

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

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday, 27 May 2025</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>1.00pm</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Council Chamber Level 1, 67 Horomātangi Street Taupō</b>

# **AGENDA**

## **MEMBERSHIP**

**Chairperson** Mayor David Trewavas  
**Deputy Chairperson** Cr Kevin Taylor

**Members**

- Cr Duncan Campbell
- Cr Karam Fletcher
- Cr Sandra Greenslade
- Cr Kylie Leonard
- Cr Danny Loughlin
- Cr Christine Rankin
- Cr Rachel Shepherd
- Cr Kirsty Trueman
- Cr Yvonne Westerman
- Cr John Williamson
- Vacancy

**Quorum** 7

**Julie Gardyne**  
**Chief Executive**

## Order Of Business

<b>1</b>	<b>Karakia</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Whakapāha   Apologies</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Ngā Whakapānga Tukituki   Conflicts of Interest</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Whakamanatanga O Ngā Meneti   Confirmation of Minutes</b>	
4.1	Ordinary Council Meeting - 29 April 2025 .....	3
<b>5</b>	<b>Ngā Kaupapa Here Me Ngā Whakataunga   Policy and Decision Making</b>	
5.1	Adoption of the Dangerous, Affected, and Insanitary Buildings Policy .....	4
5.2	Consideration of a Freedom of Expression Policy .....	8
5.3	2025 Bylaw Reviews: Trade Waste and Water Supply .....	12
5.4	Appointment of Commissioner(s) - 25 and 27 Kahikatea Drive and Otaketake Road, Kinloch .....	17
5.5	Delegation of Decision Making for Two Resource Consent Applications to Commissioners - 24 Sorrento Drive and 11 Sienna Way, Taupō .....	20
5.6	Taupō District Council Performance Report - April 2025 .....	23
5.7	Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee - Appointment of Ngāti Tūrangitukua Members .....	24
5.8	Council Engagements June 2025, Appointments, and Training and Conference Opportunities .....	25
<b>6</b>	<b>Ngā Kōrero Tūmataiti   Confidential Business</b>	
6.1	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 29 April 2025 .....	27
6.2	Consideration of Performance Monitoring Group Recommendation - Clause 35 Review .....	27

**4.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 29 APRIL 2025**

**Author:** Karen Watts, Senior Committee Advisor

**Authorised by:** Nigel McAdie, Legal and Governance Manager

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Tuesday 29 April 2025 be approved and adopted as a true and correct record.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 29 April 2025

**5.1 ADOPTION OF THE DANGEROUS, AFFECTED, AND INSANITARY BUILDINGS POLICY**

**Author:** Andrew Wilson, Policy Advisor

**Authorised by:** Nick Carroll, Policy Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to seek adoption of the Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy.

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council has an existing policy on Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings. This policy is required to be reviewed every 5 years in accordance with the Building Act 2004. Officers reviewed the policy and proposed some changes to it. Most of these changes are editorial in nature such as placing the policy into a more up to date Council template, deleting duplicate clauses, and correcting outdated references to parts of legislation or organisations. More critical changes such as the inclusion of affected buildings are required by the Act, and points for correction that have been issued by the Ministry for Business, Innovation, and Employment (MBIE) in their latest audit of our building compliance functions.

Council consulted the community on the draft policy from 1 April to 1 May 2025 and received no submissions.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council adopts the attached Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy.

**TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND**

The proposal has been before Council at a prior meeting on 25 March, where Council resolved to consult on the amended draft policy which included corrections directed by MBIE.

The community was consulted from 1 April to 1 May and there were no submissions made, and no questions or queries sent into the email inbox established for this process.

**NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION**

In accordance with [Section 131 of the Building Act 2004](#), Council is required to have a Dangerous, Affected<sup>1</sup> and Insanitary Buildings Policy. This policy must outline how Council will identify buildings in the three categories and what Council will do upon identification of such a building.

Council's current policy takes the approach of identification through reporting of the community, Fire and Emergency New Zealand, or other affected parties. Upon being informed of a potentially dangerous, insanitary or affected building, Council applies the tests outlined in the policy to determine the response.

The policy provides Council with the ability to respond by restricting access to buildings and to order corrective actions be taken to ensure the health and safety of our community. In extreme cases, the policy also allows Council to conduct immediate works to protect public safety, the cost of which will be recovered from the building owner.

Buildings that are determined to be dangerous are usually those that are impacted by natural disasters or fires. However, there are instances where buildings are put up without Council's knowledge that are potentially not to code, and Council officers have to place access restrictions on the building to prevent people from living in a potentially dangerous building. Council will also issue corrective actions for addressing this dangerous status, usually in the form of restorative works or in some cases demolition.

Buildings are determined to be insanitary if they are likely to cause harm to the health of the occupants. For example, a building with improperly or non-plumbed toilets inside the house may be considered insanitary as the waste products are not being removed from the household and pose a risk to occupants' health. Council also issues corrective actions in these cases to resolve the insanitary status, this includes things like having a plumber install a proper wastewater system or removing contaminated materials.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 132A requires Council to additionally consider affected buildings. These are a more recent addition to the legislation.

Buildings are determined to be affected when they are impacted by nearby dangerous buildings and therefore become dangerous to occupy. For example, a neighbouring property has a wall that has become separated from the building, and it may fall over, this wall is leaning towards the adjacent house. If that wall collapses it may cause damage to the nearby house that is structurally sound. This house would likely be given affected status and access to part or all of the house would be limited to protect occupants. Corrective actions are not issued to affected buildings.

