


# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN RANGITIKEI?

**& CO**



**OFFICER ANALYSIS  
OF SUBMISSIONS**



Overview of Officer Analysis of Submissions .....	4
Key Topic 1: Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan .....	5
Background .....	5
Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses .....	5
Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis .....	14
Officer Recommended Action .....	15
Recommendation.....	15
Key Topic 2: Draft Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy .....	16
Background .....	16
Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses .....	16
Summary of Results.....	16
Submitter Comments .....	17
Officer Recommended Actions.....	18
Recommendations .....	18
Key Topic 3: Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges .....	19
Background .....	19
Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses .....	19
Submitter comments .....	19
Officer Recommended Actions.....	21
Recommendations .....	21
Key Topic 4: Your view on our planned programme of work for the Annual Plan 2025/26 ...	22
Background .....	22
Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses .....	22
Topics by Activity .....	24
Topic 1 Financial Matters .....	24
Topic 2 Roading.....	25
Topic 3 Parks and Reserves .....	27
Topic 4 Democracy.....	30

Topic 5 Assets .....	31
Topic 6 3 Waters .....	33
Topic 7 Essential services and projects .....	34
Topic 8 Comments on Council and the Consultation.....	35
Officer Recommended Actions.....	36
Recommendations .....	36
Which projects or services would you like to hear more about? .....	37

## Overview of Officer Analysis of Submissions

Council prepared “Where’s the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei” which covered the following:

- Key Topic 1: Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan
- Key Topic 2: Draft Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy
- Key Topic 3: Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2025/26
- Key Topic 4: Your View on the Planned Programme of Work for Annual Plan 2025/26

Council consulted on the Where’s the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei from 4 April to 4 May 2025. A total of 23 submissions were received (including one late submission).

Officers have read, analysed, and provided recommendations on the submissions. This document groups submissions by “key topic” and provides the Officer analysis and recommendations for Council to consider as they deliberate on submissions.

# Key Topic 1: Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan

## Background

Council has a legislative requirement to review the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) every 6 years. This plan sets out the vision and target for minimising and managing waste within the Rangitikei District.

A waste assessment, completed in 2024, provided the background information to support the development of the draft WMMP. The WMMP was drafted based on the direction provided by Council after multiple workshops on the topic.

The approach within the draft WMMP to manage waste is not significantly different from the 2018-24 WMMP. The proposed vision was updated to better reflect the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2023 (Te Rautaki Para). Noting that this Strategy has recently been replaced by the Government. New goals were also included in the draft WMMP to help achieve the updated vision.

We promote recycling for every individual and educate people on the importance of recycling waste and provide free drop-off facilities for recycling waste that can help to divert landfills and reduce waste.

Educating people about how to compost at home and manage their organic waste will result in a significantly decreasing methane emissions. Otherwise, all organic waste would be disposed of in landfills, thereby increasing the amount of methane waste.

## Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses

### Consultation Question:


Do you agree with our vision for waste management and minimisation in the Rangitikei? *“To maintain a healthy and protected environment for Rangitikei by reducing our impact on the environment”*

### Summary of Responses

This question asks for respondents to use a scale from 1 to 5 to identify if they agree with the vision of the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. On this scale, 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented neutral, 4 represented agree, and 5 represented strongly agree.

Of the 23 submitters to Where’s the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, 14 submitters responded to the vision of the draft WMMP.

The below graph shows that 64% (9) of submitters who submitted on the vision of the draft WMMP support the vision. With 7% (1) of submitters strongly disagreeing and 7% (1) of submitters disagreeing with the vision in the draft WMMP. A further 22% (3) of submitters were neutral.



**Submitters and submission numbers of those that agree**

Karen Kennedy (#01), Samantha Scott (#04), Nicole Wells (#05), Andrew Dittmer (#06), Roy Lewis (#10), Taihape Community Board (#12), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13), Gregory Smith (#14), Jamiee Simpson (#22).

**Submitters and submission numbers of those who are neutral**

Paul Bakker (#03), Robert Snijders (#15), Carolyn Bates (#19).

**Submitters and submission numbers of those who disagree or strongly disagree**

Rob McCullough (#08) and Kelly (#09).



## Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #08 specifies the rates breakdown of 64 cents per day or \$233.60 for rubbish, and that households have to pay for rubbish collection in addition to this. The submitter is concerned that it is too expensive for pensioners who may produce little rubbish.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's concern is noted. The solid waste disposal targeted rate funds closed landfills, waste minimisation and the operation of waste transfer stations.

