

**MINUTES OF WESTERN BAY OF PLENTY DISTRICT COUNCIL  
COUNCIL MEETING NO. CL25-10  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1484 CAMERON ROAD, TAURANGA  
ON TUESDAY, 5 AUGUST 2025 AT 9.30AM**

**1 KARAKIA**

Whakatau mai te wairua  
Whakawātea mai te hinengaro  
Whakarite mai te tinana  
Kia ea ai ngā mahi

Āe

Settle the spirit  
Clear the mind  
Prepare the body  
To achieve what needs to be  
achieved.  
Yes

**2 PRESENT**

Mayor J Denyer, Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour, Cr T Coxhead, Cr G Dally, Cr M Grainger, Cr A Henry, Cr R Joyce, Cr M Murray-Benge, Cr L Rae, Cr A Sole, Cr D Thwaites and Cr A Wichers.

**3 IN ATTENDANCE**

M Taris (Interim Chief Executive Officer), A Henderson (General Manager Corporate Services), A Curtis (General Manager Regulatory Services), E Watton (Acting General Manager Strategy and Community), P Watson (Acting General Manager Infrastructure Services), J Fearn (Chief Financial Officer), M Leighton (Policy and Planning Manager), K Little (Operations Manager), R Garrett (Governance Manager), C Nepia (Strategic Kaupapa Māori Manager), L Balvert (Communications Manager), E Wentzel (Director Water Services), A King (Legislative Reform and Special Projects Strategic Advisor), H Wi Repa (Governance Systems Advisor) and P Osborne (Senior Governance Advisor).

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE**

**Tangata Whenua**

Dr Hauata Palmer, Riria Murray and Nessie Kuka (Ngāi te Rangi – Matakana Island)

Destiny Leaf (Ngāti Ranginui)

Darlene Dinsdale (Ngāti Whakaue)

**MartinJenkins**

Sarah Baddley

**VIA ZOOM**

**MartinJenkins**

Aaron Gabbie

**Department of Internal Affairs (DIA)**

Vanessa Blacklock and Jaron Shaw

**4 APOLOGIES**

Nil

**5 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS**

Nil

**6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Nil

**7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS**

Nil

**8 PUBLIC FORUM****8.1 DARLENE DINSDALE – LOCAL WATERS DONE WELL**

Ms Dinsdale was in attendance to speak on behalf of Te Arawa regarding the proposed Water Services Delivery Plan and Commitment Agreement. She noted the following points:

- Their preferred option was for Council to stand alone (in-house), however acknowledged that this option may not be as feasible.
- Their second option would be to have a joint Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) with Tauranga City Council (TCC).
- Iwi/hapū did not believe that the key strategic principles within the Commitment Agreement sufficiently met the needs of Tangata Whenua. They requested inclusion into the development of the Commitment Agreement.
- Iwi/hapū would also like to be involved in the governance of the water entity, noting that the required skills were held by iwi/hapū.
- Acknowledgement was made to the unresolved treaty settlement claims that had been going on for many years, which meant that the option to include Thames-Coromandel District Council (TCDC) should not be considered as an option. They stood alongside and supported their Tauranga Moana whānau in relation to this.

Ms Dinsdale responded to pātai as follows:

- There would be division between Council and Iwi/hapū if they were to form a CCO with TCDC.
- Iwi/hapū were kaitiaki of the land and therefore wore a lens that allowed them to ensure that the best decisions in relation to the land were being made.

## 8.2 DR HAUATA PALMER AND NESSIE KUKA – LOCAL WATERS DONE WELL

Dr Palmer and Ms Kuka were in attendance on behalf of Ngāi te Rangi (Matakana Island) regarding the proposed Water Services Delivery Plan in relation to Local Waters Done Well. They noted the following points:

- They did not understand the logic behind having TCDC involved in the decisions that sat within the Tauranga Moana rohe.
- Tauranga Moana iwi had been debating and trying to resolve treaty settlement issues for 16 years. The Waitangi Tribunal had said that Hauraki had a right within Tauranga Moana, however it did not give them the right to make decisions on behalf of Tauranga Moana. This is the reason that they did not accept Hauraki being a part of any decision making on behalf of Tauranga Moana.
- There were 12 iwi in Hauraki and 3 iwi in Tauranga Moana. The iwi being engaged with in relation to the Council decisions should be the iwi of the land, which was Tauranga Moana and Te Arawa.
- Ngāi te Rangi made it clear that they would not engage with Council if Hauraki iwi were brought to the decision-making table.

