



AGENDA

Ordinary Council Meeting Thursday, 10 July 2025

Date: Thursday, 10 July 2025

Time: 10.30 am

**Location: Ngā Hau e Whā, William Fraser Building,
1 Dunorling Street, Alexandra**

(A link to the live stream will be available on the Central Otago District Council's website.)

**Peter Kelly
Chief Executive Officer**

Notice is hereby given that a Council Meeting will be held in Microsoft Teams and live streamed via Microsoft Teams on Thursday, 10 July 2025 at 10.30 am. The link to the live stream will be available on the Central Otago District Council's website.

Order Of Business

1	Karakia.....	5
2	Apologies	5
3	Confirmation of Minutes.....	5
	Ordinary Council Meeting - 25 June 2025	7
	Extraordinary Council Meeting - 30 June 2025.....	21
4	Declarations of Interest	32
	25.14.1 Declarations of Interest Register.....	32
3	Resolution to Exclude the Public	37
	25.14.3 Offer for a Land Access Arrangement.....	37
6	CONFIRMATION OF CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES	38
7	CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS	38
8	public forum.....	39
9	Reports	40
	25.14.3 Southern Water Done Well	40
8	Date of the Next Meeting	67

Members Her Worship the Mayor T Alley (Chairperson), Cr N Gillespie, Cr S Browne, Cr L Claridge, Cr I Cooney, Cr S Duncan, Cr S Feinerman, Cr C Laws, Cr N McKinlay, Cr M McPherson, Cr T Paterson

In Attendance P Kelly (Chief Executive Officer), L Fleck (General Manager - People and Culture and Acting Group Manager - Community Vision), J Muir (Three Waters Director), S Righarts (Group Manager – Governance and Business Services), D Rushbrook (Regional Deals Lead), D Scoones (Group Manager - Community Experience), Q Penniall (Acting Group Manager - Planning and Infrastructure), S Reynolds (Acting Governance Manager)

1 KARAKIA

Cr Gillespie will begin the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting - 25 June 2025

Extraordinary Council Meeting - 30 June 2025

**MINUTES OF A COUNCIL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL
HELD AT NGĀ HAU E WHĀ, WILLIAM FRASER BUILDING, 1 DUNORLING STREET,
ALEXANDRA
AND LIVE STREAMED VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS ON WEDNESDAY, 25 JUNE 2025
COMMENCING AT 10.31 AM**

PRESENT: Her Worship the Mayor T Alley (Chairperson), Cr N Gillespie, Cr S Browne, Cr L Claridge, Cr I Cooney, Cr S Duncan, Cr S Feinerman, Cr C Laws,

IN ATTENDANCE: P Kelly (Chief Executive Officer), L Fleck (General Manager - People and Culture and Acting General Manager Community Vision), J Muir (Three Waters Director), S Righarts (Group Manager - Business Support), D Rushbrook (Regional Deals Lead), D Scoones (Group Manager - Community Experience), L van der Voort (Group Manager - Planning and Infrastructure), P Morris (Chief Financial Officer), Q Penniall (Infrastructure Manager), G Robinson (Property and Facilities Manager), Z Zeelie (Statutory Property Team Leader), R Williams (Community Development Lead), N Lanham (Economic Development Lead), G Bailey (Parks and Recreation Manager), M Burnett (Parks Officer – Strategy and Planning), J Remnant (Asset Management Team Leader), P Fleet (Roading Manager), P Keenan (Capital Projects Programme Manager), J Thomas (Water Services Sampling and Monitoring Team Lead), S Reynolds (Acting Governance Manager)

1 KARAKIA

Cr Claridge gave a karakia to begin the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES

RESOLUTION

Moved: Alley
Seconded: Browne

That apologies from Cr N McKinlay, Cr M McPherson and Cr T Paterson be received and accepted.

CARRIED

Note: Cr Feinerman joined the meeting at 10.33 am

3 PUBLIC FORUM

Hayley Anderson and Richard Thomson - Central Otago Health Service Limited

Ms Anderson outlined the challenges of providing healthcare in rural areas and listed the services currently offered at Dunstan Hospital.

Mr Thomson urged councillors to strengthen the case for Central Otago under the Regional Deal proposal, noting that a base hospital in Queenstown would mean that many Central Otago residents would have to travel further for care.

They then responded to questions.

Carole Gillions – Abbeyfields

Ms Gillions spoke to the Abbeyfield's proposal, noting the acute need for the facility in the district and the proven track record of the housing provider. She outlined the various benefits that this type of accommodation could offer to the community.

Ms Gillions then responded to questions.

Rob van der Mark – Sustainable Tarras

Mr van der Mark spoke about the proposed mine and raised concerns on behalf of the Bendigo and Tarras communities. He stated that he believed Santana Minerals were already in breach of the district plan operating an industrial site in a rural resource area and that he considered their plans grossly underestimate the detrimental effects to the valley and the locally affected community.

Mr van der Mark asked that the council remain vigilant to the effects of the mine in the district and that they communicate fully and rapidly with the community through the fast track application process.

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**RESOLUTION**

Moved: Cooney
Seconded: Browne

That the public minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 28 May 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were reminded of their obligations in respect of declaring any interests. There were no further declarations of interest.

6 COMMUNITY BOARD CHAIR UPDATE**25.12.2 COMMUNITY BOARD CHAIR UPDATE**

Robert Hazlett, Chair of the Maniototo Community Board joined the meeting to discuss matters of interest to the Board.

Mr Hazlett listed roads in the area where roadside spraying had been inadequate and noted some other road maintenance issues.

He also noted the problem with low water storage in Naseby and hoped this issue could be rectified soon.

He raised concerns about the unfixed sprinklers in Maniototo Park and asked that the new water services contractor be required to follow the same call-out response deadlines as previously.

25.12.3 COMMUNITY BOARD CHAIR UPDATE

Jayden Cromb, Chair of the Vincent Community Board had recorded a video that was played at the meeting.

Mr Cromb outlined the reports on today's agenda that related to the Vincent ward, specifically the Abbeyfield's report and noted the Vincent Community Boards full support of this project. He emphasized that the facility would help to reduce the town's housing shortage and free up single-occupied family homes.

7 REPORTS

25.12.4 ABBEYFIELD DEVELOPMENT - CLUTHA STREET - REQUEST TO GIFT PART OF SECTION 13 BLK XXXIV TN OF ALEXANDRA

To consider the request from Abbeyfield Alexandra for Council to gift part of Section 13 BLK XXXIV TN of Alexandra as shown in site plan, Appendix "1" to Abbeyfield Alexandra to be amalgamated with the adjoining land described as proposed Lot 2 for the purpose of the development of affordable housing.

Discussion followed on the potential for this decision to set a precedent for other developments. Consideration was also given to whether this resolution was consistent with the policy 'Provision for different housing typologies in developments on Council owned land'.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Claridge
Seconded: Feinerman

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves the proposal to gift the land indicated on site plan, Appendix "1" of the report, being part of Section 13 BLK XXXIV TN of Alexandra to Abbeyfield New Zealand (Alexandra) for amalgamation to proposed Lot 2 provided that:
 - (a) All legal and survey costs associated with the boundary adjustment, amalgamation and uplifting of designation be paid by Abbeyfield (Alexandra).
 - (b) A survey of the land be done at the cost of Abbeyfield Alexandra.
 - (c) The gifted land is utilised for the development of affordable housing.
 - (d) Should the development not proceed the land be returned to Council.
- C. Authorises the Chief Executive to do all that is necessary to give effect to the resolution.

CARRIED

Note: Rebekah De Jong, Brian Budd and Jan Bean, from Central Otago District Arts Trust and Russell Garbutt and Ann Cowie from the Central Otago Heritage Trust joined the meeting for item 25.12.5

Note: Her Worship the Mayor left the meeting at 11.32 am and returned at 11.34 am.
Cr Duncan left the meeting at 11.32 am and returned at 11.33 am.

Cr Claridge left the meeting at 11.47 am and returned at 11.48 am.

25.12.5 COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS 2024/25 FINANCIAL YEAR

To provide the accountability reports for the 2024/2025 financial year community grants to the Central Otago District Arts Trust and the Central Otago Heritage Trust.

Mr. Budd highlighted some recent projects that the District Arts Trust's had completed and cited research that showed engagement in the arts boosted community resilience and enhanced growth in business sectors. Ms Bean also outlined some recent projects that the group had been working on, notably their involvement in Henderson House.

Mr Garbutt discussed the work of the Central Otago Heritage Trust, noting the strong attendance at heritage talks, engagement with the oral history project, and the groups plans to expand to podcasts. He mentioned their intention to co-operate with the department of conservation and develop a strategic plan for the trust.

Both groups were asked about the benefit their organisations provide to ratepayers and Councillors urged them to consider this in future funding applications.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Duncan
Seconded: Gillespie

That the report be received.

CARRIED

Note: Cr Claridge left the meeting at 1154 am and returned at 11.56 am.
Cr Gillespie left the meeting at 11.59 am and returned at 12.01 pm

25.12.6 RESERVE FUNDING A TEVIOT VALLEY FUTURE PLAN

To consider allocating up to \$50,000 of Teviot Valley Community Board general reserves to fund the development of a future strategy for the Teviot Valley.

Discussion followed noting that as there was already a Teviot Valley Community Plan underway there should be consideration to the future strategy as part of this work and therefore any additional funding should be delayed until this work was completed.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Duncan
Seconded: Laws

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Notes that work on the Teviot Valley Community Plan is underway and the outcomes should be considered by the Teviot Valley Community Board before Council considers any funding from the Teviot Valley reserves.

CARRIED

25.12.7 USE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESERVES

To consider a recommendation for Economic Development reserves to fund temporary support for councils Economic Development function in 2025-26.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Duncan
Seconded: Claridge

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves the use of \$10,000 from the Economic Development reserves to fund short term support for Economic Development in the 2025-26 financial year.

CARRIED

25.12.8 MANORBURN DAM RECREATION RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2025

To approve the Manorburn Dam Recreation Reserve Management Plan 2025.

It was noted that any leasing of sections of the reserve would be evaluated separately from this plan. It was also noted that appropriate signage would be utilised to help enforce the regulations outlined in the management plan.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Feinerman
Seconded: Browne

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves the Manorburn Dam Recreation Reserve Management Plan 2025 under delegated authority from the Minister of Conservation.

CARRIED

25.12.9 REVIEW OF OPEN SPACES NAMING POLICY 2024

To approve the revised Open Spaces Naming Policy 2024.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Alley
Seconded: Browne

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
 - B. Approves and adopts the revised Open Spaces Naming Policy 2024.
 - C. Notes that the Open Spaces Naming Policy 2024 will be reviewed in July 2027.
-

CARRIED

25.12.10 CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL TREE POLICY RENEWAL

To consider adoption of the updated Tree Policy.

Staff were advised to create a long-term plan for arboriculture work because of the significant community interest in tree removal.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Duncan
Seconded: Laws

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Adopts the Central Otago District Council Tree Policy 2025.

CARRIED

25.12.11 KĀMOANAHAEHAE - RIVERSIDE PARK STAGE 2 RAMP

To consider allocating funding to complete stage 2 the Ramp of the Kāmoanahaehae - Riverside Park project following the recommendation from the Vincent Community Board.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Claridge
Seconded: Cooney

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves that Stage 2 the Ramp of the Kāmoanahaehae - Riverside Park project will be funded through account 2137 - Reserves Contribution Fund Vincent up to the value of \$400,000.

