

Council

Open Agenda



Notice is hereby given that an ordinary meeting of Matamata-Piako District Council will be held on:

Date: Wednesday 12 April 2017
Time: 9:15am
Venue: Council Chambers
35 Kenrick Street
TE AROHA

Membership

Mayor

Jan Barnes, JP

Councillors

Donna Arnold
Teena Cornes
Paul Cronin
Neil Goodger
Brian Hunter
Peter Jager

James Sainsbury
Ash Tanner
Kevin Tappin
James Thomas, JP
Adrienne Wilcock

Phone: 07-884-0060
Address: PO Box 266, Te Aroha 3342
Email: chubbard@mpdc.govt.nz
Website: www.mpdc.govt.nz



ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
PROCEDURAL		
1	Meeting Opening	5
2	Apologies	5
3	Leave of Absence	5
4	Notification of Urgent Additional Business	5
5	Declarations of Interest	5
6	Confirmation of minutes	5
7	Matters Arising	5
8	Announcements	6
9	Notices of Motion	6
DECISION MAKING		
10	Executive	
	10.1 Local Alcohol Policy - bringing into force	7
11	Business Support	
	11.1 Long Term Plan 2018-28 - Project Update Vision, Outcomes and Strategic Priorities	9
	11.2 Former Ngarua Hall	17
	11.3 Request For Special Assessment For Stormwater at 23 Rockford Street, Matamata	23
	11.4 Celebrating 20 years of ISO 9001 Certification	29
	11.5 Peakedale Estate Developer Agreement	31
	11.6 Treasury Policy Review	33
12	Community Development	
	12.1 Community Grants 2016/17	35
13	Service Delivery	
	13.1 Waitoa Hall	39
	13.2 Waikato Plan - Minutes & Council submission	43
	13.3 Meetings Attended by Elected Members	49
	13.4 Documents Executed Under Seal	51
	13.5 Mayoral Diary For March 2017	53
INFORMATION ONLY		
14	Urgent Additional Business	
PUBLIC EXCLUDED		

15	Procedural motion to exclude the public	55
C1	Chief Executive Officer Recruitment	

1 Meeting Opening

2 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3 Leave of absence

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

4 Urgent Additional Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

- (a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
- (b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-
 - (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
 - (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

- (a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-
 - (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
 - (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

5 Declaration of interest

Members are reminded of their obligation to declare any conflicts of interest they might have in respect of the items on this Agenda.

6 Confirmation of minutes

Minutes, as circulated, of the Ordinary Meeting of Matamata-Piako District Council, held on 8 March 2017

7 Matters Arising

8 Announcements

9 Notices of Motion

Local Alcohol Policy - bringing into force

Trim No.: 1866470

Executive Summary

At its meeting on 8 March 2017 Council resolved to advertise and have its Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) in place on the 22 March followed by 22 June for the maximum trading hours. The first advertisement was published on 15 March and the second advertisement was to be in the local newspapers on the 22 March 2017. Unfortunately due to an administrative error the second advert didn't meet the publishing deadline and this technical error means that the proposed date for the LAP to come into effect is not valid.

Council now needs to alter the dates for the policy to come into force. It is suggested the LAP comes into force on 26 April except for the maximum trading hours which would apply from 26 July 2017.

Recommendation

That:

1. **The information be received.**
2. **Council revokes resolutions 2, 3 and 4 from item 10.1 'Local Alcohol Policy – bringing into force' made at the 8 March 2017 Council meeting.**
3. **Council resolves to bring into force the adopted Local Alcohol Policy:**
 - a) **On 26 April 2017 with the exceptions of clauses 3.6, 4.6, 5.5 and 6.3.**
 - b) **Clauses 3.6, 4.6, 5.5 and 6.3 (maximum trading hours) on 26 July 2017.**

Content

Background

Council worked through a process of consultation and appeals on the LAP. A copy of the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) final LAP decision is attached. The ALRA decision means the LAP is adopted. After it is adopted, a LAP has no effect until it is brought into force. A copy final LAP is also attached to this report.

Maximum trading hours cannot come into effect until at least 3 months after the day public notice of the LAP's adoption was given. The rest of the LAP can come into force, after giving public notice, on the day set by Council resolution.

At its meeting on 8 March Council resolved have the policy in place on the 22 March followed by trading hours on 22 June 2017. The first advertisement was published on 15 March and the second advertisement was to be in the local newspapers on the 22 March 2017. Unfortunately due to an administrative error the second advert didn't meet the publishing deadline and this technical error means that the proposed date for the policy to come into effect is not valid. The need for two public notices prior to the date the policy is proposed to come into force is specifically identified in the legislation.

Options and Risks Considered

The risks, options and analysis were covered in the 8 March 2017 Council agenda.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

Council has worked through a process of consultation and appeals on the LAP. It will mean the LAP will not take effect as early as planned so it would have no effect on licence applications until 26 April 2017. Staff are not aware of any applications that this would affect.

Staff will write to all interest groups to advise them of the new dates for the LAP coming into force so there is no confusion.

Timeframes

The revised timeframes for the LAP to come into force are as follows:

Task	Timeframe (2017)
Council meeting to resolve to bring the LAP into force on 26 April and 26 July	12 April
Public notices issued – Piako Post and Matamata Chronicle	19 April and 26 April
LAP takes effect (except for maximum trading hours)	26 April
Maximum trading hours take effect	26 July

Financial Impact

The LAP development is funded by the Strategies and Plans budget and the effect of the error is minimal.

Attachments

- A. ARLA Final decision
- B. Local Alcohol Policy

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Policy Planner	
Approved by	Michelle Staines-Hawthorne Corporate Strategy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Long Term Plan 2018-28 - Project Update Vision, Outcomes and Strategic Priorities

Trim No.: 1867481

Item 11.1

Executive Summary

Council is required to prepare and adopt a Long Term Plan under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) every three years. This report provides an overview of the Long Term Plan 2018-28 project to date, and seeks Council's confirmation of its new vision, outcomes and strategic priorities.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.
2. Council confirms its new vision;
Matamata-Piako – The Place of Choice.
Lifestyle • Opportunities • Home
3. Council confirms its new outcome themes and outcomes as set out in Table 2 of this report, subject to considering feedback from Te Manawhenua Forum.
4. Staff commence preparation of the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-28, including the draft Financial Strategy and draft Infrastructure Strategy, based on Council's new vision and outcomes, with a focus on Council's strategic priorities as set out in Table 2 of this report.
5. Staff provide further papers on the use of SUIPs (Separately Used and Inhabited Portions), the UAGC (Uniform Annual General Charge), and the method of provision of rubbish bags for further consideration by Council.

Content

Background

Council is required to prepare and adopt a Long Term Plan under the LGA. The Long Term Plan sets out the activities, budgets, financial strategy and key financial policies of the Council for the next 10 years. The Long Term Plan is required to be updated every three years, with the last Long Term Plan being approved in 2015.

Project timeline/approach

The timeline for the project centres on key dates for completion of the draft documents in December 2017, auditing in January / February 2018 and consultation in March / April 2018. A high level timeline is set out below:

Table 1 – Project Timeline

Description	Start	Finish
Demographic/Growth/Economic/Assumptions	Feb 2017	May 2017
Revaluation of Assets	Jan 2017	June 2017
Community Outcomes Review (if required)	March 2017	June 2017
Rates Structure/Financial Strategy	April 2017	June 2017 - June 2018
Activity Plans (including budgets)	April 2017	Aug/Sep 2017
Right Debate (pre-consultation)	April 2017	Aug 2017
Infrastructure and Financial Strategy	April 2017	Oct 2017
Asset Management Plan's	Feb 2017	Oct 2017
Policy Review	April 2017	Oct 2017
Council controlled organisation section	July 2017	Nov 2017
Maori participation in decision making	July 2017	Oct 2017
Budgets/ Financials/ Notes	July 2017	Dec 2017
Document development	July 2017	Dec 2017
Quality checks and administration	July 2017	Dec 2017
Communications Strategy	July 2017	Dec 2017
External Audit Process	Jan 2017	June 2017
Special Consultative Procedure	Jan 2018	June 2018

The overall project is considered to be on track.