### Changes

Officers proposed changes to the policy based on the feedback of the building compliance team as well as the corrective actions issued by the Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment. To ensure our policy is compliant with the legislation and is fit for purpose, officers made the following changes:

- Corrected organisation names that have changed since the policy was adopted
- Reformatted the document into the policy template
- Removed duplicate clauses to streamline the document
- Inserted a definitions section
- Corrected references to sections of the Building Act 2004
- Added in references to affected buildings as required by the Act
- Added a clause that gives effect to section 40 to clarify the section 41 matters which outline when a building consent is not required for emergency corrective works.

These changes do not alter the fundamental principles of Council's existing policy, they simply update the document to reflect changes in the legislation along with formatting changes to be consistent with Council's other public facing documents.

As there was no feedback from the community, any further issues outside of those identified by subject matter experts internally and at MBIE have not been identified.

Based on this information it is considered that there are 2 options:

### NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

There are two options:

#### Option 1: Adopt the policy attached to this report

Council is required to have a Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy under the Building Act 2004. Officers have reviewed the policy in line with the corrective actions issued by MBIE.

This option is effectively the continuation of the current policy position Council has taken with respect to buildings impacted by this policy but has been updated to ensure that Council meets its legal obligations.

The disadvantage of this option is that it does not provide the opportunity to revise Council's approach to managing dangerous, affected or insanitary buildings and simply continues the reactive approach to managing them.

#### Option 2: Amend the policy attached to this report before adopting

Officers have reviewed the policy and implemented the corrective actions outlined by MBIE. Feedback from the building compliance team is that the policy is fit for purpose in its current form. However, Council may wish to fundamentally change the policy or the positions within the policy. Council may direct officers to change parts of the policy more substantially or take an entirely new policy position.

Officers note that the current policy is outside of its review period so the review must be completed as soon as possible. One disadvantage with this option is that significant changes to policy position may require reconsulting with the community, despite the fact there were no submissions this time, as a fundamentally different policy position may attract individuals to make a submission. There may also be cost and resourcing implications.

#### Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 is the preferred option as officers have implemented the corrective actions required by MBIE and do not believe there are further changes that need to be made.

## NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

### Ngā Aronga Ture | 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. That section of the Act states that the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. It is considered that social, economic, and environmental wellbeing of relevance to this particular matter.

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:

- Building Act 2004: Instructs Council that it must have a policy and what the policy must contain
- Building Code: Sets the assessment criteria to test if a building has failed and corrective actions need to be taken

### Ngā Hīraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications

The proposal has been evaluated against the following plans:

- ☐ Long Term Plan 2024-2034   ☐ Annual Plan   ☐ Waikato Regional Plan  
☐ Taupō District Plan   ☒ Bylaws   ☐ Relevant Management Plan(s)

The key aspects for consideration with regards to this proposal are as follows:

The Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy potentially can be seen to impact the Council's Housing Policy. The Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy is consistent with objective 2 of the Housing Strategy which is to support warm, healthy, sustainable and resilient homes. The policy deals directly with those properties that are unsafe or insanitary for our community to live in.

#### **Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement**

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory Tiriti O Waitangi obligations and acknowledges partnership as the basis of Te Tiriti. Council has a responsibility to act reasonably and in good faith to reflect the partnership relationship, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti. These principles include, but are not limited to the protection of Māori rights, enabling Māori participation in Council processes and having rangatiratanga over tāonga.

Our statutory obligations outline our duties to engage with Māori and enable participation in Council processes. Alongside this, we recognise the need to work side by side with iwi, and hapū of our district.

In line with these obligations and commitments we've made:

Iwi and hapū were engaged directly during the special consultative procedure via email in the first instance to ask if there was any interest in the policy. The policy alongside the two bylaws council was consulting on were also raised with the Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee as part of a policy update.

There was no feedback from Iwi and hapū

### Ngā Tūraru | Risks

There are no known risks.

## TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is significant.

**TE KŌRERO TAHI | ENGAGEMENT**

Engagement was undertaken from 1 April to 1 May there were no submissions received by Council.

**TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

A public notice will be issued informing the community of the adoption of the policy.

**WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

Officers reviewed the current policy and have proposed changes to it to comply with the corrective actions issued by MBIE as well as to improve the layout of the document. These changes were consulted on and generated no feedback.

These changes do not alter Council's existing policy position on dangerous or insanitary buildings and simply includes consideration of how to manage affected buildings in accordance with the Act. The existing policy approach has been working well. Officers therefore recommend that Council adopt the attached policy.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy

**5.2 CONSIDERATION OF A FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION POLICY**

**Author:** Andrew Wilson, Policy Advisor

**Authorised by:** Nick Carroll, Policy Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the adoption of a freedom of expression policy. The attached freedom of expression policy is intended to affirm Council's responsibility with respect to freedom of expression and provide high-level guidance for Council decision-making.

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Following agreement between the Council and the New Zealand Free Speech Union (FSU), officers have developed a draft freedom of expression policy for consideration by Elected Members. The purpose of the attached policy is to outline several core principles that should be considered when decisions are being made that have freedom of expression implications.

The draft policy was discussed at a Council workshop on 6 May 2025. Elected members discussed the draft policy and provided direction to officers about what they would like to see in the final policy.

A revised draft policy is attached to this report for consideration and adoption if appropriate.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council adopts the attached Freedom of Expression Policy.

**TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND**

Council has had two workshops on freedom of expression (free speech) and the draft freedom of expression policy. At these workshops, a range of principles and ideas were discussed. The FSU delivered the first workshop on free speech in a local government context, with Council officers leading a subsequent workshop to discuss a potential freedom of expression policy.

