

Who's
putting local
issues on
the national
agenda?

**We are.
LGNZ.**

2018 Annual General Meeting

Remits

1

Drug testing in the community

Remit: That LGNZ works with central government to develop a nationally consistent regime of waste water testing, to enable a solid basis for testing drug use in our communities.

Proposed by: Tasman District Council

Supported by: Waitomo District Council
Ruapehu District Council
Bay of Plenty Regional Council
Nelson City Council
Upper Hutt City Council
Far North District Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

- a. The technology exists now to test wastewater for the use of drugs which gives a very straight forward comprehensive picture on the drug use in respective communities. This has been trialled currently with three communities in New Zealand and in each community a different drug has shown as the major issue. Where councils or communities would like to apply these tests, a consistent methodology will enable decision makers within those communities to determine the best course of action.
- b. This will allow for the best utilisation of resources within the community to test for drugs. The aim is to provide all relevant services with the ability to identify the use of illegal and harmful substances and identify the practices to reduce harm.

2. Background to its being raised

- a. We are all familiar that from time to time, issues with the use of illegal drugs cause particular problems within our communities. Currently one drug that is causing significant concern is methamphetamine. However, we shouldn't assume that this is the only problem drug or in the future the problem drug may be different.
- b. Testing wastewater is a straightforward and effective way to demonstrate the scale and nature of problems with illegal drugs within our communities.

- c. The impacts of drivers being affected by methamphetamine have been raised within our community recently. However, there is wide spread evidence of this drug causing significant harm to families and communities. The simple straightforward test of this nature would be highly beneficial for use in communities when wanting to identify the scale and nature of this problem.

3. New or confirming existing policy

This is a new policy.

4. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

This does not relate to the current work programme.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

Three communities have trialled the technology and the primary drugs they detected are Christchurch (MDMA), Rosedale, North Shore (cocaine) and Whangarei (methamphetamine).

6. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

Not that I am aware of.

7. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone or Sector meeting

This has not been discussed at Zone or Sector meetings.

8. Evidence of support from Zone/Sector meeting or five councils

This has the support of the six mayors listed above.

9. Suggested course of action envisaged

Developing nationally consistent regime for testing wastewater for illegal or harmful drugs.

2

HCV – Rural roads policy

Remit: That LGNZ pursue investigation of a Road Pricing Policy Statement for Land Transport to incentivise route selection for HCV's that encourages the most economically efficient use of the transport network over both Local Roads and the State Highway network.

Proposed by: Ruapehu District Council

Supported by: Zone Three

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The following issues have been identified:

- a) The current Road User Fees and Charges regime incentivises the shortest transport distance from Gate to Port or processing plant of primary produce without assessment of the most economic, efficient and sustainable transport route.
- b) This does not enable efficiency in the use of the transport network nor take into account resilience and safety.

2. Background to its being raised

The cost of maintaining and renewing local road infrastructure has a significant impact on a territorial authority's budget decisions within its LTP. The consumption of low strength pavements on low volume rural road networks is not well considered by HCV fleet managers when route planning and pricing for harvesting aggregates, forests or other high intensity produce from the primary sector.

The Road Controlling Authorities Forum made up of NZTA and representatives from TA's and associated NGO's have funded Research and produced Guidelines to assist Funding Policy Decision makers in Local Government. It is considered that more can be done at a National Funding Policy level to promote efficient and effective use of limited resources for Land Transport.

3. New or confirming existing policy

New - Policy goal – That price incentives are in place to ensure the most economic use of the transport network.

4. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

This issues relates to LGNZ's strategic priority one¹ regarding infrastructure and specifically around the policy priorities, actions and projects for transport. These include:

- Government Policy Statement for Land Transport 2018 and National Land Transport Programme presented to councils in an integrated manner for LTPs which addresses sector needs including freight, regional growth and tourism.
- Ongoing advocacy for new funding models for transport.
- Integrate policy positions from Mobilising the Regions including: integrated transport planning and decision making models into the above.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

A large proportion of pavement consumption on local roads occurs on low volume roads, caused almost entirely from commodity cartage. The Special Interest Group – Low Volume Roads (SIG-LVR) of the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) (RCA Forum) has sought to provide a process for:

- Calculating pavement consumption on low volume roads caused by industrial land-use.
- Allocating the cost to industrial ratepayers, in an equitable way, using rules prescribed by local government legislation.

This work is now in circulation is being considered as one of the tools to equitably fund transport demands on Local Roads.

References

http://rcaforum.org.nz/sites/public_files/images/160429-Notes%20of%20290416%20forum.pdf

https://rcaforum.org.nz/sites/public_files/images/Guidelines_equitable_funding_pavement_maintenance_LVR-July_2017.pdf

6. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

Land Transport Management Act 2003

- This governs the issuing of the GPS, the requirement that NZTA report annually on the use of funds from the land transport fund (including the contribution to the GPS outcomes and objectives) and the compliance of RLTP with the GPS.

Local Government Act 2002

- This specifies the LTP process and the inclusion of key roading funding and planning information as a mandatory activity.

7. Suggested course of action envisaged

That LGNZ pursue investigation of a Road Pricing Policy Statement for Land Transport to incentivise route selection for HCV's that encourages the most economically efficient, safe and resilient use of the transport network over both Local Roads and the State Highway networks.

8. Discussion and conclusion

For example; The full cost of government afforestation incentives are not taken into full account when calculating Return on Investment. In the case of forest harvest today, the incentives for investment were made in the 1990's in the national interest (primary exports and carbon agendas) and in many cases the costs today largely fall on property with higher capital values.

A potential exists to introduce road pricing to incentivise the best use of transport resources and provide for economic growth and productivity in the rural provincial sector.

In order to allow for more informed and effective decisions, the transport sector needs to be incentivised to use the best possible transport routes that are proven the safest most efficient and sustainable use of the network.

It is therefore recommended that LGNZ pursue an investigation into Road Pricing that can inform NZTA and the Ministry of Transport when considering any review of funding tools for New Zealand's transport infrastructure.

3

Heritage buildings

Remit: That LGNZ lobbies for greater support for, and protection of, heritage buildings via the following mechanisms:

- Revision of the Building (Earthquake-Prone Buildings) Amendment Act to change the '25% building work' clause instead to trigger earthquake strengthening once a threshold of "25% of the Capital Value or \$200,000, whichever is the greater" is reached to make this a more equitable provision for regional centres.
- An increase in the heritage fund.
- Provision of tax relief for heritage building upgrades

Proposed by: Whanganui District Council

Supported by: Zone Three

1. Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The following issues have been identified:

- a. The current Building (Earthquake-Prone Buildings) Amendment Act (the Act) contains a clause where any work that reaches 25% of the current Capital Value (CV) of the building subsequently triggers the need to earthquake strengthen the entire building. This has a significant impact on smaller centres with low CVs (e.g. where values can be below \$100,000). This poses an imminent and real threat to heritage buildings and the future character of New Zealand's town centres.
- b. Earthquake strengthening deadlines are approaching and regional centres in particular may struggle to undertake this work. This is because there is not the same economic return for these improvements. More funding is required to ensure that this can be delivered on time.
- c. There is no tax relief available for earthquake strengthening costs. This is a deterrent for delivering on this important safety and preservation work.

2. Background to its being raised

New Zealand's heritage buildings are a critical reminder of our past. Regardless of size or splendour even unassuming pubs and shops in the smallest of towns are slowly earning respect

and recognition for their reflection of our heritage and their important historical insight. This is true irrespective of whether this is a nostalgic nod to memories of youth or a more significant need for heritage preservation. If we lose these then we lose the valuable visual reminders which mark our unique identity as a country – and once these are gone, they are gone. This recognition has been the impetus for successful rejuvenation efforts throughout the country, for example, along the Otago Rail Trail where redundant buildings have been given a new lease of life – which has translated into economic benefit for new business ventures, while adding significantly to the tourism experience. These opportunities should be encouraged and incentivised by government and strongly supported by LGNZ.

