



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

Date:	Tuesday, 30 September 2025
Time:	1.00pm
Location:	Council Chamber Level 1, 67 Horomātangi Street Taupō

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

1	Karakia	
2	Whakapāha Apologies	
3	Ngā Whakapānga Tukituki Conflicts of Interest	
4	Whakamanatanga O Ngā Meneti Confirmation of Minutes	
4.1	Ordinary Council Meeting - 26 August 2025	3
5	Ngā Kaupapa Here Me Ngā Whakataunga Policy and Decision Making	
5.1	Valedictory Speeches from Outgoing Councillors	4
5.2	Dog Control Policy and Practices Report.....	5
5.3	Traffic Control Device Updates	6
5.4	New Public Road Names - East Urban Lands Subdivision	11
5.5	Delegation of Decision Making to a Commissioner for a Land Use Resource Consent (2 Sorrento Drive, Taupō: Proposed Eatery)	14
5.6	Delegations of Decision Making for Resource Consent Applications	17
5.7	Continuation of the Taupō District Licensing Committee into the 2025-2028 Triennium	20
5.8	New Zealand Mutual Liability Riskpool - Trust Deed Variation.....	23
5.9	Approval of Operational and Capital Carry Forward from 2024/25 to 2025/26	27
5.10	Taupō District Council Performance Report - August 2025.....	32
6	Ngā Kōrero Tūmataiti Confidential Business	
6.1	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 24 June 2025	33
6.2	Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 26 August 2025	33
6.3	Release of Resolutions from Confidence.....	33

4.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 26 AUGUST 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 26 August 2025 be approved and adopted as a true and correct record.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 26 August 2025

5.1 VALEDICTORY SPEECHES FROM OUTGOING COUNCILLORS

Author: Karen Watts, Senior Committee Advisor

Authorised by: Nigel McAdie, Legal and Governance Manager

TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE

This item permits the outgoing Councillors to give a valedictory speech.

WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION

Valedictory speeches will be presented at the meeting for receipt.

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the valedictory speeches from outgoing Councillors.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.2 DOG CONTROL POLICY AND PRACTICES REPORT

Author: Cameron Tait, Compliance and Regulatory Manager

Authorised by: Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager

TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE

To receive the 2024/25 report on the administration of Taupō District Council's Dog Control Policy and its dog control practices.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION

Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires the Council, in respect of each financial year, to report on the administration of:

1. its dog control policy adopted under section 10 of the Act; and
2. its dog control practices.

WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION

The report for the 2024/25 financial year is attached for receipt, following which public notice of the report will be given.

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council receives the Taupō District Council Annual Dog Control Report 2024/25.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Taupō District Council Annual Dog Control Report 2024-2025

5.3 TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE UPDATES

Author: Anup Dahal, Asset Engineer - Transport

Authorised by: Roger Stokes, Infrastructure Manager

TE PŪTAKE | 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.

To seek approval from the Council for Traffic control devices relating to upcoming projects and changes requested by the community.

WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Taupō District Council Traffic controls may be updated from time to time with new controls or prohibitions.

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | 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
1. Taxi Stand signs and markings. Shown in Attachment 1	To allow taxis to pick-up and drop-off outside hospitality venues at the western end of Tūwharetoa Street.	Outside property 8 to 10 Tūwharetoa Street
2. Mobility Parking sign P120 and markings. Shown in Attachment 1	To retain a parallel parking space within the CBD	Outside property 8 to 10 Tūwharetoa Street
3. P60 sign for angled parking spaces. Shown in Attachment 1	To swap the existing taxi stand and mobility space with angled parking	Outside property 5 Tūwharetoa Street
4. Bus stop sign on Whites Road. Shown in Attachment 2	Formalise the bus stop, bus shelter already exists.	Corner of Whites Road and Broadlands Road intersection
5. 2 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Taharepa Road. Shown in Attachment 3	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Taharepa Road and Crown Road
6. 1 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Crown Road. Shown in Attachment 3	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Taharepa Road and Crown Road
7. Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 3	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on Crown Road	Crown Road at the intersection of Taharepa Road
8. No Stopping At All Times (Broken yellow lines). Shown in Attachment 3	To prohibit vehicles from parking on the corners to allow adequate sightlines at the roundabout	All corners of Crown Road and Taharepa

9. Pedestrian zebra crossing signs and markings 3.0m. Shown in Attachment 4	To replace the existing Kea crossing and formalise pedestrian crossing with zebra signs and markings to allow priority to pedestrians crossing from the school	Outside property # 146 Taharepa Road
10. 2 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Taharepa Road. Shown in Attachment 5	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
11. 2 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on AC Baths Avenue. Shown in Attachment 5	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
12. 4 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Tauhara Road. Shown in Attachment 5	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue (both approaches on Tauhara Road)
13. Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 5	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on AC Baths Avenue	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
14. 2 x Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 5	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on Tauhara Road (east and west approaches).	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
15. Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 5	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on Taharepa Road	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
16. No Stopping At All Times (Broken yellow lines). Shown in Attachment 5	To prohibit vehicles from parking on the corners to allow adequate sightlines at the roundabout	All corners of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

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 a public space.

