

# Corporate and Operations Committee

## Open Agenda



Notice is hereby given that an ordinary meeting of the Corporate and Operations Committee will be held on:

**Date:** Wednesday 28 June 2017  
**Time:** 9:15am  
**Venue:** Council Chambers  
35 Kenrick Street  
TE AROHA

---

### Membership

#### Mayor

Jan Barnes, JP

#### Councillors

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

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

Phone: 07-884-0060  
Address: PO Box 266, Te Aroha 3342  
Email: [chubbard@mpdc.govt.nz](mailto:chubbard@mpdc.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.mpdc.govt.nz](http://www.mpdc.govt.nz)





---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>PROCEDURAL</b>		
1	Meeting Opening	5
2	Present	5
3	Apologies	5
4	Notification of Urgent Business	5
5	Confirmation of minutes	5
<b>OFFICER REPORTS</b>		
6	Executive	
	6.1 Adoption of Eastern Waikato Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan	7
	6.2 Draft Interim Management Report Annual Report 2016/17	13
7	Business Support	
	7.1 Levels of Service for Urban Watercourses	19
	7.2 Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications	27
	7.3 Audit & Risk Committee Update	31
	7.4 Horrell Road Traffic Assessment	33
8	Community Development	
	8.1 Health & Safety Report - May 2017	37
	8.2 Transfer of Rural Fire Assets to FENZ	39
9	Service Delivery	
	9.1 Matamata-Piako Civic and Memorial Centre - Solar voltaic panels	41
	9.2 Chief Executive Officers Report for May 2017	45
10	Urgent Additional Business	
<b>PUBLIC EXCLUDED</b>		
11	Procedural motion to exclude the public	47
C1	Provision of a Water Supply within Waitoa	
C2	LGNZ Excellence Programme 2016	



---

**1 Meeting Opening**

**2 Present**

**3 Apologies**

At the close of the agenda an apology had been received from Cr P Jager.

**4 Notification of Urgent Business**

Pursuant to clause 3.7.5 and 3.7.6 of the Standing Orders NZS 9202:2003 and Section 6A (7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the Chairman to enquire from members whether there are any additional items for consideration which qualify as extraordinary or urgent additional business.

**5 Confirmation of minutes**

Minutes, as circulated, of the Ordinary Meeting of the Corporate and Operations Committee, held on 24 May 2017



# Adoption of Eastern Waikato Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan

Trim No.: 1891274

## Executive Summary

This report seeks the adoption of the Eastern Waikato Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. This was recommended by the Eastern Waikato Solid Waste Joint Committee (Joint Committee) at their meeting held on 1 June 2017. Councillors Cronin and Wilcock are Council's representatives on this committee.

The Eastern Waikato Waste Management and Minimisation Plan has been circulated separately to this report.

## Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.
2. Council adopts the Eastern Waikato Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan as recommended by the Eastern Waikato Solid Waste Joint Committee.

## Content

### Background

The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (Act) requires all territorial authorities to adopt a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP). The WMMP must set out:

- Objectives, policies and methods for achieving effective and efficient waste management and minimisation.
- How implementation of the plan will be funded.
- A framework for making any grants to organisations or individuals for waste management and minimisation purposes, should the territorial wish to make grants available.

In 2011 Matamata-Piako, Hauraki and Thames-Coromandel District Councils formed a Joint Committee to oversee the shared solid waste services project. The Joint Committee consisted of two Councillors from each Council and was given delegation of authority to enable it to undertake its roles and responsibilities. This included the authority to recommend the draft WMMP for consultation, hear submissions and make a recommendation to each Council on the adoption of the WMMP. The current WMMP was adopted in 2012.

The current WMMP is a joint plan with both Hauraki and Thames-Coromandel District Council, as provided for under the Act. This WMMP is known as the Eastern Waikato Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The joint plan also supports a joint solid waste collection contract across the three districts.

The process for reviewing the WMMP in 2017 was similar to that employed in 2012. This included a single consultation process, hearings by the joint committee, deliberations by the joint committee and adoption of the joint plan by each of the councils individually.

At its meeting on 7 December 2016 Council approved the re-establishment of the Joint Committee to oversee the WMMP review in accordance with the Joint Committee agreement previously agreed by Council. Councillors Paul Cronin and Adrienne Wilcock were appointed to the Joint Committee to represent Council. The Joint Committee were tasked with reviewing the plan and recommending it to the three Councils. The Joint Committee agreement is attached.

The three constituent councils (Hauraki District Council, Matamata-Piako District Council and Thames-Coromandel District Council) have decided to undertake a review of the plan in 2017 to:

- Make improvements to the plan as identified by the Thames-Coromandel District Council Solid Waste Manager in the capacity of lead officer;
- Ensure each council has the most up-to-date waste management and minimisation information to inform development of their 2018-2028 Long Term Plans;
- Undertake a review of the joint WMMP ahead of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plans to spread the workload of staff across a longer time period; and
- Bring forward the following WMMP review (which would not have been required until 2024) to 2022 to align with tendering of the solid waste services (the current contract expires in August 2023).

#### Issues

The Joint Committee held its first meeting on 14 February 2017. Councillor Paul Milner (Hauraki District Council) was appointed Chair and Sally Christie (Thames-Coromandel District Council) Deputy Chair. The second meeting was held on 10 March 2017.

Council approved the WMMP Vision, Goals and Objectives and targets at its meeting on 22 February 2017. Council subsequently approved the WMMP for public consultation at its meeting on 22 March 2017.

A statement of proposal was prepared along with the draft WMMP, this sets out the proposal for changes to the WMMP, Councillors should refer to this and the draft WMMP (previously circulated) for issues and options that were prepared for consultation. A copy of the Statement of Proposal is attached.

The Draft WMMP was put out to public consultation and the Joint Committee undertook hearings and deliberations on public submissions on the 1<sup>st</sup> of June 2017.

A total of 28 submissions were received. A summary of the submitters is as follows:

Submissions received	Number of submissions
Organisations who cover the 3 Council areas	3
Hauraki District Council	6
Matamata-Piako District Council	8
Matamata-Piako & Thames-Coromandel District Councils	1
Thames-Coromandel District Council	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28</b>

The Committee has now recommended the plan be adopted by Council.

The WMMP circulated separately to this report. **Part A** contains the strategy including the vision and goals of the plan. **Part B** of the WMMP contains the Action Plan which aims to reflect what the Councils plan to do over the coming years. **Part C** contains the Waste Assessment which sets out



the current situation in the Eastern Waikato relating to waste management and also attempts to identify future demand for services.

