



Minutes

of the

Judicial Committee

Ordinary Meeting

Date 11 February 2016
Venue Council Chamber
515 Mackay Street
Thames

Present

MK McLean JP (Chairperson) PA Brljevich
LA Fox
GF Leach

In attendance

Barry Smedts, Michael Jones, Steve Baker, Rebekah Duffin, Steve Hart, Daniel Gardiner, Michael Eastwood, Corrine Hamlin, Andrew Wharton, Michelle Baker

Meeting commenced 9:00am

Adjournment	Start	Finish	Reason
Chairperson McLean	10:50	11:00	Morning Tea
Chairperson McLean	12:26	12:59	Lunch
Chairperson Mclean	14:48	15:10	Afternoon Tea

Table of Contents

Item Business	Page No.
1 Meeting conduct	3
1.1 Apologies	3
1.2 Public forum	3
1.3 Items not on the agenda	3
1.4 Conflict of interest	3
1.5 10 December 2015 - Judicial Committee minutes for confirmation	3
2 Development contributions	4
2.1 ABA20150921 Review of Development Contributions 90 Moewai Road Whitianga Kuaotunu Land Search and Rescue	4
2.2 SUB20060050 57 Te Punga Road Whangapoua Request for waiver of development contributions	4
3 Hearings	5
3.1 Objection to Dangerous Dog Classification Gary Richards	5
3.2 Hearing of submissions to draft Dog Control Policy and Bylaw	6
4 Community Environment Group reports	12
4.1 November and December 2015 - Community Environment Group monthly report	12
4.2 Building Controls report	13
5 Planning Group reports	13
5.1 Planning Group report 2015 November - December	13
5.2 Resource Legislation Amendment Bill briefing and option for recommended submission	14
5.3 February 2016 - Judicial Committee action schedule	14
6 Public excluded	15

1 Meeting conduct

1.1 Apologies

Apologies were received from Diane Connors.

1/16
JC

Resolved

That the Judicial Committee receives the apology from Diane Connors.

Moved/seconded by: Fox/Brljevich

1.2 Public forum

There were no speakers received in the public forum.

1.3 Items not on the agenda

No items not on the agenda were received.

1.4 Conflict of interest

The following interests were declared:

Councillor Tony Brljevich

2.2 SUB20060050 57 Te Punga Road Whangapoua request for waiver of development contributions

2/16
JC

Resolved

The Judicial Committee receives the conflict of interest declared by Councillor Brljevich.

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

1.5 10 December 2015 - Judicial Committee minutes for confirmation

3/16
JC

Resolved

That the Judicial Committee confirms the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2015 as a correct record of proceedings.

Moved/seconded by: Fox/McLean

2 Development contributions

2.1 ABA20150921 Review of Development Contributions 90 Moewai Road Whitianga Kuaotunu Land Search and Rescue

The Judicial Committee considered the request for a waiver of the development contributions for the LANDSAR Kuaotunu Search and Rescue base at 90 Moewai Road, Whitianga.

The Committee agreed to waive the development contributions acknowledging that the facility provided a district benefit.

4/16
JC

Resolved

That the Judicial Committee:

1. Receives the 'ABA/2015/921 Review of Development Contributions Kuaotunu Land Search and Rescue' report, dated 16 December 2015.
2. Determines that the development contributions payable on the Kuaotunu Land Search and Rescue base at 90 Moewai Road Whitianga will be waived in their entirety.
3. The development contributions of \$1,691.11 will be funded out of the district activity.

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

2.2 SUB20060050 57 Te Punga Road Whangapoua Request for waiver of development contributions

Councillor Brljevich declared a conflict of interest and spoke on behalf of the Adams Family for the request for the waiver of development contributions. Mayor Leach stood in to make up the quorum of the Committee whilst Councillor Brljevich abstained from Committee discussion and decisions for this item.

The Committee considered whether or not SUB/2006/50 (and subsequent amendments), an 18 lot subdivision granted at 57 Te Punga Road, Whangapoua, qualified for a waiver or reduction of development contributions.

Councillor Brljevich provided the background to the request, including the decision made at Environment Court and tabled a summary of the Adam's family key points.

The Committee decided that due to the complexity of the request they required Council's legal counsel to provide further clarification as to how to interpret the Environment Court decision.