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.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | OPTIONS

The two options before Council are:

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

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

NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

To seek approval from the Taupō Reserves and Roding Committee for Traffic control devices relating to upcoming projects and changes requested by the community.

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
1. Taxi Stand signs and markings. Shown in Attachment 1	To allow taxis to pickup and dropoff outside hospitality venues at the western end of Tūwharetoa Street.	Outside property 8 to 10 Tūwharetoa Street
2 Mobility Parking sign P120 and markings. Shown in Attachment 1	To retain a parallel parking space within the CBD	Outside property 8 to 10 Tūwharetoa Street
P60 sign for angled parking spaces. Shown in Attachment 1	To swap the existing taxi stand and mobility space with angled parking	Outside property 5 Tūwharetoa Street
4. Bus stop sign on Whites Road. Shown in Attachment 2	Trucks are parking for extended periods, leaving no space for the school bus	Corner of Whites Road and Broadlands Road intersection
2 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Taharepa Road. Shown in Attachment 3	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Taharepa Road and Crown Road
1 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Crown Road. Shown in Attachment 3	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Taharepa Road and Crown Road
Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 3	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on Crown Road	Crown Road at the intersection of Taharepa Road
No Stopping At All Times (Broken yellow lines). Shown in Attachment 3	To prohibit vehicles from parking on the corners to allow adequate sightlines at the roundabout	All corners of Crown Road and Taharepa
9 Pedestrian zebra crossing signs and markings 3.0m. Shown in Attachment 4	To replace the existing Kea crossing and formalise pedestrian crossing with zebra signs and markings to allow priority to pedestrians crossing from the school.	Outside property # 146 Taharepa Road
10. 2 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Taharepa Road. Shown in Attachment 5	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
11. 2 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on AC Baths Avenue. Shown in Attachment 5	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
12. 4 x Give Way signs (RP2/Motsam RG-6) and markings on Tauhara Road. Shown in Attachment 5	To formalise Give Way priority at new roundabout	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue (both approaches on Tauhara Road)
13. Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 5	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on AC Baths Avenue	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue

Sign/Marking	Why	Where
14.2 x Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 5	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on Tauhara Road (east and west approaches).	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue (both approaches of Tauhara Road)
15. Keep Left Sign x2 (RD6L/Motsam RG17). Shown in Attachment 5	To advise motorists to Keep Left at the splitter islands on Taharepa Road	Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue
16. No Stopping At All Times (Broken yellow lines). Shown in Attachment 5	To prohibit vehicles from parking on the corners to allow adequate sightlines at the roundabout	All corners of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue

The above projects have been identified through our deficiency database and/or customer service requests.

Tūwharetoa Street

We've been approached by businesses on Tūwharetoa Street, Towncentre Taupō (TCT), and more recently by the Taupō Alcohol Accord Group (TAAG) with Police involved, to look again at how taxi parking is managed for people leaving nearby restaurants at night. Right now, taxis line up and block parking spaces, which causes congestion late at night and early in the morning, and forces patrons to cross the road to reach waiting taxis. The draft plans have been shared with Towncentre Taupō for their information. Local businesses support the proposed changes, and we will provide the formal feedback from both TAAG and TCT to the meeting

Whites Road bus stop

We've been approached by several parents who are concerned about how the bus stop on Whites Road is being used in the afternoons by both buses and parents. The main issue is the speed of vehicles, including heavy trucks, turning left into Whites Road while parents are picking up children from the school bus. We have now put up school bus turning signs on Broadlands Road and Whites Road to highlight the risk. However, it was also noted that there is no formal bus stop sign at the bus shelter on Whites Road.

Crown Road at the intersection of Taharepa Road and Intersection of Tauhara Road/Taharepa Road and AC Baths Avenue

These two roundabouts are part of our Long-term Plan, the tender has been awarded, and construction is set to begin on 15 September. Both roundabouts will need a number of signs and road markings to be formalised so they can be properly enforced.

Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal can be met within current budgets,

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for under the New signs and Markings budget and/or individual project 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 / or cultural are of relevance to this particular matter.

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

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 the ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district. Engagement may not always be required by law, however meaningful engagement with Māori allows Council to demonstrate good faith and our commitment to working together as partners across our district.

Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

No direct engagement is needed for this agenda item.

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 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.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. Tūwharetoa Street
2. School bus stop sign on Whites Road
3. Roundabout at Crown Road and Taharepa Road
4. New zebra pedestrian crossing on Taharepa Road outside Tauhara Primary School
5. Roundabout Taharepa Road/Tauhara Road/AC Baths Ave

5.4 NEW PUBLIC ROAD NAMES - EAST URBAN LANDS SUBDIVISION

Author: Louise Wood, Senior Resource Consents Planner

Authorised by: Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager

TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE

This item is being presented to Council to make a decision on names for five new public roads.

WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are five new public roads within a new residential subdivision off Tauhara Ridge Drive, known as Stage 1A of the East Urban Lands masterplan and shown on the attached map. This item is before the Council for approval of names for the five new public roads. The proposed road names are as follows:

Te Ranginui Road

Matariki Drive

Pōhutukawa Road

Waitī Road

Takurua Road

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council approves the new public road names within the residential subdivision off Tauhara Ridge Drive:

- i. Te Ranginui Road
- ii. Matariki Drive
- iii. Pōhutukawa Road
- iv. Waitī Road
- v. Takurua Road

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

Subdivision consent RM240129 was granted in July 2024 and authorises the creation of 62 residential lots, new public roads and reserves consistent with the East Urban Lands (EUL) masterplan. The subdivision is to be carried out over two Stages – 1A and 1B. Stage 1A is nearly completed construction and there are new roads to be vested in Council that will provide access to the Stage 1A lots (off Tauhara Ridge Drive). The developer (Taupō District Council) has lodged an application for new road names. The new road names have been provided from the hapū Ngāti Hinerau and Ngāti Hineure, of Waipahīhī Marae.

The proposal has not been presented previously.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION

The proposed road names do not have any duplications or similarities to other road names in the Taupō District. The names meet the requirements of the ASNZS 4819 Rural and Urban Address and Road Naming Standard 2011 and the names have been checked by the emergency services (Police, St John Ambulance and Fire Service) and no issues have been raised on the names. The road names have been provided from the hapū Ngāti Hinerau and Ngāti Hineure of Waipahīhī Marae.

Based on this information, it is considered that the road names should be approved.

NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

The road names have been provided from Ngāti Hinerau and Ngāti Hineure, comply with the ASNZS 4819 Rural and Urban Address and Road Naming Standard 2011, and have support from the emergency services (Police, St John Ambulance and Fire Service).

Based on this information, there are no options to consider and the road names should be approved as proposed.

NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations

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

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 cultural wellbeing of communities is of relevance to this particular matter.

As long as the proposed road names are evaluated with regards to the relevant road naming regulations and are consistent with these requirements, there are no legal considerations associated with the road names.

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. Engaging with the iwi and hapū is the responsibility of the developer in proposing the road names.

Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation. The developer has consulted with the hapū Ngāti Hinerau and Ngāti Hineure of Waipahihi Marae who have kindly provided the names for the new public roads, which are from the Māori New Year Matariki star cluster. As such, the appropriate engagement has been undertaken.

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 the Council approves the proposed road names:

Te Ranginui Road

Matariki Drive

Pōhutukawa Road

Waitī Road

Takurua Road

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. Map of EUL Stage 1A Proposed Public Road Names

5.5 DELEGATION OF DECISION MAKING TO A COMMISSIONER FOR A LAND USE RESOURCE CONSENT (2 SORRENTO DRIVE, TAUPŌ: PROPOSED EATERY)

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 within the development known as Amano Ridge (off Huka Falls Road, Taupō) for a proposed eatery at 2 Sorrento Drive, Taupō (RM250229).

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 Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) applications, delegations must be conferred by Council. This current resource consent application involves a potential conflict of interest where Council employees who hold the delegations cannot make the decisions and therefore decision-making appointments to qualified independent commissioner/s 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 the proposed eatery at 2 Sorrento Drive, Taupō within the Amano Ridge development to an Independent Commissioner with Chairperson accreditation, Ms Gina Sweetman.

