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ETICAL PUBLIC PEST MANAGEMENT PROGRAMMES

Evidence for the Aotea (Great Barrier Island) Local Board and Auckland City Council Democracy Team

Evidence that there is a majority view in the community:

- Ecology Vision Research sampled 100 residents (approximately 10%) and found a majority of those sampled were opposed to the use of toxins in pest control.
- A public meeting was held in late 2017 by members of the public concerned that this viewpoint was being disregarded, and this meeting was remarkably well attended, with 80+ people spilling outside onto the decks outside the Claris Conference Centre. An exceedingly clear majority of those attending strongly supported the idea of Aotea adopting a toxin-free approach to pest control. The gathered crowd also showed strong support for a petition asking DoC to change their methodology for the Rakitu Eradication project. A working group was formed. 2 Local Board members were present, all had been invited.
- The petition attracted the signatures of half of the adult population of Aotea (Great Barrier Island) over a 2 and a half week period (plus a few hundred signatures from visitors Dec-Jan 2018). There was further demand for that petition after it closed - many people approached the working group members stating that they wished to add their name, and hadn’t had the chance. This petition is available to audit. A truly significant proportion of our community willingly signed their names and provided their details, and comments, as public record of their opposition to the aerial poisoning of Rakitu (none were coerced, or faked, as has been rumoured).
- A number of public meetings were well attended by a wide range of community members seeking to stop the aerial drop on Rakitu.
- Many community members donated money and provided resources to support the working group to research and address the issues.
- A large number of community members have attached “Poison Free Aotea” bumper stickers to their cars.
- The working group brought lawyer and activist, Sue Grey, over for a public lecture, filling the Claris Conference Centre to capacity.
- The working group curated an art show, which had 28 participating artists, a packed opening, and national media coverage; the highest community participation rate in the Gallery’s exhibition history. The overwhelming message being towards the humane and ethical management of pests in our environment - without toxins.
- 3 week occupation of public land outside DoC. Although this was a small group permanently camped, a massive proportion of the community offered support in order for this to occur. People brought food and supplies, tagged in and out so that everyone was kept safe and healthy. They also attended a family picnic in support of the protestors. The occupation ended by an enforced eviction notice, by DoC.
- Following the the eviction, members of the community donated funds towards a court injunction to try and stop the Rakitu drop. This was being prepared when the first drop took place.
- A diverse range of people continued to attend community events designed to share information and support around the issues.

Evidence that Council has disregarded this evidence:

- Despite appearing in the research document for the Ecology Vision, the information on the “predominant” view of the community regarding pest management methodologies does not appear in the final Ecology Vision report, essentially suppressing the voice of the majority.
- Published comments by 2 Board members in the Barrier Bulletin in Dec 2017 suggesting that the community voicing their opinions on these issues was ‘disappointing’ and ‘sensationalist’. 
Item 9.

- Failure of most Board members to attend events/public meetings organised by working group. Most board members attended ZERO events on this issue, including events organised by DoC and Council Biodiversity. Thanks to Izzy Fordham for her interest.
- We presented the petition and asked the Local Board to stand with the community in asking DoC to work with the community to develop an alternative methodology. The Local Board were unable to support the community on this issue (not entirely clear why, though a clash with their PF2050 goals was mentioned), and instead wrote to DoC (dated March 7) to enquire after their community consultation. No reply to this enquiry has been shared with the community.
- Repeatedly and publicly the Local Board have been presented with evidence that the issue of toxins in public pest management are of utmost importance to our community, and that the community wants transparency and representation on this issue, and publicly and repeatedly the Local Board has refused to acknowledge the existence of a majority viewpoint.
- In the last Council Business Meeting, the chair suggested twice that those not opposed to poison were being “persecuted”, and a Board member followed up with an email to a working group member suggesting that they were duped about the level of support in the community for toxin-free pest management.