The report on the Joint Committee Deliberations is attached for reference. This provides an overview of the key points raised in submissions, staff analysis and recommendations. A copy of the Joint Committee hearing minutes is also attached.

## Analysis

### Options considered

Council has the following options:

1. Approve the draft WMMP for consultation as recommended by the Joint Committee.
2. Do not approve or recommend amendments to the draft WMMP to the Joint Committee.

If Council opts not to adopt or to amend the WMMP it is suggested it would need to be referred back to the Joint Committee for further discussion.

### Analysis of preferred option

It is recommended Council approve the draft WMMP which has been put forward by the Joint Committee.

### Legal and statutory requirements

The Act does not prescribe specific waste management and minimisation targets, or the structure or content of WMMPs, allowing significant local flexibility in the approach taken.

The Act does however include a 'waste reduction hierarchy' that Councils must consider when preparing/reviewing a WMMP. The hierarchy is listed in descending order of importance:

- reduction
- reuse
- recycling
- recovery
- treatment
- disposal

A WMMP requires public consultation which must be in accordance with the special consultative procedure set out in section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

### New Zealand Waste Strategy

The Act outlines that councils must have regard to the New Zealand Waste Strategy when preparing/amending a WMMP. The Ministry for the Environment has published guidance on reviewing WMMPs, which notes that a WMMP should demonstrate how Councils intend to meet the (2010) New Zealand Waste Strategy's goals of reducing environmental harm and improving efficiency.<sup>1</sup>

### Delegations

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministry for the Environment, *Waste Management and Minimisation Planning: Guidance for Territorial Authorities*, 2015, [www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/waste/waste-assessments-and-waste-management-and-minimisation-planning-guide](http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/waste/waste-assessments-and-waste-management-and-minimisation-planning-guide)

The Eastern Waikato Regional Solid Waste Committee has been given the appropriate delegations to approve the deliverables and recommend the draft and adoption of the joint WMMP to Council.

New deliverable

The Local Government Act 2002 now requires that all Council deliverables (whether it be an activity, service, project, programme, grant or involve any other form of expenditure) must align to the purpose of local government as outlined in Section 10 of this Act. It is considered to be aligned with the purpose of local government as it provides:

- Local public service
- Others services conferred by legislation

**Impact on policy and bylaws**

Subject to Councils agreement, the outcome of this process will result in a new WMMP.

Council has recently adopted a new Solid Waste Bylaw.

**Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan**

The final WMMP can be considered during the 2018-28 long term planning process.

**Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy**

The review and adoption of the WMMP by the Councils is considered significant and does trigger the Significance and Engagement Policy because the review has the potential to affect a large proportion of the community.

In this case there is a legal requirement to engage with the community using the special consultative procedure in accordance with section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**Communication, consultation and decision making processes**

As a joint consultation process, the submissions and hearing process was different to that usually undertaken by Council. A communications plan and materials were developed to consult with stakeholders and the wider community.

The process was as follows:

Task	Timeframes
<b>Council adopted Joint Committee Agreement</b>	7 December 2016
<b>Joint Committee held initial workshop</b>	20 December 2016
<b>Joint Committee met to discuss and agree upon draft WMMP goals/objectives</b>	14 February 2017
<b>Council adopted draft WMMP vision and high level goals and objectives and targets</b>	22 February
<b>Joint Committee considered draft WMMP</b>	10 March
<b>Council adopted draft WMMP for public consultation</b>	22 March
<b>Public consultation period</b>	7 April – 8 May
<b>Joint Committee Hearings, deliberations and recommendations regarding adoption of the WMMP by Councils</b>	1 June
<b>Council to adopt the WMMP</b>	28 June

**Contribution to Community Outcomes**

2) *Decision making*

(a) Our community/Iwi will be informed and have the opportunity to comment on significant issues

4) *Our environment*

(b) Council will provide and promote sustainable waste management options to protect our environment.

(d) The adverse effects of development, industry and farming will be managed, monitored and minimised.

## Financial Impact

### i. Cost

The costs of this process were largely staff and Councillor time. Council contracted Thames-Coromandel District Council to undertake the review of the WMMP. The process, including arranging meetings for all council representatives and consultation is estimated to cost between \$15,000 – \$20,000.

### ii. Funding Source

The cost of developing the WMMP has been funded from existing budgets and the waste minimisation funds (generated from the waste levy).

## Attachments

- A. Eastern Waikato Solid Waste Joint Committee Agreement
- B. WMMP Statement of Proposal
- C. Joint Committee deliberations report, 1 June 2017
- D. WMMP Hearing of Submissions Minutes - 01-06-17

## Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker <b>Acting Senior Policy Planner</b>	
Approved by	Michelle Staines-Hawthorne <b>Corporate Strategy Manager</b>	
	Don McLeod <b>Chief Executive Officer</b>	



# Draft Interim Management Report Annual Report 2016/17

Trim No.: 1893655

Item 6.2

## Executive Summary

The Local Government Act 2002 requires Council to prepare and adopt an annual report for each financial year. The annual report is required to be audited by independent auditors. The auditors appointed to audit Council by the Auditor-General are Audit New Zealand (Audit NZ).

During each financial year Audit NZ carries out an interim audit (completed in May 2017) prior to the final audit conducted in August/September. The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the findings of the interim audit and present the Draft Interim Management Report.

The Draft Interim Management Report is being presented to the Audit and Risk Committee on 27 June to consider providing feedback.

The Audit NZ Draft Interim Management Report is attached. The Report has concluded that the internal controls and processes are operationally effective, and can be relied upon.

## Recommendation

That:

1. The report is received

## Content

### Background

Section 98 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires Council to prepare and adopt in respect of each financial year an annual report. The annual report contains information regarding the Council's financial and non-financial performance for that year against budgets and specified performance targets. The annual report is required to be audited by independent auditors. The auditors appointed to audit Council by the Auditor-General are Audit New Zealand (Audit NZ).

During each financial year Audit NZ carries out an interim audit (completed in May 2017) prior to the final audit conducted in August/September. The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the findings of the interim audit and present the Draft Interim Management Report.

### Issues

The Draft Interim Management Report covers issues raised by Audit NZ. Council's management comment response to what has and will be done to address these issues is detailed below.

The Draft Interim Management Report has concluded that the internal controls and processes are both design and operationally effective, and can be relied upon for the purpose of planning and undertaking the most effective and efficient audit approach.

There were four issues identified in the Draft Interim Management and two outstanding matters that are being addressed.

<b>Audit NZ Interim Management Report</b>	<b>Management comment</b>
<b>Monitoring and review of suspense accounts</b>  2.1 We recommend regular reviews and monitoring of suspense accounts are performed. We also recommend that the District Council ensures that evidence is maintained of the reviews that are completed.	Staff actively monitor and keep on top of the suspense accounts to ensure that significant transactions are reflected in the ledger on a timely basis. We will formalise the monitoring and review of these accounts on a monthly basis.