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION**Amano Ridge- 2 Sorrento Drive, Taupō**

Northlit Property Limited have applied to develop the corner lot of 2 Sorrento Drive within the Amano Ridge complex. The site was identified for future development and likely for an eatery of some type to residents within the immediate area for some time. It is now proposed to construct and operate an additional building for the eatery, to utilise the existing 'church' building and to construct a car park within Amano Ridge as well as within the public road reserve on Huka Falls Road. A Taupō District Council senior staff member lives within the vicinity so to avoid any perception of influence or potential perception of conflict, 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 Ms Gina Sweetman is appointed to make the decisions. Ms Sweetman is an experienced Commissioner who has been delegated authority by Council to hear, consider and decide on two previous publicly notified resource consent applications.

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. Given the timing of the decisions it is also unclear if Councillors Westerman and Taylor will be returning Councillors to sit on a panel. Furthermore, the identified potential conflict of interest identified above would also affect them making them unable to participate.

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 – Ms Gina Sweetman - be appointed to hear, consider and decide alone for the proposed eatery at Amano Ridge, Taupō being 2 Sorrento Drive.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.6 DELEGATIONS OF DECISION MAKING FOR RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATIONS**Author:** Heather Williams, Resource Consents Manager**Authorised by:** Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

To seek approval for Commissioner/s for resource consent applications during the period where there are no Council meetings to appoint specific Commissioner/s to:

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

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.

1. Resource Consent Applications lodged with Taupō District Council for which a hearing is required and/or
2. Resource Consent Applications that will be lodged during the period that may result in a conflict of interest to which Council staff will not be able to make delegated authority decisions.

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 to one or more of the following Commissioners during the period of 1 October 2025 to 20 December 2025 where a Commissioner is required because of conflicts of interest or a hearing is required.

- Gina Sweetman
- Cam Twigley
- Rachel Dimery
- Bill Wasley

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION

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. During the period where there are no Council meetings to confirm such appointments a general appointment to the Resource Consent Manager is sought.

During the period of 1 October 2025 and 20 December 2025

1. Resource Consent Applications lodged with Taupō District Council for which a hearing is required and/or
2. Resource Consent Applications that will be lodged during the period that may result in a conflict of interest to which Council staff will not be able to make delegated authority decisions.

If a hearing is required (which would be determined after the close of submissions), the appointment of a hearings commissioner becomes time critical in order to be able to set the hearing date and prepare all parties for the timelines. There are several applications currently lodged with Taupō District Council that are

likely to be at least limited notified during the period of 1 October and 20 December 2025 and may go on to require a hearing.

There are also potentially applications to be lodged with Taupō District Council during the period where there are no Council meetings where a conflict of interest may arise with Council staff members who hold the appropriate delegations and the s.95 and s.104 decision would need to be delegated to a non-staff member. In this instance the ability to appointment a Commissioner is required in order to meet the statutory timeframe of 20 working days for a notification decision.

NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

Option Conclusion:

An option is to do nothing and not to delegate the authority to appoint Commissioner/s during the period that there are no Council meetings. This not considered an acceptable option as it would result in unnecessary statutory delays to the processing of resource consent applications and could result in the use of the Resource Management (Discount on Administrative Charges) Regulations whereby Council must discount the processing costs for not having met Statutory timeframes.

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.

Depending on what the resource consent application is for and who the affected parties are it may be appropriate to consider the appointment of a specialist commissioner/s or a Commissioner with expertise in Matauranga Māori. This would be considered as part of the appointment process and may be discussed with our iwi partners and/or in line with any of the relevant Joint Management Agreements or the Mana Whakahono as may be appropriate for the application.

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 Council delegates the functions and powers of hearing, consideration, and decision-making in relation to a resource consent application to one or more of the following Commissioners during the period of 1 October 2025 to 20 December 2025 where a Commissioner is required because of conflicts of interest or a hearing is required.

- Gina Sweetman
- Cam Twigley
- Rachel Dimery
- Bill Wasley

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.7 CONTINUATION OF THE TAUPŌ DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE INTO THE 2025-2028 TRIENNIUM

Author: Shainey James, Governance Quality Manager

Authorised by: Nigel McAdie, Legal and Governance Manager

TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to update Council on the status of committees and steering groups during the period between the elections and the Inaugural Council meeting; and to seek continuation of the Taupō District Licensing Committee into the 2025-2028 Triennium.

WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

All local authority committees are discharged at the end of a Triennium, unless a local authority resolves otherwise [Local Government Act 2002, Schedule 7, clause 30(7)]. As explained in this report, Council is involved in several joint, co-governance and statutory committees which will continue on into the 2025-2028 Triennium by virtue of their establishing legislation. There is one exception, being the Taupō District Licensing Committee, and it is recommended that Council resolves to continue this committee into the 2025-2028 Triennium.

