

---

# Papakura Local Board

## OPEN MINUTES

---

Minutes of a meeting of the Papakura Local Board held in the Local Board Chambers, Papakura Service Centre, 35 Coles Crescent, Papakura and via video conference (Microsoft Teams) on Wednesday, 11 May 2022 at 4.41pm.

As required under the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Legislation Act 2020, a recording of the meeting will be available [here](#)

---

### PRESENT

<b>Chairperson</b>	Brent Catchpole
<b>Deputy Chairperson</b>	Jan Robinson
<b>Members</b>	Felicity Auva'a George Hawkins Sue Smurthwaite

### ABSENT

<b>Member</b>	Keven Mealamu
---------------	---------------

### ALSO PRESENT

<b>Councillors</b>	Angela Dalton, Daniel Newman, JP
--------------------	-------------------------------------

---



## 1 Welcome

Member George Hawkins led the meeting in prayer.

## 2 Apologies

Resolution number PPK/2022/65

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Member S Smurthwaite:

**That the Papakura Local Board:**

- a) accept the apology from Member Keven Mealamu for absence.

**CARRIED**

## 3 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

## 4 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolution number PPK/2022/66

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Deputy Chairperson J Robinson:

**That the Papakura Local Board:**

- a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 27 April 2022, as true and correct.

**CARRIED**

## 5 Leave of Absence

There were no requests for leave of absence.

## 6 Acknowledgements

There were no acknowledgements.

## 7 Petitions

There were no petitions.

## 8 Deputations

There were no deputations.

## 9 Public Forum

There was no public forum.

## 10 Extraordinary Business

There was no extraordinary business.

## 11 Papakura Local Board Consultation Feedback and Input into the Annual Budget 2022/2023

Resolution number PPK/2022/67

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Member F Auva'a:

**That the Papakura Local Board:**

- a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Papakura Local Board priorities and activities for 2022/2023.
- b) receive consultation feedback on regional topics in the Annual Budget 2022/2023 from people and organisations based in the Papakura local board area.
- c) provide the following input on regional topics in the proposed Annual Budget 2022/2023 to the Governing Body:

Topic	Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local Board Input
Climate Action	To introduce a climate action targeted rate	Support in principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The board is concerned about the impacts of the rising cost of living expenses on the average household.</li> <li>• The board believes this is a central government issue</li> </ul>
Budget Pressures	To manage on-going budget pressures	Support	
Operating Spending Prioritisation	On how council will choose which services to reduce, stop or change	Support	Ensure that when prioritisation is done that an equity lens is applied to it – looking at the communities that need council most – particularly in the “could do’s” area
Waste	To move from a planned region-wide pay-as-you-throw	Do not support	

	system to a region-wide rates-funded refuse collection system		
	To standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support	
	To standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support	
	To standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support	
	To apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Support	
<b>Other Issues</b>	<p>Any other issues, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local board decision-making over local community services</li> <li>2. Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023</li> <li>3. Changes to fees and charges</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local board decision making over local community services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Papakura Local Board supports the allocation of budget to implement the Governance Framework Review work</li> <li>• The board requires quality, timely advice in order to make good decisions</li> <li>• The board accepts the additional responsibilities for members that will come in relation to budget decisions with the implementation of the Governance Framework Review and questions if this would require them to undertake additional hours and as a result attract additional remuneration</li> <li>• The board acknowledges the importance of the requirement for any proposed changes to be consulted with the</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

		<p>community as part of the annual budget cycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The board requests that the governing body ensures funding is sufficient to enable the ongoing operation of important community facilities at a level of service that meets community needs and demand in the Papakura Local Board area, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Art Gallery</li> <li>Museum</li> <li>Aquatic centre</li> <li>Libraries</li> <li>Hawkins Theatre</li> <li>Recreation Centre.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>2. Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The board has no feedback on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023.</li> </ul> <p>3. Changes to fees and charges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The board supports the proposed increase in fees and charges. This is because for many groups it is more manageable to have a small increase in fees and charges on a more regular basis</li> <li>The board, in formulating its input, is mindful of the importance of balancing greater facility utilisation at a lower charge, versus the possibility of a facility being used less as a result of increased charges.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

d) provide the following advocacy initiatives for the Annual Budget 2022/2023 to the Governing Body:

Initiative	Description
Advocacy for Climate Action Targeted Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrated cycle path network in south: Prioritise funding for a network of integrated recreational and active transport cycleways and shared pathways across south Auckland</li> </ul>

<p>(CATR) initiatives in the south</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The board requests support (both funding from the Climate Change Targeted Rate and staffing support) from CCOs (Auckland Unlimited and Auckland Transport) to progress the cycleway from Papakura Train Station to Clevedon (Hūnua trail), and maximising the opportunities to link the southern pathway to the town centre.</li> <li>• The board recognises cycle related tourism opportunities as an important part of the Papakura COVID recovery approach that will contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions by encouraging cycling.</li> <li>• Urban Ngahere: Request the Governing Body include funding to support the roll-out of the Urban Ngahere Strategy in the south. There are opportunities for a whole of south approach, including partnership with mana whenua.</li> <li>• Circular Economy / Establishment of a resource recovery park and recycling centres in the south:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The board is a strong advocate for a resource recovery facility / eco park / eco hub in the south and sees this as an integral part of a circular economy</li> <li>• The board advocates for support to develop key educational / partnership opportunities in relation to a circular economy approach</li> <li>• The board notes similar circular resource management views were expressed in the Ngāti Whatua and Ngaati Whanaunga submissions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Opakehe Sport Park Water / Wastewater Connection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The board advocates for regional funding towards the cost of connecting Opakehe Sport Park to the town water and wastewater supply, estimated to be \$800,000 to enable the use of the existing sport park by a range of sporting clubs and other users.</li> </ul>
<p>Impacts of housing intensification in and around Papakura</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of green space – do not sell existing green space as non-strategic assets</li> <li>• Provision of appropriate green space / tree canopy in new developments</li> <li>• Request for a review of the open space policy in terms of thresholds for neighbourhood parks.</li> </ul>
<p>Local Board Transport Capital Fund (LBTCF)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain the Local Board Transport Capital Fund of \$20million.</li> </ul>
<p>Manukau Harbour</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The board advocates for additional funding for the Manukau Harbour from the Natural Environment Targeted Rate.</li> </ul>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Ports of Auckland should be funding the Manukau Harbour Forum.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

**CARRIED**

**Note:** Pursuant Standing Orders 1.9.7 Deputy Chairperson, Jan Robinson, requested that her dissenting vote, which supports the Waste topic: “To move from a planned region-wide pay-as-you-throw system to a region-wide rates-funded refuse collection system” be recorded

## 12 Papakura Local Board and Youth Grants Programme 2022/2023

Resolution number PPK/2022/68

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Member G Hawkins:

**That the Papakura Local Board:**

- a) adopt the 2022/2023 Papakura Local Board Grants Programme and criteria as detailed in Attachment A to the report.
- b) adopt the 2022/2023 Papakura Youth Grants Programme and criteria as detailed in Attachment B to the report.

**CARRIED**

## 13 Endorsing Business Improvement District (BID) target rate for 2022/2023

Resolution number PPK/2022/69

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Member F Auva'a:

**That the Papakura Local Board:**

- a) recommend to the Governing Body the setting of the targeted rate for inclusion in the Annual Budget 2022/2023 for the following Business Improvement District (BID) programme:
  - (i) \$250,000 for Papakura Business Association.

**CARRIED**

## 14 Urgent decision - Papakura Local Board feedback on Te kapanoni i te hangarua: Transforming recycling

Resolution number PPK/2022/70

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Deputy Chairperson J Robinson:

**That the Papakura Local Board:**

- a) note the urgent decision of the Papakura Local Board which provided the board's formal feedback on the Ministry for the Environment's consultation document: *Te kapanoni i te hangarua: Transforming recycling* for inclusion into the Auckland council's submission as follows:

***That the Papakura Local Board:***

- a) ***provide the following feedback to the Governing Body on the Government's Resource Management system reform amendment proposal:***



**Relevance to the Papakura Local Board**

**Outcome four: A treasured environment and heritage**

**Objective: Papakura has successful programmes to help people reduce, reuse and recycle**

**Initiative: Continue to advocate for national law change on waste minimisation, particularly relating to product stewardship (including packaging waste). Product stewardship means those involved in a product's lifespan accept responsibility for reducing its environmental impact**