They responded to pātai as follows:

- There was a clear message to Councillors at a previous informal hui with Tangata Whenua in relation to this issue, that there had been a manifestation of Hauraki coming into the rohe and wanting to sit at the decision-making table to have a bigger voice.
- Tangata Whenua had undertaken a lot of work in relation to the Katikati Outfall project, noting that bringing TCDC into the equation would create massive difficulties.
- Anyone could own land in Tauranga Moana; however, this did not give them the right to have Mana Whenua over the land.
- Even if Council had the ability through the foundational documents to ensure that Hauraki could not be involved in the decisions in Tauranga Moana, the iwi/hapū would not be OK with them sitting at the table, given the history between the two.

---

## 9 PRESENTATIONS

### CHANGE TO ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Mayor requested that the presentation from Thunder Ridge be moved to the confidential agenda, to allow discussion on topics that were commercially sensitive at this time.

---

---

**RESOLUTION CL25-10.1**

Moved: Cr M Grainger

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

That in accordance with Standing Orders the order of business be changed and that the item 9.1 Thunder Ridge Update be dealt with as the first item of business in the confidential agenda.

**CARRIED**

---

**10 REPORTS****10.1 ADOPTION OF THE WATER SERVICES DELIVERY PLAN**

Council considered a report from the Strategic Advisor who was supported by the General Manager Corporate Services and Sarah Baddley (MartinJenkins). She provided an overview of the report, including the background of the process to date, and recommendations being sought for Council's consideration.

Tabled Item 1 – The Water Services Delivery Plan was provided separately to the agenda.

Staff and Ms Baddley responded to pātai as follows:

- The legislation restricts shareholders to be only the Council, causing concerns for some iwi. However, it allows local Councils to create representative structures to influence shareholder decisions. Various approaches are used: some Councils work directly with iwi using existing mechanisms, others collaborate in representative forums jointly with iwi, some involve iwi directly depending on treaty settlements, and others have iwi participate in a nominating sub-committee to select the board of Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs). These examples demonstrated the varied ways Councils were collaborating with Tangata Whenua.
  - The Council needed to decide how flexible they would be in forming their shareholder position by considering various options, such as sub-committee arrangements, the full council body, or partnership with iwi. This decision would guide their shareholder interest in the Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO) and influence specific decisions the CCO made, primarily through the Statement of Expectations. Additionally, during the setup of a CCO, the Council could establish expectations for how the CCO should engage with Tangata Whenua and continue existing consenting relationships.
  - In the future it would be expected that Council, as shareholders, would have a direct relationship with Tangata Whenua, and that Tangata Whenua would have a direct relationship with the CCO.
  - There were expectations regarding a joint water CCO's role in upholding Treaty Settlements. Despite legislative requirements to honour these settlements, iwi
-

representatives expressed concerns due to ongoing cross-claim issues. They felt that these issues were insurmountable because historically they had not been addressed with the good faith they expected.

- There were a number of mechanisms, from governance and operations through to Treaty Settlements, that were available to council to work with Tangata Whenua, noting that this could happen through both the stand-alone option and CCO option.
- To help understand the story in relation to depreciation, Ms Baddley provided some context from the original discussions:
  - When MartinJenkins were initially engaged, financial ring-fencing was being introduced, highlighting that the Council's historical approach involved a balanced budget, funding the Capital Programme from a broader revenue base. Unlike other councils that depreciated assets over time, ring-fencing required water assets to be independent. Consequently, the Council's approach of balancing 'unders and overs' was no longer feasible, explaining why the previous funding and financing method for water infrastructure was unsustainable and made the treatment of depreciation policy more challenging.
  - How Council was currently treating depreciation was the same way that the new entity would do it, however due to different circumstances it would work for the Water Service Organisation (WSO). It was clarified that Council was using money from other activities e.g. swimming pools, libraries and rates, whereas ring-fencing meant that the WSO would only be able to use water money.
- When MartinJenkins was first engaged, it was unclear how Financial Contributions (FinCos) would be treated.
- The LGFA had indicated an increased tolerance for debt from dedicated Water Services Organisations, due to viewing them as a utility.
- It was clarified that the 500% net debt to operating revenue percentage was not a covenant, but rather a prudent limit.
- As previously advised, the stand alone CCO option was technically feasible for Council, noting that Council could achieve financial sustainability by extending loans, materially increasing Council's revenue (through rates) in the near term to better match its capital programme, and by de-risking other parts of Council's investment plans.
- The provision of the LGFA was for councils not to have more than 20% of their total borrowing to growth councils. They would assess this regime on a case-by-case basis, noting that only two councils had approached them, which was Tauranga City Council (TCC) and Waipa. Western Bay of Plenty District Council (WBOPDC) had not had to approach the LGFA in relation to this, as they had not yet reached borrowing capacity.

