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Memorandum

14 Nov 2019

To: The Mayor, Councillors, Independent Māori Statutory Board Members, Executive Leadership Team

Subject: International Engagement Activity Update – November 2019

From: International Relations

cc: Marguerite Delbet, General Manager Democracy Services

Contact information: kimberley.wu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

This memo provides information on Auckland Council’s key upcoming international engagement activity managed or supported by International Relations (IR) in November 2019. It also notes outcomes of events and meetings that took place in October 2019.

Summary

Both inbound and outbound engagement activity for late October and November has been deliberately minimised due to the local body elections.

Of the engagement activities in October, the most notable were:

- the C40 World Mayors’ Summit in Copenhagen where Auckland Council was represented by former Councillor Hulse and the Chief of Strategy
- staff travelling to China for the 2019 Beijing Sister City Youth Camp and the celebration of 40 years of international sister cities in Guangzhou
- while in China, the IR Manager progressed the organisation of the 2020 Tripartite with her Guangzhou counterpart.

Upcoming activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Activity – November 2019</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 November</td>
<td>Visit by Lord Mayor of Adelaide Sandy Verschoor</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-28 November</td>
<td>Indonesian Young Leaders visit, accompanied by Laila Harré</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key activity – October and early November 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3-7 October   | Visit by Taichung City Government and National Fire Bureau delegations led by Deputy Mayor Bruce Linghu | Auckland | • Deputy Mayor Cashmore, Councillors Stewart and Young and Chief Executive, Stephen Town hosted the delegation
  • Acknowledged Fire and Emergency NZ’s assistance in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Taiwan Jiji Earthquake
  • Reinforced the Auckland-Taichung sister city relationship |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8-12 October | C40 World Mayors Summit in Copenhagen*                                              | Denmark  | • Former Cr Hulse presented during Summit  
• Met with LA’s Deputy Mayor of International Affairs to discuss the Tripartite initiative and Mayor Garcetti’s appointment as Chair of C40 Cities  
• LA facilitated Auckland’s attendance at a meeting of ports cities |
| 14 October  | India-New Zealand Business Summit 2019                                             | Auckland | • Updated understanding of NZ’s India engagement strategy                                                                           |
| 17-19 October | Visit by Mayor of Denver Michael Hancock                                           | Auckland | • Opportunity to strengthen bilateral engagement between Auckland/NZ and Denver/USA  
• Promoted Auckland’s economic activity via site visit to GridAKL and meetings with Auckland tech start-ups  
• Denver Airport representatives met with Air New Zealand re viability of an AKL/Denver direct flight |
| 20-26 October | 2019 Beijing Sister City Youth Camp                                                | Beijing  | • Three council staff members participated as part of their professional development  
• Promoted cultural understanding between Auckland and the 160 participants from 30 countries  
• Met with NZ Embassy staff in Beijing to reaffirm Auckland’s support for NZ’s engagement with China |
| 25 Oct     | NZUS Council – Afternoon tea with the Rt Hon Winston Peters                         | Auckland | • Provided an update on importance of the bilateral relationship, primary focus being the conclusion of an FTA between NZ and the US. |
| 31-1 Nov   | Gala Meeting: 40 years of International Sister Cities in Guangzhou                 | Guangzhou| • Supported Auckland- Guangzhou partnership  
• Connected with Mayor of Fukuoka and representative from City of LA  
• Progressed planning for Tripartite 2020 |
| 1 November | NZ Tonga Business Council Forum, supported by Auckland Council                     | Auckland | • Increasing awareness of issues impacting Tongan community in NZ and in Tonga  
• Case study NZ based de-construction company working for AC taking materials and skills back to Tonga  
• Progressing framework of Tonga engagement |
| 13 November | Lord Mayor’s International Business Forum, Brisbane, focussing on Auckland         | Brisbane | • A Brisbane business owner spoke about expanding his company (Outstanding Displays) to Auckland  
• NZTE attended the event |

*Note: A report prepared by Penny Hulse and Chief of Strategy Megan Tyler will be presented to the Governing Body.*

Next steps

- IR will provide an update on key international activity next month.
- For enquiries about the information listed above, please contact Kimberley Wu, International Relations Manager ([kimberley.wu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:kimberley.wu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)) or Mobile: 021 225 4035.
Memorandum

12 February 2020

To: The Mayor, Councillors, Independent Māori Statutory Board Members, Executive Leadership Team

Subject: International Engagement Activity Update – February-March 2020

From: International Relations

cc: Rose Leonard, Acting General Manager Democracy Services

Contact information: kimberley.wu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

This memo provides information on Auckland Council’s key upcoming international engagement activity managed or supported by International Relations (IR) in February-March 2020. It also notes outcomes of key events and meetings that took place in January 2020 and December 2019.

Summary

There has been increased level of international relations activity since mid-January from both partner and non-partner cities. The most notable engagement activities in January 2020 were visits by the new EU and Swedish Ambassadors to New Zealand and Fukuoka City Councillors.

The developing situation of the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) is of concern as we progress arrangements for the 2020 Tripartite-related activity in Guangzhou and the NZ-China Mayoral Forum in May.

Key Activity – February-March 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 February</td>
<td>Visit by Taichung City Youth Basketball delegation</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 February</td>
<td>Visit by Taiwan Teen Diplomatic Envoy delegation</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February</td>
<td>Malaysian High Commissioner calls on Mayor</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 February</td>
<td>Korean Water and Waste Association visit Healthy Waters and Watercare</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 February</td>
<td>Tripartite working group teleconference to discuss 2020 Tripartite-related activity in Guangzhou and risk management plans in relation to the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 February</td>
<td>Visit by Kakogawa students with special needs</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February</td>
<td>Visit by the NZ Honorary Consul in Fukuoka and business delegation</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February</td>
<td>Japanese Emperor’s birthday reception</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March</td>
<td>International Women’s Day event featuring Dr Anita Sands</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key activity – December 2019-January 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 31 January | Swedish Ambassador calls on Councillor Hills                              | Auckland | • Strengthened bilateral engagement between Auckland/NZ and Sweden particularly around sustainability  
• Begun preparations for visit by the Crown Princess in April |
| 31 January | Fukauka City Council Delegation (with ATEED and POAL)                     | Auckland | • Councillor Shane Henderson hosted a courtesy call with the delegation  
• Strengthened ongoing long-term relationship with Fukuoka City  
• Showcased Grid/AKL, Westhaven Marina and Ports of Auckland  
• Highlighted opportunities around America’s Cup and Start-ups |
| 30 January | New Zealand Core Cities discussion on NZ-China Mayoral Forum 2020         | Online   | • Core Cities IR teams shared updates on planning for the Mayoral Forum against the developing situation of the novel coronavirus (2019-nCov) |
| 15 January | EU Ambassador calls on Mayor Goff                                         | Auckland | • Discussed council’s priorities on reduction of carbon emissions  
• Mayor received information on European Green Capitals |
| 14 January | Ibaraki Prefecture delegation meetings with Environmental Health and Diversity & Inclusion (D & I) | Auckland | • IR provided protocol advice to the Environmental Health team and D & I  
• Received positive feedback for sharing our knowledge and best practice |
| 11 December | New Zealand Core Cities discussion on NZ-China Mayoral Forum 2020        | Online   | • Shared best practice sharing on international engagement collaboration  
• Agreed to coordinate planning for NZ China Mayoral Forum scheduled in Chengdu, China in May |
| 9 December | Visit by Shanxi Foreign Affairs Office (FAO)                             | Auckland | • Councillor Young met with the Shanxi FAO team and represented council at Shanxi Business Forum  
• Established friendly relations between IR and Shanxi FAO |
| 5 December | Chongqing local government officials’ study visit to Auckland Council    | Auckland | • Hosted by Councillor Young and Phil Wilson, Director of Governance  
• Shared best practice on Auckland Council governance model |
| 2 December | China Chamber of Commerce Vision 2020 Forum                              | Auckland | • Gathered insight about China and New Zealand economic development trends and visions in 2020  
• Mayor accepted interview by Chinese media |

### Next steps
- IR will provide an update on key international activity next month.
- For enquiries about the information listed above, please contact Kimberley Wu, International Relations Manager (kimberley.wu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or Mobile: 021 225 4035).
Memorandum

To: The Chairperson and Members of the Parks, Arts, Culture and Events Committee

Subject: Acquisition of land for a destination park at Mahurangi East

From: Kataraina Maki, General Manager, Community and Social Policy
Mace Ward, General Manager, Parks Sports and Recreation

Purpose

1. To provide an update on the acquisition of land at Mahurangi East for a destination park.

   Key message
   - Auckland Council has entered into a sale and purchase agreement to acquire 95 hectares of land for a destination park and a vehicle easement to improve access to Mahurangi (East) Regional Park
   - The land and easement were acquired for $11.750 million
   - The acquisition was partially funded by bequests from the John Tumble and Margaret Turnbull philanthropic trusts ($5.287 million).

