



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

Date:	Thursday, 1 February 2018
Time:	1.30pm
Location:	Council Chamber 107 Heuheu Street Taupō

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

1	Apologies	
2	Conflicts of Interest	
3	Confirmation of Minutes	
3.1	Ordinary Council Meeting - 13 November 2017	3
3.2	Ordinary Council Meeting - 12 December 2017	4
4	Receipt of Minutes	
4.1	Ordinary Turangi/Tongariro Community Board Meeting - 14 November 2017	5
4.2	Ordinary Turangi Reserves Management Plan Committee Meeting - 30 November 2017	6
4.3	Ordinary Fences, Roding, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting - 5 December 2017	7
4.4	Ordinary Kinloch Representative Group Meeting - 11 December 2017	8
5	Policy and Decision Making	
5.1	Increase in Value of Contract TDC1314/099 Road Marking 2013-2016	9
5.2	Contract TDC/1718/206 - Upgrade of Taupo Streetlights with LED Luminaires	12
5.3	New Road Names - Wharewaka East Subdivision	16
5.4	Acacia Bay Water Options to Meet the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand	19
5.5	Civic Administration Building Project	25
5.6	Lake Ohakuri Jetty - Request To Take On Ownership	30
5.7	100 Kinloch Road, Tree Removal	37
5.8	Updates to Taupō District Council Traffic Control Devices	41
5.9	Easement Request on Tongariro Domain	44
5.10	Adoption of Supporting Information for the Draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document Including the Draft Revenue and Financing Policy and Associated s101(3) Considerations Report for Audit New Zealand consideration	46
5.11	Adoption of the Draft Development Contributions Policy for Audit New Zealand consideration	50
5.12	Adoption of the Draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies for Audit New Zealand consideration	53
5.13	Adoption of the Draft Treasury Management Policy for Audit New Zealand consideration	56
5.14	Adoption of Draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document for Audit New Zealand Consideration	59
5.15	Council Engagements February 2018, Appointments and Conference Opportunities	62
5.16	Members' Reports	63
6	Confidential Business	
6.1	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 13 November 2017	64
6.2	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 12 December 2017	64
6.3	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Extraordinary Council Minutes - 21 December 2017	64
6.4	Ngāti Te Rangiita Draft Submission to the Māori Affairs Select Committee	65

3.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 13 NOVEMBER 2017

Author: Tina Jakes, Democracy & Community Engagement Manager

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Group Manager: Corporate and Community

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday 13 November 2017 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 13 November 2017 

3.2 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 12 DECEMBER 2017

Author: Tina Jakes, Democracy & Community Engagement Manager

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Group Manager: Corporate and Community

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Tuesday 12 December 2017 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 12 December 2017 

4.1 ORDINARY TURANGI/TONGARIRO COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING - 14 NOVEMBER 2017

Author: Raeleen Rihari, Democratic Services Support Officer

Authorised by: John Ridd, Group Manager: Business and Technology

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the minutes of the Turangi/Tongariro Community Board meeting held on Tuesday 14 November 2017.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Turangi/Tongariro Community Board Meeting Minutes - 14 November 2017 

4.2 ORDINARY TURANGI RESERVES MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING - 30 NOVEMBER 2017

Author: Raeleen Rihari, Democratic Services Support Officer

Authorised by: John Ridd, Group Manager: Business and Technology

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the minutes of the Turangi Reserves Management Plan Committee meeting held on Thursday 30 November 2017.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Turangi Reserves Management Plan Committee Meeting Minutes - 30 November 2017 

4.3 ORDINARY FENCES, ROADING, RESERVES & DOGS COMMITTEE MEETING - 5 DECEMBER 2017

Author: Tina Jakes, Democracy & Community Engagement Manager

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Group Manager: Corporate and Community

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the minutes of the Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee meeting held on Tuesday 5 December 2017.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Fences, Roading, Reserves & Dogs Committee Meeting Minutes - 5 December 2017 

4.4 ORDINARY KINLOCH REPRESENTATIVE GROUP MEETING - 11 DECEMBER 2017

Author: Raeleen Rihari, Democratic Services Support Officer

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the minutes of the Kinloch Representative Group meeting held on Monday 11 December 2017.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Kinloch Representative Group Meeting Minutes - 11 December 2017 

5.1 INCREASE IN VALUE OF CONTRACT TDC1314/099 ROAD MARKING 2013-2016

Author: Roy Menton, Senior Engineering Officer - Transportation Operations

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Group Manager, Operational Services

PURPOSE

This report is to seek Council approval to increase the value of Contract TDC/1314/099 Road Marking by \$30,000 plus GST to a total of \$912,313.60 plus GST.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current Road Marking Contract was awarded in November 2013 for a period of two and a half years (130 weeks) commencing on 1 December 2013 at a value of \$602,313.60 plus GST with the option to extend it for two further periods of one year subject to satisfactory contractor performance. The two extensions were previously approved with a current contract value of \$882,313.60 plus GST.

The contract is a combination of measure and value and lump sum and has cost escalations applied. It is in its final year and expires on 30 June 2018.

Roadrunner Markers have met the performance criteria.

This report seeks approval to increase the value of the contract as a result of additional new marking required at mobility parks, fire hydrants and other markings until the contract end date of 30 June 2018.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council approves the increase in value of Contract TDC/1314/099 Road Marking 2013-2016 with Roadrunner Markers Ltd which expires on 30 June 2018 by \$30,000 plus GST to a total sum of \$912,313.60 plus GST.

BACKGROUNDContract terms:

The current Road Marking Contract was awarded in November 2013 for a period of two and a half years (130 weeks) commencing on 1 December 2013 at a value of \$602,313.60 plus GST with the option to extend it for two further periods of one year subject to satisfactory contractor performance.

The contract is a combination of measure and value and lump sum and has cost escalations applied.

Contractor Performance:

Roadrunner Markers were awarded the contract based on their tender being evaluated as being the Lowest Price Conforming Tender. They have demonstrated their capability to successfully undertake this work and have the necessary experience and resources. The KPI's included in the contract are being monitored and Roadrunner Markers have met the performance criteria.

DISCUSSION

The increase in the value is to be considered as a result of additional new marking required at mobility parks, fire hydrants and other markings required until the contract end date of 30 June 2018.

Taupō District Council and NZTA have allocated sufficient funding within Council's Transportation Programme to carry out this work.

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

1. Increase the value of the contract
2. Hold any work required to be completed until the award of a new contract in July 2018

OPTIONSAnalysis of Options

Option 1 – Increase the value of the existing contract.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to continue with marking required 	

Option 2 – Do not increase the value of the existing contract

Advantages	Disadvantages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further marking will be done until July 2018

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 2 (Do not increase the value of the contract) – this would result in a long period with no line marking carried out.

Option 1 (Increase the value of the contract) – this option is preferred because it allows for required marking to be done and the safety of the network to be maintained.

CONSIDERATIONS**Financial Considerations**

The increase in contract value for the 2017-18 financial year is estimated to be \$30,000 plus GST.

Funding has been allocated within the 2015-25 Long-term Plan in the Transportation Maintenance and Transportation Renewals Budgets for Traffic Services.

Legal ConsiderationsLocal 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 providing local public services.

Undertaking the works will ensure that Council continues to maintain these assets and also assist with the safety of road users and the public.

Policy Implications

The proposal has been evaluated against the Long-term Plan 2015-25 and Asset Management Plan and is consistent with these plans.

Risks

If Council does not increase the value of this contract, there is a risk that critical marking will be delayed until July 2018.

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:

- The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- 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

Roadrunner Markers are an experienced Contractor with appropriate resources to fulfil the needs of this contract. They have successfully carried out pavement marking on the Road Network as per the contract and the performance measures.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.2 CONTRACT TDC/1718/206 - UPGRADE OF TAUPŌ STREETLIGHTS WITH LED LUMINAIRES

Author: Colin Giles, Transport & Projects Manager

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Group Manager, Operational Services

PURPOSE

This report is to seek Council approval to award the tender for Contract TDC/1718/206 for the Upgrade of Taupō Streetlights with LED Luminaires.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tenders closed for Contract TDC/1718/206 for the Upgrade of Taupō Streetlights with LED Luminaires at 1.00pm on Friday 19 January 2018. Three tenders were received. Tenders were evaluated using the lowest price conforming Method. The Tender Evaluation Team (TET) considered that the tender received from Downer NZ Ltd for Contract TDC/1718/206 - Upgrade of Taupō Streetlights with LED Luminaires was the lowest priced conforming tender.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council accepts the Tender for Contract TDC/1718/206 for the Upgrade of Taupō Streetlights with LED Luminaires submitted by Downer NZ Ltd for the sum of \$869,483.29 [excl. GST] and authorises His Worship the Mayor and the Chief Executive to sign the Contract Document(s) and attach the Council's Common Seal to them.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

In late 2016, NZTA advised it was considering providing 85% funding assistance to upgrade streetlights using LED Luminaires.

Taupō District Council prepared a Business Case to NZTA with a programme to replace the vast majority of its high intensity discharge (HID) streetlighting with Light Emitting Diode (LED) luminaires to realise the many benefits that this technology offers such as significant energy and maintenance savings, improved control possibilities, improved lighting, reliability and safety and reduced carbon emissions. NZTA approved the Business case and confirmed funding earlier this year.

Funding of \$2.5 million was identified in the Taupō District Council Annual Plan 2017/18.

A tender was recently let for the procurement of LED luminaires which Taupō District Council will pay for and free issue to the preferred installation tenderer. The successful tenderer was Techlight from Rotorua.

DISCUSSION

The tender for Contract TDC/1718/206 – Upgrade of Taupō District streetlights with LED Luminaires was originally tendered and closed at 1.00pm on Friday 24 November 2017.

The RFT was prepared on the assumption that it would be possible for tenderers to apply for and obtain approval from the lines companies at the time of tendering. Unfortunately, the lines companies were not prepared to provide network approval prior to the contract being awarded. This was not the outcome intended by Council, and in these circumstances, Council has made the decision to reject all of the tenders (as it is entitled to do under clause 106.1 of NZS3910:2013).

All submitters were advised of this decision and invited to retender based on the amended scope as noted below.

3: Scope of Works

...The contractor

- Must demonstrate that they are able to meet the requirements for approval to work on the Unison and The Lines Company networks.

- Must be approved to work on the Unison and The Lines Company networks within six weeks of the date on which it is notified that its tender has been accepted.

Schedule to conditions of tendering:

105.3(c), supplementary information:

“Appropriate documentation demonstrating ability to meet the requirements for approval to work on the Unison and The Lines Company networks.”

TENDERS RECEIVED

Tender documents were issued for this Contract with the amended scope on 21 December 2017. Tenders closed on Friday 19 January 2018. Three tenders were received from the following organisations:

- Downer NZ Ltd from Auckland
- Sefton Electrical Ltd from Rotorua
- Broadspectrum Ltd from Rotorua

Tender prices ranged from \$869,483.29 to \$1,132,175.98 plus GST.

The project was estimated at \$1,393,200.00 plus GST.

Downer NZ Ltd are currently the Council's Three Waters Contractor.

Downer NZ Ltd are currently the Maintenance Contractor for the local State Highways based in Taupō.

Sefton Electrical Ltd has carried out various works for Taupō District Council including Electrical Switchboard upgrade in the former Council Offices at 72 Lake Terrace.

Sefton Electrical Ltd has been involved with street lighting Upgrade in the Taupō CBD and in the Tongariro Domain.