- Ring-fencing was a provision that was discussed as part of the formation of the CCO. There would then need to be a joint decision by councils who were a part of the CCO as to whether the ring-fencing requirement should be removed in the future.
- Due to staff being given direction to date of the preferred model being a multi-council CCO, the work had not been done in relation to the borrowing constraints if Council were to go with the in-house option. It was noted however that there would need to be other considerations due to Council not being able to include some of the revenue, for example FinCos, which would therefore affect the borrowing.
- The financial strength of a multi-council approach was over the long term, due to the complementary balance sheet and investment profile between TCDC and WBOPDC. Regarding the short-term impact, the household impact would not be huge, due to the assumption that there would be a five year period where the numbers were not harmonised. The benefits of having TCDC in the arrangements were over the long-term period.
- Currently Council had three settings under which they did their borrowing, 10 year (for short term assets), 25 year or 30 year loan periods. This was based off policy settings of Council.
- Before outlining options for the Council, Ms. Baddley recognised that iwi might not find these acceptable due to views expressed during the public forum. Iwi and Māori typically had a profound interest in water from a Te Ao Māori perspective and would likely seek involvement from governance to operations in water management, from strategy to implementation. There were mechanisms available to address some of these interests which were noted as the following:
  - Options at a governance level were spoken to earlier, Council could consider the requirement of Te Ao Māori and Treaty-based competency of board directors for the Water Service Organisation.
  - The next layer related to Treaty settlements, noting that this was the only statutory obligation that was prescribed in any detail within the legislation. The legislation was clear that Councils must give effect to Treaty settlements, but not how this was done, noting that there were different mechanisms that could be put in place to achieve this.
  - Regarding overlapping iwi interests and boundary contests, staff could not address the years of disputes in this area. Relationship-based mechanisms included understanding specific cross-claims and recognising them through existing consenting processes with Bay of Plenty Regional Council.
  - Influence over management decisions was primarily through the Board's competency and Tangata Whenua's potential involvement in the Statement of Expectation (SOE). A Water Services Organisation was expected to maintain organisational capability concerning local Tangata Whenua issues and mātauranga.

- The final process was about how to bring all these mechanisms together, however the decision in front of Council today was regarding who to partner with. The significance process in relation to the designing of these details would happen afterwards.

The DIA representatives responded to pātai as follows:

- The government passed legislation of the new Local Water Done Well Policy and the legislative framework around it. Central Government had policy positions and was encouraging financially sustainable water arrangements, and councils forming these through stand alone water entities or through joining with other councils.
- Representatives were not in the position to comment on the feeling expressed by some Councillors in relation to requirements making it harder on Councils trying to do 'local waters well'. The Mayor noted that the policy position of the government was for water services to move on the path of aggregation.
- Local Water Done Well was a priority position for the government when they took office.
- The DIA was aware of other situations with Mana Whenua through the consultation period, however those were quite different to what had been expressed by iwi/hapū from Tauranga Moana. The other situations included the need for the different councils within the grouping to work through obligations, relationships, and undertakings with their iwi/hapū through the foundation documents, as part of the due diligence phase.
- The multi-council CCO structure was viewed as being more cost effective both operationally and improving access to financing. DIA believed the conservative approach to operational efficiencies (10% over the 10-year period) was imminently achievable.
- The scale would give the multi-council CCO financing efficiency, therefore from a Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) lending perspective, they took the size of the organisation into account when determining the Funds From Operations (FFO) to debt ratio, which was the bespoke lending covenant they had developed for water services CCOs.
- The LGFA and DIA's view was that due to the FFO to debt covenants developed for Water Services CCOs, those water organisations were able to take a more utility approach to financing where the debt was spread out and repaid over a longer period of time. This meant that the burden did not disproportionately fall on ratepayers today but was spread over the lifetime. This "sweet spot" for debt payment could still be worked through as a key consideration, alongside partner councils, if Council decided to progress with a multi-council CCO.
- The LGFA would allow up to five years to reach the financial ratio covenants for a CCO only, not if councils decided to go in-house.