At the second workshop, officers presented a draft freedom of expression policy and discussed the feedback received from the Free Speech Union. Officers received direction on the draft policy and a revised draft policy reflecting this direction is attached to this report for adoption if appropriate.

**NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION***Legal Foundation*

Freedom of expression is a fundamental right enshrined in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBoR). Section 14 of the NZBoR states "Everyone has the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions of any kind in any form".

[Section 5](#) of the NZBoR provides for justified limitations on rights. The section states "Subject to section 4 the rights and freedoms contained in this Bill of Rights may be subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society". [Section 4](#) clarifies that the Act does not automatically override other inconsistent law.

There is a range of legislation that places limitations on freedom of expression in New Zealand. Furthermore, case law outlines what reasonable limitations look like in a range of circumstances.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, *Moncrief-Spittle v Regional Facilities Auckland Limited* [2022] NZSC 13 provides guidance on the matters that should be considered when deciding whether events can go ahead. Conducting an assessment process with good record keeping is important. The Supreme Court noted that the right to freedom of expression is not simply a matter for consideration but is a "substantive constraint".



*Policy Development*

Following agreement between the Council and the New Zealand Free Speech Union (FSU), officers have developed a draft freedom of expression policy for consideration by Elected Members. The purpose of the attached policy is to outline several core principles that should be considered when decisions are being made that have freedom of expression implications.

The draft policy was discussed at a Council workshop on 6 May 2025. Elected members discussed the draft policy and provided direction to officers about what they would like to see in the final policy.

In response, officers have developed a draft policy that includes an addition providing the Chief Executive will respond to objections raised under the policy within 10 working days. Officers believe it is appropriate to provide a definite timeframe for responses.

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

**NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS**Analysis of Options**Option 1: Adopt the attached Freedom of Expression Policy**

The attached policy affirms Council's position clearly on freedom of expression. The policy provides a principles-based guide to decision-making and is a high-level document designed to inform those making decisions that may impact freedom of expression. It does not provide detailed procedures for matters such as venues booking or Council Standing Orders as these matters are addressed within those documents.

The disadvantage of this approach is that if further guidance is needed, Council would have to amend the policy or develop further area-specific guidance documents as and when needed.

**Option 2: Amend the attached Freedom of Expression Policy**

Although officers are of the view that the draft policy captures the intent and principles as discussed at the workshop on 6 May 2025, Council may wish to amend the attached policy further.

Further refining the scope of the policy could make it a more process-centric document instead of principles-focused. This was a matter elected members wished to avoid.

**Option 3: Do not adopt a Freedom of Expression Policy**

The law currently provides protection for civil rights in New Zealand, including freedom of expression. There is opportunity under the law currently to challenge Council decision-making through a range of legal avenues. The policy does not create any new or additional rights. It simply affirms a principled position based on the law.

For this reason, having a policy is not strictly necessary. However, officers consider that such a policy would provide high-level guidance to decision-makers when they need to consider freedom of expression related matters.

Analysis Conclusion:

Option one (1) is the preferred option. It provides a guidance document for all decision-makers when considering matters related to freedom of expression. This will help support interpretation of existing Council policies and processes in accordance with Council's legal obligations related to freedom of expression.

## NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

### Ngā Aronga Ture | 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. That section of the Act states that the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. It is considered that social and cultural wellbeing are of relevance to this particular matter.

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:

- New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990
- Human Rights Act 1993
- Harmful Digital Communications Act 2015

This body of law provides the foundation upon which the principles articulated in the attached policy are based. The law is a developing space that changes with time so the attached policy will require reviewing when new case law is developed, or legislation is changed.

### Ngā Hīraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications

This policy, if adopted, would have implications on the interpretation of all Council policies. Those particularly impacted would be the Venues Booking Policy, Council Standing Orders, the Social Media Guidelines and Council consultation processes.

### Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory Tiriti O Waitangi obligations and acknowledges partnership as the basis of Te Tiriti. Council has a responsibility to act reasonably and in good faith to reflect the partnership relationship, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti. These principles include, but are not limited to the protection of Māori rights, enabling Māori participation in Council processes and having rangatiratanga over tāonga.

Our statutory obligations outline our duties to engage with Māori and enable participation in Council processes. Alongside this, we recognise the need to work side by side with iwi, and hapū of our district.

No engagement has been undertaken on this policy with any Iwi or Hapu as the policy intends to provide guidance to decision-makers on their current legal obligations.

### Ngā Tūraru | Risks

Freedom of expression is an area of significant debate for many in our communities and in recent years, there have been several significant court cases related to this right. The attached policy seeks to mitigate some risk by providing high-level guidance to council officers and elected members.

## TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of a low degree of significance as the policy intends to provide high-level guidance to decision-makers on their current obligations.

**TE KŌRERO TAHI | ENGAGEMENT**

No engagement has been undertaken on this policy with any groups outside of the FSU as the policy intends to provide high-level guidance to decision-makers on their current obligations to support freedom of expression.

While freedom of expression is important, the attached policy simply affirms Council's existing obligations and as such, there is no need for consultation in accordance with Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

If the policy were expanded to provide additional rights or levels of support beyond those required through established law, then there may be further impacts on how Council operates and the community. These types of changes may include altering existing policies, strategies or processes. This would likely require consultation as the changes could be significant.

**TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

No communication is required.

**WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

This paper recommends that Council adopt the attached Freedom of Expression Policy which provides a set of guiding principles for decision-makers and clarifies Council's position and obligations with respect to freedom of expression. This will help both decision-makers and the community understand what decision-makers need to consider.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. Freedom of Expression Policy

**5.3 2025 BYLAW REVIEWS: TRADE WASTE AND WATER SUPPLY**

**Author:** Andrew Wilson, Policy Advisor

**Authorised by:** Nick Carroll, Policy Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the feedback received through consultation and the final Bylaws for adoption.

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council conducted a special consultative procedure with the proposed options of continuing the Trade Waste Bylaw without amendment and a number of changes to the Water Supply Bylaw. These changes seek to:

- meet legislative requirements for backflow prevention management
- improve the explanations of ordinary and extraordinary use to remove a potential inconsistency between clauses
- make it clear what metric will be used to determine if a property is using extraordinary amounts of water
- define what lifestyle use means.

Council received two submissions on the matter of these bylaws and the individual submitter did not provide context for the options they chose using Council's submission form.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand provided a submission on the Water Supply Bylaw and have requested the insertion of an additional clause for the avoidance of doubt with respect to emergency services' ability to take water from the Council supply.

Officers are recommending that Council adopt the attached bylaws which contain no substantial changes from the versions consulted on aside from the insertion of a clause clarifying the bylaws applicability to emergency services.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council:

1. adopts the attached amended Water Supply Bylaw.
2. resolves to continue the Trade Waste Bylaw 2016 without amendment.

**TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND**

The proposal has been before Council at a prior meeting on 25 March 2025 [item number 5.1 refers]. At this meeting Council resolved to consult the community on continuing the Trade Waste Bylaw without amendment and to consult on several proposed changes to the Water Supply Bylaw.

**NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION****Summary of Submissions**

Council received unusually limited feedback through the consultation process on these bylaws despite direct emails to iwi and hapū, 216 emails out to trade waste customers, placing notice in the newsletter and social media posts. There were two submitters to the entire process.

The individual submitter did not explain why they chose the options they picked.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) however provided feedback regarding a further improvement to the clarity of the bylaw by making it clear that it does not regulate FENZ's lawful ability to take water from the supply. FENZ pointed out in their submission that Council's bylaw does not supersede the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 so any inconsistency would be overruled. Officers agree that for the avoidance of doubt there should be reference to the relevant legislation.

## Trade Waste

Trade waste is waste products produced from industrial or commercial activities such as fats, oils and greases that are disposed of through the wastewater system. The purpose of the Trade Waste Bylaw is to set the requirements for trade waste within Taupō District by outlining the activities that control and monitor trade discharges into Council's wastewater system to protect:

- a. the health and safety of any persons associated with the wastewater systems by applying standards for trade waste discharges
- b. public health and the environment from the effect of the trade waste discharges and by ensuring the necessary resource consents are met
- c. sewers, pumping stations, storage tanks, wastewater treatment plants and other related wastewater system structures.

The bylaw also provides a basis for charging persons who use the wastewater system to cover the cost of conveying, treating and disposing of or reusing their wastes, while ensuring that the costs of treatment and disposal are shared fairly between trade waste and domestic dischargers. The bylaw encourages waste minimisation and provides a basis for the introduction and implementation of the New Zealand Waste Strategy.

The review of the bylaw found no issue with the existing Trade Waste Bylaw as it continues to function as intended and provides the wastewater team the necessary powers for managing trade waste discharges effectively. This bylaw is still necessary and is the most effective way to manage trade waste matters.

## Water Supply Bylaw

The purpose of the Water Supply Bylaw is:

- to detail the responsibilities of both Taupō District Council and consumers with respect to the public water supply;
- to detail mechanisms for the recovery of costs of supplying drinking water;
- to prevent the wastage of water;
- to provide mechanisms for water demand management;
- to protect public health and the security of the public water supply; and
- to detail breaches and offences.

Officers have reviewed the bylaw with the water asset manager and legal team and found that there are several shortcomings in the existing bylaw. Many of the changes are editorial to modernise the language used in the bylaw, improve readability, or provide more information to readers.

Council however proposed four key changes through consultation:

- Meeting legislative requirements for backflow prevention management by clearly outlining that council will take responsibility for backflow prevention devices.
- Improving the explanations of ordinary and extraordinary use to remove a potential inconsistency between clauses.
- Making it clear what metric will be used to determine if a property is using extraordinary amounts of water. With reference to Council's sustainable daily use maximum which is set as a performance measure through the Long-term plan.
- Defining what lifestyle use means by use of the development engineering standard of allotments larger than 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.

Through consultation with the community, Fire and Emergency New Zealand identified another change that could be made to ensure we give effect to the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. Officers have inserted clause 4 to the purpose section of the Water Supply Bylaw which states "*This Bylaw does not apply to the taking of water from hydrants and other access points in the Water Supply System by the fire service, which is regulated by the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017.*"

With these changes the Water Supply Bylaw is the most appropriate form of bylaw and is still necessary to support the management of the Council water supply network.

Based on this information it is considered that there are 3 options.

## NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

### Analysis of Options

#### **Option 1: Adopt the amended Water Supply Bylaw and resolve to continue the Trade Waste Bylaw without amendment**

Council has met its legislative obligations with respect to the bylaws outlined in this report, Council may now adopt these bylaws based on their continued relevance. Given the limited feedback on the process, it is unclear what community sentiment ultimately is with respect to the amendments to the Water Supply Bylaw.

Despite this, officers advise that the changes are appropriate as they help to improve clarity and ensure Council meets its legislative obligations.