CARRIED

Note: the meeting adjourned at 12.32 pm and returned at 1.05 pm

25.12.12 ELDERLY PERSONS HOUSING RENT REVIEW

To advise of the impact of the rent review for Council's Elderly Persons Units for 2025/2026.

It was observed that residents expressed a high level of satisfaction with the accommodation, and that there was a waiting list for the units.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Feinerman
Seconded: Gillespie

That the report be received.

CARRIED

25.12.13 PROPOSAL TO CONSIDER THE REQUIREMENT FOR AN ESPLANADE STRIP/RESERVE - HINDON STREET ROAD STOPPING

To consider the determination as to whether the Council wish to impose the requirement of an Esplanade Strip/Reserve for the previously approved road stopping of an unformed legal road adjacent to the intersection of River and Hindon Streets, Omakau.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Gillespie
Seconded: Alley

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Agrees to determine that an esplanade strip/reserve is not required in terms of section 118 of the Public Works Act, 1981 in the case of the approved road stopping of the unformed legal road adjacent to the intersection of River Street and Hindon Street, Omakau.
- C. Authorises the Chief Executive to do all that is necessary to give effect to the resolution.

CARRIED

25.12.14 RATIFICATION OF VINCENT COMMUNITY BOARD RESOLUTION 25.4.6 (PROPOSAL TO APPROVE THE LICENCE TO OCCUPY TO UPCYCLES CHARITABLE TRUST ON PART OF 60 BOUNDARY ROAD, ALEXANDRA)

To consider ratifying the proposal to approve a Licence to Occupy to Upcycle Charitable Trust being approximately 125 square metres more or less on Part Lot 3 DP 355061 held on Record of Title 224692 for the purpose of Local Purpose (Transfer/Landfill) Reserve.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Feinerman
Seconded: Laws

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
 - B. Agrees to ratify Resolution 25.4.6 of the Vincent Community Board to approve the granting of a Licence to Occupy to Upcycles Charitable Trust of approximately 125 square metres more or less on Part 3 DP 355061 held on Record of Title 224692 for the purpose of Local Purpose (Transfer/Landfill) Reserve, on the following terms and conditions:
 - Term: Five (5) years
 - Right of renewal: None
 - Commencement Date: 1 July 2025
 - Licence Fee: \$1 per annum plus GST (if demanded)
 - Rent Review: None
-

-
- Permitted Use: For the establishment and use as a bicycle repair and restoration facility.

C. Authorises the Chief Executive to all that is necessary to give effect to the resolution.

CARRIED

25.12.15 BRIDGE RENEWAL PROCUREMENT - BRIDGE 191 LITTLE VALLEY ROAD

To consider procurement plan for tendering of Bridge 191 timber component renewal.

Discussion addressed the need to deliver projects with a focus on price weighting, while also acknowledging the health and safety requirements of the project. Consideration of future pipe infrastructure requirements was also requested during the planning stage of the project.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Browne
Seconded: Claridge

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves the procurement plan for tendering of the renewal of all timber components of Bridge 191 Little Valley Road, including the following
 - (a) Tenders to be evaluated using the Weighted Attribute Method with a 50% price weighting.
- C. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to award the work to the preferred contractor following the procurement process provided that the tendered amounts are within the approved budget.

CARRIED

25.12.16 PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT CHANGES 2025

To consider approving the proposed speed limit proposals for consultation.

Discussion followed on the potential for disengagement in the consultation process as these speed limits had been previously considered. It was observed that the engagement efforts would be directed towards particular users as well as individuals who had previously participated.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Browne
Seconded: Laws

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves the speed limit proposals for consultation.

CARRIED

25.12.17 STATUS REPORT - ALEXANDRA WATERMAIN RENEWALS PROJECT

To consider the progress of the Alexandra Watermain Renewals Project.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Claridge
Seconded: Feinerman

That the report be received.

CARRIED

25.12.18 STATUS REPORT - RANFURLY AND PATEAROA WATER TREATMENT PLANTS: PROTOZOA BARRIER INSTALLATION PROJECT

To consider the progress of the Ranfurly and Patearoa Water Treatment Plants: Protozoa Barrier Installation Project.

It was requested to increase communications to raise awareness of the regulator's requirements.

It was observed that although the water quality had remained consistent, the new regulatory authority were strictly enforcing requirements, and that testing had become more rigorous than previously.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Gillespie
Seconded: Duncan

That the report be received.

CARRIED

25.12.19 STATUS REPORT - CROMWELL DRINKING WATER UPGRADE PROJECT

To consider the progress of the Cromwell Water Treatment Upgrade Project.

It was noted that the new regulations increased the demand for pumps and components nationwide, causing some supply issues and delays in the project.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Duncan
Seconded: Feinerman

That the report be received.

CARRIED

25.12.20 JUNE WASTEWATER COMPLIANCE STATUS UPDATE

To consider progress on achieving Otago Regional Council Consent (ORC) compliance for Central Otago District Council (CODC) wastewater activities.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Alley
Seconded: Browne

That the report be received.

CARRIED

25.12.21 FAST TRACK ACT APPLICATION

To revoke a previous resolution and delegate the approval of the key issues report for the application from Santana Minerals under the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024, to Council staff.

It was noted that there was an expectation from the community that although the fast track process did not allow for community comment, elected officials should have opportunity to comment, therefore the revocation was declined.

There was consideration given to the potential for the review to be appended with feedback from community groups.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Gillespie
Seconded: Browne

That the Council

A. Receive the report.

CARRIED

Note: By permission of the meeting item 25.12.29 was tabled on the day.

Note: Cr Claridge left the meeting at 2.32 pm and returned at 2.35 pm.

25.12.29 AUDIT ENGAGEMENT LETTER AND AUDIT PLAN FOR YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2025 FINANCIAL YEAR

To consider approval of the Audit Engagement Letter for the audit of the Financial Report year ended 30 June 2025 and approval of the Mayor to sign the attached letter. Also to approve the audit plan for the audit of the Financial Report to 30 June 2025.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Gillespie
Seconded: Alley

THAT THE COUNCIL

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Approves the Audit Engagement Letter for the audit 30 June 2025 as presented and authorises the Mayor to sign the Audit Engagement Letter.
- C. Approves the Audit Plan for the audit of the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2025.

CARRIED**25.12.22 REGIONAL DEALS**

The purpose of this report is to confirm how Council intends to approach Regional Deals should the Central Otago Lakes proposal be progressed by Central Government.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Gillespie
Seconded: Alley

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.
- B. Notes a similar report will be considered by Queenstown Lakes District Council and Otago Regional Council this week.
- C. Approve the establishment of a Joint Committee with limited delegations as set by the full partner Councils.
- D. Notes that the full Councils will retain approval of the final form of the deal.
- E. Delegates the Joint Committee the ability to determine the best form of Negotiating Authority based on government process and preferences.
- F. Approves the negotiating principles outlined in this report.
- G. Delegate to the Joint Committee the power to agree joint priorities for Otago Central Lakes.
- H. Note that Otago Central Lakes priorities will only guide negotiations with government.
- I. Note that to appoint a joint committee a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) must be agreed by all partner councils
- J. Note that the attached MoA outlines that the joint committee will have two elected members from each partner council and that one of these is the Mayor /Chair, but that each Council will determine how to appoint the other member,
- K. Appoints Councillor Tracy Paterson to the Joint Committee overseeing Regional Deals.
- L. Approve the Memorandum of Agreement (note this will appoint the Joint Committee based on the powers and delegations outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement).

CARRIED

Note: Cr Duncan left the meeting at 2.43 pm and returned at 2.45 pm.

8 MAYOR'S REPORT**25.12.23 MAYOR'S REPORT**
-----**RESOLUTION**

Moved: Alley
Seconded: Duncan

That the Council receives the report.

CARRIED

-----**9 STATUS REPORTS****25.12.24 JUNE 2025 GOVERNANCE REPORT**

To report on items of general interest, receive minutes and updates from key organisations, consider Council's forward work programme, business plan and status report updates.

Staff gave an update on the Play Strategy work noting that early engagement had been completed and with 580 people involved in the process. Staff were now in the drafting stage, and the draft strategy would be consulted on in November. An overview was given with a focus on outdoor play, infrastructure, with an appetite for risk and adventure.

-----**RESOLUTION**

Moved: Browne
Seconded: Laws

That the report be received.

CARRIED

-----**10 COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES**

Nil

11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next scheduled meeting is 30 June 2025.

12 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
-----**RESOLUTION**

Moved: Alley
Seconded: Browne

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of

the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Plain English Reason
25.12.25 - Ratification of Resolution 25.4.13 (Legalisation and Sale of part of Mutton Town Road)	s7(2)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information	Commercial sensitivity
25.12.25 - Ratification of Resolution 25.4.13 (Legalisation and Sale of part of Mutton Town Road)	s7(2)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information	Commercial sensitivity
25.12.26 - Draft Central Otago District Council Performance Profile	s7(2)(c)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest	Due to an obligation of confidence and to protect the public interest
25.12.27 - Risk Register Update	s7(2)(j) - the withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	To prevent use of the information for improper gain or advantage
25.12.28 - June 2025 Confidential Governance Report	s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	To enable commercial activities

CARRIED

The public were excluded at 2.58 pm and the meeting closed at 3.41 pm

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL
HELD AT NGĀ HAU E WHĀ, WILLIAM FRASER BUILDING, 1 DUNORLING STREET,
ALEXANDRA
AND LIVE STREAMED VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS ON MONDAY, 30 JUNE 2025 COMMENCING
AT 2:11 PM**

PRESENT: Her Worship the Mayor T Alley (Chairperson), Cr N Gillespie, Cr S Browne, Cr L Claridge, Cr S Duncan, Cr S Feinerman, Cr C Laws, Cr M McPherson, Cr T Paterson

IN ATTENDANCE: P Kelly (Chief Executive Officer), L Fleck (General Manager - People and Culture, Acting General Manager - Community Vision), D Rushbrook (Regional Deals Lead), D Scoones (Group Manager - Community Experience), P Morris (Chief Financial Officer), D McKewen (Corporate and Systems Accountant), S Reynolds (Acting Governance Manager)

1 KARAKIA

Her Worship the Mayor gave a karakia to begin the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES

Recommendations

That apologies from Cr N McKinlay be received and accepted.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were reminded of their obligations in respect of declaring any interests. There were no further declarations of interest.

4 REPORTS

25.13.1 ADOPTION OF THE 2025-34 LONG-TERM PLAN

To adopt the 2025-34 Long-term Plan along with the 2025-26 fees and charges schedule.

Her Worship the Mayor and Councillors acknowledged the extensive staff time spent compiling the Long-term Plan and thanked the community for the record-breaking engagement in the process.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Alley
Seconded: Paterson

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.**
 - B. Approves and adopts the revenue and financing policy 2025-31 for inclusion in the 2025-34 Long-term Plan**
-

- C. Approves the Long-term Plan 2025-34 detailed in Appendix 1, including the 2025-26 fees and charges as detailed in Appendix 2**
- D. Receive the auditor's opinion for the 2025-34 Long-term plan**
- E. Adopts the 2025-34 Long-term Plan and auditors' opinion** in accordance with Section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- F. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to prepare the final 2025-34 Long-term Plan including any amendments from the Council, auditors and legal representative.**
- G. Requests the Chief Executive Officer to formally advise the submitters of Council's decisions.**

CARRIED

25.13.2 SETTING OF RATES FOR THE 2025/26 FINANCIAL YEAR

To resolve the setting of the rates, due dates and penalties for rates for the 2025-26 financial year.

