing of the consent, the consent holder may apply to extend the duration of the consent under section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
8. Based on 300 g/m³ of kjeldahl nitrogen in wash water (litter removed and shed swept / blown) and 6 shed wash downs per year the total area required for permitted wash water disposal is approximately 120 square metres per cubic metre of wash down water.

* * * * *

*Return to report of Council meeting 29 June 2011
Item 5.1 Decision report of Okoroire Holdings Limited*

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/134)

Ordinary Business

File: 02 30 00 (Agenda Item #6)

Home of Cycling Proposal – decision to consult

File:21 20 11C (Agenda Item #6.1)

Cr Legg moved/Cr Rimmington seconded.

WRC11/135

THAT the reports:

- **Consultation and Additional Information requirements (doc#1995934)**
- **Appendix A – additional information required to support consultation on Home of Cycling Velodrome Proposal (doc#1997310)**

- **Appendix B – Home of Cycling – funding options (doc#1991376)**
- **Appendix C – Home of Cycling proposal – consultation procedure and estimated costs (doc#1993734)**
- **Appendix D – Part 6 LGA 2002 – Planning, decision-making, and accountability (doc#1997960)**

be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/135)

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Southgate seconded

THAT :

- i. Waikato Regional Council defers any consideration to consult on the Home of Cycling proposal and that the matter be considered with the Long Term Plan, and that
- ii. Waikato Regional Council clarifies with Waipa District Council all aspects of rating differentials, and that
- iii. Prior to the LTP debate, Waikato Regional Council in conjunction with regional territorial authorities, develops a criteria for the assessment of regional economic benefit proposals, and that
- iv. Waikato Regional Council seeks from Home of Cycling their detailed operational funding details, and that
- v. Should the project proceed, there be no additional funding available from Waikato Regional Council.

In moving the motion, Cr Rimmington commented:

- The community is not ready for this project at this point in time and it would be prudent to defer any decisions until consideration of the Long Term Plan, and the consequent community consultation.
- Waipa District Council's position has changed and needs clarification.
- Hamilton City Council is significantly silent on the issue.
- Home of Cycling funding details are not sufficiently detailed.
- Should the project proceed, Waikato Regional Council must ensure there is no ongoing financial commitment.
- The project is admirable but in the interests of proper process and good governance it must be deferred at this point in time.

With the agreement of the mover and seconder, clause v. was amended to read:

- v. Should the project proceed, there be no additional funding available from Waikato Regional Council in future years.

Cr Southgate advised that her reasons for supporting the motion were:

- Waikato Regional Council's newly established flagship goal in regard to facilitation of economic development has not yet had detailed discussion regarding Council's role in regional infrastructure; how it will fit across Council's core business; nor on funding aspects. These issues are to be consulted on through the LTP.

- The project is admirable and has much benefit, as are other initiatives that fit with the walking and cycling strategy, such as Te Awa river walk.
- The process has been rushed and forced. There is concern that receiving complex information at the last minute is not good process.
- By imposing its own deadline, SPARC is forcing Council into an inappropriate process of consultation.
- There are still gaps in the information required before a decision can be made.
- The territorial authorities have not been prepared to commit. They do not have to fund the special consultative process being proposed, which will be borne by Waikato Regional Council.

Chairman Buckley read out an emailed statement from Cr Hennebry, which did not support taking the proposal out to a special consultative procedure.

Discussion continued with comments for and against noted:

- By deferring the proposal to the LTP consultation process, the deadline will be missed and the opportunity to have the Velodrome in the region will be lost.
- The actual costs of the project to individual ratepayers per year are comparatively miniscule.
- The costs for the special consultative procedure are simply the costs of democracy.
- The economic benefits to the region would be huge and Council should show its leadership in this area.
- The project will provide an opportunity for local government, central government and private enterprise to work collaboratively for the benefit of the region.
- The recently reworked financial projections have not been subjected to due diligence studies.
- Rather than taking the parochial view, the Waikato region could show support for the project being located elsewhere, for the benefit of the country.
- There are many other projects coming up for consideration. While individual costs to the ratepayer may be small, they must be considered on an incremental basis.
- A cycle way around the region would be of benefit to far more people in the region than a velodrome in Cambridge.
- A special consultative procedure is the correct process to ensure there is full community consultation.

The motion was put to the floor.

Crs Rimmington, Southgate, Stark, Legg and Armstrong voted for the motion
Crs Livingston, Friar, Kneebone, Burdett, Barker and Buckley voted against the motion
the motion was lost 5-6

Cr Friar moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/135.1

THAT Waikato Regional Council:

- 1 Obtains additional information as set out and required by Section 77 (1)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002 before any resolution in respect of the funding of the Home of Cycling request is considered by the Waikato Regional Council;**

- 2 **Waikato Regional Council makes it clear that:**
 - a) Any funding that might be provided after consultation would be a one-off \$6 million only, and
 - b) That this would be released only if SPARC approves its contribution, and
 - c) That Home of Cycling will be required to provide evidence of support by way of underwriting or an alternative mechanism for dealing with any possible operational budget deficit.
- 3 **That a further amount of \$50,000 plus disbursements unbudgeted funds be made available for the work required by Section 77 (1) (b) of the Local Government Act 2002 to be completed.**
- 4 **Resolves to consult with the Waikato regional community in respect of the Home of Cycling \$6m capital request and approves a further \$61,500 unbudgeted expenditure to undertake the consultation.**
- 5 **Council to provide feedback on the funding options set out in Appendix B (docs#1991376) for inclusion in the Statement of Proposal noting there will be further discussion at a workshop on 7 July.**
- 6 **Approves the consultation process and timelines set out in Appendix C (docs#1997310).**

In moving the motion, Cr Friar noted that;

- Council will make a decision regarding funding of the project following public consultation.
- The amount of the capital request will form part of the consultation.
- The process will provide the opportunity for the public to be fully informed on the proposal.