- The DIA's role was to receive and review the Water Services Delivery Plans, and the secretary of Local Government had a statutory role to accept the plans, seek further information, or request amendment by Council. The secretary also had a monitoring role in relation to the implementation of the Water Services Delivery Plan.
  - It was clarified that the Commerce Commission was being given powers through the Bill before the house, to be the on-going economic regulator. They would be implementing an information disclosure regime that allowed them to review whether a council was under or over charging, or not investing enough into their infrastructure. They also had a range of powers available to intervene beyond information disclosure. This included setting non-binding revenue thresholds, and the ability to seek powers through the Minister, associated with price quality regulation, which would allow them to mandate a price or investment path. It was clarified that these powers could be sought whether in-house or through a CCO.
- 

### RESOLUTION CL25-10.2

Moved: Cr R Joyce

Seconded: Cr M Grainger

1. That the Strategic Advisor's report dated 5 August 2025 titled 'Adoption of the Water Services Delivery Plan' be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of **high** significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

**CARRIED**

---

11.26am The hui adjourned.

11.48am The hui reconvened.

---

### MOTION

Moved: Cr Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr Rae

3. (a) Approves the water services delivery model for water, wastewater and stormwater services to be:
  - i. In-house

---

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

---



---

For: Cr Murray-Benge, Cr Sole, Cr Rae, Cr Coxhead, Cr Henry and Cr Grainger.  
Against: Cr Thwaites, Cr Joyce, Cr Wichers, Cr Dally, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour and Mayor Denyer.

The Mayor exercised his casting vote and voted against the motion. The motion was declared lost.

**LOST 7/6**

---

### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.3**

Moved: Cr R Joyce  
Seconded: Cr D Thwaites

3. (a) Approves the water services delivery model to be:
- ii. Water Organisation

**CARRIED**

---

### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.4**

Moved: Cr R Joyce  
Seconded: Cr G Dally

3. (b) Approves the Water Organisation being:
- ii. Multi-Council Water Organisation, subject to all the partner Councils being satisfied with the results of the Due Diligence process.

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Cr Thwaites, Cr Joyce, Cr Wichers, Cr Dally, Cr Sole, Cr Grainger, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour and Mayor Denyer.  
Against: Cr Murray-Benge, Cr Henry, Cr Rae and Cr Coxhead.

**CARRIED 8/4**

---

### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.5**

Moved: Cr R Joyce  
Seconded: Cr A Henry

3. (c) Approved the Multi-Council Water Organisation being:
- i. Initially with Tauranga City Council subject to Tauranga City Council's approval of a corresponding resolution.

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

---

For: Cr Thwaites, Cr Joyce, Cr Wichers, Cr Dally, Cr Henry, Cr Grainger, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour and Mayor Denyer.

Against: Cr Murray-Benge, Cr Sole, Cr Rae and Cr Coxhead

**CARRIED 8/4**

## MOTION

Moved: Cr Dally

Seconded: Cr Sole

3. (d) During the Due Diligence phase, engage with Rotorua Lakes District Council, Whakatane District Council, Opotiki District Council and Kawerau District Council formally inviting their consideration of joining the Water Organisation either from the initial start date, or at a later date.

The motion was put and declared lost on show of hands.

**LOST**

1.28pm The hui adjourned.

1.56pm The hui reconvened.

There was further discussion required in reference to stormwater within the Water Services Delivery Plan. It was clarified that the proposed recommendation was specific due to the staff requiring a clear view from Council in order to undertake the financial analysis, including or excluding stormwater.

It was noted that at this time the Water Services Delivery Plan included stormwater.

The rationale for the proposed recommendations allowed staff to see that Council could take it's time in relation to Stormwater, while allowing the financial modelling to be developed in time to delivery their Water Services Delivery Plan whilst retaining their option in the future.