Evidence to suggest that aerial poisoning might be being considered for Aotea (Great Barrier Island)

- Under Predator Free 2050, Aotea has been named as a "candidate island" on more than one occasion by both PF2050 proponents and in the media.
- Judy Gilbert suggested in a public panel discussion hosted by Natural Heritage promoting the Predator Free 2050 concept, that Aotea might be "the first cab off the rank" for inhabited island pest eradication. We know that this would require aerial poison, from conversations with Judy, DoC and other species focussed conservation groups.
- The Local Board submitted an expression of interest to Predator Free 2050 (partnered with Next Foundation) that included the word “eradication”.
- A Board member outlined to a working group member the specifics of that plan, including aerially delivering toxins to Te Paparangi. We know from our discussions with DoC re: Rakitu that eradication in steep inaccessible terrain requires the aerial delivery of toxins.
- Methodology is not transparent in the PF2050 application, and the Board insists that the methodology must be acceptable to the local community, but the Board refuses to recognise that the local community does not want pest management via toxins, so without firm assurances from the Local Board that they will not support any aerially poisoning, the community has no reason to trust them.
- Under law (with National govt 2017 amendments to RMA), aerial poisoning can occur on our Motu with no community consultation and no resource consent, so we lack robust protection. The only protection we have is if our local Board stands up for us, and as long as they will not, we have perfectly valid reasons to fear that aerial poisoning will occur here.
- Every time a community member raises this as an issue, they are ridiculed as conspiracy theorists or accused of scaremongering, yet the local Board have failed to make a definitive statement about it, or to take it seriously. We now have Kauri dieback on the table as well - we want to know that poisons will not be the default "tool".
June 2007

ROLE DESCRIPTION

FOR

COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBERS

The role of a community board member is varied. To be an effective community board member you need to know that it consists of more than just attending community board meetings. It also involves a high level of commitment. In order to effectively represent your community you will need to attend many other meetings and events in your local community. Your community board will only be as good as you and your colleagues make it.

By electing you to a community board, your fellow citizens have appointed you to a position of leadership in your community. They will treat you with respect and will expect you in return to represent their opinions faithfully and with integrity. They will also expect you to actively work for the benefit and enhancement of the community as a whole.

Representative Role

Advocacy

- To promote residents' issues and initiatives to the community board and the council.
- To be an advocate for local issues and initiatives on behalf of residents, to the city or district council, or to central government.
- To monitor the range and level of council services provided within the community board's jurisdiction, and to advocate changes as necessary.
- To be proactive and to anticipate strategies and policies that may have a future impact on the local community.
- To respond to resident and community issues and submissions, and to act as leaders in the community where problems may arise and where issues or initiatives need to be promoted.
- To engage in community development activities in conjunction with council officers. (Board members frequently assist with the initiation and facilitation of community development initiatives and may liaise with council officers who are responsible for taking action and reporting back.)

Public Face and Consultation

- To represent the community to central government agencies and wider community forums.
- To liaise with, and to communicate with, community groups regarding local issues and initiatives, and the processes, services and decisions of the community board and the council.
- To clarify and promote the role of the community board in the ward and wider communities.
Governance Role

Relationships and Facilitation

- To work in cooperation with the council. Community boards are part of the local authority and must work within the framework of the powers and functions set out in statute and delegated by the council.

- To act as an interface between the council and the community. Board members should listen to the diversity of viewpoints and concerns in their community, represent and communicate these to the council, and work towards a common understanding.

- To attend meetings of the community board and any other bodies the member has been asked to serve on.

Decision Making

- To contribute to the development of community board policies, to set and monitor key performance indicators.

- To ensure the integrity of the community board and its decisions, and represent these to the community and particular groups in a way that promotes the board rather than the individual.

- To scrutinize council policies and services within the community board area and, to advise the council on ways of enhancing effectiveness.

- To ensure that decisions are made on the basis of sound information and rationale, and that they reflect the interests of the communities represented by the Board.

- To ensure that the structures and systems used by the board (i.e. agenda) support and encourage effective democratic decision-making.

Information Gathering

- To actively seek good quality information and keep well informed of community priorities, broader issues and local initiatives.

- To attend specifically to information directed to board members, such as emails, submissions, deputations, and financial reports.

Accountability

- To sit on hearing panels and engage in decision-making processes with no bias, acting at all times with integrity and professionalism.

- To act in accordance with democratic accountability to all residents within the area.

- To act in accordance with the community board or council’s code of conduct.

- To prepare for and attend all community board meetings.