Following discussions with Council and with other Council teams the Long Term Plan timeframes may change slightly. Things also change throughout the project itself and timeline are adjusted accordingly where possible.

The following project steps have so far been completed:

- Initial discussion with Council on overall project and risks, community outcomes, Council vision, right debate (pre-consultation) and elected member engagement, growth projections and etc.
- Project team meetings, including agreement on budget setting timeframes for internal departments
- Update to the risk register to take into consideration the community facilities asset management database issues.
- Workshops to discuss and agree on new vision, outcomes and strategic priorities have been completed.
- Initial workshop discussions with Council on Financial Strategy.
- Initial workshop discussions with Council on Infrastructure Strategy.

Achievements to date

The key achievements are expanded upon below:

1. Community outcomes / vision

Council has directed that it wishes to review the community outcomes which are the outcomes Council seeks for its community (required by legislation). These outcomes must be disclosed in the Long-Term Plan. Council has also sought a review of its vision statement. An external facilitator (Bruce Nicholson, Morrison Low & Associates) has been engaged to facilitate a workshop on 22 February and 15 March to review the existing community outcomes and vision to assess whether they are still relevant to the community need, whether they match with their areas of focus and aspirations, and to discuss and agree upon the way forward. The new vision,

outcome themes, outcomes and strategic priorities as agreed at the workshop is outlined in Table 2.

The review of the community outcomes and vision statement are important steps in the strategic direction setting for the LTP. However it is also acknowledged that the development of the strategic priorities will be an iterative process, and these may evolve as Council work through the detailed planning for the LTP.

As part of the previous outcome development these were discussed with the Te Manawhenua Forum members, it is suggested that occurs again in the coming months.

Table 2 – Vision, Outcomes and Strategic Priorities 2018-28

Matamata-Piako – The Place of Choice Lifestyle. Opportunities. Home.				
Enabling...				
Connected Infrastructure	Economic Opportunities	Healthy Communities	Environmental Sustainability	Vibrant Cultural Values
Infrastructure and services are fit for purpose and affordable, now and in the future.	We are a business friendly Council.	Our community is safe, healthy and connected.	We support environmentally friendly practices and technologies.	We promote and protect our arts, culture, historic, and natural resources.
Quality infrastructure is provided to support community wellbeing.	Our future planning enables sustainable growth in our district	We encourage the use and development of our facilities.	Development occurs in a sustainable and respectful manner considering kawa/protocol and tikanga/customs.	We value and encourage strong relationships with iwi and other cultures, recognising waahi tapu and taonga/significant and treasured sites and whakapapa/ancestral heritage.
We have positive partnerships with external providers of infrastructure to our communities.	We provide leadership and advocacy is provided to enable our communities to grow.	We encourage community engagement and provide sound and visionary decision making.	We engage with our regional and national partners to ensure positive environmental outcomes for our community.	Tangata Whenua with Manawhenua status (those with authority over the land under Maaori lore) have meaningful involvement in decision making.
Strategic Priorities – What’s most important?				
<i>We have identified some strategic priorities for Council to focus on first; these will be reviewed each year:</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Planning for and providing affordable infrastructure that is not a limiting factor in our district’s growth.</i> • <i>Developing and implementing an economic strategy that encourages and supports economic</i> 				

growth in our district.

- *Reviewing the provision and suitability of sporting and recreational facilities in the district.*
- *Supporting environmentally friendly practices and technologies.*
- *Building relationships with Iwi and other groups within our community that represent our cultural diversity.*
- *Advocating for services on behalf of our communities.*

2. Financial Strategy

Bruce Robertson from Morrison Low & Associates facilitated the first workshop on the Financial Strategy and Revenue and Financing Policy on Wednesday 29 March. The workshop provided an overview of what a Financial Strategy is and its purpose and legislative requirements. Elected members discussed their financial aspirations for council for the next ten years and priority work required to achieve this. This was followed by a second workshop 5 April, when elected members agreed on the strategic direction for the draft Financial Strategy 2018-28.

It is acknowledged that the development of the Financial Strategy and its priorities will be an iterative process, and strategic priorities may change as Council work through the detailed planning for the LTP.

Elected members agreed, for the purposes of initiating discussion on its fiscal limits, on the following strategic statements for the financial strategy:

- We will aim to improve our current levels of service
- We will smooth out costs over time – prioritising our work and providing certainty to ratepayers
- We will invest in new assets – civic, cultural and recreational
- We will borrow for new assets
- Debt will not control us – keeping ‘head room’ for unforeseen circumstances
- We will leverage alternative/external funding opportunities to maximise return to our ratepayers and community.

For the purposes of framing the Long Term Plan discussion the draft rates increase will be no more than 4%, including inflation (set as the Local Government Cost Index) currently forecast at 2.5%.

3. Funding Policy and Rating Structure

In terms of the current revenue and funding policy and rating structure the Council has identified the investigation of SUIPs (Separately Used and Inhabited Portions), the UAGC (Uniform Annual General Charge), and the method of provision of rubbish bags as potential areas for review that it wishes to have further information on.

4. Infrastructure Strategy

Bruce Nicholson from Morrison Low & Associates facilitated the first workshop on the Infrastructure Strategy. The workshop provided an overview of what an Infrastructure Strategy is and its purpose and legislative requirements. Elected members discussed their aspirations for council with regards to its infrastructure management for the next 30 years and priority work required to achieve this.

It is acknowledged that the development of the Infrastructure Strategy and its priorities will be an iterative process, and strategic priorities may change as Council work through the detailed planning for the LTP. Elected members agreed on the following strategic issues to be considered and potentially addressed through the Infrastructure Strategy:

- Seal extensions
- Factory Road, Waharoa
- Matamata Bypass
- Plan Change 47 capital projects
- Bridge upgrades
- Footpaths – improvements to levels of service
- Waharoa water supply
- Waharoa wastewater service
- Discharge to land of wastewater
- Waitoa village water and wastewater services
- Watercourses/stormwater issues service
- Earthquake prone buildings
- Asbestos containing buildings
- Headon Stadium
- Pool facilities in the district
- EPH review
- The Te Aroha Offices Library and KVS depot
- Cemeteries in Te Aroha and Morrinsville
- Non-essential buildings, halls, sports club buildings
- Streetscape depreciation
- Cycle ways

Both workshops regarding Financial Strategy and Infrastructure Strategy emphasised the need for the two strategies to be aligned and developed in conjunction with each other.

Upcoming milestones

Demographic projections

Council has commissioned Rationale consultants to update the population projections. The Final report is expected in April, and a presentation will be given to Council at its COC meeting 26 April to adopt the projections as part of the LTP forecasting assumptions.

Rating

Staff will bring back further work on SUIPs and other funding/rating policy issues to the 19 April Council workshop for discussion.

Capital programme

Staff will shortly begin discussion on the new capital programme for the long term plan, some of which will interlink with the issues identified above in the initial discussions on the infrastructure strategy.

Right Debate

As part of the LTP project Council normally completes a pre-consultation with the community on key issues. The issues to be included in the pre-consultation will be identified through a series of workshops with elected members on the activities council currently provide and levels of service and funding levels required to deliver these services. The communication plan and advertisement for the Right Debate will be presented to Council for approval in late May/early June, with consultation running for four weeks from late June.

Council workshops and reports

Workshops have been scheduled on a number of items and Council reports will be prepared to ensure an understanding of the key issues.

Project risks

Risk management involves the identification and assessment, then avoidance, mitigation or elimination of risks. A risk register has been discussed with the Audit and Risk Committee. No new risks have been identified since the last update to Council.

Legal and statutory requirements

Council is required to adopt a Long Term Plan under the Local Government Act 2002.

The LGA Amendment Bill (No 2) may also impact on the Long Term Plan project and Council staff will be monitoring progress of this Bill and considering any impact this may have on the project.