Submitter #09 does not think Council's focus should be on educating the community on reducing waste while there is a lack of opportunities and accessibility. The submitter would prefer to see opportunities first, noting that many struggle to find the time and transport to get to transfer stations. The submitter asks Council to look to partner with agencies that supply recycling, provide support to groups that reuse or repair, and provide kerb recycling collection as a priority.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's suggestions for reducing rubbish are noted. Kerbside collection for recycling is currently budgeted in the Long Term Plan 2024-34 to begin January 2027. It is however acknowledged that the Government has removed the requirement for councils to implement kerbside recycling and food scrap collection. As council decided to introduce kerbside recycling in 2027 based on a requirement by Government, council will reconsider the implementation of kerbside recycling prior to its planned introduction.

Submitter #09 notes the recent issues with RWB going into liquidation, and believes it would be prudent to have a more holistic approach to waste in our district and consider bringing it back within council, even if it happens over 10 yrs.

Officer Analysis: Rangitikei Wheelie Bin is no longer able to collect rubbish within the district. A number of existing and new rubbish wheelie bin providers are currently providing this service to a significant portion of the district. Anyone who does not wish to purchase a wheelie bin through one of these companies can drop off rubbish bags at any Council transfer station for a fee.

Submitter #09 notes that the NZ Waste Strategy referenced has been revised in March 2024

Officer Analysis: The New Zealand Waste and Resource Efficiency Strategy was adopted in March 2025. The unfortunate timing of the release of the new strategy will trigger a review of the WMMP to make sure it aligns with the new strategy. This review will be completed after the WMMP has been adopted, as it would with any future changes made by Central Government.

Submitter #13 supports the draft WMMP and the targets set for 2030, noting they align with the current National Strategy.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #14 believes that food waste and kerbside recycling is not sustainable in our district and represents an increased cost to ratepayers capable of pooling community assistance in performing their civic duties.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #15 believes a key issue is how Council monitors it, particularly with the liquidation of the Central Waste.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #15 notes that Council is not disclosing the amount of fly tipping and quantities from the public bins which are used by residents.

Officer Analysis: Council does not collect the data referred to by the submitter. It would be a challenging task and is not planned to be monitored at this time.

Submitter #19 believes the parameters have changed and RDC staff will do what they think is best for each aspect.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #10 asks that if Council go down the same path as other councils, that Council considers providing an option to opt out of compulsory council rubbish collection service to support residents and business owners who already have alternative arrangements in place.

Officer Analysis: Council has no current plans to implement kerbside rubbish collection.



## Consultation Question:

Do you agree with our 2030 targets for reducing waste?


*Reduce the amount of material entering the waste management system by 10% per person.*

## Summary of Responses

This question asks respondents to use a scale of 1 to 5 to identify if they agree with the inclusion of a target to reduce material entering the waste management system by 10% per person within the WMMP. On this scale, 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented neutral, 4 represented agree, and 5 represented strongly agree.

Of the 23 people that submitted on the Where's the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, with 13 people responding to this question.

The graph below shows that 69% (9) of submitters who responded to this question agree with the inclusion of the target to reduce material entering the waste management system by 10%. 8% (1) of submitters do not agree with the inclusion of this target, and a further 23% (3) submitters hold a neutral view.



### Submitters and submission numbers of those that agree

Karen Kennedy (#01), Paul Bakker (#03), Samantha Scott (#04), Nicole Wells (#05), Andrew Dittmer (#06), Rob McCullough (#08), Taihape Community Board (#12), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13), Gregory Smith (#14).

### Submitters and submission numbers of those who are neutral or did not specify

Roy Lewis (#10), Robert Snijders (#15), Jamee Simpson (#22).

### Submitters and submission numbers of those who disagree or strongly disagree

Kelly (#09).

## Consultation Question:

Do you agree with our 2030 targets for reducing waste?


*Reduce the amount of material that needs final disposal by 30% per person.*

## Summary of Responses

This question asks submitters to use a scale of 1 to 5 to identify if they agree with the inclusion of a target to reduce the amount of material that needs final disposal by 30% per person in the WMMP. On this scale, 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented neutral, 4 represented agree, and 5 represented strongly agree.

Of the 23 people that submitted on Where's the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, 13 responded to this question.

The graph below shows that 61% (8) of submitters agree with including this target in the WMMP. 8% (1) of submitters do not agree with the inclusion of this target in the WMMP, and a further 31% (4) of submitters are neutral on this topic.