For many people membership of a community board is their first step in a journey that may eventually lead to a role as a councillor, mayor or even a member of parliament.

Members receive remuneration which is set by the Remuneration Authority. Remuneration levels will vary from council to council so contact your local authority for more detailed information. Further information can be found on the community boards’ web page at www.lgtnz.co.nz.

Reviewed by the NZ Community Boards’ Executive Committee June 2007
INTRODUCTION

In some countries, the management of mammal pests is coming increasingly under the spotlight because of issues about the ethics of lethal control and the welfare impacts of the various pest control methods employed (Thurist 2007; McEwen 2008; Warburton and Norton 2009). Animal welfare concerns may also at times be linked to other underlying political motives, such as the hunting lobby's interests in maintaining invasive species as game animals. Some welfare conflicts have been clear and public, such as the aerial 1080 poisoning of possums in New Zealand (Fisher et al. 2008), the culling of wild horses in Australia (Nimmo and Miller 2007), or the control of white-tailed deer in North America (Warren 1997). To date, however, the eradication of pests from islands has generally not been subject to the level of controversy that has attended mainland control operations, although there are notable exceptions (eg. Anarcata Island rat eradication; Howald et al. 2007). One reason for this is that island eradication often involves unhabitied and often remote islands. This is changing as mammal pest eradication are proposed more often for islands that have permanent human habitations, pastoral uses and are closer to heavily populated mainland areas. The heightened visibility of such projects often gives rise to controversy. For example, it is doubtful if the removal of introduced hedgehogs from islands off the west coast of Scotland (Jackson 2002) would have generated such debate if it had happened on one of the more remote, uninhabited islands in the southern Atlantic. Proximity to mainland populations brings closer scrutiny of the environmental risks, such as water contamination and non-target impacts and also closer scrutiny of the core justifications for pest management and the tools that are employed. Often public opposition is generated from being uninformed or through lack of information, so it is essential for the successful development and management of an eradication programme that public education is considered as important as technology and funding (Simberloff et al. 1997).

Three key prerequisites must be satisfied before eradication is likely to be achievable (Parr 1995; Cromarty et al. 2002). These focus on animals mainly in relation to the need to kill them: all animals must be put at risk by the control tools; they must be killed faster than they can breed; and there must be no immigration. There is little explicit attention paid to the harm done to the animals during the eradication operation and to local cultural issues about the treatment of animals. We argue in this paper that future eradication must pay more attention to harm done not only because it is important in itself but also because pest eradication are set within a wider context of increasing welfare and ethical concerns related to animal pest management, increasing animal welfare guidelines, and changes in laws and regulations (Meek and Rice 2008; Warburton and Norton 2007; Yeates 2009).

ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH ERADICATIONS

Failure

The number of attempts to eradicate mammal pests, particularly rodents, from islands (Table 1) has been increasing steadily (Nogales et al. 2007; Campbell and Donjian 2005; Clout and Russell 2009; Howald et al. 2007). This trend has been largely self-reinforcing, with success breeding success, leading to operations on increasingly larger and/or more remote islands, and attempts to eradicate multiple rather than single pest species (Parr 1995; Parr and Patena 2009). The increase in eradication attempts has not, however, been accompanied by a drop in the failure rate, at least for rodents (Parr and Patena 2009). This implies that the absolute number of failed operations has increased, which is surprising given the much greater emphasis in recent years on feasibility studies and risk management, including general agreement about the criteria for attempting eradication (Parr 2005; Bonsford and O'Brien 1995; Cromarty et al. 2002; Parr and Patena 2009).

From a welfare perspective, failed eradication may have huge cost and little benefit, and so are of major
concern. The largest islands on which eradication has failed for rats, cats and goats, for example, were 1815, 650,000, and 28,510 ha, respectively. Failed eradication may mean that tens to thousands of the target pest have been killed or harmed without achieving the goal of the operation. In the worst case, the failure to eradicate means that there is no further management of the pest species on the island and animals have died to no good purpose, or at best for a temporary reduction in their impacts.

