



NOTICE OF MEETING

**Notice is hereby given of the Meeting of the
Invercargill City Council
to be held in the Council Chamber,
First Floor, Civic Administration Building,
101 Esk Street, Invercargill on
Tuesday 12 December 2017 at 4.00 pm**

His Worship the Mayor Mr T R Shadbolt JP
Cr R R Amundsen (Deputy Mayor)
Cr R L Abbott
Cr A J Arnold
Cr K F Arnold
Cr T M Biddle
Cr A H Crackett
Cr I L Esler
Cr G D Lewis
Cr D J Ludlow
Cr I R Pottinger
Cr L F Soper
Cr L S Thomas

EIRWEN HARRIS MITCHELL
MANAGER, SECRETARIAL SERVICES

Council Agenda - APOLOGIES

A G E N D A

		Page
1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	PUBLIC FORUM	
2.1	OIL AND GAS COMPANIES COMING TO SOUTHLAND	
	Jenny Campbell and Dave Kennedy will be in attendance to speak to this Item.	
2.2	REVIEW OF COUNCILLORS AS DIRECTORS POLICY	
	Nobby Clark from Invercargill Ratepayers Advocacy Group will be in attendance to speak to this Item.	6
2.3	PORK PIE ARTWORK IN INVERCARGILL	
	Jordan Wyatt will be in attendance to speak to this Item.	
2.4	ALUMINIUM DROSS	
	Cherie Chapman will be in attendance to speak to this item.	
2.5	ALEX LITHGOW STATUE	
	Cr Esler will speak to this Item.	
3.	MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2017	7
4.	MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 21 NOVEMBER 2017	17
5.	MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BLUFF COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON 20 NOVEMBER 2017	19
6.	MINUTES OF COMMITTEES	
6.1	COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE 27 NOVEMBER 2017	26
6.2	REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE 28 NOVEMBER 2017	30
6.3	INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES COMMITTEE 4 DECEMBER 2017	34
6.4	FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE 5 DECEMBER 2017	41

7.	MINUTES OF THE URBAN REJUVENATION SUBCOMMITTEE HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2017	50
8.	MINUTES OF THE SELECT REHOMING AND EUTHANASIA OF DOGS ADVISORY PANEL MEMEBERS HELD ON 12 NOVEMBER 2017	52
9.	REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES	
9.1	2018/19 FEES AND CHARGES	53
9.1.1	Appendix 1	55
9.1.2	Appendix 2	114
10.	REPORT BY ALL COUNCILLORS	
10.1	PACE TO PROGRESS REPORT	118
10.	MAYOR'S REPORT	121
11.	URGENT BUSINESS	
12.	PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION	

Moved, seconded that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting; namely

- (a) *Confirming of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of Council 7 November 2017*
- (b) *Confirming of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Community Services Committee 27 November 2017*
- (c) *Confirming of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Regulatory Services Committee 28 November 2017*
- (d) *Confirming of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Infrastructure and Services Committee 4 December 2017*
- (e) *Report of the Director of Finance and Corporate Services*

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)(d) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
(a) Confirming of Minutes – Council 7 November 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(b) Confirming of Minutes – Community Services Committee 27 November 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(c) Confirming of Minutes – Regulatory Services Committee 28 November 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(d) Confirming of Minutes – Infrastructure and Services Committee 4 December 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(e) Consultation Document Preparation	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)

Hi Eirwen

My speech will cover the following:

- The issue of Councillors also holding Directors roles within the council owned companies
- The process of seeking and independent report of that issues
- The process used to date to consider that independent report with a change of committee being used
- The outcomes of that report that does not include the option of prohibiting Councillors as Directors
- A reflection of Cnr Sopers' public statement of "If it aint broke, don't fix it" including a significant example of it being broke
- A set of recommendations on how this policy should be changed as part of full council consideration

Regards

Nobby

Nobby Clark/Karen Carter
karennobs@yahoo.com

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE INVERCARGILL CITY COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 101 ESK STREET, INVERCARGILL, ON TUESDAY 7 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4.00 PM

PRESENT: His Worship the Mayor Mr T R Shadbolt
Cr R R Amundsen – Deputy Mayor
Cr R L Abbott
Cr K F Arnold
Cr T M Biddle
Cr A H Crackett
Cr I L Esler
Cr D J Ludlow
Cr I R Pottinger
Cr L F Soper
Cr L S Thomas

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr R Fife – Bluff Community Board
Mr C A McIntosh – Director of Works and Services
Mr D J Johnston – Director of Finance and Corporate Services
Mrs E Harris Mitchell – Manager Communications and Secretarial Services
Mr M Morris – Legal Advisor
Miss A Goble – Policy Analyst
Mr P Casson – Venture Southland
Ms M Chapman – Personal Assistant

1. **APOLOGIES**

Cr A J Arnold and Cr G D Lewis.

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Pottinger and **RESOLVED** that the apologies be accepted.

2. **PUBLIC FORUM**

2.1 **K9 Cribs**

Daryn Chalmers and Kim Findlay were in attendance to speak to the Item.

Mr Chalmers said previously residents from Findlay Road had spoken to Council and now it was K9 Cribs' chance to defend themselves. They purchased the 120 Findlay Road property on 22 June 2012 and spoke to all bordering neighbours asking for any issues, which there were none. At no point had anyone said there were restrictions on dog numbers and their research with the District Plan showed no indication either. As the business grew there were more dogs and therefore more noise. As part of the development programme, a new boarding kennel was built which was fully insulated to minimise external noise, proving that noise had always been a consideration. They were unaware there were any issues with the neighbours and had the neighbours contacted them they could have addressed the issues. Once it became obvious there was a problem, they started working with Council staff to mitigate this.

They had asked Council for specific details such as time of noise but this could not be supplied. Mr Chalmers was asked to submit a noise management plan which was done and Council issued an abatement notice. All issues in the abatement notice had been fixed. Council staff had indicated that Mr Chalmers knew when the noise testing was happening but he did not. He had not received the findings from the latest Marshall Day testing. Council staff said in June there were 88 dogs onsite, but Mr Chalmers said the total number of dogs throughout June had not exceeded this. They had looked through the attendance records and there were on average 59 dogs per day in attendance. Limiting the number of dogs would not fix the noise. Council believe the warmer weather was increase the noise but this would not be the case, and restriction of opening hours would also have no effect as the dogs would still be there. Neighbours wanted complete sound proofing but this was impractical and Mr Chalmers was aiming for noise minimisation. There were 11 houses on the boundary not 29 and some of the 29 may be affected but not all. K9 Cribs employed 12 staff who were affected with the stress of this issue. K9 Cribs were involved with Civil Defence and part of the emergency response team and attended regular meetings regarding this. They believed they were an essential service for the city and urged Council to make allowance in the District Plan businesses to be developed. K9 Cribs had inherited an 11 year old problem. It was a long standing issue for the minority of neighbours which would be unlikely to ever be resolved due to the length of time but they were working to minimise. There were 1,300 dogs on the books and he asked where they would go.

In response to questions, the following answers were given:

- We haven't had 88 dogs onsite at one time. Around 70 is our limit and that is self-imposed. It is in our business plan.
- When we went door knocking we were welcomed into homes. I don't think it's at a situation yet where its 'neighbours at war'.

Cr Thomas said in the minutes of the Regulatory Services, Cr Ludlow had asked if the Director would be in a position to update Council at full Council meeting. Mrs Gare said she would be on leave but there would be a report tabled. Mr Morris apologised that a report was not prepared in Mrs Gare's absence as he was unaware. Cr Thomas said this was extremely important and if staff said they were going to provide something then it needed to be provided.

Cr Pottinger said his comments were around the common sense of the District Plan which was there to protect everyone. He agreed that dog kennels provided a brilliant service but asked if in Mr Chalmers' opinion if it was sensible where the District Plan allowed a dog kennel to be a permitted activity adjacent to residential dwellings. He could not see the common sense in that. Mr Chalmers said he could not see the common sense in the District Plan ever being signed off but it was what they were dealing with now. Cr Pottinger said he had looked at a few other District Plans from other cities which were quite clear they were discretionary. He asked if moving forward would that be something Council should look at and when Mr Chalmers did apply for resource consent being a discretionary activity and affected neighbours were consulted, he said this was a tough decision. Mr Chalmers said these decisions were made 11 years ago, probably by people not here now.

Cr Pottinger said the video clip did state that while the sun was out the dogs were playing and he asked what sort of play time the dogs have. Mr Chalmers replied that the dogs were in the kennels during the night. The dogs were out during the day. It was a high energy environment and dogs made noise.

In response to further questions, the following answers were given:

- It had steadily grown. Our daily average in 2015 was 45 and in 2016 it was 59. We haven't done the 2017 figures because we are still in 2017.
- We have 15 dogs of our own. It has been hard to ascertain if the complaints are from our own dogs. Most of our dogs are Huskies and we believe that in the early morning they go into chorus. Since we have been made aware of that by Dog Control we have been locking our dogs inside until 8.30 am. We are trying to eliminate piece by piece.
- That would be a question for council staff. No one had ever come to us to say 'did you know the noise is getting louder'?

His Worship the Mayor thanked the submitters for submitting.

Cr Amundsen said she had received the additional report from Marshall Day with regard to the noise issues. She would meet with Findlay Road residents and then the report would be provided to K9 Cribs. Daily monitoring was being undertaken from Animal Control and Noise Control to monitor noise.

3. **REPORT OF THE INVERCARGILL YOUTH COUNCIL**

The report had been circulated and Co-Chairpersons of the Youth Council took the meeting through it, summing up their experience with Youth Council.

Cr Crackett said the Youth Council had had a successful year and she was proud of how they had grown over the year and wished them well for the future.

Cr Soper asked if they had thought about how they would take what they had learned and gained, Meg O'Connell said she would apply it next year, especially walking into Council and knowing how to conduct herself and communicate.

Moved Cr Crackett, seconded Cr K Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

4. **ARTS MURIHIKU PRESENTATION**

Lisa Tou-McNaughton was in attendance to speak to the Item.

Ms Tou-McNaughton took the meeting through a PowerPoint Presentation, copy of which is available from Secretarial Services.

Ms Tou-McNaughton said the aim of Arts Murihiku was to be a champion of arts in Southland and Invercargill. The arts were an integral part of the community and it was important to support artists and arts organisations and by so doing would make Invercargill and the region vibrant and positive.

In response to questions, the following answers were given:

- We need a strategy that sees into the future with what this place could be. I have already got a few ideas in my head but I don't want to talk about them now. I love Southland and Invercargill is a great place.
- I think you should be factoring this in to the Long Term Plan. In my submission to Imagine Invercargill I said that you should factor that in.

With regard to SoRDS, which is the regional initiative, 10,000 people have got to want to stay here and so we have to have things within our community that a vibrant and engaging to families, young people, older people, and new people that are coming here that keep them here. I think the arts have a huge part to play in that.

- I think you need to work together as a team. If you were doing the same as Rotorua, with funding that's a huge amount of money but imagine the wonderful things you could do with that money. There are a lot of talented and creative people within Southland.
- We want the website to be a one-stop-shop for the arts in Southland. If artists haven't got a website or Facebook page they could be on their. It's the ability for artists to have a little bit of a profile and connect with each other and also a directory of resources so if they need assistance with funding there is also that. Lots of artists don't like to promote themselves so you have to have someone else to do that promotion.

5. **PRESENTATION ON OMAUI TRACK**

Cr Esler took the meeting through a PowerPoint Presentation on the Omaui Track, a copy of which is available from Secretarial Services.

In response to a question from Cr K Arnold with regard to car parking, Cr Esler said there was car parking at Omaui but it was limited. This was something Council would need to address at some stage.

In response to a question from Cr K Arnold with regard to funding, Cr Esler said he needed to acknowledge the ILT Foundation, Community Trust, Lotteries, Les Hutchings Foundation, Community Trust of Southland, Southern Trust and Invercargill Active Communities. The total budget was about \$90,000. He said this was cheap considering the asset Council had now gained.

In response to a question from Cr K Arnold with regard to how long it would take to walk the track, Cr Esler said to allow one and a half hours and it was a moderate gradient.

In response to a question from Cr Abbott with regard to donation boxes, Cr Esler said thanks to Lotteries, there was money in the kitty for maintenance.

In response to a question from Cr Thomas with regard to a track counter, Cr Esler said it could become like the Te Puni Track where a track counter was available. The track was on DOC land and there was a management agreement with DOC.

In response to a question from Cr Pottinger with regard to Rocky Knoll, Cr Esler said it was on private land and the track was on public land.

Moved His Worship the Mayor, seconded Cr K Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

6. **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH BYLAW**

6.1 **Chris Henderson**

Ms Henderson tabled a photograph of Invercargill in the 1940s showing in red the heritage buildings which have since been lost.

She wanted to protect what was left of the heritage buildings. Motorcycle Mecca was an example of adaptive reuse of a building. She said more could be done with the verandas and spouting. Water from the spouting could be used as grey water use in car washes or watering gardens rather than going straight into the stormwater. Instead of using treated water from the Oreti, Invercargill could become a rainwater harvest capital of New Zealand by utilising all the buildings and all the spouting's for that purpose. She asked if the general public would be given a say on the demolition on the cornerstone buildings of ILT's new hotel because this could be a good chance to cooperate and discuss the future of the building.

His Worship the Mayor thanked the submitters for submitting.

6.2 **Healthy Families**

Jarred Cappie and Stella O'Connor were in attendance to speak to this Item.

Mr Cappie thanked Council for the opportunity to speak and acknowledged the positive collaboration with Parks and Reserves around a suitable location for mobile food vendors. Healthy Families Invercargill was committed to creating a healthy, happy, safe community. As part of having a positive influence in the food system, Healthy Families Invercargill coordinated with Venture Southland and Sport Southland at community events. The vision was to have a calendar full of events that encouraged the sort of healthy behaviours which would have a positive impact on the community, and events which provided enough healthy options for participants to ensure making a healthy choice was an easy choice.

The Environmental Health Bylaw was an example of a collaborate opportunity to demonstrate transformational leadership to influence the health and wellbeing of the community. Their submission was not about changing this Bylaw but about consulting with people to ensure the best possible outcome for everyone. Under the section on Mobile Traders it stated that *'unless permission has been applied for and granted from the appropriate Council department, Council prohibits all holders of mobile trading licences from trading in the following areas ..., parks and reserves, car parks, except with the permission from Council's Parks Manager*. It also stated that an operator of a mobile travelling shop should not remain stationery in any public place or road exceeding two hours or not stand in one site for more than an eight hour period. Presently mobile food vendors were not required to liaise with those organising events. The concern was this had created situations where food and drink products were being sold that were not aligned with the vision and message of these events or the venue. Event organisers went to lengths to make sure their events were successful and Healthy Families Invercargill believed it made sense to include those organisers in the discussions with vendors to ensure alignment of messaging. The consultation would ensure there were no competitive conflicts with operators who had paid to operate within the venue.

In response to questions asked, the following answers were given:

- What we are talking about today is why we are issuing special licences, why we are changing the food environment of places where we already have an obesity environment and we are creating it more so when we are issuing licences when they shouldn't normally be there. There is food available at the Stadium. What we have done is change that food environment and what we want to see is if we are issuing licences that they align with the events that are there.

- We are not say get rid of deep fried, high sugar, high salt foods we are just saying make sure there is a healthy choice available as well so everyone has a choice.
- We are not taking choices away, we are asking for consultation and aligning it with the event as well.
- For the second year in a row at the Surf to City we have not provided deep fried foods or sugar sweetened beverages. We still allow people to bring whatever they want into the park. We have had no formal complaint. People still have a choice. What we want to create is a healthy choice being an easy choice.
- It's a complex issue with multiple levels so there needs to be a lot done so in terms of changing the food environment, more physical activity and being able to work with different communities and partner with them to make that healthy choice the easy choice and it's not a one fix solution. As I said we are happy to partner with Council. We talked about having a potential strategy around obesity and physical activity and we would be more than happy to have a workshop and talk about how we can partner and move forward. It's about working with those leaders and champions in the community. Sport Southland can't do it on their own, Healthy Families can't, DHB can't, Council, we all have to unite together to turn this statistic around. 36% of Invercargill are classed as obese and 33% are overweight so that's 69% overweight or obese.
- Sport Southland provides physical activity events but this is about multiple events in the community, not just physical activity events.
- Any organisation that is government funded should be aligning themselves to the childhood obesity strategy. It's going to require more than policy, law and regulations to help, support and drive environments that can help people make healthy decisions.
- It's difficult for our healthy mobile food vendors to make a trade. We have had people try and start a business but they can't compete with the deep fried fish and chips beside them.
- Healthy food tends to have a short shelf life. We are not here to ban sausage sizzles. We are not here to be the food police. We are here to create with the community solutions that they feel can be viable for them.

Moved Cr Abbott, seconded Cr Soper and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

His Worship the Mayor thanked the submitters for submitting.

7. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Moved Cr Abbott, seconded Cr Pottinger and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

8. **MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2017**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Ludlow and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

9. **MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 31 OCTOBER 2017**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Soper and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

10. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BLUFF COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON 16 OCTOBER 2017**

Moved Cr Esler, seconded Cr K Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be received.

11. **MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

11.1 **Community Services Committee – 24 October 2017**

Moved Cr Abbott, seconded Cr Soper and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

11.2 **Regulatory Services Committee – 25 October 2017**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Crackett and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

11.3 **Infrastructure and Services Committee – 30 October 2017**

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr K Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

11.4 **Finance and Policy Committee – 31 October 2017**

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Thomas and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

12. **MINUTES OF THE URBAN REJUVENATION GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE HELD ON 5 OCTOBER 2017**

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be approved.

13. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES**

13.1 **Bylaw Adoption and Hearings**

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that the report be received;

AND THAT

The submissions are received and considered by Council;

AND THAT

The Bylaws be adopted including any amendments arising from the submissions.

13.2 **Smokefree Areas Policy**

Cr Pottinger said his concern was that Council was confident that it had consulted with all affected parties that would be affected by this policy.

Cr Ludlow said the Smokefree CBD Policy had not been done in secret but the venue managers within the CBD had been consulted and may not have referred up to their higher management. Not all organisations needed to be consulted but all venues were.

Cr Pottinger said his concern was not limited to the ILT but there were other establishments whose only area to smoke was on the street and he was concerned their submissions had not been received. He just wanted to make sure everyone had been consulted with.

Cr Soper said this had been mentioned at the Finance and Policy Committee meeting and if Council were going to delay this because there was suspicion someone had not been consulted then nothing would happen. On the process matter she was in favour of this. She wanted it pointed out that staff had clearly written into the policy a 12 month review period. If there was someone who felt they had not been consulted there was time at the review period. It was time Council took on board this policy.

Moved Cr Soper, seconded Cr Ludlow and **RESOLVED** that the report be received;

AND THAT

Council adopt the Smokefree Areas Policy.

14. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING SERVICES**

14.1 **Temporary Alcohol Ban**

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Abbott that Council impose a Temporary Alcohol Ban on 16 December 2017 from 10.00 am to 8.00 pm from the intersection of St Andrew Street and Racecourse Road to the Racecourse Road entrance of the Ascot Park Hotel, and no Yarrow Street between Racecourse Road and Derwent Street.

Cr Abbott said this ban only applied to the racing not to individual residences.