Amendment to the Act

- Whanganui’s Earthquake-Prone Buildings Community Taskforce (the Taskforce) submitted on the Proposals for Earthquake-Prone Buildings Regulations in 2016.
- Part of this submission focused on the trigger point for earthquake strengthening of an entire building. This had been set at 25% of the current CV – meaning that in instances where a building has had an ‘earthquake strength assessment’ carried out then once the 25% threshold is reached through building work of any kind then complete earthquake strengthening is required.
- As a result, despite the legislation not requiring earthquake strengthening for many years, once this point is reached then the building owner or tenant is effectively penalised for what might amount to just a minor upgrade.
- The Taskforce challenged this clause and instead recommended that it be reworded so that work that reaches 25% of the CV, or a value of \$200,000 (whichever was the greater) become the trigger point instead.
- This is because most buildings outside of the major cities have low CVs. This is largely due to the age of the buildings and the nature of small town demand for retail and upper-storey living (with many of these CVs being below \$100,000).
- As a result, even small scale building work such as \$25,000 for a new bathroom or internal wall construction could enact this clause.
- Although the Taskforce’s submission received support from other communities it did not result in the requested changes to the legislation being made.
- The Taskforce has suggested that if the clause remains in its current form then it could cause a large number of heritage buildings (particularly in regional centres) to become dilapidated, and ultimately lost. This runs counter to the intent of the legislation and an urgent review of the determination is requested.

Increase in the heritage fund

- Heritage EQUIP provides grants for both retrofitting and major works².
 1. Retrofit grants are designed to support smaller scale seismic strengthening projects. These are to address specific aspects of the building or to provide retrofit solutions for common hazards. They provide up to 50% of costs – up to a maximum of \$25,000.

2. Major works grants are for comprehensive seismic strengthening solutions including large-scale or staged projects. These provide up to 50% of costs, with no upper limit to the grant application.
 - In 2016 the government announced a new \$12M fund to support earthquake strengthening work on privately owned heritage buildings where seismic upgrades were required.
 - Although this was initially limited to only Category 1 and 2 listed buildings, this has since been broadened to other buildings on local council heritage registers.
 - While the initial \$12M pool was a welcome funding mechanism for building owners, it is claimed that additional support will be required as earthquake strengthening deadlines approach.

Tax relief

- It is considered that commercial building owners should be allowed tax relief for earthquake strengthening costs.
- IRD currently provides no tax relief for expenditure.
- It is claimed that this discourages investment – especially for older buildings.
- The government could assist with the affordability of strengthening costs by allowing building owners to expense their construction costs by one of two ways:
 1. Allowing the cost of strengthening to be treated as an expense in the year in which the costs occur, with the deduction ring-fenced to rental income activity. This would allow owners to claim the tax benefit of the expenditure and would provide a real incentive to owners to carry out the strengthening.
 2. In lieu of the above option not being adopted then building owners should be allowed to capitalise the strengthening costs separately – with those costs depreciated or amortised over a period of, for example, 10 years. Although the first option is preferred and offers more benefit to owners, the second option would still allow the recovery of some tax relief over a defined period.

3. New or confirming existing policy

These changes would build on and support existing policy. Tax relief advantages would require new provisions.

4. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

The current LGNZ work programme identifies the implementation of earthquake prone buildings regulations as a strategic policy priority under *Housing and Building*.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

The Taskforce has advocated strongly for the needs of regional New Zealand in relation to heritage and earthquake strengthening. Supplementary research alongside its submission suggests that the following outcomes are possible without intervention:

- Buildings will not be renovated until the very last moment. As a result, deterioration in the integrity of the building is likely to be significant and could lead to the building becoming unsalvageable.
- Buildings will slowly deteriorate – becoming even less attractive to rent. This will have an impact on regional town centres.
- Buildings are likely to be abandoned once the earthquake strengthening deadline is reached – particularly in the case of overseas landlords where the cost of either clearing the site or strengthening will far exceed the value left in the property.
- The 25-year strengthening timeframe allowed in the legislation for Zone B areas (such as Whanganui) is now seriously reduced in efficacy because of the '25%' clause.

6. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

- Building (Earthquake-Prone Buildings) Amendment Act
- Income Tax Act 2007

7. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone or Sector meeting

This remit was presented to the Zone Three meeting on 20 April 2018. It was moved by Cr Helen Craig (Whanganui) and seconded by Mayor Don Cameron (Ruapehu). It was supported by all member councils:

- Central Hawke's Bay District Council
- Hastings District Council
- Hawke's Bay Regional Council
- Horizons Regional Council
- Horowhenua District Council
- Manawatu District Council
- Napier City Council
- New Plymouth District Council
- Palmerston North City Council
- Rangitikei District Council
- Ruapehu District Council
- South Taranaki District Council
- Stratford District Council
- Taranaki Regional Council
- Tararua District Council
- Wairoa District Council

In addition, Rangitikei District Council has acknowledged its specific endorsement of this remit.

8. Suggested course of action envisaged

It is recommended that:

- a) The Act be amended to allow for work up to 25% of the CV, or \$200,000, whichever is the greater.
- b) The Heritage Fund be increased to adequately meet demand.
- c) That IRD reviews its provisions in relation to tax relief for earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings with a view to introducing this assistance.

9. Discussion and conclusion

“Heritage buildings keep our history alive, telling the story of our past and giving perspective for today. Heritage buildings provide both private and public value throughout New Zealand.”

(credit Heritage Equip website: heritageequip.govt.nz)

These recommendations are based on the value of heritage and the importance of ensuring that the rules are applied in a fair and equitable way, regardless of whether you live in a major city or a smaller regional centre. The current Act does not offer this even-handedness – meaning that those in smaller centres with low CVs can be charged with responsibility for full earthquake strengthening as a result of only small scale building works. A minor reframing of the Act to set a cost threshold of up to \$200,000 would ensure that a more equitable approach could be applied nationwide, without unduly penalising regional New Zealand where the economics of building conversion are not the same. By not addressing this discrepancy heritage buildings may miss out on investment and upgrades – eventually becoming rundown and potentially lost.

The value of heritage preservation is further championed through a request to increase the Heritage Fund. This boost would provide greater opportunity for more building owners to receive a subsidy so that requisite strengthening work can be undertaken. It would also mean that government could better manage the influx of applications that are likely to be submitted as deadlines approach. It is considered that this assistance will be particularly important for regional New Zealand where there is not the same economic return for this kind of work. Although building owners are generally passionate about restoration, with costs being so high and returns so low it is possible that many buildings will be left abandoned and ultimately demolished due to a lack of financial viability. Related to this is the concern that councils will then be burdened with the cost of demolition and rates arrears. Furthermore, removal of heritage buildings will irreparably impact on town streetscapes – resulting in less attractive replacement structures (or building gaps) and generating a loss of character, community and cultural identity.

Investment can similarly be encouraged through the provision of tax relief to support heritage building owners. Although this would have minimal financial impact on the government it would

have a significant effect on the retention and strengthening of earthquake-prone heritage buildings. It is recommended that this review occur as soon as possible to mitigate the size of this issue as a growing number of older buildings increasingly require investment.

