



PUBLIC

Agenda

Notice is hereby given of a
**Community Services and Development
Committee Meeting**

Tuesday 5 December 2017

to follow the
District Infrastructure Committee
Meeting

Council Chamber
Waimate District Council
125 Queen Street
Waimate

www.waimatedc.govt.nz

Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Community Services and Development Committee will be held in the Council Chamber, Waimate District Council, 125 Queen Street, Waimate, on Tuesday 5 December 2017, to follow the District Infrastructure Committee Meeting.

Committee Membership

| | |
|----------------|--------------|
| Peter Collins | Chair |
| David Owen | Deputy Chair |
| Craig Rowley | Mayor |
| Sharyn Cain | Deputy Mayor |
| David Anderson | Councillor |
| Jakki Guilford | Councillor |
| Miriam Morton | Councillor |
| Tom O'Connor | Councillor |
| Sheila Paul | Councillor |

Quorum – no less than five members

Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968

Councillors are reminded that if they have a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda, then they must declare this interest and refrain from discussing or voting on this item and are advised to withdraw from the meeting table.

Significance Consideration

Evaluation: Council officers, in preparing these reports have had regard to Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council and Committee members will make the final assessment on whether the subject under consideration is to be regarded as being significant or not. Unless Council or Committee explicitly determines that the subject under consideration is to be deemed significant then the subject will be deemed as not being significant.

Decision Making

The Council, in considering each matter, must be:

- i Satisfied that it has sufficient information about the practicable options and their benefits, costs and impacts, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions;
- ii Satisfied that it knows enough about and will give adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decisions to be made.

Stuart Duncan
Chief Executive

Order of Business

| Report | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Item 1 Apologies | 4 |
| Item 2 Conflicts of Interest | 5 |
| Item 3 Identification of Major (Urgent Business) or Minor Items not on the Agenda..... | 6 |
| Item 4 Confirmation of Minutes: Community Services and Development Committee | 7 |
| Item 5 Receipt of Minutes: Creative NZ Communities Scheme Committee | 10 |
| Item 6 Receipt of Minutes: WDC Sports Fund Scheme Committee | 13 |
| Item 7 Receipt of Minutes: Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund Committee | 16 |
| Item 8 Receipt of Minutes: Waimate Community Anzac Group | 19 |
| Item 9 Receipt of Minutes: Waimate District Civic Awards Committee | 23 |
| Item 10 Receipt of Minutes: Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee | 26 |
| Item 11 Remuneration Authority Consultation – Local Government Review..... | 30 |
| Item 12 Discussion / Information Item: Presentation – Waimate Police 11.30am | 51 |
| Item 13 Discussion / Information Item: Presentation – Waimate Shears 12.30pm..... | 52 |
| Item 14 Discussion / Information Item: Presentation – Waimate District Resource Trust 1.00pm..... | 53 |
| Item 15 Consideration of Major (Urgent Business) or Minor Items not on the Agenda..... | 54 |
| Item 16 Exclusion of the Public | 55 |

Item 1

Apologies

Prepared by: Stuart Duncan
 Chief Executive

The Chair will call for any apologies.

Recommendation

That the apologies are accepted.

Item 2 Conflicts of Interest

Prepared by: Stuart Duncan
 Chief Executive

As per the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968 (as below), the Chair will enquire if there are any Conflicts of Interest to be declared on any item on the agenda, and if so, for any member to declare this interest.

Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968

Councillors are reminded that if they have a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda, then they must declare this interest and refrain from discussing or voting on this item and are advised to withdraw from the meeting table.

Item 3 Identification of Major (Urgent Business) or Minor Items not on the Agenda

Prepared by: Stuart Duncan
 Chief Executive

The Chair will call for any major (urgent business) or minor items not on the agenda to be raised according to Standing Orders, as below:

a Standing Orders 3.7.5 – Major Items

An item not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at the meeting if the local authority by resolution so decides, and the presiding member explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public –

- i The reason why the item was not listed on the agenda; and
- ii The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

b Standing Orders 3.7.6 – Minor Items

An item not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at the meeting if –

- i That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
- ii The presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- iii No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.

Recommendation

That the Community Services and Development Committee resolves to consider any major (urgent business) or minor items at the end of the open section of the meeting.

Item 4

Confirmation of Minutes: Community Services and Development Committee

Prepared by: Stuart Duncan
 Chief Executive

The unconfirmed minutes of the Community Services and Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday 24 October 2017 are presented for confirmation.

Recommendation

That the minutes of the Community Services and Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday 24 October 2017 are confirmed as a true and correct record.

Unconfirmed Minutes of the Community Services and Development Committee meeting of the Waimate District Council held at 125 Queen Street, Waimate on Tuesday 24 October 2017, beginning at 1.15pm, following the District Infrastructure Committee meeting.

| | |
|---|--|
| Present | Chair: Cr P Collins Mayor: C Rowley Councillors: S Cain, D Anderson, J Guilford, M Morton, T O'Connor, D Owen, S Paul |
| In Attendance | Chief Executive: S Duncan Managers: C Johns, M Jones Committee Secretary: K Reid |
| <hr/> | |
| 1 Apologies | No apologies were received. |
| 2 Conflicts of Interest | The Chair called for Conflicts of Interests. There were no Conflicts of Interest identified. |
| 3 Identification of Major (Urgent Business) or Minor Items not on the Agenda | The Chair called for Major or Minor Items not on the Agenda. There were no major (urgent business) or minor items identified. |
| 4 Confirmation of Minutes – Community Services and Development Committee | <p>Resolved:</p> <p>That the minutes of the Community Services and Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday 12 September 2017, are confirmed as a true and correct record.</p> <p>Moved Cr Owen Seconded Cr Guilford MOTION CARRIED</p> |
| 5 Receipt of Minutes – Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee | <p>Resolved:</p> <p>That the confirmed minutes of the Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee meeting held on 19 July 2017 are received.</p> <p>Moved Mayor Rowley Seconded Cr Morton MOTION CARRIED</p> <p>Action Point:</p> <p>Council asked staff to seek details / clarification of responsibilities with the boat ramp at the Waitaki River Bridge layby.</p> |

- 6 Receipt of Minutes – Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Committee** **Resolved:**
That the confirmed minutes of the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Committee meeting held on 21 August 2017 are received.

Moved Cr Anderson
Seconded Cr Guilford
MOTION CARRIED
- 7 Management Report – Community and Strategy Group** **Resolved:**
That the Community and Strategy Group Manager's report is accepted.

Moved Cr Collins
Seconded Mayor Rowley
MOTION CARRIED
- 8 Management Report – Executive Support Group** **Resolved:**
That the Executive Support Manager's report is accepted.

Moved Cr Paul
Seconded Cr Guilford
MOTION CARRIED

Action Point:
That the Waimate District Council updates its promotional DVD at the earliest opportunity.
- 9 Consideration of Major (Urgent Business) or Minor Items not on the Agenda** There were no major (urgent business) or minor items identified.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 3.10pm. These minutes to be confirmed at the Community Services and Development Committee meeting to be held on Tuesday 5 December 2017.

Cr P Collins
Chair

Item 5

Receipt of Minutes: Creative NZ Communities Scheme Committee

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

The confirmed minutes of the Creative NZ Communities Scheme Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2017 are presented for the information of the Community Services and Development Committee.

Recommendation

That the confirmed minutes of the Creative NZ Communities Scheme Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2017 are received.

Minutes of the Creative NZ Communities Scheme Committee held at the Waimate District Council, Queen Street, Waimate, at 2:00pm on Tuesday 16 May 2017.

Present Craig Rowley (Mayor)
Clare Saunders-Tack (Community Representative/Deputy Chair)
Miriam Morton (Community Representative)
Sharon Stace (Community Representative)
Ivy Johnston (Iwi Representative)

Apologies Jane Bell (Chair), Wendy Heath (Community Representative)

“That the apologies be accepted.”

Moved Sharon Stace
Seconded Miriam Morton
MOTION CARRIED

In Attendance D van der Byl (Grant Administrator)

Acceptance of Minutes

“That the minutes from the meeting of the Creative NZ Communities Scheme Committee held on 16 November 2016 are accepted as a true and accurate record.”