In response, Cr Rimmington stated:

- The shortfall in funding is too great and the threshold for triggering a special consultative procedure has not been reached.
- Council will still be required to make a decision, following the special consultative procedure.

In his right of reply, Cr Friar stated:

- While it is accepted that the process to date has been rushed, it is not the fault of the Home of Cycling, and full consideration will be given to the proposal through the due process available.

The motion was put and carried 7 – 4 (WRC11/135.1)

Crs Friar, Barker Livingston, Kneebone, Burdett, Buckley and Southgate voted for the motion
Crs Stark, Legg, Armstrong and Rimmington voted against the motion

The meeting adjourned at 11.45am and re-convened at 11.55am

Cr Rimmington out of meeting at 11.55am

Councillors' Allowances and Reimbursements Policy

File:02 12 02 (Agenda Item #6.2) Docs#1988394

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Kneebone seconded.

WRC11/136 **THAT the report 'Councillors' Allowances and Reimbursements Policy' (doc#1988394) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/136)

It was reiterated that the mileage and travel time thresholds that the Remuneration Authority has indicated it will approve are unfair to regional councillors.

Cr Friar moved/Cr Kneebone seconded.

WRC11/136.1 **THAT :**

1. **The mileage allowance paid for the 5000km travelled be increased from 70 cents per km to 74 cents per km.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/136.1)
Crs Stark, Legg and Burdett voted against the motion

WRC11/136.2 **2. Waikato Regional Council reconfirms the remainder of the Councillors' Allowances and Reimbursements policy (doc#1801332) for the 2011/2012 year.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/136.2)

Code of Conduct for External Members

File: 03 02 00 (Agenda Item #6.3) Docs#1990778

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Legg seconded.

WRC11/137 **THAT the report 'Proposed Code of Conduct for External Members' (doc#1990778) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/137)

Arising from discussion, amendments noted were:

- Part One: General Principles of Good Governance: Public interest: to include the words '*and / or organisation*' at the end of the sentence.
- Part Two: Roles and Responsibilities: Meeting Attendance: to include a clause relating to non attendance at three consecutive meetings without an apology or leave of absence being treated as a breach of the Code.
- Part Three: General Principles of Conduct: Confidential Information: to include a clause that prohibits confidential information being disclosed to family members/wider organisations.

Cr Rimmington in at 12.10pm

- Appendix 1 – Complaint Investigation/Determination Process: clauses 6 and 7: references to Council Chair/CEO to be amended to Council Chair and CEO and clarification was requested in respect of 7 (ii) as to '*Council are involved in appointing...*
- The flow chart will also need minor changes to reflect the requested amendments.
- The amended Code is to be emailed to all Councillors for confirmation of wording.
- A clause was requested requiring the Chairs of the subcommittees to notify their Deputy Chairs in advance of the meeting in the event of their absence.

Cr Kneebone moved/Cr Legg econded.

- WRC11/137.1 THAT Waikato Regional Council adopts the Code of Conduct for External Members appointed by Waikato Regional Council to Standing Committees and Subcommittees (doc#1798917) with changes as noted at the meeting, to come into effect from 1 July 2011.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/137.1)

Proposed Waikato Regional Plan – Variation No 5 – Lake Taupo Catchment - Operative

File: 23 11 02 (Agenda Item #6.4) Docs#1995533

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Livingston seconded.

- WRC11/138 THAT:**
- 1. the report ‘Proposed Waikato Regional Plan – Variation No 5 – Lake Taupo Catchment – Operative’ Docs#1995533) be received, and**
 - 2. The ‘Final Decision of the Environment Court’ dated 17 June 2011 (docs#1995808) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/138)

The Chairman commended all staff and past and present Councillors involved in the process leading to the Variation becoming Operative. A suitable celebration of the milestone, possibly held in Taupo, is to be organised.

Cr Buckley moved/Cr Southgate seconded.

- WRC11/138.1 THAT:**
- 1. Pursuant to Clause 17 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, Waikato Regional Council approves the Waikato Regional Plan: Variation No 5 – Lake Taupo Catchment and effects its resolution by affixing the seal of the Waikato Regional Council, and**
 - 2. Waikato Regional Council directs staff to make the Variation operative in accordance with Clause 20 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/138.1)

The Chairman and the Chief Executive affixed the seal of the Waikato Regional Council (WRC1742) to the Variation.

Adoption of Draft Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2011-21

File:03 04 11 (Agenda Item #6.5) Docs#1995942

Cr Legg moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

- WRC11/139 THAT the report ‘Adoption of the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2011-21’ (doc#1995942) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/139)

Cr Rimmington commended Cr Barker on his past Chairmanship of the Regional Public (previously Passenger) Transport Committee.

The Transport group was commended for its work on the RPT Plan.

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/139.1

THAT :

1. **Waikato Regional Council receives the Draft Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2011-21 (docs#1966909), and that**
2. **Waikato Regional Council adopts the draft Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2011-21 (docs#1966909) for public consultation under the Local Government Act 2002, and that**
3. **Waikato Regional Council approves the Draft Summary of Proposal for public consultation under the Local Government Act 2002.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/139.1)

2011/12 Annual Plan and 2009-2019 Long Term Plan Amendment – adoption by the Waikato Regional Council

File: 01 12 11A (Agenda Item #6.6)

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

WRC11/140

THAT the report ‘2011/12 Annual Plan and 2009-2019 Long Term Plan Amendment – adoption by the Waikato Regional Council’ (doc#1995027) be received.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/140)

Arising from discussion it was requested that the Chairman’s letter refer to \$24 per year, rather than \$2 per month.

The Chief Executive commended the Finance and Communications groups for the intense work involved in getting the Plan through to the final stage.