Note: Cr Thomas and Cr Crackett declared an interest in voting.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

15. **REPORT OF HIS WORSHIP THE MAYOR**

The report was tabled.

Moved His Worship the Mayor, seconded Cr Crackett and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

15. **URGENT BUSINESS**

15.1 **Resignation of Cr Esler**

Cr Esler said he had resigned only from the Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board. He took the opportunity to hand over the Chairmanship to someone who was younger and had fresh ideas. He also took the opportunity to resign from the Board and recommended that Cr Amundsen take his place.

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Ludlow and **RESOLVED** that this report be accepted as a late item.

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Soper and **RESOLVED** that the report be received;

AND THAT

Cr R Amundsen be appointed as the new Trustee to the Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board.

16. **COUNCIL IN PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**

Moved His Worship the Mayor, seconded Cr Abbott that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- (a) *Confirming of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of Council 26 September 2017*
- (b) *Confirmation of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Extraordinary Council Meeting 17 October 2017*
- (c) *Confirmation of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Community Services Committee 24 October 2017*
- (d) *Confirmation of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Regulatory Services Committee 25 October 2017*
- (e) *Confirmation of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Infrastructure and Services Committee 30 October 2017*
- (f) *Confirmation of Minutes of the Public Excluded Session of the Finance and Policy Committee 31 October 2017*
- (g) *Report of the Chief Executive*

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)(d) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
(a) Confirming of Minutes – Council 26 September 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
(b) Confirming of Minutes – Extraordinary Council Meeting 17 October 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(c) Confirming of Minutes – Community Services Committee 24 October 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(d) Confirming of Minutes – Regulatory Services Committee 25 October 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(e) Confirming of Minutes – Infrastructure and Services Committee 30 October 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(f) Confirming of Minutes – Finance and Policy Committee 31 October 2017	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
(g) 6 Ward Parade, Bluff	Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	Section 7(2)(a)

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE INVERCARGILL CITY
COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING, 101 ESK STREET, INVERCARGILL, ON TUESDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2017
AT 4.00 PM**

PRESENT: His Worship the Mayor Mr T R Shadbolt
Cr R R Amundsen – Deputy Mayor
Cr A J Arnold
Cr R L Abbott
Cr T M Biddle
Cr A H Crackett
Cr G D Lewis
Cr D J Ludlow
Cr I R Pottinger
Cr L F Soper
Cr L S Thomas

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr R W King – Chief Executive
Mrs P Gare – Director of Environmental and Planning Services
Mr R Pearson – Roading Manager
Mr D Booth – Manager Financial Services
Ms M Short – Manager Strategy and Policy
Miss A Goble – Policy Analyst
Ms L McCoy - Building Assets Administration
Mr P Casson – Chief Executive Officer – Venture Southland
Ms L Kuresa – Governance Officer

1. **APOLOGIES**

Cr K F Arnold and Cr I L Esler.

Moved Cr Abbott, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that the apologies be accepted.

2. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES**

2.1 **2016/17 Annual Report Summary**

The report had been circulated and Ms Short took the meeting through it.

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Biddle and **RESOLVED** that the Annual Report Summary be adopted by Council.

2.2 **Financial Policies**

The report had been circulated and Ms Short took the meeting through it.

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Lewis and **RESOLVED** that the Investment Policy and the Liability Management Policy be adopted.

2.3 **Rating Policies**

The report had been circulated and Ms Short took the meeting through it.

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Abbott and **RESOLVED** that the Rates Postponement and Rates Remission policies be continued without amendment.

2.4 **Financial Strategy Update**

The report had been circulated and Mr Booth took the meeting through it.

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Thomas that the draft Financial Strategy be adopted for inclusion in the Long Term Plan development process and provided for Audit.

In response to a question by Cr Thomas, as to whether Council had been assured that the core debt for Council remained below \$140 million, Mr Booth said that the \$140 million was the forecast just below 15%.

Cr Thomas said that it was Council's wish to not breach that 15%, and he was pointing out that it was something that Council needed to be aware of when looking at projects.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

2.5 **Infrastructure Strategy**

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

Cr Thomas said that it was critical that Council identified its core assets and the asset management of them but under the "Key Assumptions" with regard to "Catastrophes", it said that Council had made the assumption that there would be no major catastrophe that would impact on Invercargill and then on Page 92, under "Water", it said that Invercargill was a high risk in relying on open water source as a result of the catastrophic event in the city could be without access to water. He said there was some ambiguity around the wording of that.

In response to a question by Cr Ludlow, that it talked about how to reduce risk in the community and he wondered if that was correct if there was a significant event. Mr Pearson said catastrophically it would increase the risk.

Ms Short said that in the Assumptions Document, Council said that it was planning not to have a catastrophic event but the risk of that being wrong was quite high because Council was unsure of what would happen in the future. Although Council was not planning for a catastrophic event in the next 30 years, Council was aware that should it be wrong, the risk of that was quite high. She said that it would be clarified so that it read consistently.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Soper and **RESOLVED** that the draft Infrastructure Strategy be adopted for inclusion in the Long Term Plan development process and provided for Audit.

There being no further business, the meeting finished at 4.20 pm.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BLUFF COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE BLUFF MUNICIPAL CHAMBERS, GORE STREET, BLUFF ON MONDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 7.00 PM

PRESENT: Mr R Fife (Chair)
Mrs W Glassey (Deputy Chair)
Mrs G Henderson
Mr G A Laidlaw (from 7.04 pm)
Mrs P Young

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr R Pearson – Roading Manager
Mrs N Allan – Service Centre Manager
Mr L Beer – Bluff Publicity/Promotions Officer
Ms L Kuresa – Committee Secretary

1. **APOLOGY**

Cr A J Arnold, Cr I L Esler and Mr G A Laidlaw for lateness.

Moved G Henderson, seconded W Glassey and **RESOLVED** that the apologies be accepted.

2. **PUBLIC FORUM**

2.1 **Demolition of the Club Hotel**

John Edminston from Bluff Oyster and Food Festival Trust was in attendance to speak to this Item.

Note: Mr G Laidlaw joined the meeting at 7.04 pm.

Mr Edminston said the Bluff Oyster and Food Festival Trust would be applying for resource consent for the demolition of Club Hotel, and the Trust wanted the support of the Board as well as the Invercargill City Council on this matter. The Trust met last week with representatives from Heritage New Zealand and they were informed of the state of Club Hotel. The Trust was advised on what it needed to do to try and sell it in December and in the interim two reports had been carried out on the premises. One was done by GM Engineering and the other was done by Cole. The Board was aware that the premises was in a bad state, so the Trust would be putting in a report that it had exhausted all avenues to try and sell Club Hotel. It had been on Trade Me for years with no success in selling it. The Trust hoped it would be completed for next year's Festival but that depended on whether the Trust was able to get the resource consent and support it needed to plan ahead, but if it was not completed then there was always the 2019 Festival.

The Chairman said that the biggest concern he had was that if it was demolished it would be one great empty hole but he was happy to see what the Trust had planned for that site.

After further discussions, the Board said it was a great idea. The Board indicated its support for the Trust's plans going forward because it would enhance the main street and attract visitors to stop and take photos and maybe stay in town longer. The Board congratulated the Trust for its forward thinking.

The Chairman thanked Mr Edminston for taking the time to present to the Board on this matter.

2.2 **Awarua Development**

Tyrone Strongman was in attendance to speak to this Item.

Mr Strongman tabled a copy of his submission and took the meeting through it.

In response to questions, the following answers were given:

1. The reality is that we are more likely to have 16,000 passengers, which means that the shortfall will be smaller and that means that the subsidy required for the next year to run the service will be reduced. Only 10% of the ferry passengers are using the bus service at the moment but if we are able to replace this service with the service that Real Journeys is offering, we will cut the price by 60%. That will make Stewart Island and Bluff more accessible and it will also mean that tourists will have more money to spend in Bluff or Stewart Island.
2. The bus timetable coincides with the ferries from Bluff and Invercargill. It will mean that we can connect onto Catch a Bus Service and Intercity Services. It will also mean that we can join the Intercity network and get them to add Bluff as a destination to book a ticket to and from Bluff. Whilst the Regional Passenger Transport Plan for Invercargill looks good, there will be a big improvement on the current service by enhancing it. Also, if we were to have the Bus Smart Programme then Invercargill residents who had the Bus Smart card would be able to use that to come down to Bluff for the day for \$15.00 return. There will also be ongoing tourism opportunities by having the service here in Bluff.
3. There are SIT students who have wanted to utilise the bus and they were talking to the families who run the intermediate bus about using the bus but they are the position now where they are full.
4. The bus that Go Bus is looking at giving us is a 24 seater bus and it looks like a coach. It has the capacity to store bags underneath and a cage on the back to put things like prams and bikes. It will also be an opportunity to offer locals the right to bike to Bluff and catch the bus back to Invercargill or vice-versa.
5. The beneficiaries who live in Bluff are saying that they don't have access to jobs in Invercargill because of transport issues.

The Chairman said that this potentially had great opportunities and the feedback from the survey would give a good indication on what the community wanted. It also had potential especially in-line with Real Journeys.

In response to a question by R Fife, as to whether Go Bus was a national service, Mr Strongman said that Go Bus was the largest bus company in New Zealand. They had the flexibility to give Bluff bigger buses, smaller buses and essentially match the capacity along the way. Go Bus was a contractor, so they would run the service for Bluff, but Awarua Development would need to run the business of it.

In response to a question by W Glassey, as to whether this new service would replace the Intermediate school bus service, Mr Strongman said that it would.

W Glassey said it would mean that taxpayers would need to pay for people's choices because that was a contentious issue. This was due to the fact that Bluff School students had a choice, including most of the people who used that service.

Mr Strongman said that those families would need to pay \$1,000 per year under this new service. At the moment people were paying \$2.00 each way and Awarua Development would not be able to maintain that, so the fare would be increased to \$2.50 each way, which was the concession rate. Whilst the ratepayer would be subsidising this service, they would be paying for it as well. The unique thing about this new service was that it would be a tourist route as well and ratepayers would be subsidising tourists to come to Bluff. The difference was that tourists would always pay the full price, so a tourist would pay \$10.00 whereas a ratepayer would pay \$7.50.

The Chairman said that was a concern and Mr Strongman said that the school bus situation was urgent but it was something that needed to happen if the community wanted tourists to come to Bluff. If the community wanted to operate tours and open up new developments, Bluff needed to be accessible, competitive and affordable. Whilst it would be subsidising choice, those buses would be available for students, schools and all Bluff residents.

Mr Pearson said that the Regional Public Transport Plan, (RPTP) was out for consultation, so people could go to the website that sets out the process within the website to submit. He said that submissions closed on 15 December. The website had an overview of the services and part of that was for individuals to submit on what was in the Plan or what needed to be included in the Plan. He said that submissions would be heard on 26 February 2018.

The Chairman thanked Mr Strongman for taking the time to present to the Board.

2.3 **The Cycle/Walking Tracks**

Russell Hawkes from Environment Southland was in attendance to speak to this item.

Mr Hawkes updated the Board on the remainder of the Invercargill/Bluff Walking and Cycling Trail. He said that the last time he presented to the Board he had every expectation that the people would potentially be catching the bus from Bluff to Invercargill after using the trail. The trail had gone as far as Kokeno Place and Environment Southland had been trying to get approval for the next stage of the trail. Funding was in place to do the work from Bluff to Green Hills. The trail would be located on either State Highway land or Railway reserve, which was where the issue was. It had been a long and frustrating process and they had confirmation that an audit would be completed and sent to Kiwi Rail before Christmas. In the meantime, NZTA had identified that there were issues with some sections of the road, and they were not particularly with people walking across the railway line overbridge. He took the meeting through the process going forward and said that he wanted to give the Board some positive news on this matter but there had been some obstacles along the way.

In response to questions, the following answers were given:

1. The issues are not around where the track will be. It's about the railway crossing.
2. The next potentially difficult bit is at the lagoon that's not far out of Bluff where there's a wire rope barrier. They are looking at building a structure on the water side of the wire road barrier to stop the water getting onto the road, which will be convenient so that we can put a cycle track along there. That's all within the road reserve and it's also within the coastal marine area but because it's a designated road reserve they can do that as road protection works. It was hoped that we may be able to get that done before Christmas but it won't be at this stage.
3. The funding is \$150,000 for the work. It's the easiest part of the whole trail. We will be going to the Community Trust of Southland for some funding and it's included in the Environment Southland Long Term Plan. We may be able to get more funding from NZTA and there could be funding through the new Government for Walking/Cycling Road Safety. I don't think the funding to complete the work been an issue. The issue is getting a signature on a piece of paper to get the work done and the people we are dealing with are in Wellington. It is frustrating for everyone involved.
4. If we can get the trail finished to the middle of Bluff Township and turn that into a shared zone and if it becomes a safety issue, it will fall squarely on NZTA's shoulders to fund anything that needs to be done. That will take it away from local funding because it's on the State Highway. Once it becomes a shared zone, the Bluff Community Board might be able to negotiate with NZTA to do something about the safety improvements that are needed.
5. We will have the paperwork completed by the end of the year and we ready to put a contractor there to do the work. We could have tenders closed by the middle of February 2018 but I've said that before, so I will keep in touch if there are any changes.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hawkes for taking the time to update the Board on this matter.

3. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 OCTOBER 2017**

Moved W Glassey, seconded G Henderson and **RESOLVED** that the minutes be accepted as a true and correct record.

4. **MATTERS ARISING**

Nil.

5. **REPORT OF THE BLUFF PUBLICITY/PROMOTIONS OFFICER**

The report had been circulated and Mr Beer took the meeting through it.

5.1 **Classic Motorcycle Mecca Burt Munro Challenge Bluff Hillclimb – Thursday 8 February 2018**

5.2 **Summer Sounds Concert – Sunday 28 January 2018**

5.3 **America's Cup Visit**

5.4 **Christmas in the Bluff – Sunday 10 December 2017**

Moved P Young, seconded G Laidlaw that the report be received.

Mr Beer said that the picnic table that Bluff Promotions commissioned next to the Lighthouse Gallery was now in place but the concrete pad was still to be put down. Mrs Henderson had informed him that it was well used to date. He needed to liaise with Mr Pagan to get it put in the right position that he was happy with. He said that there was a Committee Meeting of the Try-Whanau Triathlon Committee last week and they were working on a media release shortly in that regard. He also informed the meeting that a media release was made today on behalf of the Oyster Festival Committee advising the public that 50% of next year's Festival tickets had been sold and that ticket sales were going very well, so people needed to purchase their tickets.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

6. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF WORKS AND SERVICES**

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

6.1 **Bluff Action Sheet**

Moved W Glassey, seconded G Henderson that the report be received.

Mr Pearson informed the meeting of the following points that were not included in the Bluff Action Sheet:

- The Christmas tree has arrived and there will be some banners and other decorations delivered to Bluff shortly.
- The planned work to seal the roads had been completed.
- I haven't heard of any contractor issues with regard to sumps not working.
- The shrubs outside the fuel tanks were an issue and some response needed to be sought on what their intentions are for that area. I will write to them on the Board's behalf and come back to the Board once I get a response.
- The Cycling Strategy is a Southland wide Strategy where all councils sit on this Group. Bluff to Invercargill is highlighted as probably the number one priority, so the Board can write to the Governance Group of Ride Southland and encourage them to speed up any installation and identify what features they would be providing and how it worked.

Mr Pearson took the meeting through a PowerPoint Presentation with regard to the Bluff Boat Ramp.

In response to questions, the following answers were given:

1. The top of my list is you have to decide whether the boat ramp is going to work for you and it's going to be usable and does what you want it to do. After that you need to make decisions on what the rest of that area is going to look like.
2. I think that you as a Board should start to think about how you might recommend that some form of user pays recovery process.

After further discussion, it was agreed that the Board needed to give this matter a lot of thought and once the costings were available then all user groups needed to meet and be informed of the options and start working from there.

The Chairman thanked Mr Pearson for his report.

G Henderson said that with regard to the new Earthquake Building Act that had just come out, it stated that a submission needed to put in relation to roading. If there was an earthquake and the roads were closed off from Henderson to Liffey streets, emergency services would not be able to access those roads. They would need to go through Liffey Street to Ocean Beach Road and the tanks were there from Ocean Beach Road to Suir Street and if they were closed off there was no other access for emergency services.

Mr Pearson said that the legislation talked about the priority of the roads and specifies what the urgency to fix buildings were. If there was only one road through town, you could not afford for that road to be closed off because if the building fell on top of it, you could not get through. As part of that, there was a need to consider the grid network of the streets. For instance if there was a street that had domestic housing on it and none of those houses were likely to fall onto the road, then the road was unlikely to close by debris. The main street which is the same as Tay Street in town, if there was an earthquake and half the building had fallen onto the road, would that matter to and around the city to a wider context. If that happened in Invercargill, we would say that cars could drive around streets but there would usually be streets that were closed progressively but there were alternatives. When looking at preparing a submission, there was a need to consider that if Gore Street was closed, were there other streets that did not have high buildings close to it that would allow people driving around the back of the streets to get through. If there was a grid network, that fortunately Invercargill and Bluff had, the pressures placed on the Gore Street properties for urgency to upgrade their buildings, could be less than if that was the only road available for emergency services to get through.

G Henderson said that if that that road was closed off from Suir Street with tanks damaged, you not be able to get out unless you drove up Konini Street and back down. Mr Pearson said it would still give you choice and the Board could have a look at that on a plan and decided if that was too hard. He was not sure if the tanks were likely to fall onto the road but that was something for the Board to look into. He said that the Board also needed to look at how much urgency they saw the earthquake strengthening on those buildings and what the positive impact of upgrading could be but equally what could be the negative impact if there was only a short time to upgrade those building.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

7. **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The report was tabled and the Chairman took the meeting through it.

7.1 **Omaui Walking Track**

The Chairman informed the meeting that there was a good turnout for the opening of the Omaui Walking Track that happened two weeks ago. It was a very good track and the Omaui Walking Track Committee and the Maori Landcare Committee who had carried out a lot of work in building the track and enhanced it to contain the possums and rats as well. It was noted that the bird life had come back there and it was very good walk that would only enhance the area and complement the walking tracks in Bluff.

7.2 **Concept Plan**

The Chairman said he was tentatively looking at the 11 December to get some of the community groups together to have further discussion on ideas before going out to the public with a draft Concept Plan. He would prefer to have that meeting before Christmas so that they could work towards having some public consultation and get the community involved as well.

7.3 **America's Cup**

The Chairman said the evening was a success at Stirling Point. There were some great stories told by the America's Cup Team. It was good to see that they had taken the Cup around to the regions and he hoped that the event went well in Auckland in four years' time.

7.4 **Sea Wall by the War Memorial**

The Chairman said he was contacted by Mary Leask who advised that the seawall by the War Memorial was cracked in a number of places. He had looked at it and it would be good to get Mr Pearson there to have a look at it and decide what needed to be done. He wanted the issue addressed sooner rather than later.

Moved R Fife, seconded G Laidlaw and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

8. **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

The report had been circulated.

