

**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
held in the Council Chambers, 15 Seymour Street, Blenheim on  
THURSDAY, 12 JUNE 2014 commencing at 1.00 pm.**

**Present**

Councillors P J S Jerram (Chairperson), J A Arbuckle, G S Barsanti, C J Brooks, D D Oddie, L M Shenfield, Mayor Sowman, Mr E R Beech (Rural representative) and Mr R Smith (Iwi representative).

**In Attendance**

Councillors J L Andrews, B G Dawson, G I T Evans, T E Hook and J C Leggett, Mr H R Versteegh (Manager, Regulatory Department), and Kathy Payne (Committee Secretary).

**Apology**

An apology for non-attendance from Councillor T M Sloan was received and sustained.

**R.13/14.452 Confirmation of Sub-Committee Business**

**Cirs Arbuckle/Barsanti:**

**That the following approvals granted by the Swimming Pools Sub-Committee acting under delegated authority (Regulatory Committee Minute (R.13/14.166) be received and the recommendations adopted:**

- **M Elston – 34 Beaver Road, Blenheim - exemption for doors opening into pool area (exemption pursuant to section 6 of the Fencing of Swimming Pools Act 1987).**
- **A Bahlsen – 157 Lindens Road, Koromiko - exemption to install an Infinity Safety Pool cover in lieu of a fence (exemption pursuant to section 6 of the Fencing of Swimming Pools Act 1987).**

**Carried**

ATTENDANCE: Mr A Johnson, Council's Environmental Science & Monitoring Manager, was present for the following item.

**R.13/14.453 Wheel of Water Research Programme – Wairau  
Valley Case Study 2013 E375-000-001**

The background on the Wheel of Water programme was outlined in the report to the Committee.

Mr Andrew Fenemor of Landcare Research attended the meeting to present the findings of the Wheel of Water research programme. He advised that the Wheel of Water is a 3-year government funded research programme to assist councils and communities to design collaborative processes for agreeing catchment limits for water allocation and water quality and to develop and trial tools to do this.

The Wairau Valley case study covering the catchment above the Waihopai was designed and led by Landcare Research in consultation with Council staff. The research included a collaborative group and four workshops at Wairau Valley.

The case study objective to pilot a collaborative water resource management process in which participants develop a common understanding of their catchment, the interconnections between their values, and the trade-offs between these values that might occur under different land and water management scenarios was described to the Committee. The utility of the WaterWheel diagram was tested as part of this process. The workshops discussed what values about the Wairau Valley catchment were most important to participants. Twelve draft indicators were agreed by the Wairau Valley group as shown in the agenda and on the draft

WaterWheels. The WaterWheel is to support decision-making with the information shown in a visual way and can be compared across scenarios.

The project team thanked Council staff and Councillors for their time and insights.

Members were advised that the full report “Designing collaborative catchment decision-making processes using a WaterWheel – reflections from two case studies” is available from Council or the authors. Copies of the Executive Summary were tabled at the meeting.

**Clrs Barsanti/Shenfield:**  
**That the information be received.**

**Carried**

ATTENDANCE: Mr P Davidson, Council’s Groundwater Scientist, was present for the following item.

## **R.13/14.454 Rai-Pelorus River Catchment Groundwater Storage Report E345-007**

The report “Rai-Pelorus Groundwater Baseline Study – Residence Time, Recharge Source, Rate and Volume, Resurgence into Rivers, and Impact of High Intensity Land Use Activities on Groundwater Quality” was attached to the agenda for the Committee’s information. The report quantified the proportion of freshwater in the Rai-Ronga-Tunakino-Opouri-Pelorus-Wakamarina River catchment stored as groundwater versus surface water channel flow.

Members were aware that Marlborough river catchments differ in their rainfall runoff characteristics depending on area, climate, vegetation, soils and geology and that for natural resources management purposes it is important for Council to know the proportion of water that runs off as quickflow versus the slower release baseflow. It was clarified that baseflow is that component of catchment water held up in groundwater storage and released slowly throughout the year.