Broadspectrum is currently the Council's streetlight maintenance Contractor.

TENDER EVALUATION

Tenders were evaluated using the lowest price conforming method. The attributes included being able to gain approval to work on Unison's network and The Lines company network.

Submitting an installation programme with suitable resources.

Appropriate Health & Safety documentation.

RAMM competency.

The Lowest Price Conforming Method involves:

Ranking the tenders by price in ascending order.

Marking the non-price attributes as either a pass or fail.

If any attribute fails, then that tenderer is eliminated and the process is then repeated with the next lowest submitter.

Downer NZ Ltd submitted the lowest price and all their attributes were considered suitable and marked as PASS.

The Tender Evaluation Team (TET) considered Downer NZ Ltd as having the Lowest Price Conforming Tender.

RECOMMENDED CONTRACT PRICE

The tender submitted by Downer NZ Ltd being \$869,483.29 plus GST over the term of the contract.

OPTIONS

Council may choose to accept the preferred tender or not. If the tender is not accepted, Council is likely to miss out on the 85% NZTA financial contribution to the upgrade of streetlights with LED Luminaires. NZTA has signalled that this subsidy will not continue for work started after 30 June 2018 and not completed by 31 December 2018.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$869,483.29 plus GST for the installation of the LED Luminaires.

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 infrastructure. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications. Risks

There are risks with the delivery of the luminaires which have been ordered but are being shipped out. There is an expected 12 to 14 week lead time.

The initial order was for 1200 luminaires. This will be followed with more orders as the lighting design is carried out to determine the required number of various luminaire types. There are about 3300 luminaires to be replaced.

Due to the re-tender of this contract, there is a shorter timeframe for the installation to be completed before 30 June 2018. Any installation work carried out after 30 June 2018 will not attract the 85% subsidy from NZTA which will revert to 51%.

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

A press release will be issued and the information will be available on the Council website.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that Council accepts the tender received from Downer NZ Ltd for Contract TDC/1718/206 - Upgrade of Taupō Streetlights with LED Luminaries

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.3 NEW ROAD NAMES - WHAREWAKA EAST SUBDIVISION

Author: Louise Wood, Senior Resource Consents Planner

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This item is being presented to Council to make a decision on new public road names within the Wharewaka East subdivision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Within the next stages of the Wharewaka East subdivision there are six new public roads that require names. The developers have selected their preferred names in consultation with Tauhara hapu. Stages 1A and 1B of the subdivision are under construction and nearing completion.

Consultation has been undertaken with emergency services and Tauhara hapu.

The proposed road names are considered to be appropriate given that there are no duplications or similarities to other road names in the Taupō District therefore the preferred option is to approve the road names proposed by developers.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council approves the following road names for the Wharewaka East Subdivision, Taupō:

- Harakeke Drive
- Raupo Crescent
- Uku Way
- Roto Close
- Wai Terrace

BACKGROUND

This item is being presented to Council to make a decision on five road names within the Wharewaka East subdivision. Subdivision consent RM060488 was granted in 2008 (and subsequently varied) for the creation of 490 residential lots on land to the east of Lake Terrace and west of the East Taupo Arterial. Construction of Stages 1A and 1B is nearing completion.

The proposal has not been presented previously.

DISCUSSION

The developers for the Wharewaka East Subdivision has put forward names for the public roads within this subdivision as follows:

- Harakeke Drive
- Raupo Crescent
- Uku Way
- Roto Close
- Wai Terrace

These road names have been put forward to the Emergency Services – New Zealand Fire Service, New Zealand Police and St John Ambulance. No objections were raised by these parties.

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

1. Accept the names
2. Reject the names

3. Select alternative names

OPTIONSAnalysis of Options

The developers have selected their preferred road names and these names are considered to be appropriate given that there are no duplications or similarities to other road names in the Taupō District. 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"> The road names are unique 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of alternative road names would require further consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no other similar road names within the District 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has not been any negative feedback on the names 	

Option 2. Reject the road names

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to select potential alternative road names that may be more suitable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of alternative road names would require further consultation

Option 3. Select alternative names

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to select potential alternative road names that may be more suitable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of alternative road names would require further consultation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The item would be required to be presented to Council again

Analysis Conclusion:

It is considered appropriate to accept the road names presented by the developers.

CONSIDERATIONS**Financial Considerations**

There are no financial impacts associated with the proposed road names.

Legal ConsiderationsLocal 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 a (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 road 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 known risks associated with the selection of these road 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.

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 with no objections raised.
- 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

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media is required.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that Council approves the road names as presented.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Wharewaka East Map Road Names 

5.4 ACACIA BAY WATER OPTIONS TO MEET THE DRINKING WATER STANDARDS FOR NEW ZEALAND

Author: Michael Cordell, Asset Manager Water & Waste

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Group Manager, Operational Services

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is for Council to select the preferred option to provide a Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) compliant water supply for the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd communities in order to assist Council to decide on the option or course of action to pursue.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Acacia Bay Water Supply (including the Mapara Rd rural water supply zone) does not currently comply with the DWSNZ. Continued non-compliance with the DWSNZ is not deemed to be acceptable in terms of Council's obligations as a drinking water supplier under the Health Act and to provide quality drinking water to our communities.

Council commissioned Mott MacDonald to assess the options for providing a compliant drinking water supply to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Road communities (see attachment 1). The report identified two practicable options:

- Option 1 – Construct a New Standalone WTP for Acacia Bay at Acacia Bay and Mapara Road at Acacia Bay.
- Option 2 – Connect Acacia Bay to the existing DWSNZ Compliant Taupō Water Supply

Option 1 has higher capital and operational costs and the longest lead time for implementation. Option 1 will require the acquisition of land and will require approval to build a new water treatment plant in Acacia Bay. Due to these requirements there is potential for higher than anticipated costs or difficulty in acquiring a suitable site to locate a new water treatment plant in Acacia Bay. There is also potential for public objection to a new water treatment plant being located in Acacia Bay and consequent difficulty in obtaining approvals to build the plant.

Option 2 is the lower cost option and is less complex. Fluoridation of the Acacia Bay water supply is inherent with this option as the Taupō Water Supply is currently fluoridated and therefore has the potential for public objection on the basis that fluoride would be added to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd rural supplies which currently receive no fluoride addition.

The preferred option is Option 2 – Connect Acacia Bay to the existing DWSNZ Compliant Taupō Water Supply because it is the lowest cost and lowest risk option with the shorter lead-time to implement.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council:

1. Agrees that Option 2: Connection of Acacia Bay to the Taupō Water Supply is the preferred option to provide a water supply to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Road communities that complies with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand.
2. Seeks feedback on the proposal as part of the Consultation Document for the Long-term Plan 2018 – 28 and that the information attached to this report is considered as information that supports the consultation document.

BACKGROUND

Council staff have been investigating options to provide the Acacia Bay and Mapara communities with a treated drinking water supply that complies with the DWSNZ.

A report commissioned from Mott McDonald identified two practicable options to upgrade the existing Acacia Bay water supply to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ.

Two potential options have been considered to upgrade the existing Acacia Bay water supply to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ:

Option 1 - the construction of a new water treatment plant (WTP) in Acacia Bay or;

Option 2 - connection of the Acacia Bay water supply to the existing water supply for Taupō.

Both options have advantages and disadvantages and therefore a thorough comparison between the two options has been conducted to assist Council to decide on the option to pursue.

DISCUSSION

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002 and the Health Act 1956

The requirements for the supply of drinking water are set out in the Local Government Act 2002 (for Local Authorities) and the Health Act 1956. Specifically, under Section 23 of the Health Act, territorial authorities have a duty to improve, promote and protect public health; and under Section 25, to provide sanitary works including drinking-water supplies. The Health Act 1956 as amended by the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act in October 2007 (the Health Act) aims to protect public health by improving the quality of drinking-water provided to communities. The Health Act requires drinking-water suppliers to take all practicable steps to ensure they provide an adequate supply of drinking-water that complies with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008) (the DWSNZ).

Timeframes for Compliance

In 2009, the requirement for each category of water supplier to comply with sections 69S to 69ZC of the Health Act (relating to drinking-water) was deferred for three years. These requirements came into force on staggered dates with the largest water supplies being required to meet compliance earlier than smaller water supplies.

Section 69V of the Health Act states that every drinking-water supplier must take all practicable steps to ensure that the drinking water supplied by that supplier complies with the drinking-water standards. A drinking-water supplier complies (takes all practicable steps) if the supplier implements those provisions of the supplier's approved public health risk management plan (water safety plan) relating to the drinking-water standards.

The Acacia Bay Water Safety Plan has an implementation timeframe for the Acacia Bay water supply to provide protozoa barrier and arsenic removal by 2020. The proposed upgrade to the Acacia Bay water supply will complete in the 2020/21 financial year.

OPTIONS

Given the current status of non-compliance with the DWSNZ and Council's obligations under the Health Act as a drinking water supplier to take all practicable steps to provide an adequate supply of drinking-water that complies with the DWSNZ, it is considered that the "do nothing" option is not a viable option.

Mott McDonald was engaged by Council to prepare an options report evaluating the two options to provide a DWSNZ compliant water supply to the Acacia Bay Community. The consultant's report is attached and the key information and findings are summarised below.

Analysis of Options

Option 1 – A New Standalone WTP for Acacia Bay

For this option the existing water intake from the lake at Acacia Bay would be retained as the raw water source and a new WTP would be built at Acacia Bay with a nominal capacity of 2.5 ML/d.

The new WTP would employ the same (or similar) treatment process as the Taupō WTP to produce a treated water capable of complying with the DWSNZ. The new WTP would provide the Acacia Bay community with the same level of service (in terms of drinking water quality) as the Taupō community receives from the Taupō WTP².

The treated water from the new Acacia Bay WTP would be conveyed to the Cherry Lane reservoir before distribution to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd supply zones via the existing reticulation network.

The estimated cost to build a new treatment plant in Acacia Bay is approximately **\$6.2 million**.

To understand the full cost implication we must also consider the cost to increase the capacity of the Taupō WTP to provide for growth. If Acacia develops a stand-alone WTP an upgrade to the capacity of the Taupō water supply is still proposed in the short term. The cost of upgrading the Taupō water supply to 30 ML/d is approximately **\$1.75 million**.

Option 1 has the following advantages and disadvantages:

Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
Ability to opt to provide fluoridation or not provide fluoridation as part of the Acacia Bay Water Supply Upgrade.	Higher capital cost option Higher operational cost option Longer implementation timeframe to build a brand-new water treatment plant.	Potential for higher than anticipated cost or difficulty in acquiring a suitable site to locate a new WTP in Acacia Bay. Potential for public objection to a new WTP being located in Acacia Bay and consequent difficulty in obtaining approvals to build a new WTP.

2. Fluoride is currently added to the Taupō supply. Fluoride addition would be optional for the Acacia Bay WTP for Option 1 depending on consultation and community feedback.

Option 2 – Connection of Acacia Bay to the Taupō Water Supply

A new conveyance pipeline would be laid from Jarden Mile in Nukuhau to Reeves Rd in Acacia Bay to supply treated water from the Taupō water supply zone to Acacia Bay. The new pipeline would connect to the existing rising main to the Cherry Lane Reservoir at Reeves Rd. The existing water intake from the lake at Acacia Bay would be abandoned. Treated water from the Taupō supply would be distributed to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd supply zones via the existing reticulation network from Cherry Lane Reservoir.



