

ORDINARY AGENDA

COUNCIL

DATE: Wednesday, 14 September 2011

TIME: 9:15 am

VENUE: Council Chambers
35 Kenrick Street
TE AROHA

MEMBERSHIP – Quorum (6)

Members:

Mayor G W H Vercoe QSM, ED, JP
Cr J E Barnes
Cr T M Cornes
Cr N C Goodger
Cr C L Greenville JP
Cr M L Gribble
Cr P M Jager
Cr R J McGrail
Cr G R Stanley
Cr M P Steffert
Cr A B Tanner
Cr L M Tisch

Information and recommendations are included in the reports to assist Council in the decision making process and may not constitute Council's decision until considered by Council.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	MEETING OPENING	1
2	PRESENT	1
3	APOLOGIES.....	1
4	NOTIFICATION OF URGENT BUSINESS	1
5	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	1
6	OFFICER REPORTS.....	2
6.1	CHIEF EXECUTIVE.....	2
	6.1.1 MAYORAL DIARY FOR AUGUST 2011	2
	6.1.2 COMMUNITY BOARD REPORTS FOR AUGUST 2011	3
	6.1.3 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY TO HINUERA GXP	4
	6.1.4 WAIKATO REGIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED - ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING	5
	6.1.5 COUNCIL YOUTH INITIATIVES	6
	6.1.6 TE AROHA EVENTS CENTRE	11
	6.1.7 DOCUMENTS EXECUTED UNDER COUNCIL SEAL - AUGUST 2011	12
	6.1.8 RESOURCE CONSENT GRANT APPLICATION - MV SKATEBOARDERS CLUB	13
	6.1.9 RESOURCE CONSENT GRANT APPLICATION – TA MOUNTAIN BIKE CLUB	16
	6.1.10 TE ROOPU RAUKURA - PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A WHAREKURA	19
6.2	ENVIRONMENTAL.....	21
	6.2.1 SUMMARY OF CONSENTS RECEIVED – JULY AND AUGUST 2011	21
6.3	INFRASTRUCTURE.....	22
	6.3.1 PROPOSED COMMUNITY HEALTH SHUTTLE GARAGE AT RAILSIDE BY THE GREEN	22
7	URGENT ADDITIONAL BUSINESS	24
8	EXCLUSION FROM THE PUBLIC	25
8.1	CHIEF EXECUTIVE.....	25

8.1.1 MANGAWHERO SUBDIVISION - SALE OF LOT 25..... 25

8.1.2 OWN YOUR OWN UNITS FOR THE ELDERLY-REVIEW OF VALUES
AND REAL ESTATE MARKETING PROPOSALS..... 27

9 CLOSURE28

1 MEETING OPENING**2 PRESENT****MEMBERS PRESENT****OFFICERS PRESENT****IN ATTENDANCE****3 APOLOGIES****MEMBERS APOLOGIES****4 NOTIFICATION OF URGENT BUSINESS**

Pursuant to clause 3.7.5 and 3.7.6 of the Standing Orders NZS 9202:2003 and Section 46A (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 Matamata Piako District Council, held on 10 August 2011

[Minutes August 10 2011 Council.DOC](#)

DRAFT RESOLUTION

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 10 August 2011 be confirmed and signed as true and correct.

6 OFFICER REPORTS**6.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE****6.1.1 MAYORAL DIARY FOR AUGUST 2011**

File No: DEM021606
Attachments: [Mayoral Diary for August 2011](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: G W H Vercoe QSM, ED, JP
Mayor

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A copy of the Mayoral Diary for the period 1 August 2011 to 31 August 2011 to is attached.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received.

6.1.2 COMMUNITY BOARD REPORTS FOR AUGUST 2011

File No: DEM021201
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: C Hubbard
Committee Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Representatives of the three community boards to be in attendance to advise Council of items of interest from their meetings.

Morrinsville Community Board

Matamata Community Board

Te Aroha Community Board

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the reports be received.

6.1.3 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY TO HINUERA GXP

File No: SUP163601
Attachments: [Security of Electricity supply to Matamata, Tirau and Putaruru](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: C Hubbard
Committee Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Powerco are the network company for the Thames Valley/Coromandel area. Matamata-Piako District falls within this area.