Auckland Council has acquired 95 hectares of land for a destination park

2. The Environment and Community Committee, at its meeting of 10 July 2019, approved the acquisition of land and an easement at Mahurangi East for a destination park [ENV/2019/114 refers].

3. The land is identified in the Unitary Plan as an outstanding natural landscape and having character values including outstanding natural features. It contains two pā sites and six middens, which are of significance to mana whenua.

4. The acquisition of 95 hectares and a vehicle easement provides council and the public with road access to Mahurangi (East) Regional Park (see Figure 1 below).

5. Mahurangi (East) Regional Park is 92 hectares. It currently has no formal road access and can only be reached by boat or kayak. This limits public access to, and enjoyment of, the regional park.

6. Expansion of Mahurangi (East) Regional Park will provide open space to help meet the recreational needs of current and future residents of Warkworth and neighbouring urban growth areas.

7. There are opportunities to extend existing recreational activities, including walking, picnicking, camping and water-based activities such as swimming and kayaking. Additional opportunities include mountain biking.

8. The land and easement were acquired for $11.750 million.

9. The acquisition was partially funded by bequests from the John Tumble and Margaret Turnbull philanthropic trusts ($5.287 million). The remainder of funding came from the non-growth rates-funded portion of the Open Space Acquisition Budget.  

10. Public access to the destination park will only be possible upon completion of a Public Access Plan after consultation with the landowners. Physical access is currently via a private road.

---

1 The Finance and Performance Committee, at its meeting of 17 September 2019, approved the allocation of additional non-growth rates-funding from the Open Space Acquisition Budget to acquire the land [FIN/2019/114 refers].
Figure 1: Site location and amenity
Kia ora koutou,

Following on from the workshop held on Wednesday, 18 March 2020 in relation to Auckland Council’s submission to the Ministry of Health on the review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation.

The submission has been updated to address points, concerns and questions raised during the workshop, except those noted in red below. A copy of the draft submission is attached for your review, the team would appreciate receiving any comments / feedback by Wednesday, 8 April 2020.

Stronger emphasis / more detail is needed on:

- Concerns about burial on private land, including burials in floodplains
- Concerns about independent cemeteries
- Concerns about cost of maintaining graves/monuments – including the cost of monument maintenance / restoration outside of health and safety requirements
- Support for providing for community groups – include list of groups we provide for along with our statements
- Cost of taking on failing cemeteries – how many private/closed cemeteries are in Auckland that are not council owned (we unfortunately don’t have exact numbers as there are a number of smaller private burial grounds across the region, however there are 13 larger-scale private and trustee cemeteries/burial grounds that are on Council’s list – a background statement has been added to this section).
- Practicality of storing ashes for 5 years

Other comments/questions:

- Request more information on what a ‘failing’ cemetery is
- Mention forward bookings and revenues as areas of concern for taking on private cemeteries
- Decisions on new methods of body disposal unclear in consultation document – request clarification. Decision making may be best placed with Ministry of Health as it is a health issue and Councillors would like to have information and research to consider before making decisions on regulating new methods
- Perhaps some comments needed on community consultation for changes to how cemeteries and burials are managed (this has not been included as we consider this is more of an operational thing if any of what the Ministry is proposing goes ahead)
• Add more about the environmental impacts of existing burial practices

For all queries and feedback please contact:

Tian Liu - tian.liu@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  MOB: 021 949 165: or
Rosie Stoney - rosie.stoney@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  MOB: 021 574 013

Ngā mihi
Maea Petherick
Kaitohutohu Mana Whakahaere Matua | Senior Governance Advisor
Mob 021 417 830
Te Kaunihera o Tamaki Makaurau | Auckland Council
Te Wharau o Tamaki | Auckland House, 135 Albert Street, Auckland
Submission to the Ministry of Health


Auckland Council XX April 2020
**Mihimihi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,</td>
<td><em>I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki ngā parī whakarongo tai,</td>
<td><em>there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,</td>
<td><em>and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ōna mana ā-iwi taketake mai, tauiwi atu.</td>
<td><em>and the newcomers among us all.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, wenerau a te mano.</td>
<td><em>Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāhore tō rite i te ao.</td>
<td><em>You are unique in the world.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission to the Ministry of Health

Introduction

1. Auckland Council thanks the Ministry for Health for the opportunity to provide feedback on Deaths, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation.

2. This submission has been approved by the Chair and deputy Chair of Auckland Council’s Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee and an Independent Statutory Māori Board member and represents the views of Auckland Council (the council).

3. Local board feedback is appended to the submission (Appendix 1).

Auckland context

4. Auckland Council owns 30 operational cemeteries, 23 closed cemeteries and three crematoria covering a total land area of 289 hectares.

5. Auckland currently experiences around 8,600 deaths per year. As the population grows and ages, the number of deaths is projected to increase, reaching an estimated 12,000 per year by 2038.

6. Annually, Auckland Council administers on average 2,600 burials (ash and body) and 2,500 cremations at our facilities.

7. Catering for the needs of people and families wishing to inter their loved ones’ remains (either through burial or interment of ashes) places significant demands on council’s financial and planning resources. That is particularly so given the cultural preference for burial over cremation by a growing sector of the population.

8. Activities within council’s 30 operational cemeteries and crematoria are regulated by the Cemeteries and Crematoria Bylaw 2014 (Bylaw) and Code of Practice (Code). The bylaw establishes the framework to make the Cemeteries and Crematoria Code of Practice 2014. The code seeks to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety, and minimise the potential for offensive behaviour in cemeteries and crematoria, covering:
   a. burial (interment)
   b. removing a body or remains (disinterment)
   c. built structures like vaults and mausoleums
d. grounds maintenance

e. records.

9. Under the Auckland Unitary Plan, existing cemeteries across the Auckland region are covered by the Special Purpose – Cemetery zone. The objectives and policies identified for this zone seek to:

   a. Ensure that cemeteries are appropriately located and managed to meet the needs of the community. This includes enabling the continued operation of existing cemeteries as well as encouraging new cemeteries to be located so that they accessible and appropriate to surrounding existing and future activities

   b. Ensure that cemeteries are managed to maintain or enhance the local environment and amenity values. The scale of accessory activities and buildings are limited to retain the spacious characteristics, and be proportionate to the scale and surrounding context, of the cemetery.

10. As Auckland’s population grows, Auckland Council’s cemeteries have all needed to be assessed for expansion to meet increasing demand. It is anticipated that as traditional independent (trustee and denominational) cemeteries reach their capacity there will be a greater reliance on council-owned cemeteries to provide burial services into the future. As the number of people living and working within Auckland continues to grow, and increased urbanisation, the council anticipates increased pressure on burial and cremation services offered from council-owned cemeteries.

11. Management of burial and cremation, meeting social, cultural and religious needs and investigating alternatives is an important area for Auckland Council.

Section 6: Proposed overarching duties regarding the disposal of bodies

Section 6.1: Treating remains with respect

Question 1: Do you agree that there should be a general duty on everybody to ‘treat any dead human body or human remains with respect’? If not, why not?

Question 2: Do you agree that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice, or, on conviction, by a fine? If not, why not?

12. Auckland Council agrees that there should be a general duty on everybody to ‘treat any dead human body or human remains with respect’ and that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice or by a fine in the case of a conviction. However, the council recommends that clear guidance is made available on what this means for those working in the funeral services sector.

Section 6.2: Disposing of a body within a reasonable time

Question 3: Do you agree that there should be a requirement that the person who has the duty to dispose of the body must do so without undue delay, including considering the mourning needs of the bereaved, any ceremonies to be performed, tikanga or other cultural practices, and any other relevant considerations (such as police investigations)? If not, why not?
Question 4: Do you agree that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice, or, on conviction, by a fine? If not, why not?

13. Auckland Council agrees that there should be a requirement for the person who has the duty to dispose of the body to do so without undue delay, taking into account any relevant considerations, and that any breach of this duty should be an offence punishable by infringement notice or by a fine in the case of a conviction.