Moved Craig Rowley
Seconded Clare Saunders-Tack
MOTION CARRIED

Conflicts of Interest

Miriam Morton: Waimate High School and Waimate Theatre Company; Sharon Stace: Waimate Patchwork Group and Waimate Theatre Company; Clare Saunders-Tack: Waimate Patchwork Group and Waituna Creek School; Ivy Johnston: Te Runanga Waihao Inc. Society.

General Business

Miriam commented on how pleasing it was to see so many applications this round. Clare added that the online application forms were a very good addition.

It was suggested that the CCS logo be promoted more. Administrator to email to Committee members as well as mention it in letters to applicants suggesting that it be used on their advertising etc.

Craig suggested that a couple of questions be added to the Project Report Form. These would include, was the CCS banner used and in what way did you advertise that you had received funding from CCS.

Creative NZ Communities Scheme - Funding Round Two 2016/17:
Consideration of Applications

A total of twelve applications were received requesting funds of \$30,749.43 from an available fund pool of \$10,685.00.00 The committee considered each application and applied the Creative NZ Communities Scheme criteria and eligibility.

“That the following funding applications are accepted, totalling \$10,537.00:”

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Waimate Christmas in the Square | \$2,000.00 |
| Te Runanga o Waihao Inc. Society | \$1,000.00 |
| Waihao Downs School | \$1,200.00 |
| Waimate Patchwork Group | \$ 500.00 |
| Waimate High School | \$1,000.00 |
| Waimate Theatre Company | \$1,500.00 |
| Waimate Rocks | \$ 337.00 |
| Waimate Historical Society | \$ 850.00 |
| St Andrews School | \$ 650.00 |
| Waituna Creek School | \$1,500.00 |

“That the following funding applications are declined:”

Connected Media Charitable Trust
Bushtown Waimate Inc.

Moved Craig Rowley
Seconded Clare Saunders-Tack
MOTION CARRIED

The amount of \$148.00 will be carried over to the next funding round in October 2017.
The meeting concluded at 2.45pm.

Chair.....

Date.....

Item 6

Receipt of Minutes: WDC Sports Fund Scheme Committee

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

The confirmed minutes of the WDC Sports Fund Scheme Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2017 are presented for the information of the Community Services and Development Committee.

Recommendation

That the confirmed minutes of the WDC Sports Fund Scheme Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2017 are received.

Minutes of the WDC Sports Fund Scheme Committee held at the Waimate District Council, Queen Street, Waimate, at 1:15pm on Tuesday 16 May 2017.

Present Craig Rowley (Mayor)
Sharyn Cain (Chair/Councillor)
Tina Stevenson (Community Representative)
Ivy Johnston (Iwi Representative)

Apologies Jeff Morrison (Sport South Canterbury Representative), Toni Oudemans (Community Representative).

“That the apologies are accepted.”

Moved Craig Rowley
Seconded Tina Stevenson
MOTION CARRIED

In Attendance D van der Byl (Grant Administrator)

Acceptance of Minutes

“That the minutes from the meeting of the WDC Sports Fund Scheme Committee held on 16 November 2016 are accepted as a true and accurate record”.

Moved Tina Stevenson
Seconded Sharyn Cain
MOTION CARRIED

Conflict of Interest

Sharyn Cain: Waimate Junior Soccer Club and the Waimate High School.

General Business

There were no items of general business identified.

WDC Sports Fund Scheme - Funding Round Two 2016/2017

A total of seven applications were received requesting funds of \$10,235.40 from an available fund pool of \$4,039.55. The committee considered each application and applied the WDC Sports Fund criteria and eligibility.

“That the following funding applications be accepted, totalling \$3,115.40:”

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Waimate High School – Sports Council | \$600.00 |
| Waimate Climbing Club - | \$1,161.50 |
| Waituna Creek School | \$555.80 |
| Waimate Swords Club | \$516.20 |
| Waimate Junior Soccer Club | \$281.90 |

“That the following funding applications are declined:”

Waimate Swords Club (Event Centre venue hire)
Waimate Bowling Club

Moved Tina Stevenson
Seconded Ivy Johnston
MOTION CARRIED

The remaining funds of \$924.15 will be carried over to the next funding round held October 2017.

The meeting concluded at 1.55pm.

Chair.....

Date.....

Item 7

Receipt of Minutes: Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund Committee

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

The confirmed minutes of the Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2017 are presented for the information of the Community Services and Development Committee.

Recommendation

That the confirmed minutes of the Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund Committee meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2017 are received.

Minutes of the Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund Committee held at the Waimate District Council, Queen Street, Waimate, at 1.15pm on Tuesday 16 May 2017.

Present

Craig Rowley (Mayor)
Sharyn Cain (Chair/Council Representative)
Tina Stevenson (Community Representative)
Ivy Johnston (Iwi Representative)

In Attendance

D van der Byl (Grants Administrator)

Apologies

Jeff Morrison (Sport South Canterbury Representative),
Toni Oudemans (Community Representative).

"That the apologies be accepted."

Moved Ivy Johnston
Seconded Tina Stevenson
MOTION CARRIED

Acceptance of Minutes

"That the minutes from the meeting of the Sport New Zealand Rural Travel Fund Committee held on Wednesday 16 November 2016 be accepted as a true and accurate record."

Moved Craig Rowley
Seconded Tina Stevenson
MOTION CARRIED

Conflicts of Interest

Sharyn Cain: Waimate Junior Soccer Club and Waimate High School.

General Business

There were no items of general business identified.

Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund - Funding Round Two 2016/17

A total of seven applications were received requesting funds of \$16,754.54 from an available fund pool of \$5,775.00. The committee considered each application and applied the Sport NZ Rural Travel Fund criteria and eligibility.

"That the following funding applications be accepted, totalling \$5,775.00:"

Waimate High School Soccer \$350.00
Waimate High School Netball \$1,800.00
Waimate Rugby Football Club Inc. \$1,800.00
Waimate Junior Soccer Club \$1,500.00
Waimate Swords Club \$325.00

Moved Craig Rowley
Seconded Ivy Johnston
MOTION CARRIED

There were no remaining funds to be carried over.

The meeting concluded at 1.40pm.

Chair.....

Date.....

Item 8

Receipt of Minutes: Waimate Community Anzac Group

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

The confirmed minutes of the Waimate Community Anzac Group meeting held on Thursday 10 August 2017 are presented for the information of the Community Services and Development Committee.

Recommendation

That the confirmed minutes of the Waimate Community Anzac Group meeting held on Thursday 10 August 2017 are received.

Minutes of a meeting of the Waimate Community Anzac Group held in the Waimate District Council Committee Room, Waimate on Thursday 10 August 2017, beginning at 10.00am.

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Present | Mayor Craig Rowley (Council) Toni Jespersen (Red Cross) Jeanette Packman (Waimate High School) Edward Fletcher (Rotary) |
| In Attendance | Karalyn Reid (Facilitator) |
| Apologies | Pastor Paul Kuriger (Minister's Association), Cr David Owen (Council), Colin Hay (RSA), Rob Boswell (RSA) |

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Pastor Paul Kuriger, Cr David Owen, Rob Boswell and Colin Hay.

"That the apologies are accepted."

Moved Mayor Rowley
Seconded Edward Fletcher
MOTION CARRIED

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

"That the minutes of the Waimate Community Anzac Group meeting held on 31 May 2017 are adopted."

Moved Mayor Rowley
Seconded Jeanette Packman
MOTION CARRIED

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Nominations were called for the position of Chair:

"That Mayor Rowley is nominated as Chair of the Waimate Community Anzac Group."

Moved Edward Fletcher
Seconded Jeanette Packman
MOTION CARRIED

As there were no other nominations MAYOR ROWLEY was declared elected as CHAIR.

Nominations were called for Deputy Chair:

"That Chub Fletcher is nominated as Deputy Chair of the Waimate Community Anzac Group."

Moved Mayor Rowley
Seconded Jeanette Packman
MOTION CARRIED

As there were no other nominations Edward Fletcher was declared elected as Deputy Chair.

CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Turkish Embassy

Email from Colin Hay (RSA) - tabled

“That the inward correspondence is accepted.”