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)

That, pursuant to clause 30(7) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, Council resolves to continue the Taupō District Licensing Committee into the 2025-2028 Triennium of Council.

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

All local authority committees are discharged at the end of a Triennium, unless a local authority resolves otherwise [Local Government Act 2002, Schedule 7, clause 30(7)]. However, Council is involved in several joint, co-governance and statutory committees which are enduring. These are set out below. The exception is the Taupō District Licensing Committee, and it is recommended that Council resolves to continue this.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION**Committee to be continued on by resolution**

There is one committee of Council which would benefit from continuing through to the 2025-2028 Triennium, namely the Taupō District Licensing Committee. It is recommended that Council resolves to continue this particular committee as permitted by the Local Government Act 2002. This will enable applications under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 to continue to be processed throughout the period with no delays.

Committees continuing on undischarged without the need for a resolution

The Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Joint Committee continues undischarged in accordance with s 12 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

Te Kōpu ā Kānapanapa, continues undischarged in accordance with s 171 of the Ngāti Tūwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018.

NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

Council could decide to continue the Taupō District Licensing Committee, or not. If the Taupō District Licensing Committee was discharged, there is the possibility that during the period before it was established again, resulting delays may cause issues for applicants.

NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS**Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations**

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$Nil.

Ngā Aronga Ture | 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. 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 well-beings are of relevance to this particular matter.

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.

There are no matters of importance specifically to Māori associated with this decision.

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 Council resolves to continue the Taupō District Licensing Committee.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

Nil

5.8 NEW ZEALAND MUTUAL LIABILITY RISKPOOL - TRUST DEED VARIATION

Author: Jeanette Paenga, Finance Manager

Authorised by: Sarah Matthews, General Manager Organisation Performance

TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE

To seek Council approval to consent to proposed amendments to the Riskpool Trust Deed, as circulated by Local Government Mutual Funds Trustee Ltd (LGMFT), the trustee for the New Zealand Mutual Liability Riskpool Scheme (Riskpool).

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council consents, in its capacity as a Member of the Scheme, to the amendments to the Riskpool Trust Deed as set out in the attached letter dated 21 August 2025 and authorises the Chief Executive to sign and return the consent form on behalf of Council.

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

Riskpool was established in 1997 by local authorities and Civic Assurance (now Civic Financial Services Ltd) to provide collective risk protection for local government entities across New Zealand. It was formed in response to an unreliable and expensive commercial insurance market, particularly following the withdrawal of key insurers from local government liability cover.

Structured as a not-for-profit mutual fund with a Board of Trustees (the Board) acting in the best interests of members, Riskpool successfully operated for 20 years, returning \$178.7 million in claims to its members in comparison to \$147.5 million in contributions. Taupō District Council was a member of the Riskpool Scheme in that period.

Since 2017, the Scheme has been in a managed wind-down phase. The Board's focus is now primarily on resolving legacy claims, pursuing recoveries from reinsurers, and ensuring sound trust governance.

Although the Riskpool Scheme is in a managed wind down phase, the Board is currently managing a number of significant workstreams relating to Riskpool including:

Domestic Litigation

Several legacy claims remain outstanding against the Scheme. In 2023, the Supreme Court in *Local Government Mutual Funds Trustee Ltd v Napier City Council* [2023] NZSC 97 confirmed that claims against the Scheme involving both weathertight and non-weathertight defects (mixed claims) could be divided, with cover available for non-weathertight defects. This ruling had wide-ranging consequences and led to a series of other mixed defect claims proceeding against the Scheme.

Two of these claims are scheduled for trial in September 2025. The central issue at trial is whether the claims were validly notified under the Scheme. These proceedings are important in clarifying Riskpool's historic obligations and the interpretation of Scheme terms. The Board is working closely with its legal advisers to prepare for trial and is keeping reinsurers updated with developments.

Reinsurance recoveries

Reinsurance remains Riskpool's primary source of funds for accepted claims. However, the process of ensuring reinsurers meet their obligations is complex, involving multi-layered "towers" of reinsurance for each fund year. The relevant reinsurance contracts are governed by English law and subject to the jurisdiction of the London commercial courts.

The Board is actively engaged with London brokers, English counsel, and New Zealand advisers to pursue recovery. Litigation in London remains a possibility. Ensuring that reinsurers meet their indemnity obligations is essential to reduce the scale of any further calls on member Councils and safeguard the wider local government sector.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION

The original trust deed between the two parties dates from 1997 and was amended in 2007.

As part of its ongoing governance review, the Board commissioned Webb Henderson to conduct a 'hygiene check' of the Scheme and its governing documents. That review identified several deficiencies in the current Trust Deed which require correction to bring the governance framework into line with best practice.