Impact on policy and bylaws

As part of the preparation of the Long Term Plan, Activity and Asset Management Plans will be checked against Council's key strategy and policy documents and wider regional and national documents for strategic fit. The preparation of the Long Term Plan may lead to the review of some Council policy documents.

Impact on significance policy

The Long Term Plan is a significant document; consultation will be undertaken with the community.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

The Long Term Plan is subject to the special consultative process under the LGA. The special consultative process is a structured one month submission process with a hearing for those who have submitted and wish to speak to their submission.

The Long Term Plan project timeline also provides for a 'pre-consultation' process with the community referred to as the Right Debate where Council can ask for feedback on key issues it is considering for the Long Term Plan.

Consent issues

There are no consent issues.

Timeframes

The Long Term Plan must be adopted prior to 1 July 2018.

It is important to ensure Councillors have sufficient time to consider and review the community outcomes and vision whilst also ensuring the overall Long-Term Plan project is kept on track. The community outcomes, vision and demographic projections are building blocks to the Long-Term Plan so other work streams are dependent on completion of this work in a timely manner.

Staff will update the Committee as the project progresses.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Policy Planner	
-----------	--------------------------------------	--

	Ann-Jorun Hunter Policy Planner	
Approved by	Michelle Staines-Hawthorne Corporate Strategy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Former Ngarua Hall

Trim No.: 1868622

Executive Summary

The former Ngarua Hall building is located on Crown Land, gazetted as Recreation Reserve in terms of the Reserves Act 1977. Council has held an appointment to 'control and manage' the reserve since 1989. A licence-to-occupy the building expired in 2015. The building has been vacant since the discovery of mould and various maintenance issues late in 2015. The Ministry of Education has confirmed they have no interest in acquiring the property for educational purposes. Council is asked to consider its future interest in the site and whether or not it wishes to continue controlling and managing the reserve.

Recommendation

That:

1. **The report be received;**
2. **Council resolves to relinquish its appointment to control and manage the Recreation Reserve containing the former Ngarua Hall.**

Content

Background

The former Ngarua Hall building is located on Crown Land (Part Section 6 Block VIII MAUNGAKAWA, also known as Ngarua Domain) that is gazetted as Recreation Reserve in terms of the Reserves Act 1977. Council has held an appointment to 'control and manage' the reserve since 1989.

For financial purposes, the former hall building on the land is regarded as a Council asset. It was used as a community hall until the end of 2004 and was formally decommissioned in 2007. Records suggest that Council considered relinquishing control and management of the reserve in 2005. Submissions on the future of the hall were sought as part of the 2007/2008 Annual Plan process. Submitters were subsequently advised that Council had resolved that "...the decision regarding halls be delayed due to further investigation into the matter being undertaken by Council".

Records indicate that on 10 October 2007 Council resolved to: "Have the Ngarua Hall advertised for tender for removal and proceedings begin to revoke the reserve status of the Crown Owned Land under the Reserves Act 1977" [sic.]. It is not clear from the records at hand whether the tender proceeded. Control of the land was retained.

In 2010 a licence-to-occupy the building was granted to Nou Te Rorou Trust, a charitable trust associated with Te Wharekura o Te Rau Aroha. The licence-to-occupy expired in April 2015.

The school approached staff in 2015 with an interest in securing tenure of the site in order to develop it for school-related purposes.

As it is located on Crown Land, an initial meeting between representatives of the school, the Ministry of Education (MoE), Department of Conservation (DOC) and Council was held at the

school on 2 September 2015 to discuss the school's needs and to explore various options to meet those needs including potential options for the reserve and hall building. Discussions included the possibility of an interdepartmental transfer of the land from DOC to MoE should it be required for educational purposes.

This meeting was followed by an impromptu site visit to the hall. During the visit, it was observed that mould was observed to be growing in several parts of the building, several electrical outlets had handwritten notices indicating that they did not work, and several fire escape doors did not appear to work properly either. Staff arranged for mould samples to be taken for analysis and requested that the school refrain from using the hall until the results of the testing were available. Mould test results confirmed that several types of mould were present within the building, some having the potential to produce toxins.

The school was informed that for health and safety reasons the building is not to be used and notices were affixed to the building to that effect.

The Ministry of Education has since confirmed that they have no interest in acquiring the land and building for educational purposes.

The building remains vacant and Council has received a few unsolicited expressions of interest in potentially leasing or purchasing the land and building. None of the expressions of interest indicated what they might be willing to pay in rent or to purchase. As Council does not own the land it does not have the ability to sell the land.

The full extent of the mould contamination is unknown.

No strategic purpose has been identified for the building or the land.

Council may wish to consider relinquishing its appointment under the Reserves Act to 'control and manage' the land. Control of the land would then revert to the Department of Conservation and if DOC has no wish to retain the land it may be disposed of via the Crown Land disposal process.

As the land is Crown Land and Council merely holds an appointment to control and manage Council does not have the authority to dispose of the land nor would it be entitled to any proceeds from the disposal.

Issues

Health and Safety

The mould inside the building poses a potential health hazard. The full extent of the mould contamination is unknown. It is likely that more in-depth sampling would be required in order to be able to classify the building as a Dangerous or Insanitary Building in terms of the Building Act 2004. The initial test results were however sufficient cause for Council to act in its capacity as landlord and stop any further use of the building.

Earthquake-prone building regulations

In order to adequately assess and treat the mould infestation building work is likely to be required. Any potential upgrade to the building would need to comply with the Building Act requirements in terms of seismic upgrading. An earthquake-prone building assessment indicated that the building meets 37% of New Building Standard (NBS) which means that it is technically not regarded as Earthquake-Prone because it exceeds 34% NBS. Depending on the intended use of the building earthquake strengthening may be required. The threshold for buildings that are to be used for educational purposes for example is 67% of NBS.

Strategic Context

No strategic purpose has been identified for the building or the land.

The classification of the under the Reserves Act, as a Recreation Reserve, and the most recent use of the building were to some extent anomalous.

The property has limited development potential as a Recreation Reserve. The former hall building occupies a significant proportion of the site. From aerial photographs it appears that the former tennis courts might be encroaching on the State Highway corridor.

There is no specific reserve management plan for the reserve and no strategic purpose was identified for it in the Open Spaces Strategy 2013.

Ownership issues

The building is located on Crown Land that is gazetted as Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Council holds an appointment to 'control and manage' the reserve. If Council were to relinquish its appointment to control and manage the land would revert to the control of the Department of Conservation. The Department would then need to decide whether or not they regard the land as surplus and if so initiate the Crown Land disposal process.

The building is regarded as a Council asset with a book value of \$127,000.

Analysis

Options considered

- A. To relinquish Council's appointment to 'control and manage'.
- B. To do nothing.
- C. To renovate and reinstate the building.

Option A may be the most cost-effective. It could however potentially be perceived by the public as 'passing the buck to DOC' and might impact upon Council's relationship with the Department of Conservation. Initial discussions between Council and DOC staff indicated that this is by no means a unique situation. Council may wish to consider whether to demolish or remove the building prior to relinquishing control of the reserve however there is no legal requirement to do so. Demolition costs are likely to be \$20,000 to \$30,000. While the community hall was decommissioned more than ten years ago, there may also potentially still be some community interest in it.

Option B may not require any significant expenditure in the short-term however as the building continues to deteriorate Council is likely to be faced with either demolition costs or renovation costs sooner or later. Demolition costs are estimated to be \$20,000 to \$30,000. Some operational and maintenance costs would continue in the interim.

Option C is likely to be the most expensive option. The full extent of repairs and maintenance required to bring the building up to standard is currently unknown. Comprehensive structural investigations are likely to cost in excess of \$10,000. Renovation costs would depend on the range and scale of remedial work required. It is difficult to assess the true market interest in the current building (e.g. potential rental income if it were restored) and whether there is likely to be any return on investment should Council choose to renovate the building.

Analysis of preferred option

Option A is the preferred option.

