



Otorohanga District Council

AGENDA

20 SEPTEMBER 2016

10.00am

Members of the Otorohanga District Council

Mr MM Baxter (Mayor)
Mr RM Johnson
Mrs RA Klos
Mr KM Phillips
Mrs DM Pilkington (Deputy Mayor)
Mr R Prescott
Mr PD Tindle
Mrs AJ Williams

Meeting Secretary: Mr CA Tutty (Governance Supervisor)

OTOROHANGA DISTRICT COUNCIL

20 SEPTEMBER 2016

Notice is hereby given that an ordinary meeting of the Otorohanga District Council will be held in the Council Chambers, 17 Maniapoto Street, Otorohanga on 20 September 2016 commencing at 10am.

9 September 2016

DC Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

AGENDA

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

ITEM	PRECIS	PAGE
PRESENT		1
IN ATTENDANCE		1
APOLOGIES		1
OPENING PRAYER		1
ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN GENERAL BUSINESS		1
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 16 AUGUST 2016		1
DECLARATION OF INTEREST		1
REPORTS		1
ITEM 335	LEASING OF PART OF BOB HORSFALL RESERVE & ASSOCIATED MATTERS	2
ITEM 336	UPDATING OF OTOROHANGA DOMAIN RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN	5
ITEM 337	POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT	8
ITEM 338	SPORT SUPPORT FUND ALLOCATION	15
ITEM 339	CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY PLANNING REPORT FOR MAY TO JULY 2016	16
ITEM 340	ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND POLICY AND PRACTICES AUTHORITY 2015-2016	25
ITEM 341	ANNUAL REPORT ON DOG CONTROL POLICY AND PRACTICES	37
ITEM 342	ODC MATTERS REFERRED FROM 19 JULY 2016	41
GENERAL		41

PRESENT

IN ATTENDANCE

APOLOGIES

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN GENERAL BUSINESS

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 16 AUGUST 2016

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

REPORTS

ITEM 335 Leasing of Part of Bob Horsfall Reserve and Associated Matters

**To: Mayor and Councillors
 Otorohanga District Council**

From: Chief Executive

Date: 20 September 2016

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
- Promote the local economy and opportunities for sustainable economic development
- Manage the natural and physical environment in a sustainable manner
- Foster an involved and engaged Community

Executive Summary

Public submissions on the proposed changes to arrangements in respect of the playing of paintball in the Bob Horsfall Reserve in Otorohanga are presented for consideration.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that:

1. A lease be granted to Kiwiana Leisure Park for the use of the area of the Bob Horsfall Reserve described in the report to Council of 17 May 2016 for the purpose of conducting games of paintball, subject to such conditions as may be specified by Council's Chief Executive. The lease shall have effect from 15 October 2016.
2. That from 15 October 2016 the previously granted permission for the general public to play paintball within the Bob Horsfall Reserve is withdrawn.

Report Discussion

At Council's meeting of 17 May 2016 issues relating to the playing of paintball in the Bob Horsfall Reserve and associated potential liabilities were discussed.

Council resolved as follows:

Public notice is given and submissions invited in respect of:

- a) The proposed withdrawal of the existing permission for the general public to play paintball within the area of the Bob Horsfall Reserve previously designated for this purpose; and*
- b) The proposed leasing of the designated area referred to above to a private party for the playing of paintball on a commercial basis.*

Such public consultation was subsequently conducted, with one submission being received, a copy of which is attached.

Many of the points raised in the submission have already been discussed with the Otorohanga Community Board.

Points 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 (the latter to a limited degree) are considered suitable for potential inclusion as conditions in a lease of the paintball area. It is not believed that point 1 can be stipulated as a condition of a lease, but words encouraging the lessee to permit such access could be included, and it seems very unlikely that there would be any problem with access being prevented outside of paintball games.

Point 2 will be addressed by the proposed resolution.

The issue raised in point 5 does need to be addressed, but it is believed that should not be particularly difficult or expensive, though this work is in addition to that

Point 6 cannot be considered directly related to paintball, and is therefore considered outside the scope of discussion at this point.

It is not considered that anything in the submission significantly opposes the original proposal, and it is therefore suggested that both elements of the proposal be approved.

Dave Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Submission to Otorohanga District Council regarding proposed changes to Reserve use in the Bob Horsfall Reserve
Dave Williams
25/05/16

I support proposal a.
Regarding proposal b.

I submit that

1. A lease for commercial paintball in the designated area (site) should allow the use of the site by the public when the site is not being used for paintball.
2. Paintball operations should cease until an approved safety plan is in place. The safety plan to include reporting accidents and incidents to ODC.
3. The track is to be cleaned of debris after each battle and left in a safe condition for the public consistent with all building codes, track standards and grading systems as identified in the Building Department report to the Otorohanga Community Board 28 Jan 2014.
4. There is no deliberate damage or removal of any of the natural vegetation.
5. The detour track along the Dry Ridge to the Cul de sac be bought up to the same standards identified in the same Building Department report, ODC to do this work.
6. The Cul de sac serves as a hub to the 5 tracks. This area should be should be landscaped to present the site better for all users including the operators. There should be a gravelled area to allow safe vehicle turnaround, no grass to mow and fast growing native trees planted around the perimeter. ODC to do this work.
7. The lease term to be no more than three years with no right of renewal.
8. The paintball operators and Council consider using the adjoining open paddock for any further developments.
9. When paintball operation cease the site is revegetated with suitable native plants

Thanks for the opportunity to make a submission to this change of use in the Bob Horsfall Reserve.

Dave Williams

Cc OCB

ITEM 336 Updating of Otorohanga Domain Reserve Management Plan

**To: Mayor and Councillors
 Otorohanga District Council**

From: Chief Executive

Date: 20 September 2016

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Foster an involved and engaged Community
-

Executive Summary

A draft copy of a proposed updated Reserve Management Plan for the Otorohanga Domain Passive Reserve Areas is presented for Council's consideration.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that:

1. Council approves the proposed revised Reserve Management Plan for the passive areas of the Otorohanga Domain, as per the supplied draft document.
2. That Council gives consideration to how the identified works required to give effect to the Reserve Management Plan might be funded.

Report Discussion

At the request of the Otorohanga Community Board (OCB), and in consultation with the Board, the existing Reserve Management Plan ('RMP') for the Otorohanga Domain Passive Reserve Areas ('ODPRA') has been reviewed. This plan covers those areas that are referred to as the Bob Horsfall Reserve and Rotary Park, that are used for passive recreation rather than formal sport. A draft copy of the proposed revised version of this document is provided under separate cover.

This draft document reflects the following:

1. A strong desire of the OCB for the ODPRA to continue to exist as a 'native bush reserve' as was envisaged when the first RMP for these areas was developed between 2000 and 2002.
2. A recognition that effective delivery of this original vision for the ODPRA requires greater levels of input from Council than was perhaps recognised when the original RMP was developed. Issues such as control of plant and animal pests, management of native vegetation (including maintenance of property sight lines), and maintenance of structures all require greater ongoing effort, with associated costs. Initial assumptions that such activities could largely be effectively undertaken by volunteers on an ongoing basis and without significant cost to Council were perhaps naïve.

Because of point 1 above the general form of the draft updated RMP has been based around the original RMP, with a significant amount of the content of that document being retained,

including details of the original RMP development process. The draft document at this stage also contains original text that has been struck out, to provide a point of reference.

The need to address point 2 has however resulted in a significant amount of new content being added, which is identified by being in red text. The most significant of these additions are considered to be a comparison of the current state of the area against the objectives of the original RMP (Appendix 6), and development of a potential program of works to address existing shortfalls (Appendix 7).

Legal Context

The ODPRA RMP is a statutory document, to which the provisions of section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977 apply. The Act requires that when an RMP for a particular area is first developed it is made subject to public consultation in accordance with subsections (5) and (6) of section 41. Such a process occurred for the ODPRA RMP between 2000 and 2002.

A similar public consultation process must be undertaken if a comprehensive review of an RMP is undertaken that suggests a fundamental change to the way in which the reserve is managed.

