



---

**PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL**

---

**AGENDA**  
**COUNCIL**

---

**9AM, WEDNESDAY 2 JUNE 2021**

COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
32 THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON NORTH

---



---

## MEMBERSHIP

---

**Grant Smith (Mayor)**

**Aleisha Rutherford (Deputy Mayor)**

**Brent Barrett**

**Susan Baty**

**Rachel Bowen**

**Zulfiqar Butt**

**Vaughan Dennison**

**Renee Dingwall**

**Lew Findlay QSM**

**Patrick Handcock ONZM**

**Leonie Hapeta**

**Lorna Johnson**

**Billy Meehan**

**Orphée Mickalad**

**Karen Naylor**

**Bruno Petrenas**

**Agenda items, if not attached, can be viewed at:**

[pncc.govt.nz](http://pncc.govt.nz) | Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square  
City Library | Ashhurst Community Library | Linton Library

---

**Heather Shotter**

**Chief Executive, Palmerston North City Council**

**Palmerston North City Council**

W [pncc.govt.nz](http://pncc.govt.nz) | E [info@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:info@pncc.govt.nz) | P 356 8199

Private Bag 11034, 32 The Square, Palmerston North



## **COUNCIL MEETING**

2 June 2021

### **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**1. Apologies**

**2. Notification of Additional Items**

Pursuant to Sections 46A(7) and 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to receive the Chairperson's explanation that specified item(s), which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded, will be discussed.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7) must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7A) may be received or referred to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. No resolution, decision or recommendation can be made in respect of a minor item.

**3. Declarations of Interest (if any)**

Members are reminded of their duty to give a general notice of any interest of items to be considered on this agenda and the need to declare these interests.

4. **Confirmation of Minutes** Page 7  
“That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of 5 May 2021 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.”

## ***REPORTS***

5. **Cuba Street Stage 2 - Report on Further Engagement** Page 13  
Memorandum, presented by Robert van Bentum, Manager - Transport and Infrastructure.
6. **Fees and Charges - Confirmation Following Public Consultation** Page 23  
Memorandum, presented by Steve Paterson, Strategy Manager - Finance.
7. **Representation Review 2021** Page 39  
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager.
8. **Review of Trust Deeds** Page 49  
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager.
9. **Council Work Schedule** Page 53

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS***

10. **Presentation of the Part I Public Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee's Recommendations from its 5 May 2021 Meeting** Page 57
11. **Presentation of the Part I Public Community Development Committee's Recommendations from its 12 May 2021 Meeting** Page 59

12. **Presentation of the Part I Public Planning & Strategy Committee's Recommendations from its 12 May 2021 Meeting** Page 61

13. **Presentation of the Part I Public Finance & Audit Committee's Recommendations from its 26 May 2021 Meeting** Page 63

#### 14. **Exclusion of Public**

To be moved:

"That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

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 are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution
15.	Presentation of the Part II Confidential Finance & Audit Committee Recommendations from its 26 May 2021 Meeting	Commercial Activities	LGOIMA s(7)(2)(h)

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 as stated in the above table.

Also that the persons listed below be permitted to remain after the public has been excluded for the reasons stated.

*[Add Third Parties]*, because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report/s [or other matters as specified] and answering questions, noting that such person/s will be present at the meeting only for the items that relate to their respective report/s [or matters as specified].



# **PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL**

## **Minutes of the Council Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 05 May 2021, commencing at 9.01am**

**Members Present:** Grant Smith (The Mayor) (in the Chair) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

### **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Vaughan Dennison declared a conflict of interest in Item 10 Confidential Finance & Audit Committee Recommendations from its 28 April 2021 Meeting (clause 43) and took no further part in discussion or debate.

### **38-21 Confirmation of Minutes**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of 28 April 2021 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 38-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, with 1 abstention, the voting being as follows:

#### **For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

#### **Abstained:**

Councillor Leonie Hapeta.

## **REPORTS**

### **39-21 Amendment to Standing Orders - Committee Quorum**

Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager.

Councillors stated they preferred a higher quorum than the legislative minimum.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

**RESOLVED**

To amend Standing Order 3.4.5 'Definition of quorum for Council and Committee meetings' so that it additionally reads "stating that the quorum for the Committee of Council meetings for the month of May 2021 be three."

Clause 39-21 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Karen Naylor.

**Amendment to recommendation** replace the words "except Committee of Council meetings for the month of May 2021" with "stating that the quorum for the Committee of Council meetings for the month of May 2021 be three."

The amendment above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

**40-21**

**Appointment of Council Representative to the Victoria Esplanade User Group**  
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

**RESOLVED**

That Councillor Billy Meehan be appointed the Council representative on the Victoria Esplanade User Group for the remainder of the 2019-2022 triennium.

Clause 40-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, with 1 abstention, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

**Abstained:**

Councillor Billy Meehan.



**41-21 Council Work Schedule**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

**RESOLVED**

That the Council receive its Work Schedule dated May 2021.

Clause 41-21 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

**42-21 Finance & Audit Committee Part I Public - 28 April 2021**

Consideration was given to Finance & Audit Committee's recommendations as appended to these minutes.

Moved Susan Baty, seconded Karen Naylor.

**RESOLVED**

To adopt:

- Clause 29-21 **Ashurst Domain- Scout Hall Lease Proposal**, recommendations 1-2
- Clause 30-21 **Otira Park - Palmerston North Pony Club Branch Lease Proposal**, recommendations 1-2

from the Finance & Audit Committee meeting 28 April 2021.

Clause 42-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, with 1 abstention, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

**Abstained:**

Councillor Leonie Hapeta.

Councillor Vaughan Dennison declared a conflict of interest, withdrew from the discussion and sat in the gallery.

**43-21 Finance & Audit Committee Part II Confidential - 28 April 2021**

Consideration was given to Finance & Audit Committee's recommendations. The decision will be publicly released once negotiations have concluded.

Moved Susan Baty, seconded Karen Naylor.

**RESOLVED**

To adopt Clause 37-21 Tamakuku Terrace Expressions of Interest Response – Affordable Housing Options, **recommendations 1-3** from the Finance & Audit Committee meeting 28 April 2021.

Clause 43-21 above was carried 13 votes to 0, with 2 abstentions, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor and Bruno Petrenas.

**Abstained:**

Councillors Leonie Hapeta and Aleisha Rutherford.

The meeting finished at 9.28am

Confirmed 2 June 2021

**Mayor**

## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 5 May 2021

**TITLE:** Presentation of the Part I Public Finance & Audit Committee's Recommendations from its 28 April 2021 Meeting

---

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Finance & Audit Committee meeting Part I Public held on 28 April 2021. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

### **29-21 Ashhurst Domain - Scout Hall Lease Proposal**

Report, presented by Kathy Dever-Tod, Manager - Parks and Reserves and Bryce Hosking, Manager - Property.

#### The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council approve the lease to The Scouts Association of New Zealand for the Ashhurst Scouts to operate from the Ashhurst Domain, attached as Appendix 1 of the report titled 'Ashhurst Domain – Scout Hall Lease Proposal' presented to the Finance & Audit Committee on 28 April 2021.
2. That Council, being satisfied that the functions and purposes of the Reserves Act have been considered, that the statutory processes have been met, and being satisfied that the decision is a reasonable one, exercise the authority delegated by the Minister of Conservation to grant consent for the lease at Ashhurst Domain to The Scout Association of New Zealand.

### **30-21 Otira Park - Palmerston North Pony Club Branch Lease Proposal**

Report, presented by Bryce Hosking, Manager - Property and Kathy Dever-Tod, Manager - Parks and Reserves.

#### The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council approve the lease to Palmerston North Pony Club Branch Incorporated at Otira Park, attached as Appendix 1 of the report titled 'Otira Park – Palmerston North Pony Club Branch Lease Proposal' presented to the Finance & Audit Committee on 28 April 2021.
2. That Council, being satisfied that the functions and purposes of the

---

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Reserves Act have been considered, that the statutory processes have been met, and being satisfied that the decision is a reasonable one, exercise their authority to approve as delegated by the Minister of Conservation to grant consent for the lease at Otira Park to Palmerston North Pony Club Branch.

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Cuba Street Stage 2 - Report on Further Engagement

**PRESENTED BY:** Robert van Bentum, Manager - Transport and Infrastructure

**APPROVED BY:** Sarah Sinclair, Chief Infrastructure Officer

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

1. That the report be lifted off the table.
2. That the Council notes the concept modifications to Cuba Street, and endorses the staging of some pedestrian safety initiatives to be removed from the Cuba Street scope and delivered as part of the Streets for People programme of work for Rangitikei Street.
3. That the Council approves the modified Cuba Street Stage 2 Project to proceed to tender.

---

### 1. ISSUE

- 1.1 Council approved funding from Programme 1440 Cuba Street Urban Streetscape Improvements to complete the transformation of Cuba Street into an attractive "Place Street" in line with the vision of the City Centre Framework. Work was prioritised as Cuba Street will form a gateway to the updated Arena. However local businesses have expressed concerns about the regeneration work.
- 1.2 Council requested additional consultation with stakeholders be undertaken to accurately assess their views on the modified designs being proposed for the regeneration of Cuba Street. This has been undertaken and the outcomes are included in this report.
- 1.3 This report summarises the engagement process undertaken to date and outlines feedback from the most recent engagement (Feb and May 2021) including proposed mitigation for any outstanding concerns. Feedback provided by stakeholders is summarised including those who are supportive of the project, to help provide a broad perspective of community responses.