5/16
JC

Resolved

That the Judicial Committee:

1. Receives the 'SUB/2006/50 Request for waiver of development contributions at 57 Te Punga Road, Whangapoua' report dated 7 January 2015.

2. Directs staff to seek further clarification from Council's legal counsel on how Council is interpreting the Environment Courts decision in relation to the consideration of costs of planting.
3. Following clarification from Council's legal counsel the Committee will reconvene to make a determination of the request for a waiver of development contributions at 57 Te Punga Road, Whangapoua.

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

3 Hearings

3.1 Objection to Dangerous Dog Classification Gary Richards

The Committee received an objection to a dangerous dog classification from Gary Richards, the registered owner of a German Pointer dog named Rommel. This dog had been classified as dangerous on 8 December 2015 under section 31 of the Dog Control Act 1996 after a series of incidents involving Rommel including attacks and rushing at people and animals.

Mr Richards spoke to his objection and outlined the following points:

- There were variations between Mr Williams' witness statements. One stated that Mr Williams called his dogs back, the later stated that the dog was within a metre of his feet. Mr Richards refutes both of these and tabled a witness statement from his wife who was there the day it happened.
- In the compliance officer's statement he noted he hesitated to get out of the vehicle until the dog was restrained, which Mr Richards understood given the complaint, However Rommel did not start barking until restrained. On an earlier check from the same officers they had not hesitated to get out of their vehicle and were surprised when Rommel did not bark.
- The complaint was not completed until after two complaints had been made about Mr William's dogs.
- A second letter now states that Rommel chased Mr Williams five year old daughter however this was not mentioned in the earlier complaint and he did not understand when this was supposed to have happened.

- In response to the Committee asking if Romel was aggressive, Mr Richard advised that if Rommel was on his chain he would bark and you would not approach him. However did not believe he was aggressive. Since the incident they had fenced the property and there were warning signs.
- Staff advised that the additional precautions taken since the incident did not change the classification as the decision was made following evidence from Mr Williams and two compliances officers as well as other complainants that came forward therefore the reasons for the classification remain.
- Mr Richards clarified that Rommel did most of his exercise on their 12.7 hectare property, with the exception of hunting. However under the new classification he would have to be muzzled to leave the property and would not be able to play fetch.

- Mr Richards was unaware of what the other complaints were as the details had not been supplied to him due to maintaining the privacy of those who had complained. Mr Richards stated that he had assumed the additional complaints had come in following Mr Williams seeking them out.

The Committee deferred their decision to later in the day following the bylaw hearing.

- The Committee considered that although they could understand the frustration of the variance in statements of the witness, there was sufficient evidence provided that the classification should remain.

6/16
JC

Resolved

That the Judicial Committee:

1. Receives the 'Objection to Dangerous Dog Classification - Gary Richards' report, dated 18 January 2016.
2. Confirms the classification is to remain as a Dangerous Dog.
3. Directs staff to advise all parties of the outcome.

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

3.2 Hearing of submissions to draft Dog Control Policy and Bylaw

The Committee was presented with the submissions received to the draft Dog Control Policy and Dog Control Bylaw for the hearing of submitters.

The Judicial Committee would make its decisions for recommendations to Council on the proposed policy and bylaw at the deliberations meeting scheduled for 17 March 2016. Council would hear those recommendations at their meeting scheduled for 18 May 2016.

3.2.1 The Coromandel Kiwi Collective (Jason Roxsburgh) - DOG15_320

Mr Roxsburgh spoke to The Coromandel Kiwi Collective's submission. He reiterated the importance of protecting vulnerable kiwi on the peninsula and asked that Kiwi were given as much importance in the bylaw as dotterel had been.

In response to the Committee's query, Mr Roxsburgh advised that only areas that needed consideration in addition to those already highlighted in the bylaw would be Papa Aroha, Kennedy Bay to Port Charles particularly around the villages. The areas did not need to necessarily be prohibited but highlighted as areas of importance for Kiwi to make people aware.

3.2.2 April Chang - DOG15_9

Ms Chang spoke to her submission and tabled an item. She thanked Council for its implementation of dog litter bag stations which were being well used and meant there were less issues around town. She encouraged the Council to consider some sort of dog obedience qualification such as the NZ Kennel Club's Canine Good Citizen qualification where those who underwent the training could be identified by a special tag and have lenience applied with leash rules. She suggested incentivising good behaviour in dog owners was preferable to punishment and lead to better behaved dogs.