Moved Mayor Rowley
Seconded Edward Fletcher
MOTION CARRIED

FINANCIAL REPORT – WAIMATE DISTRICT COUNCIL

“That the financial report, as tabled, is accepted.”

Moved Toni Jespersen
Seconder Mayor Rowley
MOTION CARRIED

2017 CIVIC ANZAC SERVICE

Financial / Budget

“That the facilitator writes to the Council requesting the annual grant to the Waimate Community Anzac Group be raised to \$2,000.00 from 2018 to cover additional costs such as the Traffic Management Plan.”

Moved Toni Jespersen
Seconder Mayor Rowley
MOTION CARRIED

Note: The Mayor will talk to the Waimate Pipe Band asking if they would be happy with their donation to be at \$100 for future years.

Guest Speaker

In light of Colin Hay’s email (tabled) it was agreed that the RSA would proceed with arranging a highly ranked Naval Officer to be the guest speaker and we would hope that we will be notified early next year that we will have a representative from the Turkish Embassy.

Rob Boswell confirmed (after the meeting) that he has confirmed that Commodore John Campbell would be available as a back-up guest speaker.

Morning Tea

“That morning tea is continued at the Waimate Town & Country Club with the Waimate Community Anzac Group contributing 50% of the costs, being a maximum of \$250.00.”

Moved Mayor Rowley
Seconded Jeanette Packman
MOTION CARRIED

Note: There will be no public invitation for morning tea, it will be by official invitation only.

Other

Waimate High School will supply ushers.

The Mayor will try and get a wooden flag holder made to hold the non-official flags)

A practice will be arranged on the Friday (last day of the term)

GENERAL

Edward Fletcher will look at getting his family's private film clip of three highly decorated Waimate returned servicemen (including Eric Batchelor) leading the military at the Queen's Coronation possession digitised, and possibly acquiring a Heritage Grant funding.

Jeanette Packman will talk to the Principals about running a district-wide poetry competition in schools prior to Anzac Day with a selected poem per school to be read out at the 2018 Anzac Service. The names of those lost could be projected on the large TV at the same time.

There being no further business the Deputy Chair Mayor Rowley closed the meeting at 11.00am.

The next meeting to be held in February 2017.

.....

Mayor Rowley
Chair

Item 9

Receipt of Minutes: Waimate District Civic Awards Committee

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

The confirmed minutes of the Waimate District Civic Awards Committee meeting held on Friday 17 February 2017 are presented for the information of the Community Services and Development Committee.

Recommendation

That the confirmed minutes of the Waimate District Civic Awards Committee are received.

Minutes of the Waimate District Civic Awards Committee of the Waimate District Council held in the Local Government Centre, Queen Street, Waimate, on Friday 17 February 2016 at 12.00pm

Present

Mayor Craig Rowley
Service Clubs Representative: Raewyn Francis (Chair)
Community Representative: Christine Wallace
Council Representative: Councillor David Owen

In Attendance

Administrator Karalyn Reid

Apologies

An apology was received from Ivy Johnston.

“That the apologies are accepted.”

Moved Raewyn Francis
Seconded Christine Wallace
MOTION CARRIED

Confirmation of Minutes

“That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016 are confirmed as a true and accurate record.”

Moved Mayor Craig Rowley
Seconded Cr David Owen
MOTION CARRIED

Selection of 2017 Award Recipients

The nominations were assessed by the Committee, with the below decisions made:

Youth Award: Rochelle Wilson

Group/Organisation Award: Waimate Volunteer Fire Brigade

Individual Awards: Alf and Glen Billett, Nancy Dobbie, Lyndsay Hossack, and Denise Campbell

Special Award (posthumous award): Cheryl Hedley

Moved Raewyn Francis (Chair)
Seconded David Owen
MOTION CARRIED

Note: Mayor Craig Rowley and Chair Raewyn Francis will visit the 2017 recipients to ensure they will accept the award.

2017 Civic Award Planning

- Letters to successful nominators will be sent out after the selection meeting and prior to the Civic Awards Function.
- The Royal NZ Navy Regional Naval Officer Lt Cdr Grant Finlayson will present the Youth Award
- Wooden plaques will be given to the recipients, along with buttonhole/sprays.
- The Waimate Event Centre will be the venue for the 2017 Civic Awards.
- The date for the 2017 Civic Awards Function is Friday 24 March 2017, 6.30pm.
- Former Committee Member Cheryl Hedley will be recognised with a posthumous award at the function. Her immediate family will be invited.

General Business

There was no general business.

The meeting closed at 12.30pm.

Raewyn Francis
Chair

Item 10

Receipt of Minutes: Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

The confirmed minutes of the Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee meeting held on Wednesday 20 September 2017 are presented for the information of the Community Services and Development Committee.

Recommendation

That the confirmed minutes of the Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee meeting held on Wednesday 20 September 2017 are received.

**LOWER WAITAKI SOUTH COASTAL CANTERBURY ZONE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF A LOWER WAITAKI SOUTH COASTAL CANTERBURY ZONE
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE WAIMATE EVENT CENTRE, WAIMATE ON
WEDNESDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2017, AT 1.15PM**

PRESENT Chair Kate White (Community); Mark Giles (Deputy Chair), Suzanne Eddington (Waihao Runanga), Andrew Feierabend (Meridian Energy), Sandra Hampstead-Tipene (Arowhenua Runanga), Andrew Hayes (Community), Mark Kingsbury (Community), Cr Miriam Morton (Waimate District Council), Bruce Murphy (Community), Brent Packman (Community), Liz Rollinson (Community), Ranui Ryan (Moeraki Runanga) and Cr Peter Scott (Environment Canterbury),

APOLOGIES Peter Ramsden

IN ATTENDANCE Nic Newman (Zone Facilitator – ECan)
Olivia Smith (Acting Minute Secretary/Zone Facilitator)

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and thanked and made a presentation to Nic Newman, being his last meeting with the Lower Waitaki Zone Committee. Committee members, along with members of the public, acknowledged Nic's outstanding facilitation skills and the enormous contribution that he has made to the Lower Waitaki community.

APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no additional interests registered.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED
LWSC17/19 Moved Sandra Hampstead
Seconded Cr Miriam Morton
"That the minutes of the Lower Waitaki Zone
Committee meeting held on 19 July 2017 are adopted
as a true and correct record."
MOTION CARRIED

RESOLVED
LWSC17/20 Moved Andrew Hayes
Seconded Sandra Hampstead
"That the minutes of the Joint Upper and Lower Waitaki
Zone Committee meeting held on 18 August 2017 are
adopted as a true and correct record."
MOTION CARRIED

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence received or sent.

REGIONAL COMMITTEE UPDATE

No update provided.

FACILITATOR UPDATE

Nic Newman informed the committee that the Iwi Management plan will be shared with the committee at a future meeting. He also advised that the zone committee refresh process is underway and applications are now open.

HUNTER DOWNS

Stacy Scott updated the committee on Hunter Downs Irrigation Scheme (HDI). Stacey provided a handout on TLI monitoring in Wainono Lagoon requesting the zone committee support more frequent TLI monitoring.

When asked for a progress update on HDI, Stacey explained that they have reduced the size of the proposed scheme to 12,000 ha. 700ha of this irrigation is expected to be in the Wainono catchment.

Stacey explained that the scheme is working toward financial close and are awaiting the result of the upcoming election. It was thought that outcome of the election may potentially influence funding from Crown Irrigation Investments Limited.

There was much discussion on the augmentation of Wainono lagoon. It was agreed that a wider discussion needs to take place which includes the location, volume and funding of augmentation. It was agreed that the conversation needs to include the community, rūnanga, Ngai Tahu, Department of Conservation, Zone Committee, Councils, MGI and HDI. There was some frustration that this conversation had not occurred earlier.

ZONE DELIVERY

Zone Manager, Chris Eccleston updated the committee on:

- Implementation Prioritisation. The Chair said it was helpful and Chris explained that the next step is prioritising projects for implementation
- Verbal Update on Activities.
 - Chris informed the committee of a GMP cropping project led by Foundation of Arable Research.
 - Work to support the Hakataramea Sustainability Collective.
 - A meeting with Liz Soal took place which included a discussion about ways to improve environmental reporting in the district.
- Annual Compliance Report - it was noted that there has been a significant increase in the number of complaints received for stock in waterways. It was explained that this may simply be a result of increased awareness of the issue.