In this case however it is suggested that since the use of ODPRA is generally proposed to remain unchanged as a 'native bush reserve' the suggested amendments to the RMP fall into the category described in subsection (4) of section 41, which states '*The administering body of any reserve shall keep its management plan under continuous review, so that, subject to subsection (3), the plan is adapted to changing circumstances or in accordance with increased knowledge*' and in this case public consultation is not required.

Furthermore recent amendments to the Reserves Act no longer require local authorities to submit RMPs for recreation reserves to the Minister of Conservation for approval, and as such the management of such reserves is an the discretion of the particular local authority that administers it, provided of course that the details of such management are in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Council is therefore the decision maker in matters relating to this document and the management of the reserve, though it could if it wished undertake public consultation.

Funding Issues

There are currently significant shortfalls in a number of aspects of the management of the ODPRA, which have had a cumulative effect. There is a backlog of work in respect of the management of vegetation and structures that needs to be addressed, and once this has been achieved there needs to be a continuing much higher level of investment in the maintenance of the reserve if it is not to again slip backwards.

The extent of work required is beyond the capability of Council's existing landscape services staff, and specialist contractors will be needed for much of it.

It is difficult to precisely know how much will need to be spent to achieve the Board's vision for the reserve, but it will be significant; an initial estimate suggests additional expenditure of around \$27,000 per year for the next 4 years, and around \$21,000 per year on an ongoing basis thereafter.

These costs reflect the fact that attempting to have such a natural area inside an urban community has a number of challenges that do not exist in more typical larger scale native bush environments. Whereas a large area of native bush that can effectively be left to 'look

after itself' substantial effort will always be needed to manage effects of surrounding private residential properties on the reserve, and vice-versa.

Whilst there appear to be opportunities to reduce some elements of these costs (in particular animal pest control) there are also other elements (such as track maintenance) where costs might be significantly higher than have been assumed, and as such it is suggested that the figures above are reasonable guidelines.

A simple way to meet these costs would be to increase the operational expenditure budgets in the Otorohanga Parks and Reserves account, but it is recognised that as this account is District funded, and has already had very substantial budget increases in recent years, Council may be reluctant to do so.

Such potential reluctance has been discussed with the OCB and another alternative could be to reallocate most of the annual *Sundry Reserves Improvements* capital budget in the Otorohanga P&R account (currently set at \$30,000 + inflation per year throughout the period of the Long Term Plan) to provide operational funding for the works in the ODPRA.

Doing so would be based on the principle that further new parks and reserves assets should not be created if we cannot properly maintain what we already have. Whilst this approach generally appears sound it will however require some other sources of funding to be obtained for the completion of other capital works that have already been commenced, the most notable of which is the enhancements to the areas around Lake Huiputea and the Huiputea Tree, in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding what we have with the Maori Trustees of that area. The Otorohanga Community's Special Fund (which has been recently been augmented by the proceeds of the sale of the last Council owned section at Progress Drive) could potentially be used for this purpose.

It should again be noted that discussions with the OCB have indicated that the Board is strongly committed to the continuing management of the ODPRA as a 'natural' bush reserve, and does not wish to consider alternative management options.

Dave Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

ITEM 337 Potential Residential Subdivision Development

**To: Mayor and Councillors
 Otorohanga District Council**

From: Chief Executive

Date: 20 September 2016

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Promote the local economy and opportunities for sustainable economic development
-

Executive Summary

Community consultation is suggested on a proposed Council funded residential property development.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that:

Consultation with the community be undertaken on the potential Council funding of a relatively large scale residential subdivision development in Otorohanga, through use of the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002, based upon the Statement of Proposal attached to this report.

Report Discussion

A critical shortage of residential property for rental in and around Otorohanga has persisted for almost two years, and more recently a similar shortage of properties for sale has also developed.

The rapid development of these shortages (which do not appear likely to ease in the short term) has highlighted the limited capacity of local housing stock. The small extent of house development that has occurred in town in recent years has only kept pace with the need to house a stable population, but with declining average household sizes, and there is very little capacity to accommodate population growth, even at a relatively low level.

There currently appear to be a number of continuing factors that have the potential to draw new residents to the community, but the lack of accommodation available for people wishing to move to the town is clearly a constraint on such growth, and Council and the OCB have in recent times been giving consideration to how this might be addressed.

Developing substantial additional housing in Otorohanga has some challenges. Opportunities to develop small-scale infill are limited and are unlikely to occur in sufficient volume to significantly increase supply. This type of small-scale development might at best be able to provide the number of additional houses (around 5 per year) needed to house the existing number of residents but with the decreasing average household sizes associated with the increases in average age of the population that has been forecast to occur up to around 2030.

It is believed that for real growth of the community to occur (which seems to be desired by all parties) larger new 'green fields' residential developments in or around the town would be essential.

Whilst it would be preferable for private investors to undertake such developments, previous experience suggests that this is unlikely to occur. Otorohanga is only located at the fringes of the strongly growing central Waikato area, and as such the potential direct financial rewards from large scale property development are balanced with some fairly significant risks, which has not created a strong investment equation for private parties.

A belief that the private sector would not take a strong role in local property development led Council to undertake the Progress Park and Westridge subdivisions in the early 2000s.

Whilst these developments were not very profitable in simple financial terms they are considered to have been broadly beneficial for the community.

Previous discussion involving Council and the OCB has indicated a belief that these parties once again need to take the lead, to conduct large scale subdivision developments in or around Otorohanga in the relatively near future.

A number of apparent opportunities for such subdivision developments have been previously discussed, and attention is currently focussed on a potential extension of the Westridge development to link Thomson and Harper Avenues, with an economic evaluation of a development concept at this location currently being undertaken, further details of which will be presented at the meeting. There is however as yet no firm commitment to the development being at this particular location, and the feedback that is sought from the community at this stage is primarily in relation to the general acceptability of Council investing in a residential subdivision at some location in or around Otorohanga, not necessarily at Westridge.

It is proposed that public consultation is undertaken on a proposal for Council funding of such a development, through use of the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002. The Otorohanga Community Board indicated its support for such consultation at its meeting of 6 September 2016.

This public consultation is necessary because such a Council funded development has not previously been indicated in Council's Long Term Plan or in any other statutory documents. Whilst it would be hoped that a Council investment in such property development would yield revenues that are sufficient to cover costs, there is nevertheless a need for a substantial initial investment and the potential for significant holding costs.

Details of the Statement of Proposal (which duplicates some of the content of this report, and which may be slightly amended to include some key details from the economic evaluation of the Westridge extension option once those are received) and the advertisement proposed to be used for this consultation are attached.

It is important to note that the consultation proposed to be undertaken at this stage is only that required in respect of matters pertaining to the Local Government Act, in particular the funding of a residential development. Consultation relating to matters under the Resource Management Act would be more site-specific and would occur if and when an application is made for a Resource Consent, at a later time.

Dave Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Otorohanga District Council

Statement of Proposal:

**Council Investment in Residential Subdivision
Development**

1. Introduction

Otorohanga District Council has recently been giving consideration to funding a further relatively large scale residential subdivision in or around Otorohanga. Such an activity and expenditure has not been previously signalled in Council's 2015-2025 Long Term Plan or in any other current planning document, and for this reason it is considered necessary to undertake consultation with the community in respect of this before any decisions on this matter are made.

2. Purpose of this Statement of Proposal

Council wishes to hear the views of the community in respect of a potential Council financial investment in a residential subdivision, and has chosen to follow the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002 to ensure that this consultation is meaningful and that the community has adequate opportunity to express those views.

As part of the Special Consultative Procedure the Council must produce a Statement of Proposal, which contains a summary of information that is a fair representation of the major matters in the proposal, and make it available to the community. This document is that Statement of Proposal. The information contained in this Statement of Proposal has been approved by Council for notification and consultation.

3. Desire for Community Growth

Like much of rural NZ, Otorohanga (both the town and the district) has until recently been experiencing a prolonged gradual loss of population, as people tend to move towards larger urban centres. This loss of population has a range of negative effects on the local economy and community. Many of the services and businesses that were previously available in small towns such as Otorohanga have been relocated to those larger centres, which in turn makes the smaller community less attractive as a destination for new residents and businesses, potentially creating a 'vicious circle' of decline.