Dr Uwe Morgenstern of GNS Science Limited attended the meeting to present the conclusions of the report. He advised that groundwater chemistry and isotope methods were used in the survey, the technicalities of which he demonstrated in his presentation. From the results the age of the water can be deduced and also the lag time of contaminants. The mean residence time of groundwater varied from one to 77 years, but most wells contained young water that had been underground for only two to four years and mirrored the age of river water. The oldest water was found beneath Havelock Harbour and at several sites near Rai Valley township. There is significant groundwater-surfacewater interaction in the upper Rai River, Ronga River and Opouri River at low flows, with a lessening influence in the Pelorus or Wakamarina Rivers, lower down in the catchment. The lower alluvial flats closer to Havelock were not surveyed.

Members were advised that the results of this investigation will be applied to inform local water users and landowners about the nature of the groundwater resource. The results confirm that the current Council water allocation approach based on observable surface flows and ignoring groundwater storage is valid and that the residence times of water transiting the catchment is needed for Council to model and account for the fate of nutrients, as required by central government.

**Clrs Barsanti/Oddie:**  
**That the “Rai-Pelorus Groundwater Baseline Study – Residence Time, Recharge Source, Rate and Volume, Resurgence into Rivers, and Impact of High Intensity Land Use Activities on Groundwater Quality” report be received.**

**Carried**

ATTENDANCE: Mr J Underwood, Council's Biosecurity Co-ordinator was present for the following two items.

## **R.13/14.455 Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership E315-013-002**

Mr Peter Lawless, Partnership Co-ordinator of the Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership provided a presentation on the background, progress and potential future direction of the Partnership.

The Partnership was formed in recognition of the threat and uncertainties facing the Top of the South marine space from invasive marine pests. The Ministry for Primary Industries, Tasman District Council, Nelson City Council and Marlborough District Council and representation from Te Tau Ihu iwi form a Management Committee. A co-ordinator is contracted to oversee the functioning and projects for the Partnership. Funding is shared between the Ministry and the councils.

Mr Lawless advised that marine biosecurity is the exclusion, eradication or effective management of risks posed by pests and diseases to the economy, the environment and human health. Unlike "traditional" pollutants, marine pests and diseases can have irreversible national scale impacts. He noted the resources at risk in the Top of the South as being ecosystem services, regional reputation, marine farms, fisheries, cultural values, recreation and flood protection.

In his presentation Mr Lawless described previous and current incursions and also the five primary target pests not in New Zealand which are under six-monthly high risk site surveillance. Mr Lawless advised the focus is on regional pathways, commercial and recreational vessels, and a priority for the new financial year is to be able to report on the set up and costs of a regional pathway plan.

In response to questions from the Councillors, Mr Lawless advised that *Sabella* (fan worm) is a filter feeder and would compete with mussels for space and food. There are also several crabs of concern. He advised that harbourmasters' powers are limited to issues of navigation and safety. Mr Lawless noted that there are powers in the Biosecurity Act for councils to add pests into their biosecurity strategies. In respect of biofouling on vessels he advised that when vessels are slipped out of the sea they are fully compliant in terms of councils' discharge requirements. For in-water cleaning the ship is wrapped in plastic and marine pests are then taken to the landfill. The Ministry is looking at national projects.

While the partners have benefited immensely through the coordination and the development of policies, the challenge for the future rests with developing further policy in relation to managing national vector risk pathways. The Councillors noted the ongoing risks and that funding implications associated with localised incursion response would also be a key area of development.

**Cirs Barsanti/Shenfield:**  
**That the information be received.**

**Carried**

## **R.13/14.456 Marine Biosecurity – Incursions Update and Future Direction E315-013-001**

The Committee was brought up to date on the recent marine pest incursions in Marlborough, namely *Styela clava*, found in Picton Marina in June 2013 and Mediterranean fanworm (*Sabella*), discovered on a vessel moored in Waikawa Bay in February 2014.

Subsequent to the discovery of *Styela clava*, a Long Term Management Plan was set up by the Ministry for Primary Industries, the Council and other stakeholders with an objective to suppress the *Styela clava* population in Picton Marina by undertaking two dive surveys per year. The first survey was due this month, however, a recent find of *Styela* in Waikawa has put this plan on hold while the Management Plan leadership makes a decision on how to proceed.