Audit NZ Interim Management Report	Management comment
<p><b>Review of pay run processing</b></p> <p>2.2 We recommend the District Council ensures reviews and checks are being performed effectively. The pay run reports generated should be compared with original supporting documentation by an independent reviewer.</p>	<p>There were a number of extraordinary circumstances that led to an error:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The employee's final day was Friday 23/12/2016 which was the end of a fortnightly pay. However, her final pay was originally calculated with her end date as 3/1/17 which is what she had indicated on her resignation letter originally (the original calculation of her final pay included payment for the Christmas and New Year stat days). On Dec 23<sup>rd</sup> the Payroll Officer realised that she wouldn't be working the shut down period of 28-30 December so her end date should be 23 December because she had no leave entitlement. The Payroll officer contacted the employee and manager to amend the resignation letter and then recalculated the final pay.</li> <li>• In her final fortnight the employee also applied online for annual leave on 14<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> December. This is automatically included in the payroll calculation. As she didn't have any annual leave entitlement she should have had these 16 hours deducted off in her final pay calculation. These 2 days (16 hours) equate to the overpayment.</li> <li>• The manual calculation for the pay was correct but it did not make it sufficiently clear that the net pay had the two days deducted. As this was not clear the error was not picked up when the Pay Edit Listing was checked.</li> <li>• As noted by Audit New Zealand, there were unique (but annual) pressures and demands on payroll created by the pre-Christmas processing requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Human Resources is reviewing Christmas payroll processes to reduce the amount of pressure on staff to ensure the robustness of the checking is maintained at a high level.</p> <p>We will also add a new step every time there is a final pay. We will check the net amount on the final pay calculation is checked against the net amount on the variance report. We feel this quick and simple bottom line check will be a good addition as the Pay Edit Listing has a lot of information.</p> <p>In addition we have approached the former employee to recover the overpayment.</p>

Audit NZ Interim Management Report	Management comment
<p><b>Information Technology function</b></p> <p>(no recommendation)</p> <p>2.3 During our audit of the Council's Information Management Systems we noted only urgent issues are being resolved and IT projects are being delayed.</p> <p>Our discussion with management noted that no-one is fully assigned to managing support and changes to the District Council's main application (Authority).</p> <p>This raises the possibility and risk of the Information Management systems not meeting organisational needs and potentially affecting the integrity of the District Council's data and service delivery.</p>	<p>Management will make decisions on priorities in all areas of the business in the context of the resources available.</p> <p>This is a normal part of the management process.</p> <p>The considerations include the risks and potential impacts on the organisation.</p> <p>The Information Technology team have a significant number of demands on it, as do other teams within Council.</p> <p>Management is comfortable that the team is managing the risks appropriately.</p> <p>This includes the option to acquire Civica managed services and consultancy in the event that the situation becomes critical.</p>
<p><b>Remote access to live system by Civica</b></p> <p>2.4 We recommend access to the Council's live system be made available to the system supplier's staff only when required and approved by the District Council's management and access disabled immediately afterwards.</p> <p>Records of access to the District Council's live data by external parties should be maintained.</p>	<p>Management have considered this matter in the past and decided that the additional administrative overhead presented was not warranted.</p> <p>Management will revisit the risks including reviewing Civica controls and contractual obligations.</p>



**Outstanding matters**

<b>Audit NZ Management Report</b>	<b>Current status</b>	<b>2017 Management proposed action</b>
<p><b>Improvements to tracking internal charges within the general ledger</b></p> <p>We recommend the District Council reviews the way it identifies internal charges and ensures they are easily identified and eliminated.</p>	<p>We were informed by the District Council that they believe they have an efficient process to easily reconcile the trial balance to the statements. They also acknowledged and stated that changes that could be made will be considered to make the process easier. This will be followed up at the final audit.</p>	<p>Any changes identified to make the tracking process easier will be implemented before the final audit in August.</p>
<p><b>Accuracy of information recorded for service requests</b></p> <p>We recommend that staff are reminded of the importance of completing service request information accurately to ensure that service request can be reported accurately.</p>	<p>During interim controls testing we identified that the details were accurately reported in the CRM reports for Wastewater. However, for Water reports, due to technical issues, the report showed information which was different to that in the system. We have been informed by the District Council that their IT team is working on resolving this issue.</p>	<p>The CRM in question had not been filled in correctly within the checklist and this created incorrect information when the report was created.</p> <p>Upon fixing this, it has been recognised that further training is required for staff that are updating the CRMs to ensure consistency and accurate information is recorded for the reports to be correct.</p> <p>Training will take place in June with ongoing monitoring.</p>

**Analysis**

**Options considered**

The Audit and Risk Committee has the opportunity to make recommendations to Council regarding the content of the Draft Interim Management Report.

**Analysis of preferred option**

There is no preferred option.

**Legal and statutory requirements**

Section 98 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires Council to prepare and adopt an annual report each financial year.

### Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan

Funding is allocated in each Long Term Plan/Annual Plan to produce and audit the Annual Report.

### Communication, consultation and decision making processes

There are no communication, consultation or decision making issues.

### Timeframes

Key audit dates for the Annual Report 2016/17 are as follows:

Annual Report	Date
Interim audit	15-19 May 2017
Draft Interim Management Report issued	7 June 2017
Final audit commences	28 August – 8 September 2017
Annual Report available for audit	11 September 2017
Verbal audit clearance given Draft final Management Report issued	19 September 2017
Draft audit opinion issued	19 September 2017
Review of audit and Annual Report by Audit and Risk Committee	10 October 2017
Audit opinion issued	11 October 2017
Council adoption of Annual Report and Summary	11 October 2017

### Financial Impact

There are no financial issues related to the Draft Interim Management Report. Funding for the Annual Report of \$15,000 and Audit Fees of \$150,000 is included in Council's budgets.

### Attachments

- A. Draft Interim Management Report, year ending 30 June 2017

### Signatories

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

# Levels of Service for Urban Watercourses

Trim No.: 1889903

## Executive Summary

There are three main aspects to reviewing the level of service for stormwater in the urban areas and this report discusses the first of these – the maintenance of watercourses.

The status of all watercourses in or close to the urban areas which have Council stormwater systems have been analysed and the various status's expressed as both lengths and percentages.

It is estimated that there are 50,145 metres of watercourses in or adjacent to the Matamata, Morrinsville, Te Aroha and Waharoa urban areas.