4

Climate change – advocate to banks

Remit:	That LGNZ, consistent with the Local Government Position Statement on Climate Change 2017 and the Local Government Leaders' Climate Change Declaration 2017, advocate to all major banks that they transition away from investments in fossil fuel industries, and consider opportunities for long-term investments in low- or zero-carbon energy systems.
Proposed by:	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Supported by:	Greater Wellington Regional Council Porirua City Council Carterton District Council Masterton District Council Kapiti Coast District Council Palmerston North City Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Climate change has been described as “a slow motion disaster that will change our lives, the economy, and our planet for ever”. The previous Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment Dr Jan Wright said that climate change is “by far New Zealand’s worst environmental problem”. The effects of climate change are already being felt globally and in New Zealand through: increased frequency of extreme weather events including storms, cyclones, tornadoes and droughts; wildfires; and rising sea levels.

Climate Change will have major impacts on areas of responsibility of local government. Over the next few decades, tens of thousands of New Zealanders will be displaced from their homes by threatened inundation by rising sea levels. Local government has the responsibility to manage, at regional, city and district levels, land use planning including requirements for coastal protection or managed retreat to ensure future residential and business development and infrastructure is located away from areas that will be inundated. Local government therefore has a very high interest in measures being taken to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, in accordance with NZ’s commitments under the Paris Agreement of 12 December 2015, and subsequent commitments by the Government.

2. Background to its being raised

Greater Wellington Regional Council has recently updated its Treasury Risk Management Policy and has included a section:

“5.3 Investments in fossil fuels The Council has a policy to divest from any direct investment in fossil fuel extraction industries and investigate existing non direct investment, with a view to preventing future investment where practical”.

The Council’s Treasurer has taken the opportunity to advise banks of this policy as part of Council’s on-going commitment to reducing carbon emissions and promoting this to the wider community. It has also advised the banks that as part of its on-going due diligence into this matter, it will continue to monitor the banks it transacts with to ascertain what they are doing to assist with reducing and discouraging the on-going use and investment in fossil fuel industries.

3. New or confirming existing policy

Local Government recognises, as stated in the Local Government Position Statement on Climate Change, 2017, and the Local Government Leaders’ Climate Change Declaration, 2017, that we must act on climate change now to avoid future risk. Local authorities have accepted that they are at the frontline of climate change adaptation and have a role to play in mitigation, and that their responsibilities will grow in addressing climate change as both anticipated and unforeseen problems are revealed. Local government has a strong interest in the impacts of climate change and what can be done to mitigate those impacts.

Support for this remit will reinforce the Local Government Leaders’ Climate Change Declaration 2017, which included: “A clear and consistent pathway toward a low carbon and resilient future needs to provide certainty for successive governments, businesses and communities to enable transformative decisions and investments to be made over time”.

4. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

LGNZ has climate change as a project in its Work Programme.

This remit relates to the following objectives of the project:

- a. Climate Change Action: “Actions to reduce emissions”
- b. A Collaborative Approach: “A collaborative and joint response to climate change, including a clear pathway to a low carbon economy”
- c. Key work streams: “Mitigating the impacts of climate change”
- d. Supporting work: “The sector will contribute to the Productivity Commission’s inquiry into NZ’s transition to a low-emissions economy”.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

On 19 October 2016, the NZ\$30 billion NZ Super Fund announced changes to become more resilient to climate change investment risk under a new strategy announced by the Guardians of New Zealand Superannuation.

CEO Adrian Orr said climate change was a material investment issue with risks for long-horizon investors. “In coming years the global energy system will transition away from fossil fuels. Some assets we invest in today may become uneconomic, made obsolete or face a dwindling market.”

“Climate change, and the coming transition to a low-carbon energy system, also present investment opportunities for long-term investors that we intend to capture”. Mr Orr said the strategy represented a significant and fundamental shift for the NZ Super Fund.

The New Zealand Super Fund has set an example for banks and other investment fund managers. The effect of this remit will be to reinforce to major banks the strategic importance and benefits of a shift of investments away from fossil fuel industries and towards long-term investments in low- or zero-carbon energy systems.

The banks that Council deals with have a range of appetites in terms of dealing with climate change issues, with them all formally acknowledging the issues of climate change.

The four Australian banks that Council deals with all have exposures in the billions of dollars to the coal mining sector. They all have some statement on environmental/climate/sustainability on their websites and in their financial statements. They all support the position on climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gases.

Westpac is a leader having been recognised as the world’s most sustainable bank in 2016 for the ninth time and has a focus on energy efficient lending, and is the only bank to publish its exposures to both the fossil fuel and clean tech/environmental service sectors.

Kiwibank has little or no exposure to direct lending to fossil fuel industries as its focus is primarily on residential lending. They provide sustainable energy loans and their guiding principles espouse an ethical approach to their products and services.

The LGFA, while having not having a formal policy on climate change, is presently considering one as part of its work programme. They have no investments in fossil fuel industries.

6. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

The current Government announced shortly after it took office in November 2017 that it will introduce a Zero Carbon Bill with the objective of NZ becoming a net zero-emissions economy by 2050. It will also establish an independent Climate Commission to set five-yearly carbon budgets and a Green Investment Fund to direct investment towards low-emission industries.

This remit could make an important contribution to assisting the Government to meet the objective of a net zero-emissions economy by 2050, by encouraging banks to divest from

investments in fossil fuel industries and instead direct investment to low- or zero-carbon energy systems.

7. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

The proposal for this Remit was discussed at the first Greater Wellington Region Climate Change Working Group meeting on Friday 16 March 2018, which included representatives of all 9 councils within the Greater Wellington Region. There was strong support for the remit from the councils. The next Zone 4 Meeting is not until after the deadline for submission of remits for the 2018 AGM of LGNZ, so it was agreed that Greater Wellington Regional Council will send the proposed remit to all councils within Zone 4 seeking their support. (Note: this paragraph will be updated once replies have been received from all councils and before the date for submission of 21 May 2018)

8. Evidence of support from Zone/Sector meeting or five councils

Can be found in folder in I drive.

9. Suggested course of action envisaged

The following action is envisaged, if this remit is passed:

- e. The President of LGNZ will write to the NZ Local Government Funding Agency, and all major banks in NZ which manage investment funds on behalf of local authorities, to advocate that they transition away from investments in fossil fuel industries and consider opportunities for long term investments in low- or zero-carbon energy systems.

5

Climate Change Adaptation Fund

Remit:	Following on from the findings and recommendations of the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group, that LGNZ calls on central government to establish a Climate Change Adaptation Fund to improve local level and community participation in responding to climate change.
Proposed by:	Christchurch City Council
Supported by:	Metro Sector Hutt City Council Selwyn District Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The impacts of climate change will be experienced New Zealand-wide with increased frequency and intensity of extreme events such as flooding, droughts, and increased coastal inundation. Over the past year this has been felt particularly keenly by local government in coastal areas. Adaptation to climate change is a necessary and ongoing process for decisions relating to infrastructure, urban development, biodiversity and land and water management.

The cost and affordability of adaptation for communities, businesses and councils is a significant issue. Some of the rationale for establishing an Adaptation Fund are as follows:

1. Responding to climate change is a significant and nation-wide issue

Climate change will touch all communities and impact on all councils throughout New Zealand. It will impact on many council roles, services and infrastructure. For some communities and councils these impacts will be significant.

2. Disproportional impacts and costs

The impacts and costs of adapting to climate change will not be felt evenly across the county. Often the most vulnerable communities are hardest hit. Many councils will have limited ability to adequately anticipate and respond to changes brought on by climate change, further raising inequalities. For some councils the costs will be beyond their means.

3. Cost is a barrier to proactive responses

For many communities and councils the cost of proactively responding to climate change is a significant barrier. While it is often more cost-effective to adopt proactive solutions, the up-front costs mean that only reactive, higher cost responses are taken. New Zealand will miss opportunities to save costs and be more exposed to higher cost recovery pathways.