For this option the Acacia Bay community would receive a fluoridated water supply as the supply from the Taupō water treatment plant (supplying the Taupō Water Supply) is currently fluoridated. This is further discussed in Attachment 3 entitled Fluoridation or Non-Fluoridation of the Acacia Bay Water Supply.

The existing Taupō WTP is currently limited to a nominal output capacity of 25 ML/d and was designed with the provision to increase capacity to 30 ML/d and 35 ML/d in two upgrade stages to expand capacity as required.

The connection of Acacia Bay to the Lake Terrace WTP will draw on some of this capacity and an upgrade to 30 ML/d will be required before Acacia Bay could be connected to the Taupō water supply. Acacia Bay would use approximately one third of the half of the capacity of the upgrade.

The cost to connect Acacia Bay to Taupō is approximately **\$4.5 million**.

The cost to increase the capacity of the Taupō WTP to 30 ML/d is approximately **\$1.75 million**.

Option 2 has the following advantages and disadvantages:

Advantages	Disadvantages	Risks
Lower capital cost compared to Option 1 (over \$1.6 million less in short term capital costs).	Fluoridation of the Acacia Bay water supply is inherent with this option.	Potential for public objection to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd supply zones receiving fluoridated water.
Lower operational cost compared to option 1 (approximately \$ 26,000 less per annum).	Projected upgrade of Taupō WTP to 35 ML/d is sooner compared Option 1 as half of the capacity of the upgrade is utilized by Acacia Bay.	

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 2 is the lower cost of the two options considered. Option 1 has the potential risk of delays and uncertainty associated with land acquisition and gaining approvals for a new WTP to be built at Acacia Bay. Option 2 has the potential risk that the Acacia Bay and Mapara communities may object to the fluoridation of the water supply as part of the upgrade which is inherent with the lower cost Option 2.

Option 2 does bring forward the upgrade of the Taupō WTP from 30-35 ML/d earlier than Option 1 as discussed.

The indicative capital cost profile for the two options is given in Figure 9 of the options report.

The impact on rates to both communities for this option are discussed in the financial considerations section.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The total budget proposed in the draft LTP is \$6.25 million dollars (uninflated values) with \$1.75 million being for the Taupō WTP capacity upgrade and a further \$4.5 million to connect Acacia Bay to the Taupō supply.

Draft Long-term Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for under the draft LTP as follows:

YEAR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	BUDGET	INFLATED LTP VALUES
2018/2019	Taupō WTP Upgrade	Capacity Upgrade from 25-30MLD, enabling works for the Acacia Bay water supply upgrade ¹ .	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000
2018/2019	Acacia Bay Water Supply Upgrade	Design work and tendering etc to occur while the Taupō WTP upgrade is completed	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
2019/2020	Acacia Bay Water Supply Upgrade	Construction	\$2,100,000	\$2,153,000
2020/2021	Acacia Bay	Construction &	\$2,100,000	\$2,203,000

	Water Supply Upgrade	commissioning		
--	----------------------	---------------	--	--

1. Approximately 50% of the Lake Terrace WTP Upgrade Cost would be attributed to Acacia Bay

A breakdown of the cost estimates used to establish the budgeted expenditure is attached.

Rates Impact

The potential rates impact for each option has been calculated for each option. The calculation includes allowance for asset depreciation, interest and operating costs. The calculation excludes the impact of the Taupō WTP upgrade this upgrade is required for both options.

Option 1 – A New Standalone WTP for Acacia Bay

Acacia Bay water rates (2017/18)	\$ 546
Projected Acacia Bay water rates change due to this project	+ \$ 609
Total	\$1,155

Option 2 – Connection of Acacia Bay to the Taupō Water Supply

Acacia Bay water rates (2017/18)	\$ 546
Projected Acacia Bay water rates change due to this project	- \$ 56
Total for Acacia Bay	\$490
Taupō water rates (2017/18)	\$ 447
Projected Taupō water rates change due to this project	+ \$ 43
Total Taupō	\$490

The Mapara water rates are based on land value and we have not attempted to calculate the impact on individuals. However we can quickly conclude that the rates impact for Option 1 will be significant compared to Option 2.

Policy Implications

The proposal to provide a water supply for the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd communities that complies with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) is consistent with Council's policies in this regard.

Taupō District Council Infrastructure Strategy

Council's current Infrastructure Strategy specifically notes that we want to have good quality drinking water and that the provision of water supplies that meet the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand is a strategic issue.

Taupō District Council Asset Management Plans

Council's Water Asset Management Plan (AMP) sets out how Council intends to manage and demonstrate stewardship of water assets on behalf of its communities in order to provide services cost-effectively, both now and into the future.

Taupō District Council Water Supply Strategy

This strategy provides policy guidance and strategic direction for the supply of potable water throughout Taupō District. This strategy was written prior to the legislative requirement for an Infrastructure Strategy and as such, there are considerable similarities between the two.

Risks

Option 1 - A New Standalone WTP for Acacia Bay – has the following risks:

- Potential for higher than anticipated cost or difficulty in acquiring a suitable site to locate a new WTP in Acacia Bay.
- Potential for public objection to a new WTP being located in Acacia Bay and consequent difficulty in obtaining planning approval to build a new WTP.

Option 2 - Connection of Acacia Bay to the Taupō Water Supply – has the following risk:

- Potential for public objection to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd supply zones receiving fluoridated water.

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.

The requirement under the Health Act to upgrade the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd water supplies to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ will have a significant cost implication to the Council and the ratepayers. Furthermore, the preferred and lowest cost option would inherently provide fluoridation to the Acacia Bay and Mapara Rd supply zones which are currently not fluoridated.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and for the reasons stated in the above paragraph are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is significant.

ENGAGEMENT

Given the significance of the proposal consultation should be undertaken with those currently connected to the Acacia Bay water supply scheme as they are directly affected by the proposal. Consultation should also be undertaken with the wider Taupō community due to the funding implications of connecting an additional scheme to the Taupō water treatment plant and the requirement to increase the capacity of this scheme earlier than anticipated. This proposal should be included in the Consultation Document for the Long-term Plan 2018 – 28.



CONCLUSION

The Acacia Bay Water Supply currently does not currently comply with the DWSNZ.

Continued non-compliance with the DWSNZ is not deemed to be acceptable in terms of Councils obligations as a drinking water supplier under the Health Act.

The preferred option to comply with the DWSNZ is to connect Acacia Bay to the Taupō water supply (Option 2). This option is the lowest cost and lowest risk option noting that this option would provide the Acacia Bay and Mapara water supplies with fluoridated water which may be objected to by the communities

ATTACHMENTS

1. Acacia Bay Water Treatment Plant Options Assessment Report - May 2017 
2. Cost Estimates for options 

5.5 CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING PROJECT

Author: Nick Carroll, Policy Manager

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This report:

- Seeks confirmation of previous Council discussions which identified the Great Lake Centre area as the preferred site for civic administration activities.
- Seeks Council direction to include provision of cultural, arts and heritage facilities to replace the existing Taupō museum as part of the overall project to develop a civic administration building.
- Outlines the next phase of work, what it is intended to cover, when it will take place and who will be involved.
- Seeks Council confirmation of the supporting information that provides the context for the financial information related to the project included in the draft long-term plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council requires a new civic administration building and has been working through a range of different site options. Having considered a wide range of information through workshops Council indicated on 18 October 2017 that the preferred location is on the local purpose reserve land around the Great Lake Centre.

To enable officers to progress work on the project Council confirmation of that preferred site is being sought. The next step is a more detailed master plan for the broader precinct so that Council can better understand how different activities, buildings, roading and public space might interact and be progressively developed over time.

Of particular interest is the future of the Taupo Museum. The existing site and building have limitations and there are opportunities to look at how new cultural, arts and heritage facilities might be provided as part of the master plan.

Provision has been made for a new civic administration building over the first four years of the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28. This is effectively a placeholder until more detailed information is available through the master planning, however it does reflect that as a minimum Council will need to build a new civic administration building.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council:

1. Confirms that the area of Local Purpose Reserve to the South of the Great Lake Centre is the preferred location for Council's civic administration activities.
2. Confirms that the preferred site and surrounding area should be master planned to ensure that there is a long term view on the way that the different activities and public space can be developed in an integrated manner.
3. Confirms that the master planning should include consideration of new cultural, arts and heritage facilities to replace the existing Taupō Museum.
4. Adopts the Warren and Mahoney feasibility report on the civic administration building (1 March 2017) (objective reference A1914694), as supporting information for the consultation document for the 2018-28 Long-term Plan.

BACKGROUND

Issues associated with the vulnerability of the civic administration building at 72 Lake Terrace to earthquakes and the presence of asbestos led to the building being vacated in 2017. In response to those issues Council started the process to look at alternative ways to provide appropriate civic administration facilities. That

included a range of options such as refurbishing the existing building, considering leasing commercial office space and constructing a new building.

The various options were discussed with the community through the Annual Plan in 2017. At that point the decision (resolution TDC201706/045) was made not to refurbish the building at 72 Lake Terrace, with a preference being for a new building.

What was less clear was the best location so various Council owned locations have been investigated. Council has also considered options to use sites in private ownership or commercial leasing options. That information was presented to Council through a series of workshops culminating with a workshop on 18 October 2017, where Council indicated a preference for the Great Lake Centre location.

GREAT LAKE CENTRE IDENTIFIED AS THE PREFERRED LOCATION

The area of Local Purpose Reserve around the Great Lake Centre and the Library has emerged as the Council's favoured location. This location has been supported since 2004 as a precinct for civic facilities. This was reinforced in the 2011 Taupō Urban Commercial and Industrial Structure Plan, which identified the development of a civic heart in that location strengthened by an extended mix of civic facilities.

A range of other opportunities at that location have also been identified:

- It would act as a catalyst for undertaking the planned realignment of Story Place and the car parking areas making the area easier to get around and connecting down to the boat harbour.
- The frontages of Story Place and Tongariro Street could be activated with new buildings and improved public spaces.
- We could deliver on previous plans to create a civic heart bringing more people into the area.
- Public space could be enhanced with better connections between the civic facilities like the library and the open space of the South Domain.
- We could also improve the connections between the Great Lake Centre, library and I-site and look for ways to improve the customer experience and achieve operational efficiencies.

To better understand how these different opportunities could be realised it is necessary to master plan the precinct. This will ensure that decisions made now are reflective of the longer term vision for the area and can be staged so as to be affordable without compromising the overall outcomes.

That proposed master planning is expected to be funded through existing budgets for the 2017/18 year and provision has been made in the draft budgets for the 2018/19 year.

For the sake of clarity, a Council decision that the Great Lake Centre is the preferred site for further investigation will not trigger any Public Works Act processes.

TAUPŌ MUSEUM TO BE INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLANNING

The existing Taupō Museum provides a mix of cultural, arts and heritage facilities. It sits as part of the broader precinct of civic facilities and it makes sense to include it as part of the overall master plan. There are some constraints in the existing museum with regard to the building height, the amount of display space and limited storage. There are also opportunities that could be investigated as part of the master planning such as better integration with other facilities and public spaces.

It is recommended that Council includes consideration of the Taupō Museum as part of the overall master planning for the precinct. Doing so would provide Council with more information to help inform future decision making. This will make the master planning more complicated however it makes sense given the current state of the museum facilities and the potential opportunities to improve the provision of cultural, arts and heritage facilities.