- 1.4 Officers are seeking approval from Council to proceed to procurement and construction on the modified design option. This is anticipated to not be able to start construction until next financial year, therefore capital funds will be carried over from this year.
- 1.5 In addition, because of concerns raised by some stakeholders, officers are seeking to stage some of the works, by adding the proposed pedestrian safety measures at the junction of Cuba Street and Rangitikei Street into the Streets for People programme of work for Rangitikei Street, to maintain left and right turning lanes at present to alleviate current concerns about traffic queues.
- 1.6 Costing at detailed design stage identified that additional funds will be needed to construct the project. Additional budget has been requested as part of the revisions to be included in the final 10 year plan considerations.

## 2. SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT PROCESS UNTIL DECEMBER 2020

- 2.1 Officers reported on the design process including the development of a Modified Design Concept for the project at the December 2020 meeting of Council. The December report outlined the extent of engagement that had been undertaken to that date.
- 2.2 Council indicated concern that there remained a small number of business stakeholders who had expressed dissatisfaction with elements of the proposed design. Officers were directed to undertake further engagement to understand the detail of these concerns and identify options to mitigate their concerns in part or in full.
- 2.3 Officers initially undertook engagement with directly affected business owners as part of developing a modified option. This engagement included:
  - Individual meetings with each business owner following letter drops
  - A facilitated presentation and engagement session at Council on 28 October 2020 attended by around 10 building owners and tenants, at which they were invited to provide written feedback
  - Follow-up face to face meetings to receive feedback and answer any further questions
- 2.4 Key information sought through the engagement has included:
  - Specific business feedback on the concept design
  - Preferences on the parking configuration being perpendicular or diagonal
  - The acceptability of contractors working on Saturdays or later into the evenings

- Specific requirements in terms of times of day and days of the week for deliveries or collections for the businesses
- Any other suggestions as to how the design might be improved was also sought

2.5 Following this engagement and based on the feedback received the design was amended. The amended concept design was one of the attachments to the report provided to Council's December 2020 meeting.

2.6 The list of stakeholders with whom Council has engaged are summarised in Attachment 1. Stakeholders were asked to provide a positive or negative assessment of the proposed design in their feedback along with any specific concerns raised.

### 3. FURTHER ENGAGEMENT IN FEBRUARY 2021

3.1 In response to Council's direction at the December 2020 meeting, Officers engaged with key stakeholders again during February 2021. The purpose of the engagement was to understand the nature of outstanding concerns and expectations around mitigation. The outcome of the engagement is summarised as follows.

- The large majority of business owners and stakeholders remained positive (17) or provided no specific feedback (16).
- The stakeholders that had previously expressed reservations (4) in respect of the redevelopment were contacted and follow-up conversations held. For all four business owners their reservations remained and are summarised in Attachment 1.
- The outstanding issues relate to concerns around wider congestion and the likely impact of a single exit lane from Cuba Street in Rangitikei Street.

3.2 Additional attempts were made to contact by email and phone those stakeholders who had not submitted or commented on the project. Where contact was made, they were invited to provide written submissions or comments.

3.3 A specific meeting was sought with Briscoes to discuss traffic flows within their car park. However, keeping the exit into Rangitikei Street to be two lanes will reduce concerns about queueing that the traffic flows and signage options identified below were intended to resolve. This discussion will continue, for the next stage of works, if staging is endorsed by Councillors.

3.4 In response to the concerns raised the specific mitigation which has been included in the modified design concept is summarised in Table 1.

**Table 1. Mitigation Incorporated into Modified Design**

<b>Issue Raised (I) or Suggestion Made to alter design (S)</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Loss of parking (I)	Additional side-street parking identified for further investigation. Concern that angled parking on both sides of the road in some sections will result in a safety issue
Parking configuration preference (S)	Preferred diagonal parking alignment has been included in modified design proposed
Loading bay provision (S)	Additional loading zones added
Locations of motorcycle parking (S)	Specific motorcycle parks included in modified design
Two turning bays onto Rangitikei (S)	Re-phasing of traffic signals around the ring-road to improve traffic flow and decrease commuter traffic numbers around the Square and on Cuba Street to be included in Streets for People project scope.
Narrowing the road prevents double-parking and makes deliveries more difficult (I)	Identified as largely an issue of timing of deliveries, which can be addressed by business owners, once Council has approved the provision of additional loading bays
A turning bay for traffic waiting to enter Briscoes (S)	Council staff are actively engaging with Briscoes to agree improvements to access and exit arrangements for the multiple entrances to on-site parking. This may include improved signage and some priority movement directions.
Two land exit provision from Cuba Street into Rangitikei Street.	This will be addressed by providing for a staged implementation of the exit. A two-lane exit into Rangitikei Street will be provided for initially. As the Streets for People concepts and upgrades are implemented, the reduction in congestion will reduce the likelihood of queuing allowing for modification of the entrance.



#### 4. STAKEHOLDER MEETING IN MAY 2021

- 4.1 Stakeholders were invited to a forum held at the Civic Administration Building on 13 May 2021 to review the latest modifications to the design for the regeneration of Cuba Street. The meeting was well attended with approximately 15 business owners and residents present, and Mayor Grant Smith, Councillors Vaughan Dennison and Leonie Hapeta.
- 4.2 The strategy of Council and the key features of the design were discussed, including the limiting of through traffic to reduce congestion in the city centre, and the proposed increased availability of parking in nearby streets. A majority of stakeholders continue to take a positive view of the work, although further modification was sought to a loading bay.
- 4.3 Four stakeholders who hold unfavourable views of the redevelopment remained concerned about the effects on traffic congestion in the area.
- 4.4 The time frame for construction was discussed with importance given to continued communication with businesses and residents in the area, a minimisation of disruption, and an effort to complete the construction as quickly as possible.

#### 5. DESIGN OPTIONS SUMMARY

- 5.1 As previously reported the Cuba Street redevelopment project is intended to create a link between the Square and the Arena. Other key objectives of the project include:
  - Ensuring consistency of the street design with the previous stage 1
  - Encouraging users to slow, stop and stay in the area and so increase economic benefit to businesses and the city centre as a destination
  - Providing increased street edge space, activation opportunities, enhanced streetscape amenity and greenspace
  - Reducing traffic speed and increase walkability and active transport connectivity
  - Providing an opportunity for story-telling, heritage and public art
  - Leaving some flexibility for future changes to street use
- 5.2 The proposed design has sought to deliver on these outcomes by incorporating the following elements:
  - Narrowing the street to slow traffic to enable safe pedestrian and active transport user movement at any location
  - Providing added pedestrian or shared space for activation, commercial frontage activity and inclusion of feature landscaping and public sculptures

- Reducing the area allocated to vehicles as street and reappportion this space to pedestrians as pavement or green space to soften the landscape
  - Maintaining as far as possible the level of parking on the street, while recognising some loss was inevitable
  - Changing the priority for traffic entering and exiting the street to discourage traffic using Cuba Street as a thoroughfare
  - Increasing available space within the pedestrian areas to allow for retroactively incorporating components like heritage features and sculptures.
- 5.3 Most of the concerns and requests raised by business owners along Cuba Street have been accommodated including:
- Retaining the preferred diagonal parking arrangement
  - Adding additional load zones
  - Adding motorcycle parking
  - Staging the reduction in lanes at the Rangitikei Street junction to align with the Streets for People programme
- 5.4 The minor loss of parking on Cuba Street has not been fully mitigated. The re-configuration of car parks on Taonui Street has been investigated as an option to increase available parking and it has been determined that 13 parallel parks on the eastern side of the street could be removed and replaced with approximately 25 diagonal parks being created to replace them. This option has not yet been progressed pending confirmation of a timeframe for the construction work to regenerate Cuba Street.
- 5.5 Parking occupancy data confirms that there is no shortage of parking within a 200m walk of Cuba Street. Further investment in strategic parking provision will be considered as part of the City-Wide Parking Management Plan.
- 6. FINANCIAL**
- 6.1 Council has approved a budget of \$620,000 in Programme 1440 Cuba Street Urban Streetscape Improvements for the 2020-21 financial year. To date expenditure on design, project management and engagement and consultation has totalled \$140,000 with expected additional design, tender and project management costs of \$10,000 leaving a balance of funds of \$470,000.
- 6.2 An additional allocation has been made in footpath and drainage renewals for a contribution of \$100,000 to \$150,000 with NZTA subsidy of 51%, based on the renewal of those assets, providing a total budget for the project of \$630,000.

- 6.3 Budget estimates prepared at the current concept design stage indicate a construction cost in the vicinity of \$1,200,000 to \$1,400,000 including project and contract management costs. In the current constrained contracting environment, a budget in the vicinity of \$1,500,000 is likely to be necessary. Although some additional contribution from renewal budgets for drainage and footpaths could be justified, a budget shortfall in the range \$700,000 to \$900,000 appears likely.
- 6.4 A request for this increased budget will be put through to the LTP process for consideration in the 2021/22 budget.
- 6.5 Officers have considered the procurement options which are most likely to deliver the project.
- 6.6 Officers intend to proceed with a closed tender process of known capable contractors following finalising of the tender documents and design to address any matters raised by Council. Once tender submissions have been received Officers will report to Council to seek tender award approval.