Moved R Fife, seconded W Glassey and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

9. **URGENT BUSINESS**

9.1 **Road Safety Initiatives**

Mr Pearson said that as part of one of the Road Safety initiatives, he had brought some tee-shirts that the Board could take away and wear. The idea was that councils from Waitaki-south wanting to do something different about the road safety toll and this initiative was to try and start a social movement. It was attempt not to tell everyone not to drive too fast but to ask the question, "What is your number in terms of the road toll". At the moment it was over 300, and as soon as you say what your number was in terms of the road toll in one year, who were you contributing towards it? It was about starting a conversation about road risk and taking the time to think about what you could do differently to change to the road toll. He also had some tape that people could use to wrap around areas that could prevent road risks.

There being no further business, the meeting finished at 9.15 pm.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 101 ESK STREET, INVERCARGILL ON TUESDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4.00 PM

PRESENT: Cr R L Abbott (Chair)
Cr A J Arnold (Deputy Chair)
Cr T M Biddle
Cr G D Lewis

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr L S Thomas
Mrs G Henderson – Bluff Community Board
Mr R Pearson – Manager Roading
Mr P Thompson – Aquatic Services Manager
Mr S Ridden – Manager Corporate Services
Ms M Napper – Community Development Manager
Ms M Foster – Manager Library and Archives
Ms L McCoy - Building Assets Administration
Miss G Crawford – Community Development Officer
Ms M Sievwright – Personal Assistant

1. **APOLOGIES**

Cr I L Esler, Cr L F Soper and Cr R Currie.

Moved Cr Biddle, seconded Cr Lewis and **RESOLVED** that the apology be accepted.

2. **PUBLIC FORUM**

Nil.

3. **MONITORING OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

The report had been accepted.

3.1 **Levels of Service**

3.1.1 ***Community Development***

3.1.2 ***Libraries and Archives***

3.1.3 ***Pools***

3.1.4 ***Housing Care Services***

3.1.5 ***Bus and Transport***

Library and Archives

In a response to a question from Cr Lewis about the drop in membership, Ms Foster responded that membership went up and down throughout the year.

It was a fluid number with people joining and leaving. The visitor numbers had been very good.

Housing Care Service

Mr Ridden said housing care was up to 100% occupancy and registrations were not being accepted.

In response to a question from Cr Thomas about the demographics in ages, Mr Ridden said 73% were on GRI, 14% in the 60 to 65 age bracket, and 13% were older than 65. Housing Care was catering for elderly.

Mr Ridden said the team was doing a good job with maintenance. Requests had been received for planning contractors for roofing and exterior paintwork.

Passenger Transport

Mr Pearson said the buses were being changed over into new plasma buses, which were buses that had been refurbished and he was hoping the customers would enjoy the ride more. He was looking for feedback on the new routes to be introduced. The new ticketing system was due to go ahead in April. Marketing for this would begin in the New Year. He had spoken with Reading Cinema about how they planned to undertake work on their veranda.

Pools

Mr Thompson said there had been a busy few months and were exceeding 70,000 people through the changing rooms. He had begun looking at replacing the hydroslide as the existing slide was at the end of its life. He was also looking at moving the location of the slide because at the moment if there was an event on the slide could not be used.

In response to a question from Cr A Arnold about whether this would have a bearing on building a smaller pool, Mr Thompson said yes. He understood from the design team that a new hydroslide would be in a self-contained area with separate water supply.

In response to a question from Cr Biddle about fees to use the hydroslide, Mr Thompson said he did anticipate a fee and this would be based on what the slide would cost.

In response to a question from Cr Thomas about consultation, Mr Thompson said replacement hydroslide was approved some months ago but the proposal would be brought back to Council for approval. There would be an initial loan along with grants to pay for the investment of the slide, and the charge would be used to pay for the loan.

In response to a question from Cr Thomas about car parking, Mr Thompson said when firmer details were available, car parking would be included as a single review for Council.

Moved Cr Biddle, seconded Cr A Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

4. **MONITORING OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

The report had been circulated.

4.1 **Financials**

4.1.1 ***Community Development***

4.1.2 ***Libraries and Archives***

4.1.3 ***Pools***

4.1.4 ***Housing Care Services***

4.1.5 ***Bus and Transport***

Cr Thomas asked if a review had been undertaken on library income and how it could be increased. Ms Foster said a review had not been done but she was aware the income was tracking down, mainly because they had implemented changes which meant the revenue from overdue books had decreased because overdue alerts were being sent. It was indicated in the Long Term Plan that alternative revenue ideas were being looked at. Mr McIntosh this was included in the Activity Plan for the upcoming Long Term Plan but he believed it would be time to look at this and see what the role of commercial advertising was, and how else revenue could be found.

Moved Cr Biddle, seconded Cr A Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

5. **OTHER BUSINESS**

5.1 **Report of the Chief Executive**

5.1.1 **Community Development Projects**

Ms Napper said the Child, Youth and Family Friendly sub Committee meet every six weeks and the minutes were included in the agenda.

Moved Cr Lewis, seconded Cr Biddle that the report be received.

Cr Thomas said with regarding to Item 5.5 Workplan 2018 in the Child, Youth and Family Friendly minutes, it was suggested that all council facilities were 'water only'. Ms Napper said this was a suggestion by a member of the Family Friendly Subcommittee and no work had been done yet. The Southern District Health Board had gone to have water only in its vending machines. Cr Thomas said this was taking people's choices away. Cr Abbott agreed as the District Health Board advocate choices but were giving no choices. Ms Napper said this was only something that came up at the Child, Youth and Family Friendly meeting and nothing had been done. It was similar to the Friendly Brand where one of the criteria was that healthy food options were available.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

6. **PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**

Moved Cr Biddle, seconded Cr A Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Report of the Director of Works and Services

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)(d) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Housing Care Rental Review for 2018	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).	Section 7(2)(i)

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,
101 ESK STREET INVERCARGILL ON WEDNESDAY 28 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4.00 PM**

PRESENT: Cr R R Amundsen – Chairperson
Cr K F Arnold
Cr A H Crackett
Cr L F Soper

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr L S Thomas
Cr A J Arnold
Mrs G Henderson – Bluff Community Board
Mr R W King – Chief Executive
Mrs P M Gare – Director of Environmental and Planning Services
Mr M Morris – Legal Advisor
Mr T Boylan – Resource Management Manager
Mr J Youngson - Manager - Environmental Health and Compliance
Mrs M Rusike - Team Leader Environmental Health
Miss H McLeod – Communications Advisor
Miss E Dickson - Team Leader - Animal Services
Ms M Sievwright – Personal Assistant

1. **APOLOGIES**

Cr T M Biddle and Cr D J Ludlow.

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Soper and **RESOLVED** that the apologies be accepted.

2. **REMEMBRANCE**

Cr Amundsen asked for a moment's silence to remember Tamati Maere, Building Consents Officer, who had passed away.

3. **PUBLIC FORUM**

Nil.

3. **MONITORING OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

3.1 **Levels of Service**

The report had been circulated.

3.1.1 ***Alcohol Licensing***

3.1.2 ***Animal Control***

3.1.3 ***Building***

3.1.4 ***Compliance***

- 3.1.5 **Total Mobility**
- 3.1.6 **Environmental Health Section**
- 3.1.7 **Resource Management**
- 3.1.8 **Valuations**

Moved Cr Soper, seconded Cr Crackett that the report be received.

Cr Crackett said there was a significant portion of new residential buildings compared to the previous year, but the report also said the motivation for holding back consents was unknown, and she asked for clarity on what this meant. Mrs Gare said staff did not know the reason but often this happened when there was a change in government as people would hold off on developments. Cr Amundsen said consents had gone on hold and then people addressed the issues from the hold notices and these had all cycled through now.

Cr Crackett asked if there were any reasons why consents were held back, and Cr Amundsen said it was coming into summer and potentially everyone wanted to start building now.

Cr Thomas said the report stated Council was understaffed in Parking Compliance and asked how understaffed Council actually was and how many officers were in the field. His concern was with the Christmas period coming up there needed to be people doing this work. Mrs Gare said there were normally three officers, one officer had transferred within Council and another officer had resigned. New staff had been interviewed and Mrs Gare expected to appoint two staff by the end of the week.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

4. **MONITORING OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

The report had been circulated.

- 4.1 **Directorate Overview**
 - 4.1.1 **Environmental Planning Services**
 - 4.1.2 **Planning Services**
 - 4.1.3 **Administration**
 - 4.1.4 **Building Services**
 - 4.1.5 **Alcohol Licensing**
 - 4.1.6 **Animal Services**
 - 4.1.7 **Environmental Health**
 - 4.1.8 **Compliance**
 - 4.1.9 **Resource Management**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr K Arnold that the report be received.

Cr Thomas said this was the flow on effect from the compliance. It was a significant amount of money. He asked why the operational expenditure had gone up. Mr Youngson said there was a relationship between financial revenue and operational expenditure and this was tickets that had gone to court. Council needed to offset what had gone to court against expenditure.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

5. **OTHER BUSINESS**

5.1 **Report of the Director of Environmental and Planning Services**

5.1.1 ***Proposed Replacement Name for Private Right of Way***

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Soper that the Right of Way be named Shand Way as it is a short and concise name which meets the requirements of AS/NZS 4819:2011.

In response to a question from Cr Amundsen whether the residents had been consulted, Mr Boylan said the neighbours were aware this name had been put forward and no negative feedback had been received. The people who owned the right of way do have some say over the naming and his understanding was the owners were aware this was going to change.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

5.1.2 **K9 Cribs**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Crackett and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

6. **PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr K Arnold and **RESOLVED** that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Report of the Director of Environmental and Planning Services

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)(d) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Taha and 62 Colyer Road, Invercargill	Maintain legal professional privilege	Section 7(2)(g)

General subject matter of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Update on District Plan Appeals	Maintain legal professional privilege	Section 7(2)(g)
Six (although on this occasion a five) Monthly Update of Legal Advisor	Maintain legal professional privilege	Section 7(2)(g)
Obligations of Council and Building Owners in the Opening of a New Commercial Building	Maintain legal professional privilege	Section 7(2)(g)
Proposed Inner City Demolition / Redevelopment	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING, 101 ESK STREET, INVERCARGILL ON MONDAY 4 DECEMBER 2017
AT 4.00 PM**

PRESENT: His Worship the Mayor Mr T R Shadbolt
Cr L S Thomas – Chairperson
Cr I R Pottinger – Deputy Chairperson
Cr A J Arnold
Cr K F Arnold
Cr A H Crackett
Cr I L Esler

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr K F Soper
Mrs G Henderson – Bluff Community Board
Mr C A McIntosh – Director of Works and Services
Mr R Pearson – Roading Manager
Mr P Horner – Building Assets Manager and Museum
Mr M Loan – Drainage Manager
Mr A Murray – Water Manager
Mr R Keen – Manager 3Waters
Ms A Smith - Team Leader - Core Services
Ms L McCoy - Building Assets Administration
Ms L Kuresa – Governance Officer

1. **APOLOGIES**

Nil.

2. **PUBLIC FORUM**

Nil.

3. **MONITORING OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

3.1 **Levels of Service**

3.1.1 ***Parks and Reserves***

3.1.2 ***Public Toilets***

3.1.3 ***Roading***

3.1.3 ***Sewerage***

3.1.4 ***Solid Waste Management***

3.1.5 ***Stormwater***

3.1.6 ***Water Supply Activity***

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Crackett that the report be received.

Cr Pottinger asked if Council could be presented with a plan with regard to what was happening with the various roads down by the river at Sandy Point and the parking area at the end of Christies Road where the horse floats get together.

Cr Thomas said that Mr Pagan was on leave but that request would be put through to Mr Pagan.

His Worship the Mayor said that Alan Dennis did a lot of work and had a Committee set up to look at issues relating to Oreti Beach and wondered if he should be kept informed as well.

Cr Thomas said that Alan Dennis was involved with the Save Oreti Beach and what Cr Pottinger was asking about was about Sandy Point.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

4. **MONITORING OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

4.1 **Finances**

4.2 **Services**

4.3 **Toilets**

4.4 **Engineering Services**

4.5 **3 Waters**

4.6 **Drainage**

4.7 **Parks Operation**

4.8 **Property**

4.9 **Roading Services**

4.10 **Water**

4.11 **Parks Assets**

4.12 **Solid Waste**

4.13 **WasteNet**

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr A Arnold that the report be received.

Cr Thomas noted that the Parks Operation was \$138,000 under budget. It stated that the expenditure was slightly down which would now change as staffing levels increased. He wondered if it was the staffing levels over the summer because of the growth factor or were the staffing levels being brought up to what they should be. Mr McIntosh said that Parks Operation had staff for extra work and for the seasonal work.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

5. **OTHER BUSINESS**

5.1 **Report of the Director of Works and Services**

5.1.1 ***Temporary Road Closure***

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

In response to a question by Cr Pottinger, as to whether February was a quiet time as there seemed to be a lot more happening in November, Mr Pearson said that Burt Munro was previously in November. There were about three reports that followed this one and he was using a regulation that gave the opportunity to object to the road closures. If there were objections, they would need to be heard by a Council Committee and the January Council meeting was the only one to achieve that.

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr Esler and **RESOLVED** that the report be received;

AND THAT

It be **RECOMMENDED** to Council that should objections be received for any of the events, these will be heard by Council on 30 January 2018.

5.1.2 ***Temporary Road Closure – Racecourse Road Ascot Park Christmas at the Races***

Note: Cr Thomas declared a conflict of interest and refrained from commenting and voting. Cr Pottinger chaired the meeting for this Item.

The report had been circulated.

Cr K Arnold said that she was present at the August Regulatory Services Committee Meeting when this road closure was first brought to Council. She had gone back through the minutes and it was also brought to Council on 7 November for approval and it was now before the Infrastructure and Services Committee. She was of the understanding that when this road closure was raised at the Regulatory Services Committee Meeting, it was to do with the Alcohol Bylaw and this Council had the authority to issue a temporary ban in relation to alcohol and she wondered if this was this report was for something different.

Mr Pearson said that there were two activities. The first one was for approval with the sale of Alcohol Regulations and that also needed Council's approval from a roading perspective. This report was for a formal process of stopping the road.

In response to a question by Cr K Arnold, as to when Council had publicly notified the temporary road closure, Mr Pearson said that was done last month. The normal process was that Council called for objections and gave at least 42 days' notice before the event and if there were no objections, then Council had delegated authority to its officers to approve it. In this case, it was the first time that some of the Councillors would have seen this process in terms of these two reports, the Christmas Races and the Don Street closures. There were two public events and it was an opportunity for Councillors to place any special conditions that they may want to on these events.

This road closure could have been notified by the Chief Executive or the Director of Works and Services and then Council but it was considered that this was an opportunity for Councillors to give some extra direction.

In response to a question by Cr Pottinger, as to whether the road closure affected Bupa being situated in that area, Mr Pearson said that people were allowed access into Bupa but you could not drive through the whole site. Discussions were understood to have occurred with Bupa. It seemed that the traffic approval was what they desired and it was relatively easy for them to manage. There had not been any objections to the road closure in recent years from the residents in that area.

In response to a question by Cr Pottinger, as to whether advertising was only done through the newspaper or was a letterbox drop done as well, Mr Pearson said that the legislation currently called for it to be advertised in the newspaper, and The Southland Times had been traditionally used in previous years.

Moved Cr K Arnold, seconded Cr A Arnold and **RESOLVED** that it be **RECOMMENDED** to Council that Council approves the temporary closure of Racecourse Road, from Yarrow Street to St Andrew Street, from 8.30 am to 7.30 pm on Saturday 16 December 2017.

Note: Cr Thomas refrained from voting.

Note: Cr Thomas resumed the Chair for the balance of the Agenda.

5.1.3 ***Temporary Road Closure – Don Street Kiln Christmas Celebration***

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

Moved Cr Crackett, seconded Cr Pottinger that it be **RECOMMENDED** to Council that Council approves the temporary closure of Don Street, between Kelvin and Dee Streets, between the hours of 3.00 pm on Friday 22 December 2017 through to 3.00 am on Saturday 23 December 2017.

In response to a question by Cr Esler, that this road closure had been notified in The Southland Times and he wondered if it was also notified in The Southland Express, Mr Pearson said he was happy to do either but the legislation said that it needed to be advertised in the newspaper in circulation. These proposed closures were general road closures, so there could be people outside the circulation of The Southland Express. It was something that needed to be clarified further going forward.

In response to a question by Cr Thomas, if it was only the Invercargill Licensing Trust area that needed to be notified, Mr Pearson said that this was a road closure, so it was advertised in The Southland Times so that anybody who had an interest could object.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

5.1.4 ***Rimu Street Cart Races***

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

In response to a question by Cr K Arnold, as to whether Mr Pearson or someone in the Directorate had delegated authority to recommend these temporary closures, Mr Pearson said that the Chief Executive and any other subsequent delegations would be able to give approval. The first three reports were being brought back to this Committee and then to full Council because they were high profile and important events. Council could also apply special conditions and given that this time last year was during the election and Council did not have that opportunity, so this was an opportunity for some of the new Councillors to apply special conditions.

In response to a question by Cr Esler, as to whether Council could run the traffic management for a public event like this, Cr Thomas said it was the event organised by South Alive which was a separate entity to Council. South Alive had sought funding from Council to run the event and this had been an ongoing event for several years. The traffic management of the event would not be that intensive but there would be a cost. He said that it would better for Council not to get involved in these sorts of events because there was public funded money involved and Council could receive several other requests and Council did not have the resources to fulfil that.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Crackett and **RESOLVED** that it be **RECOMMENDED** to Council that Council agrees that the temporary closure of Rimu Street and part of Metzger Street (from no 162 to Rimu Street) on Sunday 4 March 2018 between 12.00 noon and 4.30 pm for the purpose of a cart race will not unreasonably impede traffic;

AND THAT

Approval is given under the Local Government Act 1974 (Section 342 and Schedule 10) to permit the closure to occur, subject to having an approved Temporary Traffic Management Plan.

5.1.5 ***Stopping of Unformed Roads – Adjacent to 461 Bluff Highway***

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

Moved Cr Crackett, seconded Cr K Arnold and **RESOLVED** that it be **RECOMMENDED** Council that Council gives approval to commence the consultation process to consider the stopping of an unformed legal road as shown in the report.

5.1.6 ***Bluff Road Ramp***

The report had been circulated and Mr Pearson took the meeting through it.

Cr Pottinger said the key thing with this was the funding of work on the ramp itself and the fact that it needed to be user pays. It was common throughout New Zealand to have user pays and there were so many ways of implementing it by engaging charity groups to do it. It would be interesting to know if there were any statistics on how many people currently used the ramp.

Mr Pearson said that a video camera would be installed to record the next three months to ensure that they received some good statistics on the usage patterns. That was something that they had not received a lot of data on and it would also be useful to know the size and frequency of the users to get a reasonably good scope to understand it and potentially to identify where the users came from. He said that the Bluff Community Board had been updated on this matter. The stakeholders needed to be brought into this process and the success of the user pay system would need the support of the users.

In response to a question by His Worship the Mayor, as to whether the Bluff Community had expressed any preference on this matter, Mr Pearson said that the Bluff Community Board had been involved in the consultation carried out earlier and had expressed the desire to ensure that the ramp worked well, the jetty was there and extra carparking. The Board was reasonably happy with either option and Mrs Henderson was present at the meeting if she wanted to comment on the matter.

Mrs Henderson said that the Board was waiting to see what the outcome of today's meeting was. With regard to boats, there were up to 50 boats parked at the boat ramp on a Sunday, which made it hard to get parking for the Museum.