Cr Livingston moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

WRC11/140.1

THAT:

1. **Waikato Regional Council adopts the following documents as presented with minor editorial corrections as necessary:**
 - a. **Pursuant to section 93 and 95 of the Local Government Act 2002, the 2011/12 Annual Plan and 2009-2019 Long Term Plan Amendment, and that**
 - b. **Pursuant to clause 12, schedule 10 of the Local Government Act 2002, the Forecast Financial Statements, and that**
 - c. **Pursuant to clause 13, schedule 10 of the Local Government Act 2002, the Annual funding Impact Statement, and that**
2. **Waikato Regional Council considers those groups of activities where estimated expenses are not met by estimated revenues on a**

- yearly basis and resolves, under Section 100 of the Local Government Act 2002, that this is financially prudent, and that
3. Waikato Regional Council approves the submission responses related to financial matters (doc#1992623) in Appendix One, and that
 4. Staff be authorised to prepare responses to written submissions that are consistent with the discussion and decisions agreed upon by Council during the preparation and adoption of the 2011/12 Annual Plan and 2009-2019 Long Term Plan Amendment.

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/140.1)

Rate Setting Report – 2011/12

File: 01 12 10F (Agenda Item #6.6.1) Docs#1809889

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Legg seconded.

- WRC11/141 **THAT the report ‘Rate Setting Report – 2011/12’ (docs#1809889) be received.**

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/141)

Cr Rimmington moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

- WRC11/141.1 **THAT Waikato Regional Council sets the following rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on rating units in the region for the financial year commencing on 1 July 2011 and ending on 30 June 2012.**

a) GENERAL RATE

The General Rate is set under Sections 13(1) and (2)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and is made on every rating unit on a capital value basis. The General Rate is used to fund part of activities that are of “public benefit” where no other direct source of revenue is identified to cover the cost of the activities. The General Rate amounts to 26 percent of the Council’s total revenue for the year.

For this year, the amount of the General Rate Revenue required is \$31,916.466 (GST incl.) compared to \$28,722,375 (GST incl.) in 2010-2011.

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 2011 to 30 June 2012, on the capital value of every rating unit within the Waikato region.

THAT pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 the Council resolves:

1. That a general 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 general 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.

For the reasons contained in Council's Annual Plan for 2011-2012, Revenue and Financing Policy 2009-2019, and Funding Impact Statement 2011.

Schedule (A)

Local Authority	Dollar per dollar capital value (GST incl.)
Waikato	0.0002651
Waikato FDC	0.0002934
Hamilton	0.0003026
Thames-Coromandel	0.0002986
Hauraki	0.0002776
Matamata-Piako	0.0002936
Waipa	0.0002697
Otorohanga	0.0003035
Waitomo	0.0002891
Taupo	0.0003049
South Waikato	0.0002914
Rotorua	0.0002328

b) UNIFORM ANNUAL GENERAL CHARGE

The Uniform Annual General Charge is set under Section 15(1)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and is set at a fixed amount on every rating unit in the Waikato Region. The Uniform Annual General Charge is used to fund activities that have been identified where the:

- Expenditure does not directly change the condition or economic value of a property or resource
- Expenditure is a "public good" to which every ratepayer has equal access
- Expenditure is related to "people" rather than property

The Uniform Annual General Charge amounts to nine percent of the Council's total revenue for the year.

For the 2011/12 year the amount of the Uniform Annual General Charge revenue required is \$10,437,705 (GST incl.). For the 2011-2012 year the Uniform Annual General Charge will be \$55.23 for every rating unit (GST incl.).

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 \$55.23 (GST incl.) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, on every rating unit within the Waikato region.

c) TARGETED RATES ON A DIFFERENTIAL BASIS

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 Waihou / Piako Scheme rate is determined by a formula within the Scheme Deed of Agreement which determines a minimum rating level. The rate is levied on a benefit/contributor classification basis, using a combination of capital value, land value, land area and direct benefit.

- a targeted differential catchment rate, on a capital value basis
- a targeted differential urban direct benefit rate, on a capital value basis
- relief from the land value portion of the catchment rate for land that is in indigenous vegetation or exotic forests, is more than 10 hectares in area

and has stock excluded.

- A rural direct benefit rate which is made on a benefit classification basis using equalised land value in the Waihou Valley Scheme and on a benefit classification basis using land area in the Piako River Scheme.

The recommended rate is based on the budget approved by Council in its Annual Plan 2011-2012.

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 2011 to 30 June 2012, on every rating unit within the Waihou Piako zone.

Schedule (B)

Local Protection – Piako River Scheme Maintenance

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,870,027 (GST incl.) and is based on the land area of all properties within the Piako River scheme boundary.

Piako classifications

Tidal flooding	TF1	TF2	TF3	TF4
\$ per hectare (GST inclusive)	34.3448	25.7586	17.1724	1.7172

River flooding	RF1	RF2	RF3	RF4	RFPZ1	RFPZ2	RFPZ3
\$ per hectare (GST inclusive)	23.9776	11.9888	8.9916	2.9972	9.5911	4.7955	1.1988

Drainage	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9
\$ per hectare (GST inclusive)	26.4192	21.1354	15.8515	13.2096	12.3290	11.4483	7.0451	2.6419	0.8806
Drainage								D9	D9
\$ per hectare (GST inclusive)								0.8806	0.8806

Residential, Commercial-Industrial	RIC1	RIC2
\$ per Capital value (GST inclusive)	0.0008562	0.0004281

Local Protection – Waihou Valley Scheme Maintenance

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$3,562,829 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value or capital value of all properties within the Waihou Valley scheme boundary.

Waihou classifications

Rural	A	B	C	D	E
\$ per Land value (GST inclusive)	0.0071027	0.0036738	0.0022043	0.0004898	0.0002449

Urban	U1	U2	U3	U4
\$ per Capital value (GST inclusive)	0.0006954	0.0003974	0.0001987	0.0000745

Waihou / Piako Scheme Catchment Rate

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,908,841 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the Waihou and Piako zone boundaries.