Powerco are proposing to upgrade the security of supply to the Matamata and Waharoa areas.

This investment will increase energy costs to the consumers of the area to ensure the company earns a return on this investment.

A copy of the company's presentation is attached.

As part of the regulatory framework the Electricity Commissions requires the company to undertake consultation with the affected community to demonstrate support or otherwise for the proposal.

The company is requesting Councils view on a proposal to undertake targeted consultation with Council and major user groups. They are seeking a letter of support to that end.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no policy or bylaw issues.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That:

- 1 Council consider Powerco's request for an appropriate level of consultation in the Matamata and Waharoa areas.**
- 2 Council consider providing a letter indicating support for the proposed upgrade.**

6.1.4 WAIKATO REGIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED - ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

File No: CFA0404W01
Attachments: [Proxy vote 2011.pdf](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: M Hawthorne
Corporate and Legal Services Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Matamata-Piako District Council is a shareholder of the Waikato Regional Airport Limited (WRAL). WRAL has forwarded a form to allow Council to appoint a member of Council as its proxy. The person nominated as the proxy will be able to vote on behalf of Council at the next Annual General Meeting (AGM) of WRAL on 17 October 2011 and any adjournment thereof, or any other meetings of shareholders that may be held prior to 16 October 2011.

This report seeks authority for a member of Council to act as Council's proxy at the WRAL AGM. A copy of the proxy form is attached to this report.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no policy or bylaw issues.

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council nominate an elected member to act as its Proxy at the Annual General Meeting of Waikato Regional Airport Limited to be held on 17 October 2011 and any adjournment thereof, or any other meetings of Shareholders that may be held prior to 16 October 2011.

6.1.5 COUNCIL YOUTH INITIATIVES

File No: SUP163709
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: R Marshall
Senior Policy Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARYBackground

Staff discussed the Ministry of Youth Development's annual funding round and potential youth initiatives (including youth policies and Youth Council's) with Council during a workshop in July 2011.

The Mayor of Waipa District Council attended a Council meeting on 27 July and provided an overview of the Waipa Youth Council.

Options

Council may wish to proceed with one of the following options:

1. Status Quo – no additional youth initiatives
2. Produce a youth policy
3. Establish a Youth Council
4. Undertake a specific initiative for youth

Considerations for each of these options are discussed in this report.

Recommendation

That Council decides whether to undertake a new initiative (or initiatives) to support youth development.

BACKGROUNDLate 2010

The Ministry of Youth Development (Ministry) advertised its annual funding round, whereby Council's can apply for financial assistance to undertake youth initiatives.

Council staff met with Ministry representatives to discuss the fund and potential projects that could benefit the youth of Matamata-Piako.

The key priorities of the fund are around:

- education, training and employment, plus:
 - youth community leadership and/or
 - celebration of youth achievement

The Ministry representatives suggested a youth policy is one effective tool to identify youth needs and to outline an approach to address them. The Ministry has written a guide for producing youth policies and is able to provide resources to help Council's create them.

Council did not submit an application to the Ministry's 2010/11 youth funding round as it was identified further research needed to be undertaken before putting forward a proposal.

Early – Mid 2011

Council staff were informed that the Ministry is working with local youth service providers to prepare a youth forum and a youth survey in Matamata-Piako. The objectives of these initiatives are to highlight:

- key youth issues for young people
- similarities and differences between communities with the Matamata-Piako district

These events are currently occurring (during August – October 2011). The Ministry will collate the results of this consultation and use it to prepare a report. The report will be sent to community organisations to highlight key concerns and solutions. Council staff are being kept informed of progress.

July 2011

Staff discussed the above information with Council during a workshop in July 2011. During the workshop Council had a discussion about youth policies and Youth Council's. Council agreed to invite the Mayor of Waipa District Council to a meeting to discuss Waipa's Youth Council.

The Mayor of Waipa District Council attended a Council meeting on 27 July and provided an overview of the Waipa Youth Council. The Waipa Youth Council includes student leaders from the local schools. They have a workshop at the beginning of each year and then meet quarterly. Members also meet informally to prepare for community youth events. Positive outcomes of the Waipa Youth Council include the annual youth awards and the Waipa tri-nations interschool competition.

LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Community Development

Community Development has a focus on economic, social, environmental and cultural well being and includes activities such as Democracy, District Plan, the Long Term Council Community Plan and generally increasing community input into Council decision making. Improving representation in Council's decision making and finding other ways to improve the process of democracy in our district is important.

- *Strategies and Plans*
 - *The development of strategies and plans which contribute to achieving community outcomes*

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

- Belonging to our Community
- Community Safety and Support: Looking after People
- Economic Development: Prosperity

- Our Social Infrastructure
- Pride and Justice

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

If Council resolves to increase its involvement in youth initiatives then there are likely to be both cost and staff resourcing implications.

These may be minimised to some extent by the Ministry, who may be able to provide some assistance, depending on the initiative (e.g. a staff contribution to help produce a youth policy). The Ministry also provides financial assistance through its annual funding round; although no guarantee can be made that a funding application by Council would be successful.

OPTIONS

Council may wish to proceed with one of the following options:

1. Status Quo – no additional youth initiatives

Council may choose not to provide any additional initiatives above those which already exist in the district. The disadvantage of this option is that youth may miss out on the additional opportunities or services that Council would provide if it were to proceed with new initiatives. However, Council may believe other service providers to be more suited to providing initiatives for youth.

There are no cost or staff resource impacts to Council if it resolves to proceed with this option.

2. Produce a youth policy

A youth policy could benefit youth by:

- identifying key issues for youth in our district
- outlining an approach to address youth issues
- identifying methods to involve youth in decision-making processes
- offering youth a sense of being able to contribute to the community
- clarifying the roles of different agencies, including Council's role in the way of services, facilities, staffing and funding

In addition it would provide young people and local organisations with a positive perception that Council has an involvement in youth issues.

A youth policy would identify youth services and/or facilities that are needed but do not currently exist. This research would allow Council to make a strong application to the Ministry for funding assistance (during an annual funding round) to establish such services/facilities. However, whilst Council would have a strong chance of obtaining funding from the Ministry, this cannot be guaranteed. It is likely Council would need to allocate some funding and staff resourcing if it resolves to proceed with this option.

An advantage of undertaking a youth policy is that the Ministry is willing to offer resources to assist in the research and collating of the document. This will reduce the cost and staff resource requirements for Council. The feedback from the youth forum and survey that is currently being undertaken by the Ministry and local service providers could also feed into a local youth policy.

A benefit of investing resources into a youth policy is that it will increase Council's confidence in future decision making in regards to youth related spending (due to the further research that will be undertaken).

3. Establish a Youth Council

A Youth Council would have benefits to youth, Council and the community as a whole. Youth directly involved in the Youth Council would benefit by developing skills in leadership, communication, organisation and teamwork while becoming more active citizens in wider community issues that are linked to the Council.

A Youth Council would give young people within the district a greater voice by providing a platform for representation. This would lead to more in-depth input from young people during Council consultation processes and an enhanced relationship between youth and Council.

A strong relationship between Council and youth is likely to be of benefit to the community as a whole.

There are cost and staff resourcing implications that Council would need to take into consideration if it decided to pursue this option. Council could apply to the Ministry for funding assistance (during an annual funding round); however once again there is no guarantee the application would be successful.

As per a youth strategy, a benefit of investing resources into a Youth Council is that it will lead to increased confidence in future decision making in regards to youth related spending.

If Council resolves to implement this option it is recommended that further research is undertaken to ensure the Youth Council is established in a way that allows it to be of maximum benefit to youth and address youth issues. The youth forum and youth survey currently being undertaken by the Ministry and local service providers may be of benefit.

4. Undertake a specific initiative for youth

Council may wish to undertake a specific youth initiative (e.g. establish a new facility, event or service), without undertaking a youth strategy or creating a Youth Council. Council could still apply to the Ministry for funding assistance (during an annual funding round). However Council would have little chance of obtaining funding unless it demonstrates in its application that there is a need for the particular facility/service, and shows that youth have been involved in determining the need exists. Without undertaking a youth policy or establishing a Youth Council, some other form of targeted youth consultation would need to occur.

