

**MINUTES OF WESTERN BAY OF PLENTY DISTRICT COUNCIL  
COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEETING NO. CM24-2  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1484 CAMERON ROAD, TAURANGA  
ON TUESDAY, 18 JUNE 2024 AT 9.30AM**

## **1 KARAKIA**

Whakatau mai te wairua	Settle the spirit
Whakawātea mai te hinengaro	Clear the mind
Whakarite mai te tinana	Prepare the body
Kia ea ai ngā mahi	To achieve what needs to be achieved.
Āe	Yes

## **2 PRESENT**

Cr M Murray-Benge, Cr G Dally, Cr T Coxhead, Mayor J Denyer, Cr M Grainger, Cr A Henry, Cr R Joyce, Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour, Cr A Sole, Cr A Wichers, Katikati Community Board Chairperson J Clements, Maketu Community Board Chairperson L Rae, and Waihi Beach Community Board Chairperson R Goudie.

## **3 IN ATTENDANCE**

R Davie (Deputy CEO and General Manager Strategy and Community), J Rickard (Community and Strategic Relationships Manager), G Golding (Governance Manager), H Wi Repa (Governance Systems Advisor), E Logan (Governance Advisor), S Wilburn (Community Advisor), and L Carnie (Community Outcomes Advisor).

### **VIA ZOOM**

S Cuers (Strategy Housing Programme Lead).

### **EXTERNAL**

Brad Siebert (Partner, Tauranga Moana Biosecurity Capital), Louise Saunders (CEO, Manaaki Kaimai Mamaku Trust), and Professor Bruce Clarkson (Programme Research Leader – People, Cities & Nature, University of Waikato).

## **4 APOLOGIES**

### **APOLOGY**

---

### **RESOLUTION CM24-2.1**

---

Moved: Cr M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr A Sole

That the apology for absence from Cr A Henry, Cr D Thwaites, Te Puke Community Board Chairperson K Ellis, and Ōmokoroa Community Board Chairperson P Presland be accepted.

**CARRIED**

---

## **5 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS**

Nil

## **6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Nil

## **7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS**

Nil

## **8 PUBLIC FORUM**

Nil

## **9 REPORTS**

### **CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

That the Chairperson requested the next item of business be Natural Environmental and Sustainable Living Activity Update in order to release representatives from the meeting.

---

### **RESOLUTION CM24-2.2**

Moved: Cr M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

That in accordance with standing orders 9.4 the order of business be changed and that item 10.2 be dealt with as the next item of business.

**CARRIED**

---

## **10.2 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE LIVING ACTIVITY UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report dated 18 June from the Community Outcomes Advisor, who introduced the report. The report was taken as read, with further discussion on the below.

- Tauranga Moana Biosecurity Capital (TMBC), Manaaki Kaimai Mamaku Trust (MKMT) – Kaimai Makau Restoration Project, and Waikato University Professor Bruce Clarkson were in attendance to present to the Committee.
- Tauranga Moana Biosecurity was well aligned with the goals within the Council's Long-Term Plan.
- Following COVID-19 and the establishment of jobs for nature, a business case was put to the Government for the Kaimai Mamaku Restoration Project, this was approved to the value \$19.4 million over three years.

In response to questions, the following matters were noted:

Tauranga Moana Biosecurity Capital:

- TMBC's main area of protection was the Bay of Plenty Region. However, the organisation had members across regions such as Ōpōtiki that were also part of their network.
- TMBC was part of the National Biosecurity Pledge. The organisation was engaging with not only businesses but individuals and the wider community in the awareness programmes it carried out around biosecurity.
- The Brown Marmorated Stink Bug (BMSB) would have a large impact on industry sectors within the Bay of Plenty (BOP) region and was also a public nuisance. TMBC noted that it was important to raise awareness of the BMSB threat in the wider community beyond the industry groups.
- TMBC received quarterly reports from the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) that showed a number of both male and female BMSB found alive at the boarder out of containment. There were occasionally occurrences where BMSB had been found past the border, however, in these cases, a known pathway was able to be identified.
- Much of TMBC's role regarding zoonotic diseases was to gather information from outside agencies and ensure it was shared with communities. Zoonotic diseases were not managed by TMBC.
- There were mandatory fumigation requirements for containers that came from high-risk countries and mandatory treatment of containers that came from countries with BMSB. TMBC continued to advocate for better technology around surveillance.
- The TMBC had a wide reach to a large number of stakeholders.
- Ethanedinitrile (EDN) did not have the potential environment or worker health concerns that were present when methyl bromide was used.

