

---

# Hearings Committee

## OPEN MINUTES

---

Minutes of a meeting of the Hearings Committee held in the Council Chambers, 126-148 Oxford Street, Levin, on Tuesday 19 June 2018 at 10.00 am.

---

### PRESENT

**Chairperson** Cr J F G Mason  
**Members** Cr R H Campbell  
Cr B P Wanden

### IN ATTENDANCE

Mr P Gaydon	(Performance & Technical Manager)
Mr R Hughes	(Environmental Engineer)
Mr I McLachlan	(Risk Management Lead)
Mrs K J Corkill	(Meeting Secretary)

### ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Ms A Ainsworth	(Tonkin Taylor)
Mr C Purchas	(Tonkin Taylor – via Skype) (until 12 noon)

<u>Submitters</u>	<u>Submission</u>
	No
	34 Piri-Hira Tukapua, Enviro Clean Management, MMIL Group
	7 Ingo Schleuss
	1 Malcolm Hadlum
	12 Ross Nicholson
	28 Charles Rudd
	19 Joanna Sim
	23 Jacinta Liddell
	17 Anne Hunt on behalf of Philip Taueki
	33 Anne Hunt
	29 Christina Paton & Olaf Eady
	31 Eth Treanor, Hokio Environment & Kaitiaki Alliance
	24 Vivienne Bold
	32 Michael Kay, Horowhenua Ratepayers & Residents Association
	30 Michael Kay, Water & Environmental Care Association

### PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

There were two members of the public in attendance at the commencement of the meeting.

---

## 1 Apologies

There were no apologies.

## 2 Declarations of Interest

Stressing that she was very aware of her obligation to act in a fair and reasonable manner, Cr Mason gave a background to a matter that had arisen involving two submitters, Anne Hunt and Philip Taueki. Cr Mason said she had received independent legal advice and was assured there were no overlapping interests that would impede her ability to act fairly and reasonably.

Cr Campbell noted that he had over the years attended many of the meetings of the groups that some of the submitters represented but he did not belong to any of those organisations.

## 3 Announcements

Opening the hearing the Chair advised that this was a meeting of Council, the conduct of which was subject to Standing Orders. Copies of meeting protocols were available for anyone who may wish to check them.

Cr Mason introduced herself, her fellow Hearings Committee members and Council staff and outlined the process for the meeting which was to hear from submitters. Submitters would have 10 minutes to speak and there would be the opportunity for Panel Members to ask questions. Committee Members had read all the submissions received.

## 4 Reports

### 4.1 Waste Minimisation and Management Plan Hearing

#### Purpose

To provide the platform for the Hearings Committee (Committee) to hear and consider submissions received on the Draft Waste Minimisation and Management Plan (WMMP) & Draft Waste Assessment (WA), and make a subsequent recommendation to Council in respect of the Statement of Proposal.

MOVED by Cr Wanden, seconded Cr Campbell:

*THAT Report 18/319 Waste Minimisation and Management Plan Hearing be received.*

*THAT this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.*

*THAT late submissions be received and included in the consultation.*

**CARRIED**

#### Submission 34 – Piri-Hira Tukapua – Enviro Clean Management, MMIL Group – Ms

Tukapua advised that she was taking a voice recording so she could report back to the group (whose members she identified) that she was representing. Speaking on behalf of the group, Ms Tukapua said they wanted a better Waste Management Plan and wanted to use different technology that converted waste to energy. This would be a game changer for the future if pursued and could mean a zero waste future for this community. The process the group were supporting was the cleanest and greenest form of waste treatment available that they were aware of and it had extensive research around it. The Officer's response was that there was not enough waste in this district to support it, but this district was in a prime location to

take rubbish from other areas.

Giving a background to the past treatment of waste and what could be done in the future, Ms Tukapua gave an explanation of the waste to energy process which had been effectively used for over two decades. The process recognised waste as a resource and while it was expensive, the group was not asking for money as they had investors in mind. It was proposed that it would be a social enterprise with the profits going back into the community.

Ms Tukapua showed a video that showcased the technology and provided more information to support their submission.

Responding to a query in relation to the landfill consent which did not run out for some time and whether the group was looking to do something prior to that, Ms Tukapua said they were more concerned about long-term contractual commitments that would preclude this being pursued.