After further discussions, Cr Thomas said that the options would come back to Council which was exciting. It was great for Bluff and for recreational activity in that area.

Moved Cr A Arnold, seconded Cr Thomas and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

5.1.7 ***Stormwater Discharge Consent – Preparation of Evidence for Appeal***

Cr Thomas said that this Item would be withdrawn and he asked Mr McIntosh to explain the reasons why.

Mr McIntosh said that the purpose of the report was to update the Committee on the status of the appeal for the Stormwater Discharge Consent. Since the Agenda had gone out, the appeal had been withdrawn. It meant that the report was no longer relevant and nothing else needed to be considered.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Pottinger and **RESOLVED** that Item 5.1.7 be withdrawn from the Agenda.

6. **URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil.

7. **PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Esler and **RESOLVED** that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Report of the Director of Works and Services

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Contract 815 – Lake and Hyde Street Watermain Renewal 2017-2018	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
Roading Land Transfer Barrow Street, Bluff	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)
Contract 785 – Clifton Wastewater Treatment Plant Civil and Mechanical Enabling Works – Portion 1	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	Section 7(2)(i)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 101 ESK STREET, INVERCARGILL, ON TUESDAY 5 DECEMBER 2017 AT 4.00 PM

PRESENT: His Worship the Mayor Mr T R Shadbolt
Cr D J Ludlow – Chair
Cr G D Lewis – Deputy Chair
Cr R L Abbott (from 4.28 pm)
Cr R R Amundsen
Cr I R Pottinger
Cr L S Thomas

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr A Arnold
Cr A H Crackett
Cr L Soper
Cr T Biddle
Cr L Esler
Mr R W King – Chief Executive
Mr C A McIntosh – Director of Works and Services
Mr D Booth – Manager Financial Services
Ms M Short - Manager Strategy and Policy
Mr S Tonkin – Building Management
Mr P Horner – Building Assets Manager and Southland Museum and Art Gallery Manager
Mr P Casson – Venture Southland
Mr W Cambridge – Preston Russell
Ms M Sievwright – Personal Assistant

1. **APOLOGY**

Cr R L Abbott.

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Lewis and **RESOLVED** that the apology be accepted.

2. **PUBLIC FORUM**

Nil.

3. **MONITORING OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

3.1 **Levels of Service 1 July 2017 to 31 October 2017**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Thomas and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

4. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES**

4.1 **Financials to 30 September 2017**

Moved Cr Lewis, seconded Cr Pottinger and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

5. **DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES/BYLAWS**

Nil.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**

6.1 **Report of the Director of Works and Services**

6.1.1 **Quarterly Report - Southland Museum and Art Gallery**

The report had been circulated.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Pottinger that the report be received.

In response to a question from Cr Thomas regarding the service levels, where visitor numbers exceeded 210,000 and there were 232,580 by the end of the first quarter, he asked if this was a typo. Mr Horner said this because of winter where not so many people came to the museum.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

6.2 **Report of the Director of Environmental and Planning Services**

6.2.1 **Archaeological Assessment – 20 Don Street, Invercargill**

Mr Tonkin said 16-20 Don Street had been demolished and as part of the process an archaeological assessment needed to be undertaken because they were heritage buildings. Dr Hayden Cawte and Amy McStay were in attendance to talk through the report which was in the agenda. Dr Cawte took the meeting through a PowerPoint presentation, copy available from Secretarial Services.

Cr Thomas said under the ownership and disclaimers in the report, ownership of the primary materials created in the course of research remain the property of New Zealand Heritage Properties. Dr Cawte said any artefacts, unless of Maori origin, was owned by the property owner.

Cr Thomas said Council was charged with looking after ratepayer money and believed this was an historical document, documenting the history of Invercargill as well as the archaeological side and this report had cost in excess of \$150,000. Council had several buildings which would be demolished and would be up for a considerable sum of money for archaeological inspections. He concern was that Council has already paid \$150,000 for a one paragraph conclusion. Dr Cawte said the purpose of this presentation was to form part of the interpretation before it was submitted to Heritage New Zealand. Cr Thomas said his concern was Council was going through an inner city development, and would need to go through this process each time a building was demolished. He was aware this was government legislation but a lot of the information was provided by archives, libraries, Council plans and it showed everyday workings of a city 100 years ago.

Surely that was documented history now and this process would have to be repeated every time a building was demolished. His concern was it would hinder progress.

Dr Cawte said this was part of the legislation and it was a user pays system. Cr Thomas said there was just a lot of bottles and broken crockery and in sixty years' time Heritage New Zealand would get excited about a Watties spaghetti can. When Council had to pay so much money to be told it was everyday living he was not happy with it and was unhappy with the legislation.

Cr Ludlow said he understood Cr Thomas' sentiment but Dr Cawte did not put the process in place. Dr Cawte said it was simple commerce and it was like Forest and Bird where you were dealing with resources and if they were limited resources then you needed to mitigate against it. Cr Thomas asked why the archaeological side could not be done without the history and Dr Cawte said that was not the most expensive side of the process.

Cr Pottinger asked whether Council could archive what was found and not pay for the story. He understood this was about securing and recording so it was stored and the person doing the development paid for it. Dr Cawte said the legislation stated you needed to interpret the story and you needed to find the context around the object. It was simple user pays. If you were using a resource you needed to pay.

In response to questions asked, the following answers were given:

- Things happen and there is no getting away from mistakes and very few remain onsite. There is no big sticks being waved. Sometimes someone decides they are going to work a couple of hours extra and in this instance it wasn't a big issue. There is a legal requirement to be onsite at certain times and sometimes that doesn't happen. There are plenty of lessons and the key one here, and where a lot of the costs have come from, is that it would always be a lot easier and cheaper to deal with the archaeology in one go rather than multiple episodes of investigation which is what happened here. Going forward there are many ways of saving money, bearing in mind that the rough costs for archaeology from a surveying point of view are always one to two percent but here I would say definitely trying to deal with the archaeology in one go so there is less situations where there are multiple excavations.

Note: Cr Esler left at 4.42 pm

- As long as there are no variations to scope which could happen. This happens in every city and every town in the country. So budgeting purpose with some leeway is between one and two percent of the project budget. For smaller city developments it can be estimated.
- There was an early estimate given on the basis of two sites being excavated. It was about \$60,000 to \$70,000. Two more sites had been added.
- There would be about 1,000 who could undertake this work. They have to be approved by the Act but of those there would still be 250. They can be found through the Heritage New Zealand website.
- The reports are all approved by Heritage New Zealand. We just don't decide we want to make something up. There is a minimum requirement and every practitioner must meet the criteria.
- The report is deposited with the local council and museum.

6.2.2 20 Don Street – Results of Survey

Mr Tonkin said it was important a survey was undertaken of the neighbouring properties. He took the meeting through the results of this survey. This survey highlighted issues which would help improve processes for next time.

Moved Cr Lewis, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that the Archaeological Assessment – 20 Don Street, Invercargill and Results of Survey reports be received.

6.2 Report of the Director of Finance and Corporate Services

6.2.1 Appointment of Directors Policy

It was agreed that each recommendation and taken and discussed separately.

Cr Thomas said the history for ICHL was three directors because this was a Council company in excess of \$230 million and he would not like to Council lose the balance of power of their own company. He liked the report but was not in favour of this recommendation.

Cr Pottinger said under the current number of directors with three being councillors, to meet the requirements of the Local Government Act and council's appointment policy, directors needed to meet certain skills. There could be a time in the future when no councillor met these requirements. He asked how council would fill the three positions of there were no councillors available.

Cr Thomas said under Board and Director Skills for ICHL Appointments Criteria, suggested core competencies must include sound judgement, decision making, commercial acumen, public service ethos, high personal integrity, clear communication, effective team work and collaboration, strategic thinking, risk management understanding, corporate citizenship, understanding of the wider interest of the publically accounted shareholders. He said this was that councillors did as their position as councillors.

Cr Pottinger said the Local Government Act clearly stated that if someone was appointed as a director they had to have the same skill set as if they were standing as an individual for that particular company. Otherwise what councillors were doing was compromising the performance of the Board and that was not what he wanted. He wanted the best return for the city.

Cr Ludlow said councillors could not guarantee anything because if there was an independent director who was standing for a company, it could be possible there would not be many who fitted the gaps in the skills matrix.

Mr King said looking at the matrix, it was hard to see how you could not get a councillor given the depth and breadth of what was listed.

Cr Soper said all councillors wanted the best for the city, but she remained unconvinced about recommendation 1.1. She said Council had done well over the many years since the holding company was formed with the 3/2 split. She was uncomfortable to see Council given up control of its own company and urged councillors to consider that once the percentage was changed they could not go back. She agreed with other recommendations but not R1.1.

Cr Amundsen asked if the policy could be changed to say 'up to three' instead of 'a majority'. She said it seemed councillors wanted Council to have less say by

having less directors, but wanted Council to have more say by choosing the Chair, which seemed very contradictory.

Cr Ludlow said rather than 'up to three', the holding company would be obliged to come back to the shareholder to seek guidance. He was not sure the policy would require that amendment.

Cr Biddle asked if Council looked at 'up to three', if there were independent directors that had a strong matrix and skills based, Cr Ludlow said what councillors were looking at was the councillor appointment policy and not the independent director appointment policy. If there were only two suitable applicants, then the company would need to come back to Council to determine what happened to the third position.

Cr Lewis said not all directors were elected at the same time. There was a roll over situation to maintain continuity, and it worked very well at the moment. He would still like to see the majority of directors coming from the Council and maintain impartiality which was one criteria.

Cr Abbott said he did not have any issues with anyone's skill sets. His opinion was it was wrong and could be perceived by the public as pecuniary interest. Cr Ludlow said they were discussing a policy which was every councillors duty to be a part of.

Cr Pottinger said people repeatedly state it was doing well so why change it, but he said there was no consideration given for the benefit of the ratepayers, as there had been no open debate. This document was about exploration. Now was a good time to explore things before it was set in concrete before the next election.

Cr Soper said she was happy to suggest an alteration to the recommendation if it would help with the debate. She suggested the recommendation could be altered to say that the report be received with the exception of R1.1.

Cr A Arnold said he was of two minds. One of the things was the selection process, with council being the only shareholder they would be able to select any director they wanted even if they were not councillors. Cr Ludlow said there was the Directors Appointments Committee who looked at the councillors applying, it was not determined by Council but ultimately approved by Council so the recommendations came with a degree of independence. Councillors did get a say in who was appointed.

Cr Thomas said Council was the shareholder and asked why Council did not challenge the holding company to broaden its horizons and look for other challenges. Council was the shareholder and Council could give direction to the holding company. Cr Pottinger said a previous problem was the CEO of Holdco was the Director of Finance, the Chair of Holdco was the Chair of Finance and before that the Chair of Finance was the Chair of EIL; now the Chair of Finance was a Director of Holdco. There was a set up where there were no checks and balances to challenge the group and that needed to be there.

Cr Thomas said Council had the ability through the reporting processes that Holdco had in place, to challenge the Holdco Board to say Council would like to look at opportunities, but they do not.

Cr Biddle said she supported Cr Pottinger in that Council had never looked at not having councillors as directors.

Moved Cr Pottinger, seconded Cr Abbott that recommendation R1.1 – Reduce the number of Councillor directors to ICHL to enable a majority of independent directors, be accepted.

The motion, now being put, was **LOST**.

Note: Crs Ludlow, Lewis, Amundsen and Thomas voted against this motion.

Cr Pottinger noted that three of the councillors that voted against the motion were directors on Holdco. Cr Thomas said it was policy that was being voted on. Cr Ludlow asked Mr Cambridge if this should be noted and Mr Cambridge said it was only necessary to record the vote.

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Pottinger that recommendation R1.2 – Strengthen alternative channels of ICC influence of Council Organisations, be approved.

Cr Pottinger said this recommendation needed to be explored as the alternative channels were not defined. So Council would need to look at both the options whether commercial or legislative.

Ms Short said there was a report from the Office of the Auditor General which set out ways the relationship could be strengthened without changing the set up. She would look into this and report back to Council.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

Moved Cr Abbott, seconded Cr Thomas and **RESOLVED** that recommendation R1.3 – Develop, in collaboration with ICHL, an induction process for independent directors unfamiliar with local government, be approved.

Ms Short said there was no formal agreement to say there would be a council appointment to EIL but it had always just happened. This should be done formally.

Cr Pottinger said using the excuse of having someone on a Board as a monitoring service was not a justifiable reason to have someone on a trading company. EIL was a trading company and operated outside the Local Government Act and did not see any reason to have a councillor on EIL.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Amundsen that recommendation R1.4 – Formalise the appointment of a Council director to EIL in the ARDP, be approved.

Cr Thomas said you would need to write a statement or framework to formalise an appointment of council director to EIL. Ms Short said the skills matrix would need to be looked at.

Cr Abbott said why not just delete the word ‘councillor’ and Cr Ludlow said this report was dealing with councillor appointments.

Cr Soper said she agreed with Cr Thomas and suggested that R1.4 and R1.5 worked in together and it would be possible to write the formalisation which the report writer indicated.

Cr Lewis suggested changing the word ‘the’ to ‘any’.

Cr Ludlow said the report was saying there was no formal structure to appoint a director to EIL, and if Council did not want to appoint a director the establishment of a process would help.

Mr King said originally the law stated council could not have any more than two directors on an energy company. Councils were also trading in electricity. This is not the case now.

With the approval of the mover and seconder, the motion now read:

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that recommendation R1.4 – Formalise the appointment of a Council director to EIL in the ARDP, and R1.5 – Manage elected members directorships for EIL through the ICC Appointments Committee, be approved.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

Note: Cr Pottinger voted against.

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Amundsen that recommendation R1.6 – Elected members seeking directorships to organisations other than ICHL or EIL must receive formal Council approval before accepting a position, be rejected.

Cr Ludlow said this was a very broad recommendation. Ms Short said in the body of the report is stated CCTO's so it could be other councils trading companies not just Invercargill City Council.

Cr Soper said at the moment it was so wide that if councillors wanted to be directors on any other organisation in New Zealand permission needed to be sought from Invercargill City Council, so either it needed to be written or it be rejected.

Cr Pottinger said in the current policy of January 2014 there was no guidance on how an elected member got appointed to anything other than EIL or ICHL. There was nothing about His Worship's appointment to IAL.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

Cr Thomas said Council would need to work in conjunction with the Holding Company with the process they have now because it was the Holding Company that made the interviews and put the process in place to bring the recommendations back to Council. Was Council going to set up a list of what they wanted and then go to the Holding Company.

Cr Ludlow said it was just detailing the appointments process the committee went through.

Cr Soper said the extra information said it was to better satisfy the requirements of section 57 of the LGA.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Abbott and **RESOLVED** that recommendation R2.1 – Confirm and detail a step-by-step appointments process in the ARDP, and R2.2 – Include guidelines that detail how potential candidates will be sought, be approved.

Moved Cr Abbott, seconded Cr Thomas that recommendation R2.3 – Appointment of independent directors to ICHL should be made in the same way

as Councillor directors. An ICHL representative should form part of the Appointments Committee, be approved.

Cr Pottinger asked for clarification because on one hand it said the appointment of the independent director to ICHL should be made in the same way as council directors, so that was saying it used the appointments committee. Cr Ludlow said the recommendation was to use the appointments committee, but it did not make economic sense. Council went through an appointments process for independent directors which was staggered. If there was only one vacancy it was an expensive process to convene an independent appointments committee for the trading companies under Holdco.

Mr King said it was a detailed process but the recommendations still came back to Council.

Ms Short said the paragraph about the Office of the Auditor General state that appointing directors was an important role because it was one of the local authority's principle means for influencing the performance of the CCO and in large part good governance depends on the performance of the directors. She would check that council would have more of a say over that appointment process than what they currently have.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

Cr Ludlow said he did not understand R2.4 – Appointment of the ICHL Board Chair should be made the Council's Appointments Committee, because the Appointments Committee just appoint board members and did not know who else was involved, and he could not think of any other organisation where a Chair was appointment from outside the Board.

Cr Pottinger said R2.4 could work if R1.1 was adopted and this needed to be left open with no recommendation dependent on the outcome of R1.1.

Cr Ludlow wanted clarification on R2.5 – Outline the process for appointment of a Council appointee to Council Organisations in which Council has a non-controlling interest. This needed more development and to be more clearly defined that it related to trading organisations.

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Thomas that recommendation R3.1 – Include more detail about how required skills are identified in the ICHL appointments process. This should include the use of a skills gap analysis and / or competency matrix to ensure diversity, be approved.

Cr Pottinger asked if the actual result was part of a transparent document. Cr Ludlow said it was a consideration document to ensure items had been considered and did not see it as binding.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

Moved Cr Thomas, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that recommendation R3.2 – Include a list of core director competencies for ICHL appointments in the ARDP, be approved.

Cr Crackett said there was nothing to represent diversity in age, race or gender. Cr Ludlow said it was not a core competency but a good Board should look for diversity, but this was not the reason to appoint someone or not.

Cr Pottinger said experience was more important and that came from age and experience.

Cr Biddle supported Cr Crackett and said a lot of companies started to have policies in diversity.

Cr Soper said there could be a statement in the matrix which said if there was any quality of skills between two candidates then the appointments committee could look at the diversity of the Board make up. This would be another factor in the matrix.

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Lewis and **RESOLVED** that recommendation R4.1 – Specify the tenure of Council directors to ICHL and EIL in the ARDP, and R4.2 – Include details of how reappointments to the ICHL Board are managed and considered, be approved.

Moved Cr Lewis, seconded Cr Pottinger and **RESOLVED** that recommendation R5.1 – Develop and implement a process for declaring conflicts of interest as part of the director appointment process and include details in the ARDP, be approved.

Ms Short said this recommendation was something that was already being looked at through the Audit Committee. Audit New Zealand recommended that this be included into Council agendas.

Cr Pottinger said he did not believe the current positions with the Director of Finance and the Chair of Holdco created no conflict. Mr King said this was case since Holdco had been established as it was not a big enough role to establish independently. Cr Pottinger said he wanted this to be more transparent.

The motion, now being put, was **RESOLVED** in the **affirmative**.

6.2.2 **Flicht Credit Rating**

Moved Cr Ludlow, seconded Cr Amundsen and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

6.2.3 **Venture Southland**

Moved Cr Amundsen, seconded Cr Pottinger and **RESOLVED** that the report be received.

7. **URGENT BUSINESS**

Nil.

Meeting finished at 6.16 pm.

URBAN REJUVENATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Minutes from meeting held on Tuesday 7 November 2017 at 3.00 pm in the Chief Executive's Meeting Room, First Floor, Civic Administration Building

PRESENT: Cr K Arnold (Chair)
Cr R Amundsen

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr L Thomas
D Johnston
R Dorricott

1. Consideration of Grant request by South Alive

Cr K Arnold opened the meeting and outlined to the Committee her thoughts regarding the application which was once again for two years funding when they could only consider applications for the 2017/18 year.

South Alive had been able to furnish much of the accountability information the Committee requested for previous grant funding but Cr Arnold was concerned about the lack of detail for projects and events they wanted money for.

She was also concerned about the cost of having the South Alive newsletter published in the Southland Express, and felt it should be sponsored by businesses and the likes. She queried the appropriateness of Council funding the changing of the South Alive brand which was not a necessity.