## Submitters and submission numbers of those that agree

Karen Kennedy (#01), Samantha Scott (#04), Nicole Wells (#05), Andrew Dittmer (#06), Rob McCullough (#08), Taihape Community Board (#12), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13), Gregory Smith (#14), Jamee Simpson (#22).

Submitters and submission numbers of those who are neutral

Paul Bakker (#03), Roy Lewis (#10), Robert Snijders (#15).

Submitters and submission numbers of those who disagree or strongly disagree

Kelly (#09).

## Consultation Question:

Do you agree with our 2030 targets for reducing waste?


*Reduce the biogenic methane emissions from waste by at least 30%.*

## Summary of Responses

This question asks submitters to use a scale of 1 to 5 to identify if they agree with the inclusion of a target to reduce biogenic methane emissions from waste by at least 30% in the WMMP. On this scale, 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented neutral, 4 represented agree, and 5 represented strongly agree.

Of the 23 people who submitted on Where's the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, 13 responded to this question.

The graph below shows that 8% (1) of submitters strongly agree and 38% (5) of submitters agree with the inclusion of this target. 8% (1) of submitters disagree, and 15% (2) of submitters strongly disagree with the inclusion of this target in the WMMP. A further 31% (4) of submitters are neutral on this topic.



## Submitters and submission numbers of those that agree

Karen Kennedy (#01), Nicole Wells (#05), Andrew Dittmer (#06), Taihape Community Board (#12), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13).

## Submitters and submission numbers of those who are neutral

Rob McCullough (#08), Roy Lewis (#10), Robert Snijders (#15), Jaimee Simpson (#22).

## Submitters and submission numbers of those who disagree or strongly disagree

Paul Bakker (#03), Samantha Scott (#04), Kelly (#09), Gregory Smith (#14).

## Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #03 states that woke climate change hysteria is not proven science, it's ideological.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is acknowledged.

Submitter #08 believes that these factors cannot be controlled by Council, therefore is a waste of rate payers money.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is acknowledged.

Submitter #09 understands there is not much research that exists for district councils, but would like to see more historic data, comparisons to other actions from other areas within council and comparing to other councils or countries, keeping in mind the differences that the district council faces. The submitter states that it appears as if Council just copied someone else's findings.

Officer Analysis: Council collects information from our waste transfer stations on tonnage volume and type of waste. We do not compare this data with other councils.

Submitter #09 would also like to see more evidence and research based decision making while setting targets.

Officer Analysis: During the process of developing the WMMP, data was collected from our waste transfer stations to provide evidence for the WMMP.

Submitter #12 states that the mechanisms for collecting and processing food waste from a wide rural area will be different to those in larger urban areas.

Officer Analysis: As a rural council, we currently encourage the home recycling of organic waste into compost, which will reduce transportation emissions and expenses.

Submitter #14 believes that methane is not an issue that needs addressing as it is a natural part of the carbon cycle and due to the conservation laws of science, no new carbon or methane is produced, only converted, and this is a short term process with zero negative impact on environment.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #15 would like New Zealand to think about turning waste into energy.

Officer Analysis: The submitters comment is acknowledged. Waste to energy is difficult in New Zealand due to a lack of sufficient volume of waste available.

Submitter #23 requests that Council provides kerbside recycling services.

Officer Analysis: Kerbside collection for recycling is currently budgeted in the Long Term Plan 2024-34 to begin January 2027, noting that Council may look to review this.

## Officer Recommended Action

Officers have considered all submissions made to the above questions on the draft WMMP. A majority of submitters agree with the vision and targets within the draft WMMP, therefore Officers do not recommend any changes be made to the WMMP.

## Recommendation

That Council adopts the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan with/without [delete one] amendment and that Council gives the Chief Executive authority to make minor editorial changes.



## Key Topic 2: Draft Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy

### Background

The Building Act 2004 requires Council to review its policy on dangerous, affected and insanitary buildings every 5 years. This policy provides Council with a means to ensure that dangerous and insanitary buildings are improved to meet building code standards, and affected buildings do not pose a risk to occupants.

The changes that were consulted on are considered to be minor. The current policy approach is reactive, meaning that Council will only assess a potential dangerous, affected or insanitary building if a complaint or other information is received by Council. The draft policy proposes to continue with this approach. The changes that were consulted on were proposed to clarify the intent of the provisions, improve the flow of the policy to improve readability, and incorporate changes in legislation.

### Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses

#### Question

Do you support the Draft Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy?


#### Summary of Results

This question asks submitters to comment on whether or not they support the Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy as it was drafted.

Of the 23 submitters who submitted on Where's the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, 9 provided comment on the Draft Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Building Policy.