It is important to recognise that there are a number of other entities and groups who have strong interests in the provision of cultural, arts and heritage facilities. In particular, Council needs to engage with Ngāti Tūwharetoa to understand their views and needs so that they can be reflected in the future planning.

MASTER PLANNING PHASE

Compared to other potential sites the Great Lake Centre location has the advantage of enabling a number of opportunities. To better understand how those opportunities might be realised it is important that the precinct is master planned.

Officers intend to refine the scope for the master planning phase and bring it to Council for feedback towards the end of April. That scope is expected to include the following objectives:

- a) Provision for a civic administration building. A company, NotYetKnown, have been engaged to perform a spatial and utilisation assessment of our operations. They will help determine the future office space required and assist in establishing a more certain set of future building requirements. Their work is due to be completed in mid-April.
- b) Realignment of roading and car parking to achieve better links to the boat harbour and the south domain.
- c) Activation of Story Place and Tongariro Street frontages and consideration of better connections across both of those roading corridors.
- d) Delivery of a civic heart in accordance with Council's structure plan.
- e) Integration with the existing civic facilities (Library, Great Lake Centre and I-site) to deliver enhanced customer experiences and potentially management efficiencies.
- f) Consideration of the provision of cultural, arts and heritage facilities to replace the existing museum, in terms of location and integration with other activities.

These objectives will need to be refined to enable the master planning to be more focused. It will also be important to understand the needs of other users and interested groups to ensure that their needs are reflected.

The expectation is that the master planning will largely be undertaken utilising external expertise, although there will continue to be Council and officer involvement. To ensure that we can move the project forward as fast as practicable we will look to engage the experts prior to finalising the scope. Once the scope has been finalised and project team has been appointed it will be possible to establish the likely timeline for the master planning. The expectation at this point is that the master plan will be prepared by around September 2018.

As the master plan is developed the community and stakeholders will be engaged. The timing and detail of that engagement will need to be worked through once the project team is appointed.

FUTURE DECISION MAKING

The master planning will provide Council with considerably more information about how the preferred location could be developed over time. At that point Council will need to make a decision about whether to proceed with the Great Lake Centre option or whether to revisit previous options. It is anticipated that Council will engage with the community and make an amendment to the Long-term Plan at that point to enable funding of the future construction project.

That amendment to the long-term plan will be supported by a comprehensive business case as well as the master plan. Funding for the amendment to the Long-term Plan has been included in the draft Long-term Plan budgets.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR THE FINANCIAL PROVISION IN THE LONG-TERM PLAN

The draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 has been prepared based on an assumption that Council needs to provide a new civic administration building as soon as practically possible. This reflects the previous decision by Council, made through the Annual Plan 2017/18, to construct a new building rather than refurbish the existing one.

Previous investigation has indicated that this may cost approximately \$15 million (see the attached report – Warren and Mahoney feasibility report on the civic administration building (1 March 2017) (objective reference A1914694)). This cost will be further refined as Council undertakes more investigation and planning, however it is considered prudent to include this sum as a placeholder in the draft Long-term Plan. This reflects the best knowledge that Council's currently has around future requirements.

OPTIONS

There are three decisions points for Council to consider.

Decision 1: Is the Great Lake Centre still the preferred site?

Council has considered a range of potential sites for a new civic administration building. This has included a mix of sites in public ownership and others in private ownership. The information regarding site evaluation was presented to the Council workshop on 18 October 2017 (a summary of that information is attached to this report).

Council indicated at the time that the Great Lake Centre location was the preferred site, however that direction needs to be confirmed through a formal decision. Council can choose to confirm that previous preference for the Great Lake Centre site or alternatively relook at one or more alternative sites.

It is recommended that Council confirm the Great Lake Centre on the basis that it:

- Reflects the existing Council policy direction as noted in the Taupō Urban Commercial and Industrial Structure Plan.
- Facilitates the development of a civic heart.
- Acts as a catalyst for improvements to the roading, parking and public space in that broader precinct.
- Opens opportunities to look at improvements to the delivery and operations of other civic facilities in that precinct.

If Council does not wish to confirm the Great Lake Centre as the preferred site at this point, it would be prudent to revisit the underlying assessment information and choose an alternative site.

Decision 2: Should Council proceed with the master planning?

Assuming that Council confirms a preference for the Great Lake Centre, officers believe that the next step is to master plan the broader precinct. This approach is recommended because it will provide Council with a comprehensive view of how the different activities, open space and transport corridors can be knitted together over time.

Council could proceed without master planning, however there is a substantial risk that subsequent decisions around the location and design of a new civic administration building would compromise other activities and foreclose on the opportunities.

Decision 3: Should the master planning include future cultural, arts and heritage facilities?

Assuming that Council decides to proceed with the development of a master plan a decision must be made about the inclusion of the cultural, arts and heritage facilities. These are currently housed in the existing museum building.

It is recommended that Council does include these facilities as part of the master planning. They are important civic facilities and a range of opportunities have been identified to integrate them with the other existing civic facilities and a new civic administration building. Considering these possibilities as part of the master planning will add marginal costs to the master planning exercise, however it has the potential to save Council and the community money in the long term.

Alternatively, Council could decide to focus the master planning and exclude the cultural, arts and heritage facilities. This would reduce the complexity of the master planning and make decision making simpler with less variables to consider in the short term, however it is less likely to deliver robust long term outcomes.

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.

Council's overall decision making with regard to providing a new civic administration building is significant. This reflects the substantial investment that will ultimately be required and the high level of Community interest.

The decisions for Council being posed as part of this report form part of that overall process leading to a new civic administration building. As steps in the overall process they are not considered to be significant.

At this point Council is not making a firm decision on whether to build a new civic administration building on a particular site. Instead the decisions are focused on giving officers direction to undertake more work to better understand the Great Lake Centre site as the currently preferred option.

ENGAGEMENT

Council engaged with the Community through the Annual Plan 2017/18 process. That provided Council with a range of views on suitable locations, with strong support evident for locating a new civic administration building in the Taupō town centre. Those views have informed Council consideration of the different potential sites through the various workshops.

Council will be able to gather more information on the Great Lake Centre site through the master planning process, and then through a subsequent amendment to the Long-term Plan.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

The new civic administration building project is of considerable public interest so it is important that the Community is kept informed of progress. Council's preference for the Great Lake Centre site has previously been communicated to the Community in 2017. The recommendations in this report simply formalise that preference.

The Community will wish to be involved in the master planning so it is recommended that they are provided with updates on when it will happen, what it will cover and how they can be included. That information will be clearer at the end of April once the scope for the work has been finalised.

CONCLUSION

Council has been proceeding steadily on a path to providing a new civic administration building. This report confirms that, as a result of the work done to date, the area of Local Purpose Reserve around the Great Lake Centre is the preferred location.

That location is consistent with the Council's structure plan and opens a wide range of opportunities to improve the operation of existing civic facilities as well public space in the broader precinct. In particular, there is an opportunity to include consideration of the Taupo Museum and the provision of future cultural, arts and heritage facilities. To better understand how to maximise the benefits from those opportunities it is recommended that Council undertake master planning for the precinct. That will facilitate the long term decision making of Council.

Finally, Council is about to consult on the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 and as part of that provision has been made for a future civic administration building. Because Council knows that a new building will be required as soon as practicable \$16 million has been provided over the first four years. That cost has been based on the best information Council has at this point in time, however it is expected that the master planning and other supporting work will enable Council to progressively improve the accuracy of that costing information.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Warren and Mahoney civic administration building feasibility report - 1 March 2017 

5.6 LAKE OHAKURI JETTY - REQUEST TO TAKE ON OWNERSHIP

Author: Ella Howie, Solicitor - Property

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Group Manager: Corporate and Community

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider whether to accept ownership of a jetty to be installed at Lake Ohakuri.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council has received a request from a member of the public, Barry Murphy, to take on ownership of a jetty to be installed at Lake Ohakuri on land owned by Mercury. Mr Murphy proposes to gift the jetty to Council once it is installed and then transfer consents/licences to be obtained over to Council. Mr Murphy has said he would be happy to then maintain the jetty.

The jetty requires separate resource consents with the Taupō District Council, and Waikato Regional Council, and also a licence to occupy with the landowner Mercury. Mr Murphy has submitted an application to Waikato Regional Council for resource consent, and has made enquiries with the Taupō District Council and Mercury regarding consents required.

The preferred option is to decline to accept the gift of the pontoon jetty due to cost, risk, and liability reasons. If Council decides to accept ownership of the jetty it is recommended that a conditional agreement for sale and purchase is entered into to reduce risk for Council.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. Council declines to accept Mr Murphy's proposal to take on ownership of the pontoon jetty proposed to be installed at Lake Ohakuri.

BACKGROUND

There was an existing jetty at Lake Ohakuri that was owned by Mercury. However, the jetty was recently removed by Mercury due to its old and poor condition. Mercury have decided not to replace the jetty.

Mr Murphy, acting in his personal capacity and as a boating enthusiast, has crowd funded on 'give a little' funds to purchase and install a replacement jetty. Mr Murphy does not want the liability and responsibility of owning the jetty and has therefore requests that Council accept ownership of the jetty as it is an asset that will benefit the community.

Mr Murphy has approached Mercury, WRC, Iwi, and two local sports clubs (Upper Atiamuri Sports Club, Atiamuri Community Recreation Club Inc) to take on ownership of the jetty but they have all declined as they do not want the health and safety, and maintenance responsibilities of owning the structure. As a 'last resort' Mr Murphy has requested that Taupō District Council take on ownership of the jetty. Relevant correspondence received from Mr Murphy is attached at Attachment 1.

Taupō District Council has already supported the installation of the jetty by agreeing to waive the resource consent application fees. Waikato Regional Council have also waived their resource consent application fees. Mercury has agreed to contribute \$1000.00 towards materials. A copy a letter sent by Mr Murphy to Waikato Regional Council requesting a waiver of resource consent fees is attached at Attachment 2.

Mr Murphy has also been in touch with Taupō District Council's community team regarding funding assistance and has been advised that the next round of funding for the Mangakino Poukani grants is March 2018.

The jetty pontoon materials have arrived but installation is on hold while necessary consents are obtained and an owner for the jetty is found. Mr Murphy has made enquiries with Mercury and Taupō District Council on consents required, and has submitted an application for resource consent with Waikato Regional Council. The Waikato Regional Council resource consent is on hold, awaiting evidence of approval from Ruakawa Charitable Trust.

DISCUSSION

Description of the jetty:

Plans of the jetty purchased as attached at Attachment 3.

This location of the proposed jetty is on the outskirts of the Taupō District (near the Rotorua District boundary). The location is fairly isolated and the nearest settlement is Atiamuri. It is not known how many people would come from within or outside of the Taupō District to use the proposed jetty. Pictures of the proposed jetty location taken from a recent site visit are attached at Attachment 4.

Mr Murphy has advised that the pontoon jetty was obtained from China through a worldwide distributor called 'Hisedock', and that the New Zealand company 'Pontoon Plus' sell and install the 'Hisedock' products in NZ. Mr Murphy advises that the product is made of HDPE plastic and is built to last 20+ years in the ocean so should last even longer in fresh water, and that the jetty can hold 425kg per square meter so is very stable. Manufacturers information on the product, and instructions for installation and maintenance have been requested but not received. Instead links to the websites for "Hisedock" (<http://www.hiseadock.com>) and 'Pontoon Plus' (<http://www.pontoonplus.co.nz>) have been sent to Council.