Commenting on past consent non-compliance, Ms Tukapua said she had been through the Court information and there was some repetition in relation to consent conditions not being adhered to, mostly around odours or the flare not always working.

Mr Hughes clarified that the flare did not come under the current consent conditions.

Responding to a query in relation to waste minimisation and management and the impact of consumerism and people's buying behaviour, Ms Tukapua said with the population growing country-wide it was time to knock down the waste generated per person. The group also wanted to emphasise the three 'r's: reduce, reuse; recycle.

Commenting on the control of tonnages as mentioned, Mr Hughes said that Council control was fairly insignificant and it might be better to approach commercial operators.

Mr Purchas added that it was important to understand the context in which such plants were operating. A lot of it came down to the control of material and 100,000 tonnes was a fairly high number in terms of the Lower North Island.

Submission 7 – Ingo Schleuss – Mr Schleuss said it was about waste minimisation, not waste avoidance. He queried why people should buy things that went straight to the landfill. He suggested that the landfill was the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff and the government should step in and make industry pay for waste, which could then be passed on to the consumer, such as occurred in Germany under the green dot system where the manufacturer had the responsibility to look at the end result of a product or packaging. If industry had to be involved they would come to the party in terms of solutions and more resources needed to go into lobbying government to do something. When queried how practical it would be for Council to drive it, Mr Schleuss said he thought it should be central government led, not Council, and there should be a user/consumer charge. Also it was not just about packaging but about all products that were purchased.

Mr Schleuss further said he did not like Horowhenua taking Kapiti's waste and would like to see the landfill closed as soon as possible.

Submission 1 – Malcolm Hadlum – Mr Hadlum spoke about the history of the landfill and its placement. He said he would like, together with 20 out of the 30 submitters, was for the landfill to be closed. If one had to have something like this in one's backyard it should be like Bonny Glen, which was a state of the art landfill and it would not cost more for Kapiti Coast District Council's waste to be taken to Bonny Glen.

Mr Hadlum further commented:

- that Horowhenua could benefit from adopting a zero waste policy, which had been done in Whakatane, and turning something negative into a positive;

- if the landfill was closed it would be up to the community to take charge of its own waste which could generate a lot of opportunities in the community;
- on the cost of the Emissions Trading Scheme for Wellington.

Responding to a query about carbon credits, Mr Hughes said that these were not taken into account when the landfill was first put in but they were budgeted for now and the flare did substantially reduce Council's carbon credits.

With regard to the term "zero waste", Mr Hadlum said that was an overseas organisation which worked towards zero waste. It would not be possible to get rid of all waste, and there was also hazardous waste, but it needed to be managed.

In relation to the comment about the landfill liner being ripped, Mr Hughes said the liner was damaged, but it was repaired and the life of the liner would still outlive the leachate. For a large landfill the leachate became relatively inert in about 60 years, which would be within the life of the liner.

Mr Gaydon substantiated Mr Hughes comments about the liner repair and also noted, in relation to a comment about the leachate plume extending, that bores upstream and downstream of the landfill showed very little effect, but he would check that.

Submission 12 – Ross Nicholson – speaking as a Civil Engineer with many years' experience, and as the Council Officer who had built the 'new' landfill, Mr Nicholson said it was the best thing he had ever done. He gave a background to the new landfill's construction which he said was second to none in the country, and was better than most as the leachate was taken off the site and into the treatment plant, which then went out to the POT. Speaking of the positives in respect of the landfill, Mr Nicholson said the only thing that was not best practice was that he had not been able to persuade Council at the time to have a fund set aside for doing things in the local community.

Mr Nicholson commented on the environment and economic effects, and noting the cost of carbon credits, said these would still have to be paid if the waste went to Bonny Glen. However, he did agree that there needed to be a focus on waste reduction as it was not intended that the landfill should take everything that was disposed of. With regard to leachate, that was coming from the old landfill.

Queried if there was any evidence that the lined area of the landfill was leachate tight and always would be, Mr Nicholson said that the liner was monitored and staff would be able to see if there was anything detected in the detection well and as far as there being any problems the leachate may be causing at the waste water treatment plant, Mr Nicholson said in the time he was at Council there was none and he could not see how it would be an issue. It was a huge treatment plant and should be able to deal with the leachate quite easily.