Section A: Death certification and auditing

Section A2: Issues with the current system of death certification and auditing

Question 5: What do you think are the key problems with the current system for certifying the cause of death and existing auditing systems?

Question 6: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of the problems with the current cause of death certification and auditing systems?

14. Auckland Council has no comments to add regarding the key problems with the current system for certifying the cause of death and existing auditing systems, or the size or extent of such problems.

Section A3: Modernising the death certification system

Question 7: What do you think about the options identified for modernising the death certification system? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 8: Do you agree with the presented impacts of the options identified for modernising the death certification system? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 9: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impacts, costs or benefits that could affect you?

Question 10: What is your preferred option to modernise the death certification system? Please provide the reasons for your view.

15. Auckland Council generally supports the proposed changes, but the council is concerned that preferred Option 2 does not include mandatory requirements to identify the deceased. This is important because cemeteries and crematoria rely on the information presented as being correct and derived from a robust system that correctly identifies the deceased. It is important for our council staff and our communities to have assurance that the death certification system is accurate and detailed. As such, the council prefers Option 3.
Sections A4-A6: Auditing death certification

Question 11: What do you think about the options identified regarding the auditing of death certification? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 12: Do you agree with the impacts of the options regarding the auditing of death certification? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 13: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impacts, costs or benefits that would affect you?

Question 14: What is your preferred option for auditing death documentation? Please provide the reasons for your view.

16. Auckland Council generally supports any changes that will establish an auditing mechanism to ensure that the death certification system is accurate.

Section B: Regulation of the funeral services sector

Section B2: Issues with the current system

Question 15: Do you agree that there are issues that could be improved with the funeral services sector? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 16: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of the problems in the funeral service sector?

17. Auckland Council generally agrees with the issues identified regarding the funeral services sector and does not have any evidence about the size or extent of such problems.

18. One aspect the council believes could be improved on is ensuring people are aware of all the available body disposal options available and the environmental and public health impacts of each disposal option, particularly if new methods are being introduced as allowed for under Section E. Currently not all funeral service providers disclose such information to their customers.

Section B3: Regulating the funeral services sector

Question 17: What do you think about the options identified for regulating the funeral services sector? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 18: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified for regulating the funeral services sector? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the four options?

Question 19: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?
Question 20: What is your preferred option for regulating (or not) the funeral services sector? Please provide the reasons for your view.

19. Auckland Council does not support Option 1, which is the preferred option identified by the Ministry. The council has concerns about the lack of regulation in this sector and supports further policy development in this area. The council prefers Option 4 as it includes registration criteria and requirements, training requirements and will result in a higher standard of practice for those delivering funeral services. This option will ensure that this sector is well-regulated and managed.

20. In the case that council’s preferred Option 4 is not incorporated into the proposed legislation, the council requests that further guidance is provided for those in the funeral services sector and around the operation of funeral service businesses. The council supports the establishment of minimum standards for those working in the funeral services sector and the development of a mandatory code of conduct and complaints mechanism.

Section B4: Informing consumers about the costs of funeral services

Question 21: What do you think about the options identified for better informing consumers about the cost of funeral services? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 22: Do you agree with the presented impacts of the options regarding better informing consumers about the cost of funeral services? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 23: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 24: What is your preferred option for ensuring that consumers are fully informed of the component prices of funeral services? Please provide the reasons for your view.

21. Auckland Council does not support Option 1 as it is currently presented, which is the preferred option identified by the Ministry. The council has concerns about the lack of transparency around pricing and cost as this hinders the ability for families to make informed decisions and may result in bill shock. Due to market influences and business practices, the council acknowledges that pricing and costs may not be best addressed through legislation or regulation. If it is proposed to maintain the status quo, the council supports further policy development in this area and recommends that alternative measures could be adopted to address this identified issue. The council suggests that perhaps a best practice guide could be developed to support pricing and cost transparency within the funeral services sector.

22. The council would also like to note that all the options presented in the consultation document focus on monetary costs only and does not address the environmental and public health costs of the various body restoration, preservation and disposal methods. The council, as both a funeral services provider and a local authority, supports sustainable and environmental practices, and recommends that further investigation be carried out on these impacts. The council considers that this legislation review provides an opportunity for further
policy development in this area and that suitable policy guidance be included either within the updated legislation or via alternative measures in the form of best practice protocols.

Section C: Burial and cemetery management

Section C2: Issues with the current system

Question 25: Do you agree that there are issues that could be improved with the current framework for burials and cemetery management? Why/why not? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 26: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of such problems outlined about the current framework for burials and cemetery management?

23. Auckland Council agrees that there are issues with the current burials and cemetery framework which could be improved by reform and modernisation of the management framework.

24. The council is sometimes approached to provide direction, advice or funding for non-local authority cemeteries within our districts. The process around managing non-local authority cemeteries and our obligation to them is often unclear as this sits with the Ministry of Health. The council has, however, been able to access advice, support and direction through the Auckland Regional Public Health Service and the Ministry of Health.

25. The council is also aware of issues with the quality of monument installation with unsecured adornments causing ground maintenance problems and improperly installed monuments leading to public safety risks.

Section C3: A new burial and cemetery management framework

Question 27: What do you think about the options identified regarding a new framework for burial and cemetery management? Do you want to suggest any additional options?

Question 28: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified regarding a new framework for burial and cemetery management? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the three options?

Question 29: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 30: What is your preferred option for a new framework for burial and cemetery management? Please provide the reasons for your view.

26. The council’s feedback on specific elements of the proposed options are outlined below.
Proposed types of burial land and their management

Independent Cemeteries

27. Auckland Council does not support opening the provision of cemeteries to independent providers. The council is concerned that with the obligation to take on failing cemeteries, this could create perverse incentives for independent providers to step away from a cemetery at the end of its saleable life and transfer the long-term maintenance to local authorities with little or no perpetual maintenance funds to support this.

28. Auckland Council notes that all cemeteries need to make a surplus during their operational life, in order to fund their maintenance in perpetuity once the cemetery is closed and no longer generates revenue. If a dividend was returned to shareholders, then shortfalls in budget for future maintenance could occur, or prices for cemetery services could become unsustainable.

29. The council therefore supports the proposal within preferred Option 3 to not include provisions for independent cemeteries in the legislation.

Community Cemeteries

30. Auckland Council supports the provisions for new community cemeteries and bringing existing trustee cemeteries into this framework, as outlined in preferred Option 3. The council is aware of groups within our communities which would be interested in exploring this as an option.

31. The council however seeks clarity around the appointment of cemetery managers and the role of local government with regards to community cemeteries. The council also recommends increased management obligations on all cemetery types, as outlined in points 33 - 37 below.

Local authority cemeteries

32. Auckland Council supports a requirement for local authorities to consider applications for the provision of separate burial areas to meet specific religious or cultural requirements. Auckland Council cemeteries currently cater for a number of different groups with common burial needs such as members of the Hebrew and Muslim communities, services persons, as well as providing an urupa and natural burial area at Waikumete Cemetery. The council recommends that local authorities should be required to develop a policy and have standard criteria to assess these requests to provide for transparent decision making. The legislation should allow for flexibility in the way that such areas are developed, funded and managed and should not disadvantage communities with limited access to financial resources.

Management Obligations

33. Auckland Council supports consistent management obligations across all types of cemetery, except for burial on private land.
34. The council supports mandatory development of cemetery polices to outline how cemeteries will be managed. Cemetery managers should have the duty to create and maintain a policy for their cemetery, created in consultation with their communities, that covers at a minimum:
   
   a. Maintenance standards (including monument management),
   b. The provision of separate burial areas within the cemetery,
   c. The opening hours of the cemetery and hours that burial services can be carried out,
   d. Whether some plots are sold for limited tenure,
   e. Monumental and memorial specifications where applicable,
   f. How burials will be carried out (interment),
   g. How disinterment will be carried out,
   h. How records will be kept.

35. The council considers cemeteries maintenance standards as a level of service issue that should be left to cemetery managers to agree with their communities. The legislation should address this at a very high level only, creating an obligation for cemetery managers to have documented maintenance standards, including maintaining the land in a reasonable condition, ensuring the land is not used for other purposes, and is managed in a way to allow for continued and safe public access to gravesites.

36. In addition, the council considers that cemetery managers should be required to keep records of maintenance activities, capital developments, renewals and complaints from families and the public.