## 7. TENDER AND CONSTRUCTION TIMELINE

- 7.1 Officers have revised the timeline for the procurement and construction process based on receiving Council approval to proceed with the amended concept design. The timeline is based on going to market with the Cuba Street Stage 2 project alone.
- 7.2 The timing for the construction will depend on contractor availability and the need to avoid any periods of intense business activity. Work will not now start on the project until the next financial year as outlined in Table 2 below.

**Table 2 Revised Project Delivery Timeline**

Completion of Detailed Design for Tender	Completed
Issue Request for Tender (subject to Council approval)	2 June 2021
Tender Close	23 June 2021
Tender Evaluations Completed	2 July 2021
Contract Awarded (subject to Council approval)	4 August 2021
Construction Start	September 2021

**8. NEXT STEPS**

- 8.1 Should Council approve the recommendation, officers will proceed to issue documentation for tender, and will include the request for additional budget as part of the LTP deliberations.

**9. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?	<b>Yes</b>
If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual	
Are the decisions significant?	<b>No</b>
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	<b>No</b>
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	<b>No</b>
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	<b>No</b>
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 2: A Creative and Exciting City	
The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Creative and Liveable Strategy	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the City Centre Plan. The action is to deliver the city centre streetscape plan	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	<p>The Cuba Street Upgrade Stage 2 is the next section of the city centre streetscape linking the CBD to Arena and connects this premier sporting and events centre to the wider Streets for People programme of work. The project will continue the focus of re-allocating space from road to footpath and urban green landscape while minimising the impact on parking and business activity.</p> <p>The project will contribute to developing a premier place which provides a high quality urban landscape corridor between Arena and the CBD.</p>

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Cuba St Design [↓](#)
2. Summary of Feedback from Engagement from 2020 - **Confidential**

Proposed design of Cuba Street





## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Fees and Charges - Confirmation Following Public Consultation

**PRESENTED BY:** Steve Paterson, Strategy Manager - Finance

**APPROVED BY:** Stuart McKinnon, Chief Financial Officer

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

1. That the submission relating to planning fees, as attached in Attachment 1 of the memorandum titled 'Fees and Charges – Confirmation Following Public Consultation' presented to the Council on 2 June 2021, be received.
2. That the fees and charges for Planning & Miscellaneous Services, as scheduled in Attachment 2 of the memorandum titled 'Fees and Charges – Confirmation Following Public Consultation' presented to the Council on 2 June 2021, be approved, effective from 1 July 2021 noting this includes a change to the charge for Swimming Pool inspections and re-inspections to \$203 rather than \$205 originally proposed.
3. That the fees and charges for Trade Waste Services, as scheduled in Attachment 3 of the memorandum titled 'Fees and Charges – Confirmation Following Public Consultation', presented to the Council on 2 June 2021, be approved, effective from 1 July 2021.
4. That the changes for lease parking, as scheduled in Attachment 4 of the memorandum titled 'Fees and Charges – Confirmation Following Public Consultation', presented to the Council on 2 June 2021, be approved, effective from 1 July 2021.

---

### 1. ISSUE

At its meeting on 7 April 2021 the Council approved fees and charges for planning and miscellaneous services and for trade waste services for public consultation. This memo addresses submissions received and recommends confirmation of the fees and charges as attached.

It also proposes adjustments to the lease parking charges approved at the Council meeting on 7 April 2021 to address some practical issues faced during the implementation phase.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Previous Council Decisions

On 7 April Council adopted recommendations from the 24 March meeting of the Finance and Audit Committee. These approved a schedule of fees and charges for planning and miscellaneous services and trade waste services for public consultation.

At the same meeting updated charges for lease parking were approved.

### 2.2 Public Consultation

Public consultation was carried out over the period from 12 April to 14 May 2021. It involved direct written communication with planning consultants and trade waste users as well as public notices in local media and on Council's website.

One submission was received in relation to planning fees. A copy is attached as **Attachment One**. No submissions were received in relation to trade waste charges.

In his submission Mr Fugle mentions that he wished to be heard and he was provided with opportunities to do this but has now advised he no longer wishes to attend.

His submission contends in summary that the fees and charges proposed have been set in a manner than does not comply with the requirements of the Local Government and Resource Management Acts as the levels proposed exceed what would be necessary to recover reasonable costs.

The Council's Revenue & Financing Policy recognises that some services provided by planning staff (planning advice, information, consent monitoring and enforcement) are of a public good nature and as a consequence these are funded from general rates. Those services related to resource consent processing are private in nature and the policy expectation is these will be funded from fees and charges. Fees and charges are set at levels necessary to cover these costs and not at levels with the objective of making a profit. Time spent on processing each consent is recorded and the charge made reflects this. The processing of a resource consent and other planning related activities directly benefits the applicant. The actions Council takes to which charges relates, results from the actions of an applicant. The charges therefore meet the criteria set out in s36AAA of the RMA

No changes are recommended to the fees provisionally adopted at the April meeting as a consequence of the public consultation process.



However one change is proposed to miscellaneous fees and charges. It has been realised that it was proposed to set the fee for swimming pool inspections and re-inspections at \$205 and that this is higher than the fee of \$203 approved for building inspections that use similar resources. It is now recommended that the fee for swimming pool inspections be \$203.

The proposed charges to be approved are outlined in **Attachments Two and Three**.

### 2.3 Lease Parking

A number of changes to the parking charges regime were approved at the 7 April Council meeting. As planning has progressed to implement the changes it has been realised that there were some practical matters that were overlooked in the original report.

In broad terms these matters were:

- Some off-street carparks have configurations or contractual arrangements with third parties that mean it is not practical to implement the changes in the manner originally proposed.
- Although summarised in the body of the report, the tables in the report did not clearly indicate that it was intended that hourly rate charges would apply to leased off-street carparks on late nights as well as at weekends.
- Two off-street carparks which are currently free will become pay and display parks.

The details of the particular issues are contained in **Attachment Four** and it is recommended the planned approach be approved in each case.

### 3. NEXT STEPS

Once approved the fees and charges will be published on Council's website and in all relevant fees and charges brochures and implemented from 1 July 2021.

### 4. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?	No
Are the decisions significant?	No
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	No
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	No

Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?		<b>Yes</b>
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?		<b>Yes</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?		<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 5: A Driven and Enabling Council		
The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Driven and Enabling Council Strategy		
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Not Applicable		
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Setting fees and charges as proposed is consistent with the Council's Revenue & Financing Policy and therefore with the strategic direction of the Council.	

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Submission received on Planning and Miscellaneous Fees [↓](#)
2. Planning Services Fees and Charges [↓](#)
3. Trade Waste Charges [↓](#)
4. Lease Parking Fees and Charges [↓](#)

## Appendix One

**Submission received on Planning and Miscellaneous Fees**

Merle Lavin

---

**From:** Submission  
**Subject:** FW: Planning and Miscellaneous Services fees

**From:** Les Fugle

**Sent:** Saturday, 24 April 2021 6:27 pm  
**To:** Submission <submission@pncc.govt.nz>  
**Subject:** Planning and Miscellaneous Services fees

Democracy & Governance Manager  
 Palmerston North City Council  
 Private Bag 11-034  
 Palmerston North 4442

To whom may concern:

Submission on Council's fees and charges – closing date 24 May 2021

1. Council is empower to fix fee to recovery the amount no greater than the reasonable costs incur for the matter in which the fee is charged - LGA 2002 section 150(4).
2. Council is empowered to fix fees (and charge additional charges) only in accordance with section 36AAA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. Submitter says the current charges, and that proposed, exceed the reasonable cost that the matter to which Council's charge group applies.

I wish to be heard.

Regards  
 Les Fugle

Sent from my iPad

ID: 15192926

## Appendix Two

Palmerston North City Council

Attachment A

Planning Services

Fees & Charges

Planning services charges listed below are imposed under the Resource Management Act 1991 to recover the cost to Palmerston North City Council for processing applications, monitoring consents and for Notice of Requirements Designations and Private District Plan Changes.

Section 36 of the Resource Management Act enables the Council to charge additional fees to recover actual and reasonable costs when the fixed fee is inadequate. This means that applications that exceed standard processing times or which involve a hearing may incur additional charges. Consultants and solicitors fees associated with all work types are also included. We may also refund part of the fee if the work required to process the application is minimal.

The deposits specified in the tables below are required up front and no action will be taken in accordance with section 36AAB(2) until paid. That does not mean that the Council is required to complete the activity upon payment of the deposit. The costs incurred will be monitored and additional amounts up to the total of the fixed charge may be required. Then additional charges may also be required before completion of the task if the fixed charges are inadequate to cover the Council's actual and reasonable costs.