Alternatively Council could cover the costs to undertake a specific youth initiative without financial assistance from the Ministry.

If Council resolve to implement this option it is recommended that further research is undertaken to identify the best initiative to proceed with. The youth forum and youth survey currently being undertaken by the Ministry and local service providers may identify the need for a particular facility/event/service.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That:

- 1. Council decide whether to undertake a new initiative (or initiatives) to support youth development**
- 2. If Council resolves to undertake a new initiative (or initiatives), it identifies which initiative/s it wishes to proceed with**

6.1.6 TE AROHA EVENTS CENTRE

File No: 11/7609
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: C Hubbard
Committee Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Representatives from the Te Aroha Events Centre Charitable Trust will be in attendance at 10.30am to report on their proposal to conduct an Events Centre in Te Aroha, and the progress that has been made thus far.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no policy or bylaw issues.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

6.1.7 DOCUMENTS EXECUTED UNDER COUNCIL SEAL - AUGUST 2011

File No: REG140801
Attachments: [Schedule of Document Executed Under Council Seal - August 2011.doc](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: V Oosthoek
Policy Administration Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The schedule of documents executed under Council Seal is attached.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the schedule of documents executed under Council Seal be approved.

6.1.8 RESOURCE CONSENT GRANT APPLICATION - MV SKATEBOARDERS CLUB

File No: 11/1524

Attachments: [RC Community Grant Policy1.pdf](#)
[Application for Resource Consent Funding - Morrinsville Skateboarders Club.pdf](#)
[Council Minutes 14 July 2011.DOC](#)

Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer

Author: N Baker
Policy Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application for resource consent funding has been received from the Morrinsville Skateboarders Club (Club) to establish a Skate Park on the corner of Lorne and Anderson Streets, Morrinsville.

Matamata-Piako District Council (Council) has provided an annual fund of \$25,000 to contribute towards the costs of processing resource consents for non-profit community organisations. A copy of the Council policy (Policy) and the application is attached to this report.

This is the third application to be considered under this Policy.

ASSESSMENT - POLICY CRITERIAIs the group a non-profit community organisation?

It is unclear from the application how the Club is funded, or if they are a charitable organisation, Incorporated Society or have some other non-profit status. No information on funding is provided (such as whether or not the Club charges an annual membership fee) or the numbers of Club Volunteers versus paid staff. Council staff have clarified that the committee is entirely made up of volunteers.

Has evidence of a formal organisational structure been provided?

The Club has a committee of 8 people and a following of 40 to 50 current skate boarders of various ages. Tina Ellis is the club president.

Is the application for an activity within the Matamata-Piako District?

Yes, the proposal is to be located at 115 Anderson Street, Morrinsville.

Will the project involve a commercial aspect and provide a clear community benefit?

The application from the Club notes *"The skate park is of great benefit to the town... parents won't have to take their kids out of town to use a skate park...and make a tidy corner compared to what it is now"*.

There is no information to suggest the stake park would be a commercial enterprise. Council staff have advised the facility would become a Council asset once constructed.

Has a business plan been included with the application?

No business plan has been included, although the Application includes information about the Skate Park project, community benefits, consultation, funding and quotations from a Landscape Company for construction.

The Application put forward by the Club indicates the project will be funded by community support and Transpower. No evidence has provided showing sufficient funding to complete the project, although Council has committed funding of \$75,000 towards the project with the Club aiming to raise the remainder.

Council staff have discussed the application with the Club President who has indicated funding may be sought from community organisations (such as the Lions Club) if funding from Transpower cannot be secured or is insufficient to complete the project.

Comments from Council Staff:

The Morrinsville Skateboard Club was granted \$75,000 in the Long-Term Council Community Plan 2009-19 subject to finding a suitable site. On the 14th July 2011 Council granted approval for the Morrinsville Skate board Club to use the old Museum site in Morrinsville for their Skate Park. The relevant extract from the Council Minutes is attached to this report.

The consent application should be lodged within this calendar year. Construction of the Skate Park itself is only expected to take a month (weather permitting).