3.2.3 Ben Grubb - DOG15_19

Mr Grubb spoke to his submission and asked the Committee to consider putting a prohibition on Otara Bay as this was an established kiwi habitat. He asked that Te Karo Bay had the same restrictions for dogs as the other beaches on the Peninsula. He suggested signage include the number to call to report issues and include restrictions for the area to aid in enforcement. He also noted that signage about Kiwi would be of a benefit for tourism.

3.2.4 Tracey Pool - DOG15_20

Mrs Pool spoke to her submission and asked the Committee reconsider the prohibition of dogs on Tapu and Te Mata beaches from Labour weekend through until March. As a resident of the area there were no safe alternate areas for walking dogs with no footpaths in Te Mata. She asked that Council consider the other issues in the area such as pests (feral cats/rats/stoats on dotterel areas) and freedom camping waste being dumped at Te Mata Bay.

The Committee advised Mrs Pool that the Waikato Regional Council and Department of Conservation were responsible for pests and they recommended she make a submission to them on these issues.

3.2.5 Henry Brett Houston - DOG15_32

Mr Brett spoke to his submission and tabled a summary of his key points. He asked Council to considered maintaining Kuranui Bay as an off leash area for dogs to be walked. The stated alternate site that was being offered with Burke Street was not ideal and would require further development to meet the needs of an off leash area.

3.2.6 Andrew Wharton - DOG15_34

Mr Wharton spoke to his submission focusing on the area of Kuranui Bay. He asked the although Kuranui Bay was part of the Firth of Thames Ramsar Area it was not a key bird area on the 36km wetland and therefore asked that this bay remained available as on off leash area during non-peak period. He was supportive of it being on-leash during the peak summer period.

3.2.7 Gordon Pye - DOG15_122

Mr Pye spoke to his submission which focused on Hot Water Beach. He advised that he checked the dotterel nests daily and they had lost 4 of the 9 nests to dogs. The bylaw required dogs to be on leash or under control however he suggested this was not the case. It was also a top tourist area for the hot springs and dogs intruded on this experience by running near the pools, intimidating people and urinating near the pools. Mr Pye asked that the Council consider a year round prohibition of dogs on Hot Water Beach.

3.2.8 John Allum - DOG15_40

Mr Allum spoke to his submission and the additional information he had emailed to staff was tabled. He asked that the Council retain Kuranui Bay as an off leash area for dogs before 9:00am as it was not a wetland area and bird protection was not an issue there. He suggested the Council was creating an issue where one did not exist.

3.2.9 Dennis Allison - DOG15_48

Mr Allison spoke to his submission and advised he was pleased to see the support for endangered birds in the statement of proposal. He stated that as the bird numbers grew due to protection they were spreading further down the beach and although they could fence and put further signs up, dogs off leash were not under control. He suggested that the only way to remedy this threat was to make it on-leash only during the peak dotterel season.

3.2.10 Joyce Birdsall - DOG15_52

Mrs Birdsall spoke to her submission regarding the prohibition of dogs at Otara Bay. She advised there needed to be more balance in the consideration of bird's and human's needs on beaches. Birds need areas which were unmolested by dogs and she suggested Otara Bay should be one of those areas.

In response to the Committee query Mrs Birdsall confirmed she agreed that if there were areas that were dog free that there also needed to be areas for dogs without restriction.

3.2.11 Pam & Patrick Beehan - DOG15_309 & DOG15_310

Mr Beehan spoke to both his and his wife's submission regarding Sailors Grave and the suggested new restrictions from December-January and public holidays. He noted that it was good for both dog and human health to walk on the beach. Those who own dogs considered the dogs to be part of the family and it was unfair to exclude them from family holidays. He suggested that the restriction should be 10am - 4pm and only until mid-January as the area was much quieter post this point.

Mr Beehan responded to the Committee in relation to consistency across the district in hours. He advised that 10am - 4pm was a sufficient enough restriction for a rural beach as Sailors Grave was far quieter than other areas.

3.2.12 Peter Bethell - DOG15_70

Mr Bethell spoke to his submission and tabled an item regarding Brophys Beach which requested that it be prohibited from Labour weekend through to the first of March. He suggested this would make it simpler for enforcement officers and visitors to the area if there was one rule across the board.