37. The council advises that the legislation should not restrict the style of cemetery or burial ground and should allow for different standards to be applied in different areas of the same cemetery.

**Maintaining Monuments**

38. Auckland Council does not oppose proposed changes to monument management with cemetery managers having increased and clarified powers. However, the council has concerns that the duty being proposed may lead to power struggles between families and local authorities/cemetery managers and may create expectations for higher levels of service from local authorities and reduce families’ own initiative to maintain monuments.

39. Another consideration for council is the potential cost of maintenance for monuments and headstones. The cost of maintaining headstones can range from $450 per headstone to address those which are health and safety risks, to several thousand dollars per headstone where a full replacement is required.

40. In most cases, the council would feel comfortable only maintaining graves and monuments when they pose a health and safety risk. Exercise of this power would need to be discretionary and documented in guidance and in a cemetery policy/bylabel. The council recommends that the legislation defines what an “unsafe monument” is and requires cemetery providers to consider other means to address the safety risk that allows retention
of monuments with historic values (for example laying a headstone down rather than removing it altogether).

41. The council supports cemetery managers having the power to do work on a heritage gravesite where there are safety concerns. The council however considers that the exemption proposed under the HNZTA 2014 may not be the best solution. The definition provided in the consultation document for “archaeological sites” under this Act is incorrect and it is noted that local authorities also have scheduled cemeteries and activities relating to heritage features in cemeteries which are covered by district plans. The council has concerns that including an exemption may result in potential for misuse, and recommends that an alternative solution could be modifying Section 61 of this Act to add a clause to the effect of “also applies to other situations where public safety is at risk”. This would provide the ability to respond to immediate safety precaution while providing HNZ to ability to decline an unnecessary application, which will ensure transparency and reduce inappropriate misuse of the exemption. Another alternative could be including a provision in the proposed legislation to ensure monuments are managed to a standard so that it does not get to the situation where they are unsafe.

Approval of new cemeteries

42. Auckland Council supports the proposed changes for approval for new cemeteries. The council considers that there should be consistent criteria for establishing a new cemetery, regardless of the provider. These criteria should be published or publicly accessible.

43. The council requests that guidance on creating criteria for the approval of new cemeteries is provided for those exercising powers under the revised legislation.

Unlawful burial

44. Auckland Council supports the removal of the distance exception from this section of the legislation and agrees this is an outdated measure.

45. The council considers that clear definitions in the legislation would be essential to define what is considered ‘impractical’.

46. The council supports the inclusion of the requirement to notify the local authority of a burial. The council recommends including provisions in the statute to ensure any burial outside of an approved cemetery, including burial on private land, is recorded accurately with the details outlined in point 54 being provided to the local authority.

Disinterment

47. Auckland Council sees disinterment as a public health issue and believes health concerns need to be considered when disinterring remains, particularly where someone has died of a contagious illness or had a communicable disease at the time of death. The council considers that it is important to be aware of the reason the person died and to take any necessary precautions when handling deceased remains.

48. Auckland Council supports the Ministry of Health retaining a central role in the approval of a disinterment licence. In Auckland, the Ministry of Health has a robust process through the
Auckland Regional Public Health Services team. Their officers are well-informed, knowledgeable and responsive. The council is not resourced or trained to take on this responsibility.

49. Auckland Council performs, on average, 15 disinterments each year. Given the relative infrequency and given that an error on the part of cemetery staff may be involved in the requirement for a disinterment, the council does not feel it is appropriate for the cemetery manager to have the power to approve a disinterment licence. However, the cemetery manager should still be involved in the decision-making process.

50. Under the Option 3, the preferred option identified by the Ministry, it is not clear who would approve disinterment of multiple graves in a local authority cemetery. The council requests clarification on this.

51. The council considers that the ability to involve the courts in a disinterment request would provide a level of transparency and consistency for all parties.

52. The council consider guidance for those making decisions under the revised legislation essential.

Local Government's role in relation to all cemeteries

53. Auckland Council agrees the duty to dispose of a body in the unlikely event that there is no executor, personal representative or family member to do so, and the duty to keep publicly accessible records of cemeteries and burials within the district, should remain with the local authority.

54. The council believes the following record-keeping obligations should apply to those collecting records under the proposed legislation, to be passed on to the local authority:

   a. Full name of the deceased
   b. Any previous names
   c. Ethnicity
   d. Date of birth
   e. Date of death
   f. Date of burial or cremation
   g. Depth of grave
   h. Cause of death
   i. Contact person for administrative matters
   j. Next of kin information
   k. GIS reference of grave location
   l. Link to details of other interments within the same plot
   m. Details of memorial or other permanent items placed at the grave site
   n. Any complaints or correspondence with the family relating to the plot
o. Any damage or vandalism of the plot

55. The council considers that the impact assessment for preferred Option 3 does not assess all the additional roles given to local authorities despite the significant difference in the content when compared to Option 2. The council requests that further assessment be carried out to understand how the impacts of the additional roles proposed in Option 3 will be different to Option 2.

Obligation to assume responsibility for failing non-local authority cemeteries, or where a designated cemetery manager renounces their role

56. Auckland Council is aware of 13 larger-scale private and trustee cemeteries/burial grounds in the Auckland and acknowledges that there are also a number of other smaller privately-owned burial grounds scattered across the region.

57. The council does not support this obligation as the council considers it has potential to place a high cost burden on local authorities and ratepayers, particularly as it is unclear what the definition or criteria for “failing” covers. The council also notes that forward bookings and revenue gain are also areas of concern for taking on “failing” private cemeteries. In the case that this obligation is incorporated in the proposed legislation, the council recommends bonding provisions are included in the legislation to ensure cemeteries are not automatically handed over to the local authority once the cemetery is closed, at the end of its operation life or no longer generates favourable revenue.

58. The council requests the inclusion of strengthened management obligations to ensure records of burials, maintenance, asset ownership and renewals, capital activities, and finances are kept.

Duty of inspection and oversight, limited to an obligation to enter and inspect cemeteries to determine whether the requirements of the statute are being met, in response to information or complaints received.

59. Auckland Council generally supports the proposal; however, it is noted that this obligation has potential to have a cost burden and could be administratively challenging for local authorities to monitor and enforce compliance.

60. As such, the council supports the Law Commission’s recommendation of providing a power to inspect and enter but does not support this being an obligation. The council would support exercise of this power being discretionary with documented criteria or guidance on when this would occur.

Power to approve burial on private land.

61. Auckland Council does not support burial on private land in the Auckland region. The council does note, however, that this may be appropriate in other regions of New Zealand.

62. The council considers that allowing burial on private land would present multiple issues and would effectively lock up land in perpetuity within a region that is experiencing intensification and growth and is becoming increasingly ethnically and religiously diverse. The council does not support the proposal that local authorities must approve burials on private land if the
criteria outlined are met as the criteria do not cover all the potential effects. Some of these
effects are discussed below:

a. Maintaining access to burial plots in perpetuity, even if ownership or use of the land
   changes, poses significant complications with future development.

b. Burial on private land may also inhibit development on adjoining properties in the
   future, even though there may not be an adverse impact on neighbouring landowners
   at time of approval.

c. All burials on private land must be accurately recorded on survey plans, Land
   Information Memoranda, district plans and other similar documents. The council is
   highly concerned that the records kept for burial on private land, including the name
   of the deceased, the date of the death, the date of interment and the exact location
   of the burial, will not be up-to-date and accurate.

d. It is not clear what the obligations will be for future landowners, particularly those who
   do not have any connection with the deceased that have been buried on the land.

e. Private burials may occur within or in proximity to unidentified archaeological sites,
   sensitive environments, heritage areas, and areas of interest to mana whenua.

f. The methods and depths of burial may vary, particularly if new alternative methods
   are being provided for within the proposed legislation. Depending on the method and
   the way the body has been treated, by-products from burials may result in
   contamination on site.

g. Burials are time-sensitive, particularly for some cultures. The requirement to get
   approval for burial on private land and obtaining resource consent to do so adds
   complications and stress for families. Given the current workloads, approvals and
   consents are also unlikely to be issued by local authorities within the timeframes
   required by their respective communities.

h. Burials may occur in areas that are not currently subject to natural hazards but may
   be in the future given the rate of climate change.

63. The council is concerned that there is a lack of impact assessment provided for the preferred
    Option 3, including risk and future costs or complications when remains are not documented
    clearly due to private burials.