A response was also initiated to remove Mediterranean fanworm from the hull of a vessel with 16 fanworm being removed. Four days of diving was carried out in Waikawa Bay and the Marina with no further fanworm discovered.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the fact that the Marlborough Sounds will constantly be at threat from the domestic arrival of marine pests that are well entrenched in other localities in New Zealand. A proposition has been put forward by the Nelson City Council to work together through the Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership to develop a Joint Regional Pathway Plan. The Committee was advised that this is seen as the most desirable option to mitigate risk. It was also noted that the development of a Proposal for a Regional Pathway Plan does not constitute a commitment to proceed to the next step of implementation. Stakeholders and the funders of any such initiative would ultimately hold the decision to proceed or not. Members were advised that a Regional Pathway Plan is similar to a Regional Pest Management Plan in structure except that pathways are managed not the pests. The Ministry has commenced a project which may include a National Pathway Plan in the future.

While a Risk Pathway Plan is being considered, some form of localised intervention of individual species may be necessary depending upon risk and acceptance by stakeholders for funding.

**Cirs Shenfield/Brooks:**

- 1. That the information be received.**
- 2. That Council approve the development of options to manage domestic risk pathways of marine invasive species through the Top of the South the Marine Biosecurity Partnership.**
- 3. That Council continue to provide a leadership function for localised domestic incursions and that any decision to intervene is dependent upon a cost benefit and impact analysis, and agreed funding apportionment from the deemed exacerbaters and beneficiaries.**

**Carried**

ATTENDANCE: Ms S Henkel, Council's Water Quality Environmental Scientist, was present for the following item.

## **R.13/14.457 Recreational Water Quality – Summer 2013/2014 E370-007-001**

Members were aware that the Microbial Water Quality Guidelines published by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Health in 2003 require that councils monitor the marine and freshwater recreational areas in their region for health risks associated with faecal contamination.

Ms Henkel provided a presentation on the monitoring carried out at 21 popular beaches and river sites during the summer months.

Samples were analysed for concentrations of faecal indicator bacteria in order to assess the risk to the health of recreational users in regard to water borne diseases. The concentration of the bacteria is then compared to guideline values for each site and classified into 'Modes' (Green, Alert, Action levels). She advised that two different indicator bacteria are used depending on the type of water sampled. Freshwater is analysed for the concentration of E.coli while Enterococci concentrations are used for coastal waters. Detailed information regarding the sites sampled was shown in the "Recreational Water Quality Report 2013-2014" which was included with the agenda.

Members were advised that except for the Taylor River at Riverside site, unsafe faecal bacteria concentrations were generally associated with rainfall or flood events. However, only one sample from this site had an unsafe faecal bacteria concentration. Apart from the two Pelorus River sites and the Opawa River at Elizabeth Street, all other sites also had one sample with E. coli concentrations in excess of the level considered safe for contact recreation.

Four coastal sites had bacteria concentrations below the guideline values during the whole of the season, while another four coastal beaches and six of the river sites had at least one sample with faecal bacteria levels considered unsafe for contact recreation. The remaining four coastal beaches had at least one

sample with Enterococci concentrations above the Action Guideline. Picton Foreshore had the worst microbial water quality, although Councillors noted this was trending down, while Marfells Beach had the lowest Enterococci concentrations.

Trend analysis using the seasonal Kendall Trend Test showed significant improvements in microbial water quality at a number of sites, particularly the Rai River at Rai Falls. Nevertheless, Suitability for Contact Recreation Grades (SFR Grades) for these sites were not revised as a review had been carried out for all sites in the programme last year. Ms Henkel suggested that if water quality remains at a better state in coming seasons some of the sites could be given a better SFR Grade. Ms Henkel explained the calculation of the 5-year-95%ile values used for establishing SFR Grades and that the SFR Grade is the combination of a catchment assessment and an assessment of the Microbiological Water Quality.

**Cllrs Arbuckle/Barsanti:**

**That the “Recreational Water Quality Report 2013-2014” be received.**

**Carried**

A short recess was held.

Mayor Sowman withdrew from the meeting.

