



# AGENDA

## **Emergency Council meeting Monday, 2 February 2026**

**I hereby give notice that an Emergency meeting of Council will be held  
on:**

**Date: Monday, 2 February 2026**

**Time: 11:30 am**

**Location: Tauranga City Council Chambers  
L1, 90 Devonport Road  
Tauranga**

*Please note that this meeting will be livestreamed and the recording will be publicly available on Tauranga City Council's website: [www.tauranga.govt.nz](http://www.tauranga.govt.nz).*

**Marty Grenfell  
Chief Executive**

# Terms of reference – Council

---

## Membership

---

<b>Chair</b>	Mayor Mahé Drysdale
<b>Deputy Chair</b>	Deputy Mayor Jen Scouler
<b>Members</b>	Cr Hautapu Baker Cr Glen Crowther Cr Rick Curach Cr Steve Morris Cr Marten Rozeboom Cr Kevin Schuler Cr Rod Taylor Cr Hēmi Rolleston
<b>Quorum</b>	<u>Half</u> of the members present, where the number of members (including vacancies) is <u>even</u> ; and a <u>majority</u> of the members present, where the number of members (including vacancies) is <u>odd</u> .
<b>Meeting frequency</b>	Three weekly or as required

---

## Role

- To ensure the effective and efficient governance of the City.
- To enable leadership of the City including advocacy and facilitation on behalf of the community.
- To review and monitor the performance of the Chief Executive.

## Scope

- Oversee the work of all committees and subcommittees.
- Exercise all non-delegable and non-delegated functions and powers of the Council.
- The powers Council is legally prohibited from delegating include:
  - Power to make a rate.
  - Power to make a bylaw.
  - Power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long-term plan.
  - Power to adopt a long-term plan, annual plan, or annual report
  - Power to appoint a chief executive.
  - Power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under the Local Government Act 2002 in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement.
  - All final decisions required to be made by resolution of the territorial authority/Council pursuant to relevant legislation (for example: the approval of the City Plan or City Plan changes as per section 34A Resource Management Act 1991).
- Council has chosen not to delegate the following:
  - Power to compulsorily acquire land under the Public Works Act 1981.
- Make those decisions which are required by legislation to be made by resolution of the local authority.

- Authorise all expenditure not delegated to officers, Committees or other subordinate decision-making bodies of Council.
- Make appointments of members to the council-controlled organisation Boards of Directors/Trustees and representatives of Council to external organisations.
- Undertake statutory duties in regard to Council-controlled organisations, including reviewing statements of intent, with the exception of the Local Government Funding Agency where such roles are delegated to the City Delivery Committee. (Note that monitoring of all Council-controlled organisations' performance is undertaken by the City Delivery Committee. This also includes Priority One reporting.)
- Consider all matters related to Local Water Done Well.
- Consider any matters referred from any of the Standing or Special Committees, Joint Committees, Chief Executive or General Managers.
- Review and monitor the Chief Executive's performance.
- Develop Long Term Plans and Annual Plans including hearings, deliberations and adoption.

## **Procedural matters**

- Delegation of Council powers to Council's committees and other subordinate decision-making bodies.
- Adoption of Standing Orders.
- Receipt of Joint Committee minutes.
- Approval of Special Orders.
- Employment of Chief Executive.
- Other Delegations of Council's powers, duties and responsibilities.

## **Regulatory matters**

Administration, monitoring and enforcement of all regulatory matters that have not otherwise been delegated or that are referred to Council for determination (by a committee, subordinate decision-making body, Chief Executive or relevant General Manager).



## **Order of Business**

<b>1</b>	<b>Opening karakia</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Business</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Review Approach Following the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park Landslide— Decision on Preferred Option	8
<b>4</b>	<b>Closing karakia</b>	<b>12</b>



**1      OPENING KARAKIA**

**2      APOLOGIES**

### 3 BUSINESS

#### 3.1 Review Approach Following the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park Landslide—Decision on Preferred Option

**File Number:** A19695231

**Author:** Cashy Ball, Principal Advisor to the Executive  
Annabel Bayes, Strategic Advisor to the Mayor

**Authoriser:** Mahé Drysdale, Mayor

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To obtain Council's decision on the preferred approach to Council's review following the 22 January 2026 landslide at the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park.
2. Council is asked to choose between a Rapid Internal Assessment or an Independent Review, noting the need for assurance, transparency and organisational learning, and the presence of separate statutory investigations.