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY LONG TERM PLAN

Facilitator Nic Newman sought feedback from the committee on Environment Canterbury's Long Term Plan. The following feedback was received:

New Freshwater Management Solutions

- Resource supporting catchment GMP
- Integrated monitoring network

Step Change in Biodiversity

- More on the ground education and support
- Biodiversity corridor approach

GENERAL BUSINESS / GENERAL PUBLIC

The Chair explained that there are 4 streams on South Bank of the Waitaki River that currently have mining rights on them. These rights are due to expire and a group has been formed to work with ECan on replacement consents. 3 of the 4 streams have no minimum flows and ecological work is required to determine appropriate a flow regime for each of these streams. A representative of the group approached the Chair requesting that zone committee request that Environment Canterbury support the group with the required study.

RESOLVED

LWSC17/21

Moved Kate White

Seconded Mark Giles

“The Lower Waitaki Zone Committee ask ECan to support a study into the flows and potential allocation of the river on the South Bank of the Waitaki affected by mining rights. We ask that this is done in conjunction with the mining rights farmers and with some urgency in order to provide clarity with regard to application for water to the Kurow Duntroon Irrigation scheme.”

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting closed at 2.45pm for afternoon tea, with the committee then taking a field trip to the Black Hole on the Waihao River

K White
Chairperson

Item 11 Remuneration Authority Consultation – Local Government Review

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
 Community and Strategy Group Manager

and: Fabia Fox
 Policy Analyst

Purpose of Report

- 1 To present the Community Planning and Development Committee with Part Three of the Remuneration Authority's Local Government Review Consultation Document for discussion and to finalise the Waimate District Council submission.

Background

- 2 The Remuneration Authority have been undertaking a review of the local government remuneration process and have prepared a consultation document for consideration by local authorities.
- 3 The Community Planning and Development Committee discussed Part Two of the document at the 13 June 2017 meeting. This covered changes proposed for inclusion in the 2017/18 determination including; remuneration for plan hearings under the Resource Management Act (RMA), leave of absence periods and remuneration for acting mayors or chairs, communication allowances for ICT hardware, travel allowances and changes to the expenses policy process.
- 4 Feedback on these proposed changes was submitted to the Authority following this meeting.
- 5 The Local Government Members (2017/18) (Local Authorities) Determination 2017 came into force on 1 July 2017, implementing a number of changes as a result of the first part of the consultation process. These changes have been summarised in Appendix 1 for the Committee's information.
- 6 The third part of the consultation document (Appendix 2), which details proposed changes to council sizing, mayor and councillor remuneration and the local government pay scale, was discussed at the 1 August 2017 Committee Meeting and a draft submission was prepared. This has been circulated to councillors for consideration.
- 7 The Authority extended the consultation period to 15 December 2017 to allow for more robust discussions between the Authority and the local government sector. During this time the Authority members attended LGNZ zone meetings to engage first-hand with elected members and produced a webinar to provide an opportunity for wider engagement.
- 8 As discussed at the 1 August 2017 meeting, the key proposals (applicable to the Waimate District Council) the Authority are requesting feedback on are:
 - a Council sizing: The Authority defines council size as the accumulated demands on any council resulting from its accountability for its unique mix of functions, obligations, assets and citizenry. The council sizing index, currently derived from population and council expenditure, forms the basis of the Authority's determination of councillor/mayor/chair remuneration. Job size of the positions, proportion of full time work and the Authority's pay scale are also considered.

- b It is proposed that moving forward the factors to be used in council sizing for territorial authorities like Waimate District Council include population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights.
- c The Authority has also noted that during the consultation process they have received feedback regarding land size/area as a potential sizing factor due to the impact it may have on the council's work and the time spent by councillors travelling within their council area on council business. This is the case particularly in big, sparsely populated councils where their populations are widely dispersed. The Authority welcomes feedback on this potential factor also.
- d Weighting of the aforementioned factors for council sizing: Currently the Authority weights the factors for territorial authorities, in terms of their current view, from the highest to lowest importance:
 - Population; operational expenditure
 - Assets size
 - Deprivation index; visitor nights
 The Authority is seeking feedback as to whether Council supports this proposed weighting.
- e Mayor/chair remuneration: The Authority is proposing that all mayor/chair positions be considered full time and that remuneration is determined on this basis. It is also proposed that there should be a 'base pay' for all mayors/chairs with additional remuneration added depending on the size of the council.
- f Councillor remuneration: The Authority is looking at setting a total "governance/representation pool" that each council would distribute. The pool would be linked to the size of the council and thus be irrespective of the number of elected members. Under the current system the Authority sets the base remuneration for each councillor.

This change would mean that while the Authority would provide the fiscal framework, the decisions around the details of councillor remuneration, including additional remuneration for extra duties or responsibilities, would be in the hands of the local council. The Authority sees that local councils are better able to understand and reflect community needs and councillor responsibilities than they are on a national basis.

- g Remuneration of external representation roles: It is proposed that additional remuneration of elected members appointed to represent council on various outside committees and bodies be determined by each council from the aforementioned 'governance/representation pool'.
 - h Local government pay scale: The Authority acknowledges that with regards to pay scales local government has no exact equivalent in New Zealand, but that central government is the closest comparison. With this considered, the Authority sees it appropriate for local government remuneration to be related to parliamentary remuneration, but taking account of the differences in job sizes.
- 9 Part three of the Remuneration Authority consultation document has been attached – Appendix 2.

Proposal / Options

- 10 The Committee consider the Remuneration Authority's proposals with regards to local government remuneration setting and provide staff with clear direction to complete the submission to the Authority.

Obstacles

- 11 There are no known obstacles.

Assessment of Significance

- 12 This matter is not deemed significant under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Budget Considerations

- 13 There are no known budget considerations currently. The proposed changes would be introduced in 2019.

Cost-effectiveness

- 14 Cost-effectiveness consideration is not applicable.

Recommendation

- 1 That the Remuneration Authority Consultation – Local Government Review report is accepted; and
- 2 That the Community Services and Development Committee provide staff with direction for the feedback to be submitted to the Remuneration Authority.

Appendix 1

Summary of Main Changes made in 2017 Determination

Remuneration increase

All elected member remuneration has been increase by 1.7%, which reflects the increase in the Labour Market Statistics for the public sector in the year ending March 2017.

Hearing fees

The first significant change is that hearing fees for district and regional plans and regional policy statements will be treated the same way as fees for resource consent hearings. This removes the necessity for councils to have to apply to the Authority to be able to put aside a budget for plan hearing fees and then to have no ability to change that budget should requirements change over the year in question. As noted in our discussion document, the reasoning was that councillors are now having to be accredited commissioners and are increasingly working alongside external commissioners in this work. You will see that rather than a flat fee, we have allowed fees up to \$100 an hour for chairs of hearings and up to \$80 for other members. We noted from previous determinations that, when councils had requested provision to pay for plan hearings, some were paying councillors much less than this maximum and we felt that councils needed the ability to decide what was locally relevant. We have retained the prohibition on mayors and regional chairs being paid hearing fees since in most cases (even if they had the time to participate in hearings) they are paid considerably more than councillors.

Acting mayor or regional chair

Another change that we felt needed to be formally clarified is the situation of a member acting in the position of mayor or regional chair as a result of a vacancy or temporary absence of the incumbent. If the incumbent is not being paid (either as a result of resignation or through having been granted formal unpaid leave by the council) then the person acting in the role must be paid the full remuneration and allowances attached to the role for the period of their tenure. This package would replace that member's normal remuneration package. We felt this was important because we are aware that elected people have a genuine desire to save money for the ratepayers and there can be an awkwardness about accepting higher remuneration in the acting role. There can also be pressure put on elected people to not accept remuneration increases. Our view is that there is a "rate for the job" and in other areas of the employment market people would expect to get this rate if they were doing the work.