Council has no strategic use for the property to achieve or improve our levels of service and therefore there is no reason to retain control and management of the land.

Option A is likely to be the most cost-effective option for Council long term.

Legal and statutory requirements

Council holds an appointment to 'control and manage' the reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

If Council were to relinquish its appointment to control and manage, the land would revert to the control of the Department of Conservation. The Department would then need to decide whether or not they regard the land as surplus and, if so, initiate the Crown Land disposal process.

It does not appear that Council has any statutory obligations regarding improvements on the land. As there does not appear to have been any formal arrangement for the improvements being reserved to the former Domain Board or its successors, the Crown is considered to have title to the improvements.

Impact on policy and bylaws

None.

Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan

No specific projects affecting the land or building were identified in the Long Term Plan or Annual Plan.

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

The building is not identified as significant in terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2014. Council is therefore not obliged to consult on the future of the building and land however Council may choose to do so. Council merely 'controls and manages' the Reserve (it is not vested in Council) and therefore any consultation would be limited to whether or not to retain control and management over it. If control were relinquished it would ultimately be up to the Crown to decide the future of the land and building on it.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

While there is no legal requirement for consultation, Council may wish to consider consulting the community on whether or not to retain control and management of the reserve. There may potentially be some community interest in it as a former community hall site. When consulted on as part of the 2006/7 Annual Plan there were however only three submissions regarding the hall.

Consent issues

Any building work on the site requiring Building Consent would also require Resource Consent under the District Plan.

Timeframes

None.

Contribution to Community Outcomes

- 3a) Council's reserves and facilities will be safe, well maintained and accessible to encourage people to use them;
- 3b) People will be well informed of the districts resources, equipment, and facilities.

Financial Impact

i. Cost

Option A would mainly involve staff time in drafting a letter to the Department of Conservation, attaching a copy of the Resolution to relinquish control and management of the reserve, and copies of any relevant information about the land held by Council. The rest of the process would be handed by DOC.

ii. Funding Source

No specific funding source has been identified for any of the options. Option A could be met from existing budgets. Council would need to identify funding for Options B & C.

Attachments

- A. Attachment 1 - Former Ngarua Hall Land
- B. Attachment 2 - Timeline Ngarua Domain & Ngarua Hall

Signatories

Author(s)	Mark Naude Parks and Facilities Planner	
Approved by	Susanne Kampshof Asset Manager Strategy and Policy	
	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	

Request For Special Assessment For Stormwater at 23 Rockford Street, Matamata

Trim No.: 1870875

Executive Summary

Development contributions are a charge imposed on a developer by a council to recover some of the capital costs incurred by a council when providing infrastructure services for the development. This report seeks a decision from Council whether it wishes to enter a special assessment process with the applicant (GA & RA Diprose) to waive or reduce the amount of Stormwater Development Contributions payable on the construction of a new workshop and office on a new industrial property in Matamata. The gross floor area of the commercial building is 994m².

Under the 2015-25 policy Council can make the decision as to whether a special assessment be undertaken for specific developments or whether the DC be upheld and the applicant can proceed with a reconsideration and/or objection process.

Council made the resolution on the 8 February 2017 to uphold the water and waste contribution for the building consents and it was requested that the Stormwater be brought back to Council for consideration with further information.

Recommendation

That:

1. Council received the report and;
2. Council determine whether to enter into a special assessment with GA & RA Diprose to waiver or reduce the Stormwater Development Contributions for the proposal to add a new workshop and office at 23 Rockford Street in Matamata.

Content

Background

GA & RA Diprose have obtained a building consent for the construction of a new 994m² building, the main area is used as a workshop used for machinery, manufacturing and assembly, the remaining area is an office space/toilets/staffroom/showroom.

The purpose of development contributions is to recover the costs of growth related capital expenditures (e.g. roads, water, wastewater etc) from participants in the property development process, rather than from general rates or any other indirect funding source. In accordance with Council's Development Contributions Policy (Policy) the building consent application for the Development has triggered an assessment for Stormwater development contributions (DC). Stormwater DCs for the Development have been assessed as following (inclusive of GST).

Development Contributions – LTP 2015-25					
Activity	Total m ²	Credit m ²	Extra m ²	Value	Total incl. GST
Stormwater	1754.7	250	1504.7	\$635.67	\$9,564.92
Total to be paid	GST inclusive				\$9,564.92

Issues

The current policy allows for a reconsideration and objection process for Development Contributions but it is requested that Council consider this development as a special assessment under 7.6.2 under the policy. The reason for this being that it has the potential to lie outside the standard Household Equivalent unit (HEU) development requirement. This is also based on previous Council decisions for objections before the policy changed and made this an independent process.

Rule 7.6.2

Special assessment

Our policy on development contributions is based on the average infrastructure demands of a wide range of residential and non-residential developments. However, there may be instances where a development does not readily fit within the specified development categories, or where the infrastructure demands created by the development differ significantly from the averages upon which the policy is based. In these circumstances, we may undertake a special assessment at our sole discretion.

A decision on whether a special assessment will be undertaken will be made by Council at the application stage, once details of the development are known. Applicant will be expected to provide supporting information and detailed calculations of the likely demand for roading, water, wastewater and stormwater associated with the development. This information will be used to calculate the number of Household Equivalent Units for each activity for which the development will be liable.

Stormwater

Council has not yet received an application for a special assessment for stormwater. The general Rule around Development Contributions applicable are based on whether there is any stormwater discharge that will enter council systems.

Examples:

Subdivision	SW DC's charged	Reason
Transland, Morrinsville Residential	DC's applicable at time of initial subdivision. Network contributions applicable at time of building consent for SW -	Enters into retention pond. Then into Council Drain.
Young Street, Morrinsville Residential	DC's applicable at time of initial subdivision. Network contributions applicable at time of building consent for SW -	Enters into limited soakage/retention. Then into Council Drain
Waharoa industrial, Dunlop Road, Waharoa Industrial	DC's applicable at time of initial subdivision. No SW DC as part of building consents for industrial area.	Enters into retention pond. Then into Private Drain to stream.
Matamata Industrial, Rockford Street, Matamata	DC's applicable at time of initial subdivision.	Enters into retention pond. Then into Council System.

Industrial		
Sunridge Park Subdivision, Hangawera Road , Morrinsville Residential	No DC's applicable at time of initial consent. No Network contributions applicable	Enters into retention pond. Then into Council Drain
Banks Road subdivision, Matamata Residential	No DC's applicable through Developer Agreement. Network contributions applicable for SW	Soakage system on site which is all retained on site.
Building consents		
Grainstore at Dunlop Road, Waharoa (part of Waharoa industrial subdivision)	No	Enters into retention pond. Then into Private Drain to stream.
28 Rockford Street, Matamata Industrial = ISA 300m2	Yes but not paid yet \$1843.44	Some retention on-site. Into developer retention pond with a restricted outlet into council system to stream.
17 Rockford Street, Matamata Industrial = ISA 9788m2 (some gravel)	Yes but not paid yet \$9297.09	Some retention on-site. Into developer retention pond with a restricted outlet into council system to stream.
2 Curragh Place, Matamata Industrial = ISA 6308m2	Yes but not paid yet \$10,024.42	Some retention on-site. Into developer retention pond with a restricted outlet into council system to stream.
Banks Road subdivision, Matamata Residential	No DC's applicable through Developer Agreement. Network contributions applicable for SW	Soakage system on site which is all retained on site.

Analysis

Options considered

1. Apply a special assessment to the development under Rule 7.6.2 in the policy which waivers or reduces the development contributions required on the development; or
2. Uphold the Development contributions and advise the applicant they can proceed with the reconsideration or objection process if they wish to pursue this matter further.

With respect to option 2, people who have concerns about the development contributions they are being charged have two avenues through which they can seek to have their concerns addressed:

- a) *a reconsideration process whereby the person can formally request Council to reassess a development contribution because the person believes an error has been made or information that needed to be considered was incomplete; and*
- b) *a development contribution objection process whereby a person, regardless of whether or not they had sought a reconsideration, can formally object to a development contribution charge and have*

their objection considered by a commissioner selected from a register of independent commissioners appointed by the Minister of Local Government. The commissioners will have the power to make binding recommendations that the development contribution be quashed or amended, or may dismiss the objection.