All fees and charges shown are GST inclusive unless indicated

Fixed Charges

Charges payable by applicants for resource consents, for the carrying out by the local authority of its functions in relation to the receiving, processing and granting of resource consents (including certificates of compliance [and existing use certificates] (section 36(1)(b)))

Activity Type	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2020	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2021	Deposit from 1 Jul 2021
Instant resource consents	\$ 215	\$ 215	\$ 215
Boundary Activity	\$ 300	\$ 300	\$ 300
Temporary or Marginal Breaches	\$ 300	\$ 300	\$ 300
Non notified land use consents (minor, see note (d) (b))	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,900	\$ 1,200
Non notified land use consents (other than minor)	\$ 3,400	\$ 4,000	\$ 2,800
Limited notified land use consents	\$ 14,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 15,000
Notified land use consents (full notification)	\$ 20,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 25,000
Non notified subdivision consents (Controlled Activity)	\$ 2,100	\$ 2,400	\$ 1,800
Non notified subdivision consents (Discretionary Restricted)	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,200
Non notified subdivision consents (other)	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,600
Notified subdivision consents for up to and including 20 lots in total (full and limited notification)	\$ 22,300	\$ 22,300	\$ 16,700
Notified subdivision consents for more than 20 lots (full and limited notification)	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 29,000
Certificates of compliance	\$ 460	\$ 460	\$ 345
Town Planning Certificate (Alcohol)	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ 300
Existing use certificates	\$ 890	\$ 890	\$ 660
Outline Planning Approval	\$ 1,110	\$ 1,110	\$ 840
Waiver for requirement for Outline Plan	\$ 380	\$ 380	\$ 280
Notified notice of requirements, heritage orders, designation alterations.	\$ 16,800	\$ 16,800	\$ 12,500
Non notified notice of requirements, heritage order, designation alterations	\$ 2,550	\$ 2,550	\$ 1,900
District Plan changes	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 20,000

ID: 15192926

Charges payable by holders of resource consents, for the carrying out by the local authority of its functions in relation to the administration, monitoring and supervision of resource consents (including certificates of compliance [and existing use certificates], and for carrying out its resource management functions under section 35. {section 36(1)(c)}

Activity Type	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2020	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2021	Deposit from 1 Jul 2021
Monitoring of non notified resource consents	\$330 per consent for inspections and monitoring (2 hours)	\$348 per consent for inspections and monitoring (2 hours)	
Monitoring of notified resource consents	\$660 per consent for inspections and monitoring (4 hours)	\$696 per consent for inspections and monitoring (4 hours)	
Variations to conditions (section 127 and 221 - subdivision and land use)	\$ 1,350	\$ 1,800	\$ 1,200
Extensions of time (section 125)	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 850
Cancellation of building line restrictions (under Local Government Act 1974 )	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 850
Adjustment of easements	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 850
Subdivision certificates (including section 223, 224)	\$ 380	\$ 400	\$ 300
Subdivision certificates (section 226)	\$ 1,350	\$ 1,350	\$ 1,000
Subdivision inspections for up to and including 5 lots, or staged, in total	\$ 800	\$ 800	\$ 600
Subdivision inspections for between 6 lots and up to and including 10 lots, or staged, in total	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,200
Subdivision inspections for between 11 lots and up to and including 20 lots, or staged, in total	\$ 3,200	\$ 3,200	\$ 2,400
Subdivision inspections for more than 20 lots un-staged	\$ 4,800	\$ 4,800	\$ 3,600
Removal of designations	\$ 265	\$ 265	\$ 265
Purchase of District Plan & District Plan updates	At cost	At cost	At cost

Charges payable by holders of resource consents, for the carrying out by the local authority of its functions in relation to reviewing consent conditions if:

- 1 the review is carried out at the request of the consent holder;
- 2 the review is carried out under section 128(1)(a);
- 3 the review is carried out under section 128(1)(c)

Activity Type	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2020	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2021	Deposit from 1 Jul 2021
Review at the request of the consent holder	\$ 1,670	\$ 1,670	\$ 1,250
Review pursuant to section 128(1)(a)	\$ 1,670	\$ 1,670	\$ 1,250
Review pursuant to section 128(1)(c)	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,750

Charges for supply of documents payable by the person requesting the document. (Section 36(1)(f))			
Activity Type	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2020	Fixed Charge from 1 Jul 2021	Deposit from 1 Jul 2021
Replacement copies of certificates	\$ 110	\$ 110	
Replacement copies of resource consents	At cost of officer's time per hour + disbursements	At cost of officer's time per hour + disbursements	
Other documents	\$1 per page	\$1 per page	
Additional copies of order papers	\$ 40	\$ 40	
<b>Notes:</b>			
(a) The number of lots in a subdivision includes the balance lot			
(b) The fixed charges do not include other charges that may be imposed under the Resource Management Act or other legislation such as:			
(i) Additional charges (section 36(5));			
(ii) Bonds;			
(iii) Monitoring and supervision charges expressly provided for in a resource consent;			
(iv) Development contributions			
(c) If the fixed charges are not sufficient to meet the Council's actual and reasonable costs then additional charges may be payable. Note this may include but not be limited to charges for consultants, solicitors, independent Commissioners and Council officers' time.			
(d) Fees Methodology:			
(a) Land use and subdivision consents have been based on an average costs of consents issued. Deposits have generally been set at 75% of the average unless the difference between the deposit and the total of actual and reasonable costs is of such a minor nature it is not cost effective to recoup the difference from an applicant. In such a case the deposit is set at the same value as the Fixed Charge. In terms of the Fixed Charge they are set at 100% of the average fee. Final charges will be charged at staff hourly rates, technical officer or consultant time and any standard fees applicable.			
(b) Minor non notified land use consents usually applies to:			
(i) Applications for a dwelling or a minor dwelling, dependent dwellings, accessory buildings, home occupations and access in the residential and rural zones.			
(ii) Applications for signage in the business and industrial zones.			
(c) Monitoring and inspection charges are based on staff hourly rates to complete. For non notified resource consents the inspection fee of \$348 is for 2 hours of inspections by the Monitoring & Enforcement Officer. For notified consents the inspection fee of \$696 is for 4 hours of inspections by the Monitoring & Enforcement Officer. In terms of dealing with compliance issues this is based on the actual time spent by the Monitoring Officer based on the hourly rate for the Monitoring & Enforcement Officer.			



Other Charges		
Advisory Service - Applies where staff provide information in response to customer queries	For queries received by Front of House staff - no cost for an individual enquiry up to 30min (whether in person or in writing), where an individual enquiry is for a period longer than 30min, charged at cost based on the relevant officer's hourly rate  For any queries received by staff not based at Front of House - to be charged at cost based on relevant officer's hourly rate	
Pre lodgement meetings; Applies where staff vet information prior to the lodgement of an application	Charged at the relevant officer's hourly rate	
Objections considered by a Hearings Commissioner (section 36(1)(af))	At cost plus disbursements of the Hearings Commissioner	
Consultant Charges		
Work Type	Rate per hour from 1 Jul 2020	Rate per hour from 1 Jul 2021
Consultants and Solicitors fees associated with all work types, including the processing of a consent or certificate (including specialist technical or legal advice where a consent involves creating legal instruments) and new notice of requirements, heritage orders, designation alterations, removal of designations and District Plan changes.	At cost plus disbursements	
Charges for hearings	Rate per hour from 1 Jul 2020	Rate per hour from 1 Jul 2021
Hearings for all applications, designations, notice of requirements private District Plan changes, development contributions and remittance fees and associated work by relevant staff.	At cost of officers time per hour as per rates listed below	
Production of Order Papers	At cost plus disbursements	
The following hourly rates for Council Officers and Decision Makers will be charged for the processing of consents, hearings, designations etc that do not have a fixed charge or where the fixed charge is inadequate to cover the actual and reasonable costs of the Council.		
Council Officer's Hourly Rates	Rate per hour from 1 Jul 2020	Rate per hour from 1 Jul 2021
Planning Officers/Graduate Planning Officer	\$ 190	\$ 194
Monitoring and Enforcement Officer	\$ 170	\$ 174
Senior Planning Officer	\$ 203	\$ 207
Head of Planning Services	\$ 221	\$ 226
City Planning Manager	\$ 221	\$ 226
Senior Business Support officer	\$ 165	\$ 168
Administration/Committee Administration Staff	\$ 117	\$ 120
Technical and Professional Staff from all other Council units	\$ 190	\$ 194
General Manager	\$ 241	\$ 246
Commissioner	At cost plus disbursements	
Hearing Committee Chair and Members	At cost (\$100 per hour for Chair & \$80 per hour for members) plus disbursements	

