
Council *Kaunihera* OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held in Council Chamber, Municipal Building, Garden Place, Hamilton on Thursday 18 September 2025 at 9:30 am.

PRESENT

Chairperson Deputy Mayor Angela O’Leary
Heamana

Members Mayor Southgate (via Audio-Visual)
Cr Maxine van Oosten (via Audio-Visual)
Cr Ewan Wilson
Cr Tim Macindoe
Cr Louise Hutt
Cr Andrew Bydder
Cr Geoff Taylor
Cr Sarah Thomson
Cr Emma Pike
Cr Maria Huata
Cr Anna Casey-Cox
Cr Kesh Naidoo-Rauf

In Attendance Dr Jeremy Mayall, Creative Waikato

The Deputy Mayor took the chair. The meeting was opened with a karakia by the Council kaumatua.

1. Apologies – *Tono aroha*

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O’Leary/Cr Pike)
That the apologies for full absence from Cr Tauariki and partial attendance from Mayor Southgate (Council business) and Cr van Oosten are accepted.

2. Confirmation of Agenda – *Whakatau raarangi take*

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O’Leary/Cr Wilson)
That the Council confirms the agenda noting that:

- a) the Economic Development Committee and Strategic Growth and District Plan Committee open and public excluded minutes for Items 6 and C2 (Confirmation of Final Committee Meeting Minutes for the 2022-2025 Triennium) were circulated under separate cover;
- b) the Dog Control Panel open and public excluded minutes for Items 6 and C2 (Confirmation of Final Committee Meeting Minutes for the 2022-2025 Triennium) will be attached the open and public excluded minutes of this meeting as **Appendix 1**;

- c) **Attachment 1** of Item C7 (City Honours Recommendations 2025) was circulated under separate cover;
- d) Item C9 (Hillcrest Library Update) will be attached to the public excluded minutes of this meeting as Appendix 2; and
- e) Item 9 (Notice of Motion) has been withdrawn from the agenda and will not be discussed.

3. Declarations of Interest – *Tauaakii whaipaaanga*

No members of the Council declared a Conflict of Interest.

4. Public Forum – *Aatea koorero*

There were no members of the public present for the Public Forum.

5. Confirmation of the Council Open Minutes - 28 August 2025

Resolved: (Cr Wilson/Cr Hutt)

That the Council confirms the Open Minutes of the Council meeting held on 28 August 2025 as a true and correct record.

6. Confirmation of Final Committee Meeting Minutes for the 2022-2025 Triennium

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O’Leary/Cr Casey-Cox)

That the Council confirms the following minutes as a true and correct record of the meetings:

- a) Community and Natural Environment Committee held 5 August 2025;
- b) Strategic Growth and District Plan Committee held 12 August 2025;
- c) Regulatory and Hearings Committee held 14 August 2025;
- d) Community Grants Allocation Sub-Committee held 21 August 2025;
- e) Finance and Monitoring Committee held 26 August 2025;
- f) Traffic, Speed Limit and Road Closure Hearings Panel held 27 August 2025;
- g) Infrastructure and Transport Committee held 4 September 2025;
- h) Economic Development Committee held 9 September 2025;
- i) Strategic Risk and Assurance Committee held 11 September 2025; and
- j) Dog Control Hearings Panel held 16 September 2025.

7. Chair's Report

The Mayor took the report as read.

Resolved: (Mayor/Cr Wilson)

That the Council receives the report.

8. Council Submission – Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development 2025

The General Manager Strategy, Growth and Planning took the report as read. Staff responded to questions from Elected Members concerning possible financial implications.

Resolved: (Cr Wilson/Cr Thomson)

That the Council:

- a) receives the report;
- b) approves the **Draft 2** Council submission (**Appendix 2**) to Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development 2025;
- c) approves that the Chief Executive has authority to sign and submit the final submission, incorporating any feedback from this meeting, with the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development by Sunday 21 September 2025.

9. Notice of Motion - Minor Transport Improvements

This matter was withdrawn in Item 2 (Confirmation of Agenda).

10. Arts in Infrastructure Policy - Deliberations Report

The Programme and Planning Manager took the report as read.

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O’Leary/Cr Hutt)

That the Council adopts the Arts in Infrastructure Policy subject to the proposed amendments as per **Attachment 1**.

11. End of Triennium Matters

The Governance Lead took the report as read.