Previous Decisions

Stormwater

Council has not received any previous requests for special assessments for stormwater.

Council's plans and rules generally do not allow any new building or subdivision to discharge stormwater into Council systems without a restriction in place or retaining a large portion on site. DC's have always been applied when there is any sort of discharge, including restricted discharges, into a Council stormwater system.

Where 100% of soakage is provided on site, there are no stormwater DC's applicable.

This does not apply if there was a detention pond put in place by the original developer with no impact on any council infrastructure downstream as a result of the discharge.

In this instance, the developer is retaining a portion of the stormwater on site. A retention pond was installed by the developer at the time of the subdivision which caters for the 1 in 100 storm. There is a restricted outlet from the retention pond that enters into Council pipe which takes it to the Mangawhero Road Stream.

Analysis of preferred option

Council should only collect income from DCs where the development has a growth related component; however it should also be mindful that a failure to consistently apply the Policy to growth related costs may result in lower income for growth related projects which will need to be funded by the ratepayer.

It is often difficult to accurately identify growth and the need for new infrastructure when considering individual projects. The demand for new infrastructure is usually the result of the cumulative effects of development. The Policy uses Household Equivalent Units (HEU's), gross floor area and impervious surface area as an indicator of the demand likely to be caused from a development, and refines this through the identification of different uses (residential, commercial etc.). The use of this indicator allows Council to estimate the demand potential of a development regardless of its current use.

Stormwater

The following assessment can be made:

- There is some stormwater retention on-site.
- There is some restricted discharge into a retention pond and then into Council system that takes it to the Mangawhero Road Stream.

Legal and statutory requirements

Council should make a decision that is consistent with the purpose of the Policy and follow the principles of natural justice. Should the Council consider that it requires a hearing to consider the views of GA & RA Diprose that they have the right to a reconsideration process or objection to an independent commissioner.

Impact on policy and bylaws

Council's decision should be consistent with its Development Contributions Policy at the time of building consent. The Policy has been reviewed as part of the 2015-2025 LTP.

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

If Council makes a decision in accordance with the Development Contributions Policy this matter is not considered significant in terms of Council's significance policy.

Background information provided with this report is intended to provide an indication of the potential impact of a decision to waive contributions as part of a special assessment. A decision to waive contributions that brings in to question the basis of past and future assessments may be considered significant.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

The Developer will be advised of Council's decision as per the policy.

Timeframes

In accordance with the Policy, once Council makes the decision on the special assessment and whether any DC's are reduced or waived, the applicant will be advised and issued the DC assessment accordingly.

If Council determines that no special assessment is completed for this development and the DC's are upheld, the applicant will be advised that they can request a reconsideration and/or objection. Once the final DC's are issued, the applicant has 10 working days to request a reconsideration and Council has 15 days to get back to them. For an objection this goes through the independent commissioner process and the applicant is required to lodge this within 15 days.

Attachments

- A. Photo 23 Rockford Place

Signatories

Author(s)	Susanne Kampshof Asset Manager Strategy and Policy	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	
-------------	--	--

Celebrating 20 years of ISO 9001 Certification

Trim No.: 1870228

Executive Summary

10.15 am This year on 16 January 2017 we have been ISO 9001 certified for 20 years. To celebrate we are informing the public and staff by including items in Council in Focus, in both the Piako Post and Matamata Chronicle, on the website, facebook and the staff bulletin. We are also cutting a cake at today's meeting.

Recommendation

That:

1. the information be received

Content

Background

In 1995 the Executive team did some Management papers, including one in Quality Management Systems. They recognised the opportunity to address issues by standardising forms and procedures across the organisation.

We had three offices (Te Aroha, Matamata and Morrinsville) which operated differently and each office had an engineer, building inspector, dog control officer, etc who ran their individual areas. We also had a document management system that everyone used differently.

With the help of staff and consultants the Quality Management System was established in 1996 and gained ISO 9000:2000 certification on 16 January 1997. Surveillance audits were held in June and December each year then nine monthly. We have now been changed to twelve monthly from October 2014 because of our good ongoing track record for continuous improvement. A Triennial Audit is held every three years in December for recertification. We are currently certified to ISO 9001:2008 across all parts of the organisation other than building which is accredited through the IANZ accreditation process.

Our next triennial audit will be in November 2017.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Raewyn Ellison Quality Coordinator	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Dennis Bellamy Group Manager Community Development	
-------------	--	--

Peakedale Estate Developer Agreement

Trim No.: 1871239

Executive Summary

Council is currently looking at developing a developer agreement with Peakedale Estate after receiving a resource consent application.

Details of the options will be tabled at the Council meeting.

Recommendation

That:

1. **Council determine the basis of the developer agreement.**

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Susanne Kampshof Asset Manager Strategy and Policy	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	
-------------	--	--

Treasury Policy Review

Trim No.: 1871021

Executive Summary

The Audit and Risk Committee have reviewed the draft Liability Management and Investment Policies have recommended their adoption to Council.

Recommendation

That:

1. **The draft Liability Management Policy and Investment Policy are adopted as recommended by the Audit and Risk Committee.**

Content

Background

Council's Liability Management and Investment Policies were last reviewed in February 2015. In the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 21 February 2017, the effectiveness of the current policies was reviewed with no issues noted. The Committee recommended that on an annual basis that actual interest costs be compared to a series of benchmarks; the policy mid-point, the 90 floating rate, and the 3 and 5 year rates.

The draft policies have been modified to remove procedural elements from the policy, with those elements being provided as an appendix to the policy. The intent and requirements of the overall policy have not changed significantly. The Audit and Risk Committee recommended that Council now adopt these draft policies.

Analysis

Legal and statutory requirements

Sections 102 (2) (b) & (c) of the Local Government Act 2002 require Council to adopt a liability management policy and an investment policy.

Section 104 requires that the liability management policy adopted must state the local authority's policies in respect of the management of both borrowing and other liabilities, including—

- (a) interest rate exposure; and
- (b) liquidity; and
- (c) credit exposure; and
- (d) debt repayment.

Section 105 requires that the investment policy adopted must state the local authority's policies in respect of investments, including—

- (a) *[Repealed]*

- (b) the mix of investments; and
(c) the acquisition of new investments; and
(d) an outline of the procedures by which investments are managed and reported on to the local authority; and
(e) an outline of how risks associated with investments are assessed and managed.

Impact on policy and bylaws

Proposed amendment to policies is considered minor

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

None

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

Section 102(5) allows for the adoption of the investment and liability management policies without the requirement to use a special consultative procedure.

Attachments

- A. Draft Liability Management Policy Feb 2017
- B. Draft Investment Policy Feb 2017

Signatories

Author(s)	Larnia Weir Deputy Finance Manager	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	
-------------	--	--

Community Grants 2016/17

Trim No.: 1868753

Executive Summary

Council has a Community Grants Policy to administer the \$15,000 contestable grant that was previously administered by the Community Boards.

The second of two funding rounds held each year was open between 8 February and 17 March where Council invited applications to the fund. In total 32 applications were received. Councillors determined the outcome of the applications at their respective ward meetings.

The purpose of this report is to provide information on the final allocations for 2016/17.

Recommendation

That:

1. **The report is received.**
2. **The amount of \$181.09 for Te Aroha Ward Community Grant funding not allocated in 2016/17 be carried forward to their 2017/18 budget.**

Content

Background

Following the disestablishment of the Community Boards, Council adopted the Community Grants Policy (Policy) on 11 June 2014 to guide the administration of the \$15,000 contestable grant.

The \$15,000 contestable fund is shared evenly among the wards and is distributed in two funding rounds held in approximately August and February each financial year. The Policy gives delegated authority to the ward Councillors to determine the outcome of applications received that are relevant to their ward. The results of each application are to be reported back to Council.