The jetty is proposed to be installed permanently for people to use year round.

Mr Murphy proposes to install the pontoon himself with the assistance of local community volunteers. The jetty will be anchored by 6 tether ropes to 6 concrete anchors. Two galvanised piles will also be installed at the beginning of the structure.

There is no assurance on the structural integrity and suitability of the design of the product proposed to be gifted to Council. This risk can be limited by requiring an engineers report prior to accepting ownership of the structure.

Merits of the proposal:

Mr Murphy has advised that he benefits having a floating jetty/pontoon at the proposed location are:

- boaties don't need to come too close to the shore and people swimming in the lake;
- there is a safe way to enter and exit the boat without injury;
- limits environmental damage such as weeds being chopped up and spread by boats propellers as they won't have to come so close to the bank;
- reduces situation of people getting angry at lengthy experience of removing boat from the water and then driving dangerously down a dangerous stretch of road.

Council's existing jetty's and pontoons:

Council owns swimming pontoons at Mangakino and the jetty and boat ramps at Mangakino lakefront, and Atiamuri. Council also owns a boat ramp at Whakamaru. The swimming pontoon at Acacia Bay and Kinloch are community owned and Council does not manage or maintain these. Council therefore has limited experience in management or maintenance of jetties. All other jetties in the district are DIA/ harbourmaster or community owned.

Precedence issue:

A group of community members Mangakino have crowd funded funds to purchase materials and install a pontoon in Mangakino. They have submitted the resource consent themselves, but will be interested in the outcome of this decision. There is a risk that if Council accepts ownership of the pontoon that it will set a perceived 'precedence' other pontoons such as the one in Mangakino.

Maintenance and health and safety:

Council officers are concerned they will not have the capacity, resources, or experience to properly manage and maintain the jetty. The isolated location also makes it more challenging for Council staff to monitor and maintain the structure, and also make it more susceptible to vandalism.

Mr Murphy has advised that the community is happy to check and repair and damage to the pontoon and ensure it gets water blasted from time to time if it gets slippery or has growth etc. Some spare parts were purchased by Mr Murphy. Mr Murphy has advised that as the community use the boat ramp often, it will be the first to see any issues and make arrangements for repair.

While Mr Murphy has agreed to maintain the jetty himself with the help of the community volunteers there is risk there in either Mr Murphy walking away, maintenance not being done properly, Mr Murphy or another member of the community injures themselves while carrying out maintenance work.

In either scenario; Council maintaining the structure itself or allowing Mr Murphy to maintain the structure- Council will have a primary duty of care under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 to ensure as far as is reasonably practicable that the health and safety of other persons is not put at risk from work carried out. Council will therefore need to closely manage any maintenance work being carried out on its behalf. The onus is on the Council's contract manager to make sure the risks are properly managed so there aren't any incidents.

The risk of Council being liable for health and safety incidents may be reduced if it takes on full maintenance of the structure itself or outsources this to suitable contractor.

The pontoon will enable safer loading and offloading from boats. However it will also be a structure that leads to deep water, which is a health and safety consideration.

General discussion:

The main issues for Council to consider are the merits of the proposal (use and benefit by the community, and improved access) against the liability of the proposal (financial cost to the ratepayer, risks of quality of the structure, perceived 'precedence', Council's lack of knowledge and experience in managing jetty structures, monitoring and maintenance obligations, uncertainty as to manufacturers installation recommendations, uncertainty as to manufacturers maintenance recommendations, health and safety risks, liability risk of the structure becoming damaged during storm flooding and or causing damage to Mercury's assets, risk of Mercury not renewing landowner consent after the proposed three year term licence, costs of removal of structure if it needs to be removed). The risks, legal and financial section below further analyse these liability issues.

It would be unusual for Council to take on ownership of a private structure not on our land. It is considered more appropriate for local communities or an organisation with a strong local presence to hold ownership of jetties or pontoons. The local presence will enable better monitoring and management of the structure.

Consultation with interested parties:

Mr Murphy has advised he has been in touch with the following interested parties and that they have all indicated support:

- Tuwharetoa;
- Ruakawa Trust;
- Te Pumautanga O Te Arawa Trust;
- Waikato Maritime.

Evidence of consultation with the above parties should be required from Mr Murphy if Council chooses to accept ownership of the jetty.

Based on this information it is considered that there are two options; accept or decline ownership of the jetty.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Accept ownership of the jetty

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community receive the benefit and use of the jetty; • Safer and more convenient access to and from boats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived 'precedence' that Council will accept ownership of pontoons or jettys crowd funded by the public; • Financial cost of owning the asset (maintenance, monitoring, repairing, replacement or removal, consent fees); • Health and safety and environmental risk if product is not installed properly or is not structurally sound (note this risk can be reduced by requiring an engineer's report); • Risk that the jetty will not be maintained properly as Council has limited knowledge and experience in managing jetty structures and has not received the

	<p>manufactures recommendations on maintaining the jetty. Also the jetty is in an isolated location making it difficult for staff to monitor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • liability risk of the structure becoming damaged during storm flooding and or causing damage or injury to other property or persons; • risk of Mercury not renewing landowner consent after the proposed three year term licence; • risk of fluctuating lake levels and flows associated with the operation of the Hydro Scheme, including possible flooding.
--	---

Option 2. Decline the proposal to accept ownership of the jetty

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council avoids the risk, liability and costs of the proposal (refer disadvantages listed above). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The jetty cannot be installed as no-one wants to take on ownership of it; • Access to the water will remain via the concrete boat ramp.

Analysis Conclusion:

The disadvantages of the proposal appear to outweigh the benefits.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The cost involved in owning the jetty are outlined below:

Type of cost	Amount
Purchase price of jetty:	Nil
Waikato Regional Council resource consent:	<p>Annual charge: \$125 per annum</p> <p>Monitoring fee: \$400 approx every 3-4 years. However, If non compliances are noted this charge may increase based on the significance of non-compliance).</p> <p>Engineer inspection of the structure every 5 years: cost unknown</p>
Taupo District Council resource consent:	Nil charges
Reapplication fees for consents once these have expired:	There may be costs for application fees for the structure once the proposed consents have expired. The current application fees are between \$1500 and \$3000 for non-notified consents.
Mercury licence:	Licence fee: \$1 per annum
Depreciation fund for asset (note this is optional):	\$8,100 approx

Costs of monitoring, maintaining and repairing, and removal (if required):	Unknown
--	---------

Comments:

If Council decided to take on ownership of the jetty it would need to also decide whether it would want to create a depreciation fund to fund the replacement of the asset at the end of its life or whether it would want to simply remove the jetty once it has reached the end of its life.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently is currently unbudgeted. It is requested that unbudgeted expenditure is approved. Unbudgeted expenditure is preferred because it will mean that there will be appropriate funds set aside to manage the jetty professionally.

Legal ConsiderationsLocal 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 infrastructure. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation. The key legislation applicable to the proposal has been reviewed and the relevant matters for consideration are as follows:

Health and Safety at Work Act 2015:

Under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, Council as a PCBU has a primary duty of care to ensure the health and safety of its workers and others, so far as is reasonably practicable. This duty is not extinguished if Mr Murphy says he wants to be responsible for maintenance of the jetty; Council will still have a primary duty of care for the safety of Mr Murphy, and any other volunteers and others influenced by the work. Council will need to ensure that the public are not put at harm from any installation or maintenance work carried out on the jetty.

Council will need to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable that the product is safe, installed to the manufacturers specifications, and maintained properly to avoid any potential health and safety liability issues.

Waikato Regional Consent conditions:

The resource consent from the Waikato Regional Council has not been issued yet. However, the Waikato Regional Council has sent Council a set of example consent conditions from a similar consent. Based off these example consent conditions, Council would be required to:

- Maintain the jetty so that no part of the structure dislodges or results in a navigational hazard;
- Be responsible for the structural integrity and maintenance of the jetty and for any erosion control works that become necessary to preserve the integrity and stability of the lake marge and/or to control erosion as a result of the jetty;
- Implement the best practical option to minimise sediment discharge, damage to the lake bed and surrounding environment whilst undertaking any maintenance works on the jetty;
- Ensure the jetty as far as practicable is not used for refuelling activities.

The consenting officer from WRC has advised that the consent term would be between 10 to 35 years.

Mercury licence:

Council has received a draft Mercury licence which provides for landowner approval of the jetty. A copy of the draft licence is attached at Attachment 5. The term of the licence is for 3 years with rent of \$1 per annum. A plan of the licenced area is not attached. The licence would require Council to:

- Undertake regular maintenance checks of the jetty;
- maintain the jetty and ensuring regular maintenance checks are undertaken;
- Keep the Licence Area clean and removing any rubbish;

- Indemnify Mercury against any loss, damage etc caused by the jetty;
- hold public liability insurance of \$1 million;
- remove the pontoon before expiry of the licence and making good any damage.

The pontoon would be located on Mercury land and from time to time Mercury may need to close access to this area.

The following authorisations are required for the proposal:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Consent | <input type="checkbox"/> Building Consent | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Health |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Liquor Licencing | <input type="checkbox"/> Licence to occupy | |

Authorisations are required from external parties (Waikato Regional Council, Mercury). Building consent is not required as the jetty will sit below one meter off the water.

Policy Implications

The proposal has been evaluated against the Long-term Plan, Annual Plan, Taupō District Plan, Waikato Regional Plan, Asset Management Plan. The key aspects for consideration with regards to this proposal are as follows:

Taupō District Plan:

Under Rule 4.e.8.2 of the Taupō District Plan, any permanent structure on the surface of the water is a discretionary activity and therefore requires resource consent.

Waikato Regional Plan:

Under Rule 4.2.12.1 of the Waikato Regional Plan, use, erection, reconstruction, placement, alteration or extension of any boat ramp or jetty, as associated bed disturbances in, under or over the bed of a river or lake, and any discharge of sediment associated with construction activities is a discretionary activity which requires resource consent.

Risks

If Council accepts ownership of the jetty there is a risk that Mercury decide not to renew the proposed initial three year term licence. Council would then be required to remove the pontoon structure. There is also a risk that Mercury might in the future decide to charge a licence fee for the jetty under a renewed licence.

There is a risk that the jetty to be installed is not structurally sound or has not been installed properly. If the jetty became damaged or detached it could also cause liability for Council if it caused damage to other property or persons. This risk can be minimised by requiring an independent engineers report prior to accepting ownership of the structure. However, this risk may be difficult to manage during fluctuating lake levels and flows associated with the operation of the Hydro Scheme, including possible flooding.

There is a risk that the jetty will be vandalised in its isolated location.

There is a political risk that if Council declines to accept ownership of the structure then certain members of the public will be upset. Conversely, if Council accepts ownership of the jetty it may set a perceived precedence that it will accept other crowd funded jetties.

There is a risk to the health and safety of the public users of the jetty, particularly if Council does not properly maintain, inspect or manage the jetty. For example, there is a risk that someone could slip and fall off the jetty into deep water. There are liability risks for Council under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 in ensuring the health and safety of its works and others, so far as is reasonably practicable. Council, as a PCBU, will still owe a duty to ensure, so far as reasonably practicable, the health and safety of volunteer workers.

There is a risk of the unknown exact quantities to repair, maintain and remove the jetty.

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. Any communication will be done in conjunction with the Communications team.