It was noted that Audit NZ had reviewed the resolution, and that it had also received a legal opinion to ensure compliance.

RESOLUTION

Moved: Alley
Seconded: McPherson

That the Council

- A. Receives the report and accepts the level of significance.**
- B. That the Central Otago District Council resolves to set the following rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, on rating units in the Central Otago District for the financial year commencing 1 July 2025 and ending on 30 June 2026.**

General Rates

A General rate set on land value of the land under section 13 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on all rateable land. The Council sets a differential general rate on the land value of all rateable rating units in the district as set out in the table below:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation of liability	Rate per \$ of Land Value (GST inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
All Other Properties	Land value	\$0.0013953	\$14,116,869
Large Dams	Land value	\$0.2942774	\$1,627,354
Paerau Dam – Maniototo	Land value	\$0.1193186	\$70,398
Teviot Power Scheme – Roxburgh	Land value	\$0.1659184	\$152,645

Uniform Annual General Charge

A Uniform Annual General Charge set under section 15 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 of \$107.00 per rating unit.

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation of liability	Fixed Charge per rating unit (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Uniform Annual General Charge	Rating unit	\$107.00	\$1,571,577

Water Rates

The Council sets a differential targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on all rating units connected to or serviceable by a Council water supply (as defined in the Rating Policy - Funding Impact Statement (FIS)) as follows:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST)
Connected (Lateral Provided)	Per connection	\$684.66	\$7,845,544
Serviceable (No Lateral Provided)	Rating unit	\$342.33	\$29,928

Volumetric Water Charges

The Council sets targeted rates for volumetric water charges under section 19 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at \$1.60 per cubic meter on all rating units that are connected to a Council water supply, with effect for readings from November 2025. Reading from 1 July 2025 until November 2025 is set at \$0.60 per cubic meter on all rating units that are connected to a Council water supply. As defined in the FIS, as follows:

One unit equals one cubic meter which is 1000l or 1m³.

Water charges – including GST

Meter Reading Area	Cost per Unit \$0.60	Cost per Unit \$1.60
Clyde, Omakau, Maniototo, Teviot	July 2025	November 2025 March 2026
Alexandra	August 2025	December 2025 April 2026
Cromwell South (split along Barry Ave and SH 6)	September 2025	January 2026 May 2026

Cromwell to Luggate) including Pisa		
Cromwell North (split along Barry Ave and SH 6 Cromwell to Luggate) including Bannockburn and Lowburn	October 2025	February 2026 June 2026

Ripponvale Water Management Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate for capital contribution to the Ripponvale Water Scheme Upgrade Capital Funding Plan within the Ripponvale community. The rating basis is a fixed charge per rating unit and is applied to those rating units where ratepayers did not elect to make a lump sum payment for their share of the capital contribution to this project.

The Rates Information Database identifies properties that have a targeted rate for capital contribution, and those that made a lump sum payment and to which the targeted rate for capital contribution does not apply.

Sections 117A-M of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 relate to Lump sum payment contributions.

The targeted rate is based as a fixed charge for each rating unit for a finite ten-year period as follows:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Ripponvale Water Management (targeted rate payment per year)	Rating unit	\$602.57	\$37,962

Wastewater Rates

The Council sets a differential targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on all rating units connected to or serviceable by a Council wastewater supply (as defined in the Rating Policy - Funding Impact Statement (FIS)) as follows:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Connected (Lateral Provided)	Per connection	\$1,094.44	\$10,460,675
Serviceable (No Lateral Provided)	Rating unit	\$547.22	\$67,594

Additional Pan Commercial Accommodation Rate.

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 as a fixed charge for each additional pan or urinal after the first, on connected rating units providing commercial accommodation or commercial elderly rest homes as defined by the rating valuations rules 2008. This is calculated at 25% of the Connected (Lateral Provided).

The rates for this service are shown below:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Additional Pan Commercial Accommodation	Per additional pan	\$273.61	\$206,720

Clyde Wastewater Management Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for wastewater management as a fixed charge per rating unit within Clyde (identified by Valuation Roll 28461) not connected to the Wastewater network.

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Clyde Wastewater Management	Rating Unit	\$85.01	\$54,491

Clyde Wastewater Capital Contribution Charge Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for capital contributions to the Clyde Wastewater Reticulation Scheme Upgrade - Capital Funding Plan to properties identified in Stage 1 of the project. The rating basis is a fixed charge per rating unit and is applied to those rating units where ratepayers did not elect to make a lump sum payment for their share of the capital contribution to this project.

The Rates Information Database identifies properties that have a targeted rate for capital contribution, and those that made a lump sum payment and to which the targeted rate for capital contribution does not apply.

Sections 117A-M of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 relate to Lump sum payment contributions.

The targeted rate is based as a fixed charge for each rating unit for a finite ten-year period as follows:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Clyde Wastewater Capital Contribution Charge	Per rating unit	\$1,277.00	\$176,417

Stormwater charge

The stormwater charge is a uniform targeted rate targeted rate under section 15 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002. It recovers the funding required by Council for stormwater purposes. It is assessed on all rating units.

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Uniform Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Stormwater Charge	Rating unit	\$10.92	\$160,397

Waste Collection Charge

The Council sets targeted rates under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for waste collection for rating units (as per the FIS).

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Waste collection with collection 4 bins (availability of service)	Per rating unit	\$598.75	\$6,235,123

Waste Management Charge

The Council sets targeted rates under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for waste management for rating units with no collection (as per the FIS).

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Waste management charge (no collection from rating unit)	Rating unit	\$132.63	\$589,515

Waste Collection Additional Bins Charge

The Council sets targeted rates under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on rating units provided with any additional service, on a per additional container basis as follows:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Waste collection additional general refuse bin (red) 240L	Per additional bin	\$348.47	\$344,642
Waste collection additional general refuse bin (red) 140L	Per additional bin	\$203.58	\$35,015

Waste collection additional mixed recycling bin (yellow)	Per additional bin	\$101.79	\$87,843
Waste collection additional glass recycling bin (blue)	Per additional bin	\$47.90	\$32,955
Waste collection additional organics bin (green)	Per additional bin	\$113.76	\$14,903
Waste collection upsized household rubbish bin (red) 240L	Per upsized bin	\$143.70	\$24,142

Community Facilities Charge

The Council sets a uniform targeted rate of \$982.61 per rating unit under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for community facilities on every rateable rating unit in the district.

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Uniform Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Community Facilities Charge	Rating Unit	\$982.61	\$14,434,428

District Library Charge

The Council sets a uniform targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for library services within the District. The targeted rates will be based as a uniform charge for each rating unit as shown in the table below:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Fixed Uniform Charge \$ (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
District Library Charge	Rating unit	\$150.74	\$2,214,150

Grants Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for Grants within each ward, except Teviot Valley Ward.

For each ward the rate will be on a differential basis, based on the use to which the rating unit is placed (as defined in the table below).

The targeted rates are based on the capital value of all rating units as shown in the table as follows:

CATEGORY		Factor(s) for calculation liability	Rate Factor per \$ of Capital Value (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Cromwell Ward				
Commercial and Industrial		Capital value	\$0.0000822	\$84,593
Residential		Capital value	\$0.0000153	\$62,258
Rural		Capital value	\$0.0000118	\$33,345
Dams and Utilities		Capital value	\$0.0000106	\$234
Vincent Ward				
Commercial and Industrial		Capital value	\$0.0000706	\$29,501
Residential		Capital value	\$0.0000131	\$38,713
Rural		Capital value	\$0.0000101	\$28,898
Dams and Utilities		Capital value	\$0.0000091	\$6,736
Teviot Valley Ward				
Commercial and Industrial		Capital value	\$0.0000000	\$0
Residential		Capital value	\$0.0000000	\$0
Rural		Capital value	\$0.0000000	\$0
Dams and Utilities		Capital value	\$0.0000000	\$0
Maniototo Ward				
Commercial and Industrial		Capital value	\$0.0000441	\$2,719
Residential		Capital value	\$0.0000082	\$3,204
Rural		Capital value	\$0.0000063	\$7,971
Dams and Utilities		Capital value	\$0.0000056	\$80

Planning and Environment Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for Planning and Environment on all rating units. The rate is based on the capital value of all rating units in the District according to the table below:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Rate Factor per \$ of Capital Value (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Planning and Environment	Capital value	\$0.0001217	\$2,226,045

Economic Development Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for economic development on all rating units. The rate is based on the capital value of all rating units in the District according to the table below:

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Rate Factor per \$ of Capital Value (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Economic Development	Capital value	\$0.0000114	\$208,265

Tourism Rate

The Council sets a targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on a differential basis based on use of all rating units, except those rating units used as sport and recreation, for Tourism. The rate is based on the capital value of all rating units in the district.

CATEGORY	Factor(s) for calculation liability	Rate Factor per \$ of Capital Value (GST Inclusive)	Total revenue sought from this category (GST inclusive)
Residential	Capital value	\$0.0000750	\$577,225
Rural	Capital value	\$0.0000577	\$445,635
Commercial and Industrial	Capital value	\$0.0004026	\$622,027
Dams, Utilities	Capital value	\$0.0000517	\$68,500

C. To set due dates and penalties for the financial year.

Due Dates

Rates for 2025-26 (other than for metered water) be due for payment in four equal instalments on the dates as detailed below:

- **20 August 2025**
- **20 November 2025**
- **20 February 2026**
- **20 May 2026**

Penalties

Penalties will be added under sections 57 and 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to unpaid rates (other than for metered water):

- **10% on any outstanding amount of any instalment not paid by the due date.**
- **The penalty will be applied on 27 August 2025, 27 November 2025, 27 February 2026 and 27 May 2026 respectively for each instalment.**

-
- **10% on amounts outstanding from earlier years, such penalty being applied on 1 October 2025 and 1 April 2026.**

Sets the due dates for metered water billing as follows:

Meter Reading Area	Read Period	Billing Due Dates
Clyde, Omakau, Maniototo, Teviot	July 2025 November 2025 March 2026	28 August 2025 8 January 2026 30 April 2026
Alexandra	August 2025 December 2025 April 2026	25 September 2025 29 January 2026 28 May 2026
Cromwell South (split along Barry Ave and SH 6 Cromwell to Luggate) including Pisa	September 2025 January 2026 May 2026	30 October 2025 26 February 2026 18 June 2026
Cromwell North (split along Barry Ave and SH 6 Cromwell to Luggate) including Bannockburn and Lowburn	October 2025 February 2026 June 2026	27 November 2025 27 March 2026 30 July 2026

Penalties will be added for 2025-26 under sections 57 and 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on unpaid metered water rates as follows:

10% on any metered water rates outstanding after the due date.

Meter Reading Area	Penalty Date
Clyde, Omakau, Maniototo, Teviot	4 September 2025 15 January 2026 7 May 2026
Alexandra	2 October 2025 5 February 2026 4 June 2026
Cromwell South (split along Barry Ave and SH 6 Cromwell to Luggate) including Pisa	6 November 2025 5 March 2026 25 June 2026
Cromwell North (split along Barry Ave and SH 6 Cromwell to Luggate) including Bannockburn and Lowburn	4 December 2025 2 April 2026 6 August 2026

CARRIED

5 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next scheduled meeting is 10 July 2025.