#### **Option 2: Amend one or more of the bylaws before adoption**

Officers have identified the changes that we recommend be made to the Water Supply Bylaw. However, if Council disagrees with the proposed changes, or wants other changes to be made, they may direct officers to provide advice on incorporating further changes.

If Council wishes to make changes to the Trade Waste Bylaw that are of a significant nature, then a second consultation process will need to be conducted as those changes may generate different feedback particularly from those businesses with trade waste discharges.

#### **Option 3: Do not adopt or continue the bylaws without amendment**

The bylaws can be left as they are without completing the review and without adopting. The bylaws would continue to operate for a further two years after their reviews should have been conducted. After this point they will no longer be valid and will be revoked unless replaced by new bylaws.

Letting the bylaws lapse would create significant challenges for the management of the water supply and trade waste. It would also create challenges with protecting the health and safety of the community.

### Analysis Conclusion:

Based on the limited engagement from the community on these bylaws officers have been unable to identify any further issues or concerns held by external stakeholders. Council consulted on a Water Supply Bylaw with some changes that were recommended by officers to help assist in the proper management of the water network.

Given these changes were driven by subject matter expert review of the bylaw with the rationales outlined in the 25 March 2025 report, Officers recommend *Option 1: Adopt the amended Water Supply Bylaw and resolve to continue the Trade Waste Bylaw without amendment* as the preferred option.

## NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

### **Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations**

There is expected to be no financial impact from the changes to the bylaws. Proposed changes to roles and responsibilities for backflow prevention devices will not result in additional costs for Council because this reflects the practical status quo – the maintenance, repair and replacement of backflow prevention devices is already done by Council's water team and is already factored into existing budgets.

### **Ngā Aronga Ture | 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. That section of the Act states that the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. It is considered that social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing are of relevance to this particular matter.

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 Health Act 1956 Section 64: Provides support for the Trade Waste Bylaw in order to protect the community.

The Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) Sections 145 and 146: Provide power to create bylaws specifically targeted at trade waste and water supply.

Note that Section 148 of the Act, which outlines the special requirements to be followed when making new bylaws related to trade waste, does not apply in this instance, because Council is reviewing and proposing to continue an existing bylaw, not make a new one. Instead, Sections 155 – 160A of the Act outline the requirements for bylaw reviews, deadlines and consultation requirements. These requirements have been met.

### **Ngā Hīraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications**

- ✓ Long Term Plan 2024-2034   ☐ Annual Plan   ☐ Waikato Regional Plan  
☐ Taupō District Plan   ✓ Bylaws   ☐ Relevant Management Plan(s)

### **Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement**

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory Tiriti O Waitangi obligations and acknowledges partnership as the basis of Te Tiriti. Council has a responsibility to act reasonably and in good faith to reflect the partnership relationship, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti. These principles include, but are not limited to the protection of Māori rights, enabling Māori participation in Council processes and having rangatiratanga over tāonga.

Our statutory obligations outline our duties to engage with Māori and enable participation in Council processes. Alongside this, we recognise the need to work side by side with iwi, and hapū of our district.

In line with these obligations and commitments:

- We contacted iwi and hapū before and after the Christmas period for them to provide feedback on the existing bylaws. This was to support issue identification so that we could work through any issues from their perspectives.
- We received limited feedback, what feedback we did receive was related to the operation of water and trade waste systems rather than the bylaws themselves. This feedback asked for Council to publish more data on water consumption, trade waste discharge monitoring, and to do further metering. This feedback has been passed onto the teams but is not relevant to the bylaws directly.
- We directly contacted iwi and hapū through the consultation period and raised the Bylaws with the Tūrangi co-governance committee.
- We received no feedback from Iwi or hapū

### **Ngā Tūraru | Risks**

As with all bylaw reviews there is a risk of legal challenge once they are adopted. The risk of challenge related to the Trade Waste Bylaw is low as it is proposed to continue without amendment. The risk of challenge is higher for the Water Supply Bylaw given that there are proposed amendments. But is still considered low as we are not aware of any issues from key stakeholders and no concerns were raised through consultation.

### **TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is significant.

### **TE KŌRERO TAHI | ENGAGEMENT**

Engagement has been undertaken using the special consultative procedure as required when reviewing bylaws in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002. The results of this consultation are discussed earlier in this report.

### **TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

A public notice will be published as soon as practical to inform the community of the adoption and continuation of the two bylaws in this paper as required under the Local Government Act 2002. Additionally, information will be distributed to trade waste discharge users and the submitter regarding Council's resolution.

**WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

Given the bylaws remain the most effective and appropriate way to manage trade waste and water supply matters officers recommend Council adopt the amended Water Supply Bylaw and resolve to continue the Trade Waste Bylaw without amendment.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. Final Draft Water Supply Bylaw
2. Bylaws Submissions Report
3. Trade Waste Bylaw 2016



**5.4 APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER(S) - 25 AND 27 KAHIKATEA DRIVE AND OTAKETAKE ROAD, KINLOCH**

**Author:** Heather Williams, Resource Consents Manager

**Authorised by:** Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

To seek approval for a commissioner to hear, consider and decide on a publicly notified resource consent application for subdivision at 25 and 27 Kahikatea Drive and Otaketake Road (part of the Seven Oaks Subdivision development) in Kinloch.

