

Kaunihera | Council

Ngā Tāpiritanga – Mēneti | Attachments – Minutes

Attachments – Minutes of a meeting of an ordinary meeting of Matamata-Piako District Council held in the Council Chambers, 35 Kenrick Street, TE AROHA on 28 May 2025 at 09:00.

TAKE | ITEM NGĀ IHINGA | TABLE OF CONTENTS

WHĀRANGI | PAGE

7.1 Adoption of Development Contributions 2025/26

Attachment A Development Contributions 2025-26 Revised figures tabled at Council meeting 28.05.25 with minor amendments for clarity2

7.3 MPDC response to Waste Legislation amendments

Attachment A Additional Attachment - 7. 3 - MPDC response to WMA consultation - 28 May 20255

Note: The attachments contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Councillors require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.



UPDATED FIGURES AS TABLED TO COUNCIL MEETING 28.05.25 PLUS MINOR AMENDMENTS FOR CLARITY

Development and Financial Contribution Fees		2025/26
<p><u>Development Contributions</u></p> <p>In accordance with section 106 of the Local Government Act 2002, the development contribution fees for 2025/26 set out below have been increased by an amount not exceeding the result of multiplying together –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the rate of increase (if any) in the PPI since the development contribution was last set or increased; and (ii) the proportion of the total costs of capital expenditure to which the development contribution will be applied that does not relate to interest and other financing costs. <p>The rate for the Producer Price Index for construction (PPI) is 1.73%</p> <p>To view the full methodology demonstrating how the calculations for the development contributions were made, please see our Development Contributions Policy here</p> <p><u>Financial Contributions</u></p> <p>Financial contributions have been increased by PPI of 1.73%</p> <p>To view the provisions of the District Plan that relate to financial contributions, please see the District Plan, Part B Section 7 here</p>		
Matamata		
Development contributions		
Time Period / Relevant Policy	Activity	Fee
2024 to 2027 LTP 2024-34 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 1,916.24
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 11,739.38
	Water	\$ 359.88
2021 to 2024 LTP 2021-31 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 7,802.41
	Stormwater	\$ 780.50
	Wastewater	\$ 13,294.00
	Water	\$ 6,637.88
2018 to 2021 LTP 2018-28 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 5,353.96
	Stormwater	\$ 610.60
	Wastewater	\$ 9,741.70
	Water	\$ 5,209.70
2015 to 2018 LTP 2015-25 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 2,723.40
	Stormwater	\$ 3,097.83
	Wastewater	\$ 6,423.17

	Water	\$ 4,629.02
2012 to 2015 LTP 2012-22 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 2,818.55
	Stormwater	\$ 2,821.58
	Wastewater	\$ 5,579.54
	Water	\$ 4,503.83
Financial contributions		
Relevant Document	Activity	Fee
District Plan Part B, Section 7	Parks/reserves	\$ 1,717.74
Morrinsville		
Development contributions		
Time Period / Relevant Policy	Activity	Fee
2024 to 2027 LTP 2024-34 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 1,111.69
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 13,432.96
	Water	\$ 2,281.36
2021 to 2024 LTP 2021-31 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 2,671.11
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 9,210.38
	Water	\$ 7,122.86
2018 to 2021 LTP 2018-28 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 2,316.52
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 7,821.70
	Water	\$ 4,938.85
2015 to 2018 LTP 2015-25 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 3,537.63
	Stormwater	\$ 428.61
	Wastewater	\$ 4,275.26
	Water	\$ 3,619.90
2012 to 2015 LTP 2012-22 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 2,971.18
	Stormwater	\$ 2,014.49
	Wastewater	\$ 8,727.32
	Water	\$ 2,059.37
Financial contributions		
Relevant Document	Activity	Fee
District Plan Part B, Section 7	Parks/reserves	\$ 1,717.74