Palmerston North City Council		Attachment B	
Miscellaneous Services		Fees & Charges	
<p>The miscellaneous charges detailed below are imposed under the Local Government Act 2002. They seek to recover the cost to Palmerston North City Council for approvals, authorities and inspections not covered by the primary legislation under which the Council operates. <i>(These being the Resource Management Act 1991, Building Act 2004, Dog Control Act 1996, Impounding Act 1955, Food Act 2014 and Land Transport Act 1998).</i></p> <p>All fees and charges shown are GST inclusive</p>			
<b>Fixed Fees</b>			
Payable when request for service/information is submitted to Council. No additional charges will be applied.			
Work Type	Fixed Fee from 1 Jul 2020	Fixed Fee from 1 Jul 2021	
<b>LIMS</b>			
Land Information Memorandum	\$ 455	\$	455
<b>GIS</b>			
GIS Inputting (per consent)	\$ 180	\$	184
<b>Street Numbering</b>			
Request for street number changes	\$ 385	\$	393
<b>Noise</b>			
Return of seized sound equipment:			
- for first offence	\$ 178	\$	181
- for second or third offence	\$ 414	\$	422
- for fourth or subsequent offence	\$ 414	\$	422
Disconnection of alarms under the Resource Management Act		Recovery of actual cost incurred by Council, including staff time and contractor costs	
<b>Food Act 2014 Non-refundable Food Control Plan Auditing (including site visit, reporting and general administration)</b>			
Processing an application under the Food Act 2014 for registration of a Food Control Plan or a National Programme	\$ 276	\$	281
Processing an application under the Food Act 2014 for renewal of registration of a Food Control Plan or a National Programme	\$ 276	\$	281
Verification -Initial site visit (including reporting)(hourly rate)	\$ 171	\$	174
Verification - Follow-up visits (including reporting) (hourly rate)	\$ 171	\$	174



Deposits		
Charges for all services are based on the actual costs incurred by the Council. Any deposit specified in the table below are payable before the Council commences the service. The total charge for the service will be determined upon completion of the service, on the basis of the time spent by the relevant officer undertaking the work specified at that officer's hourly rate.		
Work Type	Deposit from 1 Jul 2020	Deposit from 1 Jul 2021
<b>Right of Way Approval</b>		
Right of Way Approval- section 348	\$ 500	\$ 500
<b>Certificates</b>		
Certificate of Compliance Building Code - Alcohol	\$103 Deposit, then billed at actual cost of officer's time per hour	<del>\$103</del> Deposit, then billed at actual cost of officer's time per hour
<b>Gambling</b>		
Gambling venue consent	\$445 plus officer's hours after 3 hours	<del>\$445</del> plus officer's hours after 3 hours

Other Charges		
These fees may be applicable to a consent or may be applied as a single charge. Note that photocopying and scanning charges includes both material and labour costs associated with such work.		
Work Type	Charge from 1 Jul 2020	Charge from 1 Jul 2021
<b>Photocopying / Copy of scanned documents</b>		
A0, A1, A2	\$10/page	\$10/page
A3	\$0.45/page	\$0.50/page
A4	\$0.35/page	\$0.40/page
Double sided A3	\$0.55/sheet	\$0.60/sheet
Double sided A4	\$0.45/sheet	\$0.50/sheet
<b>For colour copies</b>		
Single sided	Additional charge of \$1.70/page	Additional charge of \$1.70/page
Double sided	Additional charge of \$3.80/sheet	Additional charge of \$3.80/sheet
<b>Request for Property Information</b>		
Copy of Property Information	At cost of officer's time per hour plus disbursements	At cost of officer's time per hour plus disbursements
Certificate of Title	\$ 27	\$ 28
<b>Swimming Pools</b>		
Swimming Pool initial compliance inspection	\$ 199	\$ 203
Swimming Pool reinspections (second and subsequent inspections)	\$199 per inspection	\$203 per inspection
<b>Vehicle Crossings (cost per inspection)</b>		
T1; Inspect existing vehicle crossing	\$ 216	\$ 216
T2; New vehicle crossing	\$ 400	\$ 400
T3; Alter an existing vehicle crossing	\$ 216	\$ 216
<b>Over-weight Vehicle Permit (note 4)</b>		
Application for each single, multiple trip or linked permit *	\$ 18.18	\$ 18.18
Application for each continuous, high-productivity motor vehicle, or specialist vehicle permit *	\$ 54.55	\$ 54.55
Application for each renewal of each continuous permit *	\$ 9.09	\$ 9.09
* Additional charge for each of the above permits where less than 3 working days available for processing	\$ 9.09	\$ 9.09
<b>Asset Bonds</b>		
Council Asset Bond (payable for each building consent above the value of \$100,000)	\$1,000 (no GST)	\$1,000 (no GST)
Administration & processing fee	\$ 190	\$ 190
<b>Overgrown Trees/Shrubbery</b>		
Removal of Overgrown Trees/Shrubbery	Recovery of actual cost incurred by Council, including staff time and contractor costs	Recovery of actual cost incurred by Council, including staff time and contractor costs

ID: 15192926

<b>Charges for Council Officers and Decision Makers</b>		
The following hourly rates will be charged for those approvals, authorities and inspections listed in this schedule that are not listed as a fixed fee		
<b>Council Officer's Hourly Rates (per hour)</b>	<b>Charge from 1 Jul 2020</b>	<b>Charge from 1 Jul 2021</b>
General Manager	\$ 241	\$ 246
Division Head	\$ 221	\$ 226
Senior Planner	\$ 203	\$ 207
Planning Officers/Graduate Planning Officers	\$ 190	\$ 194
Monitoring and Enforcement Officer	\$ 170	\$ 174
Team Leader - Building	\$ 208	\$ 212
Senior Plumbing and Drainage Officer and Advanced Building Officer	\$ 208	\$ 212
Building Officer	\$ 190	\$ 194
Principal Environmental Health Officer	\$ 205	\$ 209
Environmental Health Officer, Environmental Technical Officer and Liquor Licensing Officer	\$ 183	\$ 187
Environmental Health Officer Cadet	\$ 166	\$ 169
Senior Business Support Officer	\$ 165	\$ 168
Administration/ Committee Administration Staff	\$ 117	\$ 120
Technical and Professional Staff from all other Council Units	\$ 190	\$ 194
Commissioner	At cost plus disbursements	At cost plus disbursements
Hearings Committee Chair and Members	At cost (\$100 per hour for Chair & \$80 per hour for members) plus disbursements	At cost (\$100 per hour for Chair & \$80 per hour for members) plus disbursements
<b>Notes:</b>		
1 The hourly rates for Council Officers noted above will be charged for the work type listed above which do not have a fixed fee		
2 The hourly rates for the services which are listed in the above tables are for those staff listed in the table headed "Charges for Council Staff"		
3 Where it states above the fee per hour, please note this should be read in full as "fee per hour or part thereof".		
4 Over-weight vehicle permit fees are set by the Land Transport (Certification & Other Fees) Regulations 2014		

## Appendix Three

Trade Waste Charges				
Pursuant to the Palmerston North Trade Waste Bylaw 2015				
	Category	2020/2021 Charge (GST Incl)	2021/2022 Charge (GST Incl)	Description
Administrative Charges (Table 2 – Schedule 1)				
2.2	Compliance Monitoring - Conditional Consents	\$36 per sampling & analysis	<del>\$135</del> per sampling & analysis	Fee to recover inspection and monitoring costs of trade premises
2.2	Compliance Monitoring – Grease Trap Sampling Fee	\$120 per inspection	\$120 per inspection	Fee to recover inspection and sampling costs of grease traps
2.4	Trade Waste Application Fee	\$1,600	\$1,600	Fee to recover cost of processing new or renewal applications
2.5	Consent Processing Fee	\$195 per hour	\$195 per hour	Fee to recover cost of processing extraordinary applications
2.6	Re-inspection Fee	\$120 per inspection	<del>\$195</del> per inspection	Fee to recover cost of re-inspections of individual trade premises
2.9	Trade Waste Charge - Permitted Consents for Grease traps/Oil interceptors/Amalgam traps	\$120 per annum	\$120 per annum	Charge to recover administration and monitoring cost of grease traps/ oil interceptors & other treatment devices/ amalgam traps at dental surgeries
2.9	All other premises (conditional) plus trade waste charges	\$1,200 per annum	<del>\$1,320</del> per annum	Charge to recover administration and monitoring cost of trade waste consents
2.9	Annual Trade Waste database Licence Fee - delete	<del>\$345</del> per annum	N/A	Charge for access to on-line database
2.9	Discharge administration fee		<del>\$600</del> per annum	Charge to recover administration and monitoring costs of permitted customers with discharges exceeding 5m³/day
Trade Waste Charges (Table 3 – Schedule 1)				
3.1	Volume Charge (\$/m³)	\$0.502/m³	<del>\$0.5871</del> /m³	Charge to recover sewerage collection costs
3.3	Suspended Solids Charge (SS) (\$/kg)	\$0.825/kg SS	<del>\$0.8498</del> /kg SS	Charge to recover suspended solids treatment costs
3.4	Organic Loading Charge (BOD) (\$/kg)	\$0.7096/kg BOD	<del>\$0.8370</del> /kg BOD	Charge to recover organic loading treatment costs
3.6	Phosphorous Charge (DRP) (\$/kg)	\$43.1707/kg DRP	<del>\$41.78</del> /kg DRP	Charge to recover phosphorous (DRP) removal costs
Tankered Waste Charges (Table 4 – Schedule 1)				
4.1	Tankered Wastes Charge	\$45/1,000 litres	\$45/1,000 litres	Charge to recover administration, receiving and treatment costs of tankered wastes