Waihou Piako catchment	WP C1	WP C2	WP C3
\$ per Capital value (GST inclusive)	0.0001834	0.0001100	0.0000734

ii. Waikato-Waipā (Watershed) Rate

The Waikato-Waipā rate is levied on a benefit/contributor classification basis, using a combination of capital value, land value and land area.

The scheme consists of several differentials which are applied to the property. These are:

- **Greater Waikato Catchment Differential:** This is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary. The rate is charged on a differential basis according to the location of the land (being relevant local authority boundaries).
- **Contributor Differential:** This is based on land value of all properties within the catchment boundary except for those identified in the differential classification as being hydro properties.
- **Contributor Differential – Hydro:** This is based on capital value of all properties identified as being hydro classification within the catchment boundary.
- **Beneficiary Differential – Hydro:** This is based on capital value of all properties identified as being hydro classification within the catchment boundary.
- **Management Zone Differential:** This is based on the capital value of all properties within the Management Zone boundaries. The differential Management Zones are Lake Taupo, Upper Waikato, Central Waikato, Waipā and Lower Waikato.
- **River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit Differential:** This is based on a differential basis of capital value and land area for each differential classification. The land within the Scheme is assigned to the appropriate classification, which corresponds to a level of benefit the land receives from the Scheme. The details of the classifications can be found in the Funding Document.

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-Waipā, hereby sets a targeted rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (D), Schedule (E) and Schedule (F) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, 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.

Greater Waikato Catchment Differential

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,923,234 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.

A Greater Waikato Catchment differential as set out in Schedule (D), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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 (D)

Zone	Dollar per dollar (GST incl.)
Greater Waikato catchment differential	
- Hamilton city	0.0000268
- Waipa district	0.0000245
- Waikato district	0.0000261
- Otorohanga district	0.0000276
- Hauraki district	0.0000353
- Matamata-Piako district	0.0000250
- South Waikato district	0.0000302
- Waitomo district	0.0000266
- Taupo district	0.0000287
- Rotorua district	0.0000240

Contributor Differential

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,590,019 (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 \$0.0000380 dollar per dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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.

Contributor Differential - Hydro

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$330,300 (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 \$0.0003593 dollar per dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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).

Beneficiary Differential - Hydro

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$34,335 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties identified as being hydro classification within the catchment boundary.

A Beneficiary differential - hydro of \$0.0000374 dollar per dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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).

Management Zone Differential

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$3,359,992 (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 (E), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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).

Schedule (E)

Zone	Local authority	Dollar per dollar (GST incl.)
Lower Waikato	Waikato district	0.0000920
	Matamata-Piako district	0.0000854
	Hauraki district	0.0000447
Central Waikato	Hamilton city	0.0000215
	Waipa district	0.0000192
	Waikato district	0.0000184
Upper Waikato	Matamata-Piako district	0.0000050
	Otorohanga district	0.0000346
	South Waikato district	0.0000402
Waipa	Taupo district	0.0000332
	Rotorua district	0.0000277
	Waipa district	0.0000274
	Waipa district	0.0000561
	Waikato district	0.0000559
Lake Taupo	Otorohanga district	0.0000610
	Waitomo district	0.0000654
	Taupo district	0.0000757
	Taupo district	0.0000757

River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit Differential

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,605,182 (GST incl.) and is based on a differential basis of land value, capital value or direct charge.

A separate River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit differential as set out in Schedule (F), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012.

Schedule (F)

Main Channel

Total Revenue to be raised \$8,400 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6A	7	8	9A	9B	9C
MCH	0.6899	0.4829	0.4139	0.3449	0.2759	0.2070		0.1725	0.1380	0.1035	0.0690	0.0345

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	9B	9C	9B	9C
MCH	0.0690	0.0345	0.0690	0.0345

Main Channel - Mangawara

Total Revenue to be raised \$5,661 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6A	7
MCSECD	0.8185	0.6548	0.5730	0.3274	0.2046	0.1228	0.0819	0.0409

Community Works - Waikato

Total Revenue to be raised \$95,401 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6A	7	8
CWK	8.3308	6.6646	5.8315	4.9985	4.1654	3.3323		2.9158	0.8331

Community Works - Mangawara

Total Revenue to be raised \$18,346 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6A	7
CWSECD	2.6517	2.1214	1.8562	1.0607	0.6629	0.3978	0.2652	0.1326

Local Protection Works – Meremere West

Total Revenue to be raised \$20,979 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/MW
LPSECB	145.5947

Local Protection Works – Meremere

Total Revenue to be raised \$48,337 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	5/MM
LPSECB	111.9848

Local Protection Works – Churchill

Total Revenue to be raised \$50,863 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/CH
LPSECB	72.8470

Local Protection Works – Island Block

Total Revenue to be raised \$17,060 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/IB	9/IB
LPSECB	138.5623	46.1874

Local Protection Works – Orchard Road

Total Revenue to be raised \$9,491 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/OR
LPSECB	372.1851

Local Protection Works – Swan

Total Revenue to be raised \$27,640 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	2/SWAN	6/SWAN	7/SWAN
LPSECB	40.0477	23.1855	18.9700

Local Protection Works – Vrsalijkos

Total Revenue to be raised \$7,109 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	2/V
LPSECB	137.5162

Local Protection Works – Waikare

Total Revenue to be raised \$45,641 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/WK	3/WK	4/WK	7/WK	8/WK	11/WK
LPSECB	41.5631	37.4068	35.3286	18.7034	16.6252	8.3126

Local Protection Works – Kimihia

Total Revenue to be raised \$15,652 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/KH	3/KH	4/KH	8/KH
LPSECB	80.8868	72.7981	68.7538	32.3547

Local Protection Works – Huntly West

Total Revenue to be raised \$153,104 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/HW	7/HW	8/HW	12/HW
LPSECB	48.3708	21.7668	19.3483	4.8371

Local Protection Works – Ruawaro

Total Revenue to be raised \$43,639 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/RUA	9/RUA	12/RUA
LPSECB	192.6158	67.9821	22.6607