Waikato Regional Council is responsible for 16,520 metres, Council maintains 16,900 metres and 16,725 metres is the responsibility of individual property owners.

Council receives requests to maintain or address issues with watercourses that it does not maintain.

The current response is typically based on Council's legal obligations. There may be occasions where maintenance is undertaken because there are wider public benefits.

Council can extend the current level of service and take over responsibility for more of the watercourses.

This report explains the legal situation and outlines various options for future levels of service.

## Recommendation

That:

1. **The report be received**
2. **Council select the option that it prefers and Staff undertake further investigations to quantify any impacts.**

## Content

### Background

- There are three main aspects to reviewing the Levels of Service for stormwater.
  - Maintenance of Watercourses
  - Maintenance of Soakholes – Council & Private
  - Proactive actions during storms

This report covers the first aspect and the other aspects will be covered in later reports

- A watercourse is a generic term which covers all rivers, streams and channels (including drains) through which water flows.
- Historically Council took over responsibility for the limited maintenance of some watercourses throughout its district but this was only formalised by the inclusion of the list in the Stormwater Bylaw a few years ago. Since then a few of these water courses have been piped during subdivisions and need to be removed.

- A review of Section 11 of the District Plan which covers Natural Hazards will be undertaken in the near future. This section includes flood related issues such as land in the flow path of tributary stream and land subject to high river levels. There will be thus some overlap with watercourses issues.

## Issues

### Maintenance of watercourses

- Plans have now been prepared of all the watercourses in urban areas which are rated for urban drainage and these are attached to this report. They have been summarised in the following table. It should be noted that the distances have been scaled from prepared plans and are thus indicative only.

The table also excludes road culverts and piped systems that do not appear to have replaced watercourses and includes only WRC drains near the towns:

(Note all distances are in metres)	WRC	Open – owner maintained	Open – MPDC maintained	Open - MPDC is owner	Piped - MPDC	Piped - owner	Total
<b>Total Eastern Te Aroha</b>	4,370	10,280	1,425	595	1,320	490	<b>18,480</b>
<b>Total Western Te Aroha</b>	6,300	400	1,700	1,620	1,120	0	<b>11,140</b>
<b>Total Morrinsville</b>	0	4,770	2,700	1,550	4,180	440	<b>13,640</b>
<b>Total Matamata</b>	4,600	0	0	230	120	0	<b>4,950</b>
<b>Total Waharoa</b>	1,250	345	0	340	0	0	<b>1,935</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>16,520</b>	<b>15,795</b>	<b>5,825</b>	<b>4,335</b>	<b>6,740</b>	<b>930</b>	<b>50,145</b>

- Thus excluding WRC drains there are approximately 33,615 metres of watercourses in the urban areas. This excludes pipe systems etc as explained above. Of these:
  - 47 % are maintained by the property owner,
  - 18 % are maintained by Council on behalf of the property owner
  - 13% are maintained by Council as the property owner
  - 20% have been piped by Council
  - 2% have been piped by private owners
- A legal opinion was recently obtained over responsibility for watercourses and a brief summary is:
  - Open sections of watercourse are not automatically public drains – and are normally the owner’s responsibility
  - Piped sections of watercourses are only public drains if piped by Council or were declared to be a public drain.
  - However the matter can become complex in some situations e.g. if Council actually and conscientiously exercised control for over 20 years prior to 1 July 2003.
  - It noted that any assistance Council provided to private landowners prior to that date to maintain watercourses does not necessarily prove intent to exercise control as Council’s frequently undertake such works out of convenience.
  - Owner’s Legal Responsibility can thus be summarised as:
    - Land owners have responsibility for watercourses (and private drains) flowing through their properties.

- Council has regulatory responsibility to require the removal of obstructions from watercourses and private drains.
- If the owner refuses to do so, then subject to following due process, Council can do the work and recover the cost.
- Likewise Council can require owners of piped watercourses to undertake maintenance
- The present situation is:
  - Council has taken over limited responsibility for 5,825 metres of open watercourses out of 21,540 metres in private ownership or 27%.
  - It is estimated that to take similar responsibility for the remaining 73% will require an additional \$150,000 - \$200,000 allocated to SW maintenance. This cost has been arrived at by interpolating the present cost over the additional length – however it could be argued that the cost will be less as many of these watercourses have little or no present maintenance. However on the other hand there could well be a greater expectation if Council rather than the landowner is undertaking the work.
  - At present the Council practise is to spray the base and lower 300 mm of sides of watercourses in September/October and again in April/May. During the later spraying any slips or other obstructions are removed prior to the winter months twice per year.
  - However in general weeds do not significantly obstruct flows as these are generally swept aside during high flows.
  - It should be noted that while most watercourses are in Te Aroha or Morrinsville, Matamata has the most soakholes which are another matter than needs addressing.
  - The limited responsibility referred to is to meet the owner's obligations under section 511 of the Local Government Act 1974 which relates to the removal of obstructions which interfere with the flow. It does not include increasing channel capacity or dealing with bank erosion beyond the sides of the channel.
  - It is accepted there has been a somewhat "ad-hoc" to stormwater decisions in the past mainly as a result of misunderstandings by staff and others. There is a real danger of creating precedence when trying to be helpful which can result in similar expectations from others.

## Public Perception

- **Expect No Flooding** – feedback from various surveys have indicated there is an expectation that ponding of stormwater can be eliminated but the real position is that the cost/benefit cannot be justified. For example most stormwater systems throughout New Zealand (including in this district) were designed for what is loosely described as a 1 in 2 year storm (2 year ARI); with more recent work catering for a 1 in 10 storm (10 year ARI).

This was fine while houses were built on piles but with the trend to concrete slabs the requirement is generally now to cater for the 100 year ARI storm. The volume difference between a 1 in 10 year storm and a 1 in 100 year storm in this district is about 1.7 times.

Even back in 1998 a major review of the Morrisville stormwater system found the cost of lifting the capacity from a 1 in 2 year storm event to 1 in 5 year storm event could not be justified.

Tauranga City have major issues with flooding within their older areas and staff undertook a high level assessment of risk against benefit and concluded the investment to achieve even a 10 year ARI is not financially prudent.

However it should be noted this approach does not take into account non-financial issues such as the insurability of property and social benefits/risks.

It also does not apply to new developments where other requirements such as the Building Act override and require compliance with a 50 year event under E1. However recent Department of Building and Housing Determinations have stated that a minimum of 1 in 100 year event is required when considering other aspects of the Building Act. Thus the Council's and most other NZ Council's adopting requirements to meet the effects of a 1 in 100 year event are both appropriate and justifiable.