ID: 15192926

## Lease Parking Fees and Charges – Changes/Clarifications

## Appendix Four

Change/ Clarification	Location	Reason	Planned approach
1.	339 Main Street (Harvey Norman)	Due to a land covenant with Harvey Norman valid until 2040, Council must provide 2 hours time limited free parking on the northern side of the lot. The southern end of park comprises 25 lease parks. It is not considered practical to implement paid after hours parking on the leased section without introducing significant confusion for users.	Leased parking charges will be increased and restricted to Mon-Friday 8 to 5pm. At all other times parking will be P60 time restricted as currently applies on the northern part of the car park.
2.	Ashley Street	The Plaza has its own parking rates for weekends. Council is also unable to vary the terms of 7 day leases currently issued. There is little demand for the spaces currently.	Ashley Street will remain as 7 day a week leased parking option with the price reduced to \$100 (currently \$110.75) to encourage demand. No extra charges will be proposed in the weekends for this area.
3.	Plaza Top Deck	Council has an agreement with the Plaza which is restricted to issuing leases for 5 day car parks. Outside of the lease periods the Plaza Management sets parking charges and access.	Lease parking charges will be varied to align, but no charges will be levied for weekend and evening use for this area.
4.	553 Main Street (next to ACC)	There is currently a mix of leased and free off-street parking in this car park. The currently free off-street parking area is proposed to become casual pay and display parking. This change was not highlighted in the previous report.	Leased car park prices will be adjusted as previously approved. The remaining parking spaces will become casual pay and display spaces charged at \$1/hour and \$5/day.
5.	15 Amesbury Street Carpark	This carpark is currently not charged. The proposal is to make this a casual off-street car park and charge fees. This change was not highlighted in the previous report.	It is proposed to convert the carpark to pay and display with rates of \$1/hour and \$5/day.
6.	All off-street leased carparks	Although the previous report explained that it was intended hourly rate charges would apply to off-street carparks on late nights (Thursday, Friday & Saturday) the tables in the report referred to only weekends.	It is planned that charges of \$1/hour and \$5/day will apply to all off-street carparks on late nights and at weekends (except in situations where there are specific contractual reasons why this is not possible).



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Representation Review 2021

**PRESENTED BY:** Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager

**APPROVED BY:** David Murphy, Acting General Manager - Strategy and Planning

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

1. That the report titled 'Representation Review 2021' be received for information.
  2. That Council agrees the principles set out in section 4.4 of the report titled 'Representation Review 2021' for assessing practicable options for representation arrangements, to be brought to its 4 August 2021 meeting.
  3. That Council schedule a meeting for 9am 23 September 2021 to hear submitters wishing to be heard on the 2021 Representation Review.
- 

### 1. ISSUE

- 1.1 The establishment of Māori wards triggers a review of representation arrangements ('representation review') under the Local Electoral Act 2001 (the Act).
- 1.2 The purpose of a representation review is for local authorities to provide for "effective representation of communities of interest" (ss19T and 19U) and "fair representation of electors" (19V).
- 1.3 A representation review must include the following:
  - a) Number of elected members
  - b) Basis of election
  - c) Any ward details
  - d) Community boards
- 1.4 Matters out of scope for this review are:
  - a) the electoral system
  - b) Māori wards



## ITEM 7

Council has decided to continue using the Single Transferable Voting (STV) electoral system for the 2022 and 2025 local government elections (resolution 49-20 of 27 May 2020). Council introduced Māori ward or wards for 2022 and 2025 local government elections under the Local Electoral (Māori Wards and Māori Constituencies) Amendment Act 2021 (resolution 20-21 of 7 April 2020).

- 1.5 When conducting a review, councils must follow the procedure set out in the Local Electoral Act, the decision making principles of the Local Government Act (requirement to consider all reasonably practicable options, awareness of community views, opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision making processes) and should also follow guidelines published by the Local Government Commission.
- 1.6 Current representation arrangements are an at-large system with 15 Councillors + Mayor. The at-large arrangements have been in place since 2013. The city has had the same number of councillors since 1989.
- 1.7 It should be noted that as a consequence of introducing Māori ward/s a general ward/s is created.

## 2. PROCESS OF REVIEW

- 2.1 Council will decide on a single initial proposal at its meeting on 4 August 2021.
- 2.2 The Act gives the public the right to make written submissions to the Council and be heard if desired. This is undertaken within strict legislative timeframes.
- 2.3 Council may amend its proposal in response to submissions or choose to retain its initial proposal.
- 2.4 There is also a right of appeal to the Local Government Commission, which has the power to make a binding decision.
- 2.5 Officers will conduct a desktop review with the purpose of benchmarking and understanding Palmerston North's communities of interest by considering population and comparative statistical data already available.
- 2.6 Questions will be added to the next two quarterly Residents' Surveys (small but representative sample) to provide further data to assist Elected Members in their decision-making.
- 2.7 Officers will speak with focus groups to gauge demand for and implications of representation options.



2.8 Expected timeframes are as follows:

<b>4 August</b>	Initial Proposal decision
<b>6 August</b>	Public Notice of Initial Proposal opening for submissions
<b>6 August- 6 Sept</b>	Formal consultation period
<b>23 September</b>	Hearings of submitters
<b>6 October</b>	Final Proposal deliberation and decision
<b>11 October</b>	Public notice of Final Proposal noting appeal period
<b>11 Oct- 12 Nov</b>	Appeal period
<b>After 13 November</b>	If no appeals, becomes final, public notice issued
<b>By 11 April</b>	If any appeals or objections, Local Government Determination

### 3. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

#### Communities of interest

*A representation review must first consider whether distinct communities of interest exist, and if so, the best way for these communities to be represented.*

- 3.1 Communities of interest can change over time. Thus, communities of interest must be considered with every representation review.
- 3.2 The Council must determine whether
  - a) There are any identifiable communities below the Māori and General ward level
  - b) Whether these communities are located in an identifiable geographical area or spread across the city
- 3.3 Community of interest requires the consideration of perceptual, functional and political aspects and evidence as to how these differ between areas.
  - a) Perceptual factors include a sense of belonging to a clearly defined physical space as a result of demographics or history etc.
  - b) Functional aspects of community interest are questions of spatial patterns of activity, that is how the community interacts with services such as schools, places of worship, shopping and sports clubs, commuting to work etc.
  - c) Political dimensions of community interest are about the non-Council community structures eg. representation through hapū authorities or community associations.
- 3.4 The distinctiveness, isolation or spread of communities must be determined before considering the matters below.

## Number of elected members

*A representation review must consider whether to increase, decrease or retain the number of councillors.*

- 3.5 The Act allows for a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 30 members, including the Mayor.
- 3.6 The number of Māori members to be elected to the Council depends on a mathematical formula based on the Maori and general electoral populations of the city, related to the total number of councillors.
- 3.7 Any change to the number of total councillors affects the possible number of Māori-ward elected councillors.
- 3.8 Palmerston North would have 2 Māori-ward councillors if total number of councillors remained at 15 (using the June 2020 population estimates for the purpose of calculation as determined by the Commission).
- 3.9 If there were to be two members, there could be one Māori ward of two councillors or two separate Māori wards each electing one councillor.
- 3.10 However, should the total number of councillors be reduced, there could only be one Māori-ward councillor.
- 3.11 If the number of councillors were reduced it would not change the cost to ratepayers. Since the 2019 local government elections the Remuneration Authority has determined the pool of remuneration to be distributed amongst councillors according to 'size index' of the territorial authority. This is measured by population, total operating expenditure, total assets and socioeconomic deprivation index. The number of members elected to Palmerston North City Council would not affect this pool. The cost to ratepayers is fixed. Elected members shared the fixed amount.
- 3.12 The only metro councils with more councillors than Palmerston North are Auckland and Christchurch.
- 3.13 As a part of the 2018 representation review 30 submissions were received to the preliminary consultation discussion, of which 50% supported the current number of councillors, 6.7% supported an increase, 36.7% supported a decrease and 6.7% made no response. To the notified Initial Proposal of 2018, 20 submissions were received. 85% (17 responses) supported the current number of councillors.
- 3.14 On notification in 2018 that the Council had adopted its Initial Proposal as its Final Proposal, four appeals were lodged with the Local Government Commission. None of the four appeals had number of councillors as the subject of the appeal.

- 3.15 In September 2020 a Notice of Motion was brought that Council to consider reducing the number of councillors. The motion was unsuccessful.

### Basis of election

*A representation review must consider whether the most effective representation for the community/communities is that elected members (other than the mayor) should be*

- a) elected at-large or*
- b) whether the city should be further divided into wards, or*
- c) whether there will be a mix of city-wide and geographical ward representation.*

“At-large” is the term used for “city-wide” where there are no wards in place. In the case where General and Māori wards have been established, as is the case with Palmerston North City Council, the consideration then is

- d) elected city-wide within both or either of the Māori and General wards or*
- e) whether the city should be further divided geographically into wards for electoral purposes, or*
- f) whether there will be a mix of city-wide and geographical ward representation.*

- 3.16 The Act expects the concept of ‘Community of Interest’ to be applied when considering geographical ward boundaries.
- 3.17 In 2007 the Council resolved for an at-large system. This was overturned by the Commission. In 2010 a poll supported an at-large system. In 2013, the Initial Proposal put forward an at large option. Submitters favoured wards and Council altered their position, however the Commission favoured the poll result upon appeal. The majority of both groups of submitters to the 2018 representation review favoured at-large representation and this was upheld by the Commission.
- 3.18 The Commission’s most recent determination noted that the 2012 boundary change which shifted some areas of Manawātū District into Palmerston North City was seen to better reflect the communities of interest in particular areas, with “more than half of the affected residents working in the city while 95 per cent saw the city as their principal shopping destination.”
- 3.19 Research shows that the Single Transferable Vote (STV) electoral system is likely to achieve proportional results when used with multi-member wards (of 5-7 members) or at-large/ city-wide systems. Proportional refers not only to demographic representation but also wider communities of interest. For example, rural

communities can choose to vote as a group for a rural candidate under the STV system.