**i. Kaupapa whakahoki ipu - Container return scheme**

**1. Do you agree with the proposed definition of a beverage? (page 31)**

**Yes**

**2. Do you agree with the proposed definition of an eligible beverage container? (page 31)**

**Yes**

**3. Do you support the proposed refund amount of 20 cents? (pages 31-34)**

**Yes - support the proposed 20 cents refund amount.**

**4. How would you like to receive your refunds for containers? Please answer all that are relevant and select your preference. (page 34 – 38)**

- **Cash**
- **Electronic funds transfer (eg, through a scheme account or mobile phone app)**
- **Vouchers (for cash or equivalent value product purchase)**
- **Donations to local community organisations/charities**
- **Access to all options - Preferred**
- **Other**

**Other: Please specify**

**5. Do you support the inclusion of variable scheme fees to incentivise more recyclable packaging and, in the future, reusable packaging? (page 34 – 38)**

**Yes**

**6. Do you agree with the proposed broad scope of beverage container material types to be included in the NZ CRS? (page 38 – 40)**

**Yes**

**The Papakura Local Board is a strong advocate for product stewardship.**

**7. If you do not agree with the proposed broad scope (refer to Question 6), please select all container material types that you think should be included in the scheme.**

**No comment**

**8. Do you support a process where alternative beverage container packaging types could be considered on a case-by-case basis for inclusion within the NZ CRS? (page 40 – 41)**

**Yes**

**The board would like to see some sort of legislative approach that encourages the use of compostable containers. Many compostable containers are not easily home composted. Therefore, a similar return fee scheme should be set so they are easily returned for commercial composting.**

**9. Do you agree with the proposal to exempt fresh milk in all packaging types from the NZ CRS? (page 42 – 44)**

**Yes**

**10. Do you support the Ministry investigating how to target the commercial recovery of fresh milk beverage containers through other means? (page 44)**

**Yes**

**11. Do you support the Ministry investigating the option of declaring fresh milk beverage containers made out of plastic (eg, plastic milk bottles and liquid paperboard containers) a priority product and thereby including them within another product-stewardship scheme? (page 44)**

**Yes**

**12. We are proposing that beverage containers that are intended for refilling and have an established return/refillables scheme would be exempt from the NZ CRS at this stage. Do you agree?**

**Yes**

**13. Should there be a requirement for the proposed NZ CRS to support the New Zealand refillables market (eg, a refillable target)?**

**Yes**

**If this encourages less waste to landfill**

**14. Do you have any suggestions on how the Government could promote and incentivise the uptake of refillable beverage containers and other refillable containers more broadly?**

**No comment**

**15. Are there any other beverage packaging types or products that should be considered for exemption?**

**No comment**

**16. Do you agree that the size of eligible beverage containers would be 3 litres and smaller? (page 45)**

**Yes**

**Perhaps the container size could be reviewed after a period time.**

**17. Do you think that consumers should be encouraged to put lids back on their containers (if possible) before they return them for recycling under the scheme? (page 46)**

**Yes**

**18. Do you agree that the scheme should provide alternative means to capture and recycle beverage container lids that cannot be put back on the container?**

**No comment**

**19. Do you agree that a NZ CRS should use a 'mixed-return model' with a high degree of mandated retail participation to ensure consumers have easy access to container return/refund points, as well as the opportunity for voluntary participation in the network by interested parties?**

**Yes**

**20. Where would you find it easiest to return eligible beverage containers? Please answer all that are relevant and select your preference.**

- **Commercial recycling facility**
- **Waste transfer station**
- **Other community centres/hubs**
- **Local retail outlet that sells beverages - Preferred**
- **Supermarket - Preferred**
- **Community recycling/resource recovery centre - Preferred**
- **Shopping centre/mall - Preferred**
- **Other**

**Comment**

**Any place that makes it easy for people to return containers when going about their day-to-day business. The return places will probably need to have an on-site person to ensure compliance and arrange quick payouts.**

**21. Retailers that sell beverages are proposed to be regulated as part of the network (mandatory return-to-retail requirements). Should a minimum store size threshold apply? (page 52)**