Cr Amundsen agreed that there was not enough of a breakdown for the events and felt the Committee should work on definitions and some clarity on what they would and would not fund.

Cr Thomas and Mr Johnston provided feedback in support of the discussion.

Moved K Arnold/Seconded R Amundsen and agreed that the request be partially funded as follows:

\$12,500 for office rent for the 2017/2018 year only.

\$4,500 for newsletter costs for the 2017/2018 year reducing to 0% for the 2018/2019 year, with the expectation that South Alive will obtain sponsorship or funding from elsewhere.

Nothing for signage or rebranding.

More details required for projects and events planned for 2017/2018 in terms of costs and outcomes that can be measured.

The committee will work with Council staff to provide clarity about the types of activities Council is prepared to consider funding for.

The meeting closed at 3.25 pm.

Footnote:

On 20 November 2017, when staff expressed concern over what additional information was being requested, it was found that the meeting was not aware of the additional 26 attachments provided by South Alive in support of the 2016/17 annual report and associated 2017/18 funding application. Cr K Arnold was out of the country. When brought to the attention of Cr Amundsen and the Chief Executive, the additional information was considered and a grant of \$13,500 for key events was agreed.

Ref: A2059895

**MINUTES OF MEETING TO SELECT REHOMING AND EUTHANASIA OF DOGS
ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS
SUNDAY, 4.00pm 12 NOVEMBER 2017
CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S MEETING ROOM, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION
BUILDING**

PRESENT: Cr R Amundsen (Chair)
Cr L Abbott
Cr A Arnold
K Swinney JP
P M Gare (Director of Environmental and Planning Services)

APOLOGY: Cr T Biddle

Cr Biddle provided Cr Amundsen with her feedback on the applicants.
The Members agreed that the Panel Members needed to exhibit a range of talents, community involvement, expertise in and knowledge of dog behaviour and dog ownership.

Crs R Amundsen, L Abbott and A Arnold and K Swinney agreed that Advisory Panel comprise of Katy Baker, Jo Miller, Colin Morrison, Eric Oostendorp, Dr Mike Sheppard and Rodney Tribe.

The meeting closed at 4.35pm.

TO: COUNCIL
FROM: DIRECTOR FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES
MEETING DATE: 12 DECEMBER 2017

2018/19 FEES AND CHARGES

Report Prepared by: Melissa Short – Manager, Strategy and Policy

SUMMARY

Staff have prepared their fees and charges based on budgets for the 2018/19 financial year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the fees and charges be approved for inclusion in the supporting documentation for the Long-term Plan.

IMPLICATIONS

1.	<i>Has this been provided for in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan?</i> No
2.	<i>Is a budget amendment required?</i> No
3.	<i>Is this matter significant in terms of Council’s Policy on Significance?</i> No
4.	<i>Implications in terms of other Council Strategic Documents or Council Policy?</i> No
5.	<i>Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?</i> The Fees and Charges will be consulted on in line with the Long-term Plan.
6.	<i>Has the Child, Youth and Family Friendly Policy been considered?</i> By individual managers when setting fees.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

No financial implications arise from this report.

FEES AND CHARGES FOR 2018/19

Managers have drafted their fees and charges for the 2018/19 financial year (*Appendix 1*). These fees and charges are based on the budgets approved by Council and help to ensure that predicted revenues are reached.

As part of the Long-term Plan consultation process, the Fees and Charges document is also subject to public scrutiny and comment. The Resource Management fees still require that Council use the Special Consultative Procedure as outlined in the Local Government Act. For this reason, staff intend to use the Special Consultative Procedure for all fees and charges.

Once approved by Council the fees and charges will be combined into a consultation document designed by our Graphic Designer. This will be consistent with the Long-term Plan consultation.

This year I requested that Managers complete a form to highlight any significant changes or new fees. These forms are included as *Appendix 2* for Council's consideration.

animal services

Dog Control Fees Registration	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Responsible Ownership Fee – Not Desexed	70.00	70.00
Responsible Ownership Fee – Desexed	55.00	55.00
Dangerous Dog	Up to 150.00	150.00
Standard Fee - Not Desexed	100.00	100.00
Standard Fee - Desexed	85.00	85.00
Working Dog	35.00	35.00
Registration Fee for a Probationary Owner	150.00	Apply fee applicable to their classification
Multiple Dog Fee (Five Dogs or More)	310.00	310.00
Menacing Dog *		150.00
Responsible Menacing Dog (Breed only)*		85.00

Pro-rate Registration Fees
 Use the fees below when registering a new dog. This could be:

1. A puppy's first registration; or
2. When a person is a new owner of a dog.

As a guide to what refund may be given in the case of a dog that has died, take the fee for that month after the refund application is received.

Registration made within	Responsible owner- Not De-sexed	Dog Responsible Owner- De-sexed	Dangerous and Menacing Dog	Standard Dog – Not De-sexed	Standard Dog – De-sexed	Working Dog	Menacing Dog Responsible (Breed only applies)
July	64.17	50.42	137.50	91.67	77.92	32.08	77.92
Aug	58.33	45.83	125.00	83.34	70.80	29.16	70.80
Sept	52.50	41.25	112.50	75.01	63.74	26.24	63.74
Oct	46.67	36.67	100.00	66.68	56.67	23.32	56.67
Nov	40.83	32.10	87.50	58.35	49.58	20.40	49.58
Dec	35.00	27.50	75.00	50.02	42.50	17.48	42.50

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Jan	29.17	22.92	62.50	41.69	35.42	14.56	35.42
Feb	23.33	18.33	50.00	33.36	28.33	11.64	28.33
March	17.50	13.75	37.50	25.03	21.25	8.72	21.25
April	11.67	9.17	25.00	16.70	14.17	5.80	14.17
May	5.83	4.60	12.50	8.37	7.08	2.88	7.08
June	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Fees				2017/18		2018/19	
				\$		\$	
Application for Responsible Ownership				40.00		40.00	
Microchip Implanting				25.00		25.00	
Replacement Tags				6.00		6.00	
Additional late fee after 1 August				25% of registration		25% of registration	
Dog Hearing Lodgment Fee				750.00		325.00	
Application Fee (keeping of more than 2 dogs)				40.00		40.00	
Surrender Fee - Rehome				30.00		30.00	
Surrender for Euthanasia				60.00		60.00	
Dog Control Infringements Set by Dog Control Act 1996 (per offence)							
Willful obstruction of a Dog Control Officer or Ranger				750.00		750.00	
Failure or refusal to supply information or willfully providing false particulars				750.00		750.00	
Failure to supply information or willfully providing false particulars about dog				750.00		750.00	
Failure to comply with any Bylaw authorized by the section				750.00		750.00	
Failure to undertake dog education programme of dog obedience course (or both)				300.00		300.00	
Failure to comply with obligations of a probationary owner				750.00		750.00	
Failure to comply with the effects of disqualification				750.00		750.00	

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Failure to comply with effects of classification of dog as "dangerous dog"	300.00	300.00
Failure to comply with effects of classification of dog as "menacing dog"	300.00	300.00
Fraudulent sale or transfer of dangerous dog	500.00	500.00
Failure to advise person of muzzle and leashing requirements	100.00	100.00
Failure to implant microchip transponder in dog	300.00	300.00
False statement relating to dog registration	750.00	750.00
Falsely notifying of death of dog	300.00	750.00
Failure to register dog	300.00	300.00
Fraudulent procurement to procure replacement tag	500.00	500.00
Failure to advise change of dog ownership	100.00	100.00
Failure to advise change of address	100.00	100.00
Removal or swapping of registration tags	500.00	500.00
Failure to keep dog controlled or confined	200.00	200.00
Failure to keep dog under control	200.00	200.00
Failure to provide proper care and attention, food, water, shelter	300.00	300.00
Failure to carry leash in public	100.00	100.00
Failure to comply with barking dog abatement notice	200.00	200.00
Allowing a dangerous dog to be at large unleashed or unmuzzled	300.00	300.00
Releasing dog from custody	750.00	750.00
Failure to advise of muzzle and leashing requirements	100.00	100.00
Dog Impoundment Fees		
First Impounding	80.00	80.00
Second Impounding	140.00	120.00

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Third and Subsequent Impounding	180.00	160.00
Additional cumulative fee after third impounding	45.00	45.00
Sustenance – per day	20.00	20.00
Long Term Stay (Greater than one month) Monthly Fee Note: Where a dog is impounded and is awaiting the outcome of a Court Hearing or similar a monthly fee will be applied and monthly invoices will be issued to the owner.	600.00	300.00
After Hours Release (Minimum of one hour staff time)	120.00	120.00
Additional Impounding Fee: After Hours Impounding (Contractor)	55.00	55.00
Stock Impounding Charges		
Horses, Asses, Mules, Cattle and Deer		
First Impounding (first animal)		
Poundage – each	100.00	100.00
Sustenance – per day	10.00	10.00
Second or Subsequent impounding (first animal)		
Poundage – each	90.00	90.00
Sustenance – per day	10.00	10.00
Additional animal impounding		
Poundage – each	10.00	10.00
Sustenance – per day	10.00	10.00
Goats or pigs		
Impounding (first animal) – each	30.00	30.00
Impounding additional animals – each	3.00	5.00
Sustenance (each animal) – per day	3.00	5.00
Sheep		
Impounding (first animal) – each	30.00	30.00

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Impounding additional animals – each	3.00	3.00
Sustenance (each animal) – per day	3.00	3.00
Droving, leading or conveying charges	120.00 per hour of part thereof	120.00
Other Fees		
Sale New Bark Collars Large	165.00	165.00
Bark Collar Rental Fee - Small (Dogtro)	Bond - 55.00	Bond – 60.00
	Per Week - 25.00	Per Week – 25.00
Bark Collar Rental - Large (Bark Limiter)	Bond - 70.00	
	Per Week - 25.00	

* Notes:

- Menacing Dog and Responsible Menacing dog (breed only) - both these fees are subject to an amendment to the Dog Control Policy.

building control

Building Consent Application	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
<p>All rates are subject to a minimum \$110 and a maximum \$22,000 fee, except any construction project with an estimated construction value greater than \$3,000,000 that will be charged a flat rate of 0.8% the construction value.</p> <p>Fees are based on the floor area affected, for example if a wall is removed the areas of the rooms on both sides of the demolished wall are used to calculate the fee.</p>		

(a) Healthy Homes		2017/18	2018/19
Council offer a 25% subsidy off the following fees as part of our commitment to the Government's Warm Up New Zealand: Healthy Homes Programme			
Solid Fuel Heater: Freestanding		270.00 -25% = 202.50	275.00 – 25% = 206.25
Solid Fuel Heater: Inbuilt/Wetbacks		400.00 – 25% = 300.00	410.00 – 25% = 307.50
Insulation		400.00 -25% = 300.00	
(b) Residential		2017/18	2018/19
New Dwellings Single/Semi-Detached/Additions (Includes plumbing and drainage)		22.00/m ²	22.50/m ²
Residential interior alterations		18.00/m ²	18.50/m ²
Building placed on site/foundation only		12.00/m ²	12.25/m ²
Multi-Residential (includes plumbing and drainage)		22.50/m ²	23.00/m ²
Conservatories/Verandahs		500.00 flat rate	510.00 flat rate
Re-roof/reclad		500.00 flat rate	510.00 flat rate
Amendment		150.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections	155.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections
(a) Fast Track Foundation Amendment		250.00 flat rate	255.00 flat rate
(b) Waiver/Modification Amendment		200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate

Solid fuel heater:		
Freestanding	270.00 flat rate	275.00 flat rate
Diesel Freestanding	400.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Inbuilt/Wetbacks	400.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Boilers - oil and diesel fired	410.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Bathroom kitchen alteration including wet area shower	500.00 flat rate	510.00 flat rate
Plumbing – Solar Heating	400.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Fences/timber deck	300.00 flat rate	305.00 flat rate
Swimming pools	215.00 flat rate	220.00 flat rate
Swimming pool registration (three yearly)	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
Swimming pool exemption request	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
Accessory Buildings (unlined)	17.00/m ² capped at 1,000.00	17.25/m ² capped at 1,025.00
Accessory Buildings (unlined)	20.00/m ² capped at 1,000.00	20.50/m ² capped at 1,025.00
Accessory Buildings Extension	17.00/m ² (minimum fee 300.00)	17.00/m ² (minimum fee 305.00)
(b) Commercial	2017/18	2018/19
New Commercial/Additions (General)	25.00/m ²	25.50/m ²
Earthquake Strengthening Fee	1,000.00 deposit plus time costs and/or inspections	1,000.00 deposit plus time costs and/or inspections
Foundation/Slab/Bridge Only	400.00	410.00
New Office/Additions	22.00/m ²	22.50/m ²
Shell only (internal unfinished)	17.00/m ²	17.50/m ²
Commercial interior alterations	17.00/m ²	17.50/m ²
Minor Work	10.00/m ²	10.25/m ²

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Re-roof/reclad	600.00 flat rate	615.00 flat rate
Amendments	150.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections	150.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections
(a) Fast Track Foundation Amendment	250.00 flat rate	255.00 flat rate
(b) Waiver/Modification Amendment	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
(c) Industrial	2017/18	2018/19
New Industrial/Additions	15.00/m ²	15.25/m ²
Industrial interior alterations	15.00/m ²	15.25/m ²
Farm Buildings (unlined) (bonafide farm use)	10.00/m ² capped at 1,000.00	10.25/m ² capped at 1,000.00
Amendment	150.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections	150.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections
(a) Fast Track Foundation Amendment	250.00 flat rate	255.00 flat rate
(b) Waiver/Modification Amendment	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
(d) Plumbing	2017/18	2018/19
Interior Plumbing and Drainage	400.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Site Servicing/Ext Drainage/Road Openers (min \$300.00)	15.00/lin m	15.50/lin m
Hot water cylinder replacement (same location)	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
Connection to North Road extension	5,377.00 flat rate	5,377.00 flat rate
On-site Waste Water Processing – (initial review) Additional costs will be charged at an hourly rate for subsequent review	875.00 flat rate	900.00 flat rate
(e) Mechanical	2017/18	2018/19
HVAC (affected area) (min. of \$300.00)	1.50/m ²	1.55/m ²
Sprinkler System (affected area) (min of \$300.00)	0.75/m ²	0.80/m ²
Fire Alarm, Auto-Doors, Other Specified System	300.00 flat rate	305.00 flat rate

(f) Demolition	2017/18	2018/19
Residential	350.00 flat rate	360.00 flat rate
Commercial/Industrial	500.00 flat rate	510.00 flat rate
Certificate of Acceptance		
Certificate of Acceptance Building <i>(Plus DBH, BRANZ and Accreditation levies if applicable)</i>	Consent fee x 2	Consent fee x 2
Officer charge out rates		
Processing - additional time <i>Third review of application will charged additional processing fee</i>	120.00 per hour	150.00 per hour
Inspection – additional <i>Third inspection per stage will be charged additional fee</i>	120.00 per hour	150.00 per hour
Project Information Memorandum		
PIM – residential	300.00 flat rate	305.00 flat rate
PIM – commercial/industrial	400.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Land Information Memorandum		
Residential – Single Property		
5 working days (electronic)	450.00 flat rate	460.00 flat rate
10 working days (electronic)	250.00 flat rate	275.00 flat rate
Other – Includes Rural/Multi Residential/ Commercial and Industrial		
10 working days (electronic)	450.00 flat rate	460.00 flat rate
<i>Note: The set fee for a Land Information Memorandum is for an electronic copy. Should you require a hard copy version; a further \$10.00 charge will apply.</i>	10.00 per copy	10.00 per copy

Annual Building Warrant of Fitness		
New Compliance Schedule	300.00 flat rate	305.00 flat rate
Building Warrant of Fitness Renewal	150.00 flat rate	155.00 flat rate
Building Warrant of Fitness audit inspection (including file note)	200.00 flat rate	150.00 flat rate plus time costs and/or additional inspections
Amendment to Compliance Schedule	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
Administrative		
Building statistics report (per month)	30.00	30.00
Property File Retrieval	10.00	10.00
Copying charges:		
Per A4 or A3 page (Plus Administrative Charge)	0.20 per page	0.20 per page
Per A1 or A0 page (Plus Administrative Charge)	5.00 per page	5.00 per page
Scanning of property files	80.00 per hour	85.00 per hour capped at 275.00
Administrative Charge	80.00 per hour	85.00 per hour capped at 275.00
Miscellaneous		
Signs/Retaining Walls	350.00 flat rate	360.00 flat rate
Playground Equipment (\$300.00 min)	5.00/m2	5.00/m2
Tents/Marquees	300.00 flat rate	305.00 flat rate
Certificate of Public Use:		
• First six months	350.00 flat rate	350.00 flat rate
• Second six months	700.00 flat rate	700.00 flat rate
• Third and subsequent six months	2,000.00 flat rate	2,000.00 flat rate
Notice to Fix/Dangerous/Insanitary/EQ Prone	500.00 flat rate	500.00 flat rate

Minor variation acceptance	150.00 flat rate	150.00 flat rate
Alternate Solution Assessment	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
Schedule 1 paperwork acceptance	110.00 flat rate	110.00 flat rate
Schedule 1 Exemption 2	400.00 flat rate	410.00 flat rate
Peer Review/Consultant	Cost plus 10%	Cost plus 10%
Permit inspection (Consent Prior to 1993)	200.00 flat rate	205.00 flat rate
House relocation suitability report (plus report costs)	300.00 flat rate	305.00 flat rate
Dangerous/Insanitary/Earthquake Prone Consultation Fee (First half hour free of charge then hourly rate applies)	Staff charged at hourly rate stated in the miscellaneous fees and charges section of the Council's Schedule of Fees and Charges.	Staff charged at hourly rate stated in the miscellaneous fees and charges section of the Council's Schedule of Fees and Charges.
Dangerous/Insanitary/Earthquake Prone Consultation/Engaging consultants	500.00 hourly rate	500.00 hourly rate
Earthquake Prone building assessment	Cost plus 10%	Cost plus 10%
Change of Use notification/acceptance	200.00 flat rate	200.00 flat rate
PSA Registration Maintenance Fee	150.00 for a three year registration	150.00 for a three year registration
Legal Processes		
Drain in Common fee <i>(Applicant to engage surveyor to draw up plan and provide to Council for lodging with Land Information New Zealand.)</i>	550.00 plus any solicitors costs	550.00 plus any solicitors costs
Section 75 of the Building Act	350.00 flat rate	350.00 flat rate
Section 73 of the Building Act	350.00 plus any solicitors costs	350.00 plus any solicitors costs
Section 37 of the Building Act	110.00 flat rate	110.00 flat rate
Government Levies (May be varied by Government legislation)		
BRANZ Levy	1.00 per 1,000.00 of GST inclusive work for all applications of 20,000 or more	1.00 per 1,000.00 of GST inclusive work for all applications of 20,000 or more