Council staff advise the benefits of this project include giving youth a positive activity to participate in, as there are currently only a limited number of youth facilities in Morrinsville. The Club will also need to consult with the play centre next to where St John's are putting their accessway.

Consistency with other Council Plans/ Strategies:

Councils Active and Leisure Strategy recommends that a moderate sized Skate Park be provided in each town, in a central and high visibility area.

District Plan

The zoning of the site is residential. The activity status of the application would be 'Discretionary' as it is considered a 'Place of Assembly' within that zone under the District Plan. This means that this type of activity is anticipated within the zone, however Council has discretion whether it approves or declines the application – a decision which is largely based on the effects the proposal will have on the surrounding environment.

Would notification of the consent be likely?

Public Notification is not likely, as it appears that the effects are likely to be localised to the site. Limited notification could be required depending on which neighbour's approvals are obtained.

What is the expected cost of the resource consent?

Application fees are set in the Council Fees and Charges 2011/12. The deposit fee for a non-notified resource consent of this nature is \$2000. As above, it is possible this application would require limited notification which requires a deposit fee of

\$4000. The deposit fee for publicly notified applications is \$6000. While the processing cost cannot be determined until the resource consent process is underway, the required deposit fees provide an indication of the expected costs.

STATUTORY ISSUES

There are no relevant statutory issues.

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

This process relates to the application of Council policy.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY

There is no delegated authority for staff to approve this grant on behalf of Council. Therefore this report seeks the Council's decision on the application.

COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION ISSUES

There are no communication or consultation issues. Council staff have provided comments on the application.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation of \$25,000. Council may grant up to \$5000 (inclusive of GST if any) under this policy. It is stated in the application the Club is not GST registered.

On 24 August 2011 the Corporate and Operations Committee granted up to \$5000 to the Matamata Historical Society under the Policy. Council is also due to consider an application from Te Aroha Mountain Bike Club at this meeting. If the maximum funds are used by the Matamata Historical Society (\$5000) and Council approves funding to the Te Aroha Mountain Bike Club (\$5000) this will leave \$15,000 for other applicants, including this one.

OPTIONS

1. Council approves the grant application
2. Council declines the grant application

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That:

1. **the information be received**
2. **Council make a decision on whether or not to grant funding up to a maximum of \$5,000 (inclusive of GST if any) under the Policy on resource consent funding for non-profit community organisations to Morrinsville Skateboarders Club.**

6.1.9 RESOURCE CONSENT GRANT APPLICATION – TA MOUNTAIN BIKE CLUB

File No: 11/1522
Attachments: [RC Community Grant Policy.pdf](#)
[Application.pdf](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: N Baker
Policy Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application for resource consent funding has been received from the Te Aroha Mountain Bike Club Incorporated (Club) to establish a BMX facility at Boyd Park, Te Aroha.

Matamata-Piako District Council (Council) has provided an annual fund of \$25,000 to contribute towards the costs of processing resource consents for non-profit community organisations. A copy of the Council policy and the application is attached to this report.

This is the second application to be considered under this Policy.

ASSESSMENT - POLICY CRITERIA

Is the group a non-profit community organisation?

The Club is an incorporated society. It is unclear from the application how the Club is funded but Council staff have clarified that the Club charges an annual membership fee but this will not be used towards the project. The proposed development is to be funded by community fundraising.

Has evidence of a formal organisational structure been provided?

A Certificate of Incorporation is provided in the application. The Club has approximately 20 members with a chairperson, secretary and treasurer.

Is the application for an activity within the Matamata-Piako District?

Yes, the proposal is to be located at Boyd Park, Spur Street Te Aroha

Will the project involve a commercial aspect and provide a clear community benefit?

The business plan from the Club notes *"It is not intended that the track be used for commercial purposes"*. The application contains information that the general public will benefit from this project by providing a recreational and sporting facility that is accessible to youth, cleaning up part of Boyd Park and providing additional cover for the old dump site.

Has a business plan been included with the Application?

A business plan has been included in the application which provides detail about the BMX project, timeline, community benefits, consultation, funding and financial information. The Business Plan put forward by the Club states the development will

be funded by community support. No evidence has provided showing sufficient funding to complete the project, however Council staff have clarified it will be funded from community goodwill with a potential contractor lined-up to build the facility.