The meeting closed at 2.26 pm.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

25.14.1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST REGISTER

Doc ID: 2514878

Report Author:	Sarah Reynolds, Acting Governance Manager
Reviewed and authorised by:	Saskia Righarts, Group Manager - Governance and Business Services

1. Purpose

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

2. Attachments

Appendix 1 - 20250710 Declarations of Interest.docx [↓](#)

Name	Member's Declared Interests	Spouse/Partner's Declared Interests	Council Appointments
Tamah Alley	Manuherikia Irrigation Co-operative (shareholder) Cliff Care Ltd (family connection) Aviation Cherries Ltd (Director) Tenaya New Zealand Ltd (Director and Shareholder) Southern Lakes Trails (Trustee) LGNZ Zone 6 Chair	Manuherikia Irrigation Co-operative Society Ltd (shareholder) Emergency Management Otago Group Controller (employee) Aviation Cherries Ltd (Director)	Alexandra Community House Trust Central Otago Wilding Conifer Control Group Destination Advisory Board Southern Lakes Health Trust (Trustee)
Sarah Browne	Anderson Browne Construction and Development (Director and Shareholder) Infinite Energy Ltd (Shareholder) Central Otago Sports Turf Trust (Trustee) Central Football and Multisport Turf Trust (Trustee) Sutherland Architecture Studio Ltd (Employee)	Anderson Browne Construction and Development (Director and Shareholder) Infinite Energy Ltd (Employee)	Cromwell Youth Trust Tarras Community Plan Group
Lynley Claridge	Affinity Funerals (Funeral Director)		
Ian Cooney			

Name	Member's Declared Interests	Spouse/Partner's Declared Interests	Council Appointments
Stuart Duncan	Penvose Farms - Wedderburn Cottages and Farm at Wedderburn (shareholder) Penvose Investments - Dairy Farm at Patearoa (shareholder) Fire and Emergency New Zealand (member) JD Pat Ltd (Shareholder and Director)	Penvose Farms - Wedderburn Cottages and Farm at Wedderburn (Shareholder) Penvose Investments - Dairy Farm at Patearoa (shareholder)	Otago Regional Transport Committee Maniototo Ice Rink Committee Maniototo Curling International Inc
Sally Feinerman	Feinerman's Ltd, 109 Scotland Street (Owner / Director) Roxburgh Pool Committee (Chair) Sally Feinerman Trust (Trustee) Feinerman Family Trust (Trustee) MPI Teviot Valley Community Hubs group	Breen Construction (Employee / Builder)	Ida MacDonald Charitable Trust Teviot Prospects Teviot Valley Walkways Committee
Neil Gillespie	Southburn Consulting (Consultant) Cromwell Volunteer Fire Brigade (Chief Fire Officer) Cromwell Bowling Club (patron) Otago Local Advisory Committee - Fire Emergency New Zealand Returned Services Association (Member)		Tarras Hall Committee

Name	Member's Declared Interests	Spouse/Partner's Declared Interests	Council Appointments
Cheryl Laws	The Message (Director) Wishart Family Trust (Trustee) Wooring Tree (Assistant Manager - Cellar Door) Daffodil Day Cromwell Coordinator	Otago Regional Council (Councillor) The Message (Director)	Cromwell Resource Centre Trust Old Cromwell Incorporated
Nigel McKinlay	Transition To Work Trust (Board member) Gate 22 Vineyard Ltd (Director) Everyday Gourmet (Director) Central Otago Wine Association (member) Long Gully Irrigation Scheme (member) CODC (employee) (Granddaughter)		Cromwell Hall Reference Group Cromwell Town Centre Reference Group
Martin McPherson	Alexandra Blossom Festival	CODC (employee) CODC (employee) (Daughter)	Alexandra and Districts Youth Trust

Name	Member's Declared Interests	Spouse/Partner's Declared Interests	Council Appointments
Tracy Paterson	Matakanui Station (Director and shareholder) Matakanui Development Co (Director and shareholder) A and T Paterson Family Trust (Trustee) A Paterson Family Trust (Trustee) Central Otago Health Inc (Elected Member) Bob Turnbull Trust (Trustee / Chair) New Zealand Wool Classers Association (Chair) Central Otago A&P Association (Member) Waiora Manuherikia Governance Group (Member) Central Otago Riding for the Disabled (Volunteer)	Matakanui Station (Director and shareholder) Matakanui Development Co (Director and shareholder) A Paterson Family Trust (Trustee) A and T Paterson Family Trust (Trustee) Federated Farmers (On the executive team) Omakau Irrigation Co (Director) Matakanui Combined Rugby Football Club (Committee) Manuherikia Catchment Group (Co-chair) Omakau Domain Board Omakau Hub Committee (Chair) Manuherikia Valley Community Hub Trust (Trustee) Southern Cross Sheep Ltd (Director) Mt Stalker Ltd (Trustee) Mt Stalker Pastoral Ltd DKIL Ltd (Shareholder) Manuherikia River Limited (Director)	Omakau Recreation Reserve Committee Ophir Welfare Association Committee Central Otago Health Incorporated

3 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Recommendations

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Plain English Reason
25.14.3 - Offer for a Land Access Arrangement	<p>s7(2)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</p> <p>s7(2)(c)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied</p> <p>s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p> <p>s7(2)(j) - the withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage</p>	<p>Commercial sensitivity</p> <p>Due to an obligation of confidence and to ensure the information avenue remains open</p> <p>To enable commercial activities</p> <p>To enable commercial or industrial negotiations</p> <p>To prevent use of the information for improper gain or advantage</p>

25.06.2025 - Confidential Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 25 May 2025	s7(2)(a) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	To protect a person's privacy.
--	--	--------------------------------

6 CONFIRMATION OF CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

7 CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

8 PUBLIC FORUM

9 REPORTS

25.14.3 SOUTHERN WATER DONE WELL

Doc ID: 2504074

Report Author:	Peter Kelly, Chief Executive Officer
Reviewed and authorised by:	Peter Kelly, Chief Executive Officer

1. Purpose of Report

The Local Government (Water Services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024 ('the Act') requires all councils to submit a Water Services Delivery Plan (WSDP) to the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) by 3 September 2025.

The purpose of this report is to:

- Recommend a Jointly Owned Council Controlled Organisation as the water services delivery model be adopted by Central Otago District Council, in partnership with Clutha District Council, Gore District Council, and Waitaki District Council.
- Note the work completed to inform consultation in addition to subsequent further financial and economic analysis work and recent correspondence from the Minister for Local Government.
- Provide the outcomes of public consultation undertaken by Central Otago District Council, in partnership with Clutha District Council, Gore District Council, and Waitaki District Council and staff advice in response to matters raised.
- Support Council's deliberations and decision making.

Council's decision will inform the preparation of the WSDP and certification by Central Otago District Council Chief Executive prior to being submitted to the Department of Internal Affairs by 3 September 2025. Under the legislation the DIA has the mandate to accept or not accept WSDPs submitted by Council.

Recommendations

That the Council

1. **Receives** the report titled 'Southern Water Done Well – Water Services Delivery Model.
2. **Agrees** to adopt
 - a) Option 1: Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation as the Council's model for the delivery of water services in accordance with section 13(1)(k) of the Local Government (Water services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024 **(Recommended)**
 - OR
 - b) Option 2: Stand-alone Central Otago District Council Council Controlled Organisation as the Council's model for the delivery of water services in accordance with section 13(1)(k) of the Local Government (Water services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024
 - OR
 - c) Option 3: In-house Central Otago District Council Business Unit as the Council's model for the delivery of water services in accordance with section 13(1)(k) of the Local Government (Water services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024.
3. **Requests** staff to prepare a Water Services Delivery Plan containing the matters set out in section 13 of the Local Government (Water Services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024 and the Council's chosen proposed water services delivery model, to be brought back to Council for approval and certification by the Central Otago District Council Chief Executive prior to being submitted to the Department of Internal Affairs by 3 September 2025 for acceptance.

If Council adopts Option 1: Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation as the Council's model for the delivery of water services:

4. **Agrees** to establish a Jointly Owned Council Controlled Organisation with Clutha, Gore and Waitaki District Councils.
 5. Notes the submissions received and thanks all submitters for their feedback.
-

2. Background

Under the Government's Local Water Done Well legislation councils are required to assess and decide on a preferred water services delivery model that is financially sustainable, meets regulatory standards, and supports long-term community outcomes.

Councils must identify and evaluate options, select a preferred option, consult with their community, consider feedback alongside technical and financial analysis, and decide on the option to adopt for the future delivery of water services.

Councils then prepare and adopt a WSDP, which outlines how the chosen model will deliver compliant and sustainable water services, before submitting it to the DIA for review and acceptance. The DIA will apply the following three tests in the assessment

of the WSDP and whether the Council's water services delivery is financially sustainable:

- Revenue sufficiency – is there sufficient revenue to cover water services delivery costs, including servicing debt
- Investment sufficiency – is the projected level of investment sufficient to meet regulatory requirements and provide for growth
- Financing sufficiency – are funding and finance arrangements sufficient to meet investment requirements

Over the past year, Otago and Southland councils have worked collaboratively to identify and evaluate water services delivery models. In March 2025, Central Otago District Council joined with Clutha, Gore and Waitaki District Councils to form Southern Water Done Well, to investigate water services delivery options that meet the legislative requirements of Local Water Done Well. This has involved joint technical analysis, financial modelling, legal advice, and independent assurance.

Morrison Low, a company with extensive water reform knowledge and experience has supported financial modelling and option analysis. Asset management advisors, Utility NZ conducted an independent assurance assessment of the individual council water service asset management plans and associated capital programmes. Independent assurance of the Morrison Low and supporting Utility NZ work was conducted by Concept Consulting a leading infrastructure economics and regulatory advisory firm. These reports are provided as (Attachment 1).

The group of four councils entered into a Commitment Agreement which provides the basis for how the group will work together. The Agreement is provided as (Attachment 2).

Under the legislation, all councils are required to state a preferred option for the delivery of water services, to form part of their community consultation. A Joint CCO was formally adopted by each council as the preferred water services delivery model. Councils proceeded to consult with their communities on the water service delivery model options, in accordance with the Act's requirements.

Central Otago District Council sought feedback on the following three service delivery options:

Option 1 – Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation (Joint CCO) **Preferred Option**

Option 2 -Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Option 3 – In-house Business Unit (similar to the existing approach to delivering water services in the district, but with changes to meet legislative requirements).

Waitaki District Council also consulted on a fourth option, to form a South Canterbury Joint CCO with Mackenzie, Timaru and Waimate District Councils.

A Consultation Document, was jointly developed to meet the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Water Done Well framework, was approved by Council in May 2025. The Consultation Document and supporting information outlined the proposal, alternative options, relative strengths, weaknesses, key risks, and implications to support informed public engagement. Central Otago District Council Consultation Document is provided as (Attachment 3).

Analysis

DIA and Minister of Local Government Communications

Government has set an expectation for councils to demonstrate their commitment to deliver water services that meet regulatory requirements, support growth and urban development, and that are financially sustainable.