When asked about the number of submitters who wanted the landfill closed and others who said it did not do any good for this community, Mr Nicholson said he thought it was a perception issue. Land values around the landfill were depressed and had been for a long time because of the old landfill, but most people would have bought their properties in that depressed effect in place.

Responding to the comment about money being set aside for community groups, Mr Hughes said it was in the pipeline.

Submission 28 – Charles Rudd – Responding to Mr Rudd comments on what he said he saw as consent breaches, Mr Gaydon said there were two issues, one was leachate from the old landfill site which was not covered under the current consent and the pumping of the leachate from the new lined landfill to

the waste water treatment plant, which was an internationally accepted practice, which was consented.

The meeting took a brief recess (10.55- 11.00 am)

Submission 19 – Joanna Sim – Ms Sim gave a power point presentation highlighting her concerns about the burning of waste in rural areas.

Responding to a query, Ms Sim said she did not know how this was policed. She said the first step should be to actually prohibit burning, particularly such things as plastic, asbestos, etc, as there currently was no clarity and the information provided was vague.

When it came to the permit system for burning, Mr Hughes said he could not comment as that did not sit with solid waste and was probably a regulatory function. With regard to infringements for littering, Mr Hughes said the Council was quite good at sending out infringement fines, which were \$400.00. The issue was identifying offenders. In terms of burning plastics, that could be difficult to enforce.

Cr Mason noted that whilst this did sit outside the solid waste plan, but it was something to be considered as if something was not burnt it could end up in the landfill or could be recycled.

Submission 23 – Jacinta Liddell - speaking in a broad way rather than getting into specifics, Ms Liddell spoke of a recent personal journey and how she came through that, saying that one needed to live in a way that supported the problem or live in a way that supported the solution. She suggested creating a working group to look at this as Council did have a role to play in the future. Cr Wanden agreed that Council did have a role to play and queried how Ms Liddell saw the practicalities of creating a think tank to solve some of these issues.

Ms Liddell said that Council did have a prototype in the Community Wellbeing group, with feedback coming back to Council and she would like to see Council being able to respond to good ideas that may be raised.

Mr Hughes said that Council would support a think tank; however the thing with such groups was they needed to be community driven and provision had been made in the Waste Minimisation and Management Plan for community grants.

Mr Purchas supported Mr Hughes' comments saying that provision had been made for grants and a community think tank was supported.

Submission 17 – Philip Taueki – Mrs Hunt joined the table to speak on Mr Taueki's behalf. When Mrs Hunt was requested to direct her comments to the topic of the Waste Minimisation and Management Plan rather than stormwater to Lake Horowhenua, she declined to continue and also withdrew from personally speaking.

Mr Hughes advised that Mr Purchas would be withdrawing from the meeting as he had to go to another meeting and thanked him for his assistance (12 noon).

Submission 29 – Christina Paton & Olaf Eady – Mrs Paton said she agreed with everything in the report. Remarking on the comment made in relation to having a Think Tank, Mrs Paton queried what had happened to the Environmental Forum. Commenting on fly tipping, she said that people did that because the transfer stations were not always open and there was also the issue of cost. Amongst her other comments, Mrs Paton said that to have effective waste management, it must be done nationwide so everyone was on the same page.

Mr Eady spoke about glass, plastic, rubber & e-waste, which he was familiar with because of his work in the liquor industry. In the past bottles were

returned to the breweries; that had now gone. There was also the growth in the wine industry. He concurred with Mrs Paton that waste management should be done on a national basis with the same standards with regard to waste disposal applying throughout the country.

Mr Eady commented on glass recycling and the use of plastics. Foxton now had an e-waste collection going and there was someone who was going to recycle the componentry. Setting up depots throughout the country was being looked at and what facilities would be needed was being checked.

Mrs Paton and Mr Eady replied in the affirmative when queried if they would be interested in participating in a think tank if one was set up.

Queried as to whether there was anything being done nationally on coordinating waste minimisation systems, Mr Hughes said LGNZ was currently lobbying for a sector approach, but in terms of a deposit scheme there did not seem to be anything on the horizon.

Submission 31 – Eth Treanor, Hokio Environment & Kaitiaki Alliance – In her comments, Ms Treanor suggested that as there were already plastic recycling bins, perhaps there could also be plastic rubbish bins which could be put on the roadside, or possibly there could be a return to paper bags. She also noted that what came from the land ended up in the waterways. Ms Treanor said that HEKA would prefer that private companies were not involved with waste management as they were in it for the money rather than the environment and they would like to work with Council on any proposed initiatives.