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Taupō District Council recently publicly notified a resource consent application at 25 and 27 Kahikatea Drive and Otaketake Road in Kinloch for:

- subdivision consent to subdivide to create 84 residential lots, four reserves and five roads over six stages
- land use consent to carry out earthworks cut and fill
- a change of conditions to Subdivision Consent RM200118A to remove Stage 9 from that consent and to incorporate this area into the proposed subdivision

The application received 34 submissions: 28 in opposition, two neutral and four in support. Nine submitters wish to be heard and therefore a hearing is required. Commissioners who hold the *Making Good Decisions* Accreditation can sit on Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) Hearings.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council, pursuant to section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991, hereby delegates the functions and powers of hearing, consideration, and decision-making in relation to a resource consent application for a staged subdivision, associated land use consent for earthworks and building development, and a variation to conditions of consent RM200118A—to incorporate an area from that proposal into the current proposal at 25 and 27 Kahikatea Drive and Otaketake Road—to an Independent Commissioner with Chairperson accreditation, Ms Gina Sweetman. If Ms Sweetman is unavailable, Ms Rachel Dimery may be appointed in her place.

**TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

**NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION**

**Publicly notified resource consent- Seven Oaks (Kinloch)** [Seven Oaks Kinloch Limited - Taupō District Council](#)

Taupō District Council recently publicly notified a resource consent application (RM240288-289 and RM200118C) for

- subdivision consent to subdivide to create 84 residential lots, four reserves and five roads over six Stages where the residential lots will be less than the minimum and average lot sizes for the Kinloch Low Density Environment; and to construct roads and extend water and wastewater infrastructure to service the lots

- land use consent to carry out earthworks cut and fill to construct roads and to shape the proposed lots in excess of the 1.5m and 0.5m vertical ground alteration limits outside and within setbacks; and for future development on the residential lots to exceed the provisions in relation to building coverage, plot ratio, and building setbacks
- a change of conditions to Subdivision Consent RM200118A to remove Stage 9 from that consent and to incorporate this area into the proposed subdivision

The application for subdivision and land use are non-complying activities under Rules 4a.4.5 and 4a.2.13 of the Taupō District Plan; and the change of conditions is a discretionary activity under section 127 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submissions closed on 3 April 2025 with 34 submissions received. Nine submitters indicated they want to be heard at a hearing and therefore a hearing is required to be held.

Under the RMA, Publicly Notified Resource Consents may be heard by either councillors or independent commissioners with accreditation in the *Making Good Decisions (RMA)* programme. As currently no councillors are accredited with the chairperson qualification, they cannot make the decision on their own. In this instance an independent commissioner with the Chairperson accreditation is required to Chair. Where a hearing is required, it is considered that one commissioner or a panel of commissioners (usually no more than three) are required.

In the submissions received, some submitters requested the decision-making is delegated to hearings commissioners who are **not** members of the local authority. Under Section 100A, submitters or the applicant can request that the decision-making is delegated to one or more hearings commissioners who are **not** members of the local authority.

Councillors Yvonne Westerman and Kevin Taylor hold the *Making Good Decisions* accreditation (but not the Chairperson requirements). Due to the above request by submitters though, the Councillors are unable to sit on the hearing.

It is considered in this instance that the delegations therefore should be made to an independent qualified Commissioner with the Chairperson qualification. Given the small number of submitters who want to be heard and the relatively similar nature of many of the submissions one commissioner is considered appropriate.

Ms Gina Sweetman is an experienced hearing commissioner and has indicated her availability to be able to sit, hear and decide on this application alone. She has previously undertaken hearings and work for the Taupō District Council.

Should Ms Sweetman not be available or unable to reschedule, another commissioner, Ms Rachel Dimery shall be approached as an alternative.

## **NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations**

The costs incurred in the process, including paying for the hearing are all the responsibility of the applicant to pay and are on charged onto them.

### **Ngā Aronga Ture | Legal Considerations**

The proposal is a matter for consideration under the Resource Management Act only.

- ✓ Resource Consent    ☐ Building Consent    ☐ Environmental Health  
☐ Alcohol Licencing    ☐ Licence to occupy

Authorisations are not required from external parties.

### **Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement**

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory Tiriti O Waitangi obligations and acknowledges partnership as the basis of Te Tiriti. Council has a responsibility to act reasonably and in good faith to reflect

the partnership relationship, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti. These principles include but are not limited to the protection of Māori rights, enabling Māori participation in Council processes and having rangatiratanga over tāonga.

Our statutory obligations outline our duties to engage with Māori and enable participation in Council processes. Alongside this, we recognise the need to work side by side with iwi, and hapū of our district.

The proposal was publicly notified. In terms of decision-making, delegation to Commissioners is required and it is considered there are no specific matters that require engagement of a specifically qualified commissioner and that the matters can be considered by a Hearings Commissioner with general planning expertise.

Raukawa and the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board were directly served notice of the public notification of the application and the applicant has engaged with them over the past couple of years on the proposed development. The proposal has reduced in scale over that time and as now presented, is a renotified version of an earlier proposal.

### **Ngā Tūraru | Risks**

There are no known risks.

### **TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of a low degree of significance.

### **TE KŌRERO TAHI | 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.

### **TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

No communication/media required.

### **WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

It is recommended that an Independent Commissioner with the Chairperson qualification – Ms Gina Sweetman - be appointed to hear, consider and decide alone.

### **NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**5.5 DELEGATION OF DECISION MAKING FOR TWO RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATIONS TO COMMISSIONERS - 24 SORRENTO DRIVE AND 11 SIENNA WAY, TAUPŌ**

**Author:** Heather Williams, Resource Consents Manager

**Authorised by:** Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

To seek approval for a commissioner to consider and decide the section 95 notification decision and to hear, consider and decide the section 104 application decision (whether a hearing is or is not required) for a resource consent application on two lots within the development known as Amano Ridge (off Huka Falls Road, Taupō) for 5 dwellings on Lot 411 (24 Sorrento Drive) and 4 dwellings on Lot 426 (11 Sienna Way).