Yes

*If yes, what size of retailer (shop floor) should be subject to mandatory return-to-retail requirements?*

- Over 100m<sup>2</sup> (many smaller dairies likely exempt)
- Over 200m<sup>2</sup> (many dairies and some petrol stations likely exempt)
- Over 300m<sup>2</sup> (many retailers, dairies, petrol stations and smaller supermarkets likely exempt)

**Additional Comments (optional)**

*A practicable approach is needed. A case-by-case approach might be required in some circumstances. The approach could be “apply for exemption” for the smaller sites.*

**22. Do you think the shop-floor-size requirements for retailers required to take back beverage containers (mandatory return-to-retail) should differ between rural and urban locations? (page 52)**

Yes

*If yes, what lower size threshold should be applied to rural retailers for them to be required to take back containers?*

- Over 60m<sup>2</sup> (as in Lithuania)
- Over 100m<sup>2</sup> (many smaller dairies likely exempt)
- Over 200m<sup>2</sup> (many dairies and some petrol stations likely exempt)
- Over 300m<sup>2</sup> (many retailers, dairies, petrol stations and smaller supermarkets likely exempt)

**Additional Comments (optional)**

*A practicable approach is needed. A case-by-case approach might be required in some circumstances. The approach could be “apply for exemption” for the smaller sites.*

**23. Do you agree that there should be other exemptions for retailer participation? (For example, if there is another return site nearby or for health and safety or food safety reasons.) (page 52)**

Yes

*Only if there is another large facility close by.*

**24. Do you agree with the proposed ‘deposit financial model’ for a NZ CRS? (page 53 - 55)**

Yes

**25. Do you agree that a NZ CRS would be a not-for-profit, industry-led scheme? (page 56 - 57)**

Yes

**26. Do you agree with the recovery targets for a NZ CRS of 85 per cent by year 3, and 90 per cent by year 5? (page 58)**

Yes

**27. If the scheme does not meet its recovery targets, do you agree that the scheme design (including the deposit level) should be reviewed and possibly increased? (page 58)**

Yes

**28. Do you support the implementation of a container return scheme for New Zealand? (page 58)**

Yes

**29. If you do not support or are undecided about a CRS, would you support implementation of a scheme if any of the key scheme design criteria were different? (eg, the deposit amount, scope of containers, network design, governance model, scheme financial model, etc).**

**No comment**

**Additional feedback:**

**Nil**

**ii. Improvements to household kerbside recycling**

**31. Do you agree with the proposal that a standard set of materials should be collected for household recycling at kerbside? (page 67 – 68)**

Yes

**The Papakura Local Board would like to see more effort by central government in encouraging enterprise to find other uses for products that are not currently recyclable. The optimum long-term objective must be a circular economy.**

**32. Do you agree that councils collecting different material types (in addition to a standard set) might continue to cause public confusion and contamination of recycling? (pages 67 – 68)**

Yes

**33. Do you think that national consistency can be achieved through voluntary measures, or is regulation required? (page 68 - 69)**

No

**It hasn't worked with a voluntary approach. However, consideration needs to be given to how councils can be financially supported to implement these changes if it is a regulated approach. Potentially council's will have made decisions regarding waste based on**

*keeping rates to a minimum rather than the optimum to the environment.*

*There is an opportunity to fund this by the product producers subsidising the regulated approach.*

*The aim should be to encourage more industries to produce or import recyclable packaging, ie: product stewardship.*

**34. Please mark below all the items from the proposed list which you agree should be included in the standard set of materials that can be recycled in household kerbside collections. (pages 69 – 73)**

- Glass bottles and jars**
- Paper and cardboard**
- Pizza boxes**
- Steel and aluminium tins and cans**
- Plastic bottles 1 (PET) and 2 (HDPE)**
- Plastic containers and trays 1 (PET) and 2 (HDPE)**
- Plastic containers 5 (PP)**

**35. If you think any of the materials above (Q34) should be excluded, please explain which ones and why. (page 69 - 73)**

**No comment**

**36. If you think any additional materials should be included, please explain which ones and why. (page 74)**

**Ordinary appliance batteries (eg: AAA, AA, DD, 9volt, hearing aid batteries etc.) should be easily returned to the retailer or recycled to keep them out of the landfills.**