64. The council is also concerned that given the new roles proposed to be given to local
    authorities, there is the risk that local authorities may end up being responsible for burials on
    private land as they are considered to be non-local authority cemeteries.

65. In the case that more relaxed burial on private land provisions are incorporated within the
    proposed legislation, the council requests further assessment of how to address the issues
    raised above, and guidance be developed for those making decisions on this matter.

**Duty to provide facilities for the disposal of bodies, rather than cemeteries specifically**

66. Auckland Council supports this proposal as it will provide flexibility to respond to changing
    needs within our communities. It also allows council to innovate and look beyond cemetery
    provision as the default method of catering for the deceased.
Considering applications from local authority cemetery managers to use cemetery land for alternative purposes

67. Under Option 3, the preferred option identified by the Ministry, the council’s understanding is that the role of considering applications from local authority cemetery managers to use cemetery land for alternative uses would lie with the local authority. The council does not feel that it is appropriate for council to have this role and recommends that an external authority considers such applications.

Section D: Cremation regulations and the medical referee system

Section D1: Cremation in New Zealand

Question 31: Do you agree that there are issues that could be improved with the current cremation or medical referee systems? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 32: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of such problems outlined with the cremation or the medical referee systems?

68. Auckland Council generally agrees with the issues identified regarding the current cremation and medical referee system and does not have any evidence about the size or extent of such problems.

69. The council does note that the lack of information or register of where ashes are scattered is an issue for local authorities. While council keeps a record of ash scattering within their own cemeteries, there is no obligation for the public or the private funeral services sector to do so. This can therefore lead to unintentional consequences. For example, council may erect a toilet block on a local park where someone has scattered ashes and cause offence to the deceased family members, even though council has no record or knowledge that ash had been scattered at this location.

Section D3: Reform of cremation and crematorium management

Question 33: What do you think about the options identified regarding the reform of cremation and crematorium management? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options?

Question 34: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified regarding the reform of cremation and crematorium management? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the two options?

Question 35: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 36: What is your preferred option to modernise the regulations for cremation in New Zealand? Please provide the reasons for your view.
70. Auckland Council supports the general direction of Option 2, the preferred option identified by the Ministry, but does not support it in its entirety. The council also has identified a range of matters that would require further clarification before council’s position on such proposals can be determined.

71. The council supports the following components of Option 2:
   - The additional clarification of responsibilities for crematoria operators regarding the storage of ashes following cremation.
   - The suggested criteria that must be met before unclaimed ashes are scattered or interred.
   - The additional clarification on who has right of custody of ashes after the body has been cremated.
   - The reduction in duplication with establishment and management of crematoria under different legislation.

72. The council does not support the proposal that scattering of ashes on land be managed by the RMA as suggested in Option 2. The council considers that would create a time-burden for cemetery staff and cause additional stress and complications for family members during a difficult period. The council does not consider the extent of environmental effects of individual scattering of ashes to be significant enough to be managed under the RMA, and notes that because the scattering of ashes is often time-sensitive, there is the question as to how practical it would be for consents, if required, to be issued within these timeframes. This may then lead to issues with compliance, monitoring and non-compliant scattering, particularly as ash scattering is not easily traceable. The council has concerns that the impact analysis of Option 2 makes no mention of the scattering of ashes on land, which makes it difficult to understand Ministry’s justification for such a proposal.

73. The council also has the following comments, recommendations and queries regarding Option 2:
   - While the council supports clarifying the criteria around holding and disposing unclaimed ashes, the council would prefer to be able to hold ashes indefinitely and store them in a vault where they are easy to retrieve should someone come looking for them. The council considers the proposed criteria for crematoria/funeral service businesses to be able to inter or scatter ashes to be light, particularly with regards to the five-year period and the only communication requirement for notice sent to last known address.
   - Further clarity is required on whether the right of custody of ashes after a body has been cremated can be delegated to an agent acting on the person’s behalf, for example a funeral director.
   - Further information is required regarding the relationship between the assessment criteria to allow the cremation of a body other than in a crematorium and RMA requirements. If this is in addition to RMA requirements, then the council questions whether there is potentially duplication in assessment. The council also has concerns about timeframes and practicality of obtaining consents for such cremations given the time sensitive nature of the activity.
The council recommends that a definition of “appropriate location” for scattering of ashes is provided.

The council recommends that there should be a national register for cremations. Cremation may not occur immediately after a person is deceased and a record of the date of each cremation should be kept. The register should also include the locations and identities of the person who ashes were scattered.

The council recommends that there should be a general obligation for the public, cremator or funeral service businesses to update the national register.

74. Although not included in Option 2 currently, the council notes that it supports stronger regulatory controls over crematoria, including licensing of crematoria operators, and a mandatory code of practice to provide minimum levels of service provision and safety. The council also supports the development of national standards or other guidance for crematoria operators.

75. The council agrees that Option 1 is not appropriate in this instance and would support a modified version of Option 2 which addresses the above comments, feedback and recommendations.

Section D4: Reform of the medical referee system

Question 37: What do you think about the options identified regarding the reform of the medical referee system? Do you want to suggest any additional options? If so, please provide the reasons for your alternative options.

Question 38: Do you agree with the impacts of the options regarding medical referee system? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the four options?

Question 39: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost or benefit that would affect you?

Question 40: What is your preferred option for changes to the medical referee system? Please provide the reasons for your view.

76. Auckland Council generally supports any changes that will improve efficiency and remove duplicated procedures. However, with the recommended appeal of the medical referee system, the council request clarity on what forms and information will be required prior to a cremation taking place under the new legislation.

Section E: New methods of body disposal

Section E1: New methods of body disposal

Question 41: Are you aware of any particular new methods of body disposal that could be made available in New Zealand? Please describe the process and the risks and benefits you see with the process.

Section E2: Issues with the current system
Question 42: Do you agree with the issues outlined regarding new methods of body disposal? Are you aware of any other problems?

Question 43: Can you provide any evidence about the size or extent of the problems regarding new methods of body disposal?

Section E3: Regulating new methods of body disposal

Question 44: What do you think about the options identified for regulating new methods of body disposal? Do you want to suggest any additional options?

Question 45: Do you agree with the impacts of the options identified for regulating new methods of body disposal? Why/why not? Can you suggest other likely impacts from the two options?

Question 46: Can you provide any information to help the Ministry gauge the size of any potential impact, cost, or benefit that would affect you?

Question 47: What is your preferred option to regulate new methods of body disposal? Please provide the reasons for your view.

77. Auckland Council agrees with the issues identified regarding new methods of body disposal and does not have any evidence about the size or extent of such problems.

78. The introduction of new methods to New Zealand will allow our country to respond to changing trends on body disposal and respond to our communities wants and needs. It will enable us to innovate to reduce the impact of burial and body disposal on the environment and reduce the amount of land required.

79. The council supports the proposal to allow for new methods of body disposal to be regulated by local authorities. The council are aware of new methods for body disposal elsewhere in the world, such as alkaline hydrolysis and composting, and anticipate further innovation in this space. However, the council seeks clarification on whose role it will be to approve new methods of body disposal. The council recommends that this responsibility may be best lie with the Ministry of Health as it is a region-wide health issue and local authorities would like to have information and guidance from the Ministry before making decisions on regulating new methods.

80. The council recommends that guidance for those exercising power under the proposed legislation could include:
   a. Assessment of effects of the method on the natural, social and cultural environment,
   b. Impact on neighbouring people, residents, businesses or activities in the area,
   c. Assessment of the safety of the method,
   d. Assessment of how bodies will be handled and stored and how the identity of each body will be traced and maintained while in the facility,
   e. Effectiveness of the method to dispose of the body in a dignified manner,
   f. Ensuring the duties of treating bodies with respect and that bodies are disposed of without undue delay are met,
g. How complaints and disputes should be managed.

81. Auckland Council supports innovation in this space and is actively investigating alternative methods to burial and cremation.

**Feedback on other issues not covered in the review document**

**Burials in archaeological contexts**

82. Auckland Council considers the legislation should include provisions covering the reburial of human remains/koīwi found in an archaeological context.

83. Koīwi/remains can be found by members of the public or by archaeologists as a result of coastal erosion, earthworks for development, during archaeological excavations, or by members of the public coming across burial repositories in rock crevices or similar places. For example, in 2008-2009, the remains of 88 individuals were found during the Northern Runway Development at Auckland Airport.