Whilst there are some benefits in living in a small town, these can be significantly offset by the negative effects of a shrinking population.

Otorohanga has however been fortunate in that it is relatively close to the central Waikato region, which has experienced strong population growth, and this has to some degree protected the town and District from the severe decline that has affected some other rural areas. Whilst we have lost some population, the extent of this loss has so far been modest.

It is however believed that Otorohanga should aspire to more than just maintaining its population at around the current level, and that it would be preferable to have some growth, which would strengthen the community both now and in the future.

4. Need for Residential Subdivision Development

In recent times extremely strong demand for property has occurred in Auckland, fueled by immigration at record levels that appears likely to continue for some time. This effect has flowed on to other regions of the country, including Otorohanga, and is considered to offer potential for significant local population growth.

There currently appear to be a number of factors that have the potential to draw new residents to the Otorohanga community. Continuing high levels of immigration into NZ and increasingly unaffordable house prices in major centres is perhaps the most obvious of these factors, but recent proposals for new major businesses to be established in or around Otorohanga have also raised the prospect of new jobs being created that could bring new residents into the town.

A lack of accommodation available for people wishing to move to the town is however clearly a constraint on growth at present. A critical shortage of residential property for rental in and around Otorohanga has however persisted for almost two years, and more recently a similar shortage of properties for sale has also developed.

The rapid development of these shortages (which do not appear likely to ease in the short term) has highlighted the limited capacity of local housing stock. The small extent of house development that has occurred in town in recent years has only kept pace with the need to house a stable population, but with declining average household sizes, and there is very little capacity to accommodate population growth, even at a relatively low level.

Developing substantial additional housing in Otorohanga has some challenges. Opportunities to subdivide existing residential sections are limited and are unlikely to occur in sufficient volume to significantly increase supply. This type of small-scale development might at best be able to provide the number of additional houses (around 5 per year) needed to house the existing number of residents but with the decreasing average household sizes associated with the increases in average age of the population that has been forecast to occur up to around 2030.

It is believed that for the desired real growth of the community to occur larger new 'green fields' residential developments in or around the town would be essential.

Whilst it would be preferable for private investors to undertake such developments, previous and current experience suggests that this is unlikely to occur. Otorohanga is still only located at the fringes of the strongly growing central Waikato area, and as such the potential direct financial rewards from large scale property development are balanced with some fairly significant risks, which has not yet created a strong long-term investment equation for private parties.

Despite the current strength of the local property market Council is not aware of any proposals for privately funded subdivisions of medium or large scale.

A similar belief that the private sector would not take a strong role in local property development led Council to undertake the Progress Park and Westridge subdivisions in the early 2000s. Whilst these developments were not very profitable in simple financial terms they are considered to have been broadly beneficial for the community.

Previous discussion involving Council and the Otorohanga Community Board (OCB) has indicated a belief that these parties once again needs to take the lead, to conduct relatively large scale subdivision developments in or around Otorohanga in the near future.

A number of apparent opportunities for such subdivision developments have been considered, and attention is now focussed on a potential further extension of the

Westridge development, with an economic evaluation of this option currently being undertaken.

5. **Proposal**

Council seeks feedback from the community on a proposal to invest a significant amount in the development of a new residential subdivision of perhaps between 40 and 50 new lots, in or around the Otorohanga township.

Whilst attention is currently focused on this development being a potential extension of the Westridge subdivision that links Thomson Avenue and Harpers Avenue, there is not currently any commitment to it being at this location, and a final decision on where such a subdivision is to be conducted would only be made at a later stage.

The subdivision would be funded from an account created for that purpose that was associated with the Otorohanga town community and the ratepayers therein.

It is envisaged that the development would be funded by loan raised for this purpose. Raising such loans would mean that – in the short term at least – the overall level of debt carried by Otorohanga District would be increased.

It would be hoped that the costs of undertaking the subdivision could be recovered and the debt repaid through the sale of the created sections, and that as such the development would be at least cost-neutral for the community.

In the short term there are also expected to be existing positive balances within the accounts of the Otorohanga Community that could be utilized to cover financial carrying costs such as interest charges until such time as those costs could be recovered through sales, without the need to increase rates.

The primary risk associated with such a subdivision is considered to be that the created sections cannot be sold sufficiently quickly, or at sufficiently high prices to cover the cost of the development. Whilst the demand for local property is currently very strong, the possibility of a downturn is always present.

Offering something that meets the demands of the market is therefore essential, and Council has learnt from its own previous experience with property development in the community and that of others, and is strongly focused on meeting those market demands in terms of property location, size, contour and the setting (or limitation) of covenants. It is important that the sections that are created can meet the needs of a relatively broad range of potential buyers, rather than attempting to create a product orientated towards a particular niche in the market.

Council will also explore potential means of working with builders to provide 'house and land packages' on some of the created sections. It is believed that many people looking to buy a home would prefer to have the reduced complexity and uncertainty that comes with buying a house that is already constructed, rather than having to organise house building themselves.

In terms of timing, Council believes that there is currently a strong opportunity to draw new residents to the Otorohanga Community if more houses were available, and is therefore keen to progress the development of a new residential subdivision as quickly as possible. There are however a number of administrative and physical stages that must be undertaken, which might in total take up to 12 months to complete.

Whilst residential property development is not generally considered to be a 'core business' of local government, the circumstances of our District are different to other districts where strong potential for profit results in the private sector effectively driving this activity. As such it is considered appropriate that ODC/OCB engages in this activity as part of its role to help facilitate economic development.

ODC has traditionally taken a conservative approach towards expenditure, and has in recent years been strongly committed to a strategy of reducing debt. In this case however Council believes that a bolder approach and a willingness to take on additional debt is necessary to take advantage of the opportunity for the community.

6. Scope of Consultation

It is important to note that the consultation proposed to be undertaken at this stage is only that required in respect of matters pertaining to the Local Government Act, in particular the funding of a residential development.

We wish to know if residents would be supportive of public funds being invested in an appropriate subdivision development that was judged to have good prospects of being at least cost neutral in the longer term.

Consultation relating to matters under the Resource Management Act would be more site-specific and would occur if and when an application is made for a Resource Consent, at a later time.

7. Making Submissions

Submissions in respect of the proposal can be made in writing, and should be addressed to:

The Chief Executive
Otorohanga District Council
PO Box 11
OTOROHANGA

Submissions must be received by Friday 28 October 2016.

Dave Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Proposed Advertisement

Consultation – Potential Council Investment in Residential Subdivision Development

Council seeks feedback from the community on a proposal to invest a significant amount – perhaps in the order of \$___ - on the development of a new residential subdivision of around 50 new sections, in or around the Otorohanga township.

It is believed that there is currently an opportunity to increase the population of Otorohanga if additional housing was available, and that it would be appropriate for Council to taking a leading role in the provision of such housing by undertaking a residential subdivision.

Whilst attention is currently being focused on this development being a potential extension of the Westridge that links Thomson and Harper Avenues, there is not currently any commitment to it being at this location, and it a final decision on a location would only be made at a later stage.

It would be hoped that the costs of undertaking the subdivision could be recovered through the sale of the created sections, and that as such the development would be cost-neutral for the community.

A more detailed Statement of Proposal is available from Council on request.

It should be noted that at this stage the consultation being conducted relates to the Council funding of some type of subdivision, rather than the environmental impact of such a development at a particular location. Consultation regarding environmental matters would be conducted as part of a subsequent process to obtain Resource Consents.

Submissions in respect of the proposal can be made in writing, and should be addressed to:

The Chief Executive
Otorohanga District Council
PO Box 11
OTOROHANGA

Submissions must be received by Friday 28 October 2016.

ITEM 338 Sport Support Fund Allocation

**To: Mayor and Councillors
 Otorohanga District Council**

From: Chief Executive

Date: 20 September 2016

Relevant Community Outcomes

- Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Foster an involved and engaged Community
-

Executive Summary

It is proposed that applications are invited for a further round of funding under Council's Sport Support Fund, and that consideration is given to the recently established District Sport Committee making the decisions on the allocation of this funding.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that:

Applications be invited from local sports clubs for operational financial support under Council's Sport Support Fund for the period from 2016/17 to 2017/18.