CONCLUSION

This report analyses the benefits and disadvantages of the proposal to accept ownership of a jetty. This report recommends that Council avoid any issues of liability and risk by declining to accept ownership of the jetty.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Attachment 1- Relevant correspondence 
- 2. Attachment 2- Letter sent by Mr Murphy to Waikato Regional Council 
- 3. Attachment 3- Jetty plans 
- 4. Attachment 4- Pictures from site visit 
- 5. Attachment 5- Mercury Licence 

5.7 100 KINLOCH ROAD, TREE REMOVAL

Author: Michael Cordell, Asset Manager Water & Waste

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Group Manager, Operational Services

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to request Council to make a decision in line with the adopted Tree and Vegetation Policy on the removal (or not) of a Poplar tree adjacent to 100 Kinloch Road, Kinloch.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Kinloch Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) upgrades are being designed and tendered during early 2018. This project identified the urgent need to protect the WWTP from flood risk, which requires a new access road to maintain reliable access during floods.

Investigations identified the only feasible new access over Council land as being adjacent to the southern side of the stormwater reserve at 100 Kinloch Road. There is a group of Poplar trees that line Kinloch Road, many of which are protected in the District Plan. The particular tree in question is not clearly identified as a protected tree in the District Plan, however, it is the last tree in the stand of trees that is protected. Therefore, we are treating the tree as a protected tree, which will require a resource consent.

The new access will disturb the root zone of this Poplar tree. The council arborist was therefore consulted and he supports trimming the tree, but does not support its removal.

Therefore, a decision needs to be made in order to remove a healthy tree under the current tree and vegetation policy.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

It is recommended that Council approves the request to remove the identified Poplar tree adjacent to the southern side of the stormwater reserve at 100 Kinloch Road, with a replacement Poplar to be planted at a suitable location nearby.

BACKGROUND

Council granted consent for the proposed flood protection scheme and new access road during December 2017. To avoid delays, it was agreed that the removal of the discussed Poplar tree was a decision for this meeting. The particular tree in question is not clearly identified as a protected tree in the District Plan, however, it is the last tree in the stand of trees that is protected. Therefore, we are treating the tree as a protected tree.

The preferred solution is to construct a standard formed concrete vehicle crossing to allow access to the site. However, this will damage the roots of tree and the arborist has suggested this could eventually kill the tree.

Council's arborist has proposed a plastic mesh roading product is installed over the existing berm to avoid disturbing the root zone. Installation of this product will not allow curb to be cut down and will add the additional height of the protection product that the truck must mount. The trucks that will use this access will be fully laden tankers and will likely cause damage to the curb, the specification of the plastic product have not been investigated, however it is unlikely that it would have a long life under such vehicle loads.

To avoid delays, it was agreed that the removal of the discussed Poplar tree was a decision for this meeting.



DISCUSSION

It is not practical to avoid disturbing the ground around the discussed Poplar and approvals have previously been granted for the new access, so the roots will be disturbed even without the construction of the proposed concrete road crossing.

OPTIONS

There are two options for consideration:

Option 1. Remove the Poplar for new access to Kinloch WWTP

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows new reliable and safe access to Kinloch WWTP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of tree removal, stump ground and replant suitable species Resource consent required if the tree is identified as protected under the District Plan

Option 2. Retain the Poplar, and trim back branches.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No cost associated with tree removal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits sight lines and turning circle for trucks increasing the hazard to public safety. Impractical to avoid damaging roots with trucks required to drive over them, creating a high risk of tree deteriorating. High risk of damage to the curb.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for under Kinloch WWTP Upgrades Project.

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 infrastructure. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

Policy Implications

The proposal has been evaluated against the Long-term Plan, Annual Plan, Taupō District Plan, Bylaws and the adopted Tree and Vegetation policy.

There are a number of protective trees identified in the District Plan and a Resource Consent is required prior to any tree(s) being removed.

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:

- The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- 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

The residents will be advised of the decision made.

CONCLUSION

While the tree is currently in a healthy condition, there are no feasible alternatives to avoid damaging the Poplar tree root with the new access road required. It is recommended to remove the existing Poplar tree, with a new Poplar be planted at a nearby suitable location.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.8 UPDATES TO TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES**Author:** Vincent Wang, Engineering Officer**Authorised by:** Kevin Strongman, Group Manager, Operational Services**PURPOSE**

To update the Taupō District Council traffic controls or prohibitions on roads or public spaces, in accordance with the Taupō District Council Traffic Bylaw 2014.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL TRAFFIC CONTROLS MAY BE UPDATED FROM TIME TO TIME WITH NEW CONTROLS OR PROHIBITIONS. Council must make a resolution whenever a sign or marking on the road is recommended or recommended to be changed, and as a consequence controls or prohibits the use of a road or public space. The ability to make such changes has been delegated by Council to the Fences, Roding, Reserves & Dogs Committee, however due to the cancellation of the 30 January 2018 Committee meeting, the request contained in this report is presented direct to Council for consideration.

The Taupō District Council Traffic Control Device Register (the Register) sets out all the signs and markings which control and prohibit the use of a road or public space in the Taupō District.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That, pursuant to the Taupō District Council Traffic Bylaw, Council imposes the following traffic controls and/or prohibitions on roads and/or public spaces in the Taupō District:

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
Two(2) 90 [Mon-Fri] minutes parking restriction signs	To provide seventeen (17) 90 minute time restricted parking spaces [Mon-Fri]	Southern kerbline of Heuheu Street outside number 101 to 107

OPTIONS

The two options before Council are:

- 1) Accept the recommendation to amend and update the controls or;
- 2) Not accept the recommendation to amend and update the controls.

It is recommended that Council accepts the recommendation to update and amend the controls.

CONSIDERATIONS

The controls require updating to incorporate the following new signs and markings:

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1. Two (2) 90 [Mon-Fri] minutes parking restriction signs	To provide seventeen (17) 90 minute time restricted parking spaces [Mon-Fri]	Southern kerbline of Heuheu Street outside number 101 to 107

Due to Taupō town and businesses growing, a P90 [Mon-Fri] zone for ten (10) parking spaces on Heuheu Street outside number 109 to 111 was approved at the FRReD committee meeting held on 18 July 2017 [FRD201707/08 RESOLUTION].

Jetts Taupō [number 107 Heuheu Street] have now formally lodged a service request to set up 120 minutes parking restriction time for the existing all day parking area and four to six reserved parking spaces for their customers in November 2017.

In addition, transportation team has received three service requests from ratepayers regarding complaints for difficulty finding parking spaces in this area since 1 December 2017.

There are seventeen (17) unrestricted parking spaces remaining along the southern side Heuheu Street between Titiraupenga Street and Kaimanawa Street and people are using these spaces for long term parking to access nearby business and services.

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of maintenance to the Register does not change and is met within current budgets.

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 proposal has been evaluated with regard to the Traffic Bylaw 2014, the Land Transport Act 1998 and the associated Rules. Prescribed signs need to be installed in order to be enforceable by our compliance officers.

Policy Implications

There are no policy implications.

Risks

There are no risks except not having prescribed signs installed.

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. The transportation team have consulted with key stakeholders including compliance team and received feedback as follows:

Transportation and compliance team have liaised with key stakeholders on Heuheu Street from Number 101 to 107.

In accordance with Jetts Taupō's request, setting up P90 parking time restriction is to keep consistency with existing P90 parking restriction zone from Medical centre on Heuheu Street, which is a preferred parking restriction time for the compliance team to undertake enforcement effectively. In addition, council currently

do not reserve public parking spaces for any business. Jetts Taupō's manager is in support of the proposed P90 parking zone as it is a positive change for their business.

Manager of Taupō Plan Service [Number 107] mentioned that this area has become much busier since Taupō District council chamber relocated to this building four months ago. They are also worried about insufficient parking spaces for their customers.

Community Kindy Heuheu Street [Number 105] was strongly against the proposal. As their staff are not allowed to park in the off street parent car park within their property, parking on the opposite side is not supported as they often have lots of resources and teaching products. This issue may be the same for a number of businesses along Heuheu Street however this proposal is to reduce the number of people parking all day along the southern kerbline thus there should be more parking spaces available for unloading purposes.

All the rest of business owners are in support the proposed change.


COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media is required.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that Council imposes the traffic controls and prohibitions detailed in the report. Staff will then update the Traffic Control Device Register in accordance with the resolution.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed 90 Minutes Parking Time Restriction on Heuheu Street outside Number 101 to 107 Plan 

5.9 EASEMENT REQUEST ON TONGARIRO DOMAIN

Author: Nathan Mourie, Senior Reserves Planner

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Group Manager, Operational Services

PURPOSE

To decide on approving an easement to Unison on Tongariro Domain for the purposes of reinforcing the security of the Taupō CBD power supply.

DISCUSSION

Unison own and operate the local electricity distribution network. They have approached Council requesting an easement to convey electricity, telecommunications and electronic data over Council administered land in Tongariro Domain.

Council's legal officers have advised that staff do not have the appropriate delegations to approve any such request. The ability to make such changes under section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 has been delegated by Council to the Fences, Roding, Reserves & Dogs Committee; however due to the cancellation of the 30 January 2018 Committee meeting, the request contained in this report is presented direct to Council for consideration.

Section 48 deals with grants of rights of way and other easements. This section allows the administering body to grant an easement over any part of the reserve for the establishment and lawful exercise of a right of way or other easement without public consultation provided:

- The reserve is vested in an administering body and is not likely to be materially altered or permanently damaged; and
- The rights of the public in respect of the reserve are not likely to be permanently affected.

Detailed information on the works have been provided by Unison and are included as attachments to this report.

To summarise, the current CBD supply feeder line is overloaded under normal configuration and Unison plan to support the load in this area by connecting to another existing feeder line which has available capacity.

Due to the overloaded lines there is a significant chance of power blackouts in the affected area if work is not carried out to ensure supply security. This solution will provide enough capacity to avoid power shortages in the CBD area due to overloaded supply lines.

The work consists of two 60 metre lengths of cable running along Story Place and new feeder cable connection cabinets. All costs associated with the creation of this easement would be borne by Unison, including any reasonable legal costs incurred by Council.

The main consideration is the future development of Tongariro Domain. It is possible that there will be significant changes within the reserve in part due to harbour area developments and the potential location of additional Council buildings within the southern part of the reserve. These potential changes however are not well understood or advanced at this stage, which means that there is no firm information to determine how they may affect the reserves layout and development. However, it is expected that any potential changes to the road corridor are expected to be minimal and that development will take place largely within the structure of the existing roading layout.

Given the early stages of the decision making and potential development process, information at this level of detail is not available; and it is assumed at this time that the current roading layout will remain in place for the foreseeable future. One part of the easement runs parallel to the existing road and is unlikely to be greatly affected if the roading layout in the domain remains the same during any reserve development. The other part runs from the road to the corner of the museum, and should be able to be relatively easily accommodated during any future reserve development.

Care will have to be taken that existing vegetation is not unduly affected by the installation as much as is reasonably possible.