At 10.08am, Cr T Coxhead left the meeting.

At 10.12am, Cr T Coxhead returned to the meeting.

Manaaki Kaimai Mamaku Trust – Kaimai Makau Restoration Project:

- The Government saw biodiversity credit as a way to compensate farmers for the biodiversity they had retained, rather than for the improvement of biodiversity outcomes. The issue encountered with this was that businesses that invested in biodiversity credits were less likely to support conservation versus supporting active restoration.
- Biodiversity investment was built on the premise that the community was aware that the environment was unable to sustain itself, its community or the economy, and that businesses were able to do more. However, businesses did not have an effective platform to provide further support. The establishment of this platform would mean that businesses would be able to support those projects that aligned with their organisation.
- Mana Whenua teams predominately employed those who Whakapapa to their area. MKMT had not engaged with the Ministry for Social Development's disengaged youth, as it needed wrap around pastoral support for these Tamariki. However, MKMT was exploring options for this.
- MKMT had connected with Priority One, and looked to work through Priority One to undertake a business analysis around what was needed for businesses locally to invest in biodiversity.
- MKMT, through the Joint Agency Committee (Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Department of Conservation, Waikato Regional Council and Manaaki Kaimai Mamaku Trust), was carrying out an economic evaluation of the entire Kaimai Mamaku area which would provide an economic thread for businesses. The Aotearoa Circle confirmed that the Bay of Plenty would be the location of an economic evaluation at scale across the region. The Bay of Plenty Regional Council (Regional Council) was on the steering group for this, and MKMT was involved as a case study.
- Each team within MKMT determined what their activity areas were. Education requirements varied from place to place, and each team decided what they wanted to upskill. Bringing people together and sharing information and skills through professional contractors was critical. The ethic of learning and building competencies was important.
- Community Conservation groups received funding from Regional Council and external fundings which included TECT and BayTrust. For the most part, funders funded collaboratively.
- MKMT carried out standard monitoring that was expected for a conservation project.
- MKMT had been working with Council's Community Team on ways that Council could support the efforts of the organisation. It was suggested that there was an opportunity through Council's Conservation Lots Programme that could extend the MKMT project teams with a contract that would help landowners with pest control.

- It was noted that a contract with Council would build social cohesions within communities. There was potential for Council's Reserves Team to work collaboratively with the MKMT project teams. Collectivism and strategy was extremely important.

Bruce Clarkson, University of Waikato – Bringing Indigenous Nature Back into NZ Urban Centres:

- First step was to build connection and relationships with those who owned land adjoining the gully or part of the gully, and gaining a shared understanding of the projects purpose. Council had to build a model example and provide communities with information to build the confidence and support in projects.
- A tree canopy was beneficial to buffering and heating of sites. There was an official method that was used across most of New Zealand's cities that produced calculations and estimates of tree cover, which was one of the criteria used to assess how well a city was doing at looking after the environment. This information was critical to understand how to reverse the degradation and decline that was ongoing. Especially as housing and intensification of urban areas increased, there was a radical and significant loss of tree cover which had impacts on the heating of the city.
- Ten percent of the species in the area had to be dominated by indigenous species otherwise there was not a built independency of native plants, native animals, and the retention of the community's native species that would be hoped to retain in the long term.
- Ecologists were not interested in the administrative boundary between the Western Bay of Plenty and Tauranga City. For a system to work it needed a bioregional approach, which would include co-ordinated and integrated planning at a landscape scale. It was noted that administrative boundaries should not be a barrier for work.

At 11.16am, Cr T Coxhead left the meeting.

## **9.1 COMMUNITY FORUMS OUTCOMES**

The Committee considered a report from the Governance Advisor. The report was taken as read, with further discussion on the below.

- It was noted that Cr Wichers recommended that the CCTV Panel look at installing as CCTV camera at the intersection of No.1 and No.2 Road and on Pongakawa Station Road, and that Council's roading team investigate options to reduce the boy racing activities at the No.1 and No.2 Road intersection.
- The General Manager Strategy and Community suggested that the above recommendations be moved through the appropriated channels, which would be to directly present them to the CCTV Panel and Council's roading staff, rather than a formal recommendation being resolved.