The DIA and the Minister of Local Government have stated their support for the development of the Joint CCO model by the Southern Water Done Well (SWDW) Councils. The proposed model has been viewed favourably against the government's revenue, investment and financing tests and as a means of achieving inter-generational economic outcomes. In a letter provided as (Attachment 4) dated 21 May 2025, the Minister stated:

"I have been clear in my expectation that councils should be working together to address financial sustainability challenges, as you are already actively doing. In particular, I expect councils to be actively considering working with and supporting their neighbouring councils, especially smaller and rural councils, particularly given there is no requirement for price harmonisation under Local Water Done Well. As you'll be aware, collaboration enables resource sharing, efficiency gains, better access to financing, and lower costs for ratepayers. Having a pipeline of future work across a region also provides greater investment certainty, and the potential to build a strong future workforce."

The Minister also attended a virtual meeting of elected members from all four councils on 19 June 2025, reinforcing the above points and the contents of his letter.

In addition, the DIA has undertaken an initial assessment of the water service delivery model options for the SWDW councils, against the criteria that Water Service Delivery Plans will be assessed by. This report, included as (Attachment 5), notes:

"The establishment of a Southern Water Done Well water CCO comprising of the four councils' water services is likely the only viable option for delivering a Water Services Delivery Plan that meets the legislated financial sustainability requirements for both water services and councils, whilst managing the affordability impact of required water services charges on household budgets. A regional Water CCO consisting of the four councils' water services will result in lower charges for communities than council in-house delivery of water services, or the establishment of individual council-owned Water CCOs."

Benefits and Economic Analysis

While consultation was underway, the SWDW Councils requested further independent assurance on the financial modelling work completed by Morrison Low. Concept Consulting concluded that the Morrison Low estimates were conservative and that the Joint CCO has the potential to deliver significantly greater financial benefits compared to councils operating individually. (Attachment 6) contains reports from Concept Consulting and Morrison Low on the Base Case modelling net savings and Concept forecasts. Summary findings are as follows:

- **The Joint CCO will save money:** Conservative base case modelling indicates 627m in revenue savings by 2054 across all four SWDW Councils compared to councils going alone.
- **Morrison Low base case assumptions are conservative:** Independent reviews by Concept and economist Brad Olsen say actual savings are likely higher. Concepts base case is \$836m with an upper range of \$1.05b of savings by 2054 across all four SWDW Councils compared to councils going alone.
- **Main savings are achieved in the following areas:**

- Smarter asset management
- Shared services and reduced duplication
- Better procurement and delivery
- **Small councils can't unlock these gains alone:** Scale matters.
- **Economic regulator will expect efficiency:** The Joint CCO is better placed to meet these expectations.
- **Conclusion:** The Joint CCO clearly delivers the best value and most future-ready option for councils and their residents.

The table below summarise the net cumulative savings available under each scenario, for a Joint CCO compared to councils adopting an inhouse model.

	ML Base case	Concept Base	Concept Upper
Cumulative Net Savings to 2034	\$43.8 million	\$46.4 million	\$52.3 million
Cumulative Net Savings to 2039 ⁱ	\$129.3 million	\$152.2 million	\$189.0 million
Cumulative Net Savings to 2054	\$627.2 million	\$ 836.4 million	\$1.05 billion

¹ Year efficiencies are fully realised

Morrison Low's report in Attachment 6 also provides a summary of two workshops where the group of four councils defined a set of key principles and features it is proposed the Joint CCO would adopt. These are not yet adopted formally by the councils and will be further defined, following council water service delivery model decision making.

Economic Review - Infometrics

Infometrics, a leading New Zealand economic consultancy provides advice on national, local, and sectoral economic trends. The SWDW councils engaged Infometrics Principal Economist Brad Olsen to provide an economic analysis, and assess the process followed, assumptions and overall findings. Infometrics report is provided as (Attachment 7) and notes the following:

- **Water reform is essential:** Costs and regulations are rising; current delivery models are unsustainable.
- **Joint CCO offers scale:** Enables greater borrowing, spreads cost and improves affordability.
- **Long-term assets need long-term funding:** Debt funding is appropriate to ensure intergenerational equity.
- **Modelling assumptions are conservative and sound:** Efficiencies (15–16%) and debt levels (500% revenue) are in line with sector norms.
- **Collaboration boosts capability:** SWDW Councils combined have stronger bargaining power and workforce appeal.
- **Status quo is no longer viable:** Staying in-house will become increasingly expensive and risky.
- **Infometrics endorses the SWDW approach:** It's the most viable and cost-effective model compared to standalone or in-house options.

Rural Water Schemes

Input from Clutha and Waitaki DC Rural Water Scheme Committees was sought to understand areas of importance and concern to Rural Water Schemes users. A proposed approach to incorporating the management and operation of Rural Water Schemes was defined and presented back to the groups for comment and is included as (Attachment 8). The proposed approach is summarised as follows:

- **Rural water is proposed to be formally recognised as a ‘fourth water’**, with distinct treatment, service, and pricing arrangements embedded in the CCO’s founding documents.
- **Service expectations and engagement with rural users** will be set through the Statement of Expectations, allowing councils to guide service levels, pricing, and consultation requirements.
- **Rural Water Scheme based pricing, for individual water schemes is supported** by the pricing model (in the same way that District Based Pricing is supported).
- **Engagement will continue via representative groups to retain local knowledge, representation and input to the Statement of Expectations.**
- **Continued use of local workforces and long-term improvements expected** through better planning and investment.

Consultation Process

Public consultation was undertaken by the four councils between 6 May and 9 June 2025. Information was made accessible to the community through multiple channels, using clear language to support broad understanding and participation. For Central Otago District Council consultation comprised:

- A Consultation Document and submission form.
- SWDW consultation material, including summary information and frequently asked questions, made available via Council’s Let’s Talk – Kōrero Mai online engagement platform.
- Two joint mayoral videos delivered via social media and other Council digital platforms.
- Hard copy consultation materials published via local newspapers.
- Hard copies of the submission form and consultation materials available at Central Otago District Council Customer Services Centres and libraries.
- Online sessions hosted by Chief Executive and staff to allow for flexible engagement and feedback.
- Stakeholder briefings and presentations upon request.

Where possible, public sessions were livestreamed and recordings made available online for those unable to attend in person. Throughout the consultation period, Council’s consultation platform was regularly updated with additional information and responses to common questions.

Consultation Summary Outcomes

Central Otago District Council received a total of 303 submissions from individuals, organisations, and community groups. (Attachment 9) to this report provides a summary of the Central Otago District Council’s consultation key metrics. (Attachment 10) is a copy of submissions received by Central Otago District Council, with personal details redacted. For

Central Otago District Council, the Option1: Joint Council Controlled Organisation received the highest level of support from respondents (47.5%), followed by Option 2: Standalone Council Council Controlled Organisation (14.9%) and Option 3: In-house Business Unit (37.6%).

Across the four councils, 1072 valid submissions were received that selected a preferred option. Of these, 617 (57.5%) selected an In-house Business Unit (option 3). Notable support came from Clutha District resident submissions (308) and Waitaki District resident submissions (161). The Joint CCO (Option 1) was selected by 287 (26.7%) of submitters.

The Joint CCO was the preferred option for Central Otago district residents (144), while Gore District residents were evenly split between the Joint CCO and In-house Business Unit (34).

A summary of the combined submissions received by the four councils, themes and key points raised is provided as (Attachment 11). A summary of submissions received by all four councils is provided below -

	Central Otago District Council	Clutha District Council	Gore District Council	Waitaki District Council (first choice figures)	Total Submissions
Option 1: Joint CCO (preferred)	144 (47%)	65 (16.5%)	34 (41.5%)	44 (14.67%)	287
Option 2: Standalone Council CCO	45 (15%)	15 (3.8%)	14 (17.1%)	64 (21.33%)	138
Option 3: In-house Council Business Unit	114 (38%)	308 (78.4%)	34 (41.5%)	161 (53.67%)	617
Option 4: Partner with South Canterbury Councils (Waitaki only)	N/a	N/a	N/a	30 (10%)	30
No selection		5 (1.3%)		1	6
Total Submissions Received	303	393	82	300	1,078 / 1072

Note: Total figures discrepancy is due to five submitters to Clutha District Council not selecting an option and one person making two separate submissions to Waitaki District Council.

As a comparator, for the level of engagement on this topic, the number of submissions received by Councils to their most recent Long-Term Plans is provided below.

- Waitaki - 650 submissions

- CODC - 1,216 submissions
- Gore - 531 submissions
- Clutha - 665 submissions

Each of the four councils received significantly fewer submissions on this topic versus their LTPs.

3. Discussion

Key Findings

The feedback demonstrates that the submitters place high value on local control and accountability. However, there was concern about financial sustainability and the ability to meet future regulatory requirements.

- **Preferred Option:** Of the 1072 submissions that selected a preferred option, 617 (57.5%) selected an in-house business unit (option 3). Clutha District residents (308) and Waitaki District residents (161) provided supported for the in-house option.
- A Joint CCO (option 1) was selected by 287 (26.7%) of submitters. It was the preferred option for Central Otago district residents (144), while Gore District residents were evenly split between options 1 and 3 (34).
- **Key Concerns:** Increased costs and debt for ratepayers were a concern across all options. Submitters opposed to a Joint CCO were worried about loss of local control and accountability. There was concern regarding the accuracy of cost modelling and the potential for cost overruns. A lack of transparency and community consultation was also noted.
- **Submitters' Priorities:** Retaining local control over water resources was a key priority. Affordability for ratepayers was paramount. Transparency and accountability in water service management were highly valued, as was water quality.
- **Notable Patterns:** There was a strong preference for local expertise and knowledge in managing water infrastructure, as well as distrust of larger bureaucracies and the potential for reduced accountability. Some submissions suggest exploring alternative funding models to reduce costs.

Other points to note:

- Despite the Queenstown Lakes District Council not being part of SWDW and not within the scope of consultation, a number of Central Otago residents' submissions raised concerns regarding Queenstown's wastewater management and its impact on water quality in the Kawarau River.
- Clutha District Council's consultation saw an active interest group advocate for Option 3 (In-House Water Services Delivery). The group solicited submission feedback from submitters via online submission or hardcopy feedback forms. This included over 40 hard copy submissions being collected and delivered to council.
- Waitaki District Council's consultation period saw some supporters of Option 3 (In-House Water Services Delivery) compiling alternative summaries which included out-of-date modelling and inaccurate data. This information was actively distributed through local media and council's engagement events. This resulted in some

submission comments reflecting opinions based on these sources of information rather than council's.

Collated Themes and Key Points raised by submitters

For each option, submission themes are summarised along with the key points raised within submissions. Staff responses to the key points raised within submissions are detailed.

Note - The themes and key points raised through consultation may not apply to all councils. Where a specific key point relates to an individual council, these have been noted.

Option 1 – Joint CCO

Themes raised in submissions:

- The potential for economies of scale, improved efficiency, and better access to expertise were seen as key benefits of a Joint CCO.
- Many respondents viewed a Joint CCO as reducing duplication and overhead costs.
- Some noted that a Joint CCO would lead to better water quality and infrastructure.
- The importance of retaining existing skilled water professionals during the transition to a CCO was noted.
- Many submissions highlight the importance of transparency, accountability, and community representation in the CCO's governance and decision-making processes.
- The desire for cost control and affordability for ratepayers was raised.
- There were concerns about the risk for increased bureaucracy, over-management, and inefficient spending within a Joint CCO.
- Concerns existed regarding the potential loss of, or changes to, local control and influence over water services, particularly for rural water schemes.
- Some submissions expressed a need for clarity on how the CCO would be funded and how costs would be allocated across different councils and user groups.