ATTENDANCE: Ms R Rait, Council’s Land and Air Environmental Scientist, was present for the following item.

## **R.13/14.458 Soil Quality Monitoring – Technical Report E355-001-001-08**

To help meet its responsibility for promoting the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources of the region, the Council undertakes a soil quality monitoring programme. The resultant “Soil Quality in the Marlborough Region 2013” report was included with the agenda.

Between 2007-2012, 118 soil quality monitoring sites have been sampled representing four soil orders and six land use activities. Soils were sampled from the same sites that were established and sampled in 2008 with two exceptions. The site under exotic forestry was not sampled as it is only necessary to re-sample every 10 years and a drystock pasture site had been converted into vineyard. Members were advised that as only two sampling points had been done trends could not be determined.

The current state of soil quality in the Marlborough region as determined by the results of soil analysis for the most recent sampling across a range of land use activities and soil types was summarised for members’ information. The primary issue is high Olsen P values found at four sites across three different land uses. Low aggregate stability, high bulk density, along with organic matter concentrations at the lower end of the desired target range, is also a potential issue at the monitored cropping sites. Three of the dairy pasture sites showed signs of soil compaction, and soil Cadmium concentrations were significantly greater than other land use activities.

Members were advised that the report is available on Council’s website and there are also meetings held with dairy and industry representatives. Ms Rait advised that industry best practice guidelines would be the same as the recommendations in the report. The landowners from where the samples are taken receive the results from soil sampling and mapping.

**Cllrs Oddie/Shenfield:**

**That the “Soil Quality in the Marlborough Region 2013” report be received.**

**Carried**

Mayor Sowman re-joined the meeting.

ATTENDANCE: Ms N Eade, Council's Land Resources Environmental Scientist, was present for the following item.

**R.13/14.459 Results of a Long Term Investigation into Short Tussock Grassland Decline, Awatere Valley, Marlborough E355-008-001-01**

The report to the Committee provided an overview of a long term monitoring investigation into vegetation change and *Hieracium* invasion in short tussock grasslands, which are inherently susceptible to highly invasive species like *Hieracium*, in the Awatere Valley, Marlborough. The latest report summarises 20 years of research effort which is the longest running monitoring project on *Hieracium*. To ensure that monitoring could continue long term the Council contributed to annual monitoring from 2001 to 2009, then reduced its contribution to five yearly monitoring with 2014 being the latest monitoring round.

Members were advised that this monitoring project confirms rapid change and decline in short tussock grasslands over time as *Hieracium* species continue to invade. The removal of grazing did not alter the direction of vegetation change and in fact seemed to increase the rate of *Hieracium* invasion, possibly because there is less trampling and grazing pressure inhibiting its spread. Removal of dung and urine (nutrient) inputs and periods of drought may also contribute to the rapid decline in tussocks and other species in the un-grazed plots.

The Committee considered options for the future as at this stage the Council has not committed to any future monitoring. Ms Eade advised she will prepare a report to bring back to the Committee on monitoring options and costings.

**Cllrs Shenfield/Brooks:**  
**That the information be received.**

Carried

**R.13/14.460 Harbour Fees and Charges H100-005-14**

A recommendation that a levy be established on Port Marlborough New Zealand under section 33R Maritime Transport Act 1994 was put before the Committee for their consideration.

Members were aware that pursuant to the Maritime Transport Act 1994, the Council as the Harbour Authority is responsible for the management of maritime safety within the Marlborough Sounds harbour – an area of approximately 1800km<sup>2</sup>.

In addition to the legislative requirements, the New Zealand Port and Harbour Marine Safety Code ('the Code') introduced in 2004, clarified formal duties and responsibilities in providing maritime safety. The Code identified Council as the 'duty holder' – the entity with ultimate responsibility for maritime safety, delivering this function through the office of the Harbour Master. Following completion of the risk assessment, a Safety Management System (SMS) was developed. The approved SMS provides for the delivery of activities in the expectation that these would provide the mitigation of the identified risks and envisages the availability of staff 24/7, 365 days a year. Full implementation of the SMS has been hindered by a budget shortfall of \$280,000. The Council has determined that it is no longer prepared to accept the risks associated with not having its SMS fully implemented.