Local Protection Works – Waahi

Total Revenue to be raised \$13,733 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	10/WAA	12/WAA
LPSECB	40.8158	16.3263

Local Protection Works – Tickers

Total Revenue to be raised \$7,229 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/TIC
LPSECB	313.2730

Local Protection Works – Te Kohanga

Total Revenue to be raised \$51,377 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/TK	4/TK
LPSECB	74.4510	63.2833

Local Protection Works – Tuakau

Total Revenue to be raised \$14,530 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/TU
LPSECB	100.1554

Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Component 1

Total Revenue to be raised \$5,200 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/MG1	4/MG1	7/MG1	8/MG1
LPSECB		58.1522	30.7864	27.3657

Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Component 2
Total Revenue to be raised \$26,459 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/MG2	4/MG2	7/MG2	8/MG2
LPSECB	140.9318	133.1023		

Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Component 3
Total Revenue to be raised \$51,235 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/MG3	4/MG3	7/MG3	8/MG3
LPSECB		99.3912		

Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Component 4
Total Revenue to be raised \$62,553 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/MG4	4/MG4	7/MG4	8/MG4
LPSECB	148.9303			

Local Protection Works – Mangatawhiri – Component 5
Total Revenue to be raised \$7,494 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/MG5	4/MG5	7/MG5	8/MG5
LPSECB		293.7229		

Local Protection Works – Motukaraka

Total Revenue to be raised \$86,151 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	2/MK	3/MK
LPSECB	61.8688	58.6125

Local Protection Works – Bell Road

Total Revenue to be raised \$19,114 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	5/BEL
LPSECB	141.4961

Local Protection Works – Waller

Total Revenue to be raised \$5,085 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/WC
LPSECB	193.5681

Local Protection Works – Parish Polder

Total Revenue to be raised \$19,713 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/PP
LPSECB	215.7935

Local Protection Works – Orton

Total Revenue to be raised \$34,810 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	4/OR	5/OR	6/OR
LPSECB	213.5861	175.8944	138.2028

Local Protection Works – Locke

Total Revenue to be raised \$3,749 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	3/LCK
LPSECB	171.9647

Local Protection Works – Mercer West Southern

Total Revenue to be raised \$3,499 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	7/MWS
LPSECB	34.4847

Local Protection Works – Mercer West Morrisons

Total Revenue to be raised \$9,228 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	8/MWM
LPSECB	63.5445

Local Protection Works – Mercer West Morrisons Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$33,673 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	8/MWMC
LPSECB	231.8673

Local Protection Works – Mercer West Onewhero Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$1,150 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Per Property

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	MWSC
LPSECB	1,149.96

Local Protection Works – Deroles

Total Revenue to be raised \$14,995 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	5/D
LPSECB	144.6029

Local Protection Works – Deroles Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$57,250 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	5/DC
LPSECB	564.34

Local Protection Works – Aka Aka

Total Revenue to be raised \$1,999 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/A
LPSECB	0.4035

Local Protection Works – Aka Aka

Total Revenue to be raised \$56,922 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/A	2/A	3/A
LPG	9.7592		
LPPG	32.5307		
LPP	42.2899	40.6633	81.3267

Local Protection Works – Mangawara

Total Revenue to be raised \$144,063 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	6/1	7
LPSECD	20.8442	16.6753	14.5909	8.3377	5.2111	3.1266	2.0844	1.0422

Local Protection Works – Whangamaire

Total Revenue to be raised \$12,996 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4
LPWP	75.8985	45.5391	30.3594	11.3848

Local Protection Works – Kawa

Total Revenue to be raised \$2,622 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2
LPKAWA	14.1427	4.2428

Local Protection Works – Tongariro

Total Revenue to be raised \$76,693 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LPT	0.0004051	0.0002431	0.0001620	0.0001418	0.0000810	0.0000405	0.0000203

Local Protection Works – Tongariro Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$66,077 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/C	2/C	3/C	4/C	5/C	6/C	7/C
LPT	0.0003359	0.0002015	0.0001344	0.0001176	0.0000672	0.0000336	0.0000168

Local Protection Works – Tauranga-Taupo

Total Revenue to be raised \$28,077 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1	2	3	3/A	4	5
LPTT	0.0002966	0.0002373	0.0001038	0.0000741	0.0000830	0.0000297

Local Protection Works – Tauranga-Taupo Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$52,475 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	1/C	2/C	3/C	3A/C	4	5
LPTT	0.0005543	0.0004435	0.0001940	0.0001386	0.0001552	0.0000554

Huntly Township Rate

Total Revenue to be raised \$63,836 (GST incl.)

Rated on fixed rate per property

Area of benefit	
Huntly Township	\$25.76 every rating unit (GST incl.)

Otorohanga Rate

Total Revenue to be raised \$69,009 (GST incl.)

Rated on fixed rate per property

Area of benefit	
Otorohanga	\$54.38 every rating unit (GST incl.)

iii. Drainage Rates

The Drainage rates recommended below reflect the work programmes and rate revenue requirements contained in the Annual Plan 2011-2012. These requirements have been developed in consultation with Council's Drainage Advisory Sub-committees.

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, Taupiri, Te Rapa, Eureka, Rotomanuka, Hautapu, Fencourt, Ohaupo-Ngaroto, Aka Aka, Franklin District and Waikato District drainage areas, hereby sets targeted rates on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (G) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, on every rating unit within each of the listed drainage areas, on the rating system as listed for each rate.