CONCLUSION



The risk to the CBD power supply is of great importance to the town and the local economy. The benefits derived from a more secure power supply appear at this time to outweigh any potential impediments to

undetermined development of the reserve. The location of the easements largely alongside the existing road mean that there should be negligible permanent impacts to the users of the reserve following completion of the work and reinstatement of the site.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council approve the granting of an easement to Unison over Tongariro Domain for the right to convey electricity, telecommunications and electronic data as outlined in the attachments to this report and authorise the Chief Executive to sign any approval documents on behalf of Council in respect of this matter.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Unison easement request 
2. Unison easement information 

5.10 ADOPTION OF SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR THE DRAFT LONG-TERM PLAN 2018-28 CONSULTATION DOCUMENT INCLUDING THE DRAFT REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY AND ASSOCIATED S101(3) CONSIDERATIONS REPORT FOR AUDIT NEW ZEALAND CONSIDERATION

Author: Hadley Tattle, Senior Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This report seeks Council's adoption of supporting information for the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document. This includes the draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101(3) considerations report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Audit New Zealand will assess the quality of the supporting information used to prepare the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document. This underlying information includes, but is not limited to,

- Draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101(3) considerations report,
- Draft performance measures,
- Draft forecasting assumptions,
- Draft Accounting Policies,
- Draft Funding Impact Statement,
- Draft Financial Strategy,
- Draft Infrastructure Strategy,
- Draft fees and charges,
- Draft financial information,
- Challenges Paper,
- Demographic Snapshot, and
- Taupō Northern Outlet and CBD Investigation report (to be separately circulated or tabled at the meeting).

Adopting these documents allows Audit NZ to consider them when auditing the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council:

1. Adopts the draft Revenue and Financing Policy 2018 and associated s101(3) considerations report for Audit New Zealand consideration.
2. Adopts the following draft supporting information for the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document for Audit New Zealand consideration:
 - a) Draft performance measures,
 - b) Draft forecasting assumptions,
 - c) Draft Accounting Policies,
 - d) Draft Funding Impact Statement,
 - e) Draft Financial Strategy,
 - f) Draft Infrastructure Strategy,

- g) Draft fees and charges,
- h) Draft financial information,
- i) Challenges Paper,
- j) Demographic Snapshot, and
- k) Taupō Northern Outlet and CBD Investigation report (to be separately circulated or tabled at the meeting).

BACKGROUND

Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires Councils to have a long-term plan and the plan must include all the information as per part 1 of schedule 10. A number of workshops have been held since the end of 2016, throughout 2017 and at the end of January 2018 to develop draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document, asset management plans, strategies and policies.

DISCUSSION

Audit NZ is required to assess the quality of the underlying information when auditing the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document. This includes the:

- Draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101(3) considerations report,
- Draft performance measures,
- Draft forecasting assumptions,
- Draft Accounting Policies,
- Draft Funding Impact Statement,
- Draft Financial Strategy,
- Draft Infrastructure Strategy,
- Draft fees and charges,
- Draft financial information,
- Challenges Paper,
- Demographic Snapshot, and
- Taupō Northern Outlet and CBD Investigation report (to be separately circulated or tabled at the meeting).

OPTIONS

The two options Council has are to either adopt the draft supporting information for the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document including the Revenue and Financing Policy and the s101(3) considerations report for audit, or not.

It is recommended that Council adopt the draft supporting information, including the Revenue and Financing Policy and the s101(3) considerations report for audit, to ensure it meets its legal obligations under the LGA. Council has spent a significant amount of time considering the various components that are included in the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document with this information being used as the basis for consultation with our community.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial considerations and implications associated with the draft supporting information have been discussed during workshops. These are included in the suite of financial statements and the funding impact statement in the supporting information. This information will be communicated to our community as part of the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document. Any changes that Council makes as a consequence of submissions on the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document will be reflected in the final Long-term Plan to be adopted at the end of June 2018.

Legal Considerations

The draft supporting information including the draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101 (3) considerations report have been developed in accordance with the legislative requirements under the LGA.

Policy Implications

The policy implications have been discussed during workshops. The draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document sets out what Council intends to deliver over 2018–28 period and its anticipated operational and capital budgets.

Risks

If Council chooses not to adopt the draft supporting information, including the draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101 (3) considerations report, Audit NZ may not have the required confidence when making an assessment of the underlying information that has been used to prepare the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document.

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

Consultation is not required when adopting the draft supporting information including the draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101(3) considerations report for Audit consideration.

The Revenue and Financing Policy will be adopted for consultation on 1 March 2018 as the LGA requires that consultation be undertaken on this policy in accordance with s82.





COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

















No communication/media is required.

CONCLUSION

Audit NZ assesses the quality of the supporting information used to prepare the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document. Adopting the draft supporting information, including the draft Revenue and Financing Policy and associated s101(3) considerations report, provides confidence to Audit NZ when auditing the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Final Revenue and Financing Policy 2018 (A2052983) (under separate cover) 
2. Draft s101 (3) considerations report for 2018 Revenue and Financing Policy (A2052975) (under separate cover) 
3. Draft Performance measures LTP 2018-28 updated Jan 2018 (A2128931) (under separate cover) 
4. Draft Forecasting assumptions LTP 2018-28 (A2072664) (under separate cover) 

5. Draft LTP 2018-28 Accounting Policies (A2125165) (under separate cover)  
6. Draft Funding Impact Statement LTP 2018-28 (A2066890) (under separate cover)  
7. Draft Financial Strategy LTP 2018-28 (A2103265) (under separate cover)  
8. Draft Infrastructure Strategy LTP 2018-28 (A2119322) (under separate cover)  
9. Draft Fees and charges LTP 2018-28 (A2063333) (under separate cover)  
10. Draft Financial information LTP 2018-28 (A2129297) (under separate cover)  
11. Challenges Paper 2016-2017 - LTP 2018-28 (A1860598) (under separate cover)  
12. Demographic Snapshot 2016-17 - LTP 2018-28 Updated Dec 2017 (A2098545) (under separate cover)  

5.11 ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY FOR AUDIT NEW ZEALAND CONSIDERATION

Author: Hadley Tattle, Senior Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This report seeks Council's consideration of the draft Development Contributions Policy 2018 (DC Policy) and agreement to adopt the revised policy for Audit New Zealand consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Development contributions are used to recover growth-related costs of new capital expenditure projects created by development. Council has a Development Contributions Policy because it is more transparent and easier to administer than financial contributions (financial contributions are also being removed from the Resource Management Act 1991).

The draft DC Policy has been considered in conjunction with the draft Long-term Plan (LTP) to take account of the new capital expenditure projects, the growth component and the timing of the expenditure. Officers have reviewed the Taupō District Growth Model (incorporated in the draft DC Policy 2018) and the proposed charges have been calculated with regard to the new lower growth estimates.

All the other charges calculated are considered appropriate and reasonable.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council:

1. Adopts the draft Development Contributions Policy 2018 for Audit New Zealand consideration (objective reference A1997323.)
2. Adopts the 2018 Growth Model Review (A1666301)

BACKGROUND

The proposal has been presented to Council at a workshop on 25 January 2018.

The effects of residential and commercial growth, particularly the cumulative effects of development, require Council to incur capital expenditure to provide new or additional services. Funding tools, such as development contributions, ensure this cost is shared fairly between the existing and incoming community.

The DC Policy identifies those activities to be funded by development contributions ensuring a fair distribution of funding of infrastructure having regard to existing and future populations. The existing population has already made considerable investment in services and enjoys the benefit of using those services. Those undertaking new development benefit from connecting to existing services and should pay their fair share of the capital expenditure for this.

The methodology for development contribution collection is set out in the DC Policy.

Development contributions are charged by a Household Unit Equivalent (HUE), which is the unit of demand that creates an equivalency factor between a type of development and one detached dwelling unit (household unit). They are assessed for each service type in each catchment area and are then charged on the number of HUEs.

DISCUSSION

Minor changes have been to this version of the DC policy since the 2015 policy. Other than minor wording changes, the only significant change relates to the funding of reserve land. This has changed from collecting contributions on a district-wide basis to a catchment based approach (Taupō and Kinloch only). This is because many areas of the district have adequate reserve land. If we continued with a district wide based approach would mean that a reserve land contribution would be charged in areas when there is no demand. The change to the policy means that new reserve land would only be charged towards the catchments of Taupō and Kinloch.

There are 2 options.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1: Status Quo – adopt the policy and collect development contributions

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions assist with paying for the growth effects of development. Meets the LGA's requirements. Allows Council to spend funds that have already been collected. Reduces some of the burden on rates by sharing this cost with developers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception that DC's may inhibit growth. Less certainty as a funding source compared to rate funding.

Option 2: Do not adopt a DC Policy and forego development contributions

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception that this may assist in encouraging growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any shortfall will be required to be collected from other sources such as rates. DC debt is transferred to the ratepayer. Does not recognise the development costs that growth causes.

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 ensures developers pay their contribution to the growth effects of their development. This option is preferred as it recognises the cost implications of development and those costs are paid by those that create it in a fair and equitable way.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

Council recovers growth-related costs of capital expenditure projects through development contributions. If Council decides not to collect development contributions it will need to fund these costs from other sources such as rates. For the proposed new charges see Attachment 1.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 has been prepared on the basis that DCs will be collected.

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 infrastructure. (i.e. efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances).

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation. The key legislation applicable to the proposal has been reviewed and the relevant matters for consideration are as follows:

The Local Government Act 2002 provides the framework for how DCs can be calculated and charged.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications

Risks

There is a risk if Council sets the charges too high or too low. The charges need to reflect the costs associated with development but also not make them too high as to inhibit growth. Any shortfall will also need to be funded from another source such as rates.

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 significant.

ENGAGEMENT

Once the DC policy has been considered by Audit NZ and a draft policy has been adopted for consultation, engagement with the community will take place through the draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 consultation period.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA



Communication on the draft DC policy will take place in conjunction with the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28.

CONCLUSION

Funding tools are essential in meeting the infrastructure needs of growing communities. Council recovers these growth-related costs of new capital expenditure projects through development contributions.

Collecting development contributions is preferred as the cost implications of development are paid for by those creating it rather than transferring it to the ratepayer. This option also allows Council to use any reserve funds already collected. It is recommended that Council adopt a draft DC Policy for consideration by Audit NZ.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Development Contributions Policy 2018 (A1997323) (under separate cover) ➡ 
2. Growth Model 2018 Review (A1666301). (under separate cover) ➡ 

5.12 ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT RATES REMISSIONS AND POSTPONEMENT POLICIES FOR AUDIT NEW ZEALAND CONSIDERATION

Author: Hadley Tattle, Senior Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This report seeks Council's consideration of the draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies 2018 and agreement to adopt the revised policies for Audit New Zealand consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council is required to adopt a policy on the remission and postponement of rates on Maori freehold land and may adopt either or both a rates remission policy and/or a rates postponement policy. Council's Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies set out Council's policies in respect of Maori freehold land and rates remissions and rates postponement. These policies allow Council to provide for rates remissions and postponements with set conditions and criteria. There are nine policies proposed which would apply from July 2018 onwards.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council adopts the draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies 2018 for Audit New Zealand consideration.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has been presented to Council at a workshop on 25 January 2018.

Section 102(2)(e) of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires Council to adopt a policy on the remission and postponement of rates on Maori freehold land. Section 108 sets out what must be included in this policy.

Section 102(3) of the LGA states that Council may adopt either or both a rates remission policy and/or a rates postponement policy. Sections 109 and 110 set out what must be included in these policies.

Council's Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies set out Council's policies in respect of Maori freehold land and rates remissions and rates postponement. A copy of the draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies 2018 is attached.