- 3.20 Mixed systems are rare in New Zealand. They exist in Gore District, Hutt City, Kāpiti Coast District and Tauranga City. In its determination the Commission has supported the use of a mixed system as a way of introducing at-large representation where wards already exist.

### Ward details

*If wards are established, a representation review must consider the names and boundaries for those wards and the number of members per ward.*

- 3.21 There is no legislative guidance on the best ratio of elected members to population. The elector to representative ratio range amongst territorial authorities with STV is 651 (Ruapehu) to 23,711(Tauranga). The elector to representative ratio range among territorial authorities with at-large systems is 391 (Kaikōura) to 6675 (Dunedin). Current mixed systems have larger at-large components of between 8000 and 24,000.
- 3.22 When establishing geographical wards there are limitations set by the Act. The Act seeks to ensure 'equality of representation' through approximate population equality per member so that some areas are not under or overrepresented and all votes are of equal value. Wards must be 'fair' in that no general ward can have a ratio of elected members to population that is more or less than 10% of other general wards and no Māori ward can have a ratio of elected members to population that is more or less than 10% of other Māori wards.
- 3.23 Wherever possible boundaries must coincide with current statistical and electoral boundaries and naming conventions apply.
- 3.24 Most councils operate with an even number of councillors. When the mayor's vote is added to the mix this allows for majority decisions.

### Community boards

*A representation review must consider whether to establish communities and have community boards and if so how many, their boundaries and membership and whether to subdivide any community for electoral purposes.*

- 3.25 The purpose of a community board is to represent and act as an advocate for the interests of a community. The board considers and reports on any matter referred to it by their council and issues of interest to the community board. Community boards maintain an overview of services provided by their council within the community. Functions are delegated to the board by the council.

- 3.26 Community boards are useful for distinct and isolated communities and where it is more efficient for local decisions to be made in close proximity to the area.
- 3.27 Each community board must have an area that is appropriate for efficient and effective performance of its role. Communities may be combined where there are sufficient commonalities to warrant combining for effectiveness.
- 3.28 A community must be large enough to service a community board, as setting up and maintaining a community board with the capacity to meet the decision-making requirements under the Local Government Act will have financial costs which are usually recouped by a charge to the community.
- 3.29 A community board can be requested at any time by members of an area according to the Local Government Act Schedule 6.
- 3.30 The Commission upheld the Council's resolution not to introduce community boards in 2018. The Commission had received a petition from 56 people supporting the establishment of a community board for Bunnythorpe. The reasoning for this decision was:
  - a) The Council had followed appropriate process in raising the option as a part of the review.
  - b) There was a mixed response to community boards in the 2018 representation review submissions.
  - c) Community boards work best where the Council is supportive of the board
  - d) Community boards can be considered by petition under Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act at any time. (A petition has not been received in the meantime).
- 3.31 Palmerston North had a community board in Ashhurst for a short time in 1989.
- 3.32 As well as Bunnythorpe, the Commission has received appeals in the past from residents interested in establishing community boards "in places like Ashhurst" and in rural wards.
- 3.33 Amongst metro councils there is a mix of councils with community boards and without. There are both STV and FPP systems with community boards.

#### 4. PRINCIPLES FOR REVIEW

- 4.1 Representation arrangements are complex and the Local Government Commission notes that the decisions of elected members should not be limited to reflecting community views on particular aspects but to seeking fair and effective representation for all individuals and communities of interest.
- 4.2 The initial proposal must note the reasons for the decision.

4.3 As there are pros and cons for all options, it is important that the Council agrees to a set of criteria by which to determine the most effective and fair representation arrangements. The Electoral Act sets out some definitions, and the Local Government Act highlights the purpose of local government. There are also practical and perceptual factors to consider.

4.4 Officers recommend that the following principles be applied:

**Fair and effective representation that meets the needs and expectations of individuals and communities:**

a) **Equality of vote**

“Fairness” defined by the Act in the +/-10% rule where geographical wards exist (LEA, 19V)) and between Māori and General ward ratios of member to population (LEA, Schedule 1A (6)).

b) **Choice of candidates**

“Fairness” in perception where the number and diversity of candidates from which a voter may choose; noting all voters have one vote in STV despite ranking.

c) **Quality candidates**

Appropriate number of seats at the table to encourage quality candidates

d) **Diverse candidates**

Appropriate number of seats and basis of election to encourage diverse candidates (LGA s3) so that residents hear representative voices (“**action by**, and on behalf of, communities” (LGA s10 (a))).

e) **Accountability**

Connection of members to their communities and the city(LGA s3(c)) so that residents experience that members know and champion their needs, in light of a member’s responsibility to represent all.

f) **Access**

Geographical spread and appropriate number of members across city to be physically accessible so that residents feel that they are heard and can be heard (“**action by**, and **on behalf of**, communities” (LGA s10 (a))).

g) **Public confidence**

Arrangements that inspire public confidence in, public understanding of local electoral processes and local government’s relevance and impact (LEA s4(1)(c)).

h) **Participation**

Arrangements that encourage participation by ensuring all qualified persons have a reasonable and equal opportunity to cast an informed vote and nominate or stand as a candidate (LEA s4(1)(b)).

## Practical and operational considerations for the city:

### i) **Capacity**

Appropriate total number of seats at the table to do justice to the work of an elected member

### j) **Cohesiveness**

Appropriate number of seats at the table so as to encourage depth and diversity of debate while promoting unity of purpose and a strong social contract that legitimises local government activity.

### k) **Financial implications**

Costs of implementation and maintenance

## 5. **COMMUNICATIONS PLAN**

5.1 A preliminary engagement period from June to July will help inform the Initial Proposal. Since representation arrangements are one way of heightening engagement with local government, and ultimately lessening inequalities of participation, the focus of meetings will be on those for whom Council wishes to encourage greater participation: youth, Māori, and other minority groups such as disability and ethnic communities. As community boards are one question considered under the representation review, engagement with villages and rural population has also been identified.

5.2 An awareness campaign will run from late July to early August to ensure residents know a formal consultation period is coming, what the representation review will cover and not cover, and how residents will be able to have their say.

5.3 The formal consultation period in August to early September will be opened by public notice. Information will be provided city-wide. It will focus on the detail of the Initial Proposal and encourage submissions.

## 6. **NEXT STEPS**

6.1 A report will come to Council in August at which elected members will be asked to make a decision on an Initial Proposal to go to consultation.

6.2 The Tokomaru and Ōpiki reorganisation decision which is expected by end of May 2021 will be included in the analysis presented in August.

6.3 After the Initial Proposal decision, public notice will be made which opens the consultation period.

## ITEM 7

- 6.4 Hearings will be held at a meeting of Council to be held 23 September 2021 with deliberation and Final Proposal to be decided upon on 6 October 2021.
- 6.5 After the Council has adopted its Final Proposal following the hearing and consideration of submissions, there is an opportunity for submitters to lodge an appeal against the Council's decision to the Local Government Commission, and if the Council has altered its Initial Proposal for representation, then anyone can make objections to the Local Government Commission.
- 6.6 In both cases, appeals and objections are lodged with the Council in the first instance and are then passed on to the Local Government Commission.

## 7. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Council have delegated authority to decide?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the decisions significant?	<b>No</b>
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	<b>No</b>
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	<b>No</b>
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	<b>No</b>
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	<b>No</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 5: A Driven and Enabling Council	
The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Driven and Enabling Council Strategy	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Not Applicable	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Reviewing representation arrangements to reflect the current needs of the city contributes to effective and fair representation of residents.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Review of Trust Deeds

**PRESENTED BY:** Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager

**APPROVED BY:** David Murphy, Acting General Manager - Strategy and Planning

---

### RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

**1. That Council agree to review the trust deeds for the following trusts:**

- Te Manawa Museums Trust
  - Regent Theatre Trust
  - Globe Theatre Trust
  - Caccia Birch Trust
  - Palmerston North Performing Arts Trust
  - Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Disaster Relief Fund Trust
  - Palmerston North Heritage Trust
  - Jaycee Trust
  - Wildbase Recovery Community Trust
- 

### 1. ISSUE

The passing of the Trusts Act 2019 ("the Act") which came into force on 1 January 2021, changed the duties and responsibilities of trustees. It is prudent that Council review the trust deeds of its trusts (CCOs and community trusts) to check for compliance against the new legislative requirements of the Trust Act 2019.

The CCOs trust deeds have not been reviewed since the early 2000s. A review offers the opportunity to make additional changes to the deeds for currency.