Initially Council was prepared to meet the budget shortfall by the implementation of its 2009 Navigation Safety Bylaws. These Bylaws introduced and adopted a range of fees and charges, but following consultation there was strong reaction to the charges being implemented.

Following discussions and consultation with Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited it was recommended that the Council establish a Harbour Control Levy of \$280,000.

**Cirs Barsanti/Brooks:**

**That Council agree to the introduction of a Harbour Control Levy of \$280,000 on Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited for the 2014/2015 and subsequent financial years under section 33R Maritime Transport Act 1994.**

**Carried**

Councillor Oddie withdrew from the meeting.

## **R.13/14.461 Aids to Navigation**

**H100-005-14**

An update on the on-going management of Aids to Navigation was provided for members' information.

The Council is responsible for the provision and servicing of 98 AtoN in the region which includes, beacons, buoys, channel markers and leading lights. These AtoN are a critical component of the Harbour Safety Management System and their operation must comply with international standards as set by the International Light House Authority (IALA).

Members were advised that all lights are in good order for the winter season. Another round of six monthly checks is underway. The Motuara North Cardinal is ready to be installed in the next few weeks depending on weather and the blue light warning system to indicate ferries departing the berth will soon be operational. The reliability of Marlborough AtoN and the failure response times achieved for the preceding six weeks have exceeded IALA standards. Aside from the 'Blue Light' there have been no failures.

Mr Versteegh advised that there are more outages during the winter season and the East Head light failed last night.

**Cirs Barsanti/Brooks:**

**That the information be received.**

**Carried**

ATTENDANCE: Mrs A Eatherley, Council's Resource Consent Manager, was present for the following item.

## **R.13/14.462 Resource Management Fees and Charges**

**R450-002-R02, F045 07-01**

The report to the Committee provided information to assist with deliberations on the Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges for activities undertaken under the Resource Management Act 1991. This comprised background information, the financial context, a summary of submissions with Council comment and options and assessment.

One submission from the Nelson/Marlborough Branch New Zealand Institute of Surveyors was received to the publicly notified proposed amendments. The submission and the hearing evidence in support of the submission were heard at a special meeting of the Environment Committee on the 27 May 2014. A copy of the submission and hearing evidence in support of the submission was included with the order paper.

Members were advised the expectation is that 60% of the total expenditure, i.e. \$1,219,075 will be recovered from applicants through resource consent fees. The Council is able to achieve this with an hourly charge out rate of \$145.00 inclusive of GST for all planning staff processing applications.

The New Zealand Institute of Surveyors raised concerns over the proposed flat charge out rate. Mrs Eatherley advised that the intent of the proposed charge out rate is to improve efficiencies and ensure consistency with other top of the south councils.

Members were advised that the engineering fee is for Council engineers to evaluate all subdivision applications and also the engineering design. The cost breakdown is the time spent on minor or significant applications. Subdivisions involving only a few lots are relatively easy to process whilst larger subdivisions

are much more complex in terms of engineering considerations, e.g. pipe sizes, locations and requirements for easements and such like.

In respect of the \$145.00 rate for administration officers, Mrs Eatherley advised this is required in order to have a modest increase in the planning officer rate. She noted that an administration officer does not have a big input into an application.

**Cirs Arbuckle/Barsanti:**

1. That the report Resource Management Fees and Charges be received.
2. That the proposal for Resource Management Fees and Charges be adopted with an implementation date of 1 July 2014.
3. That the submitters be notified of the decision.