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O’Leary/Cr Thomson)

That the Council:

- a) receives the report;
- b) extends the Chief Executive’s current delegations (detailed in the Delegations to Positions Policy) to include all of Council’s responsibilities, duties and powers currently retained by the Council or delegated to the Council’s standing committees (excluding the District Licensing Committee), subject to the following conditions:
 - i. the extended delegations will have effect from the period from 11 October 2025 (polling day) until the inaugural meeting of the new Council;
 - ii. the extended delegations do not include a delegation of any Council powers, duties and functions, which are prohibited by law from delegation including, without limitation, those set out in clause 32(1) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002;
 - iii. the Chief Executive may only exercise the extended delegations for matters that can not reasonably wait until the first meeting of the new Council;
 - iv. where reasonably practicable, the Chief Executive must, before exercising an extended delegation power, duty of function, first consult with the Mayor-elect;
 - v. the Chief Executive must report all matters relating to the exercise of an extended delegation to the incoming Council at the first meeting following the triennial general election;

- vi. should any urgent matters arise during the interim election period which by law must be made by the Council, the first meeting following the triennial election must be called by the Chief Executive as an 'emergency' meeting under Clause 21 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002; and
- c) notes that, as required under clause 30(7) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, the District Licensing Committee shall continue to exercise its delegations made to the committee (not deemed discharged) on the coming into office of the members of the elected at the 2025 triennial election.

12. Recommendations to the Council from Open Committee Meetings

Recommendation from the Infrastructure and Transport Committee meeting of 4 September 2025

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O'Leary/Cr Pike)

That the Council approves the revised 2025 Streetscape and Gateways Policy (**Attachment 1**).

Recommendation from the Strategic Risk and Assurance Committee meeting of 11 September 2025

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O'Leary/Cr Pike)

That the Council receives the Health and Safety Report – 1 May 2025 to 31 July 2025.

Resolved: (Deputy Mayor O'Leary/Cr Pike)

That the Council approves Our Climate Statement 2024/25 – Hamilton City Council's climate change disclosure report.

13. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Resolved: (Cr Wilson/Cr Hutt)

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely consideration of the public excluded agenda.

The general subject 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(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C1. Confirmation of the Council Public Excluded Minutes - 28 August 2025) Good reason to withhold) information exists under) Section 7 Local Government) Official Information and) Meetings Act 1987	Section 48(1)(a)
C2. Confirmation of Final Public Excluded Committee Meeting Minutes for the 2022-2025 Triennium		

-
- C3. Confirmation of the
Elected Member Closed
Briefing Notes 21 August
2025
 - C4. Pukete Wastewater
Treatment Plant Odour
Treatment System -
Increase in Approved
Contract Sum
 - C5. General Security Services
Contract
 - C6. Fast-track and Cross
Boundary Matters Update
 - C7. City Honours
Recommendations 2025
 - C8. Riskpool Trust Deed
Variation
 - C9. Hillcrest Library Update
 - C10. Recommendations to the
Council from Public
Excluded Committee
Meetings
 - C11. Confirmation of CE
Review Committee
Matters Minutes

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

Item C1.	to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (j)
Item C2.	to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (j)
Item C3.	to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (j)
Item C4.	to avoid the unreasonably, likely prejudice to the commercial position of a person who supplied or is the subject of the information to enable Council to carry out commercial activities without disadvantage to enable Council to carry out negotiations to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (b) (ii) Section 7 (2) (h) Section 7 (2) (i) Section 7 (2) (j)

Item C5.	to enable Council to carry out negotiations	Section 7 (2) (i)
Item C6.	to enable Council to carry out commercial activities without disadvantage	Section 7 (2) (h) Section 7 (2) (i)
Item C7.	to enable Council to carry out negotiations	
	to protect the privacy of natural persons	Section 7 (2) (a)
Item C8.	to maintain legal professional privilege	Section 7 (2) (g)
	to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (j)
Item C9.	to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (j)
Item C10.	to carry out negotiations	Section 7 (2) (i)
Item C11.	to protect the privacy of natural persons	Section 7 (2) (a)
	to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	Section 7 (2) (j)

The meeting moved into Public Excluded at 9.50am.

The meeting was declared closed at 11.49am.

Appendix 1



Dog Control Hearings Panel

Te Koomiti Whiriwhiri I Ngaa Take Kuri

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Dog Control Hearings Panel held in Committee Room 1, Municipal Building, Garden Place, Hamilton on Tuesday 16 September 2025 at 9:30 am.

PRESENT

Chairperson Cr Emma Pike
Heamana

Members Cr Anna Casey-Cox
Cr Maria Huata

In attendance Anastasia Cox – Legal representative

The Chair opened the hearing with a karakia

14. Apologies – *Tono aroha*

Resolved: (Cr Pike/Cr Casey-Cox)

That the Dog Control Hearings panel accepts the apologies from Cr Bydder and Cr Tauariki for absence.

15. Confirmation of Agenda – *Whakatau raarangi take*

Resolved: (Cr Huata/Cr Casey-Cox)

The Dog Control Hearings Panel confirms the agenda noting that *Item 8 (Objection to Menacing Classification of Dog)* has been deferred to a future date of the appropriate committee following the 2025 Local Election.