Key Points Raised	Staff Response
Concerns existed regarding the potential loss of, or changes to, local control and decision making over water services. Submissions highlighted the importance of transparency, accountability, and community representation in the CCO's governance	<p>Under a joint CCO model, each Council retains ownership as a shareholder. Water, wastewater and stormwater assets would be transferred to the CCO but remain in public ownership through the councils' shareholding. There would be a Council Shareholders Committee, with one council one vote. that would be responsible for representing their community's interests and priorities.</p> <p>The Council Shareholders Committee would manage the appointment of the board of directors, development of a Statement of Expectations, and fulfil governance and oversight roles.</p>

and decision-making processes.	<p>Councils would retain strategic oversight by setting expectations, priorities and strategic directions for the organisation that will guide and inform decision making. The organisation would be required to perform and report against those expectations. Councils could also review and adjust the organisation's strategic direction if needed.</p> <p>Transparency: The CCO would be accountability to communities through a Water Services Strategy (three-yearly, similar to LTP), annual plans and annual reports. These would include financial statements, pricing and investment plans specific to water services. These measures ensure councils maintain oversight while enabling the CCO to deliver efficient and financially sustainable water services.</p> <p>The Joint CCO is owned by the Councils and can be directed to improve reporting or performance through the described governance processes, as and when required.</p> <p>Note the introduction of the economic regulator and expanded environmental regulation will reduce the level of discretion and control that councils currently have over water services, regardless of the delivery model adopted.</p>
Cross-subsidisation concerns – where one district is paying for another district's costs, existing debt or future investment needs.	<p>Adoption of district-based pricing is a core principle of the Joint CCO. This means pricing for each Joint CCO partner council is set based on the debt profile and revenue for their district.</p> <p>Costs would be allocated based on actual use and investment needs. Under the Joint CCO residential water charges will be set so that every water user is better off than they would have been if the services had remained in-house.</p> <p>Regionally consistent pricing (price harmonisation) can be introduced only if logical and agreed. The pricing principles and associated rule sets would be defined in the Shareholders' Agreement, Joint CCO Constitution, and Statement of Expectations.</p>
Potential for economies of scale, improved efficiency, and better access to expertise were seen as key benefits of a joint CCO. Reducing duplication and overhead costs also raised.	<p>The potential for economies of scale, improved efficiency, and better access to expertise are core drivers behind the preferred Joint CCO model.</p> <p>By consolidating water service delivery across councils, the Joint CCO can reduce duplication of systems, overheads, and back-office functions, enabling a more streamlined and cost-effective operation. This approach also allows for the recruitment and retention of specialised technical staff, which smaller individual councils may find difficult to achieve on their own. These benefits align strongly with the requirement to deliver financially sustainable and high-performing water services while maintaining clear local oversight through a joint governance structure.</p> <p>Shared delivery improves access to skilled staff, funding flexibility, regulatory compliance, and investment in the systems required to support a regulated utility company of this scale.</p>
Clarity sought as to how Rural Water Schemes priorities would be met and	<p>Input from Clutha and Waitaki DC Rural Water Scheme committees was sought to understand what was important to Rural Water Schemes users and identify areas of concern.</p>

existing relationships between Scheme Committees & Councils retained.	<p>A proposed approach to incorporating the management and operation of Rural Water Schemes was presented to the scheme committees for comment. The document is provided as Attachment 8. Key features are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise rural water as a ‘fourth water’, with distinct treatment, service, and pricing arrangements embedded in the Joint CCO’s founding documents. • Service expectations and engagement with rural users will be set through the Statement of Expectations, allowing councils to define service levels, pricing, and consultation requirements. • Rural Water Scheme based pricing, for individual water schemes is supported by the pricing model (in the same way that District Based Pricing is supported). • Local rural scheme committee roles are likely to need to change, engagement will continue via representative groups to retain local knowledge, representation and input to the Statement of Expectations. • Continued use of local workforces and long-term improvements expected through better planning and investment.
Concern about increasing rates and charges and overall affordability of services. Risk of increased bureaucracy, over-management, and inefficient spending within a Joint CCO	<p>The changes in legislation, regulation and future investment requirements mean that water services charges are going to increase, irrespective of the delivery model adopted.</p> <p>The Joint CCO model offers the most cost-efficient option for customers through scale efficiencies, streamlined delivery, and better access to expertise.</p> <p>Expansion of the group to include further councils offers the opportunity to realise further efficiencies and reduce overall customer costs. This is an opportunity that is not available in the in-house or stand-alone CCO options</p> <p>Legislation provides for current rates relief processes to incorporate water service charges cost relief – for vulnerable members of the community. The entity will adopt a hardship policy to support those consumers that are not eligible for rates rebates but are experiencing material hardship.</p>
Desire for clarity on how local priorities would be retained	<p>Councils can negotiate specific service standards, investment plans, and reporting requirements to ensure continued alignment with local needs.</p> <p>Refer to earlier comments regarding “Concern about loss of local control and decision making”.</p>
The importance of retaining existing skilled water professionals during the transition to a CCO was noted.	<p>In a resource constrained industry, retaining existing and recruiting new skilled water professionals is recognised as critical to the success of the Joint CCO.</p> <p>The transition approach will seek to minimise disruption to existing staff and ensure continuity of service delivery. This will include exploring opportunities for existing council employees with water-related roles to transfer into the new organisation, preserving institutional knowledge and supporting a smooth transition.</p>

	The Joint CCO will also provide enhanced career development pathways, access to a wider network of peers, and greater professional support, helping to attract and retain talent across the region.
Perception of pre-determined outcome	<p>The legislated consultation process requires Councils to identify a preferred option for consultation.</p> <p>Submission feedback is informing Council deliberations and will help to further refine the options and future decision making.</p>
Role of Mana Whenua not defined	<p>Mana whenua has been engaged as part of the planning work and consultation for Southern Water Done Well. Further engagement will be undertaken.</p> <p>Engagement and dialogue will continue to define a meaningful role for mana-whenua as Joint CCO planning and design is progressed.</p> <p>Once a proposal has been developed it would be put to Councils for approval.</p>
Risk of privatisation of water assets	<p>Legislation prohibits the privatisation of water assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water assets must remain in public ownership. • The proposed Joint CCO will be publicly owned by councils. • Private ownership or control of strategic water assets is not permitted.
Delay a decision on the future of water services until after local body elections in October 2025	<p>The Minister of Local Government, Simon Watts, has stated in a letter to SWDW councils that there will be NO time extension to submit a Water Services Delivery Plan. Refer Attachment 4. This means councils cannot wait until after the local body election on 11 October to decide on their preferred water services delivery model and produce a Water Services Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Failure to produce a plan or producing one that doesn't meet legislative requirements will likely see the Government step in to ensure compliance at the Council's cost</p> <p>It would also be extremely difficult for a new council to overturn any decisions. The Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) must approve any changes to a Water Services Delivery Plan. The DIA has been quite clear that extreme extenuating circumstances would have to exist for this to happen, if at all.</p>
Risk that a CCO will become another Wellington Water	<p>The CCO model transfers budget-setting and asset ownership to the new entity, unlike Wellington Water.</p> <p>The structure of Wellington Water where councils retained control of budgets, limited governance and operational effectiveness.</p> <p>The delivery agency lacked control over funding despite being responsible for planning and implementation.</p>
Concerns regarding the accuracy of cost modelling and potential for cost overruns	<p>Independent and locally grounded: Cost modelling was completed by independent experts using council data, ensuring locally accurate and relevant forecasts.</p> <p>Independent assurance provided by Concept Consulting and Infometrics.</p>

	<p>Conservative estimates used: Modelling includes prudent assumptions for inflation, compliance costs, and investment needs to reduce risk of underestimation.</p> <p>Managing delivery risk to prevent cost over runs is key. SWDW is well connected with other councils planning to setup Joint CCOs and there is considerable previous work to leverage. The planned 1 July 2027 transfer date provides the time needed to develop a robust transition plan.</p>
<p>Treatment of Stranded Costs left with individual councils – (these are costs that were previously considered recoverable under a prior regulatory or contractual framework but become unrecoverable when that framework changes).</p>	<p>Stranded overheads relate to the corporate costs currently incurred by council organisations. They are not costs that relate specifically to three waters and often are not reflective of underlying effort created or attributed to three waters. These costs will remain in councils, although opportunities exist to minimise these by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing services to the water services organisation (billing and customer services in particular) • Transferring some staff to the water services organisation if organisational capacity exists, and roles will be required in the entity • Lease of surplus office space to the Water Services Organisation <p>Councils will need to consider whether they are “right sized” as part of the transition process. Stranded overheads may be managed over time through attrition, or more quickly through restructuring. Alternatively, Councils may take the opportunity to reallocate resources elsewhere within their organisation to deliver more value for ratepayers.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of stranded overheads, for each council, would be completed as part of transition planning – to ensure these are appropriately managed and provided for.</p>
<p>Concern that a Joint CCO would result in being responsible for QLDC wastewater issues –</p>	<p>QLDC is not part of the SWDW Councils and has a preferred Standalone CCO model, which it is currently consulting on.</p> <p><i>Note that this key point was raised in CODC Submissions</i></p>

Option 2 – Stand-alone CCO

Themes raised in submissions:

- The desire for local control and accountability over water resources was a key reason for supporting a stand-alone CCO.
- Concerns exist that a CCO was a step towards privatising water services.
- Concerns about potential cost increases and debt burdens on ratepayers were again evident with this option.
- Some submitters suggested only partnering with specific neighbouring councils rather than a wider amalgamation.

- Some participants expressed a lack of trust in councils' ability to effectively manage a CCO, citing past instances of what they considered poor decision-making.

Key Points Raised	Staff Response
<p>The desire for local control and accountability over water resources was a key driver in submissions for supporting a Stand-alone CCO.</p>	<p>The introduction of the economic regulator and expanded environmental regulation will reduce the level of discretion and control that councils currently have over water services, regardless of the delivery model adopted.</p> <p>Establishing separate Stand-alone CCO governance, back-office systems, and statutory functions would result in higher administrative costs without delivering scale benefits available under the Joint CCO model.</p> <p>Financial modelling shows that this option results in the highest charges for water service customers.</p> <p>As under the Joint CCO Option, each Council retains ownership as a shareholder and has a direct role in governance through the Council Appointments & Accountability Committee OR directly with the Water Organisation Board.</p>
<p>Concern about increasing rates and charges and overall affordability of services.</p>	<p>The changes in legislation, regulation and future investment requirements mean that water services charges are going to increase, irrespective of the delivery model adopted.</p> <p>A Stand-alone CCO would not benefit from the efficiencies of scale available through a Joint CCO. Without the ability to spread costs across multiple councils, a Stand-alone CCO would face higher per-household charges and greater difficulty in accessing specialist skills and resources.</p> <p>Financial modelling shows that the Stand-alone CCO would be the costliest of the three options for customers.</p> <p>Legislation provides for current rates relief processes to incorporate water service charges – for vulnerable members of the community.</p>
<p>Some submissions expressed a lack of trust in councils' ability to effectively manage a CCO, citing past instances of what they considered poor decision-making.</p>	<p>A Stand-alone CCO operated by a single council may face challenges in attracting the skilled personnel and specialist expertise needed to deliver water services to required standards.</p> <p>Without the scale benefits of a Joint CCO, a Stand-alone CCO is also more likely to face higher operating costs and increased competition for limited industry resources. Over time, this could impact service quality and affordability.</p>
<p>Some submitters suggested only partnering with specific neighbouring councils rather than a wider amalgamation</p>	<p>A Stand-alone CCO could serve as a transitional step toward potential future collaboration. However, delaying participation in a Joint CCO would result in additional costs and reduced efficiencies through the transition.</p> <p>If a council later seeks to join an established Joint CCO, it will likely need to do so under the terms already agreed by the existing partners. This could limit the council's ability to influence the governance, priorities, and service design to reflect local needs.</p>

	Early participation provides the opportunity to help shape the CCO from the outset and ensure local priorities are embedded.
Risk of privatisation of water assets	Legislation prohibits the privatisation of water assets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water assets must remain in public ownership. Private ownership or control of strategic water assets is not permitted.