	Charge Type	
<b>Minor Resource Consents</b>		
<b>Bore Construction</b>		
Domestic	Flat	\$310
Irrigation	Flat	\$620
<b>Notified Resource Consents</b>		
All Applications (including subdivisions)	Base	\$5,200
Section 127, 128	Base	\$5,200
<b>Non-Notified Resource Consents</b>		
Subdivision (Flat plan/unit title engineering fees do not apply)	Base	Delete
All Applications but excluding subdivisions	Base	\$930
Subdivisions (Note: Engineering charges are additional)	Base	\$1,350
Registration service for lodgement of change/cancellation of consent notice (Note: This is a new fee in the schedule)	Flat	\$650
Section 37 extension of time for deposit of survey plans	Base	Delete
Section 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 136, 139, 139A, 221	Base	\$930
Land Registry Compliance (Certificates, Consents)	Base	\$310



Removal of Building Line Restriction	Flat	\$310
Section 348 LGA Right of Way applications (Note: This is a new fee in the schedule)	Base	\$930
<b>Transfers</b>		
Water, Coastal (Marine Farm)	Flat	\$310
Coastal (Other), Discharge, Land Use	Flat	\$100
<b>Section 223, 224 - Approval of deposit of survey plans</b>		
4 lots or less (each stage)	Actual	
5 or more lots (each stage)	Actual	
<b>Outline Plan Approvals, Policy Statements, Plan Changes and Requirements</b>		
Section 176A Approval of Outline Plan	Base	\$930
Outline Plan Waiver (Note: This is a new fee in the schedule)	Flat	\$100
<b>Notice of Requirements or Alterations to Designations</b>		
Non-Notified	Base	\$1,350
Notified	Base	\$5,200
<b>Statements and Miscellaneous Certificates</b>		
Provide required documentation	Base	\$310
<b>Site Inspection</b>		
Disbursements, e.g. boat hire	Actual	Actual
<b>Engineering Charges - Subdivision and Land Use</b>		
Engineering:		
Evaluation for 1-3 lots	Flat	\$541
Evaluation for 4-10 lots	Flat	\$1,395
Evaluation for 11-20 lots	Flat	\$2,351
Evaluation for 20+ lots	Flat	\$3,679

Engineering evaluation for each additional dwelling (Land Use Consent)	Flat	\$354
<b>Consents - Administration, monitoring and Supervision</b>		
Sampling including the contracting of an independent consultant	Variable Actual	Variable Actual
Laboratory Costs	Variable Actual	Variable Actual
Administration fee (monitoring)	Flat	\$40
Site Inspection	Variable Actual	Variable Actual
Environmental Protection Officer	Per hour	\$130
Assistant Environmental Protection Officer	Per hour	\$91
Student Environmental Protection Officer	Per hour	\$65
<b>Other Rates and Charges</b>		
Hearings Committee or Commissioner (Local Government (Local Authorities Salaries and Allowances) Determination 2001)	Variable	Variable Actual
Hearings Cancellation Fee	Flat	\$2,000
Resource Management Officer	Per Hour	\$145
Hearings Facilitator	Per Hour	\$145
Administration Officer	Per Hour	\$145
Senior Planner/Resource Consents Manager	Per Hour	\$145
Consultants (internal or external charges)	Variable Actual	Variable Actual

**Carried**

Councillor Shenfield withdrew from the meeting.

ATTENDANCE: Mr I Sutherland, Council's Resource Management Officer, was present for the following item.

**R.13/14.463 Wine Business Park Limited - Road Name Request U081014**

Approval was sought from the Committee for the naming of a new road which is to be created by Wine Business Park Limited as part of a new subdivision off Liverpool Street in the Riverlands Industrial Estate. Copies of the locality plan and subdivision scheme plan were attached to the agenda.

Three road names were put forward for consideration, Sauvignon Street, Riverlands Row and Kendrick Crescent. The proposed names were circulated to all iwi, Marlborough Historical Society and Marlborough Roads for comment. Staff advised that to comply with the Road Naming Policy the road type should be either street or road and the name 'Riverlands' could cause some confusion as it is also used in the locality description of the wider area.

The Committee discussed the proposed road names and suggested Kendrick Road as being appropriate.

**Clr Jerram/Mayor Sowman:**

**That the proposed new road as shown on proposed subdivision U081014, once vested in Council, be named Kendrick Road.**

Carried

**R.13/14.464 Appointment of Hearings Commissioner R450-004-02**

The Committee was asked to consider a new person for inclusion on the list of Hearings Commissioners. The applicant was Julian Ironside (Environmental Law).

Further details regarding the applicant was included in the agenda.