In their Stocktake Report (2017), the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group identified the cost and/or funding of adaptation is a key barrier for councils, and communities, in being able to implement adaptation measures in their areas.

4. Cost can be a barrier to fulfilling legal responsibilities

Councils have specific roles and legal responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Act 2002 to consider the impacts of climate change and the needs of future generations that may not adequately be fulfilled, or fulfilled in a timely manner, because of cost. Up-front costs can be barrier to long-term decision making and costs on future generations are heavily discounted, meaning future costs are poorly recognised and rarely managed. The impact is that we have an “adaptation deficit” where future generations will disproportionately carry the cost of the impacts of climate change.

5. Complementary to other approaches

A Climate Change Adaptation Fund is complementary to other actions and proposals of Local Government New Zealand and the Government, described below in the New or Confirming Existing Policy section. The Fund would help unlock opportunities to collaborate and share learnings across communities and could leverage other private and public investments in adaptation research and the practical implementation of solutions.

Funding can provide an incentive for communities to adapt and ensure that costs of adaptation are equitable. It will also enable more effective conversations to be had with communities around adaptation as funding is a significant barrier in willingness to adapt.

2. New or confirming existing policy

A useful precedent for this is the International Adaptation Fund, which helps developing nations better understand and proactively respond to climate risks. This fund provides a way for relatively well-resourced countries and organisations to support those most at risk. In a similar way a New Zealand Climate Change Adaptation Fund could also leverage support from private and public organisations to help our most vulnerable communities.

A useful example is the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Resilience Fund, which was established by the Government in 2011. This well-subscribed fund supports worthwhile education, capacity building and monitoring projects across the spectrum of natural hazards, but mostly, earthquake, flood, tsunami related projects. However, climate change adaptation is currently poorly resourced through this fund as the fund itself has a limited scope and very limited resources, especially considering that New Zealand’s economy is one of the most

vulnerable economies in the world to natural hazards. Consequently, current funds are insufficient and limited in focus to support critical and large scale adaptation projects needed to adequately prepare New Zealand for climate change. A contestable New Zealand Climate Change Adaptation Fund would be an important way to address these barriers and vulnerabilities.

3. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

This remit supports and confirms LGNZ's specific policy priority on seeking clarification from central government on funding for climate change adaptation.

More generally, climate change is a key area of work for LGNZ. For example, LGNZ's Policy Statement (2017) and its Climate Change Plan on a Page stated 'All local authorities (city, regional, district and unitary councils) are at the front line of climate change adaptation'. In addition, LGNZ has catalogued the pervasive impacts of climate change for local government roles and responsibilities, with a key focus on adaptation.

Supporting the development of a Climate Change Adaptation Fund will encourage dialogue on funding options, which LGNZ seeks through its Environmental policy priority. This would help to support the critical need for proactive collaboration between central and local government, and between city, district and regional councils.

The remit also supports the LGNZ Climate Change Project which promotes a collaborative approach to address the risks, challenges and opportunities of climate change. This includes local government requiring central government to establish adaptation funding for councils to access.

4. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

As noted above, the Government's Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group has recently completed its Stocktake Report, focusing on how New Zealand can build resilience to rising sea levels, a warmer climate, extreme weather and other impacts of climate change. We understand a second report is underway, which will consider how New Zealand can effectively adapt to the impacts of climate change, in which recommendations will be made to central government. The report was expected to be completed in March 2018 but at the time of writing, had not yet been released publicly.

A research paper has also recently been completed on The Case for new Climate Change Adaptation Funding Instruments, which outlines some guiding principles and design issues in establishing an adaptation fund. The paper has key linkages with the work carried out by the Technical Working Group, and identified further areas for investigation in subsequent research.

In July 2017, the former Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Dr Jan Wright, released the report Stepping stones to Paris and beyond: Climate change, progress and predictability. Amongst its many recommendations, the report calls for the government to focus on adapting to climate change, noting its inevitability. It states that 'New Zealanders have an expectation that central government will provide financial assistance for those affected by

natural disasters’ and notes ‘it is not too soon to consider the economic and fiscal risks of sea level rise, and to include the forward liability into planning and investment decisions.’ Dr Wright’s report was well-received, however at the time the Government opted not to action its recommendations.

At a regional level, councils are considering adaptation funding as part of their own individual climate change policies. For example:

- f. Hawke’s Bay Regional Council has completed initial work on developing a contributory fund for adaptation actions in the Clifton to Tangoio Coastal Hazard Strategy 2120.
- g. Christchurch City Council is in the early stages of engaging with the Southshore and South New Brighton communities around responding to the effects of climate change. Funding of adaptation actions will be a critical component of the project.

Although work is happening at a regional level, central government leadership and action is required.

5. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

As noted above, local councils are primarily acting alone with respect to climate change adaptation funding, with some guidance from LGNZ’s policy work in this space. Central government action may stem from the Technical Advisory Group’s second report, which is expected to be publicly released soon.

6. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

Supported

Moved/Seconded: A.Turner/R. Wallace

7. Evidence of support from Zone/Sector meeting or five councils

Can be found in folder in I drive.

6

Local Alcohol Policies

- Remit:** That LGNZ seeks the Government’s agreement to:
- amend the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 so that Local Alcohol Policies can more accurately reflect local community views and preferences.
 - review policy levers it can apply to reduce alcohol-related harm that will complement LAP provisions established by TLAs and include consideration of mechanisms for addressing the density and location of off-licensed premises.
- Proposed by:** Christchurch City Council and Napier City Council
- Supported by:** Metro Sector
Hutt City Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Strong community concern about the effects of the increasing number of alcohol sale outlets in many communities resulted in changes to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act in 2012 which devolved responsibility for alcohol policy-making from a central body to local government. The 2012 legislation enables each territorial authority to develop a Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) in order to control where and when alcohol can be sold. As designed, LAPs can:

- restrict the granting of new licences in a community (or across the district);
- restrict the location of new premises with respect to proximity to other premises or sensitive sites;
- set maximum trading hours of alcohol sales from outlets e.g. pubs, night clubs, restaurants, sports clubs, supermarkets and bottle stores;
- identify conditions able to be placed on licences to minimise alcohol-related harm.

However, a LAP is only one of 11 criteria that a District Licensing Committee must have regard to in its decision-making and currently the provisions do not apply to existing licenses (apart from provisions reducing the maximum trading hours). Whilst a District Licensing Committee could impose conditions on a new licence to reflect the provisions of LAP, the LAP provisions do not automatically apply.

The biggest difficulty is the wide ground on which a LAP can be appealed and the costs councils face in defending appeals and subsequent legal avenues available to appellants. The promises of increased community input through the adoption of a LAP is largely to be realised.

The “reasonableness” test able to be applied to LAP provisions via an appeal, largely renders local preferences ultra vires. Community preferences need to be based on robust foundation evidence, which can be difficult to obtain. There is also no ability to include a “sinking lid” provision as there is with regard to Class 4 Gaming policies.

While the ability to establish a local alcohol licensing framework has been devolved to councils, it has not been accompanied by the required authority and resources. As a result, the majority of LAPs so far developed have been appealed by alcohol industry groups and, in most cases, have resulted in adopted LAPs which closely align with national legislation.

As Alcohol Healthwatch states, ‘the devolution of policy-making to local governments with limited financial and personnel resources to fight appeals appears to have been, in the most part, an impossible ask’. The lack of provisions within many of the adopted LAPs (and the requirement for District Licensing Committees to only have regard to an LAP in decision-making) creates a significant burden on communities to be involved in individual licensing decisions.