Submission 24 – Vivienne Bold – Commenting on the Tonkin Taylor Report, Ms Bold said it was interesting because it gave a full range of information. She spoke about the vandalising of the liner at the new landfill and possible ongoing leachate issues; the flare and its effectiveness; taking rubbish from Kapiti; the cost of rubbish bags; recycling and its effectiveness; the importance of the environment and our impact on it; her agreement that more trees should be planted as the land did need Council support.

With regard to comments on the flare and leachate, Mr Hughes noted that there was the old landfill that leached and the new one that did not, with one collection point.

With regard to the liner, Mr Gaydon noted the comments from Mr Nicholson, the engineer who had been responsible for putting the liner in, that it had been tested and was leachate tight.

Responding to a query in relation to the volume of waste coming from Kapiti and whether that had recently changed, Mr Hughes said that the volume of trucks varied but it was based on an annual tonnage. Over the entire year the tonnage averaged out to be the same.

In relation to the issues by submitters with regard to plastic rubbish bags and when the contract for these would be looked at, Mr Hughes said the use of compostable bags was being investigated; however it came at a higher cost. Solid waste rates for other Councils reflected their cheaper bags. In the Horowhenua the cost of bags included recycling services. Council did have a current contract for bag collection.

As she had said she did not agree with the vision for waste management, Ms Bold was queried if she had an alternate vision. She said her vision was for a positive approach, such as introducing a think tank and not just dumping rubbish at the same site. Waste had to be broken down more and she would like to see a nation-wide organisation. That would make things go more smoothly and there was a lot that could be done with our waste.

Ms Bold provided a copy of her verbal submission.

Submission 32 – Michael Kay –Horowhenua District Ratepayers & Residents Assn – Speaking on behalf of the Association, Mr Kay:



- raised the issue of the cost of bags which meant that a lot of people could not afford them;
- suggested Council provided small general rubbish bins;
- did not support private contractors being used as they were not looking to reduce rubbish;
- would like to be involved in looking into other ways of dealing with waste;
- said HDRRA was opposed to the landfill being kept in its current location;
- said they supported a zero cost model and that fining people meant rubbish would be harder to find or kept on site because of affordability which could have detrimental health affects for people in poorer communities.

Responding to the issue of private contractors and cost, Mr Hughes said that competition in the private sector did help to keep costs down.

Mr Kay provided a copy of his verbal submission.

Submission 30- Michael Kay – Water and Environmental Care Association – Mr Kay spoke about the importance of waste minimisation; the importance of recycling; and the impact of private enterprise such as vegetable growers and forestry on the environment; suggested a grant to encourage recycling. He said the Association wanted to work with Council in terms of the POT and the landfill and bringing together a group to work with Council would be a positive outcome.

A copy of Mr Kay's verbal submission on behalf of WECA was provided.

The meeting broke for a meal at 1.07 and resumed at 2.05 pm.

Having heard from those submitters who wished to speak, Members referred to the other submissions received and if there were any points from submitters or Officers that needed to be noted prior to deliberating.

Submission 2 – Jessica Hardy – no additional queries or comments.

Submission 3 – Alana Cioffi - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 4 – Anne deBorst - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 5 – Mrs D Phillips – it was noted there were some good ideas with regard to education and the disposal of nappies which should be taken into account when looking at the education aspect of waste minimisation.

Submission 6 – Mr B Barrett - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 8 – Rachael Selby on behalf of Ngatokowaru Marae Committee –this submitter reflected the wish of a number of people in that area which was to see the landfill closed.

Submission 9 – David Moore on behalf of Ngati Pareraukawa – it was stressed that they wanted Council to take the lead.

Submission 10 - Pataka Moore – no additional queries or comments.

Submission 11 – Naomi Robinson – Responding to a query, Mr Hughes advised that the POT did not form part of this consultation and issues raised by submitters were probably more to do with the leachate that goes through the wastewater treatment plant and then ended up at the POT.

Submission 13 – Chris Thake – no additional queries or comments.

Submission 14 – Susan Corkill on behalf of Fern Publishing Ltd - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 15 – Lola Haggarty - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 16 – Dean Murray – it was noted there was some suggestion that the target was too low with regard to school children.

