

**I give notice that  
an Ordinary Meeting of Council will be held on:**

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday, 28 August 2018</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>1.30pm</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Council Chamber 107 Heuheu Street Taupō</b>

# **AGENDA**

## **MEMBERSHIP**

**Chairperson** Mayor David Trewavas

**Deputy Chairperson** Cr Rosie Harvey

**Members**

- Cr John Boddy
- Cr Barry Hickling
- Cr Rosanne Jollands
- Cr Tangonui Kingi
- Cr Anna Park
- Cr Christine Rankin
- Cr Maggie Stewart
- Cr Kirsty Trueman
- Cr John Williamson

**Quorum** 6

**Gareth Green**  
**Chief Executive Officer**

## Order Of Business

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Conflicts of Interest</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes</b>	
3.1	Ordinary Council Meeting - 27 July 2018.....	3
3.2	Ordinary Council Meeting - 31 July 2018.....	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Receipt of Minutes</b>	
4.1	Ordinary Audit & Risk Committee Meeting - 23 July 2018 .....	5
<b>5</b>	<b>Policy and Decision Making</b>	
5.1	Dreamer of Peace Sculpture.....	6
5.2	Naming of Public Road - 29 Herapeka Street Subdivision .....	9
5.3	Delegation of Functions, Powers and Duties to Hearings Commisioners for Plan Change 34 - Flood Hazard.....	13
5.4	Taupo Airport - Approval of Expenditure for the Installation of a Permanent Generator .....	14
5.5	Council Engagements September 2018 and Conference Opportunities.....	17
5.6	Members' Reports .....	18
<b>6</b>	<b>Confidential Business</b>	
6.1	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 31 July 2018.....	19
6.2	Receipt of Confidential Portion of Minutes - Audit & Risk Committee - 23 July 2018 .....	19
6.3	Ironman 70.3 World Championship host city bid .....	19

**3.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 27 JULY 2018**

**Author:** Raeleen Rihari, Democratic Services Support Officer

**Authorised by:** Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Friday 27 July 2018 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 27 July 2018 [⇒](#)

**3.2 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 31 JULY 2018**

**Author:** Shainey James, Democratic Services Officer

**Authorised by:** Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Tuesday 31 July 2018 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 31 July 2018 [⇒](#)

**4.1 ORDINARY AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE MEETING - 23 JULY 2018**

**Author:** Shainey James, Democratic Services Officer

**Authorised by:** Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council receives the minutes of the Audit & Risk Committee meeting held on Monday 23 July 2018.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Audit & Risk Committee Meeting Minutes - 23 July 2018 [⇒](#)

**5.1 DREAMER OF PEACE SCULPTURE**

**Author:** John Ridd, Head of Economic Development and Business Transformation  
**Authorised by:** Gareth Green, Chief Executive Officer

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this item is to formally approve the Dreamer of Peace sculpture and to approve unbudgeted expenditure for the installation.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council was presented with an opportunity during a public forum and supported an offer to receive a piece of public art at zero cost to ratepayers. Subsequently, a formal decision to accept the piece was not made in a Council meeting, and the cost of installation was omitted when discussed by Council. Having investigated the matter further, there are requirements for a fully engineered base, lighting and certification to enable the installation. In the past Council has contributed to this type of work to allow ‘on loan’ pieces to be installed however presently the public art budget has been exhausted. The piece would add to Councils public art portfolio but will require a financial contribution.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council:

1. Approves the donation and installation of the Dreamer of Peace sculpture.
2. Approves unbudgeted expenditure of \$5750 plus GST for the purpose of installing the Dreamer of Peace Sculpture.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has been presented to Council at a public forum in May 2018.

As a result of this presentation further investigation has been undertaken which requires investment from Council.

**DISCUSSION**

The proposal for the installation of the Dreamer of Peace was presented by representatives of the Sri Chinmoy Oneness-Home Peace Run during a public forum, and it was confirmed there would be no cost to Council. At that time, there was a lack of understanding of the full implications of installing public art and Councils obligations to ensure public safety, as well as the ability to make a formal decision to accept the sculpture. In order to install the sculpture it requires a properly designed and certified plinth, and there was a request for lighting which was not factored in. The total cost for this additional work is \$5750 plus GST which the group are requesting be funded by Council. As the public art budget has been expended this will need to be approved from unbudgeted funds. The main issue is less to do with the quantum of the funding required but instead whether Council still supports the project based on the fact that Council investment is now required. Council in the past has contributed to this type of work to allow ‘on loan’ pieces to be installed however, as mentioned previously, the public art budget has been exhausted.