Hearings Commissioners can be called on to hear and determine applications for resource consent pursuant to section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Clrs Barsanti/Arbuckle:**

**That Mr Julian Ironside be appointed to act as Hearings Commissioner as and when required and that he be advised accordingly.**

Carried

ATTENDANCE: Ms G Ferguson, Council's Environmental Health Officer, was present for the following item.

**R.13/14.465 Food Bill Progress E350-004-009-02**

Members were advised that the Food Bill has now received Royal Assent and is the Food Act 2014. This will replace the Food Act 1981, and over time also replace the Food Hygiene Regulations 1974 and Food (Safety) Regulations 2002. Changes to how the sale of food will be regulated were outlined in the presentation to the Committee.

Ms Ferguson advised that the Food Act 2014 is a risk based system consisting of Food Control Plans and then a national programme broken down into three levels. Some sections commence immediately and the Act fully comes into force on 1 March 2016, or earlier by regulation. New businesses will have to operate under the new food regime from when the Act fully comes into force and existing businesses have a three year transition period from that date. Regulations will be developed over the next 21 months. In her presentation Ms Ferguson discussed the regulations, functions and duties under the Act.

Councillors were advised that the Council will be the registration authority and responsible for verification of template Food Control Plans in the district but for other Food Control Plans and the National Programme the registration authority or responsibility for verification is not known.

It was noted that the Food Act will require changes in Council's Environmental Health Group's activities and resourcing to meet the functions and duties as set out in the Act. The Food Act provides for the setting of fees by resolution, to recover the direct and indirect costs of functions under the Act.

Ms Ferguson advised she would look at the Food Act in respect of exemptions for marae activities. It was noted auditing of premises would take longer but operators would be able to influence their costs by being compliant. Premises would need to be visited at least once a year. Ms Ferguson believed that educational resources for use within the district would be provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries.

**Cirs Barsanti/Beech:**  
**That the information be received.**

**Carried**

ATTENDANCE: Ms S Lines, Council's Animal Control Contracts Manager, was present for the following item.

## **R.13/14.466 Dog Fees for the 2014/2015 Registration Year E305-001-001, F045-07-01**

The proposed dog fees for the 2014/2015 registration year were put forward for the Committee's consideration as the Council is required under the Dog Control Act 1996 to set fees for dog registration on an annual basis. It was proposed that the fees for the 2014/2015 registration year remain the same as the last four financial years.

Members were aware that the Animal Control Sub-Committee had carried out a thorough review of the Animal Control function and concluded that there was an element of public good associated with the function and suggested an 80/20 allocation between dog owners and the community. It was resolved at the Committee meeting on the 20 March 2014 that the determination of how the costs of Animal Control are apportioned be introduced into the next Long Term Plan.

**Cirs Arbuckle/Brooks:**  
**That the proposed dog registration fees for 2014/2015 set out in the table below be accepted.**

<b>Dog and Pound Fees FEE TABLE: Dog Control</b>	<b>Fees 2013/2014</b>	<b>Proposed Fees 2014/2015</b>
Dog registration - non-working (Category 1)	\$57.00	\$57.00
Dog registration - non-working (Category 2)	\$86.00	\$86.00
Dog registration - working	\$24.50	\$24.50
Dog registration - dangerous	\$129.00	\$129.00
Dog registration - duplicate tag	\$3.60	\$3.60
Property Licence - 3 or more dogs	\$77.00	\$77.00
Pound fee - first offence	\$102.00	\$102.00
Pound fee - second offence	\$153.00	\$153.00

**Carried**

## **R.13/14.467 Information Package**

**Cirs Barsanti/Arbuckle:**

That the Regulatory Department Information Package dated 12 June 2014 be received and noted.

Carried

## **R.13/14.468 Decision to Conduct Business with the Public Excluded**

**Cirs Barsanti/Arbuckle:**

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- Easter Storm Damage

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:

<b>General Subject of each matter to be considered</b>	<b>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</b>	<b>Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</b>
<b>Easter Storm Damage</b>	<b>In order to protect the privacy of natural persons, as provided for under Section 7(2)(a).</b>	<b>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.</b>

Carried

The meeting closed at 4.45 pm.

Record No. 14139179