There are several other aspects that need to be reviewed within our district relating to wave action therefore floor height above floor level and also whether height above flood level should be to below the base of the concrete floor slab or the underside of wooden floor beams, etc. These can be addressed during the review of the District Plan section on Natural Hazards.

- **Typical complaints** –
  - Want watercourse piped/concrete channelled
  - Want watercourse prevented from eroding across boundaries
  - Want Council to maintain channels and/or owner installed pipes
  - Flooding of low lying buildings sited below river flood levels
  - Water ponding on private land

Another occasional enquiry is confirmation for an insurance company that a house will not flood even though shown as in a floodable area in the District Plan – this arises from the coarseness of the boundary of affected areas and also where land is made non-floodable by filling during a subdivision or other works. In this later case the altered status can only be made by a Plan Change which is expensive but which will be looked at in the coming District Plan section 11 review

Recently a new insurance company is refusing property insurance based on the horizontal distance from a flood risk rather than the vertical height above the risk and this has led to ratepayer's being concerned that such a risk was not indicated in a LIM. Staff have raised the issue with the company without success.

- **Maintenance of Watercourses** – there is a perception that the maintenance of watercourses is a Council responsibility but this is not so as has been confirmed by recent legal opinions.

Likewise where watercourses are piped by Council the Local Government Act provides for the payment of “betterment” by the landowner on account of the increased value of the land. Hence most piping is undertaken by the landowner.

It should be noted that it is the Regional Council which approves the piping of any watercourse and the erection of any structure within a watercourse – and not the District Council.

There is one watercourse within Te Aroha which has a historical agreement with the then Te Aroha Drainage Board which has been absorbed into the Waikato Regional Council – and the Te Aroha Borough Council which has been absorbed into the MPDC.

This relates to the Suburban Outlet which now drains the area north of Aroha View Ave and behind Dunlop Cres through to and under Pooles Road where it is joined by some rural drainage and then under Te Kawana Road where it is joined by quite a large rural drainage system. It then flows under Stanley Road North and into the Waihou River.

The historic agreement is that this Council pays 20% of the maintenance cost below Te Kawana Road and 73 % above Te Kawana Road – however it has been generally agreed at staff level that we should pay 100 % of the cost above Pooles Road and nothing below. In my view this is reasonable and maybe the time has come to try and formalise this arrangement.

## Analysis

### Options considered

1. Council takes over limited responsibility for all the remaining open watercourses
2. Council takes over limited responsibility for some of the remaining open watercourses, on the basis of benefit to the public good (i.e. conveying runoff from roads and/or from a significant number of properties).
3. Council takes over responsibility for all remaining piped watercourses.
4. Council maintains the status quo.

### Analysis of preferred option

1. This option will require an estimated additional funding of \$150,000 - \$200,000 per year from rates. Watercourses will be maintained to a higher standard. The impact of this approach is likely to be welcomed by affected property owners.

This improved maintenance may not have any significant benefit for stormwater disposal for the greater community.

It is not recommended that Council consider extending its maintenance commitment beyond meeting the property owner’s obligation under the Local Government Act.

2. This option will require a smaller increase in funding but will no doubt be contentious as to which watercourses to include.
3. This option is not recommended as there is unlikely that many of the existing pipelines will meet Council standards.

4. This option will not incur any increase in funding.

#### **Legal and statutory requirements**

Council has obtained two recent legal opinions which are relevant – the first related to the Morrinsville Stream in particular and the second to a watercourse in Te Aroha in particular.

However both have wider implications. The main points have been set out in the report.

It is also relevant that it is the Regional Council who control the requirements for piping of open watercourse and not this Council

#### **Impact on policy and bylaws**

None

#### **Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan**

Ensuring watercourses are not obstructed will help to minimise the effect of stormwater in the district

#### **Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy**

None

#### **Communication, consultation and decision making processes**

None

#### **Consent issues**

None

#### **Timeframes**

Not applicable.

#### **Contribution to Community Outcomes**

Limit the extent of flooding

#### **Financial Impact**

##### **i. Cost**

Option 1: \$150,000 - \$200,000

Option 2: \$50,000 - \$100,000



ii. **Funding Source**

Rates

**Attachments**

- A. Te Aroha Watercourse Location Map - West
- B. Morrinsville Watercourse Location Map
- C. Matamata Watercourse Location Map
- D. Te Aroha Watercourse Location Map - East
- E. Waharoa Watercourse Location Map

**Signatories**

Author(s)	Susanne Kampshof <b>Asset Manager Strategy and Policy</b>	
	Graham Robertson <b>Senior Utilities Engineer</b>	

Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata <b>Group Manager Business Support</b>	
-------------	--	--



# Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications

Trim No.: 1893163

Item 7.2

## Executive Summary

Council staff have been working with other District Councils on the development of a Regional Infrastructure Technical Specification (Regional ITS) as part of one of the Mayor Forum actions.

The Specifications are now ready to be released for public consultation and Council's approval is sought.

The report outlines the current status of our Code of practice and the further requirement on Council to ensure this Regional document can be embedded in its planning and engineering framework.

## Recommendation

That:

1. **The report be received,**
2. **Council releases the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specification for public consultation,**
3. **The consultation is undertaken by the Waikato Local Authority Shared Service (LASS) and any submissions addressed by the LASS.**

## Content

### Background

The purpose of the manual/code is to give guidance to developers and their consultants and contractors to the requirements that council will accept in meeting the resource consent conditions of development. It becomes a means of compliance also to the District Plan requirements. It is however only one means, and innovation and other options can still be presented for acceptance.

One of the key benefits of the common document is that users can use the methods within the manual/code with the knowledge that their proposals will be acceptable, while other options will potentially take more time, and possibly cost, to be accepted.

Council currently has its own Development Manual and Infrastructure code of practice based on NZS 4404:2004 (Standard for Land development and subdivision engineering) and the Hamilton City Council Development Manual. Both of these base documents have now been superseded.

NZS4404:2004 has been updated and replaced by NZS4404:2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure, and the HCC Development Manual was replaced by the HCC Infrastructure Technical Specification (ITS) 2014.

The HCC ITS is based on NZS 4404:2010 but it is also set up to be the technical specification for construction and maintenance contracts. This means that the Regional ITS can also be specified

in council's contracts and this again helps designers and contractors with known and common requirements.

### **Consultation Undertaken**

The idea for this project has its origins in 2004 when staff from six councils in the Waikato region worked toward adopting the Hamilton City Council Development Manual with a supplement for the rural councils requirements. Over the following 10 years a number of councils have prepared their versions and there is no longer the consistency of development performance standards.

This project re-addresses this and also sets up a long-term management process under the Waikato Local Authority Shared Service (LASS).