This report identifies the parameters of a review and seeks Council approval to commence.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Council has four council-controlled organisations (“cultural CCOs”), which are charitable trusts:

- Te Manawa Museums Trust
- Regent Theatre Trust
- Globe Theatre Trust
- Caccia Birch Trust

It also administers the following community trusts:

- Palmerston North Performing Arts Trust
- Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Disaster Relief Fund Trust
- Palmerston North Heritage Trust
- Jaycee Trust
- Wildbase Recovery Community Trust

## 3. WHAT THE REVIEW WOULD COVER

Officers recommend the review encompasses the following four areas.

**a) Identify areas for update to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Trusts Act 2019.**

Review the trust deeds to check for compliance against the new legislative requirements of the Trust Act 2019. For example, the Trust Act 2019 sets out a list of mandatory and default duties trustees must undertake. Mandatory duties are compulsory. Default duties can be amended/ excluded by way of the trust deed. However, if default duties are not varied, then Trustees must also comply with the default duties set out in the Act.

**b) Consider changes to the trust deeds of the cultural CCOs which would allow exemption from the reporting requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) if needed in the future.**

The LGA allows Councils to exempt small CCOs from complying with the reporting requirements of the LGA – including the need to have their accounts audited by Audit NZ.

Unfortunately, in many cases, exemptions cannot be implemented because the trust deed stipulates that the reporting requirements of the LGA must be complied with. However, re-wording some of these clauses would allow for implementation of exemptions (should council approve them in the future).

**c) Consider changes to the trust deeds of the cultural CCOs to align the trust deeds of the cultural CCOs with Council's Appointment of Directors Policy.**

The trust deeds of each of the cultural CCOs contain a clause that requires a third of trustees to be rotated every year, irrespective of whether the trustee's term has expired. To meet this requirement of the deed, some trustees are required to shorten their term and seek reappointment by re-applying for their position. Council's Appointment of Directors Policy does not stipulate an annual rotation of trustees.

**d) Identify and propose any additional changes to bring the trust deeds up-to-date or to reflect current practices.**

Officers will consult with the trust boards and request any changes they would like to their trust deed.

#### 4. NEXT STEPS

If Council agrees a review, officers will seek legal advice to draft amendments to the trust deeds in line with the list above.

Trust board members will be asked for input.

Council will be presented with the proposed draft trust deeds, which if approved by Council would then be sent to the relevant trust board for approval. If adopted, the new trust deed will take effect.

#### 5. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Council have delegated authority to decide?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the decisions significant?	<b>No</b>
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	<b>No</b>
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	<b>No</b>
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	<b>No</b>
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 5: A Driven and Enabling Council	
The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Driven and Enabling Council Strategy	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in a plan under the	

**ITEM 8**

Driven and Enabling Council Strategy	
The action is: N/A	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Reviewing the trust deeds will enable Council and the trusts boards to ensure legal compliance and to consider opportunities for enhancing effective and efficient governance.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

## COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Council Work Schedule

---

### RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. That the Council receive its Work Schedule dated June 2021.

### ATTACHMENTS

1. Work Schedule [↗](#)

## COUNCIL

## WORK SCHEDULE – JUNE 2021

Item No.	Estimated Report Date	Subject	Officer Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction/ Point of Origin
1	June 2021	Representation Review (including Māori wards) – draft options	General Manager – Strategy & Planning		Council 7 April 2021 Clause 20-21
2	August 2021	Representation Review – approve proposal for consultation			Council 7 April 2021 Clause 20-21
3	23 September 2021	Representation Review – hearings		Additional Council meeting required	Council 7 April 2021 Clause 20-21
4	October 2021	Representation Review – final decision			Council 7 April 2021 Clause 20-21
5	December 2021	Manawatū Residents' card	General Manager – Marketing and Communications		Council 25 May 2020 Clause 48-20
6	TBC 2021	Cuba Street Re-development	Chief Infrastructure Officer	Tabled report	Council 21 December 2020 Clause 160-20
7	December 2021	Central Economic Development Association (CEDA) - Shareholding arrangements	General Manager – Strategy & Planning		Council 21 December 2020 Clause 157-20
8	March 2022	Remits from PNCC	General Manager – Strategy & Planning		Council 24 June 2020 Clause 69-20

9	May 2022	Remits received from other Territorial Authorities	General Manager – Strategy & Planning		Council 24 June 2020 Clause 69-20
---	----------	--	---------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

### CONFIDENTIAL DECISIONS RELEASED

Meeting date	Title	Released	Not Released
26 Aug 2019	Contract 3458 - Road Maintenance, Resurfacing and Rehabilitation 2017-21 - Progress Update.	Redacted report and decision.	N/A
3 March 2021	Award of Contract 3984 for Seismic Strengthening Pre-Aeration and Sedimentation Facility.	Redacted report, decision and division	N/A
3 March 2021	Tender Award - Contract 3938 Roading Maintenance, Renewal and Minor Capital Services - 2021-24	Redacted report, decision and division	Appendices - withheld Third Party commercial - s7(2)(b)(ii) Commercial Activities

More information on the decisions released can be found on [released decisions](#)





## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Presentation of the Part I Public Arts, Culture & Heritage's Committee Recommendations from its 5 May 2021 Meeting

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee meeting Part I Public held on 5 May 2021. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

### **16-21 Deliberations report on Section 17A Review of Caccia Birch House**

Report, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy & Policy Manager.

#### The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council endorse Option 2, Service delivery by the Council, of the report titled 'Deliberations report on Section 17A Review of Caccia Birch House', presented to the Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee on 5 May 2021, as the preferred option for the day-to-day management of Caccia Birch House, grounds and Coach House.
2. That the Chief Executive works with the Trust Board to develop a process for the management of Caccia Birch House to transition from a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) to in-house delivery.
3. That the Chief Executive develops a model to enable community involvement in the in-house service delivery and reports back to Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee by February 2022.
4. That the Chief Executive develop an operational and annual reporting model for in-house service delivery of Caccia Birch House.
5. That development of a conservation plan for Caccia Birch House and property is costed and included in the CBH Masterplan programme of work for 2023/24 and reported to Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee by June 2024.
6. That Council resolve to bring the Caccia Birch service delivery in-house by July 2022.
7. That the Chief Executive review the in-house service delivery and report back to Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee before July 2025.



## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Presentation of the Part I Public Community Development's Committee Recommendations from its 12 May 2021 Meeting

---

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Community Development Committee meeting Part I Public held on 12 May 2021. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

**16-21 Progress update - Community Funding Policy**

Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald - Strategy and Policy Manager.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

2. That the 10-year plan decisions relating to the relevant funding 'envelopes' and strategic direction inform administration of relevant funds until the adoption of an updated policy.



## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Presentation of the Part I Public Planning & Strategy Committee's Recommendations from its 12 May 2021 Meeting

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Planning & Strategy Committee meeting Part I Public held on 12 May 2021. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

### **12-21 The Future Use of Summerhays Street/ Former Terrace End Bowling Club**

Memorandum, presented by Michael Duindam, City Planning Manager (Acting).

#### The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the Statement of Proposal for "The Future Use of Summerhays Street/ Former Terrace End Bowling Club", included as attachment one to the report titled 'The Future Use of Summerhays Street/Former Terrace End Bowling Club' presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 12 May 2021, be approved for public consultation.
2. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee be given delegated authority to approve minor amendments to the Statement of Proposal for "The Future Use of Summerhays Street/ Former Terrace End Bowling Club."



## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 2 June 2021

**TITLE:** Presentation of the Part I Public Finance & Audit Committee's Recommendations from its 26 May 2021 Meeting

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Finance & Audit Committee meeting Part I Public held on 26 May 2021. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

**41-21 Review of the Elected Members' Expenses and Allowances Policy 2021, and the Elected and Appointed Members' Professional Development & Training Policy 2021**

Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Democracy & Governance Manager.

**The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

2. That Council approve the Elected and Appointed Members' Expenses and Allowances Policy 2021 (Attachment 1) as amended, subject to approval of the Remuneration Authority.

[the amendments being

- That all expense claims by Elected Members are reported annually to the Finance and Audit Committee.
- That Section 4 'Expenses on Council Business (Elected Members), Meal Allowance' (Elected and Appointed Members' Expenses and Allowances Policy) include the words 'unless needed for dietary requirements' in the following sentence: 'Separate meal costs will not be met where a meal has been provided as part of the training / conference / meeting, etc.'
- That Council will provide Elected Members with the option to claim a personal mobile plan connection with a Council-provided mobile phone.]

3. That Council approve the Elected and Appointed Members' Professional Development and Training Policy 2021 (Attachment 2), as amended.

[the amendments being

- That 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi training' be added to Section 5 'Policy, Imperative Training' (Elected and Appointed Members' Professional Development and Training Policy 2021).
- That Section 5 'Policy, Desirable Training' (Elected and Appointed Members' Professional Development and Training Policy 2021) include the word 'cultural' in the following sentence: 'It may include, but not limited to community issues which address environmental, social, and economic issues and challenges'.]

#### 42-21

#### **Victoria Esplanade Bonsai/Shade House Project Options**

Report, presented by Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks and Reserves Manager.

#### The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That during Ten Year Plan deliberations, Council considers establishing a budget of \$880,000 in Year 2, dependant on external funding of \$150,000 for a Bonsai House and Shade House.