Report Discussion

A letter has recently been received from a local sporting group expressing their interest in applying for funding from Council's Sport Support Fund.

An annual allocation of \$15,000 was previously established for this purpose, of which \$6,500 per year is now committed for the 2015/16 to 2017/18 financial year period.

The outstanding balance from the 2015/16 year was allocated to two sports club projects, but the primary purpose is to provide ongoing support for the operational activities of clubs that are facing ongoing financial challenges.

For the 2016/17 to 2017/18 years \$8,500 of the budgeted funding is currently unallocated, and it is suggested that applications be invited for the use of this funding for such operational purposes.

It is suggested that these applications would be invited for funding over a two year period, rather than three years as in the previous round. The reason for this is that it seems desirable to have a comprehensive review/renewal process for all allocations at a particular time in the future, rather than having staggered expiry dates that result in piecemeal decisions.

It is also suggested that consideration be given as to whether it would be appropriate for the recently established District Sport Committee to make the decisions on the allocation of this funding in response to the applications received, rather than having Council undertake this.

Dave Clibbery
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

ITEM 339 Civil Defence Emergency Planning Report For May To July 2016

To: **His Worship the Mayor & Councillors
Otorohanga District Council**

From: **Local Civil Defence Controller**

Date: **20 September 2016**

Relevant Community Outcomes

- The Otorohanga District is a safe place to live
 - Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Promote the local economy and opportunities for sustainable economic development
 - Manage the natural and physical environment in a sustainable manner
-

Executive Summary

To provide the quarterly update report on the Civil Defence Emergency Management activity for the period 1 May to 31 July 2016. This includes emergency management activities under the shared service arrangement between Waipa, Otorohanga and Waitomo District Councils and activities of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group including the Joint Committee.

Recommendation:

That the Civil Defence Emergency Planning report from Andrew Loe Local Civil Defence Controller and Martin Berryman Emergency Management Operations Manager for the period 1 May to 31 July 2016 be received.

Background

The Local Civil Defence Controller and Emergency Management Operations Manager will now provide a quarterly information report to Council on emergency management activities affecting the Western Waikato Emergency Operating Area (WWEOA) which includes Waipa, Otorohanga and Waitomo District Councils.

Report Discussion

During the reporting period the following significant civil defence emergency management activities were undertaken. Activities will be reported under the headings of the '4 Rs' which highlight the four main tenets of current emergency management planning.

Reduction

The CDEM Operations Manager attended a National CDEM Resilience Conference in Wellington and the Waikato Region Hazards forum in June. In both of these forums the underlying message was that more work needs to be undertaken both at the national and regional level, in identifying Natural Hazards and Risks to communities. These outcomes will help to drive Reduction initiatives in all areas.

Staff from the Regional Hazard Forum are progressively working through the region to identify the key hazards to enable us to adequately communicate this information to local territorial authorities and to support communities in their Community Response Planning processes.

Readiness

Training and exercises

Annual programmed training and exercises completed

The last of the annual Civil Defence Emergency Operating Centre (EOC) training and exercise activities were completed this quarter. Across the three Councils the following training has been undertaken:

Three Foundation Training Courses (4hrs) for new and existing staff.

One Civil Defence Exercise at each Council EOC – Otorohanga exercise was held on 18 April and I attended the Waitomo exercise on 29 June as the acting Local Controller.

Welfare

Establishment of a Civil Defence Centre training

During the three exercises held across the Western Waikato Area two Civil Defence Centres for welfare purposes were simultaneously designated in each location requiring staff to set up each and deploy resources to operate these. This activity highlighted the fact that each council requires more staff trained in the registration process and the basic operation of a Civil Defence Centre (Welfare Centre). Physical resources have and are progressively being acquired.

Civil Defence Centre identification program (Welfare)

The Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group (CDEM), using local civil defence professionals, have undertaken a project to identify region-wide local facilities that may have the resources to support the local community in a civil defence emergency. A review of the appropriate civil defence signage to identify the welfare facility is also being undertaken. This program has commenced capturing the relevant information on the location of the existing welfare centres within the three Council's urban and rural districts.

This information will be incorporated into the 'Intramaps' mapping system, being used within each of the Councils. Our GIS Officer Trevor Penwarden has established a layer within 'Intramaps' so that information i.e. key infrastructure, locations, places of significance relevant for the management of an event, can be displayed or retrieved and assist the Local Controller and EOC team to make informed decisions. These activities are continuing and the data layer will require regular updating to ensure the information remains current.

Local Marae preparedness strategy

No further activity on this matter has occurred in this quarter.

New Civil Defence coordinator role

It was identified by the WWEOA Shared Service committee that due to the future workload to be met by the three councils in order to be operationally ready there was a need to employ an additional coordinator to assist the one person allocated across the three councils.

A job description has been drawn up and sized and funding allocated, however this recruitment has been placed on hold pending the outcome of the discussions on changes to the management of the WWEOA.

Community response plans

Due to Training and Civil Defence Centre assessment being undertaken no further action has occurred with Community Response Plans.

National Exercise Tangaroa

The local and regional planning for this exercise is well under way. A workshop in Otorohanga was held in July with Council's infrastructure and civil defence staff and staff from St John, Police, NZ Fire Service and the Waikato District Health Board. The potential impact of exercise scenario on our District was discussed and all participants gained insights into the functions and responses planned by the various organisations present.

This information will be used to assist in planning for the National Emergency Operating Centre activation exercise (Day 1) and for two other days which are planned as table top exercises.

Waitomo District Emergency Operating Centre at Te Kuiti will be activated on Day 1 (8am-4pm 31 Aug). The EOC will be resourced from staff across the three Councils who will man the centre in two shifts. The Exercise scenario is to test a national response to a severe (Richter scale 8) earthquake in the Kermadec Trench which sends a powerful tsunami to the east coast of NZ.

Response

Other than monitoring Local Severe Weather Warning there have been no emergency situations requiring Civil Defence resources or personnel.

Recovery

Three Recovery Plans and the necessary processes have been prepared as the basis of a Council Recovery Plan. These have been placed into each Council's system for progression towards approval and adoption. Once completed and approved by the respective Councils it will become the basis for the Recovery Manager to commence consultation with the various community representatives.

The position of Recovery Manager is being reviewed in two of the three councils at present.

Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee

The Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee meeting was held on 13 June 2016. Minutes of the meeting are attached to this report.

The next meeting of the Joint Committee is scheduled for 5 September 2016.

Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan

The proposed Waikato CDEM Group Emergency Management Plan 2016-2020 has been reviewed and discussed at all levels of interested stakeholders.

The plan was released for public consultation mid-June with submissions closing 20 July.

A hearing and deliberations on the six submissions received was held on 8 August. No submitters asked to speak to the hearing. The final draft of the new Group Plan will be presented to the Joint Committee for adoption on 5 September.

Andrew Loe

LOCAL CIVIL DEFENCE CONTROLLER

Martin Berryman

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS MANAGER

Appendix 1: Minutes of the last meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee

WAIKATO CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, held in the Council Chambers, Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East at 1.00pm on 13 June 2016.