No council would advocate for a LAP process that is not fair, appropriate and robust, but the current ability for appellants to endlessly challenge a community’s preferences regarding the sale of alcohol is untenable.

2. Background to its being raised

From 2012 to 2017, the Christchurch City Council followed the current provisions of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 to introduce a LAP in Christchurch. Once a provisional LAP was adopted and notified, 19 appeals were filed. There were also eight interested parties. At considerable expense, the Council entered into a mediation process with all 19 appellants and eventually resolved 17 of the 19 appeals. Following conclusion of the mediation process, one appellant filed judicial review proceedings against the Council in relation to the failure to take into account an implied planning consideration. Ultimately the judicial review proceedings were successful. Following those proceedings, with the effluxion of time and no end date in sight, the Council decided to abandon its LAP process.

Overall, the Council’s costs were in the order of \$1.1 million. The majority of costs were incurred during the mediation process, judicial review proceedings and during the preparation for the appeals.

Suggested actions are as follows:

1. Review the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act to ensure community views are able to be reflected in a LAP
 - repeal or review section 81 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012; and/ or
 - add a new subclause to section 4 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the Object of the Act) “the views and preferences of communities regarding local alcohol licensing matters are appropriately responded to”.
2. Request the Government explore policy levers to address alcohol-related harm that are available to it but that aren’t able to be included in a LAP. These include:
 - review of the minimum age for purchasing alcohol
 - consideration of minimum pricing
 - consideration of changes to the taxing of alcohol

- consideration of providing funding to local authorities to offset the cost of LAP development

3. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

This issue relates to LGNZ's Social Issues portfolio, which is:

Working alongside central government and iwi to address social issues in our communities including an ageing population, disparity between social groups, housing (supply and quality) and community safety.

It can be said that good alcohol policy plays a strong role in preserving and improving community safety.

The issues with establishing LAPs have been identified by other councils, which we understand are also planning on submitting draft remits to the LGNZ Annual General Meeting on this issue.

4. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 provides for councils to develop a LAP if they wish. The Act details the matters able to be addressed through a LAP, which are limited to maximum opening hours and location of licensed premises as well as providing for the requirement of one-way-door provisions for on-license premises and special conditions to apply.

The Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No 2) is currently before the House. This Bill addresses an anomaly in the current Act that effectively provides existing use rights for licences in place before a LAP is adopted and makes the introduction of amended trading hours through a LAP problematic. The Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) has overturned the introduction of amended trading hours via LAPs on the basis they can't be applied to all licenses on an equal basis - due to existing licenses not being covered until renewal is required.

The Bill will address the practical issue of introducing new maximum trading hours but does not address the lack of weight able to be given to community preferences in an LAP or the seemingly low bar for reasonableness being applied by ARLA when considering appeals.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

As noted above, the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Renewal of Licences) Amendment Bill (No. 2) is currently before the House. However, from the Christchurch City Council's point of view, the Bill doesn't adequately address the lack of weight that can be given to community preferences in an LAP or the definition of 'reasonableness' of appeals.

6. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

Supported – suggested wording amended to ensure any changes to the Act deal with the proliferation of off-licenses as the LAP is not working. This amendment has been made.

Moved/Seconded: A.Turner/R.Wallace

7

Biofuels

- Remit:** That LGNZ encourages the Government to investigate options to support the use of biodiesel such as financial incentives; tax offsets; subsidies to bio-diesel manufacturers; and/or subsidies to renewable fuel manufacturers; and/or subsidies at the pump, in order to support the valuable New Zealand industries developing alternative and low carbon fuels.
- Proposed by:** Christchurch City Council
- Supported by:** Metro Sector
Hutt City Council
Selwyn District Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

With the decrease of global oil prices, and All-of-Government contracts negotiated on behalf of councils for the supply of diesel, the price councils now pay for diesel is substantially lower than the price of alternative fuels, such as biodiesel. While the lower cost of diesel is beneficial to councils and other consumers in the short- to medium-term, it is at the expense of the development of alternative fuels and associated technologies, and is acting against councils' activities in other areas to reduce emissions.

2. Background to its being raised

In November 2017, Christchurch City Council's Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee received a deputation from a biofuel supplier in New Zealand, which raised concerns about the impact of lower diesel prices on the alternative fuels industry. Following the deputation, the Committee requested that the Council write to the Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration, Hon Dr Megan Woods, to raise the issue. The letter invited the Government to consider potential solutions to support the use of bio-diesel and alternative fuels through mechanisms such as tax offsets, financial incentives for using bio-diesel, a subsidy to bio-diesel manufacturers, and or subsidies at the pump.

At the time of writing, the Christchurch City Council had not received a response from the Minister. Further interest from LGNZ in this area may stimulate further discussion or action in this area.

3. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

This issue is very connected with LGNZ's Climate Change Project, as increasing the amount of alternative fuels used will meaningfully contribute to the reduction of emissions. The proposed remit is also aligned with the 2017 Local Government Leaders' Climate Change Declaration, where signatories committed to 'encourage Government to be more ambitious with climate change mitigation measures.'

4. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

The most recent work carried out by central government organisations relating to biofuels relates to information provision. The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority has a repository of information on its websites relating to biofuel and bioenergy, providing information for drivers, businesses, researchers and biofuel producers on its website. In addition, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment publishes standards for biofuel quality requirements on its website.

5. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

There is no existing relevant legislation, policy or practice on this matter, likely driven by the perceived lack of need and therefore the diminished commercial viability of biofuels at this stage.

Previously, the Biodiesel Grants Scheme ran from 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2012. The Scheme aimed to kick start the biodiesel production industry in New Zealand. With the decreased cost of diesel, the commercial viability of biofuels was diminished, and the fund was discontinued.

6. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

Remit supported as package that dealt with Climate Change

Moved/Seconded: A.Turner/G.Brownless



Walking the talk – single use plastics

Remit:

- That LGNZ asks central government to urgently develop and implement a plan to eliminate the use of single-use plastic bags and plastic straws.
- That LGNZ encourage member councils take steps to phase out the use of single-use plastic bags and straws at council facilities and events.

Proposed by: Christchurch City Council

Supported by: Metro Sector

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

The environmental impact of single-use plastics has been well-traversed. Many studies and media reports have documented the risk to birds and sea-life and the proliferation of plastic-derived toxins and micro-particles in the seas, lakes and rivers from plastic bags that have been improperly disposed of.

It is estimated that New Zealanders use 1.6 billion single-use plastic bags each year, with each bag used for an average of 12 minutes before being disposed of. Plastic straws are similarly ephemeral, with an estimated 541 million straws thrown away by New Zealanders each year.

The extent of the issues posed by single-use plastic bags and plastic straws is such that a multi-pronged approach is required from central government, local councils, and citizens and should focus on limiting the use of single-use plastics and promoting responsible recycling.

2. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

This issue relates to LGNZ's third policy priority, Environment:

Leading, in collaboration with others, the challenge of enhancing environmental qualities, protecting freshwater resources and biodiversity and addressing the impacts of climate change and other threats.

As noted above, single-use plastics present real risks to New Zealand's water quality, biodiversity, and water-based fauna in particular. Reducing the use of single-use plastics, even

in a non-regulatory sense, will go a long way to reduce the volume of plastic waste that ends up in our waterways.

3. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

It is noted that a number of Mayors and Councillors from across the country were signatories to the aforementioned petition delivered to Parliament in February 2018.

Prior to this, in July 2017, LGNZ wrote to the previous Associate Minister for the Environment, Hon Scott Simpson, calling for the Government to introduce a levy on single use plastic bags. The letter was based on a remit to the 2015 LGNZ Annual General Meeting, which was supported by 89 percent of councils. This was intended to deter people from using single-use plastic bags, and was intended to, in time, reduce the number of bags that needed to be produced.