Vehicle mileage and travel time

We have removed the "30 km" rule which required that distance to be deducted from a mileage claim to and from the council office – 30 km being a proxy for a normal commuting distance by any worker. We were aware of the considerable confusion this rule appeared to generate in applying it to different types of journeys and also of the transaction costs in administering it. Again, this also aligns more closely with what a self-employed contractor or tradesperson might charge.

The mileage allowance for elected members using their own vehicles is now set at 73 cents per kilometre for the first 10,000 km and 37 cents per km for distances over that. For electric vehicles the first 10,000 km rate will be 81 cents. These are the current IRD rates. The IRD has signalled a potential change in the kilometre threshold and is using 10,000 km in the

example on its website, so we have chosen to go with that in this determination. Members need to be aware, however, that should the IRD finally decide on a different threshold figure then we will revisit this issue. Meanwhile, 10,000 km does appear to better reflect an average mileage by elected members. We were particularly conscious of the situation of members in smaller, more rural authorities who have large distances to travel on a regular basis. Despite the changes in this determination, we urge members to familiarise themselves with the IRD requirements and provisions when completing their annual tax return.

The travel time allowance remains at the same rate, but can now be claimed by mayors and regional council chairs. Mayors and chairs were previously not eligible for this allowance, on the assumption that their roles were full time – more akin to a salaried position which would not normally include a travel time allowance. However, since the Authority has not completed its council sizing work and consequent remuneration adjustments, we felt that the current situation was unfairly penalising those with geographically large constituencies and who chose to use their own vehicle rather than a council vehicle. As there is a “one hour” threshold for any travel time claim on any single day, this change is unlikely to impact much on mayors in compact urban electorates. I need to stress that when we complete the council sizing exercise and consequent remuneration adjustments, we will revisit this issue.

The formula for valuing council vehicles supplied to mayors and regional chairs remains the same.

Communication allowances

In our discussion document, we tested the idea of councils supplying a full suite of communications equipment to all elected members. The reaction to this was mixed and, not surprisingly, the smaller councils were not so keen. We have therefore provided for either option, with allowances set to try to be fair both to members who supply their own equipment and to councils who chose to supply it. Mobile phone plans caused us some difficulty because of their varied nature and we have decided on a formula that is designed to be fair to all. We would welcome feedback on this formula for next year's determination. With the increasing trend towards laptops and tablets replacing desktop computers, we have limited the “computer” allowance to either a desktop or a laptop or a tablet.

Childcare allowance

The issue of whether or not councils can or should provide childcare allowances for elected members was raised by a number of elected members in recent months. We have begun work on it but have not had time to complete that work prior to the issuing of this determination.

Appendix 2

Part Three – Longer Term Proposals

Introduction

64. The Authority is seeking the views of local government (i.e. territorial authorities, unitary councils and regional councils) on the proposals set out below in this section of the paper. These changes will affect elected mayors, chairs and councillors, as well as community board members, from every council except Auckland. Later this year we will be issuing an additional consultation paper on the Auckland Council, following the completion of its governance review. However, we are proposing that the general principles outlined in this paper around council sizing should apply to Auckland.
65. Please note that we are seeking the views of councils, not of individual elected members or staff.
66. We would appreciate feedback to info@remauthority.govt.nz by Friday October 20th 2017. Please email to info@remauthority.govt.nz

Recent history of local government remuneration setting by the Authority

67. In late 2011 the Authority issued a discussion document - *Review of Local Authority Remuneration Setting*. This was followed in November 2012 by a further document - *Remuneration Setting Proposals for Local Authorities* - which outlined the system that the Authority was proposing to institute from the 2013 election. A copy of that document is attached as *Appendix 1*. It transpired that for a variety of reasons in the years 2014 to 2016 the Authority did not completely implement the proposed process. However, significant elements are in place. Importantly, the work which the Authority commissioned from the Hay Group in 2015 remains current in our view and has provided useful data to assist with our current considerations.
68. To assist with context, the main elements of the 2013 proposal are summarised below. They were:
- a) Moving away from the traditional salary/meeting fee mix for local government remuneration.
 - b) Creating a size index for councils derived from population and council expenditure.
 - c) Basing the remuneration for councillors/mayors/chairs on:
 - the relative place of the council in the size index;
 - the job size of the positions as assessed for sample councils;
 - the proportion of full time work as demonstrated by survey results;
 - the Authority's pay scale.
 - d) Providing a pool for each council equivalent to one councillor's remuneration to be allocated for additional positions of responsibility.

- e) Reviewing local government remuneration approximately two years after each election and setting the base remuneration for councillor and mayor/chair roles at the beginning of each election year, together with provision for changes in positions of responsibility within each council.
- f) Recalculating annually each council's place on the size index and, in the following July determination, automatically applying any increase warranted, with the proviso that any reductions in the base remuneration would not be implemented during the term of that council.
- g) Providing a loading of 12.5% for unitary council remuneration to recognise their additional regional responsibilities.
- h) Retaining arrangements for resource consent hearings whereby elected members can be paid an hourly fee in addition to their base remuneration.
- i) Requiring councils to confirm their expenses policies only in election year rather than annually.
- j) Retaining valuation methodology for mayor/chair vehicles with adjustments made each year on July 1 to coincide with the determination.
- k) Various changes to community board remuneration setting.

69. The new system was in place for the 2013 Determination in which the Authority made the following comment: *"Aware of its responsibility of fairness to both elected members and ratepayers, the Authority moderated both increases and decreases to smooth the transition to the new system"*.

70. In the 2014 Determination, the same comment was made with the additional comment that *"this approach was continued, with moderation to reflect wage growth, this year"*.

71. In 2015 the same comment was again made. However, in issuing that Determination the Authority said the following: *"The relationships between council size and remuneration, as well as any necessity for moderation of large increases or decreases, will be reassessed during the 2015/16 year ready for implementation at the time of the 2016 local body elections"*.

72. During 2015 the Authority reviewed the framework again, including job-sizing the positions of a representative group of councils and assessing workloads. In issuing its 2016 Determination the Authority made the following comment: *"The Authority found clear evidence regarding the size of positions but has less confidence in the evidence relating to workload. Given that uncertainty, the Authority has not proceeded to fully or partially implement increases that would in many cases have been well in excess of 10%. It has instead applied increases to the base remuneration payable to councillors ranging from 1.5% to 3% depending on the size of the council. This reflects at the higher level the movements in the public sector remuneration more generally."* The following comment was also made: *"The Authority is also concerned that the expectations placed on local representatives continue to increase and remuneration does not in all circumstances reflect the skill and effort required from members. It will therefore begin further work this year to*

establish an ongoing basis for remuneration that treats both the ratepayer and the elected member fairly”.

Rationale behind current proposal

73. While the legal requirements are set out above in paragraph 2 of Part One (above), the Authority members have also decided that these legal requirements (including attraction and retention of competent people) should be aimed at attracting a wide variety of competent people and balanced by the need to have a local government remuneration system that is accepted in the wider community. To enable this, we require a robust process that is as transparent as possible, intuitively plausible and sustainable for the foreseeable future.
74. We recognise that whether or not the level of financial reward matches the personal contribution of any elected member is not necessarily a significant determinant of the willingness of many people to stand for election. However, remuneration may be an issue for some, depending on personal circumstances, and it may also become an issue for an incumbent deciding whether or not to continue.
75. In considering this proposal, the Authority has decided to maintain a number of existing approaches. The principal ones are:
- a) Maintaining a “total remuneration” approach rather than meeting fees.
 - b) Using a size index to determine relativity between various councils.
 - c) Adopting a “pay scale” for local government that is fair and seen to be fair.
 - d) Reviewing the components of the council size index every three years and applying appropriate factors to territorial authorities and regional authorities.
 - e) Recognising that unitary councils have dual responsibilities and sizing them accordingly.

Council Sizing

76. Overview

We define council size as the accumulated demands on any council resulting from its accountability for its unique mix of functions, obligations, assets and citizenry. The size of councils varies considerably. The most obvious difference is in the size of population with the biggest council (Auckland) having 1,614,300 citizens and the smallest (the Chatham Islands) just 610 at the last census. Even outside of these two, there still a wide population range from Christchurch (375,000) to Kaikoura (3,740).