DBH Levy	2.01 per 1,000.00 of GST inclusive work for all applications of 20,000 or more	2.01 per 1,000.00 of GST inclusive work for all applications of 20,000 or more
Accreditation Levy	1.00 per 1,000.00 of GST inclusive work for all applications of 5,000.00 or more	1.00 per 1,000.00 of GST inclusive work for all applications of 5,000.00 or more
General Building Offences		
s40 - Failing to comply with the requirement that building work must be carried out in accordance with a building consent.	1,000.00	1,000.00
Bs40 - Failing to comply with the requirement that building work must be carried out in accordance with a building consent.	500.00	500.00
s101 - Failing to comply with requirement to obtain a compliance schedule	250.00	250.00
s108(5)(a) - Failing to display a building warrant of fitness required to be displayed.	250.00	250.00
S108(5)(aa) Failing to supply territorial authority with a building warrant of fitness	250.00	250.00
s108(5)(b) - Displaying a false or misleading building warrant of fitness.	1,000.00	1,000.00
s108(5)(c) - Displaying a building warrant of fitness other than in accordance with section 108.	1,000.00	1,000.00
Legal Processes		
s116B(1)(a) - Using, or knowingly permitting the use of, a building for a use for which it is not safe or not sanitary.	1,500.00	1,500.00
s116B(1)(b) - Using, or knowingly permitting the use of, a building that has inadequate means of escape from fire.	2,000.00	2,000.00
s124 - Failing to comply with a notice, within the time stated in the notice, requiring work to be carried out on a dangerous, earthquake-prone, or insanitary building.	1,000.00	1,000.00
s128 - Using or occupying a building, or permitting another person to do so, contrary to a territorial authority's	2,000.00	2,000.00

hoarding, fence, or notice.		
s128A(2) Using or occupying a building, or permitting another person to do so, contrary to a territorial authority's hoarding, fence, or notice.	2,000.00	2,000.00
s168 - Failing to comply with a notice to fix.	1,000.00	1,000.00
s362D(4) Failing to provide prescribed disclosure information	500.00	500.00
Failing to provide prescribed checklist	500.00	500.00
s362F(4) Failing to have a written contract as prescribed	500.00	500.00
S362T(4) Failing to provide prescribed information or documentation to specified persons	500.00	500.00
s363 - Using, or permitting use of building having no consent or code compliance certificate or certificate for public use for premises for public use	1,500.00	1,500.00
s367 - Wilfully obstructing, hindering, or resisting a person executing powers conferred under the Act or its regulations.	500.00	500.00
s368 - Wilfully removing or defacing a notice published under the Act or inciting another person to do so.	500.00	500.00
Restricted Building Work	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
s85(1) - Person who is not licensed building practitioner carrying out restricted building work without supervision of licensed building practitioner with appropriate licence.	750.00	750.00
s85(2)(a) - Licensed building practitioner carrying out restricted building work without appropriate licence.	500.00	500.00
s85(2)(b) - Licensed building practitioner supervising restricted building work without appropriate licence.	500.00	500.00
s314(1) - Person holding himself or herself out as being licensed to do or supervise building work or building inspection work while not being so licensed.	500.00	500.00
Dam Safety Offences	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$

s134C - Dam owner failing to classify dam.	500.00	500.00
s138 - Dam owner failing to comply with a direction from a regional authority to have a classification re-audited and submitted.	250.00	250.00
s140 - Dam owner failing to prepare, or arrange the preparation of, a dam safety assurance programme and submit it for audit.	500.00	500.00
s145 - Dam owner failing to comply with a direction from a regional authority to have a dam safety assurance programme re-audited and submitted.	250.00	250.00
s150(4)(a) - Dam owner knowingly failing to display a dam compliance certificate required to be displayed.	250.00	250.00
s150(4)(b) - Dam owner displaying a false or misleading dam compliance certificate.	1,000.00	1,000.00
s150(4)(c) - Dam owner displaying a dam compliance certificate other than in accordance with section 150.	1,000.00	1,000.00
s154 - Dam owner failing to comply with a notice, within the time stated in the notice, requiring work to be carried out on a dangerous dam.	2,000.00	2,000.00

compliance

Parking Compliance Fees	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Pursuant to: Land Transport Act 1998 Invercargill City Council Bylaws Transport (towage fees) Notice 2004		
Any parking offence involving parking on a road in breach of a Local Authority Bylaw, in excess of a period fixed by a meter or otherwise, where the excess time is:		
Not more than 30 minutes	12.00	12.00
More than 30 minutes but not more than one hour	15.00	15.00
More than one hour but not more than two hours	21.00	21.00
More than two hours but not more than four hours	30.00	30.00
More than four hours but not more than six hours	42.00	42.00
More than six hours	57.00	57.00
Offence: Other Infringements		
Parked within six metres of an intersection	60.00	60.00
Parked near corner, bend, rise or intersection	40.00	40.00
Parked on or near a pedestrian crossing	60.00	60.00
Parked in a prohibited area	40.00	40.00
Parked on broken yellow line	60.00	60.00
Parked in area reserved for hire or reward vehicles	40.00	40.00
Parked within six metres of an indicated bus stop	40.00	40.00
Parked obstructing a vehicle entrance	40.00	40.00
Parked within 500mm of a fire hydrant	40.00	40.00

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Double parked	60.00	60.00
Incorrect kerb parking	40.00	40.00
Parked on a footpath	40.00	40.00
Parked a trailer on a road over seven days	40.00	40.00
Inconsiderate parking	60.00	60.00
Parked in a (non GSV) loading zone - over the time limit	40.00	40.00
Incorrect angle parking	40.00	40.00
Parked facing wrong way	40.00	40.00
Parked on a level crossing	150.00	150.00
Parked near a level crossing	150.00	150.00
Operated vehicle with a damaged tyre	150.00	150.00
Operated vehicle with a smooth tyre	150.00	150.00
Parked in area reserved for disabled persons	150.00	150.00
Failed to park entirely in marked parking area	40.00	40.00
Failed to pay for parking at car parks using pay and display, pay by space or pay by plate method	40.00	40.00
Parked in a parking space exceeding time paid for at a pay and display, pay by space or pay by plate method	Between 12.00 – 57.00 as above	Between 12.00 – 57.00 as above
Operated an unlicensed vehicle	200.00	200.00
Obscured or indistinguishable registration label	200.00	200.00
Obscured or indistinguishable registration plate	200.00	200.00
Used a vehicle with exemption from continuous licensing	200.00	200.00
Failed to display registration plates	200.00	200.00
Displayed other than appropriate label	200.00	200.00

Used unauthorised registration plate (not on registry)	200.00	200.00
Failed to display current Warrant of Fitness	200.00	200.00
No Certificate of Fitness - commercial vehicle	600.00	600.00
Towage Fee	52.50	Actual and reasonable costs
Noise Control (Resource Management Act 1991) Note: Infringements set by statute		
Monitoring Under Resource Management (Infringement Offences) Regulations 1999		
Contravention of Excessive Noise Direction under Section 327	500.00	500.00
Contravention of an abatement notice for an unreasonable noise under Section 322(1)C	750.00	750.00
Other Charges/Fees		
Release of seized equipment	65.00 plus actual and reasonable costs	65.00 plus actual and reasonable costs
Litter (Litter Control Act 1979) Clean up related to litter and illegal dumping infringements		
Litter Infringement	400.00	400.00
Removal of Abandoned vehicles	Actual and reasonable costs	Actual and reasonable costs
Bylaw Fees and Fines		
Note: The cost recovery of bylaw monitoring and/ or enforcement and related processes is based on time, administration and costs for work undertaken, e.g. overgrown/untidy sections	Actual and reasonable costs	Actual and reasonable costs
Amusement Device		
• First device	11.50 flat rate	11.50 flat rate
• Each additional device (same company)	2.60 flat rate	2.60 flat rate

environmental health

Corporate Fees	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Food Businesses operating under the Food Act 2014		
<u>Registration and Verification Under the Food Act 2014</u>		
1. Registration		
New Business or Initial Registration Fee for a Food Control Plan or National Programme	160.00	165.00
Multi-Site Business- in addition to above – Additional fee per site	40.00	60.00
Renewal of a Food Control Plan or National Programme Registration		
Food control Plan - Minimum Registration Period- 12 months	120.00	125.00
National Programme 3 – Minimum Registration Period- 2 Years	120.00	125.00
Registration National Programme 2- Minimum Registration Period- 2 Years	120.00	125.00
Registration National Programme 1 - Minimum Registration Period- 2 Years	120.00	125.00
Multi-Site Business- in addition to above – Additional fee per site	25.00	40.00
Amendment to a Food control Plan or National Programme Registration, including change of ownership	40.00	45.00
2. Verification, Compliance and Monitoring		
Verification Fee for Food Control Plans and National Programmes (includes follow ups)	480.00	Hourly fee of 125.00 part thereof PL disbursements w/ includes mile: outside the boundary
Food Businesses still operating under the Food Hygiene Regulations 1974 and are yet to transition to the requirements of the Food Act 2014		
Category B: Food Premises Restaurant, Takeaways, Dairies etc. with on site food preparation	445.00	455.00
Category C: Food Premises Service Stations, Grocery Shops/ other businesses selling pre-packaged food items only	250.00	255.00
Mobile Shop (Food)	165.00	170.00
Pre- opening inspection (undertaken before the premises open for business to check that your establishment complies with health laws)	120.00	125.00

Re-inspection (undertaken following the initial inspection where there are any outstanding matters)	120.00	125.00
Change of ownership	40.00	45.00
Late Payment Fee	70.00	75.00
Other Health Licences		
Camping Grounds	445.00	455.00
Hairdressers	250.00	255.00
Funeral Directors	250.00	255.00
Offensive Trades	250.00	255.00
Skin Piercing (subject to Bylaw)		255.00
Change of ownership	40.00	45.00
Late Fee charges	70.00	75.00
Pre-opening inspection – new business set up assistance (per hour or part thereof)	120.00	125.00
Hazardous Substances (Hazardous Substances and New Organism Act 1996)		
Inspection and or Report under HSNO - per hour or part thereof if outside normal working hours fees as per	120.00	125.00
Clean up, sampling, testing, seizure or removal of material / disposal or transfer to holding site/other agency	Actual and reasonable costs	Actual and reasonable costs
Gambling Venue Consent (Gambling Act 2003)		
Venue consent application	500.00	500.00
Hearings lodgment fee payable on lodgment of application (for hearings that last up to 2 hours)	1,500.00	1,500.00
Monitoring of venue premises (per hour or part thereof)	120.00	125.00
Other Charges – Processing Applications / Variations / Extra Audits or Inspections Outside of Normal Business Hours		
Normal Working Hours (Per hour or part thereof)	120.00	125.00
Outside Normal Working Hours (Per hour or part thereof)	155.00	160.00
Statutory Holidays (Per hour or part thereof)	200.00	210.00

housing care

Housing Care GST Not Applicable	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Studio units (per week)	Up to 98.00	Up to 115.00
One bedroom units (per week)	Up to 112.00	Up to 135.00
One bedroom units with carport (per week)	Up to 112.00	Up to 135.00
Two bedroom special needs unit (per week)	Up to 165.00	Up to 185.00

invercargill airport limited

Invercargill Airport Fees	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Car parking charges		
Up to 1 hour	Free - 8.00	Free - 8.00
Up to 24 hours	From 8.50 – 25.00	From 8.50 – 25.00
Up to 2 days	From 25.50 – 39.00	From 25.50 – 39.00
Up to 3 days	From 39.50 – 49.00	From 39.50 – 49.00
Up to 4 days	From 48.50 – 53.00	From 48.50 – 53.00
First week (7 day) maximum	Maximum 60.00	Maximum 60.00
After the first week, per 12 hour period or part thereof	Maximum 80.00	Maximum 80.00
After the first week, weekly maximum	12.00	12.00
Lost ticket fee	100.00	100.00
Unlimited card use (12 months)	980.00	980.00
Leases	Market rate	Market rate
Fuel sales	Market rate	Market rate
Meeting rooms, per hour (minimum three hours)		
Meeting Room	45.00 – 150.00 plus GST	45.00 – 150.00 plus GST
Official Information Requests (per hour)		
Executive Staff	220.00 plus GST	220.00 plus GST
Managers and Team Leaders	180.00 plus GST	180.00 plus GST
Professional and Technical Staff	120.00 plus GST	120.00 plus GST

Administrative Staff	80.00 plus GST	80.00 plus GST
Photocopying		
A4 page	0.20	0.20
A3 page	0.40	0.40
Travel per km	0.75	0.75

Alteration of Fees

Fees and charges may be refunded, remitted or waived by the General Manager, Invercargill Airport Limited. The fees and charges listed were correct at the time of going to print. The Council reserves the right to alter fees and charges during the year. Any changes will be publicly notified for submissions. All fees and charges are GST inclusive unless otherwise stated.

invercargill venue and events management limited

Civic Theatre Complex	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Civic Theatre (seating capacity 1,015)		
Hire charge per performance	Price by negotiation	Price by negotiation
Second performance	Price by negotiation	Price by negotiation
Matinee or rehearsals with an audience	1,900.00	1,950.00
Dark days pack in/out rehearsals	1,100.00	1,150.00
Security deposit per performance	570.00	600.00
Specialist services are also available at an additional charge		
Function Rooms		
Weddings – basic hire for a day	Price by negotiation	Price by negotiation
Drawing Room		
Day booking	230.00	240.00
Half day booking (maximum four hours)	120.00	130.00
Day/night	350.00	360.00
Victoria Room – whole room		
Day booking	365.00	375.00
Half day booking (maximum four hours)	185.00	195.00
Day/night	550.00	560.00
Victoria Room – Venue 1 or Venue 2		

Day booking	230.00	240.00
Half day booking (maximum four hours)	120.00	130.00
Day/night	350.00	360.00
Rugby Park		
	Price by negotiation	Price by negotiation
Scottish Hall		
Venue Hire	Price by negotiation	Price by negotiation

ALTERATION OF FEES

Fees and charges may be refunded, remitted or waived by the Manager, Invercargill Venue and Events Management Limited. The fees and charges listed were correct at the time of going to print. The Council reserves the right to alter fees and charges during the year. Any changes will be publicly notified for submissions. All fees and charges are GST inclusive unless otherwise stated.

investment property

Investment Property	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Lease Charges	Market rate	Market rate

libraries and archives

Lending Services	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Library Bag	2.00	2.00
Book Covering	5.00	5.00
Book mending/book repair (minimum)	6.00	10.00
Digital image (minimum)	5.00	5.00
DVD (including Bluray)	1.00	1.00
Video Games (PS / Xbox / Wii)	2.50	2.50
Hot Pick Books/Magazines/DVDs	2.50	2.50
Interloans (minimum)	5.00	5.00
Interloans (urgent)	25.00	25.00
Internet (30 minutes) – Note Council continues to provide the “pay” option for internet usage, but also has free internet available.	2.00	2.00
Meeting Room Hire – Hourly by Arrangement		
Half day	70.00	70.00
Full day	125.00	125.00
Overdues non-chargeable items (per day)	0.20	0.20
Overdues chargeable items (per day)	0.50	0.50
Printing (per copy)		
A4 Black and white	0.20	0.20
A3 Black and white	0.50	0.40
A4 Colour	0.50	0.50

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

A3 Colour	1.00	1.00
Library Card Replacement	2.00	2.00
Research	Price on Request	Price on Request
Scanning – email	2.50	2.50
Holdings – (Note: These are Free for Children)	0.60	0.60
USB stick (8GB)	10.00	10.00

miscellaneous

Bank Fees and Charges	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Credit card and electronic transfer charges	Actual charge	Actual Charge
Laboratory Services		
Testing services	Technical hourly rate plus materials	125.00 per hour plus materials
Litter		
Litter fine	400.00	400.00
Official Information Requests and Compliance Investigations		
Executive Staff (per hour)	220.00	225.00
Managers and Team Leaders (per hour)	180.00	185.00
Professional and Technical Staff (per hour)	120.00	125.00
Administrative Staff (per hour)	80.00	85.00
Photocopying		
A4 page	0.20	0.20
A3 page	0.40	0.40
Travel per km	0.75	0.75
Rates Postponement Policy Fees		
Administration fee	50.00	50.00
Interest rate	8%	8%

Request for establishing a new Rating Area		
Request for establishing a new Rating Area	7,187.50	7,187.50
Services Provided to other Local Authorities		
Charge for services provided to other Local Authorities (per hour)	150.00	150.00
Fees and Charges Wachner Place		
Showers – Wachner Place Public Toilets	3.00	3.00
Engineering Plans		
Lodgement of Engineering Plans and Specifications of Subdivision Including Checking and Inspection as Required Under the Council's Code of Land Development Bylaw.	1.5% of the estimated cost of the Engineering Works or \$1,000.00, whichever is the greater. (Estimated cost to be acceptable to Council).	1.5% of the estimated cost of the Engineering Works or \$1,000.00, whichever is the greater. (Estimated cost to be acceptable to Council).