16. Declarations of Interest – *Tauaakii whaipanga*

No members of the Panel declared a Conflict of Interest.

4. Confirmation of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Open Minutes 17 April 2025

Resolved: (Cr Casey-Cox/Cr Pike)

That the Dog Control Hearings Panel confirms the Open Minutes of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Meeting held on 17 April 2025 as a true and correct record.

5. Confirmation of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Open Minutes 12 May 2025

Resolved: (Cr Casey-Cox/Cr Pike)

That the Dog Control Hearings Panel confirms the Open Minutes of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Meeting held on 12 May 2025 as a true and correct record.

6. Confirmation of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Open Minutes 28 April 2025**Resolved:** (Cr Casey-Cox/Cr Pike)

That the Dog Control Hearings Panel confirms the Open Minutes of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Meeting held on 28 April 2025 as a true and correct record.

7. Objection to Menacing Classification of Dog - Ms Malcolm

The Chairperson noted that the objector would be in attendance with legal representative. The objector provided a written statement to her objection, which was circulated to Members.

Legal Representative and Ms Malcolm spoke to the historical events with the dog, family friendliness and additional letters of support. The Animal Education and Control Manager then spoke to the report in particular the behaviour of different dogs in varying environments and historical incidents reported.

8. Resolution to Exclude the Public**Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987****Resolved:** (Cr Pike/Cr Casey-Cox)

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely consideration of the public excluded agenda.

The general subject 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(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C1. Confirmation of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Public Excluded Minutes 17 April 2025) Good reason to withhold information exists under Section 7 Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987	Section 48(1)(a)
C2. Confirmation of the Dog Control Hearings Panel Public Excluded Minutes 28 April 2025		
C3. Confirmation of the Dog Control Hearings Public Excluded Minutes 12 May 2025		

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

Item C1.	to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through protecting persons from improper pressure or harassment	Section 7 (2) (f) (ii)
----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

- | | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Item C2. | to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through protecting persons from improper pressure or harassment | Section 7 (2) (f) (ii) |
| Item C3. | to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through protecting persons from improper pressure or harassment | Section 7 (2) (f) (ii) |

The meeting moved into the public excluded session at 10:06am

During the public excluded session of the meeting the following was resolved to be released to the public via the minutes:

Item 7: Objection to Menacing Classification of Dog – Malcolm

That the Dog Control Hearings Panel:

- a) receives the report;*
- b) confirms it has considered the mandatory matters specified under the Dog Control Act 1996, and other matters relevant to the objection;*
- c) notes that the Dog Control Hearings Panel in determining any objection can only either uphold or rescind the classification under the Dog Control Act 1996;*
- d) **rescinds** the menacing classification of the dog 'Cashew'; and*
- e) approves the release of the decision from Public Excluded via the open minutes of this meeting.*

The meeting was declared closed at 10:37am

Appendix 2



Draft Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development 2025

Consultation Questionnaire

August 2025



Introduction

What is the Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD)?

The Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD) states the government's overall direction and priorities for housing and urban development. It informs and guides the decisions and actions of agencies involved in housing and urban development and sets out how government and others will work together to make this happen, and shape future government policy, investment and programmes of work. The first GPS-HUD was published in 2021.

GPS-HUD review

The Ministers of Housing and Finance are required to review the GPS-HUD every three years. Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (the Ministry) leads the review.

In section 24 of the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019, it says:

24. Preparation or review of GPS

When preparing or reviewing a GPS, the Ministers must–

- a. be satisfied that the GPS promotes a housing and urban development system that contributes to the current and future well-being of New Zealanders; and
- b. consult Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities and persons, and representative group of persons, who have an interest in housing and urban development in New Zealand.

[See section 24 of the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019](#)

The proposed draft GPS-HUD includes the Māori and Iwi Housing Innovation (MAIHI) approach. This was done to strengthen and provide greater protection and government accountability for the MAIHI approach, make the system strategic approach clearer, more coherent and easier to manage, and more clearly show the relationship between Māori housing initiatives and government priorities.

Providing feedback on the proposed GPS-HUD

We want your feedback on how well the proposed draft GPS-HUD 2025 presents a multi-decade system strategy for housing and urban development, and places current work programmes in the context of what needs to be done to achieve the desired outcomes.

We recommend that you read the draft GPS-HUD before you complete the survey: [Draft GPS-HUD 2025](#).

You may also wish to refer to the previous GPS-HUD 2021 to see changes made: [GPS-HUD 2021](#).

Once you are ready to provide your feedback, you can make a submission via this online survey: [Consultation Form](#).