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Review Approach Following the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park Landslide—Decision on Preferred Option".
- (b) Selects the preferred approach for undertaking Council's organisational review into the systems, processes, and decision-making leading up to the landslide at the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park on 22 January 2026, being either:  
Option 1: a Rapid Internal Assessment; or  
Option 2: an Independent Review.
- (c) Authorises the Mayor to approve the Terms of Reference, appoint the reviewer (internal or external depending on the option selected), and confirm the review timeframes and associated costs once scoping is complete.

---

### BACKGROUND

3. On 21 and 22 January 2026, a severe weather event affected the Tauranga area that caused multiple slips on Mauao, including a substantial landslide that impacted the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park, resulting in a serious and significant event for the community and the loss of six lives.
4. Tauranga City Council has multiple roles relating to Mauao and its surrounds, including reserve management, regulatory and planning functions, emergency management, and the operation of the Holiday Park. It is also linked to the adjacent Mount Hot Pools (managed/operated by Bay Venues Limited, a Council Controlled Organisation). Given these responsibilities, it is appropriate that Council undertakes a formal review to understand how the incident unfolded from an organisational and operational perspective, and to identify any lessons or improvements needed to strengthen systems and processes in the future.
5. Governance, on behalf of the community, need to establish a factual timeline, actions and information known, to fully understand the leadup to the landslide.
6. In considering how best to undertake this review, two feasible approaches have been identified—a Rapid Internal Assessment and an Independent Review. An option to do

nothing has been discounted as it is not prudent governance to ignore an incident of this scale and the need to provide assurance, transparency, and organisational learning.

## STATUTORY CONTEXT

7. The decision-making requirements of the Local Government Act (s77-s79) require Council to identify and assess reasonably practicable options and consider the advantages and disadvantages of each (s77), consider the views of persons likely to be affected or interested (s78), and make judgements about the proportionality of analysis and compliance with these requirements (s79) in light of the decision's significance. This report presents two practicable options (Rapid Internal Assessment and Independent Review) and notes that "do nothing" has been discounted due to the scale of the incident and the need for assurance and learning. The Independent Review option particularly addresses the public interest and assurance considerations following the event.

## OPTIONS ANALYSIS

8. A review is required to gather and collate the facts and provide assurance to elected members and the community following the 21–22 January 2026 weather event and resulting slips on Mauao, including the substantial landslide that impacted the Mount Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park.

9. In determining how best to undertake this review, Council must consider the reasonably practicable options (LGA ss77–79). Two options are presented for decision: a Rapid Internal Assessment and an Independent Review. An option to do nothing is also noted, although this has been discounted.

### Summary of Options

Option	Independence	Transparency	Timeframe	Cost	Public Confidence	Suitability
1. Rapid Internal Assessment	Moderate (procedural independence)	Moderate	Faster	Lower	Moderate–Low	Credible but less aligned with public expectations
2. Independent Review	High	High	Longer	Higher	High	Strongest option overall
3. Do Nothing	N/A	Very Low	N/A	None	Very Low	Discounted

### Option 1: Rapid Internal Assessment (Internal Independent Reviewer)

#### 10. Description

A senior staff member with no prior involvement in the event would lead a structured assessment, supported by relevant internal expertise and external specialists where required. The work would be guided by a Terms of Reference (ToR) approved by the Mayor and conducted independently of operational influence. Staff and documentation would be made fully available.

#### 11. Advantages

- Faster delivery than an external review (exact timeframe to be confirmed).
- Lower cost, drawing primarily on internal capability.
- Ability to rapidly access organisational knowledge and documentation.
- Strong focus on practical, implementable organisational improvements.
- Provides a credible review pathway with independence from operational decision-making.

**12. Disadvantages**

- Perceived independence is weaker than for a fully external review, despite safeguards being in place.
- Likely to carry lower public confidence, particularly given media interest and the significance of the incident.
- Less visibility and transparency for external stakeholders.
- Recommendations may not carry as much weight as recommendations put forward by an external independent reviewer.

**13. Risks and mitigation**

- Perception of bias or internal defensiveness. Mitigated through: a robust ToR; selection of a reviewer with no involvement in the incident; clear access to information; fact-check only process; and full publication.
- Capacity constraints if key internal experts are required concurrently for response and recovery activities.

**14. Overall suitability**

A credible option that offers timeliness and low cost, but may not provide the level of transparency or perceived independence required given community expectations and scrutiny.