Consistency with Council plans and strategies:

The Boyd Park Reserve Management Plan does not provide for a BMX track to be located on the reserve. At the Council meeting on 14 July 2011 Council passed a resolution to support, subject to Te Aroha BMX group obtaining a resource consent, a BMX track to be constructed at the Spur Street/Boyd Park site. Fish and Game have approved in principle the BMX track being located at the proposed site, subject to some minor design changes.

District Plan

The development is proposed to be situated within the Residential Zone and appears to extend into the Spur Street road reserve. Although zoned 'Residential' the site has 'Reserve' status.

The proposal has an overall status as discretionary. This is because it is not provided for in the Boyd Park Reserve Management Plan for the site, it is also classed as a Place of Assembly within the Residential Zone' the proposed clubhouse building will be within a Public Reserve, and it could involve greater than 1000m³ of clean fill deposited onsite.

Would notification of the consent be likely?

Notification would depend on the extent of the effects of the proposal, however this could be likely as the activity is not provided for in the current Reserve Management Plan for the site. Given that it is proposed to operate at night, the ability to control noise will be a major determining factor when assessing potentially affected parties.

What is the expected cost of the resource consent?

Application fees are set in the Council Fees and Charges 2011/12. The deposit fee for a non-notified resource consent of this nature is \$2000. As above, it is possible this application would require limited notification which requires a deposit fee of \$4000. The deposit fee for publicly notified applications is \$6000.00. While the processing cost cannot be determined until the resource consent process is underway, the required deposit fees provide an indication of the expected costs.

STATUTORY ISSUES

There are no relevant statutory issues.

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

This process relates to the application of Council policy.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY

There is no delegated authority for staff to approve this grant on behalf of Council. Therefore this report seeks the Council's decision on the application.

COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION ISSUES

There are no communication or consultation issues. Council staff have provided comments on the application.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation of \$25,000. Council may grant up to \$5000 (inclusive of GST if any) under this policy. It is stated in the application the Club is not GST registered.

On 24 August 2011 the Corporate and Operations Committee granted up to \$5000 to the Matamata Historical Society under the policy. If the maximum funds are used by the Matamata Historical Society (\$5000) this will leave \$20,000 for other applicants, including this one.

OPTIONS

1. Council approves the grant application
2. Council declines the grant application

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That:

1. **the information be received**
2. **Council make a decision on whether or not to grant funding up to a maximum of \$5,000 (inclusive of GST if any) under the Policy on resource consent funding for non-profit community organisations to Te Aroha Mountain Bike Club Incorporated.**

6.1.10 TE ROOPU RAUKURA - PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A WHAREKURA

File No: 11/1521
Attachments: [Te Roopu Raukawa - Consultation document.doc](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: N Baker
Policy Planner
Proposed Meeting Date: 14-Sep-2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council has received a request for feedback from Te Roopu Raukawa on a proposal to establish a Wharekura (school) in the district. Details of the proposal are attached to this report.

This item was placed on the Te Manawhenua Forum Mo Matamata-Piako (Forum) meeting agenda (6 September 2011) so that it could provide advice to Council on responding to the proposal. No formal resolution was recorded as at the time the item was discussed the Forum no longer had a quorum and the meeting had to be closed. However, the matter was discussed informally after closure of the meeting by the remaining Forum members.

The Forum representatives from Ngati Raukawa, Ngati Haua, Ngati Paoa, Ngati Whanaunga and Ngati Tumutumu voiced their individual support for the project and requested that their responses be put forward to the Council. Ngati Maru representatives were not present at the time this issue was discussed.

Discussion at the Forum meeting indicated the project will provide significant economic and social benefits to the district, by attracting staff and providing better social outcomes for Maaori.

Forum members also noted that the proposal aligns with Council's revised Community Outcomes, in particular:

- 3.e – Maaori cultural facilities (such as Marae) will be recognised for their contribution to community wellbeing
- 5.d –People will have the opportunity to learn about their own and others kawa(protocol), tikanga (customs), whakapapa (ancestral heritage), heritage and culture

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

Council does not have direct involvement in education matters, other than in an advocacy capacity; it has in the past lobbied central government for more support of schools in the district.