Staff and Ms Baddley responded to pātai as follows:

- It was noted that it would be problematic if the ownership of the stormwater infrastructure was split between Council and the joint water service organisation.
- It was acknowledged that the need for the specificity in the third paragraph of recommendation 3(e) could be seen as a contradiction if it were not for the inclusion of the financial analysis. It was noted that staff did not have the information at the moment to apportion what stormwater assets would transfer, and which assets would remain. The first decision was agreement on progressing

---

through the due diligence process to outline what assets would transfer, and which ones would not. The wording proposed in the third paragraph of recommendation 3(e) was to address the short-term requirements for the Water Services Delivery Plan, to make assumptions around the financial analysis.

- There was nothing in the legislation at this time that determined how Council could charge for stormwater, this was something that was yet to be determined by Council.
- 

### RESOLUTION CL25-10.6

Moved: Cr M Grainger

Seconded: Cr A Henry

3. (d) Agreed that developed stormwater infrastructure (manholes, pipes, networked infrastructure) predominantly in urban environments should be considered for transfer to the joint water service organisation as part of the due diligence process and that non-urban stormwater infrastructure will be retained by Western Bay of Plenty District Council (WBOPDC) and be managed in conjunction with the primary interface of transport infrastructure.

Agreed that assets (including land) where a significant purpose is recreation and open space, should remain with the Council and should not be planned to transfer to the joint Water Service organisation.

Directs that the Water Services Delivery Plan (WSDP) financial analysis be based on the above stormwater assets transferring although further work needs to be undertaken to determine the treatment of specific stormwater assets and services consistent with principles set out in the Water Services Delivery Plan (WSDP).

Agrees that specific advice around the treatment of these assets be reported back prior to the receipt of the report from due diligence.

**CARRIED**

---

### RESOLUTION CL25-10.7

Moved: Cr M Grainger

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

4. That Council directs the Chief Executive Officer to amend the Water Services Delivery Plan (**Tabled Item 1**) on the basis of a multi-Council Water Services Council-Controlled Organisation with Tauranga City Council; and that the amended Water Services Delivery Plan be presented to Council for adoption.
-

5. That Council receives the presentation and minutes from the Council Workshop on 4 June 2025 (**Attachment 2 and 3**) 10 July 2025 (**Attachment 4 and 5**) and the Council Workshop on 14 July 2025 (**Attachment 6 and 7**).

**CARRIED**

## **10.2 APPROVE THE COMMITMENT AGREEMENT FOR A JOINT COUNCIL WATER SERVICES COUNCIL CONTROLLED ORGANISATION**

Council considered a report from the Strategic Advisor.

Tabled Item 2 – The Commitment Agreement was provided separately to the agenda.

Given the above resolutions, Council suggested the below recommendations in relation to the Commitment Agreement.

### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.8**

Moved: Mayor J Denyer  
Seconded: Cr M Murray-Benge

1. That the Strategic Advisor: Legislative Reform and Special Project's report dated 5 August 2025 titled 'Approve the Commitment Agreement for a Joint Council Water Services Council-Controlled Organisation' be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of high significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That Council directs the Chief Executive Officer to amend the Commitment Agreement (**Tabled Item 2**) to remove Thames-Coromandel District Council; and to present an amended Commitment Agreement for approval.

**CARRIED**

## **11 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

### **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

#### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.9**

Moved: Cr A Sole  
Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

1. That in accordance with Standing Orders the order of business be changed, and that the confidential agenda be dealt with next, to release external presenters following the Thunder Ridge Update.
2. That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, with the exception of Glenn Snelgrove and Roger Williams from Thunder Ridge, for the presentation update to Council as part of Agenda Item 11.1.
3. The general subject matter 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 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
<b>11.1 – Thunder Ridge Update</b>	<p>s7(2)(h) – the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p> <p>s7(2)(i) – the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p>	s48(1)(a)(i) – 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 would exist under section 6 or section 7
<b>11.2 – Award Pool Service Delivery Contract</b>	<p>s7(2)(b)(ii) – the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</p> <p>s7(2)(i) – the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations</p>	s48(1)(a)(i) – 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 would exist under section 6 or section 7

	(including commercial and industrial negotiations)	
CARRIED		

2.15pm The hui moved into public excluded.

3.25pm The hui moved back into open.

**NOTE:** Resolutions CL25-10.10 – CL25-10.12 were captured within the confidential minutes.

## 12 REPORTS CONTINUED

### 12.1 STANDARD & POORS CREDIT RATING – 2025 ANNUAL REVIEW

Council considered a report dated 5 August 2025 from the Financial Analyst. The report was taken as read.