In summary, the proposed changes:

- i. Clarify the duties owed under clause 6 of the Trust Deed. The amendments make clear that these duties are owed by LGMFT, rather than by the Board. It appears that has always been the intention of the drafting given that the Board is not a party to the Trust Deed. The Board will remain mindful of them and continue to seek to cause LGMFT to give effect to them.
- ii. Clarify that the Trustee can distribute surplus funds to Members. This is implicit at present but as the Scheme pursues reinsurance recoveries it is appropriate to put the point beyond any doubt. See clauses 6.13 and 6.14 of the Amended Riskpool Trust Deed.
- iii. Clarify that the role of the Scheme Manager under clause 9 of the Trust Deed passed to Civic Financial Service Limited, formerly known as New Zealand Local Government Insurance Corporation Limited (LGIC).
- iv. Properly provide for indemnification and limitation of liability of LGMFT, as trustee, and the Board. The Trust Deed, as currently drafted, provides insufficient protections to LGMFT and the Board when compared to the position at common law and in typical commercial trust arrangements. The Board considers that this is an oversight which, in the interests of the Scheme and Members, should be addressed. See clause 13 of the Amended Riskpool Trust Deed.
- v. Ensure consistent use of defined terms and correct other minor drafting issues.

Council staff are supportive of the changes and the reasons given by the Board.

In accordance with clause 17.1 of the Riskpool Trust Deed, the proposed amendments are conditional on not less than 90% of Members consenting in writing to the changes. There are 75 Member Councils in the relevant period each with a casting vote.

This consent is required to be given no later than 30 September 2025.

NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

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

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Give consent to the proposed amendments to the trust deed

Advantages	Disadvantages
- The amendments will make clear matters that were previously understood but not documented - Provides clear provisions for indemnifying the Board in line with standard practice - Clarifies that Trustee can distribute funds to members - Will ensure that Riskpool can continue to attract and retain capable Board members to act on Members behalf (including Taupō District Council)	The proposed indemnification and liability limitations for the Board and LGMFT could reduce Council's ability to hold these individuals accountable, except for in the case of dishonesty or wilful default

Option 2. Do not give consent to the proposed amendments to the trust deed

Advantages	Disadvantages
The existing indemnification and liability retain members ability to hold the board accountable in certain situations (outside dishonest and wilful default)	- Continued ambiguity around undocumented understandings - Potential challenges to attract and retain capable board members to act on members behalf, due to the lack of protection from personal liability - Risk that the Trustee will not be able to distribute funds to Members

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is option 1 - to approve the proposed amendments to the Trust Deed. This clarifies matters that were previously implied or understood but not documented in the Trust Deed and indemnifies individuals who are acting on the members behalf (including Council). Although the proposed indemnification and liability limitations may reduce Council's ability to hold the board to account if there are any issues during this wind-down phase, this is standard practice and the shortcomings in the current trust deed would make it challenging to get capable board members who are willing to act on members behalf.

NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$nil.

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 economic is of relevance to this particular matter.

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.

Officers believe no engagement is required as this is a procedural matter and has no impact on our relationships with Iwi.

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 beneficial to Council to approve the amendments to the Trust Deed as the practical effect of the amendments will be to reduce governance risk, ensure compliance with best practice, and provide the Board with adequate protections and safeguards when acting in the best interests of Taupō District Council and other Members, in resolving legacy claims and winding down the Scheme.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. Letter from Local Government Mutual Funds Trustee Ltd (LGMFT) date 21 August 2025
2. Draft Deed of Amendment and Restatement
3. Amended Riskpool Trust Deed - Proposed Amendments in Mark-up

5.9 APPROVAL OF OPERATIONAL AND CAPITAL CARRY FORWARD FROM 2024/25 TO 2025/26**Author:** Jeanette Paenga, Finance Manager**Authorised by:** Sarah Matthews, General Manager Organisation Performance**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is for Council to approve the transfer of unspent operational and capital budgets to be carried forward from 2024/25 into the 2025/26 financial year, so that unfinished projects can be completed. Reductions in capital budgets are also included in this representation where budgeted expenditure for 2025/26 was incurred late in the preceding financial year. This report is also intended to update Council on upcoming forecasting improvements.

NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council approves:

1. a net increase in capital budgets for 2025/26 financial year of \$39,715,731 (Thirty-nine million, seven hundred and fifteen thousand, seven hundred and thirty-one dollars), to allow for carry forward of uncompleted capital projects from 2024/25 and to account for budget reductions in 2025/26 where timing of the capital expenditure occurred late in the 2024/25 financial year; and
2. an increase in operational budgets of \$1,442,912 (One million, four hundred and forty-two thousand, nine hundred and twelve dollars) to allow for carry forward of uncompleted operational projects from 2024/25.
3. directs the Chief Executive to consider deliverability of Council's 2025/26 capital programme in the first reforecast to be presented to the incoming Council in December 2025.

TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND

At the end of each financial year, budgets for operational and capital projects that have not been fully completed are required to be formally transferred to the next financial year, with a resolution of Council recorded.

These project budgets have already been approved through Council planning processes and funded in the respective financial years and as such have no additional impact on rates, loans, or other funding sources.

While carry forwards of budget will always be expected due to timing of expenditure, Council Officers have been focused on reducing the quantum of these. During the 2025/26 Annual Plan process, reductions to Council's capital programme were approved due to consideration of the overall programme deliverability. Council Officers also advised Council that the carry forward process will be given the same consideration, with the aim to reduce the amounts carried forward.

Council Officers are also making improvements to Council's forecasting process, with two formal reforecasts planned for 31 October and 28 February (presented at the December 2025 and March 2026 Council meetings) and ad-hoc reforecasts done as required throughout the year (presented in Council's monthly performance report). The Independent Chair of the Risk and Assurance Committee has endorsed more regular forecasting due to the uncertainty in the current environment.

NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION

The Finance team have worked with business units to assess each project budget and the necessity of these to be included in the carry forward process and to assess any budget overspends, which will reduce capital budgets for 2025/26.

Key principles were communicated to the business to assist with decision making:

- No carry forward of renewal or pooled budgets where funding exists in the next financial year
- No carry forwards for budgets dependent on other events or circumstances to progress
- No carry forwards where delivery is uncertain
- No operating cost carry forwards except for operating projects

The Executive team have reviewed the proposed lists.

Capital carry forward

While the transfer of the budget is being requested for approval by Council, the budgets themselves have already been approved and consulted on with the community through the Long-term Plan (LTP) or Annual Plan processes. The funding for these projects was accounted for in the 2024-34 Long-term Plan, and therefore the decision required is specifically in relation to budget transfer only, to ensure Council's approved budget for 2025/26 is recorded formally for audit purposes.

It is proposed to carry forward net \$39,715,731 for capital projects. There are two main reasons why capital budgets are carried forward:

- 1) The project is a multi-year project with budgets over several years – carry forward is generally due to the timing of the phases of the project slipping behind what was originally anticipated or;
- 2) A single year project which has had an element of slippage in timing, supply of goods or internal resource allocation.

Capital budgets of \$4.3 million have been removed through this verification process, which is generally due to the consideration of the above principles, projects being completed under budget, sufficient future budget available or budget no longer required.

While the \$4.3 million reduction was less than expected when the 2025/26 Annual Plan capital programme was being assessed for deliverability, the remaining carry forwards are either committed via contract, purchase order, or tendering processes. This will require extra focus on the deliverability of Council's capital programme during upcoming forecasting processes.

The carry forward of these capital projects have no additional impact on rates, loans, or other funding sources. The carry forward amount will increase our proposed capital budget to \$111 million.

We have indicated in prior papers that we are moving to regular forecasting and intend to bring the first formal reforecast to the incoming Council in December 2025. It is likely that we will need to rephase some capital expenditure to 2026/27 to ensure deliverability of the 2025/26 capital programme.

Attached is a schedule by group of activity of the Capital projects proposed to be carried forward. The total net amount of \$39.7million is required to be transferred to the 2025/26 budget to enable the carry forwards and budget reductions as well.

Operational carry forward

In year one of the long-term plan there were a variety of operational projects that were not completed due to conflicting priorities, lack of resources or scheduling of work.

Most of the proposed projects related to the management of organisational risk.

The amount proposed to carry forward is \$1,442,912. These projects will not affect rates as we have already rated for them in 2024/25, or in the case of resource consent renewals, these are not funded from rates.

Attached is a schedule of the operational projects proposed to be carried forward.

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

NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Approve budget transfer of \$39.7million capital budget and \$1.4 million operational budget from 2024/25 to 2025/26 financial year, to allow for project carry forwards and budget reductions where budgets were spent in advance of the 2025/26 financial year.

Advantages	Disadvantages
- Approval is consistent with previous Annual Plan and LTP processes and decisions. - Projects have already been agreed with the community through planning processes and funded through these processes. - Council are committed to the majority of the carry forwards as these are generally project timing only.	- Increases 2025/26 capital & operational budgets by net carry forward amounts. - Will likely impact deliverability of Annual Plan projects due to overall capital programme deliverability.