Of those who responded, 67% (6) of submitters identified that they agree with the policy as it is drafted. 22% (2) of submitters identified that they partially support the policy as it is drafted. A further 11% (1) of submitters are neutral on this topic. No submitters identified that they do not support the policy as it is drafted.

## DO YOU SUPPORT THE DANGEROUS, AFFECTED AND INSANITARY BUILDING POLICY



### Submitters and submission numbers of those that agree

Nicole Wells (#05), Kelly (#09), Taihape Community Board (#12), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13), Carolyn Bates (#19), Jamiee Simpson (#22).

### Submitters and submission numbers of those who are neutral or partially agreed

Samantha Scott (#04), Gregory Smith (#14), Robert Snijders (#15).

### Submitter Comments

Submitter #04 states that it is sad to see history erased, doing that killed Johnsonville.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is acknowledged.

Submitter #13 supports the changes made to this policy, noting it aligns with government requirements for the approach, priorities and application to heritage buildings outlined in the Building Act 2004.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is acknowledged.

Submitter #13 strongly encourages Council to support building owners to re-develop and re-furbish existing buildings, and asks Council to develop a separate policy that supports the development and maintenance of buildings.

Officer Analysis: This is out of scope of this policy. Presently Council does not have a policy or fund for dealing with existing buildings within the town centres. Work underway on the Marton Streetscape redevelopment has identified opportunities in this space. A policy or other action, including but not limited to providing funding or other types of support could be considered as part of this work.

Recommendation: That Council does/does not [delete one] ask Officers to investigate options that may include a policy to support building owners to re-develop and re-furbish existing buildings and to bring this back to Council for its consideration in the 2025/26 financial year.

Submitter #14 partly supports the policy. The submitter states that Council has been accused of being ridiculous in failing to apply common sense and allow sane mitigations.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted, when developing and implementing this policy Council will follow Central Government legislation and guidelines.

Submitter #19 states that anything which keeps people safe gets their vote.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #22 supports the policy provided it does not have a significant effect on jobs and that it is achievable for business owners.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

## Officer Recommended Actions

Officers have considered all submissions made to the Draft Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Building Policy. Officers note that a majority of submitters support the draft policy, therefore, Officer do not recommend any changes to the policy.

## Recommendations

That Council adopts the Dangerous, Affected and Insanitary Buildings Policy with/without [delete one] amendment.

That Council does/does not [delete one] ask Officers to investigate options that may include a policy to support building owners to re-develop and re-furbish existing buildings and to bring this back to Council for its consideration in the 2025/26 financial year.

## Key Topic 3: Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges

### Background

Council reviews its Schedule of Fees and Charges every year. The fees and charges that are set by legislation remain unchanged. Most other fees were increased by 2.3%, the CPI increase for local government provided by BERL.

A number of other changes have been made to the schedule of fees and charges for 2025/26 in the following areas: cemeteries, animal seizure and rehoming fees, alcohol license notice fees, three waters new connection fees and bonds, vehicle crossing bonds, and hall hire charges.

These changes were workshopped with Council prior to being adopted for consultation.

### Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses

#### Consultation Question

Are there any fees/charges you think should be changed?

#### Summary of Results

This question asks submitters to identify if they agree with the proposed fees and charges, or if they wish to see any particular fees or charges changed.

Of the 23 people that submitted on the Where's the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, 8 commented on this question.

One person supports the proposed fees and charges, and one other person supports the proposed fees and charges except for one area. Three submitters identified that they do not support fees and charges changing.

In addition, three submitters provided comments on rates rather than fees and charges.

#### Submitter comments

Submitter #04 states that people have no more money to give and wants Council to leave them as is or reduce them.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's concern is noted.

Submitter #08 asks Council to reduce rates and council expenditure to focus on things that are essential, not nice to do initiatives.

Officer Analysis: Fees and charges are a tool that Council has to help manage the overall burden on ratepayers, by ensuring those who benefit from particular services directly, pay for a portion of the cost of delivering the service by being charged a fee for that service as opposed to the fee not being charged and the service being rated for.

Submitter #09 understands why council needs to increase fees and charges, and agrees with most. However, the submitter believes that Council should be making it easier for people to build in our district, so does not like the increased cost for new connections.

Officer Analysis: The submitters comments are noted. While the new connection fee is a fee that will be charged for all new connections, the bond for new connections will be repayable upon completion of the work if it is up to standard and means Council does not have to cover the cost of any additional work required for substandard connections. This will limit the impact on the cost to add a new connection.

Submitter #14 would like to see rates dropped to match CPI/Inflation only and asks Council to cut the unnecessary debt laden building projects.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted.