#### RESOLUTION CL25-10.10

Moved: Cr M Grainger

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

That the Financial Analyst's report dated 5 August 2025 and titled 'Standard & Poor's Credit Rating – 2025 Annual Review', be received.

CARRIED

### 12.2 RECOMMENDATORY REPORT – STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE – CEMETERIES BYLAW 2025

Council considered a report dated 5 August 2025 from the Senior Policy Analyst. The Policy and Planning Manager provided an overview of the report and recommendations therein.

#### RESOLUTION CL25-10.11

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr M Murray-Benge

1. That the Senior Policy Analyst's report dated 5 August 2025 titled 'Recommendatory Report – Strategy and Policy Committee – Cemeteries Bylaw 2025', be received.

2. That Council adopts the Cemeteries Bylaw 2025 (included as **Attachment 1** of this report), to come into force on 8 September 2025.
3. That Council directs the Chief Executive to publicly notify the adoption of the Cemeteries Bylaw 2025 in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002.

**CARRIED**

---

### **12.3 RECOMMENDATORY REPORT – STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE – LIVESTOCK MOVEMENTS BYLAW 2025**

Council considered a report dated 5 August 2025 from the Senior Policy Analyst. The Policy and Planning Manager provided an overview of the report and recommendations therein.

---

#### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.12**

Moved: Cr A Sole  
Seconded: Cr M Murray-Benge

1. That the Senior Policy Analyst's report dated 5 August 2025 titled 'Recommendatory Report – Strategy and Policy Committee – Livestock Movements Bylaw 2025', be received.
2. That Council adopts the Livestock Movements Bylaw 2025 (included as **Attachment 1** of this report), to come into force on 8 September 2025.
3. That Council directs the Chief Executive to publicly notify the adoption of the Livestock Movements Bylaw 2025 in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002.

**CARRIED**

---

### **12.4 APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATE LOCAL RECOVERY MANAGER**

Council considered a report dated 5 August 2025 from the Operations Manager. The report was taken as read.

---

#### **RESOLUTION CL25-10.13**

Moved: Cr M Grainger  
Seconded: Cr L Rae

---

1. That the Operations Manager's report dated 5 August 2025 titled 'Appointment of Alternate Local Recovery Manager', 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, in accordance with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, and the Bay of Plenty Emergency Management Group Policy for selection and appointment of Local Controllers and Local Recovery Managers, Western Bay of Plenty District Council:
  - a) Acknowledges the resignation of Cedric Crow and recommends that his appointment to the position of Alternate Local Controller/Alternate Local Recovery Manager be rescinded; and
  - b) Recommends to the Bay of Plenty Joint Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee that Jo Lynskey be appointed as Alternate Local Recovery Manager - Western Bay of Plenty District Council.

---

**CARRIED**

---

## **12.5 MAYOR'S REPORT TO COUNCIL**

Council considered a report dated 5 August 2025 from the Senior Executive Assistant – Mayor/CEO.

The Mayor responded to pātai as follows:

- It was still appropriate for the Mayor to attend LGNZ events/meetings, as a non-member, noting this was an opportunity for professional development and networking.
  - Councillors were able to attend the LGNZ conferences in their Councillor capacity. If they wished to attend the Community Board conference, it was expected that this was funded through the existing Community Board conference budget.
  - It was clarified that because Council was no longer a member of LGNZ, the Mayor did not attend or vote at the AGM, so did not represent Council in this forum.
  - There were no more LGNZ events before the end of the triennium.
  - The meeting with Peter Cooney was a general relationship meeting, as they had never met before.
  - The 'Leading for Delivery, Te Tumu, Geoffrey Ford' meeting was a preliminary discussion, noting that there was another meeting scheduled to talk to the issues, and what needed to be resolved to help progress this project.
-



---

**RESOLUTION CL25-10.14**

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr A Henry

That the Senior Executive Assistant – Mayor/CEO’s report dated 5 August 2025 title ‘Mayor’s Report to Council’ be received.

**CARRIED**

---

**12 INFORMATION FOR RECEIPT**

Nil

**The Meeting closed at 3.40pm.**

**Confirmed as a true and correct record at the Council meeting held 4 September 2025.**

.....  
Mayor J Denyer  
**CHAIRPERSON / MAYOR**