77. However, despite their differences, there are also many similarities between different councils and the roles of elected representatives.
78. All local government representatives have a basic workload that includes decision-making around local plans, policies and regulations; civic representation; assisting constituents; and

working with other organisations (public and private sector). Importantly, councils are also tasked with employing a chief executive and monitoring performance and delivery.

79. With regard to differences, as noted above, the starkest is in population, but even then there is not an exact connection between population and work load. We have taken account of several characteristics in addition to population to compare the size of each council. We are limited by the ready availability of information. However, with the information that is available, we have been able to use statistical methods to identify several factors that are significant influences on the workload of Councils.
80. We can identify councils that are most likely to be comparable in size, despite differences in what brings this about. Such comparisons can never be exact, because amongst all the councils there are influences on their size that are either unique or unable to be quantified using existing evidence. The analytical approach taken this year by the Authority will be further developed whenever the information base is able to reflect such situations.
81. We considered a variety of factors that could be used for sizing councils and, after consultation and further analysis, we are proposing several factors, with some differences between territorial authorities and regional/unitary councils. The indicators for each factor came from official statistics and departmental reports, and they were analysed by standard statistical methods which enabled the variety of demands on councils from different sources to be compared and accumulated. The initial list of factors and the modelling was identified with a representative group of elected local authority leaders, and then developed further by the Authority.
82. The strong direct effects on size from population, assets and operational expenditure were modified by differences in guest night stays, social deprivation levels and physical size.

Factors proposed to be used in sizing

83. Territorial authorities:

- a) **Population.** This factor not only determines the scale of services that a council will provide, but also the rating base by which activities are funded. Population is most likely to be the indicator that most New Zealanders would use when asked to distinguish between various councils. The statistics we are using are the most recent population estimates by Statistics New Zealand.
- b) **Operational expenditure.** In many cases, operational expenditure correlates with population, but there are also some differences - in particular when a council may be in the midst of a specific expansion programme in a particular area of activity. Our data is taken from the annual accounts of councils.
- c) **Asset size.** This represents the capital base of the council that the council is required to manage, providing essential service such as water, wastewater, roads and flood protection, and also social infrastructure. One of the challenges in asset management is to ensure that assets do not lose value. In recent years there has been greater focus on asset management in the sector, requiring (if it is undertaken rigorously) a higher degree

of attention to detail on the part of elected members, not just the asset managers in the organisation. The data on asset size is also extracted from the consolidated annual accounts of councils and includes the value of their council controlled organisations (CCOs).

We acknowledge that there are different degrees of assets held by local government. Some have highly commercial assets with commercial boards comprising directors selected for their relevant competencies and business experience. Others have land holdings that are long-term and more “passive” investments. Others again are assets such as ports which although highly commercial and competitive are often also strategic assets for their local government owners.

There are also different degrees of oversight. Some councils are extremely “hands on” with their assets and others are more arms-length in their relationships, particularly with CCOs. We recognise that whatever measure of asset size is used, its relevance will differ somewhat among councils to a greater extent than is likely with other factors.

- d) **Social deprivation.** This measures the differences between councils in their need to take account of economic disadvantage among citizens. We recognise that in many council districts the high level of social deprivation in some areas is counterbalanced by a higher economic status in others. However, we believe there are some councils that do not have this balance and that, given the reliance of many councils on rates income, for those councils a high level of social deprivation will have a significant impact. Data is drawn from the third quartile of the NZDEP index prepared from the last population census.
- e) **Number of guest nights.** This represents the demands on councils (e.g. infrastructure development and service provision) resulting from visitors. We recognise that this is a current issue which may in future years be resolved and that it is but one sector in New Zealand’s economy which is of concern to local government. However, it has been raised with us on many occasions and we believe it is relevant to allow for such demands being faced by council at present. It may be that it is replaced by another factor in future years. For this factor we use the Monthly Accommodation Survey of Statistics New Zealand. We were unable to find any data on visitors who may pass through a district and use facilities but not stay overnight, or on the current vexed issue of freedom campers.

84. Regional councils:

Although all councils (territorial, regional and unitary) have a power of general competence, the legal responsibilities of regional councils and unitary councils differ from those of territorial authorities. The breadth of their mandate in national legal instruments (such as the Resource Management Act) requires regional and unitary councils to operate at a different scale from that of territorial authorities, especially in their focus on regulating and managing land and water. For example, regional and unitary councils must develop and administer Regional Plans and Unitary Plans, and territorial authorities must give effect to these plans, which drives behaviour around issues such as water quality (i.e. storm water

and waste water). In contrast, regional councils do not have the significant focus on social issues that is required from either unitary or territorial councils. Hence **land size** is inherently important to the work of a regional or unitary council. In measuring size, we are proposing to eliminate the deprivation index factor for regional councils and add a land area factor.

85. Unitary councils:

For some years, the Authority has added a loading of 12.5% to account for the additional regional council responsibilities of the four smaller unitary councils – Gisborne, Marlborough, Nelson and Tasman. This did not include Auckland, even though it is also a unitary council, because the remuneration for Auckland was considered separately when it was set up.

We are uncertain as to the basis for the 12.5%, and are thus proposing that this loading now be removed and that instead the size of these four unitary councils be measured by both the regional and the territorial authority factors. Thus the factors by which we measure the size of unitary councils would include both land area and social deprivation.

The Authority believes that with the additional regional council factor of land area included, this is a fairer way of sizing unitary councils.

With regard to the proposed factors to be used for sizing councils

- **Are there significant influences on council size that are not recognised by the factors identified?**
- **Are there any factors that we have identified that you believe should not be used and why?**
- **When measuring council assets, do you support the inclusion of all council assets, including those commercial companies that are operated by boards?**
- **If not, how should the Authority distinguish between different classes of assets?**

Weighting

86. The weight given to each factor was assessed intuitively by the Local Government Advisory Group, drawing on their knowledge and experience. These weights were then further refined by formal statistical analysis. The Authority has not yet completed this part of the exercise and, before we do, we would like to hear views on the proposed factors. Nevertheless, in our work to date, the following “order of magnitude” listing indicates what

we consider to be the relative importance of the various factors in determining size. They are listed here in terms of our current view of the highest to lowest influence on size.

87. Territorial authorities:

- Population; operational expenditure
- Assets
- Deprivation index; visitor nights

88. Regional councils:

- Operational expenditure; geographic size
- Assets; population
- Visitor nights

89. Unitary authorities:

- Population; operational expenditure; geographic size
- Assets
- Deprivation index; visitor nights

90. When the weighting exercise is completed, the size of each council estimated in this way will become the size index.

- **Are you aware of evidence that would support or challenge the relativity of the factors for each type of council?**
- **If you believe other factors should be taken into account, where would they sit relative to others?**

Mayor/chair remuneration

91. The work that the Authority commissioned from the HayGroup in 2015 included a review and evaluation of the roles of mayor, regional council chair, committee chair and councillor across 20 councils.

92. The evidence reported by Hay was that mayor and regional council chair roles generally require a full-time commitment, though this is not true in absolutely all cases. Even in smaller authorities where the mayor's role may not be full time, the nature of the job means that it is usually difficult to get another job to supplement what might not be a fulltime income. From the knowledge of members of the Authority and advice from a range of participants in local government, including the Advisory Panel, the Authority accepts that mayors/chairs are full time and we propose that mayor/chair remuneration be determined on this basis.

93. We are also proposing that there should be a “base pay” for all mayors/chairs. Additional remuneration would then be on top of this, depending on the size of the council.

- **Should mayor/chair roles should be treated as full time?**
- **If not, how should they be treated?**
- **Should there be a “base” remuneration level for all mayors/chairs, with additional remuneration added according to the size of the council?**
- **If so, what should determine this “base remuneration”?**

Councillor remuneration

94. The relativity between mayor/chair and councillors is somewhat more difficult to determine and we note that in 2015 the Authority suggested that although there was evidence about the size of positions, there was less evidence about workload.

95. We are aware that there are clear differences in both the job size and the workload of councillors on different councils for a several reasons. There can also be significant differences in workloads of councillors within a single council. The influences on a councillor workload obviously include measurable factors such as population and the other indicators we have outlined above in paragraph 5, as well as the number of councillors, which varies from council to council.