Submitter #15 believes that all fees should remain the same except for library charges where the cost to borrow books and fines for late returns should be implemented.

Officer Analysis: Libraries charging for borrowing books has been found to negatively affect equitable access, particularly for people who cannot afford to pay. The majority of public libraries are now "Fine Free" to support and encourage reading within communities and encourage families, parents and children into our spaces without cost association of fines or costs to borrowing. Here is a link to more information about this initiative: [Fine Free Public Libraries Aotearoa](#)

Submitter #22 notes that they do not think rural ratepayers or those who have tank water should pay the same rates as those in town.

Officer Analysis: If a ratepayer is connected to Council water, the ratepayer is liable to pay for the connected water service under our Revenue and Financing Policy. There is also a public good component of water charges right across the district, which is separate to the targeted, connected water rate. If a rate payer is not connected, they do not get charged for a targeted connected water rate but they will still be charged the public good rate. Furthermore, if a ratepayer has tank water but are within an area where reticulated water is supplied then they will still be charged the targeted connected water rate as they have the ability to connect and access this service.

## Officer Recommended Actions

Officers have considered all submissions made to the Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2025/26. Support for the proposed changes to the Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2025/26 is split. However, it is noted that many of the comments of those not wanting fees and charges to increase are concerned about increases to rates or have some misunderstanding about the purpose of fees and charges, Therefore, on balance, Officers do not recommend any changes to the fees and charges.

## Recommendations

That Council adopts the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2025/26 with/without [delete one] amendment.

## Key Topic 4: Your view on our planned programme of work for the Annual Plan 2025/26

### Background

Last year Council developed and consulted on the Long Term Plan 2024-34.

This year, Council has not proposed any significant or material changes to the planned work programme for the 2025/26 financial year. This means that council plans to primarily be doing what we have already told ratepayers we will be doing for the 2025/26 financial year.

Council consulted on its planned work programme for 2025/26 to give our community the opportunity to raise any new concerns or provide feedback on our priorities.

### Summary of Submissions and Officer Responses

#### Consultation Question

Do you think Rangitikei District Council's programme of work proposed in the Annual Plan 2025/26 reflects the needs and priorities of the community?


#### Summary of Submissions

This question asks respondents to use a scale of 1 to 5 to identify if they agree that the planned programme of work in the draft Annual Plan 2025/26 reflects the needs and priorities of the community. On this scale, 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented neutral, 4 represented agree, and 5 represented strongly agree.

Of the 23 people that submitted on Where's the Annual Plan 2025/26 & Co @ Rangitikei, 14 responded to this question.

The graph below shows that 13% (2) of submitters who responded to this question agree that the planned programme of work represents the needs and priorities of the community. 40% (6) submitters disagree or strongly disagree with the planned programme of work. A further 47% (5) submitters hold a neutral view, and (2) provided comment but do not specify if they support the proposed work programme.





#### Submitters and submission numbers of those that agree

Karen Kennedy (#01), Taihape Community Board (#12).

#### Submitters and submission numbers of those who are neutral or do not specify

Andrew Dittmer (#06), Kelly (#09), Roy Lewis (#10), Gregory Smith (#14), Carolyn Bates (#19), Jamiee Simpson (#22), No name (#23).

#### Submitters and submission numbers of those who disagree or strongly disagree

Samantha Scott (#04), Nicole Wells (#05), Khan Coleman (#07), Rob McCullough (#08), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13), Robert Snijders (#15).

## Topics by Activity

Topic 1	Financial Matters
Topic 2	Roading
Topic 3	Parks and Reserves
Topic 4	Democracy
Topic 5	Assets
Topic 6	3 Waters
Topic 7	Essential Services and Projects
Topic 8	Comments on Council and the Consultation

### Topic 1 Financial Matters

#### Submitter and submission numbers

Samantha Scott (#04), Roy Lewis (#10), Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (#13), Robert Snijders (#15), Marton Community Committee (#18), Jaimee Simpson (#22).

#### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #04 states tax the rich, noting this is a central government decision.

*Officer Analysis:* As stated by the submitter, they are referring to central government taxes, which are not set by territorial authorities.

Submitter #10 asks the council to think long and hard before raising rates yet again as many in the community are stretched to their limits and struggling to keep up with the rising cost of living. The submitter believes another increase could be devastating for families and individuals who are trying to hold on and asks Council not to make the decision lightly as the wellbeing of real people, not just numbers on a page, is at stake. Submitter #10 also acknowledges that Council is doing the best Council can.