Advantages	Disadvantages
• Council Officers can focus on delivering projects as per LTP and reducing this carry forward budget transfers in future years. • Capital budgets are focused on delivery of critical infrastructure and legislative compliance and non-approval of budget transfer may compromise their delivery. • Council can consider deliverability of its capital programme and rephase Annual Plan budgets if required during improved forecasting processes.	

Option 2. Do not approve budget transfer of \$39.7million capital budget and/or \$1.4 million operational budget from 2024/25 to 2025/26 financial year.

Advantages	Disadvantages
• Capital & operational budgets would stay the same as 2025/26 Annual Plan budget and deliverability would not require consideration.	• Would be inconsistent with 2024-34 Long-term Plan and Annual Plan decisions. May trigger inconsistent policy decision and/or LTP amendment. • Due to a large portion of the carry forwards being committed to or spent, Council Officers would not be able to deliver planned LTP projects. • For 2025/26 year capital budgets focused on delivery of critical infrastructure and legislative compliance, non-approval of carry forward budget transfer would compromise their delivery. • Operational projects relating to consenting and risk management would not be able to proceed. • Council forecasting improvement and 2026/27 Annual Plan would be challenged as would be more complicated to rearrange budgets to ensure critical work is completed, instead of rephasing new budgets (from 2025/26 Annual Plan).

Analysis Conclusion:

Council Officers are recommending that Council proceed with Option 1, to approve the budget transfer of \$39.7million capital budget and \$1.4 million operational budget from 2024/25 to 2025/26 to allow for project carry forwards and budget reductions where budgets were spent in advance of the 2025/26 financial year.

NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be a net increase in approved capital budgets for 2025/26 of \$39.7million and an increase in approved operational budgets of \$1.4 million, which has already been funded in previous planning processes and allowed for in the 2024-34 LTP. The transfer of these budgets has no effect on rates for 2025/26.

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 well-beings 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.

Ngā Hīraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications

The proposal has been evaluated against the following plans:

✓ Long Term Plan 2024-2034 ✓ Annual Plan

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

The recommended option is in line with the 2024-34 LTP, previous planning processes, and consistent with applicable policies of Council. The recommended option would not trigger an LTP amendment.

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 projects within the carry forward list and 2025/26 year (LTP year 2) have been subject to iwi, and hapū consultation. The approval of carry forwards is in line with consultation completed during these processes. Where applicable, project specific consultation is undertaken during project phases.

Ngā Tūraru | Risks

There are reputational and legal risks in relation to the decision not to carry forward budget from 2024/25 due to the projects being agreed to through Council's planning process. Due to a large portion of the carry forwards being committed to or spent; Council Officers would not be able to deliver planned LTP projects if this budget transfer is not approved. 2025/26-year capital budgets focused on delivery of critical infrastructure and legislative compliance, and non-approval of carry forward budget transfer would compromise these projects.

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, assuming the preferred option is approved. If the preferred option is not approved, this decision would be significant as it is inconsistent with decisions of past planning processes and previously approved projects/budgets

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 approving the budget transfer.

TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media required.

WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the approval of the budget transfer of \$39,715,731 capital budget and \$1,442,912 operational budget from the 2024/25 to the 2025/26 financial year is essential to ensure the continuity and completion of projects. This transfer aligns with previous planning processes and community consultations, and it allows Council Officers to focus on delivering projects as outlined in the Long-term Plan (LTP). By approving this transfer, Council will be able to maintain the momentum of ongoing projects, confirm existing budgets, and ensure that critical infrastructure and legislative compliance projects are not compromised.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed 24/25 Capital Carry-forward into 25/26
2. Proposed 24/25 Operational Carry-forward into 25/26

5.10 TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL PERFORMANCE REPORT - AUGUST 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 receives the information contained in the Performance Report for the month of August 2025.

NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS

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

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
Agenda Item No: 6.1 Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 24 June 2025	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	There is a need to exclude the public for the consideration of the confidential minutes, to protect the Chief Executive's privacy.
Agenda Item No: 6.2 Confirmation of Confidential Portion of Ordinary Council Minutes - 26 August 2025	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	It is necessary to exclude the public to protect Council's negotiating position while key commercial terms are still being negotiated.
Agenda Item No: 6.3 Release of Resolutions from Confidence	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)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial	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	Council will consider these resolutions still retained in confidence from previous meetings and determine if they should be released.

	position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information 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)		
--	--	--	--

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]*.