Based on this information it is considered that there are two options.

**OPTIONS**

Analysis of Options

Option 1 – Council funds the installation works

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another sculpture piece is added to the Taupō public art collection.</li> <li>• Assurances around safe installation can be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is potentially a cost to Council which the group at the time stated there was none.</li> </ul>

made.	
-------	--

Option 2 – Do not fund the installation works

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unbudgeted expenditure will not be required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sculpture is not installed.</li> <li>Plans for an unveiling late September would need to be cancelled.</li> </ul>

Analysis Conclusion:

With the quantum of Council investment being low for what is a \$20,000 art installation it is recommended that Council allocate an unbudgeted amount of \$5750 plus GST to assist with installation costs even though the group did highlight no cost to Council.

**CONSIDERATIONS**

**Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$5750 plus GST. This will be unbudgeted, as the Public Art budget for 2018/19 has been fully allocated in support of the gifted archway being installed on the South Domain.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently unbudgeted. It is requested that unbudgeted expenditure is approved. Unbudgeted expenditure is preferred because there is not remaining allocation in the public art budget.

**Legal Considerations**

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. The matter will enable the Council to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality local public services. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation.

Authorisations are not required from external parties.

**Policy Implications**

There are no known policy implications.

**Risks**

There are no known risks.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

**ENGAGEMENT**

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

**COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

No communication/media is required.

**CONCLUSION**

Council was presented with an opportunity to receive a piece of public art at zero cost to ratepayers. It would appear that the cost of installation was not considered when the proposal was presented at the public forum. This agenda item provides the opportunity to formally accept the piece of artwork. Having investigated the matter further, there are requirements for a fully engineered base, lighting and certification to enable the installation. Council in the past has contributed to this type of work to allow 'on loan' pieces to be installed however the issue in this case is that the public art budget has been exhausted. The piece would add to Councils public art portfolio but will require a financial contribution.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Dreamer of Peace Sculpture - proposed location [⇒](#)

**5.2 NAMING OF PUBLIC ROAD - 29 HERAPEKA STREET SUBDIVISION**

**Author:** Darren Clark, Resource Consents Planner

**Authorised by:** Brian Fox, Head of Regulatory and Risk

**PURPOSE**

This item is being presented to Council to make a decision on one new road name within a new residential subdivision at 29 Herapeka Street, Taupō.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Within the subdivision is a new public road that requires a road name. The new road will form a short cul-de-sac off Herapeka Street. The developer has selected their preferred road name which reflects the last owner, being the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Hamilton.

Construction works for the subdivision are well under way and near completion.

The road name is considered to be appropriate given that there are no duplications or similarities to other road names in the Taupō district.

Appropriate consultation has been undertaken with Iwi and the emergency services.

The preferred option is to approve the road name proposed by the developer.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council approves the road name 'St Pats Grove' for the residential subdivision at 29 Herapeka Street, Taupō.

**PURPOSE**

The naming of public roads and allocation of property addresses is Council's responsibility under the Local Government Act 2002. The approved subdivision will contain one public road that requires naming, and this name requires approval from Council.

**BACKGROUND**

This item is being presented to Council to make a decision on a public road name within an approved subdivision at 29 Herapeka Street, Taupō.

Subdivision Consent RM170359 was granted on 23 March 2018 to create 22 lots (18 residential development lots), involving vesting of public road and local purpose reserve, an access lot, and an amalgamation. Construction works for the subdivision are well under way and near completion.

Please refer to Attachment 1 showing the roading map.

The proposal has not been presented previously.

It is noted that there is a private road that is also part of the subdivision, however private roads do not require full Council approval. Delegation is held by the Council's Consents & Regulatory Manager, Risk & Regulatory.

The private road is to be named 'Hato Patariki Lane', which is the Māori transliteration of St Patrick.

**DISCUSSION**

The developer for the subdivision at 29 Herapeka Street, Taupō, has put forward a name for the new public road within this subdivision as follows:

- **St Pats Grove**

The above name is in reference of the previous owner of the parcel of land being subdivided, which was once part of St Patricks School owned by the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Hamilton.