3.2.13 Graeme Harrison - DOG15_80

Mr Harrison spoke to his submission regarding the Burke Street Reserve. The draft bylaw has the dog area as on the west of the path, however he advised there were 3 paths and this was easy to misinterpret. He suggested that the area could be from the rocks to the rainbow fence as this was not a bird area and would be less confusing.

3.2.14 Brett Wilson - DOG15_326

Mr Wilson spoke to the Whangamata Ratepayers Association submission and tabled an additional item. The Association asked that the restriction from 15 December - 15 February 9am-7pm remain. They also requested that the Otahu Estuary and beach access from points 20-23 be included in the restriction. Mr Brett also stated that clear and consistent signage was required as the current signage was conflicting and not helpful for enforcement.

3.2.15 Dennis Stapleton - DOG15_95

Mr Stapleton spoke to his submission and tabled his speaking notes. He suggested that Kiwi aversion training should be required as part of dog registration as there was no cost for this training through the Department of Conservation for dogs over 12 months. He raised that there were only 11 areas that were off leash during the peak period and these were not well spread. The closest off leash area to him was 45 minutes away. He also suggested that the signage was inadequate and not helpful to visitors to the area.

3.2.16 Helena van der Merwe - DOG15_102

Ms van der Merwe spoke to her submission and asked that Council did not take a one size fits all approach to dealing with dogs. She suggested a responsible owner tag would help by allowing those with the tags to take their dogs on the beach and without a tag dog owners would be fined.

3.2.17 Wallace & Leighton Fern - DOG15_181

Mr Fern spoke to his individual submission and the Opiotio Bay Ratepayers Association submission. He tabled additional information. He focused on Opiotio and Matapaua Bay and requested both retain the status quo as the current rules worked well as reflected in the statistics for the area.

3.2.18 Brent Page - DOG15_123

Mr Page spoke to his submission and tabled a petition with 313 signatures that requested "that dogs, under their owners control, had full access to Matarangi (excluding 'the spit'), Kuaotunu East and West Beaches at all times with the following exception - 20 December to 31 January, from 10am until 5pm"

In response to the Committee Mr Page advised he did not see that having two-three variations of times on beaches across the district would be too difficult to enforce. He suggested the Council had lead the way in community empowerment and therefore needed to give the power to communities decide what was right for their area.

3.2.19 Terry & Lynne Wilson - DOG15_130

Mr Wilson spoke to his submission and tabled an item relating to Whangamata Beach and asked that each part of the beach be considered separately as not all parts were used the same and therefore the same restrictions should not apply.

3.2.20 Jim Elder - DOG15_137

Mr Elder spoke to his submission and suggested that dog owners were not being considered as part of the community even though they make up a significant portion of it. He stated it was unnecessary to restrict beaches where there were no issues and asked the Council to be permissive and supportive.

3.2.21 Kevin & Jenny Edwards - DOG15_140

Mr Edwards spoke to their submission and tabled additional information. He asked for consideration of dog free beaches. He suggested that signage was not sufficient to manage this as they go unnoticed by dog owners and the "term under control" did not have a universal interpretation.

3.2.22 Michelle Mason-Smith - DOG15_144

Mrs Mason-Smith spoke to her submission and requested that dog owners be able to walk their dogs on leash during the peak dotterel season at Te Mata as there were no alternate places to exercise them safely.

3.2.23 Alison Mackrell - DOG15_154

Ms Mackrell spoke to her submission in relation to Pauanui and Tairua. She stated it seemed unwise to have off leash areas during the summer restrictions given very few dogs were able to be controlled off-leash. She also suggested more work needed to go into signage and clear communication as this was currently very ambiguous and confusing.

3.2.24 Chris Brodie - DOG15_160

Mr Brodie spoke to his submission regarding Te Mata Bay and noted that (the access point having to cross a state highway bridge with no footpath) to get to the beach was not safe. He also raised that there were no safe alternate places to walk dogs in Te Mata. He suggested that it should be on-leash during the four month peak period.

3.2.25 Adrian Catran - DOG15_190

Mr Catran spoke to his submission regarding the Burke Street Reserve. He stated that it was not a workable solution and the whole area should be signposted as off leash. He suggested that with appropriate signage Council could advertise the area and also note the fines.

In response to the Committee Mr Catran advised the area was a suitable off-leash area as dogs loved the long grass and there were paths as alternate routes.