Alternatively, you can fill out a copy of this document and send us your submission by email to hud_gps@hud.govt.nz.

Disclaimer

We will include a summary of submissions in recommendations to ministers and Cabinet, which may be proactively released. This will include a summary of submitters' views and may include the names of individuals or organisations that have made submissions. The Privacy Act 2020 establishes certain principles with respect to the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals.

Any personal information you supply to us while making a submission will only be used for the purpose of assisting in the development of the final GPS-HUD. If you do not wish for your name, or any other personal information, to be included in the summary of submissions, please email us at hud_gps@hud.govt.nz.

Submissions may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982. If you have any objection to the release of the information contained in your submission, please email us at hud_gps@hud.govt.nz.

Please set out clearly which parts you consider should be withheld, together with the reasons for withholding the information. We will take such objections into account and will consult with submitters when responding to requests under the Official Information Act.

Overview of the GPS-HUD 2025

The GPS-HUD sets out the government's long-term direction for housing and urban development, alongside five priority actions aimed at establishing the foundations of a more adaptive, responsive system that enables growth while supporting those in greatest need.

The priorities include supporting housing growth, reforming the resource management system, resetting investment to better support those most in need, improving efficiency and competition in building and construction, and strengthening rental markets.

The updated GPS-HUD reflects the current government's priorities and is intended to guide the housing and urban development system towards more equitable and effective outcomes.

For the first time, the GPS-HUD will incorporate the MAIHI (Māori and Iwi Housing Innovation) approach, recognising that Māori housing solutions are integral to the broader housing system.

Changes made to the GPS-HUD during our review

The strategic framework for the GPS-HUD 2025 has been updated from GPS-HUD 2021 to incorporate and highlight five key government housing and urban development priorities. Other adjustments have been made to reflect the current context.

Roles and expectations of key government agencies have been integrated into each priority.

The 'focus areas' from the GPS-HUD 2021 are no longer their own category. While not all of these are highlighted in the government priorities directly, we expect that all of them will be impacted over time by this work. For example, addressing housing supply and housing need will have flow-on effects on housing quality and homelessness.

Changes have also been made to streamline and shorten the document to make it more readable and accessible.

We are looking for your feedback on these changes.

The future we want to see – outcomes

The GPS-HUD 2021 has four outcomes for the housing and urban development system to help achieve its vision. The outcomes for housing and urban development are long term, so the outcomes outlined in the GPS-HUD 2021 have been largely retained in the GPS-HUD 2025. There have been some updates to the wording for the current context.

See page 7-8 of the consultation document.

Outcome: an adaptive and responsive system

The label of this outcome statement is unchanged, but the description has been updated for the current context (see page 7).

We’ve done this to show how this outcome applies across all facets of the system including urban development, housing supply and social housing.

Proposed GPS-HUD 2025 text

A housing and urban development system that is integrated, self-adjusting and delivers in response to emerging challenges and opportunities.

Land, infrastructure, development and construction markets that are responsive to demand, well-planned and well-regulated.

Place-based investment, with central and local government working with partners in places to identify and deliver the best mix of public and private initiatives and services.

Decision-making supported by excellent evidence and data.

Questions

Do you think this outcome statement adequately describes what an adaptive and responsive system looks like?
Yes / No / Unsure / No preference
[If no] How can we better describe what an adaptive and responsive system looks like?
<p>Hamilton City Council supports the outcome statement’s emphasis on integration, responsiveness, and evidence-based decision-making. These principles are reflected in our Hamilton Urban Growth Strategy, District Plan, and our role within the Future Proof partnership, which coordinates growth across the sub-region.</p> <p>While Hamilton City Council supports the intent of Going for Housing Growth, we are concerned that fast-track consenting may compromise strategic infrastructure investments, such as those in Peacocke. To ensure the system remains adaptive and responsive, fast-track processes must align with local infrastructure planning and sequencing. We recommend safeguards to protect infrastructure readiness and prioritised growth areas.</p> <p>However, to strengthen the GPS-HUD, we recommend:</p>

- Explicit recognition of local government's role in spatial planning and infrastructure coordination, especially under the proposed Planning Act.
- Greater clarity on funding mechanisms for place-based investment, including how councils will be supported to deliver infrastructure in growth areas.
- Inclusion of adaptive planning tools, such as scenario modelling and dynamic spatial plans, to better respond to emerging challenges like climate migration, economic viability/feasibility of development and demographic shifts.

Outcome: stable, affordable, healthy homes

The label of this outcome has changed from 'Wellbeing through housing' to 'stable, affordable, healthy homes' (see page 7).

The descriptive text has been updated to fit the current context, while being more specific about the outcomes we want to see.