Te Aroha		
Development contributions		
Time Period / Relevant Policy	Activity	Fee
2024 to 2027 LTP 2024-34 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 58.22
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 116.43
	Water	\$ 359.88
2021 to 2024 LTP 2021-31 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 1,284.21
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 1,664.96
	Water	\$ 31.44
2018 to 2021 LTP 2018-28 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 1,134.33
	Stormwater	\$ -
	Wastewater	\$ 3,821.66
	Water	\$ 38.39
2015 to 2018 LTP 2015-25 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 826.05
	Stormwater	\$ 2,559.57
	Wastewater	\$ 4,843.78
	Water	\$ 2,743.42
2012 to 2015 LTP 2012-22 Development Contributions Policy	Roading	\$ 2,927.43
	Stormwater	\$ 4,670.66
	Wastewater	\$ 7,626.52
	Water	\$ 3,769.53
Financial contributions		
Relevant Document	Activity	Fee
District Plan Part B, Section 7	Parks/reserves	\$ 1,717.74

Response to: Consultation on proposed amendments to waste legislation on behalf of MPDC

Glossary		
EPR	Extended Producer Responsibility	i.e. Tyrewise programme/ 20 cents on beverage containers
WTE	Waste to Energy	Burning waste for energy recovery/ anaerobic digestion
WMMP	Waste Management & Minimisation Plan	Our TA Waste Plan

This paper is in response to MfE consultation to the Waste Management Act 2008 and Litter Act 1979

Proposed amendments to waste legislation including:

1. Creating a framework for extended producer responsibility
2. Improving the waste levy system through changes to levy allocation, distribution and use
3. Clarifying the roles and responsibilities in the waste legislation
4. Creating a modern, effective compliance regime
5. Enabling efficient and effective controls for littering and other types of mismanaged waste

Questions – Overview for readers

There are:	Staff have answered:
3x questions related to waste and 16x questions related to litter	Yes to 25 waste related questions
Each question requires a Yes/No/Unsure response	No to 4 waste related questions
Extra comments are then added	Unsure or None to 2 questions

Staff have collaborated with:

- Waikato and Eastern Bay of Plenty councils & regional councils
- Our national waste industry sector group and the TAO Forum (TA's nationwide)
- National Zero Waste Network

Council's response aligns with all of these groups with some small variations.

For example some TA's recommend a 3-year review, while we support the 5-year review proposed.

We all support retaining the use of waste levy funds being retained for waste related activities and oppose the expansion to allow for other 'environmental activities'.

Litter

Councils Solid Waste Lead has spoken to the roading and enforcement team internally about the proposed amendments to the litter sections of the Act.

The feedback has resulted in answering yes to all the litter related questions.

We will not submit any further comments on litter as some of the groups listed above have larger teams, more formal procedures and are better placed to provide feedback to this section

1. Creating a framework for extended producer responsibility

We are interested in your views on an EPR framework

Q1: Do you support the proposal for a modern EPR framework?

Yes - We see EPR as an essential tool and support the changes outlined.

If shifting EPR schemes to regulation will allow for faster implementation including obligations, key financial controls and compliance we fully support this change. The current priority schemes have been in development for over 10-years and in the meantime ratepayers continue to bear the costs. Any move that will expedite the EPR process to manage a wider range of materials and products is welcomed and is well over due.

It is clear business and industry support regulation as do territorial authorities and action has been requested on multiple occasions by all parties involved.

Q2: Do you support discontinuing the government accreditation of voluntary product stewardship schemes?

Yes - We fully support discontinuing voluntary schemes as they are of no benefit to our ratepayers. Resources are better used speeding up regulated schemes.

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on this proposal.

MfE staff during their final webinar on 21/5/25 mentioned a 'Priority Setting Tool' and requested feedback. This 'tool' would allow for new products and materials to be included for EPR. We support this and recommend new products are included for EPR based on volume and harm.

The Investment categories included in the cabinet papers released are somewhat limiting and do not reflect the current situation. They appear to be stuck in the previous decade while we confront other significant wastes that continue to grow.

It is noted Mint Innovation a NZ company seen as a global leader in extracting critical metals from e-waste have yet to invest in NZ stating 'both financial and regulatory support' is needed.¹ The new framework proposed appears to support these comments by shifting to a regulated environment. It seems out of step that other countries can take advantage of innovative NZ technology while we continue to lag behind.

In addition, textiles are a significant waste stream, and growing, both in NZ and globally. While we have some local solutions they require scaling up, and investment. Textiles should be added as an Investment Category.²

We support investment through the WMF to scale-up a wider range of problematic waste streams rather than diverting funds to 'other environment activities'. This includes reuse which sits at the top of the waste hierarchy. This will reduce exports of waste to lesser developed countries³, many of whom are closing their doors to waste imports with little notice.⁴ This leaves NZ in a risky situation with no place to go.