Submission 18 – Raymond Page - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 20 – Delwyn Sanson - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 21 – Sharon Freebairn on behalf of Waitarere Beach Progressive & Ratepayers Assn - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 22 – Linda Morgan - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 25 – Radha Wardrop & Charles Bagnall - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 26 – Leone Brown - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 27 – Don Elliott - no additional queries or comments.

Submission 35 – Sharon Williams – Mr Hughes noted that Mrs Williams' submission had been received as an LTP submission. Mrs Williams had been contacted and advised that her submission would be included as part of this process.

Submission 36 – David Moore on behalf of Ngati Pareraukawau - no additional queries or comments.

With the submissions all noted, the Chair said it was now for the Hearings Committee to deliberate on the draft Plan, to consider whether it adequately reflected what Council aspired to, and recommend to Council whether or not it should be adopted.

Cr Wanden said the indications he got from submitters was that they were reasonably satisfied with the proposed targets. There were a number of issues that came out that required more thinking about, but around the plan for waste management and minimisation, whilst he agreed with most of the targets he suggested that these could be made more aspirational. There were challenges in terms of what was currently being done and he would like to see education fleshed out a little bit more. It may be that future generations would get the chance to change things for the better. He would also challenge the 500 kg disposal of waste per person.

Cr Mason said she was broadly satisfied with the Plan. She noted Mrs Paton's endorsement of the Tonkin & Taylor report, as well as her comment that some of the targets were soft. Many had raised the landfill as an issue and there was something included for its future medium and long term and there was also a challenge about responding to new ideas in terms of waste treatment. In terms of education, whilst she said she understood the ideals of the zero waste model, she did not believe that could ever be achieved. It was an aspiration. Whilst waste was a Council responsibility, Cr Mason said it was also the responsibility of every consumer. She endorsed the idea of a think tank and if there was a focus on education those from within the community would be brought on board.



Commenting on the considerable consultation that had recently been undertaken, Cr Campbell said he was very pleased with the number of submissions received and it showed that there was concern in the community on the issue. He said what had come out of the process for him, which he found exciting, was the practical ideas and new technology that people were investigating and how the waste generated could best be handled. Cr Campbell said the other thing for him was the need to keep the Environment Forum alive and well. In terms of the landfill, there were a lot of people who were concerned not only for the environment, but for the cost should it be closed. There were those who thought the landfill was now an out of date process. The environmental concerns had come through to him, outweighing the costs and education and he thought the Action Plan should more reflect that.

Coming back to the suggested waste disposal target, Mr Hughes advised that the target in the Statement of Proposal should be 400 kg, with it noted that some had suggested that even 400 kg was too high.

As the Plan needed to be presented to Council for approval, Mr Hughes said the other directive he was seeking from today's Hearing was confirmation of the vision. There had been two options consulted on for the vision: "reduce waste" or "zero waste".

When considering the vision the following was discussed:

- it was about reducing or minimising waste; zero waste was aspirational but probably not possible.
- was there another way of wording it to reflect what had come through from submitters?
- zero waste was an aspirational target. While there would be a section of the community that would applaud that aspiration others would say it was unattainable.
- the aspiration would be to get as close to zero as possible and that should be signalled as the long term goal.
- remove "zero waste" and say "try to minimise waste as much as possible"?
- get waste as low as possible through responsible reduction and through education so that people understood the "why".

The landfill and the comments that had come through from submitters was raised by Cr Campbell. He noted that some had said the landfill was out of date and nothing would be achieved for the environment whilst it was still there. Most had said close the landfill; no-one suggested having another landfill in another place. The huge number of local people who were opposed to the landfill should support serious consideration of its future.

Cr Mason noted that there was some confusion around the report on the landfill and whilst there had been some clarity provided today in terms of the integrity of the liner, it would be helpful if the information on monitoring was more readily available and easier to understand. That may assist in people's understanding and help Council in considering solid waste going forward.

Mr Hughes said that information could be made more accessible and more understandable for the general public.

With there now being a focus on education, Cr Wanden said part of that would be to educate the public about the landfill as there was some confusion about the 'old' and 'new' landfills and their environmental impacts. If the think tank eventuated there would be the opportunity to have a serious impact on some of the discussion points around the landfill.