**37. Do you agree that the standard set of materials should be regularly reviewed and, provided certain conditions are met, new materials added? (page 74 – 75)**

**Yes**

**Happy for new materials to be added but do not support materials being deleted as it will add to confusion over time.**

**38. What should be considered when determining whether a class of materials should be accepted at kerbside in the future? (Mark all that apply) (page 75)**

- Sustainable end markets**
- End markets solutions are circular and minimise Environmental harm**
- Viable processing technologies**
- Processing by both automated and manual Material recovery facilities**
- No adverse effects on local authorities, including financial**

*Supply chains contribute appropriately to recovery and end-of-life solutions for their products*

*Other*

*Additional comments (optional)*

*Emerging new technologies and innovation to expand the circular economy approach to recycled materials needs to be financed and supported. A long-term approach needs to be taken.*

**39. Who should decide how new materials are added to the list?**

*The responsible Minister*

*Ministry for the Environment staff in consultation with a reference stakeholder group*

*Existing Waste Advisory Board*

*An independent board*

*Other (please specify):*

*Additional comments (optional)*

*A collaborative approach with all affected parties would be best in determining adding new materials to the list.*

**40. Do you agree that, in addition to these kerbside policies, New Zealand should have a network of convenient and easy places where people can recycle items that cannot easily be recycled kerbside? For example, some items are too large or too small to be collected in kerbside recycling.**

Yes

**41. Do you agree that food and garden waste should be diverted from landfills? (page 76 – 77)**

Yes

*Papakura has had a food scraps waste collection service for several years now and it has proved successful. A continued education programme is required to keep people motivated to use it. We also see the benefit of the output (the compost) where the community can make arrangements to collect a couple bags of compost to use on their gardens free of charge.*

**42. Do you agree that all councils should offer a weekly kerbside food scraps collection to divert as many food scraps as possible from landfills? (page 76 – 77)**

Yes

**43. Do you agree that these collections should be mandatory in urban areas (defined as towns with a population of 1000 plus) and in any smaller settlements where there are existing kerbside collections? (page 76 – 77)**

**No comment**

**44. Do you think councils should play a role in increasing the diversion of household garden waste from landfills? (page 77)**

**Yes**

**If yes, what are the most effective ways for councils to divert garden waste?**

- **Offering a subsidised user-pays green-waste bin? - preferred**
- **Making it more affordable for people to drop-off green waste at transfer stations? - preferred**

**45. We propose a phased approach to the rollout of kerbside food scraps collections. The timeframes will depend on whether new processing facilities are needed. Do you agree with a phased approach? (page 77 – 78)**

**Yes**

**This allows for gearing up. However, there is already a food scraps processing facility developed in Reporoa with a transfer facility in Papakura that could potentially be used in the interim. It would be worth investigating whether there is an opportunity to scale up and take food scraps from a wider area than just Auckland.**

**46. Do you agree that councils with access to suitable existing infrastructure should have until 2025 to deliver food scraps collections? (page 77 – 79)**

**Yes**

**47. Do you agree that councils without existing infrastructure should have until 2030 to deliver food scraps collections? (page 77 – 79)**

**No, it should be sooner**

**The government should provide financial assistance for those council without existing infrastructure.**

**48. Are there any facilities, in addition to those listed below, that have current capacity and resource consent to take household food scraps? (page 77 – 79)**

**No comment**

**49. Are there any additional materials\* that should be excluded from kerbside food and garden bins? (page 79 – 81)**

**No comment**

**50. For non-food products or packaging to be accepted in a food scraps bin or a food and garden waste bin, what should be taken into consideration? Mark all that apply.(page 82 – 83)**



- Products help divert food waste from landfills.*
- Products meet New Zealand standards for compostability.*
- Products are certified in their final form to ensure they do not pose a risk to soil or human health.*
- Products are clearly labelled so that they can be distinguished from non-compostable products.*
- A technology or process is available to easily identify and sort compostable from non-compostable products.*
- Producers and users of the products and packaging contribute to the cost of collecting and processing.*