DISCUSSION

Council currently has nine rates remission and postponement policies:

- Rates Remission for Lake Taupō Lakebed and Lakeshore Reserve
- Rates Remission for Community, Sporting and Other Organisations
- Rates Postponement for Extreme Financial Hardship
- Remission of Rates Penalty
- Rates Remission and Postponement on Maori Freehold Land
- Remission of General Rates for Council Owned Utilities
- Water Rates remission attributable to water leaks
- Natural disasters rates remission
- Waitahanui – fixed charge targeted water rate remission policy

Each policy outlines the objectives, conditions and criteria specific to that policy including the information that must be provided when an application is made. It should be noted that although rates remission is provided for on Maori freehold land, Council's postponement policy is to not provide for any postponement of rates on Maori freehold land.

There are still nine rates remission and postponement policies proposed for 2018/19 onwards, this includes a new rates remission policy for *Crown owned Hydro lakes (with easements to carry out the electricity*

generation business). This new policy has been added to the current Rates Remission policy for Lake Taupō Lakebed and Lakeshore Reserve.

- Rates Remission for Lake Taupō Lakebed, *Crown owned Hydro Lakes lakebeds (with easements to carry out the electricity generation business)* and Lakeshore Reserve
- Rates Remission for Community, Sporting and Other Organisations
- Rates Postponement for Extreme Financial Hardship
- Remission of Rates Penalty
- Rates Remission and Postponement on Maori Freehold Land
- Remission of General Rates for Council Owned Utilities
- Water Rates Remission Attributable to Water Leaks
- Natural Disasters Rates Remission
- Waitahanui – fixed charge targeted water rate remission policy

The new Hydro Lakes lakebeds (with easements to carry out the electricity generation business) rates remission policy recognises the significance of public access to the lakes for enjoyment and recreational activities.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Adopt the draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies 2018

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has in place a current set of rates remissions and postponement policies which meet the requirements of the LGA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Option 2. Do not adopt the draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies 2018

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council does not have in place a current set of rates remissions and postponement policies which meet the requirements of the LGA.

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 is the preferred option. Council must have in place current policies on rates remissions and postponements. The draft policies (including the new policy for Hydro lakes lakebeds) meet the requirements of the LGA and are considered best practice since the policy was last amended in 2015.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial implications of these policies have been considered during the development of the draft Long-term Plan 2018 – 28.

Legal Considerations

The draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies 2018 have been developed in accordance with the legislative requirements under the LGA.

Policy Implications

The policies allow Council to provide for rates remissions and postponements with set conditions and criteria.

Risks

If Council chooses not to adopt the draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policies there is a small risk in that Council will not have a current set of policies that reflect best practice

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

Section 102(4) of the LGA requires consultation must be undertaken in accordance with s82. Consultation will be undertaken in conjunction with the Consultation Document for the draft Long-term Plan 2018 – 28 in order to minimise costs.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

Communication will be undertaken in conjunction with the Consultation Document for the draft Long-term Plan 2018 – 28 from 12 March to 16 April 2018.

CONCLUSION

Council is required to adopt a policy on the remission and postponement of rates on Maori freehold land and may adopt either or both a rates remission policy and/or a rates postponement policy. Council's Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies set out Council's policies in respect of Maori freehold land and rates remissions and rates postponement. These policies allow Council to provide for rates remissions and postponements with set conditions and criteria. There are nine policies proposed which would apply from July 2018 onwards.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policies 2018 (A2052986).pdf (under separate cover) 

5.13	ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR AUDIT NEW ZEALAND CONSIDERATION
-------------	---

Author: Hadley Tattle, Senior Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This report seeks Council's adoption of the draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 for Audit New Zealand consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council is required under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) to have a liability and investment policy. The Treasury Management Policy provides for this requirement. The policy maintains the prudent and conservative focus of the existing policy.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council adopts the draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 for Audit New Zealand consideration.

BACKGROUND

Section 102(2)(b) and (c) of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires that Council must adopt a liability policy and an investment policy outlining its policies to manage its investments and liabilities. Sections 104 and 105 set out what must be included in these policies. Council's Treasury Management Policy includes Council's policies in respect of both liabilities and investments. A copy of the draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 is attached.

DISCUSSION

There are minor changes within the policy to the purpose of the distribution of the TEL fund earnings, from providing a rates subsidy to the funds being made available for future community projects. These were discussed with Council at a workshop on 18 October 2017.

The policy maintains a prudent and conservative focus with accountability to Council via a monthly Treasury Report.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Adopt the draft Treasury Management Policy 2018

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the requirements of the LGA to have a liability and investment policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None

Option 2. Do not adopt the draft Treasury Management Policy 2018

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet the requirements of the LGA to have a liability and investment policy

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 is the preferred option. Council is required to have a current liability and investment policy in place. The draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 provides for this requirement.

CONSIDERATIONS**Financial Considerations**

The Treasury Management Policy provides the policy framework for all of Council's borrowing and investment activities and defines key responsibilities and the operating parameters within which borrowing, investment and related risk management activities are to be carried out.

Council acknowledges that there are various financial risks such as interest rate risk, currency risk, liquidity risk and credit risk arising from its treasury activities. Council is a risk adverse entity and does not wish to incur additional risk from its treasury activities.

Legal Considerations

The draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 has been made in accordance with the legislative requirements under the LGA.

Policy Implications

Key borrowing and investment objectives form the basis of the policies. These objectives, while consistent with corporate best practice, are subject to overall Council objectives, as stated in the Annual Plan and Long-term Plan.

Risks

Adopting the Treasury Management Policy will ensure that Council's policy is up to date and reflects our current information. There is a small risk if Council chose not to adopt the changes as proposed.

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 is required under the LGA to have a liability and investment policy. The draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 provides for this requirement. The proposed changes to the policy maintain the prudent and conservative focus of the existing policy.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Treasury Management Policy 2018 (A2054305) (under separate cover) ➡ 

5.14 ADOPTION OF DRAFT LONG-TERM PLAN 2018-28 CONSULTATION DOCUMENT FOR AUDIT NEW ZEALAND CONSIDERATION

Author: Hadley Tattle, Senior Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Group Manager: Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

This report seeks Council's adoption of the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document for Audit New Zealand consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 93A(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires that Council must adopt a consultation document for the Long-term Plan 2018-28. Section 93C(4) requires that the Consultation Document contains a report from the Auditor-General on whether the Consultation Document gives effect to the purpose set out in s93B, and the quality of the underlying information and assumptions underlying the information provided in the Consultation Document.

This item allows Council to adopt the consultation document for consideration by Audit New Zealand. Throughout the audit process there may be amendments recommended by Audit NZ. Any changes that are required will be included in the Consultation Document and will be provided to Council.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council adopts the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document for Audit New Zealand consideration.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has been presented to Council at a workshop on 25 January 2018.

DISCUSSION

A number of workshops have been held since the end of 2016, throughout 2017 and at the end of January 2018 to develop the underlying information that has been used to prepare the Consultation Document.

This information has been adopted by Council and includes but is not limited to the:

- draft Asset Management Plans;
- draft Development Contributions Policy;
- draft Treasury Management Policy;
- draft Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies;
- draft Revenue and Financing Policy (including the s101(3) considerations report);
- further supporting information.

Throughout the audit process there may be amendments recommended by Audit NZ. Any changes that are required will be included in the consultation document and will be provided to Council to consider at the Council meeting on 1 March 2018.

OPTIONSAnalysis of Options

The two options Council has are to either adopt the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document for audit, or not.

It is recommended that Council adopts the draft Long-term Plan 2018-28 Consultation Document for Audit NZ consideration, to ensure it meets its legal obligations under the LGA. Council has spent a significant amount of time considering the various components that are the basis for the Consultation Document.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial considerations and implications contained in the Consultation Document are based on the information included in the underlying information, which Council has adopted and which has been discussed through a series of workshops. The LGA has specific requirements regarding the level of financial disclosure and they are reflected in the Consultation Document

Legal Considerations

The Consultation Document has been prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements under the LGA.

Policy Implications

The policy implications within the Consultation Document have been discussed by Council during workshops and reflect the choices that the Council wishes to discuss with the community when consultation begins on 12 March 2018.

Risks

There is a risk if Council chooses not to adopt the Consultation Document. The LGA states that Council must adopt a consultation document and Council will not be meeting its legal obligations under the Act.

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 decision to adopt the Consultation Document is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Following the completion of the audit by Audit NZ, Council will adopt the Consultation Document for consultation on 1 March 2018. A special consultative procedure will be undertaken in accordance with section 93A of the LGA.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication is required regarding a decision to adopt the Consultation Document for consideration by Audit NZ.



CONCLUSION

Section 93A(1)(a) of the LGA requires that Council must adopt a consultation document for the Long-term Plan 2018-28. Section 93C(4) requires that the Consultation Document contains a report from the Auditor-General on whether the Consultation Document gives effect to the purpose set out in s93B, and the quality

of the underlying information and assumptions underlying the information provided in the Consultation Document.

This item allows Council to adopt the consultation document for consideration by Audit NZ. Throughout the audit process there may be amendments recommended by Audit NZ. Any changes that are required will be included in the consultation document and will be provided to Council.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Consultation Document LTP 2018-28 (A2061739) (under separate cover)  

5.15 COUNCIL ENGAGEMENTS FEBRUARY 2018, APPOINTMENTS AND CONFERENCE OPPORTUNITIES
--

Author: Tina Jakes, Democracy & Community Engagement Manager

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Group Manager: Corporate and Community

Engagements

ENGAGEMENT	DAY	DATE	TIME
Turangi Reserves Management Plan Committee meeting (Turangi Service Centre, Turangi)	Thursday	8	9.30am-11am
Turangi/Tongariro Community Board meeting (Turangi Service Centre, Turangi)	Tuesday	13	1pm-4pm
Workshop - Kinloch Development (Kinloch Community Hall, Mata Place, Kinloch)	Thursday	15	11am-12.30pm
Kinloch Representative Group meeting (Kinloch Community Hall, Mata Place, Kinloch)	Thursday	15	1pm-2.30pm
Taupō Airport Authority Committee meeting (Taupō Airport, ANZAC Memorial Drive, Taupō)	Monday	19	10.30am-noon
Mangakino-Pouakani Representative Group meeting (Mangakino Service Centre, Mangakino)	Tuesday	20	10am-11.30am
Performance Monitoring Group meeting (closed) (Council Chamber, 107 Heuheu Street, Taupō)	Tuesday	20	1pm-2pm
Citizenship ceremony (East Wing, Great Lake Centre, Taupō)	Thursday	22	10am-11am
Public forum (Council Chamber, 107 Heuheu Street, Taupō)	Tuesday	27	1pm-1.30pm
Council meeting (Council Chamber, 107 Heuheu Street, Taupō)	Tuesday	27	1.30pm-5pm

Conference and Professional Development Opportunities

To approve, either prior or retrospectively, Councillor attendance at conferences and professional development courses – *none received*.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the information relating to engagements for February 2018.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.16 MEMBERS' REPORTS

Author: Tina Jakes, Democracy & Community Engagement Manager

Authorised by: Brian Fox, Group Manager: Corporate and Community

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
Agenda Item No: 6.1 Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 13 November 2017	Section 7(2)(g) - the withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege	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
Agenda Item No: 6.2 Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 12 December 2017	Section 7(2)(a) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons Section 7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable [the Council] to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities 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)	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
Agenda Item No: 6.3 Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Extraordinary Council Minutes - 21 December 2017	Section 7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable [the Council] to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities 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)	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

Agenda Item No: 6.4 Ngāti Te Rangiita Draft Submission to the Māori Affairs Select Committee	Section 7(2)(c)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied	Section 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
--	--	---

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]*.