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) decision-making is a function that cannot be sub delegated. Therefore, for non-Taupō District Council employees to make decisions on RMA applications, delegations must be conferred by Council. A current resource consent application involves a potential conflict of interest where Council employees who hold the delegations are not able to make the decisions and therefore decision-making appointments to qualified independent commissioners is required.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council, pursuant to section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991, hereby delegates the functions and powers of hearing, consideration, and decision-making in relation to a resource consent application for a subdivision and development at Lot 411 and Lot 426 of the Amano Ridge development in Taupō to an Independent Commissioner with Chairperson accreditation, Mr Cam Twigley.

**TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

**NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION****Amano Ridge- 11 Sienna Way (Lot 426) and 24 Sorrento Drive, Taupō (Lot 411)**

Northlit Property Limited have applied to develop two lots within the Amano Ridge complex. The sites were identified for future development. It is now proposed to construct and subdivide four one-bedroom single story dwellings consisting of two duplex units on Lot 426. It is proposed to construct and subdivide 5 two-bedroom units on Lot 411. A Taupō District Council staff member who has been a member of the resource consents team owns one of the properties that adjoins Lot 411. To remove a potential conflict of interest, it is proposed to appoint an independent commissioner to make the decision on the notification process under section 95 of the RMA. This will determine if there are any affected parties or whether public notification is required.

The processing of the application is being undertaken by a planning consultant on behalf of Council and it is proposed that an RMA Commissioner with the Chairperson qualification be delegated the authority to:

- consider and decide the section 95 notification decision and
- to hear, consider and decide the section 104 application decision (whether a hearing is or is not required)

It is proposed that Mr Cam Twigley is appointed to make the decisions. Mr Twigley is an experienced planner who has been delegated authority by Council to hear, consider and decide on a previous limited notified resource consent application.

Councillors Yvonne Westerman and Kevin Taylor hold the *Making Good Decisions* accreditation but would not be able to conduct a hearing (if required) because they do not have the Chairperson accreditation. Councillors Westerman and Taylor will be approached closer to the time if a hearing is required to check their availability to sit on a hearing panel.

## **NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations**

The costs incurred in the process, including paying for the hearing are all the responsibility of the applicant to pay and are on-charged to them.

### **Ngā Aronga Ture | Legal Considerations**

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:

Authorisations as follows are required for the proposal:

- ☒ Resource Consent    ☐ Building Consent    ☐ Environmental Health  
☐ Alcohol Licencing    ☐ Licence to occupy

Authorisations are not required from external parties.

### **Ngā Hīraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications**

There are no known policy implications.

### **Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement**

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory Tiriti O Waitangi obligations and acknowledges partnership as the basis of Te Tiriti. Council has a responsibility to act reasonably and in good faith to reflect the partnership relationship, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti. These principles include but are not limited to the protection of Māori rights, enabling Māori participation in Council processes and having rangatiratanga over tāonga.

Our statutory obligations outline our duties to engage with Māori and enable participation in Council processes. Alongside this, we recognise the need to work side by side with iwi, and hapū of our district.

These delegations will determine the notification process of these proposals. In terms of decision-making, delegation to Commissioners is required and it is considered there are no specific matters that require engagement of a specifically qualified commissioner and that the matters can be considered by an RMA Commissioner with general planning expertise.

### **Ngā Tūraru | Risks**

There are no known risks.

## **TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of a low degree of significance.

**TE KŌRERO TAHI | 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.

**TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

No communication/media required.

**WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

It is recommended that an Independent Commissioner with the Chairperson qualification – Mr Cam Twigley - be appointed to hear, consider and decide alone for Amano Ridge, Taupō being 24 Sorrento Drive and 11 Sienna Way.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

**5.6 TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL PERFORMANCE REPORT - APRIL 2025**

**Author:** Julie Gardyne, Chief Executive

**Authorised by:** Julie Gardyne, Chief Executive

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

This report provides Council with an overview of the performance of the organisation including updates from the executive team, a portfolio update, and a finance report.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council notes the information contained in the Performance Report for the month of April 2025.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. Performance Report - April 2025
2. Portfolio Update - April 2025
3. Finance Report - April 2025

**5.7 TŪRANGI CO-GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - APPOINTMENT OF NGĀTI TŪRANGITUKUA MEMBERS**

**Author:** Karen Watts, Senior Committee Advisor

**Authorised by:** Nigel McAdie, Legal and Governance Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

To appoint Ngāti Tūrangitukua representatives (replacing outgoing members) to the Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee.

**NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION**

Following Local Government elections, committees of Council for the 2022-2025 triennium were established at the Taupō District Council meeting on 15 November 2022, including the Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee. This Committee was established to govern the implementation of the Mana Whakahono ā Rohe (MWaR), a partnership agreement between Ngāti Tūrangitukua and Council, and fulfil the purpose and functions as prescribed by the agreement. It is made up of equal membership from Ngāti Tūrangitukua and Council, being four members from each.

Clause 10.12 of the MWaR says that Committee members will collectively hold an appropriate level of skills and expertise. This reflects clause 31 of Schedule 7 to the Local Government Act 2002 that provides a local authority may appoint to a committee or subcommittee a person who is not a member of the local authority or committee if, in the opinion of the local authority, that person has the skills, attributes, or knowledge that will assist the work of the committee or subcommittee.