At the time, the then Associate Minister maintained his stance against a legislative approach, and instead undertook to establish a working group to explore options for reducing plastic bag consumption.

It is apparent that the plan to establish the working group was overtaken by the subsequent Foodstuffs and Progressive Enterprises announcements that they would be phasing out single-use plastic bags by the end of 2018.

At a local level, the Christchurch City Council received a staff report in 2016, further to a 1,500+ signature strong local petition that called on the Council to ban single-use plastic bags. The staff recommendations, later resolved by Council, encouraged the Council to champion non-regulatory initiatives, such as:

- a. Taking a leadership role by reducing where the Council itself uses plastic bags, such as in libraries and at Council-run events
- b. Expanding community education about alternatives
- c. Advocating to central government for a national response

Staff advice was that non-regulatory initiatives were preferable to a regulatory approach due to the limitations of the bylaw-making powers available to the Council and the practical difficulties of enforcing any bylaw banning single-use plastic bags. It was also determined that if regulatory reform was to occur, broader, nationwide action would be more appropriate as the issue is a matter of concern for the whole country.

4. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

Single-use plastic bags

The Associate Minister for the Environment, Eugenie Sage, has recently requested advice from officials on banning plastic bags, after a 65,000 signature-strong petition was delivered to Parliament in February 2018. The timeframe for when the Minister will consider this advice is

not yet known, nor are the options or next steps. It is suggested that LGNZ continues to push for central government action in this space, to maintain the momentum that has gathered to date.

New Zealand's two largest supermarket chains, Foodstuffs and Progressive Enterprises, are leading non-regulatory efforts to reduce the use of single-use plastic bags, announcing last year that they plan to phase out all single-use plastic bags in their respective New World and Countdown supermarkets by the end of 2018. Other large retailers, such as Bunnings, have adopted similar approaches by choosing to phase out plastic bags based on community interest.

In conjunction with the Packaging Forum, supermarkets are also continuing to promote a soft plastics recycling scheme, initiated in 2015 with support from the Government's Waste Minimisation Fund.

Following a Council decision in 2016, the Christchurch City Council has opted to take a non-regulatory approach to reducing the use of single-use plastic bags in Christchurch by:

- a. reducing the number of plastic bags it uses itself at Council-run events and at libraries;
- b. expanding its community education about waste minimisation;
- c. working proactively with retailers; and
- d. including more environmental considerations in its procurement policy.

Plastic straws

It's estimated that over 800 straws are given out weekly by some bars and restaurants, and Sustainable Coastlines has stated previously that straws, or parts of straws, are one of the top five items found during beach clean ups.

Non-regulatory approaches are underway to reduce the use of plastic straws. Examples include:

- a. Wellington City Council, which has been working with local communities and Sustainable Coastlines to raise awareness of the impact of plastic straws, with the aim of reducing usage overall.
- b. Mackenzie District Council, which has been driving a change of habit by encouraging local hospitality operators to provide straws only on-request.
- c. Industry-led initiatives, such as that led by Hospitality NZ, which is encouraging bars and restaurants to stop offering straws automatically with every drink; and switch to biodegradable paper or reusable straws where possible.

5. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

Remit supported as package that dealt with Climate Change

Moved/Seconded: A.Turner/G.Brownless

9

A mandatory register of cooling towers

Remit:

1. That LGNZ acknowledges the potentially fatal risks posed by legionella bacteria in industrial water cooling towers used for air conditioning and manufacturing;
2. That LGNZ asks central government to resume its work related to reducing the risks posed by legionella bacteria in industrial water cooling towers. This could include:

- Amending the Building Act 2004 and/or the Building (Specified Systems, Change the Use, and Earthquake-prone Buildings) Regulations 2005 to collect information for a mandatory register of cooling towers and a mandatory testing and reporting regime.
- Providing enforcement powers to councils to address the risks associated with cooling towers such as requiring regular testing, reporting and compliance with specified standards under Building Warrant of Fitness certification.
- Requiring medical professionals to report cases of legionellosis (Legionnaires Disease) to local District Health Boards' Medical Officers of Health (as is required with Campylobacter outbreaks)..

Proposed by: Christchurch City Council

Supported by: Metro Sector
Hutt City Council
Selwyn District Council

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Every few years Legionnaires' disease dominates headlines for a period as another "outbreak" occurs. In order to assist preventing such outbreaks we propose a mandatory nation-wide register of cooling towers to be updated annually, and overseen by the Ministry of Health via District Health Boards.

Regulatory action is required to help combat instances of legionellosis from water-based sources. Mandatory testing and reporting regimes will help building owners and authorities to ascertain the health of specific water cooling towers and will enable early intervention if

unacceptable levels of legionella bacteria are found to be present. A mandatory register of water cooling towers' locations will help healthcare professionals to isolate sources of legionellosis outbreaks, and will aid them to reach potentially affected individuals and communities in a timely manner.

2. Background to its being raised

Legionella bacteria from the wet surfaces of water cooling towers, evaporative condensers (cooling plant) and scrubbers can cause a pneumonia called Legionnaires' disease, which is often severe and can be fatal. Although this is a nationwide issue, this issue is of particular concern to Christchurch City Council after in 2005, an outbreak of 19 cases of Legionnaires' disease (legionellosis) led to the deaths of three Christchurch citizens. The subsequent coronial investigation into their deaths in 2007 recommended better regulation of industrial, water-based cooling towers, with monthly testing and a mandatory register of cooling towers' locations to help pin-point sources of legionella bacteria more readily. The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment undertook to act on these recommendations at the time. However work to establish a testing regime and register seems to have been paused recently.

Outbreaks of legionellosis in New Zealand are sporadic but the disease's impact is often severe. Approximately 240 people contract legionellosis each year. This figure includes people who contract legionellosis from soil or potting mix, as well as those who contract the disease from water-based sources. One-third of patients with legionellosis become unwell enough to warrant admission to intensive care units¹. The medical and social cost of the disease is consequently high.

Citizens are becoming increasingly aware of the risks posed by handling soil or potting mix after a number of well-publicised cases of legionellosis. However, the spread of the disease from water-based sources is more difficult to avoid or mitigate against, due to the comparatively 'invisible' nature. The spread of legionella from water-based sources is more insidious than cases caused by exposure to potting mix. This is because the source of the bacteria is not as readily identifiable by health professionals during a routine examination and patients can sometimes be misdiagnosed with other respiratory infections.

3. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

As noted above, the Coroner made a number of recommendations to the Ministry of Health, District Health Boards and to the Government as part of their 2007 investigation into the deaths of three Christchurch residents from legionellosis:

To the Ministry of Health and District Health Boards:

- (i) *That the Legionellosis case definition for New Zealand be reviewed in light of the testing methods now available.*

¹ <https://www.nzdoctor.co.nz/in-print/2014/november-2014/5-november-2014/legionnaires%E2%80%99-disease-likely-not-just-a-canterbury-phenomenon.aspx>

- (ii) *That appropriate samples where clinically indicated be collected for Legionella culture and PCR testing from suspected Legionellosis cases. Bronchial washing, bronchoalveolar washing lavage, pleural fluid, sputum, or lung tissue specimens are regarded as appropriate samples for Legionella culture and PCR testing. All these clinical samples where available should be forwarded to the Legionella Reference Laboratory for purposes of national surveillance of the disease.*
- (iii) *That if they have not already done so, District Health Boards consider including the urinary antigen test in the range of tests for Legionellosis.*

To the Government through it appropriate Departments and Ministries: - that it gives consideration to legislation and/or regulatory amendments to achieve the following outcomes:

- (i) *That the owners and/or operators of all cooling towers be required to register the towers with their Territorial Authorities.*
- (ii) *That Territorial Authorities create and maintain a single database of all cooling towers for heating and ventilating systems for both commercial and industrial processes.*
- (iii) *That all cooling towers, whether commercial or industrial, be brought within the Compliance Schedule/Building Warrant of Fitness regime administered by Territorial Authorities.*
- (iv) *That cooling towers be classified as a separate class of specified system for the Compliance Schedule/Building Warrant of Fitness regime.*
- (v) *That it be mandatory for all new and existing cooling towers to comply with AS/NZS 3666 or other comparable standard and that NZS 4303 no longer be optional for any towers, with pre 2004 towers that do not now comply being required to up-grade within a specified period.*
- (vi) *That testing for Legionella be undertaken at least monthly to AS/NZS 3896 and AS 4276.3.1 by an IANZ biologically accredited laboratory.*
- (vii) *That it be mandatory for the laboratories to notify Legionella test results greater than, or equal to, 100 cfu/ml within 48 hours to the local Medical Officer of Health, and the required control strategy from Table 3.1 of AS/NZS 3666.3 be implemented by the owner or operator.*
- (viii) *That Territorial Authorities and Medical Officers of Health be given powers to audit testing and test results and to ensure that appropriate corrective action is taken following results that do not meet the standard.²*

From our understanding, these recommendations have not been substantively addressed by central government in the 10 years since the Coroner's findings were released. In 2015, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment stated that cooling towers were covered by Health and Safety guidelines and that it was up to councils to create their own registers³.

² FINDING OF CORONER T L SAVAGE IN THE MATTER of Inquests into the Death of ROSS ANDREW HERN, PETER RUSSELL JONES, VALMAI MARJORIE FINLAYSON (April 2008)

³ <https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/national/290386/still-no-action-on-coroner's-legionnaires-call>

In 2015 Auckland Council introduced its own bylaw that requires all industrial cooling towers to be registered, tested and regularly maintained. One of the purposes of the [Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw](#) is to:

c) protect, promote and maintain public health and safety by requiring all industrial cooling tower water systems in Auckland to be registered with the council and regularly tested and where appropriate maintained to mitigate against the risk of exposure to Legionella bacteria often linked to outbreaks of Legionnaire's disease.

Given the bylaw was introduced relatively recently, its efficacy is not yet widely known. It must be noted that for some councils, the cost and resource required to introduce a bylaw to address the risks of industrial cooling towers may be prohibitive. In addition, councils will need to ensure that any bylaws are consistent with and do not supercede the requirements of the relevant legislation (e.g. the Building Act 2004 or the Building (Specified Systems, Change the Use, and Earthquake-prone Buildings) Regulations 2005).

4. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

The Building (Specified Systems, Change the Use, and Earthquake-prone Buildings) Regulations 2005 refer to mechanical ventilation and air conditioning systems in the definition of 'specified systems'. Under the Regulations, if a building has a 'specified system', the relevant Building Consent Authority will issue a Compliance Schedule that sets out the inspection, testing and maintenance requirements for the system. Building owners must maintain the systems in accordance with the Compliance Schedule, issuing a Building Warrant of Fitness to the Territorial Authority each year confirming that this has been done. The Regulations go some way in addressing the risks of ventilation and air conditioning systems harbouring bacteria, such as legionella, however industrial cooling towers are not included as a specified system and are therefore not subject to a compliance schedule. Industrial cooling towers are instead governed by Health and Safety at Work legislation, which is less prescriptive in its approach and does not require Compliance Schedules to be adhered to in the same way.

5. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone or Sector meeting

Remit supported as package that dealt with Climate Change

Moved/Seconded: A.Turner/G.Brownless

10

Copper in brake pads

Remit:	That LGNZ calls for central government to introduce legislation to limit or eliminate the copper content of vehicle brake pads to reduce contaminants in our urban waterways.
Proposed by:	Environment Canterbury
Supported by:	Regional Sector

1. Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

Many urban centres have some level of waterway degradation as a result of urbanisation. Stormwater runoff is the major source of copper and other metals.

A necessary part of any water quality measurement strategy is to reduce or eliminate contaminants at the source. Some sources can be managed at a regional or local level with bylaws and district plans, however, the control mechanisms available to a local authority are not sufficient to tackle copper. The remit seeks central government action.

2. Background to its being raised

Research and modelling from various parts of New Zealand indicates that brake pads are the dominant source of copper in urban waterways. Many brake linings contain copper or bronze chips or powder to improve braking properties and provide mechanical strength. The debris worn from brake linings may be retained within the brake pad housing or released onto the road. Brake pad dust is frequently washed from wheels into the storm water network when a vehicle is cleaned.

Research shows that end-of-pipe stormwater treatment practices such as treatment basins, swales and filters are insufficient to achieve the outcomes sought. Therefore, councils across New Zealand see a need for national-scale mechanisms to take the most effective action to remove copper from stormwater.

3. New or confirming existing policy

In 2010, both Washington and California passed legislation-requiring brake pads sold or installed to have reduced levels of copper and other heavy metals. There is no such legislation in New Zealand.

4. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

The issue fits under LGNZ's priority 3 – Environment: leading, in collaboration with others, the challenge of enhancing environmental qualities, protecting freshwater resources and biodiversity and addressing the impacts of climate change and other threats.

The issue fits within water 2050 Work stream 2: Water Quality.

5. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

The Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Water Management Strategy's Christchurch Melton Zone Committee are closely collaborating to improve water quality outcomes. These groups have worked together to investigate the issue and possible solutions. More detailed analysis is available should it be required.

Wet weather data that is available – from limited monitoring that has occurred during wet weather and from research by NIWA, Canterbury University and other centres – indicated that copper concentrations in storm water runoff are two to ten times in Canterbury land and water regional plan water quality standard. Research elsewhere suggests that is will be the case for most large urban centres.

Modelling software developed at the University of Canterbury was used in a study of urban catchment in Christchurch. It defined large carparks and highly trafficked roads as primary contributors of total suspended solids, and highly trafficked roads and industrial carparks as primary contributors of copper. Modelling also showed:

- Removal of copper contributors onto roads and carparks via implementation of copper-free brake pads is predicted to have significant reduction (78%) on catchment copper loads.

Copper free and low-copper brake pads are available for sale in New Zealand but there is no one source of information in New Zealand and there are varying prices and quality for all brake pads. Unlike in the US and Europe there is no requirement for labelling. As an importer of brake pads, New Zealand could easily achieve a 'quick win' for water quality by restricting imports to low copper or copper free brake pads with no significant implications for New Zealand industries. The United States Environment Protection Agency (in 2015) committed to reduce copper in brake pads to less than 0.5 percent by 2025.

6. Evidence of support from Zone/Sector meeting or five councils

Environment Canterbury proposed the remit at the 4 May Regional Sector meeting and sought support from members. The remit is:

LGNZ calls for central government to introduce legislation to limit or eliminate the copper content of vehicle brake pads.

The remit was supported unanimously by the members present.

7. Suggested course of action envisaged

That LGNZ work with central government to raise the issue and advocate for legislation change.

11

Reducing the waste stream

- Remit:** That LGNZ asks central government to address the China National Sword issue (action 1) and implement the local government waste manifesto (actions 2 - 6), to reduce New Zealand's waste by:
1. adopting a New Zealand-wide strategic approach to the collection, and processing of recyclable materials within New Zealand;
 2. reviewing the New Zealand Waste Strategy and align, where practicable, with the "Local Government Waste Management Manifesto" to set a clear programme for action;
 3. expanding the Waste Disposal Levy and progressively raise the levy rate in order to reduce total waste to landfills;
 4. officially adopting the National Waste Data Framework and oversee its implementation to enable better planning and monitoring;
 5. establishing a container deposit scheme in consultation with local government in order to lift recycling rates; and
 6. declaring tyres, e-waste, agricultural chemicals and plastics, as priority products under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, to address problem waste streams.