*Officer Analysis:* The submitter's comment is noted. Council continually balances what it must do to support Rangitikei communities and deliver its agreed work programme, while being fiscally prudent. Council recognises the financial strain of rising costs and seeks to identify savings and efficiencies wherever possible whilst also ensuring that we can continue to provide the services that we are responsible for.

Submitter #18 notes that they have concern at the increase in rates continuing to be detrimental to those on fixed incomes, and that any alterations to plans should have the purpose of reducing the burden of rates for all.

*Officer Analysis:* This is front of mind for Council when making decisions on the work programme over our ten-year Long Term Plan period. Council continually walks a fine line

between what Council must do to support our community while being fiscally prudent. It is pleasing to see that as a result of this, Council has been able to reduce rates forecast in the Long Term Plan for year 2 by close to 1% from 9.9% to 9.1% for the 2025/26 financial year.

Submitter #22 notes that it appears that smaller communities pay rates like everyone else, but do not see the investment that the bigger towns receive.

Officer Analysis: Council strives to ensure the revenue it collects from rates, and the programme of work it completes is equitably spread across the district. Our councillors cover the Rangitikei district and advocate for community needs across all towns and communities - not just the bigger towns. As Council prioritises its work programme in order to manage the impact of rising rates, one community may receive significant spend in one year and another community a few years later. This is the byproduct of Council balancing the cost of meeting community needs, delivering its programme of work across the district, and affordability for ratepayers.

Submitter #15 would like to see a complete review of all capital spending as current levels are unsustainable.

Officer Analysis: As part of the consultation process for the 2024-34 Long Term Plan, our ten-year capital programme was detailed and made available for public feedback. The feedback from the community on these projects was considered by Council and as a result factored into the 2024-34 Long Term Plan. The projects included in the 2025/26 Annual Plan are the projects agreed to be completed in year two of the Long Term Plan. The capital programme in the 2024-34 Long Term Plan meets debt serviceability benchmarks. The capital programme will be reviewed as part of the development of the next Long Term Plan.

Submitter #13 is concerned the forecast capital spends are not being spent while debt levels continue to increase, at the same time Council continues to run deficits.

Officer Analysis: While the submitter's concern is noted, Council does not borrow the funds required until a project is being carried out. Therefore, the cost of debt (interest) is not incurred until Council requires the cash to pay for the construction/contractors. Deficits that Council runs is due to Council making a decision to not fully fund all depreciation costs as the growing cost of depreciation places a burden on ratepayers.

## Topic 2 Roothing

### Submitter and submission numbers

Kim Good (#02), Nicole Wells (#05), Robert Snijders (#15), Carolyn Bates (#19), Hunterville Community Committee (#20), Kate Williams (#21).

## Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #02 requests the speed limit on Wellington Road where entering and leaving Marton by Hawkestone Road currently set at 70km, be reduced to 50km. The submitter states that they have spoken to neighbours about traffic speeding through the 70km area and feel with so many houses, children and animals now living in this area it would be better reduced to 50km for safety.

Officer Analysis: Officers have traffic speed data that supports the submitter's concerns. This submission will support a recommendation to the Director of Land Transport to extend the 50km/h zone on Wellington Road to Hawkestone Road. Costs to facilitate this change are minor and can be absorbed within existing budgets.

Recommendation: That Council agrees/does not agree [delete one] that officers apply to the Director of Land Transport to extend the 50km/h zone on Wellington Road to Hawkestone Road.

Submitter #05 thanks Council for upgrading the walkway on Milne Street to being wheelchair accessible, noting it looks great and has been used often by their tetraplegic son.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's appreciation is noted.

Submitter #20 requests that as part of this Annual Plan that Council explores the cost for providing disabled access to the Hunterville Swimming Pool by cutting the roadside curb down giving access to the pool and rugby clubrooms.

Officer Analysis: It is a requirement of a building consent at the Hunterville Swim Centre for there to be a designated accessible car parking space. Staff will investigate, with the Hunterville Community Assets Trust, improvements required to enable the required parking space and wheelchair access onto the footpath.

Submitter #05 states that school children picked up and dropped off by buses need shelter from the rain in winter, noting that they have previously made this request. They would like to see at least 5 scattered bus shelters for the community to use.

Officer Analysis: School bus stop funding and management is primarily handled by the Ministry of Education or by individual schools. RDC does not administer funding through our Rooding programmes for this purpose.

Submitter #19 asks why Council is going ahead with the walkway down and from Nga Tawa Road towards Bredins Line when only critical works should be done to keep rates lower.