**Comment**

*New technologies need to be advanced to achieve the best results.*

**51. If you think any of the materials listed above should be included in kerbside food and garden bins, please explain which ones and why. (page 82 – 83)**

**No comment**

**52. Do you agree that it is important to understand how well kerbside collections are working? (page 84 – 86)**

**Yes**

**53. Do you agree with the proposal that the private sector should also report on their household kerbside collections so that the overall performance of kerbside services in the region can be understood? (page 84 – 86)**

**Yes**

**54. Do you agree that the information should be published online for transparency? (page 84 – 86)**

**Yes**

*Potentially there is an opportunity for an education campaign to be built around the release of the information.*

**55. Apart from diversion and contamination rates, should any other information be published online? (page 84 – 86)**

**No comment**

**56. Should kerbside recycling services have to achieve a minimum diversion rate (eg, collect at least a specified percentage of recyclable materials in the household waste stream)? (page 87)**

**Yes**

*A consistent education programme will be required to keep people motivated to recycle and use the food scraps bin to achieve the proposed targets.*

**57. Should the minimum diversion rate be set at 50 per cent for the diversion of dry recyclables and food scraps? (page 87)**

**Yes**

***A consistent education programme will be required to keep people motivated to recycle and use the food scraps bin to achieve the proposed targets.***

***The target should be reviewed regularly with an ultimate aim of increasing the target.***

**58. We propose that territorial authorities have until 2030 to achieve the minimum diversion rate, at which time the rate will be reviewed. Do you agree? (page 87 - 88)**

**Yes**

**59. In addition to minimum standards, should a high-performance target be set for overall collection performance to encourage territorial authorities to achieve international best practice? (page 87 – 88)**

**Yes**

**60. Some overseas jurisdictions aim for diversion rates of 70 per cent. Should New Zealand aspire to achieve a 70 per cent target? (page 87 – 88)**

**Yes**

**61. What should the consequences be for territorial authorities that do not meet minimum performance standards? For example withholding levy payments or paying a fine. (page 88)**

***Incentives may be required but a punitive approach should be the last resort.***

**62. Should either glass or paper/cardboard be collected separately at kerbside in order to improve the quality of these materials and increase the amount recycled? (page 90 - 92)**

- Glass separate**
- Paper/cardboard separate**
- Separated, but councils choose which one to separate**
- Status quo – they remain comingled for some councils**

**63. If glass or paper/cardboard is to be collected separately, should implementation: (page 90 – 92)**

- Begin immediately**
- Wait for any CRS scheme design to be finalised**
- Wait until the impact of a CRS scheme has been observed**

**64. Should all councils offer household kerbside recycling services? (page 93 – 95)**

**Yes**

**65. Should these services be offered at a minimum to all population centres of more than 1000 people? (page 93 – 95)**

**No comment**

**66. Do you agree that councils without any council-funded kerbside recycling collections should implement these collections within two years of their next Waste Management and Minimisation Plan? (page 93 – 95)**

**Yes – with government support**

**67. What research, technical support or behaviour change initiatives are needed to support the implementation of this programme of work? (page 96 – 98)**

**No comment**

### **iii. Separation of business food waste**

**68. Should commercial businesses be expected to divert food waste from landfills as part of reducing their emissions? (page 98 – 100)**

**Yes**

**69. Should all commercial businesses be diverting food waste from landfills by 2030? (page 105 – 107)**

**Yes**

**70. Should separation be phased in, depending on access to suitable processing facilities (eg, composting or anaerobic digestion)? (page 108 – 109)**

**Yes**

**71. Should businesses that produce food have a shorter lead-in time than businesses that do not? (page 108 – 109)**

**Yes**

**72. Should any businesses be exempt? (page 108 – 109)**

**No**

**73. What support should be provided to help businesses reduce their food waste? (page 108 – 109)**

*There should be some support eg:*

- *Education programme*
- *Phased financial support for upgrades*
- *Expert advice on best practice*

**Additional feedback:**

*No comment*

**CARRIED**

## 15 Consideration of Extraordinary Items

There was no consideration of extraordinary items.

4.48 pm

The Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and attention to business and declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD  
AT A MEETING OF THE PAPAURA LOCAL BOARD  
HELD ON

**DATE:**.....

**CHAIRPERSON:**.....