The first funding round for the 2016/17 financial year was open for applications between 27 July and 31 August, with the ward Councillors making their decisions in September.

The second funding round for 2016/17 was open for applications 8 February and 17 March, with ward Councillors making their decisions on 29 March,

Issues

In total 32 applications were received throughout the district, with one application split across two wards – 11 from Matamata, 9 from Morrinsville and 13 from Te Aroha.

Summary follows of the applications received, and the funding decisions by the respective ward Councillors.

Matamata Ward	Funding towards	Amount requested	Amount granted	Reason for decline
Red Star Country Music Awards Inc	Help with funding the awards	1150.00	250.00	
Hinuera Playcentre	Renewal of sandpit equipment and toys	1100.00	100.00	
Matamata Playcentre	Refurbishment and renewal of outdoor wooden fort/play structure	2500.00	100.00	
Rotary Club of Matamata Inc	To extend Peria Road Memorial Walkway	2500.00	250.00	
United Matamata Squash Club Inc	Carpet replacement	2500.00	500.00	
Matamata Gymnastics Club	Additional mats	1650.00	500.00	
Matamata Community Vege Garden Project	New hose and connections	200.00	200.00	
Matamata Community Patrol	Hi Viz safety clothing	1000.00	500.00	
Matamata Geriatric Day Care Centre	Catering expenses	350.00	250.00	
Transition Matamata	Plants and maintenance materials	500.00	120.00	
Waikato South IHC	Pool slings, floats, staff training	2985.00	300.00	
Total funding allocated Round 2			\$3,070.00	
Remaining budget after Round 2			\$0.00	

Morrinsville Ward	Funding towards	Amount requested	Amount granted	Reason for decline
Morrinsville Croquet Club Inc	Fridge/freezer purchase	999.00	500.00	
31 Squadron ATC	Hand held radios	1384.00	342.00	
* Piako Gymnastics Club Inc	First aid supplies	450.00	0.00	Incomplete information, no financials.
Morrinsville Bowling Club Inc	Replacement of rink and boundary number standards	964.00	0.00	Insufficient funds available. Apply again in next funding round.
Morrinsville Little Theatre Inc	Microphone purchase	558.00	558.00	
Morrinsville Pickle Ball	Establishment equipment	200.00	200.00	

Morrinsville Community MenzShed Inc	New tools	800.00	400.00	
Morrinsville Rugby Football Union Inc	Replacement of referee showers	2500.00	0.00	Funding already provided, through Long Term Plan.
Morrinsville Care and Craft Society Inc	Advertising, travel, project supplies	250.00	0.00	Received funding from last three rounds.
Total funding allocated Round 2			\$2,000.00	
Remaining budget after Round 2			\$0.00	

Te Aroha Ward	Funding towards	Amount requested	Amount granted	Reason for decline
Te Aroha Fish and Game Association	Building weir at the Howarth Memorial Reserve	493.97	493.97	
Te Aroha Scouts & Cubs	Scouting leadership course	766.00	495.00	
Te Aroha Toy Library	New sensory development toys	355.81	0.00	Funded last time.
Future Te Aroha	Resources for after school activities	841.35	0.00	Funded last time.
Te Aroha Family Budgeting Services Inc.	Rent assistance	1,500.00	0.00	Not eligible.
Te Aroha Dramatic Society	Dressmaker models and ladder	1,000.00	209.00	Limited funding availability.
Mapuna Turner	Support paying for activities for A Day in the Domain	2,100.00	0.00	Application not complete.
Our Village Garden Te Kete o Te Aroha Inc.	Rate payment assistance	149.00	149.00	
Youth Empowerment Service	Funding for YES event	3,000.00	0.00	Lack of funding.
Te Aroha Business Association	Float parade street closure, advertising and stationery	1,500.00	0.00	Application not complete.
Domain Christmas Craft Market	Advertising, insurance and portaloos	1,500.00	0.00	Lack of funding.
* Piako Gymnastics Club Inc	First aid supplies	225.00	0.00	Incomplete information, no financials.
Te Aroha Show Home Industries	Event centre hireage, new wood stands and material	1450.00	0.00	Lack of funding.
Total funding allocated Round 2			\$1,346.97	
Remaining budget after Round 2			\$181.09	

*Piako Gymnastics request is included in both Morrinsville and Te Aroha, amount requested split evenly between both wards.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

The funding round was advertised in the local papers, on our website and an e-newsletter was sent to the Grants and Funding mailing list. All previous applicants were also sent a letter to advise them of the funding round. The funding round was open between 8 February and 17 March. Councillors assessed the applications at ward meetings on 29 March. All applicants were sent letters the following week.

Financial Impact

ii. Funding Source

The \$15,000 fund is an operational grant and is included in the Annual Plan 2016/17 budget.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Vicky Oosthoek Corporate Strategy Administration Officer	
Approved by	Michelle Staines-Hawthorne Corporate Strategy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Waitoa Hall

Trim No.: 1860227

Executive Summary

Waitoa Hall

Waitoa Hall requires extensive structural repairs estimated at approximately sixty seven thousand dollars, the Hall Committee have requested that Council allow the hall to be decommissioned and declare the hall surplus to requirements.

The Waitoa Hall building was built in 1911 and is largely a timber structure. The Hall requires extensive structural repairs and is not considered earthquake prone although it is recommended for strengthening in the future. The hall's roof needs replacing at an estimate cost of Thirty five thousand dollars along with repairs to the exterior, repainting, scaffolding and re-piling bringing the total cost to around just over seventy thousand dollars in total. The replacement of the hall's roof would also require a building consent, earthquake engineering report and a property report. The cost of this is upwards of two thousand dollars and, although Council can arrange for this to be completed, would be at the Hall Committee's cost.

Council currently supports the Hall Committee by allocating targeted rates for the upkeep of the hall. The procedure for a committee requesting Council to assist financially on a large project would be for them to apply for a loan; however the community would have to agree to this option.

The Committee called for a public meeting to be held on the 19th July 2016 to engage with the community and to discuss options for the Hall. Concerns were raised at the meeting regarding the changing dynamics of the community that services the Hall and its declining use.

A letter went out to ratepayers to ask if they were happy to fund a loan for repairs to the hall. If the loan was granted, ratepayers will see an increase to the targeted rate for the hall. The loan would have to be paid in full within a ten year period. The maximum for a loan of this type is thirty thousand dollars and a submission would need the majority of the responders agree to the funding of that loan, for it to be granted. (sixty five to seventy per cent)

This threshold was not reached. Of the submitters that responded only 35 per cent agreed to fund the loan. The committees concern was raising a loan for a building that is seldom used.

The Committee requests that Council allow the hall to be decommissioned and declare the Hall surplus to requirements.

Recommendation

That:

1. Council receive this report
2. Council consider the option to decommission the hall
3. Council consider the options and decide how to proceed with the property.

Content

Background

Hall committees are elected bodies who administer the halls on behalf of targeted ratepayers who fund the hall through their rates. Council owns the hall and the day to day management is done by the committee. Halls are self-funded through the rates and or fund raising activities.

Waitoa Hall Committee met to assess the future of the Waitoa Hall November 30th 2015.

Council supplied a conditional report on the hall, 19th May 2015 at the request of the Committee. The inspection showed several urgent repairs were necessary to be undertaken immediately to ensure the safety of the building. While the Waitoa Hall is not the worst of our buildings, it is showing age as far as interior standards and its need of extensive exterior maintenance to replace rotten timber and for protection from water penetration; it requires a new roof, flashings and fastenings. Repainting and upgrading is also needed to help protect the building and to make it more appealing to hirers. To bring the building up to standard the hall would also need the wiring system replaced and the plumbing upgraded. The Committee acquired quotes to ascertain the possible cost of the necessary repairs and Council undertook to complete immediate repairs that were causing health and safety concerns.

The Committee held a public meeting to present the findings to the community on July 19th 2016. Earthquake Reports, financial statements and the building report were presented and the options discussed. The committee formally requested at this meeting to ask that Council survey the ratepayers.