The above name is the developer’s preferred name, however they have also submitted two alternative names as per below:

- St Patricks Grove
- Heemi Te Rama Grove

Heemi Te Rama is the surname of the original Māori landowner and is related to Herapeka. This name was offered for use by the developer as a result of consultation that took place with the whanau of the original land owners (Mr Rama Gordine and Mr Manu Blake).

All of the above road names have been put forward to the emergency services – New Zealand Fire Service, St John Ambulance and New Zealand Police for comment. All of the feedback from these parties was positive, with none stating any concerns about the road name.

The *Australian / New Zealand Standard for Rural and Urban Addressing* states that the length of a road name should be shorter, rather than longer, especially where the road itself is short. The alternative name of ‘Heemi Te Rama Grove’ is considered to be a long name considering the short nature of the cul-de-sac road. A local map cartographer has expressed general concern with fitting longer names on maps. However, consultation was undertaken with Land Information New Zealand and they raised no concern.

Based on this information it is considered that the names are appropriate. Council has the following options:

1. Accept the names
2. Reject the names
3. Select alternative names

**OPTIONS**

Analysis of Options

The developer has selected their preferred road name and this name is considered to be appropriate given that there are no duplications or similarities to other road names in the Taupō district and because it reflects their wish to reference the previous owner of the land. It is not considered effective to reject or select alternative road names given the level of acceptance by key parties.

Option 1. Accept the road names

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road names are unique</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of alternative road names would require further consideration</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no other similar road names within the district.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has not been any negative feedback on the names</li> </ul>	

Option 2. Reject the road names

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to select potential alternative names that may be more suitable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of alternative names would be required</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consultation would be required</li> </ul>

Option 3. Select alternative names

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council could select potential alternative names that may be more suitable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consultation would be required</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The item would be required to be represented after consultation</li> </ul>

Analysis Conclusion:

It is considered appropriate to accept the road name presented by the developer.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Financial Considerations**

There are no financial impacts associated with the proposal.

### **Legal Considerations**

#### Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. The matter will enable the Council to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality infrastructure (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

The matter assists Council in the performance of Council's regulatory function.

The proposed names have been evaluated with regards to the relevant road naming regulations and are consistent with these requirements.

### **Policy Implications**

There are no known policy implications.

### **Risks**

There are no risks associated with the selection of these names.

## **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

## **ENGAGEMENT**

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

## **COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

No communication/media is required.

## **CONSULTATION**

In addition to the consultation that is outlined above, consideration and internal consultation has been completed to ensure that the relevant matters are covered.

- Tangata Whenua consultation is complete. The applicant consulted with Nukuhau Marae and Te Rangitā Marae (Nukuhau) with no objections raised. Consultation also took place with the whanau of

the original land owners (Mr Rama Gordine and Mr Manu Blake). Two kaumatua suggested the alternative street name 'Heemi Te Rama Grove' which is historically connected with the land. The developer has submitted this as an alternative name. The kaumatua also suggested another name for use for the private road - 'Hato Patariki Lane' which the developer has chosen to adopt for the private road (not the subject of this report).

- Community views and preferences consultation is complete with no objections raised by the following parties:
  - Emergency Services – New Zealand Fire Service, New Zealand Police and St John Ambulance, and Land Information New Zealand.

## **CONCLUSION**

Construction of the public road and subdivision works is near complete and the developer wishes to obtain Council approval for the road name so that the new allotments can be addressed in accordance with Sections 319A and 319B of the Local Government Act 2002. No objections were received in regard to the proposed road name from Emergency Services or iwi and no other consultation is required.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Roading Layout Plan - 29 Herapeka Street subdivision [⇒](#)

**5.3 DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS, POWERS AND DUTIES TO HEARINGS COMMISSIONERS FOR PLAN CHANGE 34 - FLOOD HAZARD**

**Author:** Sue Mavor, Senior Policy Advisor

**Authorised by:** Alan Menhennet, Head of Finance and Strategy

**PURPOSE**

To delegate, to three Hearings Commissioners, functions, powers and duties under the Resource Management Act for the hearing, deliberating and recommendation of a decision to Council for Plan Change 34 - Flood Hazard.

**DISCUSSION**

Plan Change 34 Flood Hazard was notified on 20 October 2017 and further submissions notified on 4 May 2018. We received 22 original submissions and three further submissions. The hearing of these submissions and deliberations are set down for 26, 27 and 28 September 2018.