Council staff have clarified the Te Roopu Raukawa project is working through a consultation process with schools, iwi, churches and other groups. If Council resolves

not to support or adopts a neutral position towards the proposal this is not expected to materially affect the success of the project.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That:

- 1. the information be received**
- 2. Council decide whether it supports, does not support, or adopts a neutral position to the proposal**
- 3. Te Roopu Raukawa be advised of Council's response**

6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL**6.2.1 SUMMARY OF CONSENTS RECEIVED – JULY AND AUGUST 2011**

File No: DEM0208R01

Attachments: [Consents Received - July 11.doc](#)
[Consents Received - Aug 11.doc](#)

Responsible Officer: D Bellamy
Group Manager Community Development

Author: K Rogers
Planning Administration Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A summary of the resource consent applications received for the month of July and August 2011 is attached.

The summaries of applications attached also include the resource consents that were notified during that month.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the information on the Summary of Consents for July and August 2011 be received.

6.3 INFRASTRUCTURE

6.3.1 PROPOSED COMMUNITY HEALTH SHUTTLE GARAGE AT RAILSIDE BY THE GREEN

File No:	DEM022401
Attachments:	Proposal from Matamata Community Health Shuttle
Responsible Officer:	F Vessey Group Manager Service Delivery
Author:	C Smithers Parks and Property Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Matamata Community Health Shuttle Trust has approached Council requesting approval to construct a double garage on Hetana Street Reserve. Any building on a reserve requires resource consent therefore consent will be required for the garage.

BACKGROUND

The Matamata Community Health Shuttle Trust has approached Council requesting approval to construct a double garage on Hetana Street Reserve, adjacent to the Railside by the Green (as shown in the attached plans). The Matamata Community Health Shuttle Trust has purchased a third shuttle to cope with the increased demand for the shuttle services. The Trust currently has one shuttle garaged at the rear of the Railside by the Green building, and the premises where the other two vehicles are stored will no longer be available soon.

STATUTORY ISSUES

The land is classified as a reserve for local purpose (community use). Under the District Plan any building on a reserve requires a resource consent, therefore consent will be required for the construction of the garage.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no policy or bylaw issues.

LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

- Community Safety and Support: Looking after People
- Planning and Development

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION ISSUES

Consultation may be required as part of the resource consent process.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

No financial resource impact.

OPTIONS

Option One: Council allows the Community Health Shuttle to construct a garage on Hetana Street Reserve (subject to resource consent).

Option Two: Council does not allow the Community Health Shuttle to construct a garage on Hetana Street Reserve.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council allow the Community Health Shuttle to construct a garage on Hetana Street Reserve (subject to resource consent).

7 URGENT ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

8 EXCLUSION FROM THE PUBLIC

8.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE

8.1.1 MANGAWHERO SUBDIVISION - SALE OF LOT 25

File No: 05320/103.25
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: M Hawthorne
Corporate and Legal Services Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the grounds specified in Section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

That the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting:

- Council directions to staff on negotiations with the purchaser of Lot 25 of the Mangawhero subdivision.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting:

- Council directions to staff on negotiations with the purchaser of Lot 25 of the Mangawhero subdivision.

The general subject of the matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to the 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:

Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter:

- Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7

Ground(s) under Section 48 (1) for the passing of this resolution

- Section 48 (1)(a)

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 the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

- 7(2)(g) Maintain legal professional privilege.
- 7(2)(i) Enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations.

8.1.2 OWN YOUR OWN UNITS FOR THE ELDERLY-REVIEW OF VALUES AND REAL ESTATE MARKETING PROPOSALS

File No: HOU520402
Responsible Officer: F Vessey
Group Manager Service Delivery
Author: S Berry
Property Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the grounds specified in Section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

That the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting:

- Own your own units for the elderly

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting:

- Own your own units for the elderly

The general subject of the matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to the 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:

Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter:

- Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7

Ground(s) under Section 48 (1) for the passing of this resolution

- Section 48 (1)(a)

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 the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

- 7(2)(h) Enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.
-

9 CLOSURE