3.2.26 Tairua-Pauanui Community Board (Bob Renton) - DOG15_169

Community Board Chair Renton spoke to the Community Board's submission requesting the status quo remain and that the hours were aligned with the rest of the district. He also raised that the Department of Conservation and Council signage needed to be one as they were conflicting and confuse people. He requested from staff for the future to sort submissions by area so that they did not have to read through them all to find the ones that related to their area.

3.2.27 Department of Conservation (John Rich & Cassandra Craig) - DOG15_185

Mr Rich and Ms Craig spoke to the Department of Conservation's submission. They congratulated staff for the policy and bylaw as they had enjoyed collaborating with them and were happy with the outcome. They requested that Boat Harbour, Otara Bay and Kuaotunu be added to the prohibited areas. They advised they would work with Council staff on fencing off areas, signage and enforcement where appropriate under the Wildlife Act.

3.2.28 Berwyn Mason - DOG15_144

Mrs Mason spoke to her submission which focused on the Thames area. She was unsure of the stance on the prohibition of dogs on Pollen Street as it was not mentioned however if it were to remain she was not supportive of it. This was the only place in New Zealand where dogs were not allowed in the main street and this rule was openly flouted. She also suggested changes to other areas such as Kuranui Bay, Tararu and Burke Street as it seemed inconsistent with the reasoning used.

3.2.29 Whenuakite Kiwi Care Group (Arthur Hinds) - DOG15_189

Mr Hinds spoke to the Whenuakite Kiwi Care Groups' submission. They were supportive of the Department of Conservation's stance for Hot Water Beach with prohibition over the peak period and onleash for the remainder of the year. They also requested that Otara Bay and Sailors Grave were prohibited as there had been Kiwi killed there by dogs.

3.2.30 Tairua Residents & Ratepayers Association (Tony Jacobs) - DOG15_282

Mr Jacobs spoke to the Tairua Residents & Ratepayers Association's submission regarding Otara Bay which requested prohibition for this area as it was a key Kiwi habitat. They asked that the signage include dog control officers details for reporting offenders as a deterrent.

3.2.31 Kim Coppersmith - DOG15_101

Ms Coppersmith spoke in support of the Tairua-Pauanui Ratepayers Association's submission. They requested retaining the status quo with the new proposed hours and prohibition over the peak period.

3.2.32 Douglas Ngatua - DOG15_366

Mr Ngatua spoke to his submission regarding dogs on Pollen Street. He was a business owner and had issues daily with dogs urinating and defecating up the main street and in front of his store.

The Committee advised this was more of an enforcement issue as the main street was currently a prohibited area and therefore asked the enforcement staff to note the issues raised.

3.3.33 David Thurgood - DOG15_208

Mr Thurgood spoke to his submission regarding Buffalo Beach and requested the area be off leash for dogs. He stated that socialised and well exercised dogs were better behaved dogs. He suggested that those owners who took their animals places to be exercised were not the owners of concern and this was not bird breeding area so there should not be an issue.

7/16
JC

Resolved

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Receives the 'Hearing of submissions to the draft Dog Control Policy and Bylaw' report, dated 19 January 2016.
2. Receives the submissions made to the draft Dog Control Policy and Dog Control Bylaw including the late submissions from: Brown, James (DOG15_197); Holehouse, Stephen & Barbara (DOG15_342); Ngataua, Douglas (DOG15_366); Nicholson, Alice (DOG15_196); Opito Bay Ratepayers Association (Cook, Paul) (DOG15_339); Russell, Kristen (DOG15_340); Whitham, Joe & Raewyn (DOG15_341); Wilson, Jeannie (DOG15_333)

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

4 Community Environment Group reports

4.1 November and December 2015 - Community Environment Group monthly report

Staff reported on key activities within Community Environment Group for the months of November and December 2015.

- Staff advised they were now reporting the percentage of people compliant and those noncompliant as it paints a more positive picture. They were continuously being asked for more patrols which would exceed budget and yet most were compliant during these additional checks.
- Checks on food premises, was raised. Of the 310 monitored 60 had not had an inspection undertaken for a number of years. The issue was due to two main factors,

the dates were not appropriately recorded in the system and the computer system. Staff were working to remedy the issue by scheduling additional checks on top of their usual ones during the next three months. In future they would annually check all dates in the system to prevent a reoccurrence.