Three commissioners will be appointed to hear, deliberate and provide a recommended decision on this plan change. The following commissioners have been chosen for their relevant expertise:

- Jeff Jones (Chair and commissioner)
- Councillor Rosanne Jollands (Commissioner)
- Steven Wilson (Commissioner for tikanga Māori and perspectives of local iwi and hapū)

They all hold the necessary certificate (Making Good Decisions) and are willing and available to be hearings commissioners for Plan Change 34.

Section 34A (1) of the Resource Management Act states that “A local authority may delegate to an employee, or hearings commissioner appointed by the local authority (who may or may not be a member of the local authority), any functions, powers, or duties under this Act except the following:

- (a) the approval of a proposed policy statement or plan under clause 17 of Schedule 1:
- (b) this power of delegation.”

Under the Delegations Manual (Resolution 4669 31/5/2011) the Chief Executive is authorised to exercise all of the powers of Council; under any statute, regulation or bylaw. The RMA does not permit further sub delegation by the Chief Executive to the hearings commissioners. So the delegation of functions, powers and duties to the hearings commissioners to hear submissions, deliberate and make recommendations to Council on Plan Change 34 – Flood Hazard must be made by Council.

**CONCLUSION**

Under the provisions of the RMA only Council can delegate the function of conducting hearings. It is recommended that Council delegates that function to the proposed hearings panel of Jeff Jones, Councillor Rosanne Jollands and Steven Wilson to hear, deliberate and make recommendations on Plan Change 34 – Flood Hazard. Doing so will enable an efficient and effective process for both submitters and Council.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Council delegates functions, powers and duties under the Resource Management Act to hear, deliberate and make a recommended decision on Plan Change 34 – Flood Hazard to:

- Jeff Jones (Chair and Commissioner)
- Councillor Rosanne Jollands (Commissioner)
- Steven Wilson (Commissioner for tikanga Māori and perspectives of local iwi and hapū)

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**5.4 TAUPO AIRPORT - APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A PERMANENT GENERATOR**

**Author:** Brian Fox, Head of Regulatory and Risk

**Authorised by:** Gareth Green, Chief Executive Officer

**PURPOSE**

To further protect Council’s interest in the Taupō Airport Authority operations and in particular its emergency and business continuity requirements through the provision of a permanent generator.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Taupō Airport is a strategic asset in the district. This is not only in the economic and tourism sectors but also in terms of emergency management particularly at times of significant events. Currently these strategic objectives are exposed during power outages where fuel and water supply reticulation in particular are compromised. At times such as this firefighting capacity is also consequentially compromised.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**  
 That Council approves expenditure of \$55,000 + GST from its Disaster Recovery Reserve for the installation of an additional permanent generator at the Taupō Airport.

**BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously. However the Taupō Airport Authority has discussed the issue of power outages and the need for alternate power supply capacity in principle for specific operational areas as identified. It has had events where outages have occurred and the availability of alternate suitable mobile generators could not always be guaranteed. Council officers have also been aware of this issue from a more strategic district wide context and the need to protect Council’s and the community’s needs at all times. Airports are a significant lifeline in all communities they are located and the Taupō airport is no different.

In considering this need Council officers have determined that a current Council generator held previously for contingency purposes is no longer required to the same extent given other resources now available and could be used for this purpose, subject to Council approval. Council’s independent electrical consultants have also confirmed the capacity of the proposed Council generator is fit for the purpose required at the airport and that the required loadings could be met at times of power outages.

**DISCUSSION**

The Taupō Airport is a significant asset that assists Council to meet its overall vision for the district. It is a lifeline for the district and communities within it. Council along with the Crown is also a shareholder in the airport. Council officers are also mindful that Council’s insurers will have a specific interest in the airport come insurance renewal time and the new disclosures around risk relating to power outages.

This agenda item is fundamentally around mitigation of risk and the Council’s appetite in this regard.

Funding to address this mitigation via Council’s Disaster Recovery Reserve already has precedent with permanent fixed generators located at the GLC and TEC both being funded in this manner. It is seen as an appropriate use of the reserve in a proactive manner for facilities where a role in post disaster recovery is paramount.

**OPTIONS**

Analysis of Options

Install Council available generator at Airport

Advantages	Disadvantages
------------	---------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigates operational exposures at airport</li> <li>• Contributes to strategic resilience of asset</li> <li>• Contributes to Council's strategic vision</li> <li>• Enhances continuity of services and customer experience at strategic gateway to district</li> <li>• No significant effect on rates give use of existing reserves</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul>
---	---

Option 2.