The project commenced in January 2016 and over the year a Project Manager and Document Writer have been working part time with technical staff from the various councils to produce a document that can be used within the region.

Specific consultation has recently been undertaken with key stakeholders: Waikato Raupatu River Trust, Waikato Regional Council and the Property Council.

This was done to help ensure the Regional ITS would address their needs and concerns, for example the Waikato -Tainui Environmental Plan, and the Waikato Regional Plan/Regional Policy Statement (RPS).

### **Impacts on Council**

Some councils, including Matamata Piako, have specific references to the Development Manual in their District Plans. The new Regional ITS includes some aspects which are in the current MPDC Development Manual. A District Plan change is required to reflect the relevant Regional ITS changes. The main content relates to the Infrastructure Code of Practice which sits independently from the District Plan and Development Manual.

If the reference is merely an advice note, then the change is simple and can be done by council resolution. In some cases the references are embedded into the District Plan and more work is required, followed by public consultation. This is the case for Matamata-Piako District Council and will require the current Development Manual to be split, moving some of the information back into the District Plan which won't be covered in the Regional ITS as it is more than just a means of compliance.

It is proposed that Council staff will instigate the Plan Change after the Long Term Plan is finalised. In the interim developers will be advised that the Regional ITS will be an acceptable means of compliance.

## **Analysis**

### **Options considered**

Council has two options;

1. Continue with the status quo, i.e. retain the use of the existing Code of Practice/Subdivision Manual,
2. Complete the project initiated by the Mayoral Forum in late 2015, to have one regional infrastructure specification.

### **Analysis of preferred option**

Option 2 is recommended, as there is no reason not to continue and complete the project, and realise the benefits.

### **Legal and statutory requirements**

The statutory requirement of how the technical specifications will be linked to our district Plan and some of the data currently sitting in the Development Manual will need to be moved back into the District Plan.

### **Impact on policy and bylaws**

No impact on the policy and bylaws

### **Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan**

This project is not directly linked to the Annual Plan but will provide consistency for Developers and Surveyors throughout the region.

### **Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy**

No impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

### **Communication, consultation and decision making processes**

The Regional ITS is now ready to be shared and consultation with the public commenced. The Project Manager will undertake this jointly with the other participating councils. Many of the consultants and contractors will be common across the councils, and it is unlikely that the general public will have a lot of interest in the document.

The consultation will be for 4 weeks, and any submissions considered by the Project Manager and where necessary shared for comment with the appropriate technical staff at each council.

### **Timeframes**

It is intended that all of the participating councils will consider this report in early 2017 with consultation taking place in July. Assuming there are no major issues, the Regional ITS should be finalised in August for a September release.

Where councils have specific references to the Development Manual in their District Plans a district plan change is required.

### Next Steps

Once the Regional ITS has been completed, following consultation and updates completed, council will need to adopt it, or delegate this task to the Chief Executive.

A process needs to be put in place to make the necessary changes to the District Plan.

### Contribution to Community Outcomes

### Financial Impact

#### i. Cost

The project has already incurred staff cost in working with the Technical Group to finalise the Regional ITS. Going forward there will be continued staff involvement through the consultation process of the Regional ITS and then approximately \$40,000 to \$60,000 for the specific Plan Change that is to follow.

#### ii. Funding Source

The Plan Change and Staff time associated with this will be funded from the Operational Asset Management Budget and the District Plan Review Budget.

### Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

### Signatories

Author(s)	Susanne Kampshof <b>Asset Manager Strategy and Policy</b>	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata <b>Group Manager Business Support</b>	
-------------	--	--

## Audit & Risk Committee Update

Trim No.: 1894562

Item 7.3

### Executive Summary

10.30am Sir Dryden Spring will be in attendance to give an update from the Audit & Risk committee meeting held on Tuesday 27 June 2017

### Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.

### Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

### Signatories

Author(s)	Caroline Hubbard <b>Committee Secretary</b>	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Don McLeod <b>Chief Executive Officer</b>	
-------------	--	--





# Horrell Road Traffic Assessment

Trim No.: 1892274

## Executive Summary

As part of plan Change 47 the rezoning of part of Horrell Road was considered.

The proposed Roding works and new designation is not supported by the NZ Transport Agency.

Council decision is sought on the way forward.

## Recommendation

That:

1. Council receives the report;
2. Council determines how it wishes to proceed.

## Content

### Background

As part of Plan Your Town (PC 47) approximately 76 ha (potential creation of an additional 57 lots) on Horrell Road, Morrinsville, was proposed to be rezoned from Rural to Rural Residential. As a consequence of the proposed rezoning, a designation for a new intersection/road layout was proposed to improve traffic safety and efficiency.

Through the consultation process, Council received a number of submissions on this matter, one of which was from NZ Transport Agency who did not support the proposed rezoning or designation.

Prior to notification a Traffic Assessment by Ian Carlisle from Traffic Design Group (TDG) was completed which looked at a number of different options, the full report was circulated as part of the plan change documentation:

- Option 1. Existing Horrell Road with existing SH26 intersection  
*This option retains the current road infrastructure to access the one from Horrell Road and associated SH26 intersections of Horrell Road/SH26 and Murray/SH26.  
The option includes upgrading of the Murray Road rail crossing and construction of a right turn bay at the intersection of Murray Road and SH26.*
- Option 1a. Ban exit movements out of Horrell Road/SH26 intersection  
*This option retains the current Horrell Road/SH26 intersection for entry into Horrell Road but eliminates the right turn out and left turn out.  
The option includes upgrading of the Murray Road rail crossing and construction of a right turn bay at the intersection of Murray Road and SH26.*
- Option 2. Relocate Horrell Road/SH26 intersection to the west.  
*This option involves relocation of Horrell Road to the west by approximately 40m. This option includes the upgrading of Murray Road Rail crossing and construction of a right turn bay at the intersection of Murray Road and SH26.*

- Option 2a. Relocate Horrell Road/SH26 intersection to the west.  
*This option involves what's prescribed in option 2 above with an alternative tie into existing Horrell Road at a new "T" intersection and retains the intersection of Horrell Road and Murray Road in the current form.*
- Option 3. Relocate Horrell Road/SH26 intersection to 260m West – Short Alignment  
*This option involves relocation of Horrell Road to the west by approximately 260m. This option includes the upgrading of Murray Road Rail crossing and construction of a right turn bay at the intersection of Murray Road and SH26.*
- Option 3a. Relocate Horrell Road/SH26 intersection to 260m West – Short Alignment  
*This option involves what's prescribed in option 3 above with an alternative tie into existing Horrell Road at a new "T" intersection and retains the intersection of Horrell Road and Murray Road in the current form.*
- Option 4. Relocate Horrell Road/SH26 intersection to 260m West – Long Alignment  
*This option involves what's prescribed in option 3 above but with a different alignment to tie into Horrell Road.*
- Option 4a. Relocate Horrell Road/SH26 intersection to 260m West – Long Alignment  
*This option involves what's prescribed in option 4 above with an alternative tie into existing Horrell Road at a new "T" intersection.*
- Option 5. New Access Road  
*This option involves the construction of a new access road running parallel to Horrell Road around the middle of the zone area and connecting back to Horrell Road at the north of the growth area.*

*Plan Change 47 was consulted on with recommending Option 2a.*

### Issues

The NZ Transport Agency was consulted on with all the options. Their original informal response was that they were happy to consider any options apart from Options 1 and 1a and as a result we pursued option 2a as part of Plan Change 47.