- Changes to the Food Act 2014 would be reported to the February Council meeting and include advise on the changes and the implications to Council new fees and charges to recover costs associated with registration, verification and monitoring of various food and alcohol operations were required.
- Councillor Fox requested that all liquor licensing decisions made under the District Licensing Committee be distributed to all commissioners.
- Dog control had seen an increase in compliance on beaches over the summer period and might be linked to an increase in signage in areas such as Buffalo Beach. However there had been some significant attacks reported over this period with a total of 18 reported which was far more than usual for this period.
- Fly dumping had been an increasing issue. Council had publicised that enforcement would occur and 4 infringements were issued over Janaury. Staff's intention is that if Council get a reputation for being tough on this issue they would see a decrease in it happening across the district.
- An increase in the fines for fly dumping would only happen if the Bill was selected from the ballot box. It was suggested that staff should be lobbying LGNZ to push for the fines to be increased.

8/16 **Resolved**

JC That the Judicial Committee receives the Community Environment Group Monthly report - November and December 2015 dated 18 January 2016.

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Brljevich

4.2 Building Controls report

Staff reported to the Judicial Committee on the key activities and results for the Building Unit for the months of November and December 2015 on its role as a building consent authority and a territorial authority.

9/16 **Resolved**

JC That the Judicial Committee receives the November and December 2015 Building Controls report, dated 29 January 2016.

Moved/seconded by: Brljevich/Fox

5 Planning Group reports

5.1 Planning Group report 2015 November - December

Staff reported on the key activities within the Planning Group for the months of November and December.

- 10/16 **Resolved**
JC That the Judicial Committee receives the 'November to December 2015 - Planning Group Monthly Report' dated 26 January 2016.

Moved/seconded by: Fox/Brljevich

5.2 Resource Legislation Amendment Bill briefing and option for recommended submission

Staff sought a recommendation from the Committee on making a submission on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill.

- The Committee discussed that LGNZ might not consider points that were relative to this district and therefore it might be appropriate for Council to make its own submission to the select committee. The also encouraged staff to contribute to the LGNZ submission.
- The Committee asked that staff allow enough time for elected members to be able to read and understand the Bill before letting them know if they would contribute.
- Staff advised they would bring a report to the February Council workshop to allow elected members a chance to read and consider it. Members could provide their feedback to staff at or following the workshop allowing for staff to have it ready for Council to confirm at the March Council meeting.

- 11/16 **Resolved**
JC That the Judicial Committee:
1. Receives the 'Resource Legislation Amendment Bill' report, dated 25 January 2016.
 2. Recommends to Council that staff contribute to the Local Government New Zealand submission on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill.
 3. Request staff to seek comments from elected members on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 to prepare a Council submission to the Local Government and Environment Select Committee.

Moved/seconded by: Brljevich/Fox

5.3 February 2016 - Judicial Committee action schedule

- 12/16 **Resolved**
JC That the Judicial Committee receives the February 2016 Judicial Committee Action Schedule.

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

6 Public excluded

13/16 **Resolved**
JC That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting namely:

- 6.1 Public excluded minutes
- 6.2 Public excluded Judicial Committee Action Schedule
- 6.3 Waikato Cluster Group report

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 the resolution
10 December 2015 - Public Excluded Judicial Committee Minutes for Confirmation	<p>(7)(2)(g) – Maintain legal professional privilege.</p> <p>(7)(2)(i) – Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>(48)(1) – Subject to subsection (3) of this section, a local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the following grounds:</p> <p>(48)(1)(a) – That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.</p>
February 2016 - Public Excluded Judicial Committee Action Schedule	<p>(7)(2)(g) – Maintain legal professional privilege.</p> <p>(7)(2)(i) – Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>(48)(1) – Subject to subsection (3) of this section, a local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the following grounds:</p> <p>(48)(1)(a) – That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.</p>
Waikato Cluster Group	7(2)(a) – Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	(48)(1)(a) – That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.

Moved/seconded by: Fox/Brljevich

14/16
JC

Resolved

That the public be re-admitted to the meeting and resolutions taken with the public excluded be confirmed in the public session except for the following items which are to remain in the Public Excluded Minute Book.

Item	Description
6.1	Public excluded minutes
6.2	Public excluded Judicial Committee Action Schedule
6.3	Waikato Cluster Group report

Moved/seconded by: McLean/Fox

Meeting closed at 16:36

The foregoing minutes were certified as being a true and correct record of the meeting of the Judicial Committee held on 11 February 2016.

Chairperson _____ **Date** _____