- It was suggested that the Te Puke Community Board could fund the installation of a CCTV camera at the No.1 and No.2 Road intersection out of its own budget. It was noted that it would be best practice to progress this issue through the CCTV Panel.
- Community-forum convenors would encourage those in attendance at the public forums to sign up to Council's monthly newsletter as a mechanism to provide further communication on the location of the forums.
- It was suggested that Council staff attend the public forums to allow the notes to be reflective of the meeting.

In response to questions, the following matters were noted:

- There was a rationalised framework around the investment of CCTV, due to their short shelf life and the operational costs that were associated with them. Investment to fund the capital of a CCTV from the Te Puke Community Board, meant that Council would have to fund the operating expense and renewals. All conversations that regarded this issue, whether at the CCTV panel or the Te Puke Community Board, had to involve Council's Operations Team from a strategic property perspective.
- It was suggested that a service request be raised in relation to the establishment of new locations for the speed indications device camera in Te Puke in order to formally close the loop.
- Staff would investigate a different mechanism that could be used to better communicate the location of public forums.

The wire cutting along the roads on the westside of the district was not a Council project or decision, this was a NZTA Waka Kotahi decision. Council had expressed its dissatisfaction to the Minister of Transport.

---

### RESOLUTION CM24-2.3

Moved: Cr M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Maketu Community Board Chairperson L Rae

That the Governance Advisor's report dated 18 June 2024 titled 'Community Forum Outcomes', be received.

**CARRIED**

---

## 9.2 COMMUNITY MATCHING FUND - ENVIRONMENTAL FUND OPTIONS

The Committee considered a report from the Community Outcomes Advisor. The report was taken as read, with further discussion on the below.

In response to questions, the following matters were noted:

---

- The Community Matching Fund opened on 1 July 2024, the budget used would be for the financial year of 2024/25.
- Staff wanted to ensure money was set aside for the Sub-Regional fund that would allow for Council to contribute to the fund once it was established. The fund was to be set up in the 2024/25 financial year, however, at the time of the meeting, the fund had not been set up.
- Staff were working through the mechanics of the programme alongside funding partners.
- The joint fund was able to be leveraged through other funders and establish easier pathways for funding for community groups by engaging with one fund but leveraging all of them together.
- Staff wanted to ensure the Community Matching Fund was available to launch and allocate, while also having the funding set aside for the Sub-Regional fund once it was established.
- For the 2024/25 financial year staff suggested that the Community Matching Fund ran with a slightly lower budget to allow Council to contribute to the Sub-Regional Fund.

---

#### RESOLUTION CM24-2.4

Moved: Cr M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

1. That the Community Outcomes Advisor's report dated 18 June 2024 titled 'Community Matching Fund – Environmental Fund Options' be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of **low** significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That the Community Committee agrees to set the Community Matching Fund – Environmental Fund at \$40,000 for the July 2024 funding round, out of the total allocated budget of \$60,000.
4. That the Community Committee agrees to investigate contributing \$20,000 to potential joint funds with other funding partners for community-led environmental initiatives, allocated from the Community Matching Fund – Environmental Fund budget of \$60,000.

**CARRIED**

---

#### 9.3 DELEGATION OF DECISION MAKING FOR 2024 COMMUNITY MATCHING FUND

The Committee considered a report from the Community Outcomes Advisor. The report was taken as read, with further discussion on the below.

---

- To maintain consistency and representation across the district. It was suggested that the same members as 2023 were put forward.

---

## RESOLUTION CM24-2.5

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr A Wichers

1. That the Community Outcomes Advisor report dated 18 June 2024 titled 'Delegation of decision making for 2024 Community Matching Fund' be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That pursuant to clause 32 schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, Council delegates to Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour, Councillor M Grainger, Councillor A Sole, together with the Chief Executive Officer, or his nominee(s), the power to make decisions in respect of applications to the Community Matching Fund 2024, including but not limited to the following powers:
  - a) To award grants according to the purposes and guidelines of the Community Matching Fund 2024, within the allocated budget of \$160,000.And
  - b) To make payments to grant recipients as soon as practicable after the award decisions have been made.
4. That recommendations 3a and 3b will form the terms of reference for the Community Matching Fund working party.

**CARRIED**

---

## 10 INFORMATION FOR RECEIPT

### 10.1 2024 WESTERN BAY COMMUNITY AWARDS

The Community and Strategy Relationships Manager introduced the report. The report was taken as read.

---

**The Meeting closed at 12.37pm**

**Confirmed as a true and correct record by Council on 15 August 2024.**