**Option 2: Independent Review (External Reviewer)****15. Description**

An external reviewer would be commissioned to undertake a comprehensive assessment, with full access to staff, records, and relevant information. The ToR would be approved by the Mayor. The review would be carried out entirely independently of Council operations and governance.

**16. Advantages**

- Highest level of independence, both real and perceived.
- Strongest pathway for transparency and public confidence, particularly given the significance of the incident and extensive public interest.
- Aligns strongly with expectations already signalled publicly by the Mayor and CE regarding the need for an independent, transparent, high-trust review.
- Supports Council's governance role by providing objective assurance.
- May more easily integrate findings with other external processes (Coroner, WorkSafe, and the Crown-appointed independent investigation announced by the Prime Minister).
- Delivers findings that are more likely to be accepted and referenced by other organisations and regulatory bodies when assessing wider lessons across the sector.
- Facilitates system-wide insights and recommendations across emergency management, reserve management, regulatory functions, and operational practices.

**17. Disadvantages**

- Higher cost, due to commissioning external expertise.
- Potentially longer timeframe, depending on reviewer availability and scope.
- External reviewers may require more time to understand context and operational settings.

**18. Risks and mitigation**

- Could overlap with other external investigations (Coroner, WorkSafe, and the Crown-led review).

Mitigation: clear ToR specifying scope, sequencing, and focus on organisational systems, processes, decision-making, and lessons learned (not causation or legal liability).

- Expectation management regarding public release and implementation.

Mitigation: early communication on process and publication intent.

#### 19. **Overall suitability**

Provides the strongest assurance, transparency, and independence. Well-aligned with public expectations and the Mayor's public statements that a review will be undertaken independently. Supports the Council's governance role and community confidence in the system-level learning process.

#### **Option 3: Do Nothing (Discounted)**

20. Not recommended. While several external investigations will occur, these serve different statutory purposes and are not expected to provide the system-level organisational learning, oversight, or assurance that Council requires. Reliance solely on those processes would not meet community expectations or support Council's duty under the LGA to consider lessons and improvements.

#### **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

21. The financial implications of the two review options differ, although specific cost estimates are not yet available.

#### **Rapid Internal Assessment**

22. This option is expected to involve minimal direct costs, as it would be led by an internal staff member with support drawn from across the organisation. Costs may arise if specialist external expertise is required for aspects of the assessment, however these are expected to be limited and can likely be met from within existing budgets. Depending on the role of the person leading the review some back fill costs may be incurred.

#### **Independent Review**

23. An external review would entail higher costs, reflecting the need to procure an independent reviewer or review team with the required skills, experience, and public trust. The total cost will depend on the scope and duration of the review, the expertise required, and the procurement approach. Costs would be met from existing budgets where possible, with any funding shortfall to be reported to Council once scoping is confirmed.

#### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS**

24. Several statutory processes are expected (Coroner, WorkSafe, and a Crown-appointed independent investigation), so Council's review, whether internal or external, must be tightly scoped via a Mayor-approved Terms of Reference to focus on organisational systems, processes, and decision-making, and to avoid interfering with, duplicating, or prejudicing those inquiries. Not undertaking a review would risk criticism that Council has not adequately considered lessons and improvements, in a timely way, following a significant incident and could undermine public confidence. Conversely, a poorly scoped or poorly governed review risks challenge, contested findings, or fairness concerns. Both options carry moderate legal and reputational risk if mismanaged.

25. The Independent Review best mitigates perceived bias and supports transparency and public assurance, while the Rapid Internal Assessment is credible but more exposed to perceptions of conflict. Key mitigations for either pathway include full access to information and staff, a fact-check-only process for draft findings, clarity on publication of the final report (subject to legal constraints), and disciplined alignment with the Terms of Reference.

26. The commitment has been made by the Mayor that the report will be a transparent and public process. It should however be noted that some limited content may need to be

withheld or redacted for legitimate reasons allowed for by the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act.

## SIGNIFICANCE

27. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
28. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
  - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
  - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the decision.
  - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
29. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of medium significance.

## ENGAGEMENT

30. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of medium significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

## NEXT STEPS

31. If Council selects option one or two, the Mayor and Councillors will prepare a detailed Terms of Reference for approval by the Mayor, confirming the scope, methodology, access to information, and governance arrangements for the review. Once approved, the appropriate staff member (option one) or independent reviewer (option two) will be appointed and the review initiated. Timeframes and any associated costs will be confirmed following approval of the Terms of Reference and commencement of the review.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil

## 4 CLOSING KARAKIA