96. However, other influences include current issues within a council area and individual councillor interest in or affiliation to different interest groups. The latter also applies to workload differences amongst councillors on a single council, as does the appetite for work amongst different councillors. The Authority is not able to take account of such differences in our determinations. Nor are we able to provide for “performance pay”. This means that on any single council the remuneration of the hardest working councillor will be the same as that of the lowest contributor.

97. Having looked carefully at the sizing factors, and discussed mayor/chair and councillor relativity with a variety of people, we have formed a view that we are unable to accommodate the differences between councillors on different councils with sufficient granularity to have a single national approach. The large metropolitan councils, for example, seem to have a higher councillor workload than of smaller rural and provincial councils, though this is not a universal rule. Additionally, there are differences between

similar sized councils which are addressed at council level by the allocation of committee and portfolio responsibilities.

98. We are also conscious of the discrepancies amongst councils in the current relationships between councillor remuneration and that of the mayor/chair. The range is from 54% down to 21%, and in some cases the proportion appears to be arbitrary. Discrepancies are also evident where councils of similar size (population) show variances of up to 10% in the ratio between councillors and mayors/chairs remuneration. Some of this may be historical - the legacy of previous approaches - or the result of councils having decreased or increased the number of councillors over time.
99. The Authority is looking at a new approach that, while providing a fiscal framework, would put the decisions round the details of councillor remuneration into the hands of the local council, which we believe is better able to understand and reflect community needs than we are on a national basis.
100. We are looking at setting a total “governance/representation pool” that each council would distribute. The pool would be linked to the size of the council and thus be irrespective of the number of elected members. Because we are now proposing formally that all mayor/chair roles be considered full time, the Authority would be in a position to set the salary for that position. Thus the mayor/chair remuneration would be separately allocated by the Authority, but included in the governance/representation pool allocated to each council. However, all other positions – councillors, deputy mayor/chair, chairs of committees, portfolio holders etc and community board members – would be allocated from its own pool by each council.
101. The pool proposal was included as one alternative in the 1997 LGNZ consultation paper, albeit the remuneration framework then was very different from how it has evolved today.
102. The advantages of this approach are that it focusses on the total governance and representation cost for each council (minus the mayor/chair) and that it allows each council to decide its own councillor and community board remuneration levels, including for positions of responsibility, reflecting its priorities for the current triennium. The total pool would be relative to the size of the council rather than to the number of elected members. Consequentially, if a council wished to increase its numbers via a representation review, and thus spread the workload, the allocated pool would need to be spread amongst more people. The reverse would also apply. It should be noted that if the workload for the whole council increased because of a change in the metrics of any factor(s) by which the council is sized, then the council would move to a higher ranking on the scale which would provide overall higher total remuneration pool.
103. The disadvantage is that no council is necessarily the master of its own destiny in terms of numbers of councillors. It must convince the Local Government Commission of the need to increase or decrease numbers. However, we do note that where representation changes reflect changes in what we call the “size” of the council (as described above in para 77-91),

any changes should also be reflected in the remuneration pool available to the council so there would then be a direct connection.

104. The pool approach provides councils with the flexibility to provide differences in positions of responsibility in a nuanced way. Because each council varies in terms of its committee/portfolio structure, this is an area where councils need discretion to decide. Current practice is for the Authority to set the councillor remuneration for each council, then to provide each council a “pool” equivalent to twice the base remuneration of one of its councillors to allocate to those undertaking specific positions of responsibility. These may include deputy mayor, committee chair, portfolio holder or other specifically designated roles. We have had no significant advice that the size of this extra pool is inadequate. However, we are aware that the provisions are applied in slightly different ways by different councils and that there are some councils that find the current provisions restrictive.
105. For example, there has been some confusion in the past as to whether every single councillor on a council can receive part of this additional pool by being allocated a position of responsibility. Generally, the Authority has not agreed to this when the council has proposed sharing the additional pool equally because this has simply amounted to a pay-rise for all councillors to move them above the level applied in the Determination. However, we have had enquiries about this and also observed current practice.
106. We propose that under the new regime (i.e. a total governance/representation pool for each council) the following rules should apply:
- a) All roles and remuneration levels will need to be agreed by formal resolution of the council, with a 75% majority.
 - b) A remuneration rate must be set for the base councillor role
 - c) The council needs to have a formal written role description for each additional position of responsibility above that of the base councillor role.
 - d) The Authority will expect that any such roles within a council will have different levels of additional remuneration, depending on the nature and workload involved. In particular this needs to apply where every single councillor is allocated an additional position (as distinct from a more usual practice of having a deputy mayor/chair and a handful of committee chairs).

- **Should councillor remuneration be decided by each council within the parameters of a governance/representation pool allocated to each council by the Remuneration Authority?**
- **If so, should each additional position of responsibility, above a base councillor role, require a formal role description?**

- **Should each council be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all its positions?**

107. We also note that elected members are increasingly being appointed to represent their council on various outside committees and bodies. We propose that if any council wishes to do so, such appointments can also be captured under the process outlined above.

- **Should external representation roles be able to be remunerated in a similar way to council positions of responsibility?**

108. The issue of director's fees for elected members who are appointed to CCOs is a difficult one. On the one hand it could be said that a councillor sitting on a CCO is doing work that is similar to that of another councillor who may have a specified position of responsibility – or even less if the second councillor is, for example, a committee chair. However, the legal liabilities of CCO directors have become more onerous in recent years and may be more than those of elected members.

109. Those appointed as directors of CCOs need to be aware of the specific legislative duties and regulatory obligations that are imposed on them, in their capacity as directors, by the various acts, including the Local Government Act 2002, the Companies Act 1993, the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, the Charities Act 2005 and the Public Audit Act 2001.

110. It is not for the Authority to determine whether or not elected members should be directors of a CCO, but we do recognise the additional responsibility that is taken on in those cases and that it may require developing capabilities to meet obligations that are different from those required of other elected members. We also observe the increasing trend towards the appointment of external professional directors to such roles.

- **Do the additional demands placed on CCO board members make it fair for elected members appointed to such boards to receive the same director fees as are paid to other CCO board members?**

Community Board remuneration

111. We note that 40 councils (more than half the territorial authorities) have community boards. We also note that there is a huge variety in the nature of the work undertaken by community boards and in the powers delegated to them. Some undertake substantial and substantive governance work on behalf of the council, whereas others are more in the nature of community representatives and advocates.
112. We are also aware that in some places community board members are doing work that elsewhere might be undertaken by council officers. However, assuming that community boards are part of the governance/representation structure of a council, then this means that, all else being equal, the current cost of governance and representation for these councils could be relatively higher than that of councils which do not have them. Some councils fund the boards out of a targeted rate applied to the area that the board represents, whereas others use a general rate – i.e. the same as for funding the remuneration of councillors.
113. We suggest that if a council wishes to not cover remuneration for its community board members from the proposed governance/representation pool, then a targeted rate should apply to the area represented by the particular community board. However, councillors appointed to represent the council on the community board would be paid from the governance/representation pool.
114. We also consider that it is important that the functions undertaken by any community board are clearly and transparently defined by the council concerned and consider that all community board delegations should be by way of a formal council resolution.

- **Should community board remuneration always come out of the council governance/representation pool?**
- **If not, should it be funded by way of targeted rate on the community concerned?**
- **If not, what other transparent and fair mechanisms are there for funding the remuneration of community board members?**

A local government pay scale

115. Local government has no exact equivalent. The nearest that we have in New Zealand is central government, yet even that is not an exact match.

116. Section 2 of this paper sets out the legal requirements that the Authority is required to consider in making determinations. The first of those requires that the Authority “shall have regard in particular to the need to achieve and maintain fair relativity with remuneration received elsewhere”. This is particularly difficult in determining the remuneration for local government elected members because there is no obviously relevant comparator group. The Authority considered and rejected as inappropriate the following:

a) Local government senior managers’ salaries.