Cr Campbell said that people lived by perception and if people believed they were being affected, to annul that the reports put out needed to dispel those perceptions and that was a hard job.

Responding to a query about Mrs Paton's comment of "soft targets" and whether these should be made a little tighter, Mr Hughes said that was hard to say as this was the first time these targets had been in place and the base-lines were not known. He suggested that one target that could be tightened was the one with regard to education and that could be extended to include more students.

What would be an appropriate number of students was discussed, with the number to be increased to 700 instead of 300.

The proposed targets in the Action Plan were discussed.

1. *Reduction in waste disposal to the landfill per person to 400 kg* – currently it was over 500 kgs.  
Mr Hughes said he thought it would be a struggle in the first year as it was a 20% reduction; however it should be achievable by the time the Plan was reviewed.  
Members said they were comfortable with the 400 kg per person target.
2. *Recycle at least 40% of waste collected from households at the roadside* – Mr Hughes said that was a step up from the current rate which was about 17%.  
Members expressed their support as it was double what was currently being collected.
3. *Recover or recycle at least 50% of the waste taken to transfer stations* – with this addressing the issue of sorting that had been raised, Mr Hughes said this was about diverting waste away from the transfer stations. Currently the rate was approximately 19%, so this was a big step up.  
Members said they were comfortable with this target.
4. *Over 85% of residents are satisfied with kerbside recycling, refuse and transfer station services* – queried if there was a benchmark for this target, Mr Hughes said it was part of the Residents Satisfaction Survey. He believed the current rate was 75%. Whilst there was room for improvement, the higher the target was set the harder it was to achieve.  
With regard to the issue of transfer station opening hours that had been raised and these being more user friendly, Mr Hughes said rural transfer stations were very expensive to operate and any changes would be reflected in the cost. In terms of providing EFTPOS at transfer stations, Mr Hughes said that was in the process of being set up.  
Members said they were comfortable with this target.
5. *Over 75% of residents are satisfied with Council litter and illegal dumping services* – Mr Hughes suggested this could be better worded before being taken to Council and also suggested a target of 85%. He noted that as this was a new target there was nothing to measure it against.  
Members said they were comfortable with this target.

As these targets would be set for six years when the Plan would be reviewed, it was queried if it was possible for them to be revisited within the next few years. Mr Hughes responded that the Plan provided a baseline to work from and the targets had been chosen on the understanding that they could be achieved by 2023 and would be set again in the next Plan.

Cr Mason noted that should reports come through to Council that the targets were

not being met as they were too high, as a responsible Council they would be revisited.

Responding to a query if there was work being done nationally, Mr Hughes said there was nothing that he was aware of being worked on at a national level. All the focus of local government was the circular economy and the Waste Minimisation Act was driver at present.

The need for a national approach to solid waste management was raised and discussed, with Council being involved in lobbying central government through LGNZ supported.

In terms of public education, signage was suggested at strategic locations about the use of such things as plastic bags. It was noted that there were a number of initiatives being undertaken at present in terms of reusable bags.

Mr Hughes noted that there were various avenues that could be explored in terms of waste minimisation; however, these needed to be driven by the community and supported by Council.

Investigating the new technology options for waste disposal was discussed and supported, with it noted that that was something that could be included in the Annual Plan.

Whilst it did not fit into the scope of the WMMP, Cr Mason raised the issue of the burning of plastics and how that should be addressed. Whilst it was also a Regional Council issue, Mr Hughes said he would pass on the matter to Council's Regulatory team and get them to respond back to the submitter.

With the Hearings Committee having received the submissions, heard from those submitters who wished to speak; and having deliberated on the information provided it was:

MOVED by Cr Campbell, seconded Cr Wanden:

*THAT after receiving and considering submissions on the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) the Hearings Committee recommends to the Horowhenua District Council the adoption of the WMMP, with the following amendments;*

- *the vision to be updated;*
- *reduce disposal of waste to the landfill to below **400 kg** per person;*
- *over **85%** of residents are satisfied with Council litter and illegal dumping services;*
- *school students target increased to **700** per year;*
- *addition to provide for exploration of alternative innovative waste disposal/ treatment.*

**CARRIED**

3.20 pm

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD  
AT A MEETING OF THE HEARINGS COMMITTEE  
HELD ON

**DATE:**.....

**CHAIRPERSON:**.....