Schedule (G)

Thames Valley Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$721,466 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Hungahunga	132.1174	13.2117	10.5694	6.6059	3.3029	1.9818	0.6606
Manawaru	257.0780	25.7078	20.5662	12.8539	6.4270	3.8562	1.2854
Waiheke	104.8494	10.4849	8.3880	5.2425	2.6212	1.5727	0.5242
Tatuanui		265.3829	21.2306	13.2691	6.6346	3.9807	1.3269
Whakahoro		18.0149	14.4119	9.0075	4.5037	2.7022	0.9007
Waitoa		18.9113	15.1290	9.4556	4.7278	2.8367	0.9456
Waihou		22.3964	17.9171	11.1982	5.5991	3.3595	1.1198
Eilstow	240.3136	24.0314	19.2251	12.0157	6.0078	-	1.2016
Tahuna		18.9745	15.1796	9.4873	4.7436	2.8462	0.9487
Ahikope pumping		39.5953	31.6762	19.7976	9.8988	5.9393	1.9798
Tahuna pumping		46.0276	36.8221	23.0138	11.5069	6.9041	2.3014
Rowes East		97.6773	78.1419	48.8387	24.4193	14.6516	4.8839
Bancroft		6.8287	5.4630	3.4144	1.7072	1.0243	0.3414
Matamata Urban		191.6168	153.2934	95.8084	47.9042	28.7425	9.5808

Waikato North Drainage Area

Taupiri Drainage & River Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$398,362 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Freshfield maintenance	206.0560	20.6056	15.4542	10.3028	5.1514	3.0908	1.0303
Freshfield pumping	-	243.7453	182.8089	121.8726	60.9363	36.5618	-
Komakorau	-	20.8155	14.5708	10.4077	6.2446	3.1223	1.0408
North Mangawara	-	2.2111	1.5477	1.1055	0.4422	0.3317	0.1327

South Mangawara	72.0359	7.2036	5.0425	3.6018	1.4407	1.0805	0.4322
Tauhei	166.2339	16.6234	11.6364	8.3117	3.3247	2.4935	0.9974
Tenfoot	210.6274	21.0627	14.7439	10.5314	4.2125	3.1594	1.2638
Uapoto	370.0852	37.0085	25.9060	18.5043	7.4017	5.5513	2.2205

Te Rapa Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$206,625 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Ngaruawahia	827.6893	82.7689	66.2151	41.3845	20.6922	12.4153	4.1384
Rotokauri	931.8099	93.1810	74.5448	46.5905	23.2952	13.9771	4.6590
Ohote Basin	314.8692	78.7173	51.1662	47.2304	-	19.6793	11.8076

Eureka Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$107,235 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Mangaonua	262.2554	26.2255	18.3579	13.1128	5.2451	3.9338	-
Waitakaruru	161.9604	16.1960	11.3372	8.0980	3.2392	2.4294	0.8098
Manor Park	706.2467	141.2493	-	-	-	70.6247	-

*Waikato South Drainage Area**Rotomanuka Drainage Area*

Total Revenue to be raised \$3,020 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	A	B	C	D
Rotomanuka	1.5799	0.6664	0.0868	-

Hautapu Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$42,307 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Hautapu	155.5568	15.5557	10.8890	7.7778	3.8889	2.3334	0.7778

Fencourt Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$24,252 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Fencourt	156.5653	15.6565	10.9596	7.8283	3.1313	2.3485	0.7828

Ohaupo-Ngaroto Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$10,661 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	Urban	A	B	C	D	E	F
Ohaupo-Ngaroto	-	8.7626	6.1338	4.3813	2.1906	1.7525	0.4381

Aka Aka Drainage Area

Total Revenue to be raised \$191,112 (GST incl.)

Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Subdivision	
Aka Aka	\$40.89 fixed rate (GST incl.) per hectare

Franklin District Drainage Area
 Total Revenue to be raised \$140,333 (GST incl.)
 Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	A	B	C	D	E	F
Waller Commins	-	88.1851	-	-	-	-
Motukaraka	26.4072	-	-	-	-	-
Bell Road	-	-	33.0406	-	-	-
Tuakau Swamp	-	40.0781	-	8.9062	-	-
Mangatawhiri Compartment 1	-	-	11.5461	3.8487	2.3092	-
Mangatawhiri Compartment 2	-	45.6682	30.4455	10.1485	6.0891	-
Mangatawhiri Compartment 3	-	11.4847	7.6565	2.5522	-	-
Mangatawhiri Compartment 4	-	29.3410	19.5607	6.5202	-	2.6081
Mangatawhiri Compartment 5	-	-	-	134.6089	-	-
Orton	45.8385	27.5031	18.3354	9.167	-	-
Morrison's Swamp	295.8687	221.9015	147.9343	73.9672	-	-
Te Kohanga	18.1411	6.0470	3.0235	-	-	-
Kaawa	61.9942	30.9971	-	-	-	-
Onewhero	66.6899	50.0174	33.3449	-	-	-
Onewhero Downstream	65.6546	52.5237	32.8273	-	-	-
Tickles	0.0000	-	-	-	-	-

Waikato District Drainage Area
 Total Revenue to be raised \$207,148 (GST incl.)
 Rated on Area – Rates made on Dollar per Hectare

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	A	B	C	D	E	F
Okowhau	81.0664	46.3312	23.1656	11.5696	-	-
Huntly west	34.2572	24.4710	9.7862	4.8985	-	-
Hills	24.4085	17.4362	6.9723	3.4916	-	-
Horoehoe	74.2714	53.0432	21.2173	10.6086	-	-
Austins	57.8362	36.1516	14.4564	-	-	-
Blairs	41.6592	29.7584	11.9008	5.9567	-	-
Guests	18.5032	12.3408	-	-	-	-
Ruawaro Furness	-	28.1189	18.7422	-	-	-
Ruawaro central	22.0304	15.7360	-	-	-	-
Ruawaro north	13.9683	9.9831	3.9952	-	-	-
Kimihia SRA	24.3305	12.1709	-	-	-	-
Rangiriri	76.6099	63.8399	38.3100	-	-	-
Island Block	27.8010	13.8948	6.9531	-	-	-
Swan Road	-	144.1613	96.1042	48.0570	-	-
Vrsalijkos	46.0371	23.0128	-	-	-	-
Orchard Road	21.9648	17.5739	-	-	-	-
Churchill East	66.6297	53.2998	39.9797	-	-	-
Meremere East	138.0645	103.5426	69.0206	34.5219	-	-
Greenhill	25.7798	23.2018	16.2413	-	-	-

iv. Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) Rate

The Peninsula Project rate is levied on a benefit/contributor classification basis, using a combination of capital value, land area and direct benefit.