Non-target impacts

Most, and probably all, eradication also harms and kills non-target species (eg. Cowan 1992). Minimising such harm is a major component of eradication planning, and the implicit assumption in most eradication feasibility studies is that the benefits of eradication outweigh the costs, including non-target species impacts. Such arguments do not always assuage public concern or public expectations, for example, after the recent deaths of gulls and bald eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) during the rat eradication in Rat Island in the Aleutian Islands (see http://www.all-creatures.org/articles/island.htm) in 2010. Single species pest eradication may also have perverse effects on non-target species, notably through trophic cascades and trophic release, and in extreme cases drive non-target species towards extinction (Conroy et al. 1999, Roemer et al. 2002). In manipulating populations to the extent of eradication, we need to be sceptical about our motives and about our ability to intervene successfully in large, complex systems (Jarmison 1995).

Choice of eradication methods

A range of methods have been used to eradicate pests from islands (Table 2). All methods have welfare issues for the target and non-target animals involved. Different control tools have different welfare impacts (eg. Mason and Litin 2003), and this has given rise to research into the relative humanness of control methods and decision support systems to aid pest managers to assess them and make informed choices about methods of control (eg. Littin et al. 2004; Fisher et al. 2008; Sharp and Saunders 2008).

Most island pest eradication involves rodents, and 70% of those involved the use of non-selective toxoids, particularly anticoagulants (Howard et al 2007). The most commonly used of these, bromadiolone, is increasingly the focus of concern. These derive from the potential environmental risks associated with bioaccumulation and persistence in carcasses and sub-lethally poisoned animals and also the welfare impacts induced by its mode of action (Mason and Litin 2003; Paparella 2006; Merberg et al. 2008). Bromadiolone is now restricted for domestic use in the USA and the EU, and in New Zealand is no longer used by the Department of Conservation for mainland pest control. Other rodenticides, such as diaphanone, are being investigated as alternatives to bromadiolone for island eradications. The main driver for these assessments is not animal welfare but reducing the risk of secondary poisoning through use of compounds with significantly shorter tissue residue half-lives.

**QUESTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH ETHICS AND WELFARE**

What are the ethical and welfare issues in island pest eradication?

In simple terms, welfare issues include the pain and suffering caused directly by the control method used (to both target and non-target) and any flow on effects (eg. trophic cascades), whereas the ethical costs relate more to the justification and outcomes of the eradication programme. Ethical issues are more complex because they relate both to the concept of eradication itself and to the specific operation under consideration. A further issue is that of dealing with uncertainty. In such situations, the Precautionary Principle may be applied, namely, acting to avoid serious or irreversible potential harm, despite lack of scientific certainty as to the likelihood, magnitude, or causation of that harm.

Two criteria used to assess the feasibility of eradication (Parkes 1993; Bomford and O’Brien 1992, 1995; Crompton et al. 2002) are particularly relevant to welfare and ethical issues. The first states that the benefits of eradication must outweigh the costs, which is a utilitarian view (Singh 1990). Although the benefits and costs are usually considered to be monetary, there is no reason why the same balancing of costs and benefits should not be undertaken from a welfare perspective. Such an approach underlies the application of various national codes of animal welfare (eg. http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/regs/animal-welfare/stks accessed 1 February 2010). Most island eradications have been based on the premise that the long-term benefits to the at-risk indigenous species outweigh any welfare impacts in the short-term. Nevertheless, any welfare impacts in the short-term should be minimised by explicit consideration of animal welfare as a criterion when selecting eradication methods, and preferably by selecting those methods that pose the least harm. The second states that the techniques used for eradication must be acceptable to stakeholders and communities. In effect, this is usually another cost-benefit decision by those involved, balancing the need for efficient and effective killing methods to minimise risk of failure against the various community views on the ethical issues involved and welfare costs of the methods used.

**How might the welfare and ethical issues be addressed?**

Welfare impacts can be described by a formula that accounts for the direct impacts on target and non-target species, and includes flow on effects as part of the non-target impacts.

\[ W_{c,t} = (W_{c,t}^*N) + (W_{c,t}^*N) \]

where:

- \( W_{c,t}^* \) = Welfare cost to target species that are killed
- \( W_{c,t}^* \) = Welfare cost to target species that are sub-lethally poisoned or injured
- \( W_{c,t}^* \) = Welfare cost to non-target species that are killed
- \( W_{c,t}^* \) = Welfare cost to non-targets that are sub-lethally poisoned or injured

N = the number of animals in each of these categories.