84. Discarded fragmentary remains may also be present in an occupation site. Burials may be found outside of formal cemeteries (for example in remote areas of settlement or in shipwrecks or where washed ashore from shipwrecks, as burial at sea) or as unrecorded graves in early cemeteries. It is common practice for koīwi from archaeological sites to be reinterred without the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 being followed. Often the remains are reburied close to where they were found, and in some cases in a designated urupā.

85. Another potential issue is for crime scenes to be disturbed. It is undesirable to impose unnecessary legal constraints and associated delays and costs on the process of reburial of koīwi. However, when human remains are buried outside a formal urupā or cemetery, it is important that as a minimum, the location is recorded and information concerning the location/existence of the koīwi can be accessed by individuals with a legitimate interest (such as the landowner).

**Limited or renewable tenure on burial plots, ash chambers and cremation memorials**

86. Consideration should be given to providing for limited or renewable tenure of burial plots and cremation memorials in the proposed legislation. Limited tenure plots are provided for in many other countries including some states in Australia. A move towards limited or renewable tenure would allow local authorities to manage the issue of limited space in existing cemeteries and the increasing cost of acquiring and developing new land for cemeteries. Over the medium to long term it could reduce the need to acquire new land for cemetery purposes. Ongoing licence fees from limited and renewable tenure provide an income stream to support the ongoing maintenance of gardens and grounds.

87. Auckland Council would support any recommendations to implement limited or renewable tenure given:

   a. Limited tenure is not mandatory; the option for burial in perpetuity should remain.
   
   b. At the end of the tenure period families should have the option to renew the tenure if desired.
   
   c. Limited or renewable tenure should not be implemented retrospectively.
d. That the practice is regulated to ensure that human remains are treated with dignity and respect.

**Scattering of ashes into water and marine areas**

88. There are several competing interests affected by the scattering of ashes, including family wishes to scatter in a significant place, tikanga Māori and the impact of ashes on soil and plants. Auckland Council agrees with the Law Commission’s finding that the scattering of ashes should not be restricted under legislation. Instead individual local authorities should prepare guidance for appropriate locations after consultation with mana whenua.

89. Auckland Council considers there should be reference to how the scattering of ashes into water or marine areas will be managed by local government as per the recommendation above.

90. Auckland Council believes the matter of ash scattering and artefact placement on or near watercourses and marine areas is more appropriately addressed through continued discussions between council, mana whenua and other cultures.

**Te Tiriti o Waitangi**

91. The Burials and Cremation Act 1964 does not include mention of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the obligations the Act has towards Māori. Māori have a special relationship with the Crown different to that of all other cultures in Aotearoa which is not reflected in the wording of the 1964 Act given its proximity to the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. Resulting Acts like the RMA 1991 contain several provisions that are specific to Māori and Te Tiriti. Other environmental legislation, such as the Conservation Act 1987, give greater weight to the principles of Te Tiriti. More recently developed legislation is also more explicit about what the Crown’s responsibility to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti.

92. Auckland Council supports the acknowledgement of Te Tiriti and Māori in the legislation including references to the Treaty principles.

**Environmental and public health costs of body disposal methods**

93. As touched upon previously within this submission document, Auckland Council considers that little consideration has been given to the environmental and public health costs of body disposal methods. The council recommends that further policy development should be undertaken in this area and that the proposed legislation should include provisions to encourage or promote more sustainable methods and practices.

94. Traditional burial methods have high environmental impacts. Burying the body at a depth of six feet prevents aerobic decomposition, and as a result, there is a build-up and gradual release of comparatively large amounts of methane when compared with natural burial methods. Materials used for the graves and in the coffin, as well as the embalming fluids used in body restoration and preservation and littering as a result of plastic grave adornments also lead to undesirable environmental outcomes.

95. Cremation also has its environmental costs. Bodies are routinely embalmed prior to the cremation process. Embalming products are categorised as hazardous and are regulated
under the hazardous substances legislation (HSNO). New Zealand’s Environmental Protection Authority categorises embalming products such as glutaraldehyde and formaldehyde as highly toxic and carcinogenic. The burning of coffins and caskets used in cremations also results in emission of highly toxic chemicals. In addition, the cremation process itself requires high heat and a lot of energy, which results in additional emissions.

96. The council considers that not enough information or prominence is given to alternative body disposal practices or methods. For example, embalming is often presented as the default option for body restoration and preservation, predominantly because people are unaware that it is not necessary to embalm and are not provided with the alternative option of chilling the body. Natural burial or alkaline hydrolysis are more sustainable body disposal methods that have less of an environmental impact in comparison.
Appendix 1. Local Board Feedback
Memorandum 8 May 2020

To: Mayor Phil Goff and Councillors
Richard Northey, Chair Waitāmatū Local Board

Subject: Q Theatre COVID-19 trading position and funding request

From: Graham Bodman, General Manager, Arts, Community and Events

Purpose

1. To provide an overview of the Council response to a funding request and trading position of Q Theatre due to the COVID-19 environment. This memo aims to signal in a no surprises manner likely future reports coming to elected members for consideration and decision making.

Summary

A. COVID-19 restrictions have closed the facility at 305 Queen Street and eliminated the income streams Q Theatre Trust (the Trust) rely on to remain solvent. The national alert level measures and trading conditions will not likely see the theatre fully operational until 2021.

B. The Trust has received the 12-week Government Wage subsidy and has asked Council for financial support over this period the remain solvent ensuring they can responsibly ‘wind down’ the public facing business and ensure staff are provided for. The Trust has requested a pay-out of the remaining Q Theatre budget line ($112,000 that was anticipated this financial year).

C. If the Trust becomes insolvent, Council becomes the owner of the theatre complex (305 Queen Street).

D. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Council and the Q Theatre entities had been working on a business improvement project to increase long term sustainability and ensure a future-proofed operational and delivery model. The project titled Q Theatre Business Evolution Project or QTBE had recommendations relating to funding levels and consideration to which entity is best positioned to care and maintain the building.

E. The recommendations of the existing business improvement project need to be reviewed within the current operating environment and a new business case written.

F. The current and short to medium term trading conditions has accelerated the need to decide on the appropriate ownership and preservation of 305 Queen Street but also gives an opportunity to rebuild the operational model from a ‘ground zero’ position. Reports will be coming to the appropriate committees on the asset ownership of 305 Queen Street, the Q Theatre operational model and business case for the recovery of service.
Context

1. COVID-19 restrictions have closed the facility at 305 Queen Street and eliminated the income streams the Trust relies on to remain solvent. The national alert level measures restricting indoor gatherings and social distancing measures will continue to impact the ability to resume normal services for some time. In addition, the pipeline of performing arts product will take some time to recover and be impacted on the general trading conditions of the venues sector. The current forecast to achieve a fully operational state is optimistically forecast to be February/March 2021.

2. The Trust has begun a 12-week wind down of the public facing operations to a suspended state with the aid of the Government subsidy.

3. The public facing business will remain dormant until such time as operating restrictions ease and shows return. With the current information available, the anticipated return to trading is unlikely to be before February/March 2021.

4. The recovered service may have a new operational and delivery model and be designed to meet the needs of a post pandemic environment.

5. At this point in time it is not possible to describe what our relationship with the Trust will be past the 12-weeks; nor can we responsibly commit future budgets until ‘all of Council’ priorities are debated as part of the Annual Plan.

Response

6. In a spirit of partnership and in recognition of the importance of Q Theatre and 305 Queen Street to arts and culture provision, the remaining $112,000 Q Theatre budget will be paid via a Funding Agreement to the trust to support the 12-Week responsible wind down period.

7. The Funding Agreement will be executed within the Sector Responsiveness programme as approved in the Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme Report and executed under delegation described in resolution number ENV/2019/135.

8. The Funding Agreement will be given context by an accompanying letter from Council outlining the intentions and relationships over the 12-week period.

9. A responsible wind down period is valuable for Council, so that it can gain detailed service level, operational and business intelligence/IP. This will help inform scenario planning, decision making and future resource allocation with regards to future service and asset management.

10. During the 12-week wind down Council and the Trust will work together to:

   a. agree and execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to clarify the Council and Q Theatre Trust relationship during the wind down period
   b. review and progress as appropriate the recommendations of the QTBE project and bring relevant political reports to appropriate decision-making bodies, including likely asset transfer of 305 Queen street and the associated IP from the Trust to Council
   c. develop a Business Case detailing the suspended recovery and ‘new normal’ service levels, operating model, and recommendations on who is best positioned to deliver them
   d. where possible, align messaging and communication from the Trust and Council to the arts sector, stakeholders, ratepayers, and residents.
Next steps

11. The Trust will receive a funding agreement for $112,000 executed under Res ENV/2019/135 to assist with the wind down of the public facing operations, funded from the existing Q Theatre budget allocation. Accompanying the funding agreement will be a letter to the Trust (Attachment A) informing the Trust of Council’s approach.