The scheme consists of several differentials which are applied to the property. These are:

- Peninsula Catchment CV basis Differential: This is based on capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.

- Peninsula Catchment property basis Differential: This is based on a uniform rate per property.
- River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit Differential: This is based on the amount of benefit a property receives from river and flood control works. The land within the scheme is classified on this basis and assigned within rating differentials. Rating is calculated on either a capital value or per property basis within each differential. This applies to capital works and maintenance associated with capital works. Base level stream maintenance is funded by one differential across the whole scheme. The details of the classifications can be found in the Peninsula Project (Coromandel Zone) Revenue and Funding Policy.

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 (H) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, 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 (H)

Peninsula Catchment Differential – CV basis

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$575,300 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.

A Peninsula Catchment CV basis differential of \$0.0000455 dollar per dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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.

Peninsula Catchment Differential – Per Property basis

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$575,300 (GST incl.) and is based on a uniform charge on every property within the catchment boundary.

A Peninsula Catchment property basis differential of \$25.55 dollars per rating unit (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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.

River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit Differential

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$201,794 (GST incl.) and is based on a differential basis of capital value or per property basis.

A separate River Control and Flood Protection Direct Benefit differential as set out in Schedule (I), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 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 (I)

Local Protection Works – Te Puru

Total Revenue to be raised \$26,651 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Te Puru Maintenance indirect	0.0002565

Local Protection Works – Te Puru Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$15,511 (GST incl.)

Rated on a per property basis

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Te Puru Channel Capital Indirect	11.24
Te Puru Capital Channel 1	97.13
Te Puru Capital Channel 2	48.57
Te Puru Capital Channel 3	24.28

Local Protection Works – Waiomu- Pohue

Total Revenue to be raised \$27,920 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Waiomu-Pohue Maintenance	0.0004450

Local Protection Works – Waiomu- Pohue Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$3,783 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Waiomu-Pohue Capital Indirect	0.0000603

Local Protection Works – Pohue Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$2,482 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Pohue Capital Channel 1	0.0002344

Local Protection Works – Waiomu Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$9,927 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Waiomu Capital Channel 1	0.0010432
Waiomu Capital Channel 2	0.0005216
Waiomu Capital Channel 3	0.0002608

Local Protection Works – Waiomu Stopbank Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$2,723 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Waiomu Stopbank 1	0.0005269
Waiomu Stopbank 3	0.0000878

Local Protection Works – Graham's Creek

Total Revenue to be raised \$6,486 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Graham's Crk Maintenance 1	0.0002936
Graham's Crk Maintenance 2	0.0000419

Local Protection Works – Tapu

Total Revenue to be raised \$12,973 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Tapu Maintenance	0.0002639

Local Protection Works – Coromandel Township

Total Revenue to be raised \$53,301 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Coromandel Maintenance	0.0001265

Local Protection Works – Coromandel Township Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$17,434 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Coromandel capital indirect	0.0000083
Coromandel capital channel 1	0.0003412
Coromandel capital channel 2	0.0001706
Coromandel capital channel 3	0.0000853

Local Protection Works – Whangamata Harbour Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$75,105 (GST incl.)

Rated on a per property basis

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Whangamata Harbour Capital	15.85

Local Protection Works – Coromandel Retirement Village

Total Revenue to be raised \$1,125 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Coromandel Retirement Village Maintenance	0.0001247

Local Protection Works – Karaka Stream Capital

Total Revenue to be raised \$8,797 (GST incl.)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Area of benefit (GST incl.)	
Karaka Strm Stopbank capital KL1	0.0006320
Karaka Strm Stopbank capital KL2	0.0003161
Karaka Strm Stopbank capital KL3	0.0001054

v. West Coast Rate

The West Coast rate is levied on a per property and capital value basis.

The scheme consists of two differentials which are applied to the property. These are:

- West Coast Catchment CV basis Differential: This is based on capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.
- West Coast Catchment property basis Differential: This is based on a uniform rate per property.

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 (J) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, 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 (J)

West Coast Catchment Differential – CV basis

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$145,571 (GST incl.) and is based on the capital value of all properties within the catchment boundary.

A West Coast Catchment CV basis differential of \$0.0000347 dollar per dollar (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 on the capital value of every rating unit within the West Coast zone area.

West Coast Catchment Differential – Per Property basis

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$145,571 (GST incl.) and is based on a uniform charge on every property within the catchment boundary.

A West coast Catchment property basis differential of \$21.63 dollars per rating unit (GST incl.), for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 on a uniform basis on every rating unit within the West Coast zone area.

vi. Protecting Lake Taupo Rate

The purpose of this rate is to fund the cost of work required to be funded by the Regional Council for the Protecting Lake Taupo project. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$3,164,579 (GST incl.).

THAT pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purpose of funding the Protecting Lake Taupo project, hereby sets a targeted rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (K) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, on every rating unit within the Waikato region.

Schedule (K)

Classification	Dollar per dollar (GST incl.)	
Forestry	\$12.09	on every rating unit within Taupo Management Zone ¹⁵ with VNZ category code of "forestry"
Protecting Lake Taupo	\$16.78	On every rating unit in Waikato region excluding those with forestry differential

¹⁵ Waikato River Catchment Services, "Project Watershed". Level of Service and Funding Policy, June 2002. Docs #752002.

vii. Biosecurity Rate

The purpose of this rate is to fund the Biosecurity and Bio Diversity functions, works or services in section 3.2 "Objectives and Policies" of the Regional Pest Management Strategy 2007-2012.

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$6,374,574 (GST incl.).