Proposed GPS-HUD 2025 text

Housing that is affordable and has stability of tenure, whether it's rented or owned.

People able to choose where they live and what type of home they live in.

People with enough money left over after housing costs for other things they need.

The quality, accessibility, size and features of homes support people and families to be healthy and productive.

People in greatest housing need get the support they need, and homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring.

Questions

Do you think this outcome statement adequately describes what stable, affordable, healthy homes look like?

Yes / **No** / Unsure / No preference

[If no] How can we better describe what stable, affordable, healthy homes look like?

Hamilton City Council supports the GPS-HUD's goal of reducing homelessness. We encourage a stronger emphasis on prevention and the role of Emergency Housing as a vital safety net. Our Housing Strategy, through the Waikato Housing Initiative, recognises emergency accommodation as an essential part of the pathway to permanent housing.

Outcome: Māori housing through partnership

The label of this outcome statement is unchanged, but the descriptive text has been updated for the current context (see page 7).

Proposed GPS-HUD 2025 text

Māori and the Crown working together in partnership to ensure all whānau have stable, affordable, healthy homes.

Māori housing solutions led by Māori and delivered locally, with Māori able to utilise their own assets and whenua.

Active Māori participation in the system through partnership with the Crown to invest in and support housing solutions.

Questions

Do you think this outcome statement adequately describes what Māori housing through partnership looks like?
Yes / No / Unsure / No preference
[If no] How can we better describe what Māori housing through partnership looks like?
[Enter your answer here]

Outcome: thriving and resilient communities

The label of this outcome statement is unchanged, but the descriptive text has been streamlined and updated for the current context. (see page 8)

Proposed GPS-HUD 2025 text

Development aimed at creating towns and cities that have abundant housing and well-functioning physical and community infrastructure.

Transport that gets people where they need to go quickly and efficiently.

Towns and cities that are resilient to natural hazards, help reduce emissions and adapt to the impacts of a changing climate.

Communities that drive economic growth and support businesses to grow.

Questions

Do you think this outcome statement adequately describes what thriving and resilient communities look like?
Yes / No / Unsure / No preference
[If no] How can we better describe what thriving and resilient communities look like?
<p>The statement reflects Hamilton’s strategic direction toward compact, connected, and climate-resilient growth. Our transport planning, infrastructure investment, and community development strategies aim to support economic vitality, reduce emissions, and enhance resilience.</p> <p>To strengthen the GPS-HUD, we propose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stronger alignment with national climate adaptation frameworks, including funding for managed retreat and infrastructure resilience.• Recognition of social infrastructure (e.g., libraries, parks, community hubs) as essential to community wellbeing and resilience.• Align policy, funding and legislation to support integrated transport and land use planning, particularly in Tier 1 cities like Hamilton, where growth pressures are high.• Strengthen alignment between housing and transport investment frameworks. To give effect to the GPS-HUD’s vision for thriving and resilient communities, central government must prioritise the most efficient transport options, including public transport, walking, and cycling. This requires stronger integration between housing and urban development priorities and the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2024. Land transport

funding settings should actively support development proximate to compatible land uses and transport options, enable mode shift, and contribute to the creation of well-connected, accessible communities. This requires close collaboration between the Ministries for the Environment, Housing and Urban Development and Transport.

Government priorities

The Government's five housing and urban development priorities provide a basis for action to set the conditions that will enable housing growth, enable the market to achieve housing and development outcomes, and meet the needs of the most vulnerable people. They are:

- Going for Housing Growth
- reforming the resource management system
- resetting investment to help those most in need
- improving efficiency and competition in building and construction
- improving rental markets.

Each priority has a set of objectives and achievable initiatives designed to accelerate progress towards the long-term GPS-HUD outcomes.

Under the heading for each priority is a table that shows how the priority contributes to the GPS-HUD outcomes. For example, Going for Housing Growth contributes to the outcomes adaptive and responsive system, stable, affordable and healthy homes, and thriving and resilient communities.

We are seeking your feedback on whether the GPS clearly shows how each priority contributes to the outcomes.

See pages 9–21

Questions

Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe how these Government priorities contribute to the long-term outcomes:

Going for Housing Growth?
<u>Yes</u> / No / Unsure / No preference
Reforming the resource management system?
<u>Yes</u> / No / Unsure / No preference
Resetting investment to help those most in need?
Yes / No / <u>Unsure</u> / No preference
Improving efficiency and competition in building and construction?
<u>Yes</u> / No / Unsure / No preference
Improving rental markets?

Yes / No / Unsure / No preference

How could the GPS-HUD better describe how the Government priorities contribute to the long-term outcomes?