Option 3 – In-House Business Unit

Themes raised in submissions:

- There was a desire to retain local control and decision-making power over water assets.
- Some submitters were concerned that CCOs would increase costs and debt for ratepayers.
- Many submitters considered keeping water services in-house would be more cost-effective, avoiding bureaucracy and establishment costs of new entities.
- Councils should prioritise core services and live within their means.
- Concern about the accuracy of cost modelling and the potential for cost overruns with CCOs.
- Submitters saw this option as the best way to retain local expertise and knowledge in managing water infrastructure.
- Distrust of larger bureaucracies and lack of accountability.
- Avoiding cross-subsidisation of other districts' water infrastructure needs was a driver for supporters of this option.
- There were some comments around councils collaborating and achieving economies of scale without forming a CCO.
- Some respondents want to retain flexibility and the option to join a CCO later if necessary. They view the in-house option as the least risky.

Key Points Raised	Staff Response
Strong preference to retain current local control and decision-making Submissions note that this is considered the most accountable and locally responsive model Keeping in house avoids large bureaucracies and lack of accountability.	<p>Introduction of an economic regulator and expanded environmental regulation reduces the level of discretion and control that Councils have previously held over their three waters operations.</p> <p>Council will need to meet the requirements of the regulator who will be able to require that they invest more in water and charge more. If the Council does not fulfil its responsibilities, this may result in the intervention of the economic regulator and/or appointment of a Crown Facilitator.</p> <p>As for the Joint CCO Option, each Council retains ownership as a shareholder and has a direct role in governance through the Council Shareholder Representative Group.</p>

<p>Keeping water services in-house would be more cost-effective, avoiding bureaucracy and establishment costs of new entities. Belief that councils can collaborate and achieve economies of scale without forming a CCO.</p>	<p>The changes in legislation, regulation and future investment requirements mean that water services charges are going to increase, irrespective of the delivery model adopted.</p> <p>While an In-House Business Unit model has lower establishment costs, financial modelling, with conservative assumptions, confirms that the in-house model will result in higher customer costs compared to the Joint CCO (including establishment costs).</p> <p>Further, keeping water services in-house restricts the ability to access the specialist skills, systems, and procurement efficiencies required to meet the challenge of setting up a regulated utility company within council.</p> <p>Collaboration between councils through shared service arrangements has historically delivered only modest gains and the arrangements lack permanence.</p> <p>DIA advice is <i>“the establishment of a Southern Water Done Well water CCO comprising of the four councils’ water services is likely the only viable option for delivering a Water Services Delivery Plan that meets the legislated financial sustainability requirements for both water services and councils, whilst managing the affordability impact of required water services charges on household budgets.”</i></p>
<p>Leave water services in house and decide later whether to form a Joint CCO</p>	<p>The SWDW Councils have a common set of challenges and is working effectively to define the best approach that works for the combined group. Securing a decision to continue this collaboration will provide much needed certainty for staff, and contractors to build a future ready water services organisation.</p> <p>Delaying a decision to join a Joint CCO model by leaving water services in house would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incur additional costs through delivering the work needed to setup a compliant inhouse utility business – followed by costs to transition to an established CCO. • Lose the opportunity to design a water services organisation that works best for the district
<p>Desire to retain current staff and local jobs</p>	<p>The retention of existing staff and local knowledge can be delivered by all three options.</p> <p>However, in an In-House Business Unit, recruiting and retaining skilled staff in a competitive labour market, competing against larger water organisations, may become more difficult without scale.</p>
<p>Concern about affordability and future compliance</p>	<p>Substantial new investment in people, systems, and infrastructure would be required to meet future drinking water and environmental standards.</p> <p>This option results in the higher costs for water service consumers. This option will also limit or prevent Council's</p>

	<p>ability to invest in other non-water infrastructure as debt ceiling is reached.</p> <p>Water service delivery costs will rise irrespective of the option chosen. The Joint CCO model is the most efficient and offers the lowest costs for consumers.</p>
Confidence, and conversely lack of confidence, in council service performance and management of water services	<p>While water service customers may consider councils are currently delivering water services reliably, the introduction of economic and environmental regulation and the need for future investment, requires change to the current approach.</p> <p>A contradictory theme in submissions is that Councils have previously not operated, maintained or managed water services to an acceptable level.</p>
A belief that councils should prioritise core services and “live within their means.” Concern that the in-house model lacks scale and capacity.	<p>Substantial new investment in people, systems, and infrastructure would be required to meet future drinking water and environmental standards.</p> <p>Without the ability to share costs or resources across councils, smaller operations are more vulnerable to shocks, cost escalation, and compliance failures.</p>
Avoiding cross-subsidisation of other districts' water infrastructure needs was a driver for supporters of this option.	<p>Under this option while costs are retained within the district and are borne by water services users, the Joint CCO model also offers this feature through the adoption of district-based pricing. Debt / investment and revenue requirements are calculated at a district level. Note that Rural Water Schemes also benefit from this approach.</p>

Significance

This decision is of **high** significance in accordance with the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy due to the financial, operational and governance implications for Council and the community. The decision will shape Council's approach to water service delivery for the next decade and beyond.

Public consultation has been conducted in accordance with the alternative requirements in the Local Government (Water Services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2004.

Options

The following table summarises the advantages and disadvantages of each option previously identified prior to consultation. Updates have been made to reflect outcomes of further analysis and relevant additional key points or themes identified through consultation – and are shown in bold italics. (The financial advantages and disadvantages of each option are detailed further in the implications and risks section of this report.)

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1 – Joint Council Controlled Organisation This option proposes a Joint CCO to manage water services for all four district councils (Central Otago, Clutha, Gore and Waitaki). The CCO will be jointly owned, with shared governance, financial responsibility, and resource management. (Preferred Option)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>DIA initial assessment is that this is the only option likely to meet the legislated financial sustainability requirements.</i> ○ <i>This option provides the lowest cost for water users. Spreading costs across multiple councils makes water services more affordable for communities than if each council managed them alone</i> ○ Standardised asset management improves planning and efficiency. ○ Shared workforce increases resilience and career opportunities ○ Larger scale enables better access to expertise, specialists and improved systems. ○ Improved contractor attractiveness through larger procurement programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Investment prioritisation may vary across communities. ○ Joint CCO may independently set charges, impacting on affordability (potentially offset by regulatory oversight) ○ Potential loss of high-value jobs in small districts, though local presence is likely. ○ Risk of minimum-cost investment decisions rather than enhancing service levels ○ Potential reduction in council control (potentially offset by regulatory oversight). ○ Less capacity to procure services from individual councils, potentially impacting stranded overheads. ○ 159 submissions received by Central Otago District Council <i>did not support this option</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Certainty of long-term funding enables consistent project delivery. ○ 'First mover advantage' for Councils forming the Joint CCO to design a solution that works for them. ○ Independent professional board appointments via council process ○ Financial separation reduces pressure on council balance sheets. ○ <i>District pricing ensures each community pays only for the cost of services and investment in its own area, avoiding cross-subsidisation.</i> ○ <i>Independent assurance confirms benefit estimates are conservative and may be considerably higher.</i> ○ <i>Legislation prohibits the privatisation of water services</i> ○ <i>Expansion of the group to include further councils offers the opportunity to realise further efficiencies and reduce customer costs.</i> ○ <i>Rural Water Schemes provided for as a Fourth Water</i> ○ <i>Other NZ Water Service Joint CCOs are being setup to an advanced timeline and offer opportunities to leverage their approach & experience.</i> 	<p>(52.4% did not support Option 1, 14.8% for Standalone CCO and 37.6% for in House Business Unit.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Risk that stranded overheads cannot be fully managed and add cost to ratepayer.</i> ○ <i>Establishment of a Joint CCO is a significant undertaking and poses significant financial and delivery risks if not managed appropriately.</i>
--	--	---

<p>Option 2 – Stand-alone Central Otago District Council Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) Each council establishes a separate CCO for water services, providing financial separation and independent governance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Financial separation of water debt reduces pressure on council finances. ○ Independent professional board appointments via council process ○ CCO controls investment priorities and risk management ○ Certainty of long-term funding supports consistent project delivery. ○ Greater likelihood of the retention of higher-wage jobs in districts compared to a Joint CCO ○ Legislation prohibits the privatisation of water services ○ Negligible financial and delivery risk to implement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DIA initial assessment is that this option is not financially sustainable ○ Smaller scale limits financial and workforce resilience ○ Reduced scale to meet asset management and regulatory requirements. ○ Increased costs due to weaker procurement power ○ Higher setup and operational costs ○ Higher customer water charges than a Joint CCO ○ Difficulty attracting qualified board members with a limited talent pool. ○ May require stricter borrowing covenants than a Joint CCO ○ Limits to council control - Commerce Commission may direct investment or revenue decisions.. ○ 258 submissions received by Central Otago District Council did not support this option (85% did not support Option 2, 47.5% for the Joint Council Controlled Organisation, 37.6% for the in House Business Unit. ○ Adoption of this option as a stepping stone to a Joint CCO – incurs additional cost & lose opportunity to input to Joint CCO design.
<p>Option 3 – Central Otago District Council In-House Business Unit This option involves each council managing its own water services as an internal business unit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Minimum change to existing service delivery structure compared to CCO options (but will still require changes to set up ring fencing and meet economic regulatory requirements)</i> ○ <i>Councils retain control over work programmes and investment priorities – subject to regulatory requirements.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DIA initial assessment that the option is not financially sustainable and therefore not compliant with the legislation ○ Higher administrative costs and compliance burdens ○ Increased scrutiny from regulatory bodies. ○ Higher risk of financial strain impacting other council services

in Council with financial ringfencing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 114 submissions received by Central Otago District Council supported this option, 47.6% for the Joint CCO, 14.8% for the Stand-alone CCO. ○ <i>Use of local resources supported – noting the challenges to attract and retain a skilled workforce.</i> ○ <i>Lowest setup costs of the three options</i> ○ <i>Negligible financial and delivery risk to implement.</i> ○ <i>Avoids the additional governance structure of Standalone & Joint CCO options.</i> ○ <i>Existing arrangements with Rural Water Schemes retained</i> ○ <i>No risk of cross subsidisation across other districts.</i> ○ <i>The in-house business unit's sole focus would be Central Otago.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited flexibility to control water charges under economic regulation. ○ Higher water charges than a Joint CCO ○ Reduced ability to attract and retain skilled workforce. ○ Cannot access enhanced financing options. ○ Reduced scale to meet asset management and regulatory requirements. ○ Future delivery model may be imposed by the regulator – removing council decision rights. ○ Lost first mover advantage to design a delivery model that best meets the needs of the district. ○ Councils would struggle to fund other important council projects because they would need to borrow heavily for water infrastructure.
--	---	--

4. Financial Considerations

Implications and Risks

Strategic Consistency

Councils must revisit their respective Long-term Plans and associated supporting strategies (including Financial & Asset Management Strategies), to ensure that water service delivery complies with Local Water Done Well legislation requirements.