MEMBERS: Waikato Regional Council

Cr Hugh Vercoe

Hamilton City Council Representative

Cr Leo Tooman

Hauraki District Council Representative

Mayor John Tregidga

Matamata Piako District Council Representative

Cr Brian Hunter

Otorohanga District Council Representative

Cr Robert Prescott

South Waikato District Council Representative

Cr Thomas Lee

Thames Coromandel District Council Representative

Cr Peter French

Waikato District Council Representative

Cr Jacqui Church

Waipa District Council Representative

Cr Judy Bannon

Waitomo District Council Representative

Cr Allan Goddard

IN ATTENDANCE Hauraki District Council Representative

Cr Max McLean

STAFF: CEG Chair (Langley Cavers), Group Controller (Lee Hazelwood), Team Leader GEMO (Greg Ryan), Democracy Advisor (Jennie Cox)

APOLOGIES Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management

Suzanne Vowles

Taupo District Council Representative

Cr Anna Park /1st alt Cr Kirsty Trueman /alt Mayor David Trewavas
Accepted

Confirmation of Agenda

(Agenda Item 1)

Mayor Tregidga moved/Cr Hunter seconded

CD16/10 THAT the agenda of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group of 13 June 2016 as circulated be confirmed as the business for the meeting. The motion was put and carried (CD16/10)

Report of Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 13 June 2016 p2

Disclosures of Interest

(Agenda Item 2)

There were no disclosures of interest

SCHEDULE A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Minutes of Previous Meeting

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 3) Docs # 3712687

Cr Church moved/Cr Tooman seconded

CD16/11

THAT the Minutes of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee meeting of 7 March 2016 be received and approved as a true and correct record.

The motion was put and carried (CD16/11)

Prior to commencing the agenda the Chair acknowledged there were a number of staff to be commended following recent recognition of their service to CDEM.

Lee Hazelwood – for his contribution to CDEM as acknowledged by him being awarded a Silver Ministerial CDEM award. The Chair noted that Lee could be credited with building a quality team that has now become a benchmark for other regions.

Sharon Cousins-O'Donnell – who had left the organisation – for her contribution over the past four years as the Waikato CDEM Group Training and Exercise Coordinator. The Chair noted that Sharon received praise for her work across groups and was expressly thanked by the Chair.

Matthew Pryor – who would be leaving – for his contribution over the past year as the Waikato CDEM Group Community Resilience Coordinator. The Chair thanked Matthew for his work and advised his focus on social marketing had boosted the profile of the Waikato CDEM to a national level.

Waikato CDEM Group Plan

File: 33 10 01 (Agenda Item 4) Doc # 6522416, 6536068

The report provided the Joint Committee with an overview of the proposed Waikato CDEM Group Plan, and request approval to proceed to the public consultation stage of the project. The Team Leader GEMO (Greg Ryan) and Group Controller (Lee Hazelwood) were present to take members through the plan and respond to any queries.

During questions, answers and related discussion, the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

Report of Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 13 June 2016 p3

- Within Section 8 (Partnerships), the map provided for the St John was not correct in the North, and the Fire Service Region 2 extended through to Gisborne. Members were advised the maps would be reviewed and updated following the meeting and prior to going to public consultation.

- Within Section 4 (Resilience) – a member noted a disconnect in the Statistics and Goals when compared with the Community Resilience plans. Members were advised that there would be explanatory notes included within the Introduction that would expand on the information that the graphic provided and explained what the tool was actually a measure of (Civil Defence readiness rather than Community resilience).

- Members noted that Section 5 related to organisational readiness and Section 3 (Reduction) would acknowledge the work that had been done.

- On page 50, point 3.5.3 – a definition was requested to determine what would be an acceptable risk by a Territorial Authority and by the public. This was sought as a way to bridge the gap between the two expectations.

On Page 41 and Page 42 it was highlighted that the perception of the colour charts would be a risk to any one with colour blindness. Staff advised that they would look at the charts as part of the public consultation process.

- Members queried why drought was considered a “Very High” risk for Civil Defence. Members were advised that Civil Defence would be involved in the consequences of a drought particularly welfare of those in the community affected by a drought.

- Within the “Moderate” risks Terrorism was considered to be more likely in the realm of eco terrorism that would impact on the region, and the region’s economy rather than international terrorism that may have more of a national impact. Should this change, the scenario that is used to evaluate terrorism risk would change, possibly resulting in a higher risk assessment. It was noted that risk is not static and would be re-evaluated throughout the five-year cycle of the plan.

- Waikato’s CDEM staff provided support for the Regional Council’s response to the Velvetleaf incursion.

- Concern was noted that Coastal erosion and global warming were not higher on the list of risks. Members were advised that the risk was based on a 100 year event that was becoming more and more frequent. The purpose of the table was to identify risks for Civil Defence and ensure the level of response was appropriate.

- Members acknowledged the amount of work and staff time taken to get the Group Plan Review to this point. Staff were thanked for their efforts.

- Members were provided with the dates for Public consultation, Hearings and Deliberations. Following the meeting of the Joint Committee in September 2016, to make the final decisions on the plan, the Plan would be released for Ministerial Approval and was expected to be returned for Committee approval at the meeting in November. Members were advised that the Committee was not discharged at the end of the triennium and the members would remain until membership of the Committee was determined by each of the member Councils.

- Members sought consideration to hold the Hearing and Deliberations on the same day if possible. Members were advised it would depend on the number of submissions and people seeking to be heard within the hearings but staff would look in to the options available.

Report of Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 13 June 2016 p4

Cr French moved/Cr Church seconded

RESOLVED

CD16/12 THAT the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee:

(a) ...receive this report “*Waikato CDEM Group Plan review*” (Doc # 6522416, dated 1 June 2016) for information.

(b) ...approve the proposed *Waikato CDEM Group Plan* (Doc # 6536068) for public consultation.

The motion was put and carried (CD16/12)

SCHEDULE B: (FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL)

GECC Accommodation

File: 30 10 01 (Agenda Item 5) Doc # 6307585

The report provided the Joint Committee with an update regarding the review of the GECC accommodation arrangements, along with requesting a recommendation regarding the options currently available. The Team Leader GEMO (Greg Ryan) and Group Controller (Lee Hazelwood) were present to take members through the report and respond to any queries. During questions, answers and related discussion, the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

- Members were advised that an All Hazards Centre with either Police or the NZ Fire Service was not in the immediate future for either organisation. The rental agreement was due to expire on 150 Victoria Street, Hamilton and the GEMO and Waikato Regional Council staff would be moving from the premises.
- The GEMO would initially relocate to the Deloitte building with other Waikato Regional Council staff, however it was considered impractical to remain at that location as it was not an Importance Level 4 (IL4) building nor did it support the desired level of integrated response.
- The Bryant Trust were building a building for Genesis Energy that would provide an IL4 space for the GEMO and provide an opportunity to further build on the stakeholder relationship held with Genesis. The building was occurring in central Hamilton on Ward Street, opposite Seddon Park.
- Members agreed that the six year term would provide for further discussions with either Police or the NZ Fire Services to continue around an All Hazards Centre, and should that still not be an option then a right of renewal for a further six years would provide certainty for GEMO staff.
- The recommendation of the Committee would be presented to Waikato Regional Council at the Council meeting on 30 June 2016.

Report of Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 13 June 2016 p5

Cr Vercoe moved/Mayor Tregidga seconded

RESOLVED

CD16/13 THAT the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee:

(a) ...receive this report “*GECC accommodation review*” (Doc # 6307585, dated 7 June

2016) for information.

(b) ...recommend to the Waikato Regional Council that Option 1 (establish the GECC at the new Genesis Energy building for a 6 year term with a right of renewal for a further 6 years) be adopted in order to address the current GECC accommodation issues.

The motion was put and carried (CD16/13)

SCHEDULE A: (UNDER DELEGATION FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL)

Summarised CEG Minutes

File: 33 10 01 (Agenda Item 6) Doc # 6517819

The report provided the Joint Committee with a summary of the matters raised and discussed at the last Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) meeting on 20 May 2016. The CEG Chair (Langley Cavers) advised members of a review that was occurring of the CEG regarding effective operation.

Cr Hunter moved/Cr Lee seconded

RESOLVED

CD16/14 THAT the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee:

(a) ...receive this report “*Summarised CEG minutes*” (Doc # 6517819, dated 1 June 2016) for information.

The motion was put and carried (CD16/14)

GEMO Report

File: 33 10 01 (Agenda Item 7) Doc # 6521960

The report provided a consolidated update on the work the Group Emergency Management Office (GEMO) is undertaking, including key projects and any additional matters for Joint Committee attention. During questions, answers and related discussion, the Committee raised or noted the following matters:

- Members were advised of a new Hazards application that was free and for use on smart phones. The GEMO would be ensuring there was promotion of the application to the public.
- The area of interest is determined by the user as a radius from a point on a map. Parameters could also be set by the user to determine what notifications would be received.
- There would be tutorials being rolled out through social media.
- As an ongoing item introducing members of the GEMO to the Joint Committee, Team Leader GEMO (Greg Ryan) provided his background to members.