Submitter #15 states that nice to haves like the Calico Path should be removed.

Officer Analysis: Calico Line was consulted on as a Key Choice as part of the 2023/24 Annual Plan following a request from Nga Tawa School for the installation of the pathway and agreed

to fund the project as it is a safety issue. In December 2024 Council reviewed this decision and voted to proceed with the project.

Submitter #21 requests that RDC undertakes road safety improvements at McPhersons Reserve, estimating the cost of \$46,000 to cover the cost to realign the road boundary fence, rehabilitate the water table and construct a car parking area parallel to the Turakina Valley Road. This will mean that cars will no longer have to park on the road.

*Officer Analysis:* Staff have assessed the cost of improvements with our maintenance contractor. An estimated cost of \$46,000 has been provided to undertake work to facilitate safer off-road car parking at McPhersons Reserve. This cost will not attract a NZ Transport Agency subsidy. Should this project be accepted by Council, new Capex funding would need to be allocated to the Urban Reconstructions cost centre.

Recommendation: That Council does/does not [delete one] agree to fund improvements to enable off road parking at McPhersons Reserve to the value of \$46,000, and this shall be funded as a new capital expense in the Urban Reconstructions cost centre.

Submitter #15 states that nice to haves like the Broadway upgrade should be removed.

*Officer Analysis:* As part of the consultation process for the 2024-34 Long Term Plan, Council sought feedback on the Marton Town Centre, Broadway upgrade. A decision was made to fund the development of a plan with an additional \$2 million to construct the upgrade. The plan has been developed in conjunction with stakeholders and is nearing completion. Once the plan has been adopted, Council will determine how the budgeted \$2 million will be invested.

## Topic 3 Parks and Reserves

### Submitter and submission numbers

Khan Coleman (#07), Taihape Playground Group (#11), Gorges To See Cycle (#16), Carolyn Bates (#19), No Name (#23).

### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #11 has received draft plans for a new playground near the grandstand at Memorial Park. This includes a covered area with BBQ facilities and picnic table seating. The submitter considers this addition will be a great asset to the Park, and can be used for events such as birthday parties, fundraisers, or to just sit and watch horse or rugby events in the shade, or children playing. The submitter would like the council to consider funding this asset with first cost estimates at \$67,249. The submitter states that they are trying to create

a playground for the whole community, and visitors to the region to enjoy and that the shelter would be a valuable resource to encourage visitors to stop, and for our residents to benefit from.

Officer Analysis: It is noted that the Rātana Playground project also received a grant of \$50,000 from Council, and the Taihape Playground initial request of \$25,000 was increased to match the Rātana decision. The Rātana Playground project included a covered BBQ facility, and no additional funding was provided for this facility.

At this time, the final playground plans for Taihape Playground have not been submitted for approval (including the concept of a BBQ). However, it should be noted that operational and maintenance costs including cleaner costs, including travel, cleaning consumables, and equipment, plus energy costs, is estimated at approximately \$15,000-\$18,000 per annum. These costs would be additional to current operational budgets and would need to be included in the budget once the playground is constructed. It would also need to be clarified if the \$67,249 cost includes connecting to an electrical source, or, if this were an additional cost, who would pay for the connection.

That Council does/does not [delete one] agree to fund a covered area with BBQ facilities for the Taihape Playground to the value of \$67,249, and this will require additional rate funded operational expense in the Parks and Reserves cost centre.

Submitter #23 requests that the Council provides a source of water at the entry to cemeteries across the district.

Officer Analysis: Most of our cemeteries across the district do not have a potable water connection. Water supplied at cemeteries would have to make use of alternative solutions such as rainwater or water tanks that can be manually filled when empty. There is a risk of visitors drinking the water from these alternative supplies, and it will not be possible to guarantee the safety of the water for human consumption. Due to the risks and the high standards required under the Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules, water supplies to cemeteries are not planned at this time.

Submitter #16 requests funds of \$34,479 to be allocated in the 2025/2026 Annual Plan to undertake a feasibility study for the proposed Gorges To See Cycle Trail - a 200km multi-day cycling experience from the Napier-Taihape Road to Koitiata on the West Coast, noting the trail offers a visionary opportunity for the Rangitikei District.

The submitter identifies a number of benefits including, revitalisation of small towns, showcasing the natural beauty of Rangitikei, health, recreation, and community

engagement beyond tourism, alignment with national cycle trail growth, supporting infrastructure that already exists, and strategic timing.

The submitter clarifies that if total funding is not available, partial funding would give them a better probability of acquiring external funding as several external funding agencies have given feedback to get the initial support from Council, and then the funders would be more likely to fund at the development stage.