¹ E-waste recycler Mint raises \$60m Series C - why it's still favouring offshore plants over NZ - NZ Herald

² Envirohub BOP Reported that they face a bill of \$190,000 annually for waste. Some of this is as a result of "dumping" and some are textiles that are donated that just cannot be repurposed.

³ <https://english.elpais.com/climate/2025-03-01/where-do-the-clothes-go-after-we-put-them-in-a-recycling-bin-an-11-month-investigation-covering-thousands-of-kilometers.html>

⁴ [Thailand bans all plastic waste imports](#)

2. Improving the waste levy system through changes to levy allocation, distribution and use

Scope of use of levy funds

Note to readers: all questions relate to the use of levy funds

Q3: Do you support changing the distribution of levy funds to territorial authorities from a population-based calculation to a combination of a base flat rate (20 per cent) and a population based calculation (80 per cent)?

Yes We support the distribution altered to the 20/80% split

Q4 a activities that promote or achieve waste minimisation, in accordance with and as set out in the territorial authorities' Waste Management and Minimisation Plan

Yes – TA's should only be allowed to spend funds as per their WMMP's. Provided WMMP's are focused on waste activities as per the scope of the current WMA and are not expanded to include 'other activities'.

Q4 b and c costs associated and with managing emergency waste and activities that provide for the remediation of contaminated sites and vulnerable landfills

No -The cost of managing emergency waste can be substantial.
As can the remediation of contaminated sites and vulnerable landfills

These activities should be managed through a central government agency as the costs can be both onerous and ongoing. Hawkes Bay cleanup from Cyclone Gabrielle is still underway 2-years later. We are concerned the responsibility for remediation of 'orphan' sites will be shifted to TA's who were not responsible for the site in the first place.

This could also deplete TA funds dealing with emergency and historic wastes rather than investing in new infrastructure and services for the reduction of waste on behalf of our communities.

Q4 d: compliance, monitoring and enforcement of mismanaged waste.

Unsure – to be able to answer we would require greater clarity around exactly what is being proposed.

Q4 e activities that reduce environmental harm or increase environmental benefits.

No - We categorically do not support the expansion and inclusion of activities that cause or reduce environmental harm being funded by the waste levy.

Without a clear definition of 'environmental benefits' this could include any activity. Further, measuring outcomes, compliance and financial reporting would be extremely difficult. De-hypothecating the levy from its intended use (to reduce and minimise waste) would effectively make the waste levy a 'tax'.

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on this proposal.

Governments Waste Levy funds were expanded in 2024 (under urgency) to fund contaminated site remediation, restoring fresh water catchments, and emergency management waste. Other than fresh-water the activities the investment categories are waste related as per the intent of the WMA.

We do not support further expansion of the waste levy to other categories that may have, or are, funded through other ministries budgets at this point in time, noting in the cabinet papers released this is clearly the intent and will result in passing costs from the crown to TA's⁵:

'We heard from you that in relation to potential cost savings from the waste levy and WMF, your preferred approach to explore further is option three: broadening the scope of the waste levy to fund a broader set of Government waste-related activities and in doing so achieve savings by offsetting costs currently borne by the Crown.

There is an opportunity to make changes to the Act to broaden the scope of activities fundable via the levy and continue the incremental increases in the levy rates. This will enable us to fund a broader range of waste-related and environmental outcomes, and to also achieve overall savings in respect to the 2024/25 to 2027/28 budget period.

Based on this proposal, a wider set of environmental activities would be funded from levy revenue (through a scope expansion of the Waste Minimisation appropriation). This allows for a reduction, or closure, of the separate appropriations through which these activities are currently funded. By reducing or closing these appropriations, savings for the Crown are generated'.

Funding for environmental activities is well outside the established scope and intent of the WMA. This change appears to reduce Government operating budgets and provide savings to the Crown at the expense of our sector. NZ waste levy is \$65 per tonne. We note while some Australian states do allow for the waste levy to fund other environmental activities their levy rates per tonne are substantially higher (Victoria \$167.90, NSW \$163.20).

It is well recognised NZ has a financial deficit of between \$2.1-\$2.6 billion for waste minimisation and management infrastructure⁶. WMF investment to date has only just begun addressing a very narrow range of products and existing infrastructure clearly needs significant and ongoing investment. Other waste streams are increasing and investment will also be needed to manage these.