Alteration of Fees

Fees and charges may be refunded, remitted or waived by the Chief Executive, Director of Environmental and Planning Services, Director of Finance and Corporate Services or Director of Works and Services. The fees and charges listed were correct at the time of going to print. The Council reserves the right to alter fees and charges during the year. Any changes will be publicly notified for submissions. All fees and charges are GST inclusive unless otherwise stated.

parks and reserves

General Casual Use Park Charge (Plus any Special Requirement Charges)	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Any area of any park or reserve for a wedding, picnic or non-commercial event	25.00	25.00
Special Locations (Plus any special requirements)		
Queens Park Band Rotunda (includes power)	50.00	50.00
Queens Park Winter Gardens (between 5.00 to 7.00 pm summer only)	85.00	85.00
Anderson Park Pavilion/Kitchen (includes power)	60.00	60.00
Anderson Park Pavilion/Kitchen and BBQ (includes power)	90.00	90.00
Anderson Park Second Picnic Area	40.00	40.00
Otepuni Gardens Band Rotunda (includes power)	50.00	50.00
Otatara Scenic Reserve (ex Guide Camp Area)	40.00	40.00
Special Requirements		
Queens Park		
Power – where available	25.00	25.00
Gates – to have gates opened for official vehicles (1 hour maximum)	100.00	100.00
Anderson Park		
Marquee site – includes use of pavilion and kitchen	From 400.00	From 400.00
Access after dusk	195.00	195.00
Gala Street Reserve		
Power – Fountain	25.00	25.00
Fairs and carnivals	From 285.00	From 290.00

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

	Plus power if required	Plus power if required
Circuses (non performing and performing days) per day As determined by the Parks Manager based on size, duration, location and nature of event	From 285.00 Plus power if required	From 290.00 Plus power if required
Power – Fair, Carnival and Circus Area	Connection fee PLUS cost of power used based on actual reading	Connection fee PLUS cost of power used based on actual reading
Wachner Place		
Commercial site including power (per day charge)	From 240.00	From 240.00
Others on application including power (per day charge)	50.00	50.00
General Reserves		
Commercial concession	350.00 - 500.00 pa Dependent upon number of days of week used	350.00 - 500.00 pa Dependent upon number of days of week used
Other reserves and activities (including concerts or similar) As determined by the Parks Manager based on size, duration, location and nature of event	From 125.00	From 125.00
Power – where available	25.00	25.00
Access to reserves through gates and barriers (key fee)	100.00	100.00
Bonds		
Marquee site	From 530.00	From 530.00
Commercial activities (including fairs and carnivals)	From 530.00	From 530.00
Circuses	From 1,125.00	From 1,125.00
Where not defined above, bond to be determined by Parks Manager		
Car Park Maintenance		
Surrey Park sports clubs with shared car parks	Per funding policy	Per funding policy
Sports Clubs Occupying Council Reserves (buildings charged as extra)		

Bowling Green	400.00	408.00
Croquet Greens	375.00	380.00
Dog Obedience Club	315.00	320.00
Model Engineers	570.00	580.00
Surrey Park Grandstand and Athletics Track		
School sports (50% paid to Athletics Southland)		
Year 7 and over	535.00	545.00
Years 1 to 6 (inclusive)	435.00	440.00
Athletics – use of sports area, per season (enclosure)	905.00	920.00
Sportsfield and Park Facility Charges (Per Field)		
Summer Sports		
Touch Rugby	250.00	255.00
5-a-side Soccer	250.00	255.00
Cricket (per wicket)		
Prepared wicket (per season)	Price on application	Price on application
Artificial wicket		
Per season	420.00	428.00
Per day	65.00	65.00
Unprepared wicket (evenings only)		
Per season	150.00	153.00
Per evening	45.00	45.00
Per day	65.00	65.00
Softball		

Enclosure (per year)	905.00	920.00	
Grass diamond			
Per season	420.00	428.00	
Per game	45.00	45.00	
Per day	65.00	65.00	
Practice area			
Per season	320.00	325.00	
Tennis – court per season	165.00	168.00	
Marching (reservations of practice area) per season, per team	85.00	85.00	
Winter Sports - Note: Effective April 1	2017 \$	2018 \$	2019 \$
Field rent (per field)			
Rugby, football and rugby league			
Per season	755.00	760.00	775.00
Single game	70.00	75.00	75.00
Per day	90.00	95.00	95.00
Practice field	525.00	530.00	540.00
Netball Court rental (per court)			
Per season	165.00	165.00	168.00
Hockey – artificial turf (enclosure)	900.00	905.00	920.00
Football – artificial turf (enclosure)	900.00	905.00	920.00
Sandy Point Domain			
Clubs occupying Sandy Point Domain			
Club buildings	400.00	410.00	415.00

Grounds Annual charge to be assessed on the area of land occupied per hectare or part thereof, minimum charge 1 ha. Where a building is also on the site, the charge shall be the land area plus the building rate.	185.00	190.00	193.00
Crib sites Sandy Point Domain – per annum	745.00	750.00	765.00
Buildings other than Sandy Point			
Buildings other than Sandy Point	Current market value	Current market value	Current market value
Fencing Contribution			
For reserves boundary fences			
Half cost of materials, up to a yearly set fee per lineal metre	40.00	40.00	40.00

Miscellaneous Charges Applications Requiring Management Plan Change	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Initial application fee	60.00	60.00
Associated costs of application including but not limited to advertising, Minister of Conservation fee, survey fees, legal fees etc.	Recovery of actual cost incurred by Council	Recovery of actual cost incurred by Council
Firewood		
Permit – issued for up to 4 weeks	15.00	15.00
Hire of Plants from Mclvor Road Nursery		
(Charges do not include delivery)		
Planter Bag Sizes 2, 3 or 5	3.00 (each)	3.00 (each)
Planter Bag Sizes 8, 12 or 28	4.00 (each)	4.00 (each)
Planter Bag Size 40	6.00 (each)	6.00 (each)
Tubs	12.00 (each)	12.00 (each)
Parks Operations		

Non Council work	Tender/quote	Tender/quote
Parks and Services - Cemeteries and Crematorium	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Cemeteries – Burial Fees		
Monday to Saturday, excluding Sundays and public holidays, including pre-purchase of right of burial. Hours 8am to 5pm weekdays (summer months); 8am to 4pm weekdays (winter months); 8am to 1pm Saturdays.		
Person over five years of age	840.00	855.00
Child five years of age or under (children's burial area)	500.00	510.00
Stillborn and child up to one year	300.00	305.00
Breaking concrete	Actual time taken	Actual time taken
Second burials – and subsequent burial/s	1,000.00	1,000.00
Maintenance Fee – on each burial (not applicable to stillborn and up to five years old; and Ex-Servicemen in the Servicemen's section)	565.00	575.00
Handfill - Using existing material - Using new material brought in	No charge 100.00	No charge 100.00
Burial of ashes in cemetery		
Burial of ashes	125.00	127.50
Maintenance fee on each burial of ashes	225.00	230.00
Recording fee for scattered ashes	40.00	40.00
Ex-Servicemen's burial in Servicemen's area of cemetery		
For burials		
Monday to Saturday	840.00	855.00
Ash burial fee	125.00	127.50

Out of hours fee for burials Saturday 1pm to 4pm		
Out of hours fee, subject to special approval, in addition to normal fees	325.00	330.00
Purchase of Allotments		
(Including pre-purchase of allotment for right of burial)		
Single one burials	750.00	765.00
Children's plot, 1.8m x 0.75m	385.00	390.00
Standard width plot (2 capacity), 2.75m x 1.2m	880.00	895.00
Double width plot (4 capacity), 2.75m x 2.4m	1,760.00	1,790.00
Family plots – fee to be determined by size of plot requested (based on multiples of two-capacity plots)	Fee to be determined	Fee to be determined
Plot for burial of ashes (standard size)	160.00	163.00
Plot for burial of ashes (60cm x 60cm)	280.00	285.00
Other fees		
Memorial beam (including lost Seamen)		
Permit fee	45.00	45.00
Beam	45.00	45.00
Free ground plaques	45.00	45.00
Beam	45.00	45.00
Maintenance fee	225.00	230.00
Memorial Grove (including permit, planting, tree and recording fees)	225.00	230.00
Miscellaneous		
Permit fee for the erection of memorials		
Prior to erection	45.00	45.00
Non-notified	75.00	75.00

Genealogical search fee		
Inspection of records/cards	1.00	1.00
Print-out per page/copy per card	1.00	1.00
Search (correspondence including email – minimum)	11.00	11.00
Disinterment and Reinterment		
Disinterment fee, adult over five years old	2,300.00	2,345.00
Disinterment fee, child under five years old	1,100.00	1,120.00
Reinterment fee (same plot)	520.00	530.00
Disinterment of ashes	125.00	127.50
Reinterment of ashes	125.00	127.50
For cremations (including pre-purchase)		
Cremations (excluding use of chapel) Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 5pm, Saturday morning 8.30am to 1pm		
Persons over 10 years of age	770.00	785.00
Child 1 to 10 years of age	460.00	470.00
Stillborn and child up to one year old	230.00	230.00
Under 20 weeks gestation	50.00	50.00
For cremations (including pre-purchase) continued		
Additional Fees		
Saturday afternoons, 1pm to 4pm (subject to special approval and in addition to normal fees)	325.00	330.00
Use of chapel for funeral service; committal prior to cremation; or memorial service where no cremation is involved	270.00	275.00
Storage of ashes more than 14 days after cremation, per calendar month or part thereof	50.00	50.00
Crematorium	2017/18 \$	2018/19

		\$
Purchase of allotments		
Memorial Gardens		
Kerb plot	160.00	163.00
Garden of Memorial	160.00	163.00
Garden of Rest	370.00	375.00
Garden of Roses	160.00	163.00
Children's Garden	160.00	163.00
Avenue of Tranquillity	370.00	375.00
Miscellaneous		
Burial of ashes	125.00	127.50
Maintenance		
Fee on each burial of ashes (not applicable to stillborn and up to five years)	225.00	230.00
Fee recording scattered ashes	45.00	45.00
Disinterment and Reinterment		
Disinterment of ashes	125.00	127.50
Reinterment of ashes	125.00	127.50
Book of Remembrance	15.00 per line	15.00 per line

passenger transport

Passenger Transport Fees	From 1 February 2018 \$	From 1 July 2018 \$
Travel including Adults, Child, School or Tertiary Student, Senior Citizen – Per Trip - All times and All trips (to Hub)		Paid by:
A trip completed by a Tag Off		Bus Smart Card \$2.00
A trip <u>not</u> completed by a Tag Off		Bus Smart Card \$3.00
Any other trip		Cash Payment \$3.00
Transfer within 30 minutes of trip finish when paying with Bus Smart Card only (no cash trip transfers)		\$0.00
Under Five Years Old – All travel times		Free
Super Gold Travel Trip (Registered Bus Smart Card only for travel between 8.45 am and 3.00 pm, and all trips on Saturdays)		\$0.00
Bus Smart Card (Off Bus purchase, including online)		\$5.00
Bus Smart Card (On Bus purchase including \$5.00 top up)		\$10.00
Minimum Bus Smart Card On Bus Top Up		\$5.00

Notes:

1. The Bus Smart Card may be renamed and branded at 1 July 2018 and shall be read as the same.
2. A trip is inclusive of travel which can start anywhere within a route but concludes at the CBD Hub.
3. Payments made by Bus Smart cards are a specific fare type and are not considered as a discount fare as it does not require cash handling or driver assistance costs within the fare.
4. A tag off action is defined within the RITS Implementation Schema as having completed a Tag On when entering the bus and also a Tag Off (swipe) when leaving the bus.
4. Maximum fares shown. Council may select not to implement this level of fare if other strategies are agreed. Actual fares may be confirmed on Council's website.

5. There are no peak or off peak times and fares are a flat fare per trip as shown above.
6. Supergold card holders must register and validate their Bus Smart card to be eligible for the travel type(free) and also complete a Tag Off on concluding the trip. Failure to complete the Tag Off may result in the suspension of the card being eligible for that fare.
7. Supergold travel is between the hours shown above unless amended by NZTA and travel must be compliant with the rules set by Council to be eligible for the fare.

pools

Splash Palace Fees	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Adult	6.20	6.30
Senior (60 years or over)	4.60	4.70
Student (Full time tertiary)	4.60	4.70
Child	4.60	4.70
Lane Space (peak time) (20/25m lane space per hour plus entry)	20.00	20.00
Lane Space (off peak) (20/25m lane space booking fee plus entry)	9.50	9.50

public toilets

Fees and Charges	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Showers – Wachner Place Public Toilets	3.00	3.00

resource management

Land Use and Subdivision Applications	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Fixed initial deposit for Non-Notified applications (Land Use Resource Consents, Cancellation of Resource Consent Conditions, and Objection to Resource Consents and Requests for Extensions of Time Limits).	600.00	620.00
Fixed initial deposit for Non-Notified Applications (Land Use Resource Consents for Demolition – Rule 4.30 only).	315.00	320.00
Fixed initial deposit for Non-Notified Subdivision Consents.	1,000.00	1,050.00
Fixed initial deposit Non-Notified Applications which are decided by the Hearings Panel. A Hearing Fee will also be charged.	2,000.00	2,050.00
Fixed initial deposit for Applications where notice is served under Section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Resource Consents, Change or Cancellation of Conditions, Extensions of Time Limits). Where the application is decided by the Hearings Panel a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	2,400.00	2,450.00
Fixed initial deposit for Notified Applications. Where the application is decided by the Hearings Panel a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	3,800.00	3,900.00
Where any of the above fixed initial deposits are insufficient to cover the costs associated with the processing of an application the following fee charges will apply.	Actual fee for external professionals, postage and packaging. Staff 120.00 per hour	Actual fee for external professionals, postage and packaging. Staff 150.00 per hour
Combined Land Use and Subdivision Applications		
Fixed initial deposit for Non-Notified Combined Applications.	1,300.00	1,400.00
Fixed initial deposit for Non-Notified Combined Applications which are decided by the Hearings Panel. A Hearing Fee will also be charged.	2,500.00	2,600.00
Fixed initial deposit for Combined Applications where notice is served under Section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991. Where the application is decided by the Hearings Panel a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	2,800.00	2,900.00
Fixed initial deposit for Notified Applications for combined Applications. Where the application is decided by the Hearings Panel a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	4,200.00	4,300.00
Deemed Permitted Boundary Activity		

Fixed initial deposit for a Deemed Permitted Boundary Activity		250.00
Outline Plans		
Fixed Initial deposit for an Outline Plan request - section 176A	600.00	620.00
Fixed initial deposit for a request to waiver the requirements for an Outline Plan – section 176A (2)(c)		300.00
Monitoring		
Monitoring of Resource Consents (per hour)	120.00	150.00
Lodging of Objections		
Objections lodged under Section 357 and Section 357A. Where a Hearing is required a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	750.00	800.00
Peer Review of Applications returned under Section 88 of the RMA		
Applicant requests a review of Council's decision to return the application under Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Actual fee where Council's decision to return the application is upheld	Actual fee where Council's decision to return the application is upheld
Independent person to chair pre-application meeting		
Applicant requests an independent person chairs the pre-application meeting.	Actual fee	Actual fee
Designations/Heritage Orders and Plan Changes		
Fixed initial deposit for Notice of requirement for Designations (Section 168) and Heritage Order applications. Where a Hearing is required a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	6,200.00	6,200.00
Fixed initial deposit for the Alteration or Removal of a Designation or Heritage Order.	800.00	820.00
Request for a Plan Change (for minor requests for a Plan Change the costs could be significantly lower than this fee, in which case an appropriate fee would be negotiated). Where a Hearing is required a Hearing Fee will also be charged.	13,000.00	13,000.00
Hearing Fees		
Fixed Initial Deposit (To be paid prior to the Hearing)	1,500.00 for Hearings lasting	1,500.00 for Hearings lasting

	up to two hours.	up to two hours
Hearing Fee per hour after the first 2 hours	600.00	600.00
Hearings Commissioner	Where a commissioner hears and decides/ recommends on an application the Commissioner's fee will be charged.	Where a commissioner hears and decides/ recommends on an application the Commissioner's fee will be charged
External Professionals (where required)	Actual fee	Actual fee
Documents and Certificates		
Certificates under Sections 10 and 139 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and other Certificates, eg Local Authority Compliance Certificate under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.	400.00	420.00
Council Signing Under Seal of Legal Documents	350.00 and any associated legal fees	360.00 and any associated legal fees
Council Signatories for Legal Documents	300.00 and any associated legal fees	320.00 and any associated legal fees
Documents and Certificates continued		
Council Signing of Survey Certification		
Section 223	150.00	160.00
Section 224(c)/Section 224(f) <i>Note – Should a bond be requested and accepted, an administration fee will be charged.</i>	200.00	210.00
Section 221	200.00	210.00
Combined Section 223 and Section 224(c)/224(f)	200.00	210.00
Section 226 application including Certification	500.00	520.00

Applications by Council Business Units, Council Controlled Organisations and Council Organisations		
All applications	Actual costs for processing, hearing and decision-making, including the cost of Hearings Commissioners and External Professionals when required.	Actual costs for processing, hearing and decision-making, including the cost of Hearings Commissioners and External Professionals when required
Engineering Plans		
Lodgement of Engineering Plans and Specifications of Subdivision Including Checking and Inspection as Required Under the Council's Code of Land Development Bylaw.	1.5% of the estimated cost of the Engineering Works or \$1,000.00, whichever is the greater. (Estimated cost to be acceptable to Council).	1.5% of the estimated cost of the Engineering Works or \$1,000.00, whichever is the greater. (Estimated cost to be acceptable to Council)
Re-Inspection Fees – Additional inspections other than those required by the Code of Practice of Code of Land Development (per hour).	120.00	150.00
Infringement fees – Resource Management (Infringement Offences) Regulations 1999		
Section 338(1)(a) – Contravention of Section 9 (restrictions on use of land)	300.00	300.00
Section 338(1)(c) – Contravention of an abatement notice (other than a notice under 322(1)(c))	750.00	750.00
Section 338(2)(a) – Contravention of Section 22 (failure to provide certain information to an enforcement officer)	300.00	300.00
Section 338(2)(c) – Contravention of an excessive noise direction under Section 327.	500.00	500.00
Section 338(2)(d) Contravention of an abatement notice for unreasonable noise under Section 322(1)(c).	750.00	750.00

Other Legislation		
Section 327A Revocation of Building Line Restriction.	600.00	620.00
Section 348 Right of Way Approval.	600.00	620.00
District Plan		
Invercargill City District Plan		
Within Southland	250.00	350.00
Remainder of New Zealand (including postage and packaging)	300.00	400.00
Rapid Signs and Aerial Photos		
RAPID Number Sign Charges		
Single Flat Sign	41.00	45.00
Range Sign	51.00	55.00
Row Signs (each)	10.00	15.00
Installation	75.00	80.00
Supply of Aerial Photo		
Customised projects (per hour)	120.00	150.00
Requests for Remittance of Fees and Charges		
Requests for Remittance of Fees and Charges under Section 36(5) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Written requests to the Director of Environmental and Planning Services, Invercargill City Council	Written requests to the Director of Environmental and Planning Services, Invercargill City Council

roading

Roading Fees	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
License to occupy road – “Café License” (No Alcohol Permitted) – Annual Charge		
Up to 15 square metres	125.00	125.00
Per additional square metre	12.50	12.50
Special designated area of footpath for Alcohol Licence or similar (Annual Charge)	1,050.00	1,050.00
Metered parking space removal (Annual Charge or pro rata for longer periods)	2,000.00	2,000.00
Restricted use of footpath, eg scaffolding permit (monthly fee – also requires CAR permit)	Minimum of 80.00 (for up to 30 days) then 5.00 per calendar day thereafter	Minimum of 80.00 (for up to 30 days) then 5.00 per calendar day thereafter
Overweight permit	Set by legislation	Set by legislation
Vehicle crossing application per crossing	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 60.00)	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 60.00)
Corridor Access Request Excavation or Similar	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 55.00)	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 55.00)
Corridor Access Request No Dig or minor event or similar approval	35.00	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 50.00)
Approval for a Roadside Grazing permit or Dust Suppressant application permit or Demolition or removal of property or Placing of Shipping Container of Frontage or Approval for use of any Road Space.	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 50.00)	Technical charge based on processing time (minimum 50.00)
Parking		
Esk Street Number 1 off street car park (per hour)	1.20	1.20 -1.50
Esk Street Number 2 off street car park (per hour)	1.20	1.20 -1.50

Don Street off street car park (per hour)	1.20	1.20 -1.50
Tay Central off street car park (per hour)	1.20	1.20 -1.50
Esk No 2 Carpark Reserved Permit Parking	55.00-70.00	60.00-80.00
Permit Parking where available at any Carpark not specified		100.00–150.00
Park Zone Car Park Building (Leven Street)		
Casual parking (per hour)	1.20	1.20-1.50
Reserved Permit Space (Red Zone)	75.00	80.00
Reserved Space (Level 7 – Blue Zone) (limited numbers)	55.00	60.00
On street parking meters (per hour)	1.20 to 1.50	1.20 to 1.50
Coach parking (per hour)	2.50	2.50
Meter Bags		
Per day	15.00	15.00
Per calendar week	65.00	65.00

Notes

1. Carparking approach will be changing to include an App and On Street equipment with the gradual removal of meters. Variable rate charges are technically possible within new pay equipment and the parking strategy will enable a range of charges.
2. Pay by Plate equipment is the preferred technology.