At the Taupō District Council meeting held on 13 December 2022, the following Ngāti Tūrangitukua representatives were appointed pursuant to clause 31 of Schedule 7 to the Local Government Act 2002:

*Mr Christian Asher, Ms Lauren Fletcher, Mr Te Takinga New and Mrs Amy Walker.*

Clause 10.13 of the MWaR requires that if a member resigns or is removed from the Committee, the relevant appointer (in terms of the MWaR) will, as soon as reasonably practicable, make a replacement election for the remainder of the term.

At the Ngāti Tūrangitukua hapū hui held Sunday 4 May 2025, Ms Bernice Te Ahuru and Mr Te Wharau Walker Junior were elected to serve as its representatives on the committee. They replace outgoing representatives and committee members Mr Christian (Waka) Asher and Mr Te Takinga New.

**WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

It is recommended that Council makes the appointments to the Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee as detailed in this report.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council appoints Ms Bernice Te Ahuru and Mr Te Wharau Walker Jr to the Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee for the remainder of the 2022-2025 Triennium, replacing members Mr Te Takinga New and Mr Christian Asher.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

Nil



<b>5.8</b>	<b>COUNCIL ENGAGEMENTS JUNE 2025, APPOINTMENTS, AND TRAINING AND CONFERENCE OPPORTUNITIES</b>
------------	---

**Author:** Karen Watts, Senior Committee Advisor

**Authorised by:** Nigel McAdie, Legal and Governance Manager

### **ENGAGEMENTS**

ENGAGEMENT	DAY	DATE	TIME
Workshop: Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee (Te Mataapuna, Tūrangitukua Park, Hirangi Road, Tūrangi)	Wednesday	4	9.30am-10.30am
Tūrangi Co-Governance Committee meeting (Te Mataapuna, Tūrangitukua Park, Hirangi Road, Tūrangi)	Wednesday	4	10.30am-12.30pm
Tongariro Representative Group meeting (Te Mataapuna, Tūrangitukua Park, Hirangi Road, Tūrangi)	Wednesday	4	1pm-2.30pm
Workshop: Risk Appetite (Council Chamber)	Thursday	5	10am-12pm
Risk and Assurance Committee meeting (Council Chamber)	Thursday	5	12.30pm-3.30pm
Rangitaiki River Forum (Bay of Plenty Regional Council, 5 Quay Street, Whakatāne)	Friday	6	10.30am-3pm
Regional Transport Committee meeting (Waikato Regional Council Chamber, 160 Ward Street, Hamilton)	Monday	9	9.30am-1pm
Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group – Hearings and Deliberations (Waikato Regional Council Chamber, 160 Ward Street, Hamilton)	Monday	16	10am-1pm
Te Kōpu ā Kanapanapa (Council Chamber) – tentative date	Wednesday	18	1pm – 3pm
Council meeting – Hear and Deliberate on the Water Services Delivery Model (Council Chamber)	Thursday	19	10.30am-6pm
Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group – Hearings and Deliberations (Backup Date) (Waikato Regional Council Chamber, 160 Ward Street, Hamilton)	Monday	23	10am-1pm
Taupō Airport Authority Committee meeting (Conference room, Taupō Airport, ANZAC Memorial Drive, Taupō)	Monday	23	1.30pm-3.30pm
Reconvene – Council meeting – Hear and Deliberate on the Water Services Delivery Model (Council Chamber) (If required).	Tuesday	24	10.30am-12pm
Public forum (Council Chamber)	Tuesday	24	12.30pm-1pm
Council meeting (Council Chamber)	Tuesday	24	1pm-3pm
Taupō East Rural Representative Group meeting (River Road Community Hall, River Road, Reporoa)	Thursday	26	11am-12.30pm
Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group meeting (Waikato Regional Council Chamber, 160 Ward Street, Hamilton)	Friday	27	10am-1pm
Te Kōpu ā Kanapanapa (Council Chamber) – tentative date	Friday	27	2pm-4pm

### **APPOINTMENTS**

No new requests for appointments have been received.

**TRAINING AND CONFERENCE OPPORTUNITIES**

In accordance with the Expenses Policy 2022-2025, this is a request to approve, either prior or retrospectively, Elected Member attendance at training and/or conferences:

The following request to attend a training and conference opportunity has been received:

- Mayor David Trewavas and Crs \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_: Local Government New Zealand SuperLocal Te wānanga/SuperLocal conference on Wednesday 16 and Thursday 17 July in Christchurch with travel, accommodation and attendance costs to be paid by Council.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That Council:

1. Receives the information relating to engagements for June 2025.
2. Approves / declines the attendance of Mayor David Trewavas and Crs \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ at the Local Government New Zealand SuperLocal Te wānanga/SuperLocal conference on Wednesday 16 and Thursday 17 July in Christchurch with travel, accommodation and attendance costs to be paid by Council.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

## 6 NGĀ KŌRERO TŪMATAITI | 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	Plain English reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter
<b>Agenda Item No: 6.1</b> Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 29 April 2025	Section 48(1)(d) - the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation where a right of appeal lies to any court or tribunal against the final decision of the Council in these proceedings	Section 48(1)(d)- the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation where a right of appeal lies to any court or tribunal against the final decision of the Council in these proceedings	Council needs to deal with this item with the public excluded because there is a right of appeal to the Environment Court in relation to the Council's decision.
<b>Agenda Item No: 6.2</b> Consideration of Performance Monitoring Group Recommendation - Clause 35 Review	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 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	It is necessary to exclude the public to protect the Chief Executive's privacy.

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 [\[specify\]](#).