Report of Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 13 June 2016 p6

Cr Bannon moved/Cr Goddard seconded

RESOLVED

CD16/15 THAT the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee:

(a) ...receive this report “*GEMO report*” (Doc # 6521960, dated 1 June 2016) for information.

The motion was put and carried (CD16/15)

MCDEM Report

File: 33 10 01 (Agenda Item 8) Doc # 6521969

Due to the absence of Suzanne Vowles of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management, the report was not received.

Items for Next meeting

File: 03 04 18 (Agenda Item 9)

The report provided for discussion on items for inclusion at the next meeting on 5 September 2016.

- Waikato CDEM Group Plan (approval for ministerial feedback).

- Informal barbecue or gathering for the members of the Joint Committee suggested to follow the final meeting of the triennium.

Meeting closed at 2.45pm

Doc # 7896058

Joint Committee minutes 16.11.2016.

**ITEM 340 Annual Report To The Alcohol Regulatory And
Licensing Authority 2015-16**

**To: His Worship the Mayor and Councillors
Otorohanga District Council**

From: Environmental Services Manager

Date: 20 September 2016

Relevant Community Outcomes

- The Otorohanga District is a safe place to live
 - Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Promote the local economy and opportunities for sustainable economic development
 - Manage the natural and physical environment in a sustainable manner
-

Executive Summary

The Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority covering the financial year 2015/16 is tabled for Councils information.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that:

The Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority 2015/16 be received.

A Loe

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES MANAGER

Attachment – Annual Report to ARLA

2016 ANNUAL REPORT TO ALCOHOL REGULATORY AND LICENSING AUTHORITY

To: The Secretary of the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority
From: Andrew Loe, for Secretary Otorohanga District Licensing Committee
Subject: **ANNUAL REPORT TO THE ALCOHOL REGULATORY AND LICENSING
AUTHORITY 2015/16**
Date: 18 August 2016

1 OVERVIEW OF THE OTOROHANGA DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE

The Otorohanga District Licensing Committee is largely unchanged from that appointed in November 2013, being:

- Mrs D Sharpe Commissioner/Chairperson
- Mr R Johnson Deputy Chair (serving Councillor)
- Mr R Murphy Member
- Ms P Davies Member
- Mr G Whittaker Member

Dr B McEwan resigned from the District Licensing Committee during the year but remains active with other Committees.

The Council staff supporting the DLC also remain largely unchanged, and have had delegations approved under the new Act. They are:

- Mr D Clibbery Council Chief Executive/DLC Secretary
- Mr A Loe Environmental Services Manager
- Mr K Tutty Environmental Services Team Leader/ Delegated
Secretary (for Waipa District)
- Mrs M Fernandez Licensing Inspector/Environmental Health Officer
(Otorohanga/Otorohanga)

Karen Murray is the Environmental Services administrator for alcohol regulatory and licencing matters.

The Otorohanga District Licensing Committee appointments were for three years in order to align with the local government election cycle. These appointments will be reviewed in November this year. Should vacancies arise through current members standing down, these will be advertised and recommendations for appointments made to Council.

2 DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE WORKLOAD

The hearing workload of the District Licensing Committee has continued to be light, with no matters relating to Otorohanga required to be heard by the Committee. The anticipated increase in opposition from the public and agencies based on the new criteria has not eventuated.

The DLC has met to determine six temporary authority applications. Temporary authority applications are circulated to the committee by e-mail and the committee then determines whether a teleconference or physical meeting is required.

There have been no substantiated complaints regarding the operation of individual licensed premises. The Police have not advised Council of any instance where it has been necessary to issue an alcohol infringement notice within Otorohanga District.

The overall number of licences in force has fallen by two due to the sale and closure of two adjoining businesses. The Otorohanga Local Alcohol Policy does not propose a cap on any type of licence and it is anticipated the new owners will be applying for a licence(s) when their development of the new premises is completed.

The statistics of applications considered by the District Licensing Agency are summarised on page 3. They show the total number of applications on-par with previous periods.

The expanded criteria of the Act have seen the amount of time devoted to licensing activities increase, particularly in association with special licences. Council will need to assess future demand closely and also the demand of other legislation such as the Food Act 2014 which recently came into force.

Currently the application for the local supermarket's off-licence renewal is being held by the District Licensing Committee due to opposition from the Medical officer of Health in relation to single-alcohol areas. This is being held pursuant to advice from ARLA, and awaiting the outcome of matters under appeal.

3 DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE INITIATIVES

From an administrative perspective work has continued to amend and simplify forms to assist both applicants and staff, such as creating separate and shorter forms for on-site and off-site special licences.

Effort has also continued to ensure applications arrive on time, and a number of applicants, particularly clubs, have had their special licence applications refused due to late filing times. This has been reiterated to applicants at every opportunity, including in pre-application information, press releases and direct communication.

Now that the implementation of the new Act has been completed and the Local Alcohol Policy is in force, regular liaison meetings with other agencies have resumed.

The District Licensing Committee has been proactive, making recommendations to the Secretary where issues arise with process or forms. For example, a recent change is the amendment of the wording where conviction information is requested, to clarify that excess breath alcohol and related offences are not “traffic offences” and must be declared.

4 LOCAL ALCOHOL POLICY

As previously reported the Otorohanga District Council has made good progress in adoption of a Local Alcohol Policy (LAP). All appeals have been dealt with and the Council has obtained permission from the Authority for minor amendments to the provisional policy.

The final adoption and notification of the policy has fallen outside of this reporting period and will be covered in more detail in 2017. Despite the extended appeals process, the final version and practical application of the LAP is little-changed from the first draft. The maximum trading hours and other criteria signal a status-quo in many respects and most of the provisions of the LAP apply to new premises being licensed for the first time.

5 CURRENT LEGISLATION

In its last report the Otorohanga District Council raised concerns with the need to convene a meeting of the DLC in one form or another for unopposed temporary authorities, which are often needed at short notice. This remains the case. Efficiencies could be achieved if these matters were dealt with ‘on the papers’ with Committee members being allowed to confer by phone or email if necessary.

It was also highlighted that the threshold of 400 patrons between “large” and “small” events for special licences was problematic, and Council through staff delegations regularly exercise the ability to reduce events by one fee category in an effort to balance this. This continues to be the case.

The inclusion of the term “sell or supply” in section 22 relating to the need for special licences continues to cause confusion. This section uses the term “supply”, but supply without a licence is not an offence. This Council has continued with its ‘no sale – no licence’ approach, reading the meaning as sell *and* supply, with the exception of events within restricted alcohol areas under the Alcohol Control Bylaw.

6 ENFORCEMENT AND INSPECTIONS

The Otorohanga District Liquor Control Bylaw 2007 places a seasonal restriction over the Kawhia Community during the peak Christmas holiday season. The bylaw bans the consumption of alcohol on roads, reserves and public places. This is the third year since the period of the ban was extended from New Years Day until after Waitangi Day. As in previous years the Police did not report any instances of drunkenness or disorder. The feedback from the community confirmed the effectiveness of the bylaw.

Licensed premises continue to be inspected, primarily by the Police, at random and without notice. No enforcement action on the Council's behalf has resulted from these visits. The Council notes the encouragement to be more active in terms of the monitoring and enforcement of licensed premises. All premises receive at least one annual inspection with some business being visited multiple times depending on the Inspectors risk assessment. This is a similar number as last year indicating a consistent level of monitoring.

An effort has been made to ensure that a good proportion of these visits are after-hours when premises are operating. Events operating under special licences also continue to be a focus, with joint inspections by the Inspector and Police, or Medical Officer of Health when necessary. During the year two controlled purchase operations were conducted in the District. It is pleasing to report there were no sales to the minors attempting to purchase alcohol.