Proposed by: Wellington City Council and Christchurch City Council

Supported by: Zone Four

Background information and research

1. Nature of the issue

On 1 January 2018, a Chinese ban on foreign waste came into effect, meaning that all plastic, slag, unsorted waste paper and textile products that were once sent to China for processing needed to be sent somewhere else. The change in policy, made by the Chinese government for environmental reasons, has had a significant impact on global recycling processing companies, which have had to find alternative processing facilities (generally shifting operations to South East Asia). The issue being the low prices paid for the product

In the New Zealand context, it is estimated that seven of the 41 million kilograms of plastic waste exported from New Zealand to other countries in 2017 was sent to China (with the

balance being sent Hong Kong (13.5m kilogram), Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and Vietnam (19 million kilograms))[1].

At the time, the Ministry for the Environment provided a statement noting that options included finding alternative markets for these materials overseas, or improving on-shore processing. While committed to the idea of increasing processing of recyclable materials in New Zealand, the Associate Minister for the Environment, Hon Eugenie Sage, has so far declined the suggestion of using Ministry for the Environment funds to build a recycling processing facility in New Zealand, suggesting instead that funding other companies that are already doing this work would be preferable. However, processing recyclables is a low margin business built on the economies of scale, which cannot readily be achieved in New Zealand.

With a council-by-council approach to solid waste collection, processing and disposal, it is unlikely that the necessary economies of scale needed to profit from recyclables processing in New Zealand can be achieved. Central government direction is required to develop a New Zealand-wide approach to recyclables processing.

2. How the issue relates to objectives in the current Work Programme

Waste minimisation, including through recycling and reduction in waste to landfill, is a key aspect of addressing the risks of climate change, which is a key area of work for LGNZ.

LGNZ Climate Change Project promotes a collaborative approach between local and central government to address the risks, challenges and opportunities of climate change. As noted above, local government is unlikely to achieve the required economies of scale to improve the volume of recyclables processed in New Zealand, given the council-by-council model of contracting services relating to recyclables. Therefore, a national approach is warranted.

3. What work or action on the issue has been done on it, and the outcome

Some smaller scale recyclables processing plants are already operating in New Zealand, such as Flight Plastics in Lower Hutt, which processes PET plastic from plastic bottles, recycling it into punnets for fruit and other similar products. The \$12 million plant was opened in August 2017 with the aid of a \$4 million grant from the Government's Waste Minimisation Fund, which made it a more feasible proposal. Smaller operators have contested the economic realities of establishing similar infrastructure for other types of plastics.

WasteMINZ, New Zealand's largest representative body of the waste, resource recovery, and contaminated land sectors is working with councils and the Ministry for the Environment to understand the impact of the Chinese policy change; the availability of other markets for recyclables processing; and the potential for increasing recyclables processing in New Zealand. Christchurch City Council's Solid Waste Manager has been invited to a summit on the issue, held in May, which may inform the next steps and an approach to central government.

4. Any existing relevant legislation, policy or practice

Collecting solid waste is a core requirement for councils, set out in the Local Government Act 2002. However, how waste is collected; whether recyclables are separated; and how waste is processed is up to councils to decide.

5. Outcome of any prior discussion at a Zone/Sector meeting

Remit supported as package that dealt with Climate Change

The following documents may be requested from LGNZ for further background:

- Local Government Waste Manifesto (WasteMINZ)
- Rebooting Recycling – What Can Aotearoa Do? (WasteMINZ)

12

Tyres stewardship

Remit:	That LGNZ requests that the Government urgently implements a comprehensive and mandatory product stewardship programme for tyres.
Proposed by:	Palmerston North City Council
Supported by:	Metro Sector

Background information and research

Proposal

The proposal put forward is “that LGNZ requests that the Government urgently implements a comprehensive and mandatory product stewardship programme for tyres”.

Background

Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, the Minister for the Environment can declare a product to be a priority product. When this happens, a product stewardship scheme becomes mandatory and the priority product must be managed through accredited product stewardship schemes. No products have been designated as priority products by any Minister for the Environment, and thus far only voluntary product stewardship schemes exist in New Zealand.

There are three criteria which must be met for the Minister to declare a priority product:

- the product will or may cause significant environmental harm when it becomes waste, or
- there are significant benefits from reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery, or treatment of the product, and
- the product can be effectively managed under a product stewardship scheme.

In 2012 an industry-led Tyrewise initiative was developed to provide a framework for the development of a stewardship programme. In 2018 the Tyrewise model was broadly endorsed by the Local Government Waste Management Manifesto, developed by the Territorial Authority Forum, a local government group representing 64 city and district councils.

In 2014 the Ministry for the Environment consulted on *Priority waste streams for product stewardship intervention: A discussion document*. In the Foreword to this document, the then Minister for the Environment, Hon Amy Adams noted that:

[s]ince passing the WMA five years ago, the Government has encouraged voluntary product stewardship efforts as a first priority. Over this time, 11 voluntary product stewardship schemes have been accredited by the Minister for the Environment. Nearly 34,000 tonnes of waste per year is being diverted from landfill for recycling or safe destruction under these schemes. This is an excellent start,

but in quantity is equivalent to only 1.4 per cent of the total waste stream going to disposal facilities which pay the waste disposal levy. There is an opportunity to foster greater progress in waste minimisation and resource reuse through improved producer responsibility. In my view, the time has come to consider appropriate mandatory approaches for selected priority waste streams.”

The priority products proposed in the discussion document were:

1. electrical and electronic equipment
2. tyres
3. agricultural chemicals and farm plastics
4. refrigerants and other synthetic greenhouse gases.

Pages 19-22 of the Government’s 2014 discussion document, addressing the proposed tyre scheme, are attached to this report. Around 70% of submitters on the discussion document were in favour of tyres being a priority for the Government to consider regulatory interventions.

In 2015, the Waste Minimisation Fund was targeted at applications that would help solve the end-of-life tyre problem in New Zealand. Nine projects received \$18.7 million from the Waste Minimisation Fund, for a variety of projects aiming to collect, shred, and recycle tyres.

No further action was taken by the 2014-2017 National-led Government towards the declaration of tyres as a priority product under the Waste Minimisation Act.

The establishment of a tyre stewardship fund is included in the Coalition agreement between Labour and New Zealand First. In January 2018 Hon Eugenie Sage, the Associate Minister for the Environment, confirmed the new government’s intention to consider product stewardship schemes as part of a review of the implementation of the Waste Minimisation Act.

Discussion

The Ministry for the Environment has shown that there is both the demonstrated need for measures to address the tyre problem, and also widespread industry support for a mandatory product stewardship scheme. The Tyrewise initiative makes a strong case for the viability of a mandatory scheme, and this approach is endorsed by local government experts.

Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, the Government is able to declare tyres as a priority product. This declaration would require the development of a mandatory product stewardship scheme. A mandatory stewardship scheme would provide a comprehensive approach to tyre waste, and be a significant development for New Zealand.

While the mechanism for a mandatory product stewardship scheme currently exists under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, the Council notes that a review of the implementation of this Act has been signalled by the Government. The current remit proposal, therefore, simply requests that the Government urgently develops a comprehensive and mandatory product stewardship programme for tyres.

This remit proposal meets the LGNZ requirement of relevance to local government as a whole. It also meets the second LGNZ requirement as it addresses a major policy issue.