---

**Table 2** Summary of methods used for eradications of mammal pests from islands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Welfare Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trapping</td>
<td>Stress, self-injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage traps</td>
<td>Stress, self-injury, trap injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg-hold traps</td>
<td>Stress, self-injury, trap injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kill traps</td>
<td>Time to unconsciousness, cause of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning traps</td>
<td>Stress, time to unconsciousness, cause of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisoning</td>
<td>Symptoms, time to unconsciousness, sub-lethal dosing, positive effects (eg. via residues), cause of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute toxins</td>
<td>Symptoms, time to unconsciousness, sub-lethal dosing, positive effects (eg. via residues), cause of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticoagulants</td>
<td>Symptoms, time to unconsciousness, sub-lethal dosing, positive effects (eg. via residues), cause of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>Wounding, stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological control</td>
<td>Symptoms, time to unconsciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodenticides</td>
<td>Reproductive manipulation, surgery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment B**

Item 9.
The welfare costs are minimised when N is minimised and the method(s) chosen has the least welfare cost. Eradication programmes should therefore aim for success as quickly as possible to minimise any harms during the process, and use the most humane and target-specific methods. If the indigenous species that is threatened by the invasive has a very high conservation value (e.g. if it is the world's sole population), the benefits of eradication are very likely to be considered greater than if the indigenous species also occurs elsewhere. Benefits and costs thus need to be weighed against each other, and a higher cost (including welfare costs and uncertainty) might be accepted when the benefits are exceptionally high.

Ethical issues can be addressed by considering a series of questions. Based on the principles underlying the ethical approval of the use of animal in research, Yester (2009) presents a generic ethical decision-making algorithm to assist this process for pest management (Fig. 1).

In the case of island pest eradication, two sets of questions should be asked. First, do the conservation benefits actually justify the killing of the exotic species? The justifications for island pest eradication cannot encompass a wide range of projected benefits – how should different benefits be compared and/or combined? The number of island pest eradication is increasing but, at a global level, little thought appears to have been given to prioritisation – on how many and which islands is it crucial to remove invasive alien species? Second, is the risk of failure too high? Will perverse outcomes result in minimal benefits, will the eradication fail because of cessation of funding or because of unforeseen technical problems, or will the benefits of successful eradication be lost if the islands cannot be secured from natural or human-assisted future invasions?

These issues all contribute uncertainty to eradication attempts. Failures highlight the welfare and ethical issues, and justifiably raise the bar for future attempts. To address this, programmes must identify uncertainties at the planning stage and develop mitigation strategies which are done increasingly as part of eradication feasibility studies. Such approaches to reducing the risk of failure should be complemented by a long-term strategic decision approach. This is the central feature of the ethic proposed by Warburton and Norton (2005), to ensure that even if eradication fails it provides knowledge to improve future attempts. They suggest that this ethic can be made functional within an adaptive management framework that has as its first tenet the need to learn and reduce uncertainty (Walker and Holling 1990).

CONCLUSIONS

Welfare impacts (i.e. inhumaneness) of the eradication methods used are an increasing focus of opponents of the killing of invasive species, and some methods, such as anticoagulant toxins, will most probably continue to be a concern. However, even if eradication methods were 'humane', wildlife managers planning or conducting eradication still face ethical challenges. These revolve around whether the number of animals killed is justified in terms of the conservation benefits realised, especially when the uncertainty surrounding an eradication attempt is high, with the risk that many animals may be killed for no benefit. Eradication programmes will always have uncertainty such as that related to funding, ability to target all individuals, and probability of reinvasion. We propose that programmes with such uncertainty should only proceed and can only be defended on ethical grounds if they are structured in such a way that learning is maximised and applied to reducing uncertainty in future operations. Because structured eradication programmes as learning experiments will have additional costs (especially for additional monitoring) this approach raises the issue of how much we are willing to pay for this learning and for ensuring the welfare and ethical costs of eradication programmes are reduced.
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Izzy Fordham
Aotea Local Board Chair

I table these questions to be answered by the Aotea Local Board:

[1] Why did the Local Board ignore the Rakitu petition accepted by them in February this year?