Hamilton City Council supports the long-term outcomes and the five priority areas outlined in the GPS-HUD 2025. The framework provides a strong foundation for system-wide change. However, we consider that there are additional opportunities to strengthen delivery, particularly by enabling local government and incentivising private sector participation in affordable housing provision. These recommendations are informed by Hamilton's experience as New Zealand's fastest-growing city and our recent planning reforms, including MDRS and NPS-UD changes.

1. Going for Housing Growth

Hamilton City Council supports the intent of Going for Housing Growth to address infrastructure and planning barriers. However, the primary constraint to enabling housing in Hamilton remains infrastructure funding and delivery.

Funding tools like the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) and Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) along with NZTA investment have been vital in unlocking housing and urban growth – these investments by Government have been catalysts for local government and private sector investment (for example Ruakura). We support their continuation and expansion, and recommend improvements such as clearer criteria, better alignment with spatial plans, and more streamlined processes. However, they need to be more securely tied to the delivery of specific outcomes by local authorities and the private sector. For example, local authorities ensuring land use enablement to achieve affordable housing and economic growth outcomes and, private sector commitments for investment and development – these could take the form of tripartite agreements between central government, local government and the private sector.

To ensure growth is achievable and sustainable, we recommend:

- Clearer mechanisms for aligning central government investment with local spatial plans, including formalised co-investment models and infrastructure sequencing tools.
- Strengthening city and regional deals with transparent criteria to incentivise housing growth in high-demand areas.
- Recognition of infrastructure constraints as a critical factor in feasibility assessments and land release decisions.
- Address the long-run costs of infrastructure delivery that fall on local councils, including the servicing and maintenance of a large asset base. Current funding models often leave councils exposed to significant financial risk, particularly in high-growth areas. We recommend the development of enduring co-investment frameworks and central government support to ensure infrastructure funding is equitable, predictable, and aligned with growth objectives.
- Balancing infrastructure delivery with affordability and service expectations. Current models often assume high levels of service, which can be

unaffordable and delay development. New Zealand is sparsely populated and has not had the GDP growth required to support increasingly expensive infrastructure assets as standards rise. One lever to unlock growth is accepting lower levels of service where appropriate. This requires central government to set clear standards and regulatory settings that enable scalable, cost-effective infrastructure solutions.

- Expand the funding contribution expectation to include all major infrastructure projects (e.g. three-waters, electricity transmission and generation), not just transport.

2. Reforming the Resource Management System

Hamilton's District Plan already enables medium-density and mixed-use development. We support reforms that reinforce this direction but caution against a one-size-fits-all approach. To ensure successful implementation:

- National planning reforms should explicitly support urban intensification, while allowing councils to tailor responses to local conditions.
- Transitional support for councils is needed, including technical guidance and resourcing to implement new legislation effectively.
- Capacity assessments must be grounded in feasibility, not theoretical zoning, and reflect infrastructure availability and market demand.
- Future local government funding and financing tools, and efficient pathways for territorial boundary adjustments for growing urban areas should be considered in parallel.

3. Resetting Investment to Help Those Most in Need

Hamilton City Council supports the flexible funding approach but emphasises the need to enable and incentivise the private market to provide affordable products. Currently ~5% of the existing housing stock is public (owned or provided by Kāinga Ora), while a further ~5% is affordable homes provided by not-for-profit developers including CHPs, the remaining 90% is market housing provided by private developers. To produce outcomes at scale, we must enable opportunities for these '90% developers' to deliver these affordable products.

Hamilton City Council is exploring innovative funding models to support housing delivery, including leveraging the Municipal Endowment Fund (MEF) for strategic property partnerships. While not a grant fund, the MEF enables Council to invest in developments that align with city growth objectives. We welcome opportunities to collaborate with government and sector partners to expand capital access for Community Housing Providers and support scalable solutions. Where there are successful place-based initiatives like this that are delivering effectively the Government should consider how to support these financially and/or through policy – and avoid investing in new initiatives which might duplicate or compete with those already being successfully implemented.

To unlock this potential:

- Re-establish progressive home ownership and shared equity schemes to support households who can service a mortgage but cannot afford a deposit.

- Explore alternative funding or tax incentives for developers who wish to experiment with new ways of providing affordability should also be explored. Developers rely on banks to finance their projects. Developers report that banks can be risk-averse when it comes to financing new forms of housing - resulting in continued delivery of conventional products rather than affordable or diverse housing solutions.
- Clarify regional allocation of the flexible fund and ensure councils can access it to support local housing needs.
- Ensure investment strategies reflect local housing deprivation data, and support community housing providers with proven delivery capacity.
- Monitor transitions out of emergency housing, ensuring people move into stable, permanent housing rather than experiencing repeat homelessness. The GPS should frame the reduction of emergency housing use as a pathway to the broader goal of housing all New Zealanders in homes that meet their needs.
- Enable private sector delivery of infrastructure to support housing growth. The GPS-HUD should establish clear regulatory pathways and funding mechanisms that allow developers to deliver infrastructure directly, particularly in high-growth areas. This will help unlock development capacity and reduce reliance on constrained public funding sources.