Council underwent a survey to determine the view of the community August 1st 2016. The ratepayers were asked to consider keeping and upgrading the hall. A letter to ratepayers outlined financial and relevant information so that the ratepayers could make an informed decision on whether to fund a loan for the necessary repairs and keep the Hall or to not raise a loan and risk losing the hall.

The results were compiled and presented to the Hall Committee for consideration. The Committee was unable to identify any solution that would help retain the Hall without a loan and unless considerable fundraising was undertaken by the community.

At a meeting held on October 28th 2016, the Committee requested that the Matamata Piako Council decommission the Waitoa Hall and declare it surplus to requirements.

Issues

The Waitoa Hall building was built in 1911 and is largely a timber structure. The Hall is not considered earthquake prone but is recommended for strengthening in the future. The hall's roof needs replacing at an estimate cost of thirty five thousand dollars along with repairs to the exterior, repainting, scaffolding and re-piling bringing the estimated cost of repairs to around just over sixty seven thousand dollars in total. The replacement of the hall's roof would also require a building consent, earthquake engineering report and a property report.

The land consists of two sections one of which houses a prefab type building that is sublet to the local Red Cross. This building is not owned by Council. It is a transportable prefab type building owned by the community. They open weekly and operate from this site and have done for the last 20 years. Seven to eight volunteer staff from the local community services the community selling used goods to raise funds that are returned to the Red Cross. There is no legal Licence to occupy and the only financial transaction is reimbursement to the Hall for the cost of electricity.

Council currently supports the Hall Committee by allocating targeted rates for the upkeep of the hall. The procedure for a committee requesting Council to assist financially on a large project would be for them to apply for a loan to a maximum of thirty thousand dollars. The raising of a loan would require over sixty five percent of responders agreeing. A loan would have to be paid in full by the targeted ratepayer within a ten year period. With seventy thousand dollars needed, a short fall of forty thousand dollars remains for what is required to bring the Waitoa Hall up to standard.

The Committee called for a public meeting to be held on July 19th 2016 to engage with the community and to discuss options for the Hall. Concerns were raised at the meeting regarding the changing dynamics of the community that services the hall and its declining use.

A survey was sent to targeted ratepayers and residents in August 2016 asking if they wished to fund the repairs to the hall. Of those that responded only thirty five percent agreed to fund a loan.

The Committee has now requested that Council decommission the hall.

Analysis

Options considered

Option 1: Decommission the hall and declare surplus to requirements. Give notice to the Red Cross to find alternate accommodation for the prefab building. A resource consent to develop the property maybe required due to a reserves overlay in the District Plan. This could affect the development of the building.

Option 2: Decommission the hall but retain the property. As the property is a recognised reserve council may choose to remove the hall and decide another use for the land. This option could allow for the Red Cross to remain.

Option 3: Raise a loan to undertake all necessary repairs and retain the building as a Community Hall. This would require funding from a source yet to be determined. Should Council fund the repairs the hall usage may not increase.

Analysis of preferred option

Option one is the preferred option. There is little interest from the community to retain the hall. Should Council decide to retain the land and /or building, there would be on going operational and maintenance costs on a building that is over one hundred years old. There is little evidence that the hall is regularly used.

Legal and statutory requirements

The Waitoa Hall is located on Farmer Road, Waitoa, legally described as Lots 6 and 7 DP 6665 Blk IV Maungakawa SD, being more or less 0.2024 sq. meters in area. The Land held in Fee Simple therefore there is no requirement to first revoke the reserve status in terms of that act. The property is zoned residential in the District Plan, although not gazetted as a reserve in terms of the Reserves Act 1977; the land is however subject to the Reserves overlay in the district Plans maps which may restrict development options for the property. There is however an existing building on the property and certain existing use rights may apply. It is likely that resource consent would be required to develop the property or change its use.

Impact on policy and bylaws

Section 131 of the building act 2004 required all territorial authorities to adopt a policy on earthquake prone, dangerous and insanitary buildings by May 2006. This Council adopted a policy at its meeting on July 12th 2006; the act requires a review of the policy every five years.

Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan

That Council resolve that a decision on whether or not to reduce the hall rate for the Waitoa Hall zone in the 2016/2017 Annual Plan and subsequent annual plans/ Long Term Plans be considered as part of the Annual Plan process.

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

As defined in Section 5 of the local Government Act 2002 Council will notify the outcome of the decision of Council to the residents and targeted ratepayers of Waitoa Hall and its surrounding district.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

Should Council decide not to fund repairs and decommission the Hall, an investigation would be required to take place to determine if Council have an obligation on the land under the Public Works Act.

Financial Impact

i. Cost

No resources have been allocated for the repair of the building. Targeted ratepayers provide for operational costs and there is no allocated capital available.

ii. Funding Source

- The Hall account has a balance of twenty six thousand, nine hundred and four dollars. This is an operational budget funded by targeted rates. If Council wish to raise a loan for repairs, ratepayers will have their rates increased to cover this loan which will have to be paid in full within a ten year period. The maximum for a loan of this type is thirty thousand dollars e.g. a ten year loan of this amount, split between the hall's two hundred and thirty rate payer's works out to a repayment of thirteen dollars and four cents per household per year.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Vicki Black Property Services Officer	
-----------	---	--

Approved by	Dave Locke Team Leader Contracts	
	Fiona Vessey Group Manager Service Delivery	

Waikato Plan - Minutes & Council submission

Trim No.: 1867841

Executive Summary

This report seeks to update Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC) on the Waikato Plan Joint Committee briefing held on 28 September 2016 and Joint Committee meeting on 27 February 2017.

Mayor Barnes is MPDC's appointed representative on the Joint Committee. Councillor Wilcock is the alternate member.

The meeting minutes are attached to the report. The agenda and more information about the Waikato Plan are available on the Waikato Plan website <http://www.waikatoplan.co.nz/Leadership/Agendas-and-minutes/>.

In addition, this report seeks approval for a Council submission to the Waikato Plan. The submission has been previously discussed with Councillors and has been submitted to the Waikato Plan team.

Copies of the draft Waikato Plan and summary have been previously provided to Councillors. A copy of the plan summary is attached to this report.

Recommendation

That:

1. **The information be received.**
2. **The Council submission to the draft Waikato Plan be approved.**

Content

Background

The development of a Waikato Plan has been underway since May 2013. The aim of the Waikato Plan is to take a 'one Waikato' view about the future of the region to enable informed decision making. The primary aim for the plan is: "*We want to build champion communities, together.*"

The Waikato Plan speaks with 'one voice' on our agreed top priorities, so that our messages are consistent and collectively shared. The shared aspirations and enduring relationships strengthened by this Plan will help leverage additional resourcing and funding for the Waikato.

The Plan will also:

- Develop a shared vision and collective voice on the high priority regional and sub-regional issues that will improve the quality of living for people and communities in the Waikato over the next 30 years.
- Provide an important opportunity to identify, negotiate and agree on priorities, actions and funding arrangements across multiple parties including local and central government, the private sector and non-government organisations.

- Provide a shared evidence base from which to make investment and policy decisions that are efficient and effective in a collective way.
- Enable a conversation on enduring governance frameworks required to support the development and implementation of the Waikato Plan and its vision for the region;
- Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of local authorities, central government and communities to address high priority issues.
- Help to rationalise the existing planning and service delivery system for people and communities.