However, as already outlined above, the NZ Transport Agency submitted against Option 2a through the formal submission process. After discussions with council staff following the close of submissions, the NZ Transport Agency have come back with a final decision that they will accept Option 2a but require a right turn bay at both Horrell Road/SH 26 and Murray Road/SH 26.

Unfortunately, the inclusion of right turning bays at both Horrell Road/SH 26 and Murray Road/SH 26 will require a re-design of both intersections and land purchase from the adjoining land owners as the current road reserve cannot accommodate the right turning bays.

Throughout this process, Ian Carlisle, Council's independent engineering advisor, has advised us that on an effects bases (i.e. as a result of the rezoning), he does not consider that the right turn bay at Horrell Road\SH 26 is necessary.

As we have not been able to reach agreement with the NZ Transport Agency, the matter will not be considered at the Plan Change 47 Hearing on the 20 and 21 June 2017. The matter will now need to be considered separately and be heard by an independent Commissioner.

## Analysis

### Options considered

Council has the following options on how to proceed with this particular matter:

1. Remove the Horrell Road re-zoning entirely from the Plan Change and re-evaluate how to proceed. Council then has the option of reassessing potential options with the NZ Transport Agency and can initiate a separate plan change for this area or abandon the zoning altogether.
2. Proceed to a hearing with Option 2a, (without the land purchase). The hearing will need to be chaired by an independent commission given that Council are the requiring authority for the designation. However prior to setting a hearing we recommend that a peer review of the traffic assessment be completed as we currently have two conflicting traffic views.

### Legal and statutory requirements

Council is currently in a plan change process and is not able to make any decisions outside of the process that may influence the outcome. It is therefore recommended that Council decide to either remove the Horrell Road designation and rezoning from Plan Change 47 or it continues to proceed with its consulted Option 2a.

### Impact on policy and bylaws

No impacts on the policy or bylaws.

### Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan

Council has to make provision for growth through its Long Term Plan. Plan Change 47 is a District Plan Change that sets up the framework and rules to allow for the identified growth.

### Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

Not applicable.

### Communication, consultation and decision making processes

This is part of Plan Change 47 and has been consulted on with the residents and general public.

### Consent issues

No consent issues.

### Timeframes

Depending on the options chosen.

## Contribution to Community Outcomes

### Financial Impact

#### i. Cost

Costs have already been incurred with regards to the detailed traffic investigation and consultation on Horrell Road. To date these are estimated to be around \$40,000. Additional costs have been incurred through the plan change process however these costs are difficult to identify separately.

Further costs will be incurred for both options.

Option 1 – There will be no external costs to meet with NZTA to consider options however if a separate plan change is initiated this is likely to cost around \$50,000 - \$100,000 depending on the chosen option and the objection and hearing process.

Option 2 – The total cost of this is likely to be around the \$50,000. This will include a commissioner for the hearing and expertise for the traffic evidence.

#### ii. Funding Source

Operating budgets.

### Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

### Signatories

Author(s)	Susanne Kampshof <b>Asset Manager Strategy and Policy</b>	
	Ally van Kuijk <b>District Planner</b>	

Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata <b>Group Manager Business Support</b>	
-------------	--	--

## Health & Safety Report - May 2017

Trim No.: 1893070

Item 8.1

### Executive Summary

The health & safety report for the month of May 2017 is attached.

The Health & Safety Manager will be in attendance to answer any questions from members.

### Recommendation

That:

1. the report be received.

### Attachments

- A. Health & Safety Report - May 2017

### Signatories

Author(s)	Sandy Barnes <b>Health &amp; Safety/Quality Manager</b>	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Dennis Bellamy <b>Group Manager Community Development</b>	
-------------	--	--



## Transfer of Rural Fire Assets to FENZ

Trim No.: 1895426

### Executive Summary

From 1 July 2017 Council's rural fire responsibilities under the Forest and Rural Fires Act are transferred by legislation to Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) and Council will no longer have a role in rural fire activities.

FENZ are now asking that Council's rural fire assets be transferred to them at \$1 plus GST (if demanded) and that some assistance with fire permitting and support from experienced staff continue through to 30 June 2018.

### Recommendation

That:

1. Council transfer the ownership of the two water tankers and one fire trailer to FENZ ownership at \$1.00 plus GST (if demanded).
2. That the transfer be subject to the assets being retained in their respective areas until mutually agreed by both parties.
3. Council continue to provide support for issuing of fire permits and in response to fire incidents within the previous Thames Valley Rural Fire Authority Area through to 30 June 2018

### Content

#### Background

From 1 July 2017 Council will no longer have a role in rural fire. The new entity Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) will be responsible for all fire activities within New Zealand.

As Council was previously responsible for rural fire activities it had funded 2 water tankers, one each in Matamata and Te Aroha. These tankers assisted by providing an on the site water source to fight fires in the rural environment. Council has also provided a trailer and equipment at the Te Aroha station for use during rural fires.

There will be an ongoing requirement by the local Fire Brigades for these assets after 1 July 2017 and FENZ is asking that they be transferred to FENZ ownership. The transfer would include all the maintenance and operating costs of the assets.

#### Issues

These assets have been funded by Council (i.e. funded by the local community) and it is expected that once owned by FENZ they will remain for use in the local community. FENZ has given an undertaking that assets funded locally should be retained in the local community. This does not give certainty about local retention and it is suggested that the following clause be added to the transfer agreement:

### **Transferred Assets to remain in the Local Community**

1. Fire and Emergency New Zealand acknowledges that the transferred assets have been acquired by the local community.
2. Fire and Emergency New Zealand agrees that the transferred assets will remain in the local community until mutually agreed by both parties.

The assets proposed for transfer are:

#### Te Aroha

Scania Water Tanker 13,000 litres (GDY 18) book value \$25,741, has approximately 10 years of life before replacement.