sewerage

Trade Waste Bylaw Fees	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Reinspection Fee		
Volume Charge (C _F)	40.6c/m ³	45c/m ³
Biochemical Oxygen Demand Charge / Organic Loading (C _B)	40.5c/Kg BOD	42c/Kg BOD
Suspended Solids Charge (C _S)	36.8c/Kg SS	40.2c/Kg SS
Tankered Waste (Clifton)		
Plant influent (main sewer)	9.50/m ³	9.75/m ³
Digester	19.00/m ³	19.50/m ³
Other	9.50/m ³	9.75/m ³
Connection Fees		
Kennington Connection	7,000.00	7,000.00

solid waste

Invercargill Transfer Station	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Cash minimum	5.00	5.00
Account minimum	10.00	10.00
General waste per tonne	192.00	192.00
Mixed waste > 80% green waste per tonne	157.50	192.00
Mixed waste < 80% green waste per tonne	192.00	157.50
Green waste only per tonne	78.00	78.00
Cleanfill only per tonne	88.50	88.50
Hazardous waste per tonne	88.50	88.50
Car tyres, each (weight charges also apply)	6.00	6.00
Truck tyres, each (weight charges also apply)	11.00	11.00
Bluff Transfer Station		
Rubbish		
Car	10.00	10.00
Station wagon	16.00	16.00
Ute/large van	26.00	26.00
Trailer – single axle	41.00	41.00
Trailer – tandem axle	69.00	69.00
Tyres – car, each (no bulk loads)	6.00	6.00
Tyres – truck, each (no bulk loads)	11.00	11.00
Greenwaste		

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Car	5.50	5.50
Station wagon	8.00	8.00
Ute/large van	13.00	13.00
Trailer – single axle	20.50	20.50
Trailer – tandem axle	34.50	34.50

southland museum and art gallery

AV Theatre	2017/18 9.00am to 5.00pm	2017/18 After Hours	2018/19 9.00am to 5.00pm	2018/19 After Hours
Community Rate	Free	Free	Free	\$60.00 per hour
Not for Profit Rate	\$30.00 per hour	\$60.00 per hour	\$30.00 per hour	\$60.00 per hour
Commercial Rate	\$50.00 per hour	\$100.00 per hour	\$50.00 per hour	\$100.00 per hour
Tuatara School Groups/Lectures	Free	N/A	Free	N/A
Exhibition Gallery Spaces	2017/18 9.00am to 5.00pm	2017/18 After Hours	2018/19 9.00am to 5.00pm	2018/19 After Hours
Community Rate	Free	N/A	Free	\$60.00 per hour
Not for Profit	30.00 per hour	60.00 per hour	30.00 per hour	60.00 per hour
Commercial Rate	\$50.00 per hour	\$100.00 per hour	\$50.00 per hour	\$100.00 per hour
Community Gallery	2017/18		2018/19	
Gallery hire – per exhibition	\$260.00		\$260.00	
Exhibition Sales	2017/18		2018/19	
Commission	1/3 (33%) of the GST exclusive sale price, plus GST		1/3 (33%) of the sale price, plus GST	
Digital Services	2017/18		2018/19	
Photo emailed/printed (personal use)	\$25.00		\$25.00	
Photo emailed/printed to be published	\$25.00 + \$50.00 (acknowledgement fee)		\$25.00 + \$50.00 (acknowledgement fee)	
Request for photo of collection item	\$55.00		\$55.00	
Photo to be used on front cover	To be negotiated		To be negotiated	

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Filming by prior arrangement per hour	\$250.00	\$250.00
Other Southland Museums and Historical Societies	Cost only	Cost only
Research	2017/18	2018/19
Research fee (pro rata)	\$180.00 per hour	\$180.00 per hour First half-hour free
Photocopying	2017/18	2018/19
A4 Black and white	\$0.20	\$0.20
A4 Colour	\$0.50	\$0.50
Official Information Requests (per hour)	2017/18	2018/19
Executive Staff	\$220.00	\$225.00
Managers and Team Leaders	\$180.00	\$185.00
Professional and Technical Staff	\$120.00	\$125.00
Administrative Staff	\$80.00	\$85.00
Photocopying		
A4 page	\$0.20	\$0.20
A3 page	\$0.40	\$0.40
Travel per km	\$0.75	\$0.75

Museum Entry Fee	2017/18	2018/19
All Residents of Southland	Free	Free
All Visitors to Southland:		
Adult	\$10.00	\$10.00
Students (secondary, tertiary, adult)	\$5.00	Free
Under 10 yrs of age	Free	Free
Family	\$20.00	\$20.00

Alteration of Fees

Fees and charges may be refunded, remitted or waived by the Manager, Southland Museum and Art Gallery. The fees and charges listed were correct at the time of going to print. The Council reserves the right to alter fees and charges during the year. Any changes will be publicly notified for submissions. All fees and charges are GST inclusive unless otherwise stated.

water supply

Sale of Water	2017/18 \$	2018/19 \$
Class A: Excess usage by Easement Grantors (by agreement) m ³	0.0254	0.0254
Class C: Extraordinary Consumers of Reticulation (non-residential rating units) Annual Consumption m³:		
0 to 249	0	0
250 to 100,000	0.64	0.653
100,001 to 200,000	0.58	0.592
200,001 to 300,000	0.51	0.52
300,001 and above	0.45	0.46
Class D: Southland District Council consumers off Branxholme pipelines m ³	1.40	1.43
Class G: Bulk water ex waterworks to tankers etc (minimum \$17.20) m ³	2.10	2.15
Class H: Supplied per metered standpipe ex hydrants (minimum \$17.20) m ³	2.10	2.15
Plus standpipe hire per day	40.00	40.80
Class I: Builders Unmetered Supply Paid with Permit Fees		
Dwelling	40.00	40.80
Commercial buildings	80.00	81.60
Water Connection Charges		
Ordinary Connections (Invercargill area)		
20mm service each	1,750.00	1,750.00
25mm service each	2,350.00	2,350.00
Ordinary connections (Bluff area)	Quote	Quote

Council Agenda - REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Extraordinary connections	Quote	Quote
Renewals (20mm diameter)	1,310.00	1,310.00
Disconnection Fee		
Up to and including 50mm each	700.00	714.00
Above 50mm	Quote	Quote
Reconnection fee (up to 50mm diameter)	1,000.00	1,020
Service connection flow test each	300.00	306
Backflow Preventer Fee		
Registration and installation	125.00	127.50
Annual inspection	70.00	71.40
Fire protection water connection annual licence	70.00	71.40



Fees and Charges Form

Setting or changing the Council's fees and charges

Complete fields in the right hand column in the table below. The instructional text in *grey italics* is there to guide you. Include as much information as possible.

Item	Activity/Asset Manager to complete
Name the fee:	Officer charge out rate as currently outlined in the fees and charges schedule
Describe what you are proposing to change.	I propose to increase an existing fee
If changing an existing fee, structure, or wording:	I propose to change from 120.00/hr to 150.00/hr <i>If this fee supersedes others, note this here.</i>
Why are you creating or changing this fee?	External factors In line with SoRDS desire to align fees. We are currently well under other BCA's hourly rates.
Are there other legislative requirements about setting the fee?	No If yes, please explain:
When does this fee need to take effect?	Sunday, 1 July 2018
Have you reflected the fee change in your budgeted revenue for the year it applies?	No If no, please explain the expected effect on revenue: Not a lot of our work is actually charged on an hourly basis so the effect is minimal.
Does the change to the fee and projected revenue align with the Revenue and Financing Policy for your activity?	Yes <i>Show how alignment is achieved. For example: If the Revenue and Financing Policy states that 40% of income is to come from rates and 60% from fees and charges, will the fee change throw this balance out?</i>
Does legislation state we need to consult the public?	Yes The form of consultation required: Consultation principles (LGA s. 82)
Have you checked that systems are in place to give effect to the change?	Yes <i>IMPORTANT: check with customer services how they usually charge this fee, and whether any system updates will need to be carried out to implement the new fee.</i>



Fees and Charges Form

Setting or changing the Council's fees and charges

Complete fields in the right hand column in the table below. The instructional text in *grey italics* is there to guide you. Include as much information as possible.

Item	Activity/Asset Manager to complete
Name the fee:	Book mending as currently outlined in the fees and charges schedule
Describe what you are proposing to change.	I propose to increase an existing fee
If changing an existing fee, structure, or wording:	I propose to change from 5.00 to 10.00 <i>If this fee supersedes others, note this here.</i>
Why are you creating or changing this fee?	Increased costs <i>If it is due to external factors such as legislative changes, please state the legislation and applicable section.</i>
Are there other legislative requirements about setting the fee?	No If yes, please explain: <i>e.g. must be changed by 1 March 2014 and be publicly notified within one month of adoption.</i>
When does this fee need to take effect?	Sunday, 1 July 2018 <i>Ideally 1 July, unless prescribed by legislation.</i>
Have you reflected the fee change in your budgeted revenue for the year it applies?	Yes If no, please explain the expected effect on revenue: <i>This should only be applicable for changes to fees outside of the long term planning budgeting process.</i>
Does the change to the fee and projected revenue align with the Revenue and Financing Policy for your activity?	Yes <i>Show how alignment is achieved. For example: If the Revenue and Financing Policy states that 40% of income is to come from rates and 60% from fees and charges, will the fee change throw this balance out?</i>
Does legislation state we need to consult the public?	No The form of consultation required: Choose an item.
Have you checked that systems are in place to give effect to the change?	Yes IMPORTANT: <i>check with customer services how they usually charge this fee, and whether any system updates will need to be carried out to implement the new fee.</i>



Fees and Charges Form

Setting or changing the Council's fees and charges

Complete fields in the right hand column in the table below. The instructional text in *grey italics* is there to guide you. Include as much information as possible.

Item	Activity/Asset Manager to complete
Name the fee:	Deemed Permitted Boundary Activity Fee as currently outlined in the [this is a new fee]
Describe what you are proposing to change.	I propose to add a new fee
If changing an existing fee, structure, or wording:	I propose to change from Click or tap here to enter text. to Click or tap here to enter text. <i>If this fee supersedes others, note this here.</i>
Why are you creating or changing this fee?	External factors Resource Management Act 1991 Section 87BA <i>If it is due to external factors such as legislative changes, please state the legislation and applicable section.</i>
Are there other legislative requirements about setting the fee?	No If yes, please explain: <i>e.g. must be changed by 1 March 2014 and be publicly notified within one month of adoption.</i>
When does this fee need to take effect?	Sunday, 1 July 2018 <i>Ideally 1 July, unless prescribed by legislation.</i>
Have you reflected the fee change in your budgeted revenue for the year it applies?	Yes If no, please explain the expected effect on revenue: <i>This should only be applicable for changes to fees outside of the long term planning budgeting process.</i>
Does the change to the fee and projected revenue align with the Revenue and Financing Policy for your activity?	Yes <i>Show how alignment is achieved. For example: If the Revenue and Financing Policy states that 40% of income is to come from rates and 60% from fees and charges, will the fee change throw this balance out?</i>
Does legislation state we need to consult the public?	Yes The form of consultation required: Special consultative procedure (LGA s. 83)
Have you checked that systems are in place to give effect to the change?	Yes IMPORTANT: <i>check with customer services how they usually charge this fee, and whether any system updates will need to be carried out to implement the new fee.</i>



Fees and Charges Form

Setting or changing the Council's fees and charges

Complete fields in the right hand column in the table below. The instructional text in *grey italics* is there to guide you. Include as much information as possible.

Item	Activity/Asset Manager to complete
Name the fee:	Annual Building Warrant of Fitness - Audit as currently outlined in the fees and charges schedule
Describe what you are proposing to change.	I propose to change the structure of a fee or fees
If changing an existing fee, structure, or wording:	I propose to change from 200.00 flat fee to 150.00 plus time <i>If this fee supersedes others, note this here.</i>
Why are you creating or changing this fee?	Increased costs An audit can take a long time in large premises and also if a BWOFF is not up to date.
Are there other legislative requirements about setting the fee?	No If yes, please explain: .
When does this fee need to take effect?	Sunday, 1 July 2018 .
Have you reflected the fee change in your budgeted revenue for the year it applies?	No If no, please explain the expected effect on revenue: We have no numbers at this stage on the number of audits to be done. Should be at least 5% per annum.
Does the change to the fee and projected revenue align with the Revenue and Financing Policy for your activity?	Yes
Does legislation state we need to consult the public?	Yes The form of consultation required: Consultation principles (LGA s. 82)
Have you checked that systems are in place to give effect to the change?	Yes <i>IMPORTANT: check with customer services how they usually charge this fee, and whether any system updates will need to be carried out to implement the new fee.</i>

TO: COUNCIL MEETING
FROM: ALL COUNCILLORS
MEETING DATE: TUESDAY 12 DECEMBER 2017

PACE TO PROGRESS REPORT

Report Prepared by: All Councillors

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the report be received;

AND THAT

Council sets in place the above expectations of the Chief Executive;

AND THAT

Council expects reports at each full Council meeting from the Chief Executive on progress towards these goals.

IMPLICATIONS

1.	<i>Has this been provided for in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan?</i> No
2.	<i>Is a budget amendment required?</i> No
3.	<i>Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance?</i> No
4.	<i>Implications in terms of other Council Strategic Documents or Council Policy?</i> Activity Plan for Regulatory Services.
5.	<i>Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?</i> Public will be consulted
6.	<i>Has the Child, Youth and Family Friendly Policy been considered?</i> This will be considered

PACE TO PROGRESS

On behalf of the Invercargill City Council, First Retail Group has completed stage one of the Pace to Progress project. Pace to Progress is intended to deliver measurable and sustained change in the way our organisation interacts and supports stakeholders, with a goal to become an exemplar in the way Council responds to and supports opportunities for its community.

Pace to Progress is an integrated approach to identifying stakeholder expectations and best practice, then aligning culture and delivery, to create a customer-centric organisation that is demonstrably open for business.

Pace to Progress is about accelerating commercial and community growth for Invercargill through a culture of collaboration and shared success with Council, an enabler and champion of progress.

Stage One of this project was the Discovery Phase. This was achieved through both an internal and external survey. These perspectives were used to determine overall performance perspectives of staff and stakeholders.

First Retail Group have presented the findings of the surveys to councillors and senior management (separately).

Three main areas were identified as the Focus Themes:

- People and Culture
- Communication and Engagement
- Capability and Process

In order to ensure the Invercargill City Council is working towards its new vision - to enhance our city and preserve its character, while embracing innovation and change - Council wants these three areas to be focused on by the Chief Executive.

In addition, Councillors acknowledge that the council's own Compass mission is - making it better by making it happen. The core values of this are Respect; Above and Beyond; Responsibility and Positivity.

We believe that focusing on the themes identified in the Pace to Progress work aligns with council's new vision and council's Compass. Council is determined to achieve the goal of accelerating commercial and community growth for Invercargill through a culture of collaboration and shared success with Council, an enabler and champion of progress.

The following expectations are being set by Council in order to start working towards this goal:

1. Customer experience is the number one priority of this council
2. Breaking down of silos within the organisation
3. Recognition of staff performance
4. Communication that is consistent within the organisation and with external stakeholders
5. The organisation is proactive rather than reactive
6. Staff skill development and empowerment
7. Improved use of technology
8. No excuses approach

In setting these expectations, Councillors are committed to drawing a line under where we are now and to focus on the future. We cannot change the past. We would like to invite the community to do the same. This is our city and we are committed to making this Council the most customer-centric city in the country.

We believe Invercargill has the opportunity to be New Zealand's most customer-centric City Council due to its size, drive from Councillors and new leadership and expectation from stakeholders. It is an audacious shift in position, but we need to make this seismic move if the city is to realise the success necessary to support social and commercial goals that have been set.

We also acknowledge that it is not councillors place to determine how Council responds to these new expectations. First Retail Group will work with the Chief Executive and staff on Stage Two - Collaborative Change. This will include a timeline of actions and measures for those actions as well as outcomes. We expect quick wins to be identified and worked on immediately.

We require the Chief Executive to report back on actions and outcomes at each full Council meeting.

A working group of three councillors – Cr Amundsen, Cr Pottinger and Cr Thomas – will support the Chief Executive. Their role will be to make sure the expectations remain clear and that the Chief Executive has support to address the expectations put in place by councillors. At the request of the Chief Executive they will meet on a regular basis with the Executive Leadership Team to ensure everyone is rowing in the same direction and to share and get commitment for the ideas going forward.

As part of this process councillors have set expectations for themselves also.

1. Councillors will draw a line under where we are now and focus on the future.
2. We will hold each other accountable for how we respond and speak about Council. (Above the line and below the line).
3. We will put in place a process for managing any concerns raised with us by the community.
4. We will support Council staff as they trial new things to see what works and how processes can work better, acknowledging that these trials may not always be successful but you don't know until you try them.

TO: COUNCIL
FROM: HIS WORSHIP THE MAYOR, MR T SHADBOLT
MEETING DATE: TUESDAY, 12 December 2017

MAYOR'S REPORT

Report Prepared by: His Worship the Mayor, Mr T Shadbolt

SUMMARY

List of engagements and current issues.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received.

IMPLICATIONS

1.	<i>Has this been provided for in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan?</i> N/A.
2.	<i>Is a budget amendment required?</i> N/A.
3.	<i>Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance?</i> N/A.
4.	<i>Implications in terms of other Council Strategic Documents or Council Policy?</i> N/A.
5.	<i>Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?</i> N/A.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A.

ENGAGEMENTS

- SIT Chrysalis Graduate Showcase – Nova
- TV 3 – The Project
- SIT Korean Day
- MND Walk 2 D Feet
- Omaui Track Opening
- CATE Conference Opening
- LGNZ Rural and Provincial Meeting
- Chairs Meeting
- Extraordinary Council Meeting
- Council Workshop
- Weber Bros Circus
- Invercargill Brass Band 150 years celebration

- SIT Award Ceremony
- 120th Birth Anniversary of Rewi Alley event
- Invercargill Santa Parade
- La Muse – Little Mermaid
- Meet with E Wilson
- Infrastructure and Services Committee Meeting
- TV 3 Interview
- Finance and Policy Committee Meeting
- Buddy Program Christmas Party
- James Hargest Senior Campus Prizegiving
- The Hits Interview
- Invercargill Police Long Service Medal Ceremony
- Preston Russell Christmas Celebration
- Oreti Sands Golf Club Christmas Function
- Events Committee Meeting
- 7 Days Live
- SIT Decree/Diploma Graduation Ceremonies
- Gingerbread House competition judging
- John Husband Exhibition Opening
- South Alive World Record attempt
- Shelley E Coutts Dance Academy – To Neverland and Back
- Shoe Clinic Store Official Opening
- Audit Committee Meeting
- Citizenship Ceremony

REPORTS

There is the usual ideological divide between those who believe in co-ops and community wealth and those who believe in corporations and individual wealth. The tension between these two opposing philosophy's occasionally erupt when outside forces challenge their existence. This happened to the SBS, a co-operative building society that faced a hostile takeover by the private sector. Thanks to Acton Smith and others this move was blocked out and the SBS is now one of the few New Zealand owned banks in the country. The ILT is another example of community wealth that occasionally faces a challenge by the supermarkets who wish to sell alcohol. Some members of our community also feel the ILT represents an example of monopoly control and regulation while others sing its praises because of the distribution of wealth throughout the community.

Now it's the turn of the Invercargill City Council to be challenged by those who strongly object to Council ownership of business enterprises in forestry, electricity and property development. They wish to sack Councillors who are also directors and transform Venture Southland.

Naturally passions have been aroused and it appears that once again a City Councillor who holds strong views on this subject has been assaulted. On the first occasion it involved verbal abuse but the most recent attack was physical. I was criticised for not taking firm action regarding the verbal abuse which I believe was most unfair. When I questioned Councillor Pottinger about his black eye he denied anything had happened but this is a common response for victims of an assault. I have therefore requested our CEO to investigate the matter. Councillors should be able to express their political views in public without being assaulted.