The options analysis completed to date includes consideration of the impacts on current LTPs. The impacts of the selected options were detailed in the Consultation Document for community consultation.

Following decision making, amendments to Annual and / or LTPs will be made from FY 26/27.

Financial Implications

The financial implications for ratepayers and impact on overall Council debt are included within the Morrison Low Report (Attachment 1) and were summarised for each option in the Consultation Document (Attachment 2).

Option 1 – Jointly Owned CCO:

A jointly owned CCO will have greater capacity to manage debt and fund infrastructure upgrades. It will be able to access debt under an assumed 8% FFO to debt covenant and its waters debt will not be considered as part of Council's total borrowing.

Financial models indicate **lower charges** for all Districts than options 2 and 3, with charges under the Joint CCO model expected to rise by 161% between 2025 and 2034.

The Joint CCO would use a local pricing approach, setting water charges for each council area based on local investment needs and debt profile. Consumers would only be charged for the services they receive and would not be subsidising services in other districts.

Efficiency savings from collaboration would be shared proportionally to ensure fair and transparent pricing. This approach provides the following advantages:

- Charges reflect local service and investment levels
- Prevents cross-subsidisation between councils
- Builds public trust and supports local accountability
- Encourages efficient, targeted investment
- Enables performance monitoring and benchmarking across the region

An initial estimate of cost to establish the **Joint Water Services CCO** is calculated at **\$13.8 million**. The saving projected are the net savings after set-up and running costs are accounted for. This includes the transition costs for governance structure development, a transitional entity, asset transfers, regulatory compliance, and initial investments in IT infrastructure and systems. The costs would be shared equally among the participating councils, with the financial modelling demonstrating that no council faces undue financial

strain. Financial modelling reflects these costs and a Joint CCO remains the most cost-effective water service delivery model for consumers.

Option 2 – Stand-alone Central Otago District Council CCO

A stand-alone CCO will borrow under an assumed 12% FFO to debt covenant, and its waters debt will not be considered as part of Council's total borrowing. Water charges under a Stand-alone CCO are expected to rise by 195% between 2025 and 2034.

Option 3 – In House Business Unit

Under the in-house delivery model, councils are projected to face significant financial pressures due to rising water infrastructure costs and the increased burden of compliance with new regulations. Water charges under an in-house delivery model are expected to rise 180% between 2025 and 2034.

Council's ability to borrow will be highly constrained with Council's debt to revenue ratio exceeding 200% by 2034. Removal of three waters revenue and debt will increase CODC's borrowing capacity by over \$120 million by 2034.

Legal Implications

- The decision supports compliance with statutory obligations under the Water Services Preliminary Arrangements Act and enables timely preparation and submission of a joint WSDP.
- If a territorial authority struggles to comply with the requirements for a compliant WSDP, the Act provides for the Minister to appoint either of two new roles, costs of which are borne by Council:
 - Crown facilitators, who may work with Councils to assist, advise, or amend draft WSDPs; and
 - Crown water services specialists, who may prepare, direct, or adopt a WSDP in accordance with their notice of appointment.
- In addition, the Act provides that a person who contravenes an obligation to disclose information can be fined up to \$500,000 or, in the case of an entity, \$5 million.

5. Compliance

Local Government Act 2002 Purpose Provisions	This decision enables democratic local decision making and action by, and on behalf of communities by
Decision consistent with other Council plans and policies? Such as the District Plan, Economic Development Strategy etc.	Yes this is consistent with council plans and policies.
Considerations as to sustainability, the environment and climate change impacts	Climate Change impacts would be assessed as part of any change to service provision.
Risks Analysis	See below

Significance, Consultation and Engagement (internal and external)	<p>This decision is of high significance in accordance with the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy due to the financial, operational and governance implications for Council and the community. The decision will shape Council's approach to water service delivery for the next decade and beyond.</p> <p>Public consultation has been conducted in accordance with the alternative requirements in the Local Government (Water Services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2004.</p>
--	--

Risks

Risk	Impacts
Failure to proceed with a Joint CCO may jeopardise Council's ability to deliver a compliant WSDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DIA review determines the WSDP does not meet legislative requirements and tests leading to DIA requiring the Group of Councils to alter the WSDP. • Potential DIA intervention with associated loss of decision-making control and additional cost
Individual Councils do not approve progressing with a Joint CCO approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The remaining councils will need to reassess the viability of a Joint CCO with the remaining members of the group and confirm whether to proceed with a revised WSDP (noting that further councils may seek or be compelled to join the group). • Group may become unviable. • Individual Councils may not be able to complete a compliant WSDP • Potential DIA intervention with associated loss of decision-making control and additional cost
WSDP is not submitted by 3 Sept 25 statutory deadline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputation risk for Councils • Potential DIA intervention with associated loss of decision-making control
DIA does not approve the WSDP and requires the document to be revised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIA requires the Group of Councils to alter the WSDP • DIA requires the Group of Councils to change the Operating Model Design • DIA requires other Councils to join the Group of Councils before the WSDP is accepted and appoints a Crown Facilitator or Water Services Specialist
Ratepayers do not appreciate the impending costs increases for 3 Waters Services – irrespective of the delivery model adopted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing affordability issue for larger group of ratepayers • Negative publicity and reputation risk for Councils • Lack of engagement in consultation process
Joint CCO planning may reveal that actual establishment costs are greater than forecast (note that implementation costs have been conservatively modelled and subject to independent assurance).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential increase in project budget • Erosion of forecasted benefits • The transition approach may require revision.
Changes to legislation through Bill 3 may require additional resource commitments and amendments to arrangements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost and time associated with rework • Potential increase in project budget • Additional council resource commitments

6. Summary of reasons for recommendation to adopt - Option 1 - Joint CCO Model.

In March 2025 CODC along with the three other SWDW Councils identified a Joint CCO as the preferred model for water service delivery. This option was informed by financial modelling and analysis to determine the recommended structure to deliver future water services for the community and meet government's intentions under the Local Water Done Well legislation.

This report has presented a range of information, including additional analysis and peer review outcomes, DIA's Initial Financial Sustainability Assessment and the outcomes of community consultation. Staff responses to the key submission themes and points raised in submissions has been provided. The advantages and disadvantages of the individual delivery model option have been updated to reflect outcomes of the additional analysis and community consultation.

Based on the further work completed and the outcomes of community consultation, the recommendation is for CODC to adopt Option 1 Joint CCO model for water service delivery in partnership with Clutha District Council, Gore District Council, and Waitaki District Council.

The reasons for this recommendation include:

A. Affordability for Households

- Independent modelling shows the Joint CCO is the least-cost option for communities over time.
- Delivers operating efficiencies and shared procurement savings that reduce upward pressure on household bills.
- District based pricing approach ensures communities only pay for their own services and investment needs.

B. Improved Service Delivery and Compliance

- Creates a dedicated, specialist water organisation with scale to deliver safe, reliable, and compliant services.
- Enables consistent investment in skilled personnel, systems, and asset management.
- Better placed to meet evolving public health, environmental, and regulatory standards (e.g., Taumata Arowai, Commerce Commission).
- Recognising and providing for Rural Water as a Fourth Water.

C. Resilience and Deliverability

- Shared workforce and capital delivery capacity provide greater resilience to industry shortages.
- Enhanced ability to scale resources, deliver capital programmes, and respond to emergencies across the region.

D. Governance and Local Control

- Designed by councils to retain ownership, control, and strategic direction through shareholder representation.
- Local priorities reflected through council input and localised service plans.
- Potential for a meaningful role for Mana Whenua, subject to further engagement and discussion.

E. Public Confidence through Transparency

- A Joint CCO enables clear lines of accountability, financial transparency, and reporting.
- Locally set prices and performance benchmarking increase community trust.

- Avoids the inefficiencies and duplication across the four councils which occur with the Standalone CCO and In-house models.

F. **Economic and Strategic Opportunity**

- Positions the region to attract and retain skilled staff, invest in smart infrastructure, and drive innovation.
- Joint capability opens up funding and co-investment opportunities not available to smaller entities.

G. **Risk Mitigation**

- Spreads the risk of cost overruns, compliance breaches, and staff shortages across multiple councils.
- Avoids the risk of stranded assets or underinvestment seen in status quo or fragmented models.

H. **Legislative and Regulatory Compliance**

- DIA advice that the Joint CCO is likely the only viable option for delivering a Water Services Delivery Plan that meets the legislated financial sustainability requirements.
- Joint CCO provides the basis for ongoing legislative compliance.

7. **Next Steps**

Consequential Decisions and Next Steps

Based on Council's resolutions the following consequential decisions and next steps will be undertaken:

Should Council resolve to adopt the Option 1 - Joint CCO Model:

- Council's decision will be communicated to the other Southern Water Done Well Councils. Council's decision, along with the decisions of the other Southern Water Done Well Councils, will inform the basis of the WSDP for council resolution to approve on 5 August 2025.
- Chief Executives are required to certify that the Water Service Delivery Plan meets the Government's criteria including financial sustainability in advance of submission to the DIA by 3 September 2025. DIA advice to date is that this option is likely to meet the criteria.
- Under the Commitment Agreement, the Southern Water Done Well Council Executive Group and Project Steering Group will progress arrangements for the establishment of the Joint CCO during the Local Government election and DIA review period (which is expected to be complete by December 2025). Updates will continue to be provided to the Councils.

The work will include the development of a detailed implementation plan beyond that included in WSDP and retention, identification and appointment of resources to support the transition phase. Given the long lead times, planning and recommendations for the identification and recruitment of an interim Chief Executive and Establishment Board-necessary to establish the Joint CCO by July 2027, will also be undertaken. Further updates on the transition plan will be brought back to the Councils for approval in early August 2025.

- DIA review and assessment (and request for further information) of the WSDP will occur from submission and is expected to be complete by December 2025.

Should Council resolve to adopt Option 2 Stand-alone CODC Council Controlled Organisation or Option 3 In-house CODC Business Unit:

- This decision will be communicated to the other Southern Water Done Well Councils. Council's agreed option will inform the basis of the WSDP to be presented for council resolution to approve in early August 2025.
- Chief Executives are required to certify the Water Service Delivery Plan meets the Government's criteria including financial sustainability in advance of submission to the DIA by 3 September 2025. Advice from the DIA is that the Internal Business Unit and the Single Council CCO options are not likely to meet the criteria.
- Further updates on the transition plan will be brought back to the Councils for approval in August 2025.
- DIA review and assessment (and any request for further information) of the WSDP will occur from submission and is expected to be complete by December 2025.

8. Attachments

Appendix 1 - Morrison Low Report (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 2 - SWDW Commitment Agreement (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 3 - CODC LWDW Consultation Document (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 4 - Minister of Local Government Hon Simon Watts Letter to CODC (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 5 - DIA SWDW Assessment Report (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 6 - SWDW Concept Review Letter and Design Elements Report (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 7 - Infometrics Report - Economic Analysis (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 8 - Rural Water Schemes - Summary of Approach (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 9 - SWDW Submission Document (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 10 - Engagement Report (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

Appendix 11 - Overall Submissions Report (under separate cover) [⇒](#)

8 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The date of the next scheduled meeting is 30 July 2025.