4. Improving Efficiency and Competition in Building and Construction

Hamilton is actively exploring innovation in consenting and welcomes national alignment. To support efficiency and affordability:

- Supporting councils to streamline building consent processes through shared services, fast-track consenting models, AI-enabled tools, and standardised digital platforms.
- Encouraging modular and prefabricated construction methods by introducing procurement incentives and targeted regulatory reform.
- Promoting the standardisation of design and build methods to support the development of fast-track consenting pathways.
- Addressing regulatory and market barriers to product substitution and approval, which currently limit competition and contribute to increased construction costs.

5. Improving Rental Markets

Rental affordability and tenure security are pressing issues in Hamilton. The GPS-HUD's focus on improving rental markets is welcome, but could be strengthened by:

- Ensuring tenancy law reforms balance investor confidence with tenant wellbeing, particularly for vulnerable groups.

- Supporting Māori housing providers to deliver affordable rentals, aligned with MAIHI priorities and local housing strategies.

Māori housing through partnership – the MAIHI approach

The MAIHI (Māori and Iwi Housing Innovation) approach was developed by Māori and the Crown. The MAIHI vision is that “all whānau have safe, healthy, affordable homes with secure tenure, across the Māori housing continuum”.

MAIHI aims to better position the system to deliver an equitable approach to housing. Tailored Māori housing solutions are delivered alongside the wider housing and urban development efforts being undertaken across the country.

MAIHI breaks the actions needed to address Māori housing challenges into six key priority areas:

- Māori-Crown partnerships
- Māori-led local solutions
- Māori housing supply
- Māori housing support
- Māori housing system
- Māori housing sustainability.

These MAIHI priorities are set out in the consultation document, together with current Government actions to improve housing outcomes for Māori.

See pages 22–24

Questions

Does the GPS-HUD sufficiently incorporate the MAIHI priorities?
<u>Yes</u> / No / Unsure / No preference
[If no] How could the MAIHI priorities be better incorporated in the GPS?
Does the GPS-HUD clearly link current Government actions to improve Māori housing outcomes and the MAIHI priorities?
Yes / <u>No</u> / Unsure / No preference
[if no] How could the GPS-HUD more clearly link the current Government actions to improve Māori housing outcomes and the MAIHI priorities?
While the GPS outlines current actions, it needs a robust monitoring framework to ensure these actions are delivered. A high threshold for cancelling projects is also essential.

Long-term projects require continuity to delivery policy outcomes and test effectiveness. For example, Te Mauri Paihere ki Mangakootukutuku was cancelled as part of the review of Kāinga Ora projects. This was a unique partnership between Kāinga Ora, Waikato-Tainui, the Office of the Kiingitanga and the Department of Corrections. It would have provided 47 homes in south Hamilton alongside a community services hub. It was well advanced and aligned strongly with the GPS's partnership goals, yet it was still discontinued. To prevent similar outcomes, the GPS must be backed by mechanisms that protect and prioritise projects that clearly support its objectives.

Does the GPS-HUD clearly reflect Māori housing interests and aspirations?

Yes / No / Unsure / No preference

[if no] How could the GPS-HUD better reflect Māori housing interests and aspirations?

[Enter your answer here]

Working together to deliver change

Government plays a key role in housing and urban development, by supporting private and community sectors, and delivering change itself where there are gaps others in the system cannot fill.

The GPS-HUD includes a description of the roles of government agencies, including the Ministry and Kāinga Ora, and how they are expected to contribute to the achievement of housing and urban development outcomes. The GPS-HUD also describes the roles of players outside government who government needs to partner and collaborate with to help achieve outcomes for the system.

See pages 25-27

Questions

Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe the role of government in the housing and urban development system?
Yes / No / Unsure / No preference
[if no] How could this be more clearly described?
<p>The GPS-HUD provides a comprehensive overview of government's role, particularly in enabling land markets, supporting housing for those in need, and regulating the system. Hamilton City Council supports this framing, especially the emphasis on place-based investment and cross-agency coordination.</p> <p>To improve clarity and effectiveness, we recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater specificity on the role of local government, particularly in spatial planning, infrastructure delivery, consenting, and capacity assessments. Councils like Hamilton are central to implementation and should be recognised as co-leads in system transformation, with the flexibility to tailor responses to local conditions. • A shared accountability framework between central and local government, including joint targets, funding alignment, and reporting mechanisms. This is essential to ensure infrastructure readiness, sequencing, and the principle that 'growth pays for growth' is upheld.
Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe the role of HUD in the housing and urban development system?
Yes / No / Unsure / No preference
[if no] How could this be more clearly described?
Hamilton City Council recommends that the GPS-HUD more clearly articulate the complementary role of local government in delivering housing and urban development outcomes. Councils are not only regulatory authorities but also

infrastructure providers, spatial planners, and community partners. The success of HUD's system leadership depends on strong alignment with local government responsibilities, resourcing, and decision-making processes.