Do not install Council available generator at airport

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not mitigate overall strategic, operational and business risks that currently exist</li> </ul>

Analysis Conclusion:

The installation of the available generator is a sound business decision for Council to make for the reasons outlined.

**CONSIDERATIONS**

**Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$55,000.00 (GST excl.)

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for under disaster recovery reserves.

**Legal Considerations**

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. The matter will enable the Council to meet the current and future needs of communities for good quality local public services and local infrastructure (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

The following authorisations are required for the proposal:

- Resource Consent                       Building Consent                       Environmental Health
- Liquor Licencing                       Licence to occupy

Agreement from Taupō Airport Authority is required.

**Policy Implications**

There are no known policy implications.

**Risks**

There are no known risks.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

#### **ENGAGEMENT**

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

#### **COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

Decisions made by Council should be communicated in the appropriate manner to relevant regulatory authorities and other stakeholders relevant to operations of the airport.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Given that Taupō Airport is a strategic asset in the district, the installation of a permanent generator will provide surety during power outages that essential services relating to water supply reticulation, fuel supply and firefighting capability are maintained.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**5.5 COUNCIL ENGAGEMENTS SEPTEMBER 2018 AND CONFERENCE OPPORTUNITIES**

**Author:** Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

**Authorised by:** Gareth Green, Chief Executive Officer

**Engagements**

ENGAGEMENT	DAY	DATE	TIME
Fences, Rooding, Reserves & Dogs Committee meeting (Council Chamber, 107 Heuheu Street, Taupō)	Tuesday	4	10am-noon
Turangi/Tongariro Community Board meeting (Boardroom, Turangi Service Centre)	Tuesday	11	1pm-4pm
Taupō Airport Authority Committee meeting (Taupō Airport, ANZAC Memorial Drive)	Monday	17	10.30am-noon
Kinloch Representative Group public forum (Kinloch Community Hall, Mata Place, Kinloch)	Thursday	20	3pm-3.30pm
Kinloch Representative Group meeting (Kinloch Community Hall, Mata Place, Kinloch)	Thursday	20	3.30pm-5pm
Public forum (Council Chamber, 107 Heuheu Street, Taupō)	Tuesday	25	1pm-1.30pm
Council meeting (Council Chamber, 107 Heuheu Street, Taupō)	Tuesday	25	1.30pm-5pm

**Conference and Professional Development Opportunities**

To approve, either prior or retrospectively, Councillor attendance at conferences and professional development courses:

- Local Government New Zealand Zone 2 meeting taking place on 20-21 September 2018 in Gisborne: Councillors \_\_\_\_\_

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

1. That Council receives the information relating to engagements for September 2018.
2. That Council approves the attendance of Cr(s) \_\_\_\_\_ at the Local Government New Zealand Zone 2 meeting taking place on 20-21 September 2018 in Gisborne.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**5.6 MEMBERS' REPORTS**

**Author:** Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

**Authorised by:** Gareth Green, Chief Executive Officer

**PURPOSE**

This item permits members to report on meetings/functions they have attended as Council's representative, or on behalf of Council, since the last Council meeting.

The item also provides an opportunity for members to report back, either verbally or by way of tabled information, specifically on conferences, seminars and professional development courses that they have attended.

No debate and/or resolution is permitted on any of the reports.

**CONCLUSION**

Members' reports will be presented at the meeting for receipt.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council receives the reports from members.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

## 6 CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

### RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter 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:

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
<p><b>Agenda Item No: 6.1</b> Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 31 July 2018</p>	<p>Section 7(2)(g) - the withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege</p>	<p>Section 48(1)(a)(i)- the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 7</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item No: 6.2</b> Receipt of Confidential Portion of Minutes - Audit &amp; Risk Committee - 23 July 2018</p>	<p>Section 7(2)(a) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons</p> <p>Section 7(2)(g) - the withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege</p> <p>Section 7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable [the Council] to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p>	<p>Section 48(1)(a)(i)- the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 7</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item No: 6.3</b> Ironman 70.3 World Championship host city bid</p>	<p>Section 7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable [the Council] to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p> <p>Section 7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable [the Council] to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p>	<p>Section 48(1)(a)(i)- the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 7</p>

I also move that *[name of person or persons]* be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of *[specify]*. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because *[specify]*.