Recycling is an exponential and increasing cost to TA's. Having clear criteria and not a 'catch-all' for any environmental programme will reduce and delay the expansion of much needed waste infrastructure development.

The coalition government waste hierarchy has reduction and reuse at the top of the hierarchy. Reuse systems are developing globally and there is no indication investment will be allocated towards actions that will limit the production of wastes in the first place.

The waste sector has waited a long time for the required investment in infrastructure and while some progress has been made it is clear more investment is needed. To expand the use to include other environmental activities when the funds are beginning to become useful, and before essential infrastructure is developed, is a real cause for concern. We do not support this expansion at all.

We recommend the Investment Categories (contaminated sites and vulnerable landfills, Infrastructure, System Design, Other Project investment) are retained and not expanded any further unless it is a large waste stream causing issues, for example textiles, or a system that focuses on waste prevention, or reuse as recommended to MfE in the Sapere Report.⁷

We note the water and waste water sector has access to both assistance, low interest rate loans and funding through the NZ Infrastructure Commission, while the waste management sector is specifically excluded. The waste sector few options for infrastructure financing outside of the waste levy funds, ratepayers, and commercial operator investment.

⁵ <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/Proactive-release-full-pack-Waste-Minimisation-Amendment-Bill-final-version.pdf> - pages 44 & 4

⁶ <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/program-of-action-for-reducing-waste-in-aotearoa-cabinet-paper.pdf>

⁷ <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Waste-levy-review.pdf>

We are asking for the necessary investment be made, (particularly in rural areas) before the use of waste levy funds is further expanded to support any other environmental activities. That is both the TA portion and the Government portion.

The inclusion of other categories outside of waste could be included following the first review (in 5-years' time) but not before. And, only provided the waste sector has developed the systems, infrastructure and capacity to manage waste effectively.

5: Please share any suggestions for criteria that could form a decision-making framework for possible spending of the waste levy on environmental benefits and/or reduction of environmental harm.

Q5

None - We reject the expansion of the WMA to include any other environmental activities in full.

Further levy effectiveness considerations

Q6: Do you support removal of the current blanket exclusion from the levy for waste-to-energy facilities?

Yes - we support waste-to-energy facilities of all types being included for levy payments.
To do so will require clear definition of each type of waste-to-energy facility.

Similar to landfill classes the levy rate on any WTE facility should be based on the level of perceived harm and include facilities of all types; i.e. WTE, anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis etc.

A low levy rate attributed to facilities that cause 'less harm' (i.e. anaerobic digestion with energy recovery) would be a cost effective way to gather real time and accurate data around a wide range of activities which currently sit outside reporting requirements.

Regulation needs to be flexible enough to provide for the inclusion of new processing methods to manage waste that may be developed over time due to innovation.

Q7: Do you agree that the Minister's considerations for a review of the effectiveness of the waste levy should mirror the scope of the purpose of the WMA and the parameters for levy spend (once these are decided)?

No - We do not support the TA levy allocation being broadened to match the new spending parameters for central government which includes restoring fresh water catchments added in 2024 under urgency. A yes answer would de facto indicate our support for the addition of 'other environmental activities' included in the government al.

Q8: Do you support changing the timeframe for review of the effectiveness of the waste levy from every three years to at least every five years?

Yes - We support a review being moved to 5-years noting the initial 1-2 year period could be the construction phase and reduction or diversion would not commence until plant was fully commissioned.

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on these proposals.

Use of waivers

Q9: Do you support replacing the current levy-waiver requirement of 'exceptional circumstances', instead enabling the Secretary to waive the requirement for an operator to pay any amount of levy in specified circumstances?

Yes – we support any initiative that will speed up processes and reduce overheads

Q10: Do you support limiting the waiver requirement to emergency event situations for which a state of national or local emergency has been declared under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and biosecurity responses have been undertaken under Part 7 of the Biosecurity Act 1993?

Yes – provided this is managed by a central agency

Q11: Do you agree the waiver requirement for waste from the remediation of a contaminated site should specify any eligibility criteria that an application must meet?

Yes – provided criteria is published and this is managed by a central agency and the responsibility and cost is not de facto shifted to TA's.

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on these proposals.

We fully support the Secretary being enabled to waive levy requirements on the proviso the reasons for doing so are published and there is transparency around decision making.