7 LIAISON WITH OTHER AGENCY GROUPS

The Otorohanga District is served by four Police stations (Te Kuiti, Otorohanga and Te Awamutu and Kawhia (Single Officer)). Council continues to experience a very good working relationship with Police, though there has been some variability in terms of the staff reporting on licence applications, meaning points of contact are not always clear. It is accepted that this is due to routine operational issues.

Council staff, Police, NZ Fire Service, and Public Health staff meet quarterly to discuss alcohol licensing issues. An Alcohol Collaboration Group has been formed covering the three Districts served by the combined Licencing Committee. Members of the group share hosting of the quarterly meeting, agendas are prepared and minutes kept for each meeting.

Inspectors continue to benefit from a very active NZ Institute of Liquor Licensing Inspectors both through its annual conference and e-mail forum.

The amount of communication with the District Health Board has increased with the need to consult with them in respect to special licences and off-licences which was not previously the case. Meetings have occurred to streamline processes around special licenses in particular.

Otorohanga District Council is in a shared services agreement with Waipa District Council who provide Licensing Inspector services to Otorohanga District and Waitomo District.

8 OTHER MATTERS

The Authority's direction that a replacement licence with a new licence number be issued each time a licence is renewed has continued to be applied, but as this also contains the text-box detailing the new expiry date of the licence, it serves to render the renewal notice obsolete.

Subject to the requirements of the Act relating to payment of fees and to the provisions of the Act relating to the suspension and cancellation of licenses the licence expires on: **The 4th day of July 2018**
NOTE: This licence replaces licence number 16/ON/012/2014 issued by Otorohanga District Licensing Committee

As raised previously this causes an issue where the renewal notice then refers to the new licence number and that there are "no changes" to the conditions on that licence (which there would not be, as the renewal notice is then referring to a replacement licence that has already captured any amended conditions).

A direction that a replacement licence which contains that text-box shall be considered as a reminder notice in terms of section 135 would avoid this duplication.

The District Licensing Committee and its staff would also appreciate receiving copies of notices of hearings and decisions of the Authority in relation to action against managers or premises within the District. At present it does not appear that District Licensing Committees/Inspectors are receiving these documents unless they are party to the applications. The District Licensing Committee and Inspectors have been unaware of some hearings and decisions until informed by the Police. This creates issues for District Licensing Committees as one of the matters required to determine a premises' risk category is whether it has been subject to enforcement applications. The monthly summary of Authority decisions is however, useful.

9 CONCLUSUON

As always the District Licensing Agency wishes to acknowledge the work of the Authority, the Secretary, case managers, research officers and other support staff who assist in a range of capacities. This is much appreciated.

A Loe

For SECRETARY DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE

Appendix 2

Statistical information for the year ending 30 June 2015
for Otorohanga District Licensing Committee

Application type	# received in fee category VERY LOW	# received in fee category LOW	# received in fee category MEDIUM	# received in fee category HIGH	# received in fee category VERY HIGH
On-licence new			1		
On-licence variation					
On-licence renewal	1	1	2		
Off-licence new			1		
Off-licence variation					
Off-licence renewal					
Club licence new					
Club licence variation					
Club licence renewal	2				
Total number	3	1	4		
Total Fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)	\$51.75	\$34.50	\$207.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Annual fees for existing licences received:

Licence Type	# received in fee category VERY LOW	# received in fee category LOW	# received in fee category MEDIUM	# received in fee category HIGH	# received in fee category VERY HIGH
On-licence	2	1	6		
Off-licence			4		
Club licence	5		2		
Total number	7	1	12		
Total Fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)	120.75	34.50	621.00		

Managers certificate applications received

	Number received
Manager's certificate new	7
Manager's certificate renewal	14
Total number	21
Total Fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)	\$603.75

Special licence applications received

	Number received in category:	Number received in category:	Number received in category:
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Special licence	0	12	20
Temporary authority		1	
Permanent club charter payments		0	

Total paid to ARLA	\$1673.25
---------------------------	------------------

Appendix 3

Annual return year ending 30 June 2016

Application type	# received in fee category VERY LOW	# received in fee category LOW	# received in fee category MEDIUM	# received in fee category HIGH	# received in fee category VERY HIGH
On-licence new		1	1		
On-licence variation					
On-licence renewal			2		
Off-licence new		1			
Off-licence variation					
Off-licence renewal			2		
Club licence new					
Club licence variation					
Club licence renewal	4	2	1		
Total number	4	4	6		
Total Fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)	\$69.00	\$138.00	\$310.50	\$0.00	\$0.00

Annual fees for existing licences received:

Licence Type	# received in fee category VERY LOW	# received in fee category LOW	# received in fee category MEDIUM	# received in fee category HIGH	# received in fee category VERY HIGH
On-licence		1	5		
Off-licence		1	4	1	
Club licence	7	2	1		
Total number	7	4	10	1	
Total Fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)	\$120.75	\$138.00	\$517.50	\$86.25	\$0.00

Managers certificate applications received

	Number received
Manager's certificate new	12
Manager's certificate renewal	11
Total number	23
Total Fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)	\$661.25

Special licence applications received

	Number received in category:	Number received in category:	Number received in category:
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Special licence	1	10	27
Temporary authority		6	
Permanent club charter payments		0	
Total paid to ARLA			\$2041.25

Appendix 4

Current Licences

MANAGERS CERTIFICATES

MC0199 Janice Alecia Anderson
 MC0234 Harmandeep Singh Bamrah
 MC0267 Aleesha Aspery
 MC0269 Tracey Cashmore
 MC0080 Troy Richard Leather
 MC0235 Rangimarie Lei Hepi
 MC0268 Kathryn Neal
 MC0146 Philippa Rogers
 MC0270 Rohini Lakhera
 MC0271 Ernest Foster
 MC0273 Lydia Parnell
 MC0274 Janet Clark
 MC0240 Haylee Aroha Trangmar
 MC0195 Jenna Andrea Connors
 MC0241 Adele Toni Mailman
 MC0150 Anne Marie Teki
 MC0095 Christine Phyllis Crake
 MC0243 Mandeep Singh
 MC0189 Judith Geraldine Johns
 MC0275 Pauline Tane
 MC0249 Tracey Joanne Rowe
 MC0276 Tyrone Tane
 MC0250 A D Pearson

MC0260 E K Te Kanawa
MC0157 Louise Josphiene Tock
MC0158 Shirley Esme Elsie Gwatkin
MC0259 J K Cresswell
MC0252 Charlotte Bolger
MC0253 Tammy Hammersley
MC0201 Annie Ani-Wai Tapara
MC0039 Rosalie Rauora Wanden
MC0205 Wendy Anne Piggales
MC0054 Brenda Jean Rogers
MC0162 Janna Leigh Gray
MC0171 Joanne Louise Fox
MC0210 David Leslie Stewart Barnett
MC0256 N T Tamani
MC0057 Nancy Alona Porima
MC0177 Mereira Regina Richards
MC0257 Sandra Janet Ashley
MC0203 Mihi Te Ra Carr
MC0272 Angrej Singh
MC0222 Grant Joseph Scott
MC0223 Douglas Bruce Smith
MC0277 Paramjit Singh
MC0106 Kenneth Charles Scott
MC0265 Awhina Jahlene Hesketh
MC0279 Michele Lorraine Williams
MC0280 Ricky Matara
MC0281 Pauline Te Wao
MC0185 Lesley Ellen Mueller
MC0266 Navkiran Kaur
MC0231 Doris Slade
MC0282 Gurmeet Singh
MC0022 Sandra Ann Butler

CLUB LICENCES

CL0013 Kio Kio United Rugby Sports Club
CL0002 Kawhia Golf Club Inc
CL0014 Tigers Rugby Football Club
CL0015 Otorohanga Domain Sports Assn
CL0007 Otorohanga Club Inc
CL0006 Otorohanga Bowling Club
CL0010 Otorohanga Sports Club
CL0011 Oparau Community and District Club Inc
CL0003 Kawhia Sports Club Incorporated
CL0001 Kawhia Boating & Angling Club Inc

ON LICENCES

ON027 The Old Hall Ltd
ON028 Castle 91
ON009 The Thirsty Weta
ON005 Oparau Roadhouse
ON022 Kawhia Hotel 2010 Limited
ON025 Lavish
ON026 Thai Aroma

OFF LICENCES

OF0013 Countdown - General Distributors
OF0028 Seven Stars Ltd
OF0029 J & J Clark Ltd
OF0014 W B & B J Rodgers Ltd
OF0024 Kawhia Hotel 2010 Limited
OF0026 Lavish
OF0025 KB 2010 Limited

ITEM 341 ANNUAL REPORT ON DOG CONTROL POLICY AND PRACTICES
To: His Worship the Mayor and Councillors
Otorohanga District Council
From: Environmental Services Manager
Date: 20 September 2016

Relevant Community Outcomes

- The Otorohanga District is a safe place to live
 - Ensure services and facilities meet the needs of the Community
 - Manage the natural and physical environment in a sustainable manner
-

Executive Summary

The Annual Report to the Department of Internal Affairs on Dog Control Policy and Practices for the financial year 2015/16 is tabled for Councils information.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that:

The Annual Report on Dog Control Policy and Practices be received.