[2] If the Local Board had reason to believe more members of the Gt barrier community supported the poisoning of Rakitu, how was this information gathered? What were the figures?

[3] If indeed members of the Gt barrier community are approaching the Board about being "persecuted" could board please give evidence of this. Please give numbers of people involved [no names necessary]

Regards Mike Toseland

Mike Toseland
kumarahed@gmail.com

M 16/10/2018
Vivien Keenan, RE MURRAY STAPLE

I know the Board has funded Murray Staples in the past and I want to know if he is currently receiving funding either as an individual or under the umbrella of Windy Hill Sanctuary.

Is the Board aware of his actions in respect to domestic cats? So far he has admitted to the owners of 3 cats that he did shoot them. There are numerous other cats/pets that have been found with gunshot wounds - fatal.

He has twice told me that he will shoot the cat that has recently come to live on my property, if it doesn’t have a collar. In his words “a cat up a tree is a cat up a tree and I will shoot it.”

In the past you have funded him, why - when he uses unapproved baiting.

He nails toilet rolls to a tree at the height on average about 1.7m sometimes lower. These baits are left till they rot away. The poison is available to any living thing that is attracted to it.

When I recently talked to Murray about where he was poisoning on Earthsong he indicated the area around the ford which is on my land. When I said that I thought he was poisoning on my land we agreed that we should go and I would show him where my boundary was. As it turned out he wouldn’t walk down the track where it is obvious where the boundary is. He took me down (ordered is the appropriate word) a poison line he had laid when I questioned him about a particular bait that had been ripped apart obviously by a bird - not a rat. He told me that kaka were not interested in the baits.
He kept telling me that I didn't know where my boundaries were when I told him that I wanted to show him again where my boundaries were.

Today (Oct. 16th) I walked over the land in question and found numerous poison baits on my land. I assume this is illegal. I have never given Murray permission to be on my land let alone to poison.

I have photo & video evidence of this.

I would like to know why public money is going to someone who has no respect for a person's right to own a cat - still legal as far as I know.

And public funding going to someone who doesn't bother to find out where boundaries are, doesn't seem very responsible.

Don't get me wrong with this next comment, I do love kaka. I have to add that the one good thing that Murray seems to have done is get rid of the kaka on my property that were eating all my fruit.

I would a written answer to this issue.
Morena Koutou,

Please find below email from Lucie withdrawing her application from Great Barrier Local Board: Local Grants Funding Application 2018/2019 - round one.

Ngā mihi | kind regards,

Samantha Arumugam
Environmental Grants Advisor | Operations – Commercial & Finance
Mob: 021 734 399 Ph: 09 890 7234 Ext: 467234 | E samantha.arumugam@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council, Level 5, Bledisloe House, 24 Wellesley Street, Auckland.
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Lucie blaževská <lucieblazevska@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2018 10:53 AM
To: Samantha Arumugam <samantha.arumugam@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: REQUEST ACTION PLEASE Great Barrier Local Board: Local Grants Funding Application 2018/2019 - round one

Ka Ora Samantha,

I’m sorry for the complications but could you please discard my application? I no longer won’t be able to work this out even if the application is approved.

Apologies for any inconvenience.

Regards,

Lucie Blazevska
Graphic designer

M +54 22 100 6161
W lucie-blazevska.com
Review of the Code of Conduct – Feedback by the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board

The Aotea Great Barrier Local Board provides the following feedback on the draft Code of Conduct:

1. Material breaches: Discrimination

   Section 21 of the Human Rights Act 1993 provides the prohibited grounds of discrimination, including sex, marital status, religious belief, ethical belief, colour, race etc. Other forms of discrimination are lawful and accepted in society, including within a local governance framework, for example discrimination in the allocation of grant funds in favour of local initiatives and applicants.