12. Over the wind down period staff will actively work alongside the Trust as described above.

13. When more of the current environment is understood and when appropriate, information and thinking gleaned from the learnings of the 12-week phase will be presented to appropriate committees for information and decision making.

Attachments:

| Attachment A | Letter to the Trust informing Council’s approach. |
| Attachment B | FAQ’s Q Theatre/ 305 Queen Street |
| Attachment C | Arts and Culture Work Programme Resolutions from the Environment and Community Committee 13 August 2019 |
Attachment A  Letter to the Trust informing Council’s approach

8 May 2020

Q Theatre Trust
305 Queen Street
Auckland City 1010

By Email to:  andrew.js@xtra.co.nz
               Board@qtheatre.co.nz

To the Trustees of Q Theatre Trust,

RE: Response to insolvency Pressures COVID-19

The purpose of this letter is to set out the parties’ intentions and aims with respect to the wind down period of the Q Theatre’s business operations as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Background

Representatives of Q Theatre entities and staff from Auckland Council (“Council”) have been working through issues relating to the asset preservation of 305 Queen Street and the Q Theatre’s business operations (“Q Theatre Business”) in the context of COVID-19 conditions. This work builds on the positive working relationship and endeavours of both parties who have worked on the Q Theatre Business Evolution Project (“Project”) to find sustainable solutions and improvements to the Q Theatre Business and its funded relationship with Council. The current environment necessitates a review of the Project recommendations that were to be presented to elected members in April 2020.

Council values our ongoing relationship and the openness, transparency and pragmatism demonstrated by your representatives in recent months. As an organisation which also operates theatres and venues for hire in both the community and commercial spheres, we acknowledge and understand the increasingly complex operating environment and the additional challenges COVID-19 has placed on the Q Theatre Business and performing arts sector.

We understand that the COVID-19 alert level restrictions have necessitated the closing of the facility at 305 Queen Street and eliminated the income streams that the Q Theatre Trust (“Trust”) relies on to remain solvent. We also understand that although the Trust has received the 12-week government wage subsidy and intends to operate through the 12 week subsidised period, its objective is to wind down the public facing business of the Q Theatre to a dormant state for the foreseeable future.

Financial assistance

Council and the Trust will enter into a Funding Agreement, under which Council will contribute $112,000 towards the responsible wind down of the Q Theatre’s public facing operations over the 12 week wind down period. This payment will be funded from the existing Q Theatre Consequential OPEX budget under the delegation and detail of the Regional Arts and Culture Work Programme (RES ENV/2019/135).

To further reduce the financial pressure on the Trust over the 12 week wind down period, Council will undertake ‘landlord type’ activities for 305 Queen Street such as maintenance, insurance and some service costs to ensure the preservation of the building whilst in a largely dormant state. The offer to support the Trust on asset preservation costs is based on Council being the beneficial owner of 305 Queen Street and in recognition of the ongoing conversation between Council and the Trust on the
recommendation of the Project that Council is likely better placed to carry the burden of 305 Queen Street than the Trust.

The offer to provide additional support to the Trust is done on an interim basis until the end of the current Council financial year (30 June 2020), thereby allowing appropriate time for any asset transfer and associated decision making from elected members and the Trust. Any ‘landlord type’ activities will be in accordance with those offered as part of a standard Council community lease, and the details of these costs and activities will be set out in the Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") currently being developed by the parties.

Future relationship

Council is still working through the immediate and future budget implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on Council and its activities, and is mindful of equity between Strategic Partners whilst also prioritising investment in line with the needs of the ratepayers and residents we serve. Future uncertainty means Council is unable to make any further commitments beyond 30 June 2020, as we need to ensure the democratic process and debate on prioritisation in relation to the development of the 2020/21 Annual Plan and variation to the Long Term Plan. As Council is not in a position at this stage to make any commitment to the Trust beyond this financial year, the Trust is advised to refrain from any commitments that would rely on continued Council investment or underwriting.

However, Council will continue to work with the Trust during the wind down period to assess the most appropriate way forward. Council has previously described and validated the need for the service level that 305 Queen Street and the Q Theatre Business has previously delivered. The characteristics of the service level are unique across the network and complementary to the performing arts and venues sectors that Council funds.

During the wind down period Council will work with the Trust to document the service level, re-evaluate the Project recommendations and prepare a business case for the recovery of service. The business case will describe service levels in relation to the Project recommendations and describe a programme of service recovery options on the most appropriate delivery of the service aspects. Any recovered service delivery will need to operate in a manner fit for purpose for the ‘new normal’; this means scaled to the service demand, available resources and preferably building on the improvement and opportunity recommendations from the Project.

Council and the Trust will continue to develop the MOU to guide the parties’ relationship, shared communication and areas of collaboration. It is envisaged that the MOU will primarily cover the wind down period but will be fit for purpose for extension if appropriate in the circumstances. We look forward to continuing our important relationship and thank you for your cooperation during what we appreciate is a difficult and unprecedented time.

Yours faithfully
Auckland Council

Graham Bodman
General Manager, Arts, Community and Events
1. What is the difference between 305 Queen Street and Q Theatre Business? 305 Queen Street is the ‘bricks and mortar’ theatre complex - it is a purpose-built facility for the performing arts that was built to address a gap in theatre provision in Auckland. Q Theatre business provides support to the mid-level and professional performing arts sector so they can stage productions effectively in 305 Queen Street. The Q Theatre Business is owned by the Q Theatre Trust who trades through their Limited Liability Company Q Theatre Ltd.

2. Do we need 305 Queen Street? Yes, whilst the limited seating makes it difficult to recover costs it is the right size for a diverse range of art forms. The only similar sized venue in the CBD was the Malden which is now closed. A number of Council funded events and companies rely on 305 Queen St to deliver their product. Without it some companies would likely struggle to reach audiences. Some events and shows could move to other venues but would struggle due to size and cost.

3. Do we need Q Theatre Business? Yes, without the soft infrastructure and support many of the mid-level performing arts events and company would struggle to stage their shows effectively. The service provider/delivery is not reliant on Q Theatre Trust and could be delivered by another party if one were found but the ongoing relationship with the Trust and their connections with the sector are a valuable asset. The Trust has demonstrated a willingness to evolve to meet sector needs.

4. Don’t we have enough theatres? We have plenty of theatres and therefore a lot of competition in the venues market for the profitable product – 305 Queen Street is however unique in its size and versatility in the CBD.

5. Who owns 305 Queen Street? Council owns the land, the Trust owns the substantive portion of the building except for some heritage facades that Council owns.

6. Why are we giving attention to this one group amidst all the other struggling community partners at this time? This sustainability of Q Theatre is a long-standing issue. Council was already underway with a business improvement project with the Trust. COVID-19 has put additional pressure to resolve the issues.

Council is the beneficial owner of the asset and should the Q Theatre entities fail to be able to provide the agreed service provision or become insolvent the asset and operations of the site revert to council control.

7. Could RFA (Auckland Live) own and/or run the business? This is a question that RFA needs to answer. The Trust has been engaging with RFA and prior to closing had enjoyed a growing cooperative relationship with the RFA team. RFA has expressed an interest in participating in discussions during the 12 week period to provide valuable sector experience and collegial assistance.

8. Could ACE operate the venue? ACE does not have the capacity or capability to deliver all the services of Q Theatre presently, however there are some aspects where we are experienced such as education programming, community access, and room hire.

9. Is the Q Theatre Trust under contract to deliver our service? No, the trust receives a contribution grant towards their operations (around 11% as a base level). A Service Contract with deliverables we set would require much higher level of funding.

10. How much do we fund Q Theatre Trust? Operational funding $438,636 (approx. 11% of costs) for the delivery of arts programmes and sector infrastructure.
11. What is Council’s Budget for Q Theatre/ 305 Queen Street? We have a budget envelop of $1,180,954 approved in the LTP and approved in the Arts & Culture Work Programme.

In addition to the operational grant provision Council has a consequential OPEX budget of $742,318 for asset related and intervention costs of 305 Queen Street recognising the anomalous joint asset owner relationship. We have used this to top up the operational gap between Q Theatre costs and their grant whilst we undertook the business improvement project. $112k remains in this budget in FY20.