Plan making process

An overview of the plan development process is provided below:

Common Evidence Base Development	2013	The Mayoral Forum approved the development of a Waikato Plan.
	February 2014	The Mayoral Forum adopted a set of headline strengths, challenges and opportunities for the Waikato Plan.
	April 2014	Completion of an extensive evidence base. Technical experts and strategic partners to assist in the development of the Plan agreed.
	June 2014	Invitations released for the development of a joint committee to oversee the development of the Waikato Plan.
	September 2014	The first meeting of the Waikato Plan Joint Committee.
	November 2014	Confirmation of the proposed Waikato Plan scope.
	Early 2015	Evidence base updated.
Stage 1: Project Scope, Priorities & Strategic Direction	June 2015	Headline strengths, challenges and opportunities updated. Three initial priority work areas were agreed by the Joint Committee.
Stage 2: Wider Plan Structure & Agreeing Strategic Direction	September 2015	The first executive summary of the Waikato Plan was produced for Joint Committee approval – this was used to confirm priorities and support.
	November 2015	Joint Committee considers draft strategic direction.
Stage 3: Spatial Plan Development & Adoption of Strategic Direction Doc Parallel Implementation	February 2016	Executive summary document and strategic direction adopted by the Joint Committee as basis for full Plan development.
	February 2016	The Strategic Partners Forum is constituted and also discusses the executive summary and strategic direction, then continues with bi-monthly input into the process.
	February to July 2016	A series of meetings and workshops were held with key implementation partners to agree on plan implementation actions, and who can do what to implement the Plan.
	April 2016	Executive summary document updated and adopted by the Joint Committee.
	June 2016	The Joint Committee was presented with a first draft of the full Waikato Plan.
	Sep 2016	After refinement and editing following Joint Committee

		feedback, a second version of the draft Plan and the Summary document presented to a Joint Committee briefing.
	Dec - Feb 2017	Further revisions of the draft Plan and Summary completed.
Stage 4: Plan Draft for Consultation, Hearings and Final Adoption	Feb 2017	Version 3 of the draft Plan completed to present to the Joint Committee on the 27 th Feb to request approval for consultation. Consultation, Hearings and Final adoption - March to August 2017
Stage 5: Waikato Plan Implementation Arrangements and Actions Mid 2017 onwards	Mid 2017 onwards	

What value does the Plan add?

The most important thing about the Waikato Plan is that it is the first time in New Zealand that councils, central government and other agencies have worked together to create one plan that speaks with one voice about the top priorities for the whole region. Because it brings everything together, the Plan provides an important opportunity to agree on priorities, actions and funding arrangements across multiple parties and well-beings. It will provide clarity for everyone about the future direction of the region.

The Plan also provides a place to have potentially difficult conversations about issues such as population decline and aging, where to target investment, and what infrastructure to invest in. Once agreed, this will give the region better bargaining power, making it more competitive against other regions.

What are the underlying principles?

1. It is an evolution – the Plan will never be ‘finished’ – rather it is an on-going collaborative relationship that will progress over time
2. It is a joint Plan, not a council Plan - the community sector, central government, Iwi, and the private sector are all involved
3. Everyone involved has to be able to compromise - to recognise that trade-offs will need to be made in order to reach shared aspirations and speak with a collective voice
4. The Plan will not duplicate the work of others – rather its role is to fill gaps.

How is the Plan governed and managed?

Governance: Joint Committee: Mayors/Chair from each council (currently excluding Thames-Coromandel District Council), five independent representatives, Iwi (to be confirmed), three observers (District Health Board, National Infrastructure Unit, NZ Transport Agency).

Forums: Government Advisory Forum (initially linking with Intersect Waikato), Strategic Partners Forum, potential Business Forum (may be established February/March 2017).

Management: Waikato Plan Chief Executive Steering Group (including the Independent Chair, Chief Executive from a selection of councils and the Project Team) supported by the Project Team

(comprised of two Project Advisors who lead the project, supported by a team of seconded council staff and a contractor).

Technical Support: Technical Reference Group (with representatives from councils and NZTA), technical experts (brought in as required) and a Communications advisor.

Maori Engagement

The Joint Committee is seeking to ensure meaningful partnership structures with Iwi/Māori are established including representation on the joint committee. The proposed Waikato Plan implementation arrangements provide for co-governance, co-management and co-implementation with Iwi/ Māori. The Waikato Plan has set aside resourcing to ensure effective Iwi engagement and input into the Waikato Plan.

Council staff have also discussed the Waikato Plan with the Te Manawhenua Forum Mo Matamata-Piako. The Forum have expressed some concern regarding Iwi engagement, and have nominated Forum member Mike Baker as a potential candidate to sit on the implementation committee if appropriate.

Issues

Council has discussed a submission on the draft Waikato Plan. The submission is attached for Council approval. The submission has been submitted to the project team so it was received by the deadline of 10 April 2017. If Council wishes to make changes to the submission staff can advise the project team.

The Waikato Plan has been developed with the emphasis on implementation. The draft Plan includes clear actions including who will lead be key support partners, timing and rough-order cost estimates. Council will need to consider the projects assigned to it and the costs and implications of implementation.

Analysis

Options considered

The Waikato Plan process will set a new overarching policy direction for the region.

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

These issues are not significant. MPDC is not the decision-making body for these matters as the Waikato Plan preparation is delegated to the Joint Committee.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

There are no consultation issues. It is expected the Waikato Plan will be publically consulted on early in 2017.

Consent issues

There are no consent issues.

Timeframes

The proposed consultation timeline is as follows:

- 27 February 2017 – approval from the Joint Committee for consultation on the draft Waikato Plan
- 10 March and 24 March 2017 – Newspaper advert in the Waikato Times and NZ Herald on the opening of the submissions period on the Plan
- 10 March to 10 April 2017 – draft Waikato Plan consulted, with the focus on making online submissions easy to do
- 21 April 2017 and first week of May – public hearings at Waikato Regional Council offices and somewhere in the districts.
- 30 May 2017 - Joint committee makes final changes arising from submissions and recommends year 1 actions to councils for inclusion into their Annual Plans 2017/18 implementation
- 19 June 2017 – Joint Committee approves the final full Plan and summary document
- July – Waikato councils ratify the final full Plan and summary document
- 21 August 2017 – launch of the Plan and implementation activities.

Financial Impact

i. Cost

A copy of the Waikato Plan implementation budget is attached which shows Councils contribution as 35,873 for the 2017/18 financial year.

Attachments

- A. Notes of the Waikato Plan Joint Committee Briefing - 28 September 2016
- B. Minutes of Waikato Plan Joint Committee 27 February 2017
- C. Waikato Plan - DRAFT Revised Implementation Budget 2017 FINAL - 2017-03-28
- D. Waikato Plan Council Submission

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Policy Planner	
-----------	--------------------------------------	--

Approved by	Michelle Staines-Hawthorne Corporate Strategy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Meetings Attended by Elected Members

Trim No.: 1871215

Executive Summary

Elected members represent Matamata Piako District on various committees.

Minutes from Waihou-Piako Catchment Committee, Hauraki Gulf Forum, Regional Transport Committee and Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee meetings are attached.

Recommendation

That:

1. **The information be received.**

Attachments

- A. Waikato-Piako Catchment committee
- B. Hauraki Gulf Forum
- C. Regional Transport committee
- D. Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee

Signatories

Author(s)	Caroline Hubbard Committee Secretary	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	
-------------	--	--

Documents Executed Under Seal

Trim No.: 1870004

Executive Summary

Certain documents need to be executed under the Council Seal, these documents are typically warrants of appointment, agreements, consent forms and bonds. These documents are reported to Council every two months. The schedule of documents executed under Council Seal for October and November 2016 is attached.

Recommendation

That the report of the schedule of documents executed under Council Seal be received.

Attachments

A. Schedule of Executed Documents - February and March 2017

Signatories

Author(s)	Samantha Vautier Corporate Strategy Administration Officer	
Approved by	Michelle Staines-Hawthorne Corporate Strategy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Mayoral Diary For March 2017

Trim No.: 1871188

The Mayoral Diary for the period 1 March to 31 March 2017 is attached.

Recommendation

That the report be received.

Attachments

A. Mayoral Diary - March 2017

Signatories

Author(s)	Jan Barnes Mayor	
-----------	----------------------------	--

Approved by	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	
-------------	--	--

Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

The following motion is submitted for consideration:

That the public be excluded from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this 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 follows.

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, as follows:

C1 Chief Executive Officer Recruitment

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person. . s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. .	s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.