Fire trailer and equipment – The trailer is 25 years old and has no book value. It holds a number of items of equipment used for rural firefighting that have an estimated value of \$5-8,000.

#### Matamata

Volvo FL10 Water tanker 10,000 litres (CUI 855) Matamata, book value \$6,000, is due for replacement.

FENZ has also noted that the new entity may take some time to get all operational matters tidy up and has ask that Council continue to provide a fire permitting service to the local community, at an agreed cost to FENZ, and that Council's experienced firefighting staff be available to assist in response to major fir incidents for the next year to 30 June 2018.

## **Financial Impact**

The only cost to Council for these transfers is the loss of book value of the assets and as they are still to be used within the local community they are still meeting their intended use.

## **Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

## **Signatories**

Author(s)	Dennis Bellamy <b>Group Manager Community Development</b>	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Dennis Bellamy <b>Group Manager Community Development</b>	
-------------	--	--



# Matamata-Piako Civic and Memorial Centre - Solar voltaic panels

Trim No.: 1895197

## Executive Summary

The design of the new Matamata-Piako Civic and Memorial Centre includes a number of aspects that aim to reduce operating costs in the form of energy savings.

Submissions from Transition Matamata and reviewed by councils energy consultant were the subject of a report to Council on 14 June 2017.

At that meeting Council approved the installation of double glazed external joinery. They also requested an options report on the benefits of installing PV solar panels.

Indications from both design engineers and councils energy consultant suggest that a system which generates base power requirements is the best option.

Consultants suggest that a comprehensive report together with full costings for each option has limited value. Based on their industry experience full or partial generation that involves exportation to the grid during low demand is not justified.

## Recommendation

That:

1. **The report be received**
2. **Council approve the redesign cost of \$6,500 plus GST for the PV Solar Panels system**
3. **Council approve an expenditure of up to \$30,000 plus GST for the supply and installation of a PV Solar Panel system.**

## Content

### Background

The design on the new Matamata-Piako Civic and Memorial Centre contained a number of initiatives to assist in reducing energy costs. These were balanced with a challenging budget and potential short and long term savings.

Two further initiatives were reported to Council on 14 June 2017 for consideration.

- Installation of double glazing to external joinery (approved)
- Re-design costs to provide for PV solar panels

Staff had indicated a panel system that would generate power at base energy requirements was considered to be the best option.

Council requested staff to look at options for assessment that included higher levels of generation and exporting to the grid system.

## Issues

Council's energy consultant – Power Solutions Ltd and the electrical design consultant – Opus International have both been contacted and have responded that anything other than a base energy generation system has no real benefit and that payback would not be favourable.

Their advice is that a full options report is not warranted in this case.

## Analysis

### Options considered

Both Mark Fleming (Opus) and Kevin McGrath (PSL) were sent the following options for consideration. Their responses are document below each option:

- Basic system to cover background energy requirements with no exportation of power

Mark – *System would be sized to weekend base load only which we estimate is no greater than 10kw.*

*There is no real benefit in installing a larger system. Payback is unlikely to be favourable. There is no benefit in sizing a system on the basis of exporting to the grid. The sell cost to the utility company is small compared to buy cost.*

Kevin – *Agrees with above statement.*

- A mid-range system that can generate 60 – 80% of requirements mid-season.

Mark – *Unlikely to provide economic payback. In addition, panel area required will be substantial.*

Kevin – *Agrees.*

- Options to export to grid. Can the grid take the load?

Mark – *As comments above under first bullet point. There is no issue with grid taking the load.*

Kevin – *The grid will always be able to take electricity however the economics of doing so are very marginal due to the low payment for exported electricity.*

- Can council export to themselves and use it at their other offices?

Mark – *Not deemed practical unless offices are located in close proximity. Again unlikely to provide economic viability.*

Kevin – *This is not possible at present.*

- Can council store energy on site and use it themselves?

Mark – *You could potentially feed into a battery store. However, space and cost will be an issue plus impact on economic viability again.*

Kevin – *Agree. The most cost effective system will be to have no storage and sized to minimise export. Adding battery storage adds significant cost.*

### **Analysis of preferred option**

A system sized to weekend base load which is estimated to be no larger than 10kw.

Payback on a larger system is unlikely to be favourable.

There is no benefit in sizing a system on the basis of exporting back to the grid. The sell cost to the utility company is small compared to buy cost.

Panels are likely to be located on the main hall roof which has an aspect pointing north. The panels would be angled as the roof is relatively flat.

The system would be metered to allow for exportation.

### **Legal and statutory requirements**

None

### **Impact on policy and bylaws**

An Energy Policy was developed and adopted by MPDC in May 2013. Clause 6 states:-  
Undertake energy performance audits on the plans and specifications of proposed council buildings and other proposals involving energy consumption, including alterations and additions to existing buildings, report on potential inefficient energy use where identified and make recommendations for improvement.

### **Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy**

None

### **Communication, consultation and decision making processes**

Ongoing with Transition Matamata. Specialist consultants in design and specification

### **Consent issues**

None

### **Timeframes**

Shop drawings have been produced ready for steel fabrication. Any changes required to structural frame would result in time delays and costs.

## **Financial Impact**

### **i. Cost**

Design checks and revised specification for solar panel is \$6,500.

Current best estimate for supply and installation of solar panels for a basic system is \$30,000

ii. **Funding Source**

Project contingencies if available, otherwise by way of loan repaid from energy savings. The payback period is estimated to be around 10 years.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Signatories**

Author(s)	Roger Lamberth <b>Kaimai Consultants Manager</b>	
-----------	---	--

Approved by	Don McLeod <b>Chief Executive Officer</b>	
-------------	--	--

## Chief Executive Officers Report for May 2017

Trim No.: 1894353

Item 9.2

A copy of the Chief Executive Officer's report for May 2017 is attached.

### Recommendation

That the report be received.

### Attachments

- A. Full eligibility and assessment criteria
- B. Consents received for May 2017
- C. Chief Executive Officers Report for May 2017

### Signatories

Author(s)	Don McLeod <b>Chief Executive Officer</b>	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Don McLeod <b>Chief Executive Officer</b>	
-------------	--	--



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

The following motion is submitted for consideration:

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

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

### C1 Provision of a Water Supply within Waitoa

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	<p>s7(2)(c)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to damage the public interest.</p> <p>.</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p> <p>.</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)</p> <p>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</p>

### C2 LGNZ Excellence Programme 2016

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(c)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information or information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information	<p>s48(1)(a)</p> <p>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</p>

---

	should continue to be supplied.	
--	---------------------------------	--