THAT pursuant to Section 13(2)(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 (L) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, on the capital value of every rating unit within the Waikato region.

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.

For the reasons contained in Council's Annual Plan for 2011-2012, Revenue and Financing Policy 2009-2019, and Funding Impact Statement 2011.

Schedule (L)

Local Authority	Dollar per dollar capital value (GST incl.)
Waikato	0.0000530
Waikato – FDC	0.0000586
Hamilton	0.0000604
Thames-Coromandel	0.0000597
Hauraki	0.0000554
Matamata-Piako	0.0000586
Waipa	0.0000539
Otorohanga	0.0000606
Waitomo	0.0000577
Taupo	0.0000609
South Waikato	0.0000582
Rotorua	0.0000465

viii. Animal Health Board Rate

The purpose of this rate is to fund the region's contribution of 10 per cent to the Waikato region Bovine Tb programme of the Animal Health Board.

The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$885,500 (GST incl.).

THAT pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, for the purpose of funding the Animal Health Board Bovine Tb programme, hereby sets a targeted rate on a differential basis as set out in Schedule (M) for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012, on each rating unit of two hectares or greater, within the Waikato Region.

Schedule (M)

Rated on Capital Value – Rates made on Dollar per dollar

Classification	Dollar per dollar (GST incl.)
Livestock	0.0000229
Non-livestock	0.0000156

ix. Hamilton City Urban Passenger Transport Rate

The purpose of this rate is to fund part of the cost of the Hamilton City urban passenger transport service by a works and services rate on Hamilton City. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$8,291,486 (GST incl.).

THAT pursuant to Section 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Waikato Regional Council, hereby sets a targeted Hamilton City Urban Passenger Transport rate for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 of \$0.000385009 per dollar (GST incl.) on the capital value of every rating unit within Hamilton City, other than those properties shown on the valuation roll as being used for rural purposes.

d) TARGETED RATES ON A UNIFORM BASIS

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

The purpose of this rate is to fund the cost of work associated with protecting natural heritage areas in the Waikato Region. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,082,806 (GST incl.).

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 2011 to 30 June 2012 on a uniform basis of \$5.73 (GST incl.) on each rating unit within the Waikato Region.

ii. Permitted Activity Monitoring Rate

The purpose of this rate is to fund the cost of work associated with monitoring compliance with activities permitted under the Waikato Regional Plan. The amount required to be collected in accordance with the Annual Plan 2011-2012 is \$1,131,602 (GST incl.).

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 2011 to 30 June 2012 on a uniform basis of \$42.74 (GST incl.) on each rating unit of two hectares or greater, within the Waikato Region.

DUE DATES FOR PAYMENT OF RATES

THAT a single invoice be sent in September 2011 with payment due 31 October 2011.

PENALTIES

THAT pursuant to Sections 57 and 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, those rates not paid by 30 June 2011 will attract a penalty of 10 percent to the extent of non payment on 6 July 2011, and those 2011/12 rates not paid by 31 October 2011 will attract a penalty of 10 percent to the extent of non payment on 1 November 2011.

FINANCIAL CHARGES ON POSTPONED RATES

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% above the average 90 day bill rate on the outstanding yearly balance including interest charges from any previous years.

PAYMENT OF RATES

THAT Council accepts the following payment options:

Cheque

Internet/Phone Banking

Direct Debit/Automatic Payment

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

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/141.1)

Report of Routine Documents Executed Under Seal

(Agenda Item #6.7)

Cr Southgate moved/Cr Burdett seconded.

WRC11/142

THAT the following routine documents executed under the Common Seal for the period 23 May 2011 to 9 June 2011 be received for information.

Variation No 2 of funding agreement for the Afforestation Grant Scheme (WRC 1739)

Memorandum of Understanding – Student Industry Projects Wintec (WRC 1740)

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/142)

Resolutions to Exclude the Public

(Agenda Item #7)

Cr Burdett moved/Cr Barker seconded.

WRC11/143

THAT in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders NZS 9202:2003 Incorporating Amendment No 1, Appendix A&B (p40/42) and Section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the public be excluded from the following part/s of the meeting:

Item No.	Item Name and general subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution

8.1	Council Minutes – 29 May 2011	Good reason(s) to withhold exist(s) under Section 7	Section 48 (1) (a)
8.2	Minutes - Proposed Waikato Regional Plan: Proposed Variation No 6 – Water Allocation Appeals Hearing Committee – 7 June 2011	Good reason(s) to withhold exist(s) under Section 7, and	Section 48 (1) (a)
		Right of Appeal as per S48 (2) (a) (i)	S48 (1) (d)
8.3	Minutes - Policy and Strategy Committee – 9 June 2011	Good reason(s) to withhold exist(s) under Section 7	Section 48 (1) (a)
		Right of Appeal as per S48 (2) (a) (i)	S48 (1) (d)
8.4	Minutes - Regulatory Committee – 10 June 2011	Good reason(s) to withhold exist(s) under Section 7	Section 48 (1) (a)
		Conclusive reason(s) to withhold exist(s) under Section 6	Section 48 (1) (a)
8.5	Minutes - Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee – 23 June 2011	Good reason(s) to withhold exist(s) under Section 7	Section 48 (1) (a)

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 No	Reason/s for withholding official information	Section/s
8.4	Maintenance of the law and right to a fair trial	S6 (a)
8.1, 8.4	Protection of privacy of natural persons	S7 (a)
8.1,8.5	Prejudice commercial position	S7 (b) (ii)
8.1,8.2, 8.3,	Conduct of negotiations	S7 (i)
8.2, 8.3, 8.4	Maintain legal professional privilege	S7 (g)
8.2, 8.3	Right of Appeal	S48 (2) (a) (i)
8.1	Protect confidential information	S7 (c) (i)

The motion was put and carried (WRC11/143)

Return to Open Meeting 12.35pm

Meeting closed 12.35pm

Chairman