Information on local government management remuneration is readily available in market salary surveys and through councils’ annual reports. However employees of councils are selected for the knowledge, skills and experience they hold relative to the needs of the employment role. Elected members do not fit that profile at all. They are democratically chosen by the electors to represent the interests of the people of a particular area and provide governance over the council’s operations. There is no logical alignment that would connect the remuneration of the two groups.

b) Central government sector senior managers’ remuneration.

Information on public sector management remuneration is readily available in market salary surveys and the State Services Commission’s annual reports but this option suffers from exactly the same difficulties as option (a) above.

c) Remuneration of directors on boards, including public sector boards, commercial boards and large not-for-profit boards.

A significant part of the work of elected members consists of representational activities of one sort or another. Most boards of directors do not have this role. Those that do are often in the not-for-profit or NGO sector and, even there, the nature and time requirements of the representational work, including managing constituency issues, is different. Further, most boards are governing an enterprise that is essentially focused on a single group of goods or services within one industry, whereas councils have a significant array of services that are not necessarily similar in any manner – for example, providing building consents compared to social services.

117. Other aspects of local government elected roles which differ from the above are:

- The sheer “visibility” of the people involved, resulting in a lack of privacy. In some cases where the elected person is very high profile or important in a community, or when the community is very small, this is extreme and often their close family members are also impacted by this.
- This visibility is associated with the need for publicly elected representatives to “front” on difficult issues. This is less common amongst other boards members and

managers. When something goes wrong on a council the councillors and mayor/chair are held to account by the public, whereas on a board it would normally (though we recognise not always) be the CEO.

- The meeting requirements on local government are more onerous than they are in other sectors. The Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and public expectation is that meetings will be held in public and that information behind decisions and actions will be readily available.
- Finally, and perhaps related to all the above, local government entities hold far more frequent meetings/workshops than do other governance boards and the distinction between governance and management is less clear than it is in most other models.

118. In the light of this, the Authority looked at a possible alignment with parliamentary remuneration for comparative purposes. Even though (as we note above) local government is not an exact match to central government, parliamentarians are also democratically elected to represent sections of the populace, and those who are members of the Government of the day also exercise governance over the public service. Within the parliamentary group there are different levels of remuneration between backbenchers, ministers and some other identifiable roles.

119. Given the obvious difference between central and local government elected members, any remuneration alignment could not be a direct one-on-one relationship. However, the nature of the roles is such that there are also similarities and this is the closest the Authority can find to “fair relativity with remuneration received elsewhere”. As in other areas of our work, this decision involved a degree of judgement – there is no exact science here and we would observe that the utility and value of any elected person is in the eye of the beholder.

120. We therefore propose that mayor/chair remuneration be related to that of MPs, but capped so that the highest remuneration for any individual mayor or chair cannot be more than that of a cabinet minister. All other mayor/chair roles would be provided with a relative alignment below that upper limit.

- **Is it appropriate for local government remuneration to be related to parliamentary remuneration, but taking account of differences in job sizes?**
- **If so, should that the relativity be capped so the incumbent in the biggest role in local government cannot receive more than a cabinet minister?**
- **If not, how should a local government pay scale be determined?**

Timetable

121. The current practice of the Authority – major three-yearly reviews with annual updating in non-review years – has been a sensible approach. We propose to continue it in the interests of efficiency and also to reflect the fact that the data we are using for sizing is not necessarily available annually.
122. In the intervening years, we propose that any change in local government remuneration reflect the change in the salary and wage rates for the public sector as shown in Statistics NZ's Labour Market Statistics (LMS) which are produced quarterly. In 2014 the LMS replaced the Quarterly Employment Survey (QES), which was the mechanism chosen as the reference index when Parliament passed the Remuneration Authority (Members of Parliament Remuneration) Amendment Act 2015. Therefore, changes in MP remuneration are also tied to the change in salary and wage rates as published in the LMS. In addition to salary and wage rates, the LMS contain information on New Zealand's official employment and unemployment statistics, number of filled jobs by industry group, total hours worked, levels of income, total gross earnings and paid hours, and average hourly rates by sector.
123. The cycle adopted by the Authority for setting local government remuneration will be as follows:
- The first year of the cycle will be the local government election year. In that year the Authority will undertake a full review of council sizes, utilising the indicators described above. Prior to applying the result of the review, the Authority will apply the LMS changes to all local government remuneration, and the council sizing results will then be applied.
 - This determination will be issued on or about July 1 for implementation from the date the council formally takes office following the local government election later that year. At that time the Mayor/chair remuneration will be applied but the remuneration for all other positions to be decided out of the "governance/representation pool" will be applied on the day following the day on which the council formally resolves its remuneration policy for that triennium. Until then, from the day of assuming office, all councillors will be paid the base councillor remuneration that applied in the preceding triennium. The new determination will apply till the council ceases to formally hold office at the next local government election.
 - Meeting fees for RMA plan or consent hearings, as well as the parameters for expense reimbursement, will also be assessed at that time and any changes will apply to all councils at the same time as the remuneration changes.
 - In the subsequent two years, the determination will again be issued on or about July 1 but on these occasions for immediate implementation. For all councils, it will contain adjustments reflecting the change in the LMS. There will be no changes in plan or consent hearing fees or expenses policies at this time.

This consultation process from now on

124. This proposal is being circulated to all councils to obtain feedback on the approach. The Authority would need to receive any written feedback that councils wish to make by **30 October 2017**. We look forward to hearing from you.
125. For this year (2017) the Authority proposes to change remuneration according to the LMS change and we also propose to introduce the new provisions outlined in Section Two of this paper. All other changes would be introduced for the year 2019. This timetable allows time for councils to fully discuss the proposals and give us their responses. It allows us to then refine and test our final model for the “governance/representation pool” prior to implementation.
126. **We are conscious that 2019 is three years after the local government sector would have been expecting changes. However, with our proposal to change the model for sizing councils and to radically change the way councillor remuneration is decided, we believe that such a time period is justified.**

Item 12

Discussion / Information Item: Presentation – Waimate Police 11.30am

Purpose of a Discussion / Information Item: To discuss the item presented in order to provide staff with direction, or to provide Council with information. No formal resolution or recommendation will be made.

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

Overview

The last time Waimate Police presented to the Community Services and Development Committee was on 15 November 2016. Sergeant Kevin Reynolds will give an update on Policing in the Waimate District, and there will be an opportunity to ask questions.

Options

This is an information item only.

Outcome

No further action.

Item 13

Discussion / Information Item: Presentation – Waimate Shears 12.30pm

Purpose of a Discussion / Information Item: To discuss the item presented in order to provide staff with direction, or to provide Council with information. No formal resolution or recommendation will be made.

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

Overview

Waimate Shears have been asked to present to the Community Services and Development Committee on their Council Grant of \$50,000.

Options

This is an information item only.

Outcome

No further action.

Item 14

Discussion / Information Item: Presentation – Waimate District Resource Trust 1.00pm

Purpose of a Discussion / Information Item: To discuss the item presented in order to provide staff with direction, or to provide Council with information. No formal resolution or recommendation will be made.

Prepared by: Carolyn Johns
Community and Strategy Group Manager

Overview

The Waimate District Resource Trust have been asked to give an annual grant presentation to the Community Services and Development Committee.

Options

This is an information item only.

Outcome

No further action.

Item 15

Consideration of Major (Urgent Business) or Minor Items not on the Agenda

Prepared by: Stuart Duncan
 Chief Executive

The Community Services and Development Committee is to consider any major (urgent business) or minor items identified earlier in the meeting.

Item 16

Exclusion of the Public

Prepared by: Stuart Duncan
Chief Executive

For the Community Services and Development Committee to exclude the public in order to take the following public excluded agenda items:

- i Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee – Refresh of Committee Membership
- ii Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Committee: Refresh of Committee Membership

| General Subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution | Ground(s) under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution |
|---|--|---|
| Lower Waitaki South Coastal Canterbury Zone Committee – Refresh of Committee Membership | Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 | 7(2)(a) Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons. |
| Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Committee: Refresh of Committee Membership | Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 | 7(2)(a) Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons. |

Recommendation

That the Community Services and Development Committee resolves to exclude the public from the following parts of the meeting on the grounds contained in section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act, or section 6 or section 9 of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may require, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public.