12. What would the impact be on 305 not opening again? A high proportion of council-funded arts partners, grant recipients and programmes relied on the services of Q Theatre and the facilities of 305 Queen Street. The sector could sustain a closure for a limited time before impacting on the viability of other council-funded arts partners.

13. What are the agreements, relationships and other legal documents between Council and Q Theatre Trust?
   - A Deed Document – That describes Council as the beneficial owner of the building
   - A Council Loan ($200k) – Impacting on the solvency position of Q Theatre Trust
   - An annual Funding Agreement’s for – Contribution to operational costs
   - A Ground lease for 305 Queen Street.

14. Are there optimisation/ co-location / integrated opportunities? Yes, there are opportunities to closer integrate Q with services of other Council and family operations. There are opportunities to deliver joint services, programming and potentially collocate multiple creative sector partners together.

15. Is Q facing insolvency? The COVID-19 halt to trading has removed Q’s ability to generate income through venue hire, profit-share and hospitality. Pre COVID-19 the business was under increased market pressure and the lack of commercial income will affect the trading solvency of Q Theatre.

16. Will Q Theatre ever be self-sufficient? Most public theatres in New Zealand are owned by a council or their CCOs; the remainder will likely be recipients of funding from central or local government or an education provider. Theatres are notoriously expensive to operate with a high cost to patron ratio. It is unlikely that Q will ever become ‘self-sufficient’, the aim for the Trust and Council is to become sustainable.

17. What does sustainable look like for 305 Queen Street and Q Theatre? A predictable funded relationship with Council and other funders, predictable and scalable services that meet the need of the sector and is delivered my those who are best positioned to do so – that means potentially Council, its family and community partners being responsible for different parts of the business or asset.

18. What were the Q Theatre Business Evolution Project recommendations? The proposed, pre-COVID-19 QTBE project recommendations were to, within the existing budget envelop of $1,180,954:
   - Gift the building to Council to remove building costs and execute a community lease
   - Council to purchase the building chattels as allowed for in the Deed enabling Q Ltd. to pay off its Council Loan
   - Increase the operational grant to the amount calculated in the original feasibility study (plus CPI) Circa $670,000 per annum
   - Create a fund for potential hirers to apply to for adaptive reuse venue hire for UNESCO music events at 305 Queen Street and other venues.

19. Is the current expenditure on Q Theatre over budget? Is it going to cost Council more in the future? No. All expenditure on Q theatre to date has been within the budget envelope. The recommendations of the business improvement plan were to ensure the most impactful and efficient use of that budget including leveraging Council’s purchasing power and service contracts. Initial calculations projected a potential saving to Council from 2022 onwards.
Attachment C:

Arts and Culture Work Programme Resolution from the Environment and Community Committee 13 August 2019

Environment and Community Committee
13 August 2019

12 2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Programmes
A presentation was provided. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number ENV/2019/135
MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Filipaina, seconded by Chairperson P Hulse:
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the 2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme (Attachment A to the agenda report).

b) delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve changes to individual items on the work programme provided such changes do not significantly affect the intent of the programme, noting that any significant changes will be presented to the committee for consideration.

CARRIED

Attachments
A 13 August 2019, Environment and Community Committee: item 12 - 2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Programmes, Presentation

Line detail of the Q Theatre Consequential OPEX budget as described in Attachment A.
Kōmiti Whakarite Pāræ, Mahi Toi, Hapori, Kaupapa
Parks, Arts, Community and Events
Committee
Workshop: Forward Work Programme

NOTES

Notes of a workshop of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee held in the Reception lounge, Town Hall, 301 Queen Street on Tuesday, 10 December 2019 at 2.30pm.

PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Cr Alf Filipaina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chairperson</td>
<td>Cr Dr Cathy Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Cr Josephine Bartley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Pippa Coom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Angela Dalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Chris Darby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Hon Christine Fletcher, QSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Shane Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Richard Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Daniel Newman, JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Sharon Stewart, QSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Daniel Newman, JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Desley Simpson, JP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 3.49pm

Until 3.47pm

From 3.03pm

From 2.48pm

From 4.15pm, until 3.53pm

Until 3.26pm

APOLOGIES

Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
Cr Paul Young
IMSB Member Terrence Hohneck
IMSB Member Tony Kake
Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.

Purpose:
The purpose of the meeting is to:
- Review and discuss the committees forward work programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 4.04pm.
Kōmiti Whakarite Pārae, Mahi Toi, Hapori, Kaupapa / Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee Workshop:
Regional Work Programmes
NOTES

Notes of a workshop of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee held in Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street, Auckland on Wednesday, 4 March 2020 at 10.01am.

PRESENT
Chairperson
Cr Alf Filipaina

Members
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Pippa Coom
Cr Chris Darby
Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Cr Shane Henderson
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Daniel Newman, JP
Cr Desley Simpson, JP
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
Cr Paul Young

From 10.04am
From 10.05am
From 10.59am

APOLOGIES
Deputy Chairperson
Cr Cathy Casey
Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins
Cr Linda Cooper
Cr Angela Dalton
Cr C Fletcher
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Sharon Stewart

On council business

Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
Purpose:
The purpose of the workshop is to:

- Inform the committee of the:
  - range of regional Community Facilities work programmes
  - respective decision-making roles in approving regional work programmes
  - process for approval of regional work programmes
- Seek feedback from the committee on the projects within regional work programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Apologies</td>
<td>Apologies from Cr Linda Cooper, Cr Cathy Casey, Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins, Cr Angela Dalton, Cr C Fletcher, Cr Greg Sayers and Cr Sharon Stewart, were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Declarations of Interest</td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 Regional work programmes | Presenters:  
  - Rob Cairns, Head of Investigation & Design  
  - Rod Sheridan, General Manager Community Facilities  
  - Mace Ward, General Manager Parks Sports & Recreation General Manager Parks Sports & Recreation  
  A presentation was provided.  
  Discussion points:  
  - Regional parks development and renewals  
    - Regional Park network  
    - Holiday Parks  
    - Botanic Gardens  
    - Auckland Domain  
  - Cemeteries  
  - Coastal renewals  
  - Slips prevention  
  - Local parks and sports fields development (growth) |

The workshop closed at 11.04am
Kōmiti Whakarite Pārae, Mahi Toi, Hapori, Kaupapa /
Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee
Workshop:
Sport and Recreation Facility Investment Fund
NOTES

Notes of a workshop of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee held in Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street, Auckland on Wednesday, 11 March 2020 at 1pm.

PRESENT

Chairperson
Cr Alf Filipaina

Deputy Chairperson
Cr Dr Cathy Casey

Members
Deputy Mayor Cr Bill Cashmore
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Christine Fletcher, QSO
Mayor Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Cr Shane Henderson
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Desley Simpson, JP
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr Paul Young

From 1.16pm until 2.21pm
Until 1.34pm
Until 2.26pm
Until 1.22pm from 1.32pm
From 1.19pm

APOLOGIES

Cr Pippa Coom
Cr Fa´amanana Efeso Collins
Cr Linda Cooper
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr John Watson

On council business
Parental leave
On council business
On council business
On council business

Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
**Purpose:**

The purpose of the workshop is:

1. Present to elected members the assessment criteria used to inform funding recommendations
2. Present an overview of the contestable process
3. Discuss recommended projects and a programme approach to allocation of the Sport & Rec Facility Investment Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 2.30pm
Kōmiti Whakarite Pārae, Mahi Toi, Hapori, Kaupapa / 
Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee 
Workshop: Burial and Cremation 
NOTES

Notes of a workshop of the Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee held in Room 1, Level 26, 135 Albert Street, Auckland on Wednesday, 18 March 2020 at 11.45am.

PRESENT

Chairperson
Cr Alf Filipaina
Deputy Chairperson
Cr Dr Cathy Casey
Members
Cr Josephine Bartley Until 11.56am
Deputy Mayor Cr Bill Cashmore From 11.58am
Cr Pippa Coom From 12.12pm
Cr Linda Cooper, JP Until 12.28pm
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Shane Henderson
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Desley Simpson, JP From 11.48am
Cr Paul Young From 11.56am

APOLOGIES

Cr Christine Fletcher, QSO Leave of absence
Cr Greg Sayers

Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.
Purpose:
The purpose of the workshop is:

- to discuss the Auckland Council Submission on Deaths, Funerals, Burial and Cremation: a Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and Related Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 12.43am

Minutes