   Recommendation: The Code of Conduct should be amended as follows: Discrimination on grounds prohibited in the Human Rights Act 1993

2. Material breaches: Sanctions by the Complaints Commissioner

   Clause 4.9 provides that the Complaints Commissioner may suspend the elected member from committees or other representative bodies. Clarification is required within the local board context of:

   - the meaning of “other representative bodies”. Does this mean that the elected local board member may be suspended from the local board as this is an “other representative body”?
   - the duration of suspension. May a local board member be suspended from a local board for the duration of the term? Suspension of a local board member from the local board deprives the electorate of their duly elected representation and a time restriction should be imposed on the suspension to ensure continued representation of the community by the elected member.
   - Suspension from a committee of a local board that deals with a specific issue may validly be imposed for the duration of the term if the material breach relates to a conflict of interest.

   Recommendation: The Code of Conduct should be amended as follows:

   - suspending the elected member from committees or other representative bodies for the remainder of the term of the council or such shorter period as is deemed appropriate. An elected member may not be suspended from the governing body or a local board for a period exceeding a prescribed number of days (e.g. 60 days).
3. Non-material breach: Resolving complaints in timely manner
To ensure that complaints of non-material breaches are resolved in a timely manner and not be left unresolved for months, to the frustration of the complainant and the elected member, a time limit for resolution should be imposed. Similar to applications under other legislation, suspension of the time limit may be justified where further information or responses are required from either the complainant or the elected members.

Recommendation: The Code of Conduct should be amended as follows:
- A non-material breach must be resolved within 20 working days after receipt by the Investigator. The calculation of the resolution period may be suspended by the Investigator to allow for further information or responses to be provided by either the complainant or the elected member and shall recommence upon receipt of the information or response.
Aotea Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Healthy Homes Guarantee Act

Introduction

Aotea Great Barrier Local Board supports a bill which enables minimum standards for healthy and resilient homes. However, we would not want any requirements to inhibit future innovation and flexibility especially for off the grid rural rentals.

Aotea Great Barrier Island is off the grid with no reticulated water, septic tanks, nor power. Off-grid houses work in different ways to urban on-grid ones. We have the same aspirations for houses that are clean and safe, warm and dry, but the approach/system within off-grid homes may be quite different.

The rental housing market on the Island is extremely limited as Great Barrier and other coastal islands become back destinations for wealthy city owners. And house owners are increasingly opting for an Air B&B tourist market over the long-term rental market.

We need to come up with viable schemes (i.e. assistance to upgrade solar power and/or septic systems) to support our potential landlords in turning their baches into long-term rental homes, suitable not only during the summer months but during the cold winter ones too.

Responding to the discussion document

1. Heating

Being off the grid, most houses on Aotea are heated by fireplace in the living room. We support heating for a house that fits with off the grid alternative energy heating, to achieve a warm, dry, healthy home. Our aspiration is for all houses on island to use passive-solar design and wood ranges in order to become fossil-fuel-free.

2. Insulation

We support option two for the replacement or retrofitting of ceiling and underfloor insulation in their rental homes if it’s not in a reasonable condition ‘akin to the 2001 Building Code’. We also recommend that ‘retrofit-your-home’ scheme offer a better standard of insulation to assist landlords in the retrofitting of their rental places.

3. Ventilation

We support the status quo option for ventilation of a house that ensures every bathroom has at least one openable window and all habitable rooms are provided with adequate means of ventilation to achieve a dry, mould-free and healthy home.

4. Moisture ingress and drainage

All landlords should meet their existing legal obligations against moisture ingress and inefficient drainage. If vents are not adequate, then landlords should install ground moisture barrier and ensure drainage is efficient. We support ensuring proper moisture ingress and drainage for a house that fits with off the grid alternative systems, to achieve a healthy home.
5. **Draught stopping**
   As most houses are heated by a fireplace in the living room, we support minor draught stop interventions to improve the warmth of homes, which we feel is currently catered for within the status quo option.

6. **Date to comply with the Standards**
   We support staggered compliance dates over five years with the compliance dates set by location of the rental home.

7. **Implementation**
   We recommend a mechanism for auditing rentals that is separate from complaints lodged by tenants. An independent tenancy audit authority to track compliance with quality standards so that tenants are not responsible for keeping landlords to the minimum standards.

8. **Accessibility**
   We would also recommend that rental accommodation have pathways that are in a safe and maintained condition to enable elderly, or young parents with babies and small children, get to their house safely.