We recommend that HUD:

- Recognise councils as co-leaders in place-based planning and infrastructure delivery.
- Provide clearer guidance on how HUD will support councils in implementing housing growth targets and infrastructure sequencing.
- Ensure that funding and investment strategies reflect the realities of local government capacity and constraints.
- Strengthen mechanisms for collaboration and shared accountability between central and local government.
- Consider that tier 1 councils differ from other territorial authorities in their ability to deliver change.

Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe the role of Kāinga Ora in the housing and urban development system?

Yes / No / Unsure / No preference

[if no] How could this be more clearly described?

[Enter your answer here]

Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe how the Government expects Kāinga Ora to manage its functions and operations to meet the government's directions and priorities?

Yes / No / Unsure / No preference

[if no] How could this be more clearly described?

[Enter your answer here]

Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe how Māori and iwi are involved in the housing and urban development system?

Yes / No / Unsure / No preference

[if no] How could this be more clearly described?

[Enter your answer here]

Does the GPS-HUD clearly describe who government needs to partner and collaborate with to deliver on its priorities?

Yes / No / Unsure / No preference

[if no] How could they be more clearly described?

The GPS-HUD identifies a broad range of stakeholders, including iwi and Māori, local government, the private sector, community housing providers, and the social sector. However, the document could more clearly define the nature of these partnerships and how they will be operationalised.

Hamilton City Council recommends that the GPS-HUD:

- Clarify the role of local government as a co-leader in spatial planning, infrastructure delivery, and regulatory implementation.
- Define mechanisms for collaboration, including how central government will support councils to align housing growth targets with infrastructure sequencing and funding.
- Ensure partnerships are resourced and governed effectively, particularly in high-growth areas facing infrastructure constraints.

About the GPS-HUD as a whole

The GPS-HUD has been revised to reflect key changes in government's focus and approach.

Changes have also been made to streamline and shorten the document to improve readability.

Questions

Do you have any other comments, suggestions or changes for the GPS-HUD?

Hamilton City Council supports the overall direction of the GPS-HUD but recommends the following refinements to improve clarity and implementation:

- Strengthen the role of local government as a co-leader in spatial planning, infrastructure delivery, and regulatory implementation.
- Clarify HUD's coordination mechanisms with other agencies and councils, particularly in aligning housing growth targets with infrastructure readiness and funding.
- Ensure feasibility and infrastructure capacity are central to housing capacity assessments, not just theoretical zoning.
- Improve integration between spatial planning and funding mechanisms, ensuring long-term strategies are supported by enduring investment pathways through multiple coordinated agencies (e.g. Ministry for the Environment, NZTA).
- Provide clearer guidance and flexibility for councils to tailor responses to local conditions, especially in high-growth areas facing infrastructure constraints.
- In the reform of the Local Government Act, acknowledge the long-term financial implications of growth for local government. Infrastructure delivery is not only a technical challenge but also a fiscal one. Sustainable funding mechanisms are essential to ensure councils can continue to support housing growth without compromising service delivery or financial stability. Financial incentives for councils to embrace growth would assist in achieving the government's aims for housing and development, and council has previously submitted on this to government through numerous other processes.

Privacy statement

Providing this information is optional. We collect this information from you to understand whether we heard from different types of stakeholders during our consultation.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong.

If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us by:

- email hud_gps@hud.govt.nz
- freephone 0800 646 483
- post to Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, PO Box 82, Wellington 6140.

Questions

Are you submitting on behalf of yourself or an organisation?
Individual / <u>Organisation</u>
[if organisation] What type of organisation are you submitting on behalf of?
Iwi/Māori / Central government / <u>Local government</u> / Private sector / CHP / Social sector / Advocacy group / Academic / Other
[if organisation] What region(s) does your organisation cover? (multichoice)
Nationwide / Northland / Auckland / <u>Waikato</u> / Bay of Plenty / Gisborne / Hawke's Bay / Taranaki / Manawatū-Whanganui / Wellington / Nelson / Tasman / Marlborough / West Coast / Canterbury / Otago / Southland
[if organisation] What is your organisation, group or rūpū name?
Hamilton City Council
[optional] What is your name?
Juliana Reu Junqueira

Ngā mihi nui!

Thank you for your submission!