Conditions and exemptions

Q12: Do you support requiring a Minister to consider specific criteria before recommending levy exemption regulations are made (instead of the current requirement that the Minister is satisfied 'exceptional circumstances' exist)?

Yes

Q13: Do you support applying a timeframe of a maximum of five years before levy exemptions via regulations must be reviewed or allowed to expire?

Yes

Q14: Do you agree that the Minister should be able to impose conditions on levy exemptions?

Yes

We support all of the conditions listed above and agree with the 5-year review period.

Reuse of material at disposal facilities

Note to readers – disposal facility means landfill

Q15: Do we need to clarify in legislation when the levy should be imposed on waste disposed of at a disposal facility, so that waste reuse on site is operationally necessary and reasonable?

Yes

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on this proposal.

Stockpiling controls

Q16: Do you support improvements to stockpiling controls by introducing tools such as:

16a: an approval system with limits and conditions?

Yes

We fully support these amendments for disposal facilities to provide clarity around stockpiling, including use onsite.

Q16b: changes to the stockpile calculation process to track the throughput of materials

Yes

Q16c: a stockpile volume threshold limit.

Yes

Q16d: improved data collection, record-keeping and reporting provisions, to increase transparency and traceability of material entering and leaving a site

Yes

Q16e: defining/amending the terms 'diverted material', 'accumulation' and 'stockpiling' in the legislation?

Yes

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on these proposals.

3. Clarifying the roles and responsibilities in the waste legislation

We are interested in your views on clarifying the role of central government and territorial authorities in the waste legislation

Q17a: Do you support the proposed changes to the roles and responsibilities for the Ministry for the Environment:
Yes

Q17b: Do you support the proposed changes to the roles and responsibilities for the New Zealand Customs Service
Yes

Q17c: Do you support the proposed changes to the roles and responsibilities for territorial authorities?
Yes

Q18: Do you support a change in the Secretary for the Environment's ability to retain levy payments to a territorial authority, from mandatory to discretionary?

Unsure: Our concern the inclusion of activities that fall outside the scope and intent of the current WMA could, or would, be imposed. This includes the direction of funds towards 'other environmental activities' which we do not support.

Q19: Do you support enabling the Waste Advisory Board to provide advice at its discretion?
Yes

We support this change on the proviso however signal the possible risk of lobbying.

4. Creating a modern, effective compliance regime

Q 20. Do you agree the regulator should have greater powers to receive data, including the ability to share with other regulators and the Ministry?

Yes - We support and understand the regulator requires greater powers, including the sharing of data.

Q 21: Do you support the proposed tiered approach to the compliance tools and sanctions?

Yes

We support the tiered approach to compliance tools.

Please share any further thoughts or ideas on these proposals

While this question relates data sharing for the Compliance/ Monitoring/ Enforcement (CME) functions and for EPR purposes we believe gathering data and reporting should be extended to support national licensing, reporting and tracking of waste and recycling for all commercial operators.

Excluding commercial operators belies the fact significant tonnages of recycling and materials do not pass through a disposal facility or transfer station, the only facilities where data is collected. This will bring commercial sector waste services in line with the existing reporting obligations of TA's.

Commercially collected recycling tonnages may go directly to a baling plant, or Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and following baling be sent for reprocessing or export. Scrap metal and e-waste tonnages are also not accounted for and are not captured. Not accounting for these tonnages skews tonnage diverted and recycled results, including those reported internationally. Without this data it is unclear where further investment is needed, and what progress (if any) has been made.

Eunomia Research and Consulting NZ has completed a number of different reports and in the Waikato District we have completed a pilot project that is yet to be implemented. All data should be managed by a 3rd party to maintain commercial sensitivity and the results published annually. Data should be gathered regionally for reporting to a national level and be managed to maintain commercial sensitivity.

The Australian Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water have regulations that capture this data at a state level, and on a far wider range of facilities, other than disposal facilities. Aggregated at a country level this allows for better decision making and investment.⁸ We should follow this example as once again NZ continues to lag behind.

⁸ <https://www.dcccew.gov.au/environment/protection/waste/publications/national-standard-waste-resource-recovery-data-reporting-second-edition>

5. Enabling efficient and effective controls for littering and other types of mismanaged waste

Questions 22 to 37 all answered Yes