A Loe

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES MANAGER

Attachment – Annual Report on Dog Control Policy and Practices

Otorohanga District Council

Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996: Annual Report on Dog Control Policy and Practices - 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016

1. Overview

The number of dog owners and dogs has remained at a constant level over recent years. As of 30 June 2016 there were 1296 owners and 2355 registered dogs in Otorohanga District. Of these totals 325 urban owners have 407 registered dogs.

Otorohanga District Council contracts its dog control duties to Otorohanga District Animal Control Services. There is one full time warranted Dog Control Officer and Poundkeeper. The contractor has part time staff on call to provide cover or extra staffing when required.

During the year the contract for Animal and Dog Control services was awarded to a new contractor. The previous contractor ceased operations in December 2015 and the new service provider commenced duties on 1 April 2016. During the interim period Council staff with dog and animal control experience were appointed as dog control officer and poundkeeper on an temporary basis. The new contractor has extensive experience in animal control and enforcement roles.

Council has one dog pound located in Otorohanga.

2. Enforcement Practices

The Dog Control Officer provides monthly reports on dog control matters. During the year the animal control contractors reported receiving and responding to 160 complaints on dog control matters. This total does not cover the entire year due to the change in contractors and the interim period when Council staff were appointed to the role. A detailed breakdown of these complaints is not available.

The Council call centre logged 96 complaints about dogs. These complaints are listed by type in Part 2 of this report. Some of these complaints will also have been included in the total number of complaints that the contractors received.

Complaints cover a wide range of issues. Many relate to stray or wandering dogs that have been secured and require pick up. Urban area calls include dogs roaming, barking dogs and animal welfare matters. Rural owners generally report on wandering dogs and an occasional incident involving stock worrying. Any reports of dogs acting in a threatening or aggressive manner are responded to immediately as required by the conditions of the contract.

During the year 28 infringement notices were issued. Of these notices 18 were issued for failing to register in the months following the annual dog registration in July, the balance being for other breaches of the Act such as failing to keep a dog under control. No prosecutions were taken by Council for breaches of the Dog Control Act.

3. Dogs Prohibited, Leash only and Exercise Areas

The main street of Otorohanga, the harbour foreshore and the Jervois St playground, both in Kawhia are designated as prohibited areas in the Otorohanga District Dog Control Policy.

Designated dog exercise areas are located on a section of Waipa River flood bank in the middle of Otorohanga and along the beach from Kawhia to Aotea in the morning and the evening. At all other times and during public holidays the beach area is a leash control area. The Otorohanga exercise area is becoming increasingly popular and additional directional signs have been installed.

All other public spaces in the District are deemed to be leash control areas.

4. Dog Registration Fees.

The following dog control fees were approved by Council for the 2015-2016 financial year. There was no increase to the fees set the previous year.

<i>Urban Dogs</i>	<i>\$124 per dog</i>
<i>Urban Dogs - Neutered</i>	<i>\$ 98 per dog</i>
<i>Urban Dogs - Special Owner Scheme</i>	<i>\$ 98 per dog</i>
<i>Urban Dogs - Neutered and Special Owner Scheme</i>	<i>\$ 54 per dog</i>
<i>Rural Dogs</i>	<i>\$ 98 per dog</i>
<i>Rural Dogs - Special Owner Scheme</i>	<i>\$ 54 per dog</i>

5. Dog Education and Dog Awareness

There are no dog training providers in the District. An initiative introduced by the new contractor has seen the creation of a pool of surplus dog kennels which are provided at no charge to approved owners. Many barking and roaming dog complaints have a lack of suitable housing for the dog as a key factor. This programme has seen positive feedback for Councils Dog Control Officer and in conjunction with the efforts of the Waitomo District Dog Control Officer some 16 kennels have so far been placed in both communities.

6. Disqualified and Probationary Owners

There are no probationary owners or people who have been disqualified from owning a dog living in the District.

7. Menacing and dangerous dogs.

At the end of the year there were 38 menacing dogs and no dangerous dogs registered in the District. These dogs have 31 owners and all properties where menacing dogs are kept are inspected by the Dog Control Officer to ensure fencing is adequate to contain the dogs. 28 menacing dogs are kept on properties within the urban area. There has been a small increase in the number of menacing dogs. In another programme to promote compliance the new Dog Control Officer is providing microchipping at a reduced rate to owners whose dogs have been classified as menacing. Microchipping a dog can impose a significant financial burden and compliance barrier. This programme has also been extended to outlying areas such as Kawhia where the cost of transporting a dog to town for microchipping is a further disincentive to complying with the provisions of the Dog Control Act. In some instances muzzles are provided to the owners of menacing dogs to reinforce the message that extra responsibilities are attached to owning classified dogs.

During the year Council declined an objection against classification from a couple who live in Otorohanga and own two dogs that were classified as menacing by behaviour by the Dog Control Officer.

8. Other information.

Council places a high priority on controlling dogs roaming around urban areas in Otorohanga and Kawhia. The dog control contract specifies a minimum number of street patrols to be conducted every month. During the year the Dog Control Officers logged 31 night time patrols and 301 day time patrols in addition to their normal duties.

Andrew Loe
Environmental Services Manager

Part 2 Statistical information

	At 30 June 2015	For period 1 July 15 to 30 June 2016	Comments
Total number of registered dogs	2349	2357	
Number of urban dogs	403	407	
Total number of dog owners	1283	1296	
Number of urban owners	303	325	
Probationary owners	Nil	Nil	
Disqualified owners	One	Nil	Left District
Dangerous dogs	Nil	Nil	
Menacing dogs	33	38	
i) s33A(1)(b)(I) By breed	18	20	
ii) s33C(1) By behaviour	15	18	
Total number of infringement notices	27	28	
Total number of complaints received by Animal Control contractor	229	160	Due to change of contractor total is only for 7 months
Total number of complaints received by Council call centre	72	96	
By Category			
Roaming	45	36	
Barking	23	24	
Other	4	9	
Total number of Prosecutions	Nil	Nil	

ITEM 342 ODC Matters Referred From 19 July 2016

**To: His Worship the Mayor & Councillors
Otorohanga District Council**

From: Governance Supervisor

Date: 20 September 2016

Executive Summary

HIS WORSHIP

20 October 2015

To follow up on the suggestion for a future Council meeting to be held on a local Marae in the District

CR PHILLIPS

17 May 2016

To ascertain from the Kio Kio Hall Committee how active they are in particular, the demand for the use of the Hall.

CR KLOS

16 Aug 2016

Investigation into the installation of Toilets at Waipapa Reserve.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES MANAGER

19 July 2016

To extend an invitation to Kevin Smith of the Waikeria Prison to attend a Council meeting to speak to members on matters relating to the Prison.

OTOROHANGA COMMUNITY BOARD

19 July 2016

To consider a suggestion from Councillor Phillips that coin operated / free dumping stations be installed on Tourist routes around the Community to cater for Caravans and Campers.

CA Tutty

GOVERNANCE SUPERVISOR

GENERAL