Officer Analysis: Council received an overview of the Gorges to See Cycle Trail Concept in August 2023. At this meeting Council staff were asked to engage with the drivers to investigate costings and next steps. Officers have worked closely with the submitter and note the difficulty the group has had in seeking funding for the feasibility study. The purpose of the feasibility study is to show return on investment. Officers are aware that some of the reasons for funding being declined was timing around the establishment of the Trust (being only established in August 2024), resulting in the Trust not being able to provide an annual report, and therefore, unable to comply with grant criteria.

Recommendation: That Council does/does not [delete one] agree to fund the feasibility study for the Gorges To See Cycle Trail to the value of \$[insert value], to be funded as an additional rate funded operational expense as part of the District Promotions cost centre.

Submitter #19 notes that they are supportive of the Commemorative Walls at Cemeteries.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's support is noted.

Submitter #07 would like to see Council invest in parks and reserves. The submitter notes that good outdoor spaces and recreation trails benefit individuals and the community, and the outdoor spaces in the Rangitikei leave a lot to be desired. The submitter uses the Bulls river access as an example, noting it looks like a dumping ground and that people do not want to be there.

Officer Analysis: Council maintains a wide range of parks and reserves throughout the Rangitikei District. Officers note the benefits these spaces provide for the community. A loop was identified in the Bulls section of Pae Tawhiti Rangitikei Beyond: Community Spatial Plan as a community priority. This project does not have funding associated with it. Officers acknowledge the issue with the dumping of rubbish under the Bulls bridge and are working with Horizons regarding responsibilities for disposal. Officers have also recently commenced work on open space planning for Bulls which is looking at Council's reserves in Bulls, how they are currently used, and how they could be improved to better meet the community's needs going forward.



## Topic 4 Democracy

### Submitter and submission numbers

Taihape Community Board (#12), Gregory Smith (#14), Robert Snijders (#15).

### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #12 notes that the Community Board has a Small Projects Fund, which is assessed as a fixed amount based on the number of ratepayers in the Northern Ward. The submitter requests that the annual grant should be adjusted to keep pace with the increase in rates and CPI, enabling the Community Board to undertake a wider range of projects.

Officer Analysis: The Terms of Reference identify the Taihape Community Board has an allocation of \$5,000 (excluding GST) per annum for small local works. This value has been increasing by CPI every year, the updates provided to the Board will specifically show this to make it clear that CPI has been added each year.

Submitter #14 states that the Community Leadership Group of Activities provides strategic direction to Council activities and supports opportunities for the whole community, not just iwi, to participate in civic life and to have an impact over decisions that affect them. The submitter raises concerns about Council's focus on partnership with tangata whenua, including concerns of equity. The submitter also raises concerns about children having significant roles unelected.

Officer Analysis: The comments are noted. Council is committed to developing its partnership with iwi and believes that this partnership benefits the entire community. Council's Youth Council deliver a wide range of benefits to youth councillors themselves, Council, and the wider community. Youth Council helps build skills and understanding Council's role for its members, and gives Council the ability to understand the priorities of youth within our communities.

Submitter #14 asks what constitutes the "Māori responsiveness framework" and whether this is the next phase of "Development of Māori Capacity to Contribute to Council Decision-Making Policy"? The submitter suggests this document is withdrawn and raises concerns about Te Rōpū Ahi Kā receiving information before the public. The submitter also raises concerns about the process for establishing Māori wards. The submitter identifies the range of governance and funding opportunities available to iwi and hapu and raises concerns about Te Rōpū Ahi Kā and hapu being consulted about resource consent applications and early consultation with iwi representatives for Local Water Done Well and the annual plan.

Officer Analysis: Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2002 states:

*A local authority must—*

- (a) establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and*
- (b) consider ways in which it may foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and*
- (c) provide relevant information to Māori for the purposes of paragraphs (a) and (b).*

Further Schedule 10 Clause 8 states *A long-term plan must set out any steps that the local authority intends to take, having undertaken the consideration required by section 81(1)(b), to foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority over the period covered by that plan.*

Council's Māori Responsiveness Framework identifies the areas of focus for Council staff in building partnership with iwi.

All agendas of the Te Rōpū Ahi Kā Komiti are available on Council's [website](#) and the meetings are open to the public.

In establishing the two Māori Wards in the Rangitikei, Council followed the process provided for in legislation.

The Resource Management Act 1991 sets out notification requirements for resource consents. Council's role is to implement these legislative requirements.

Submitter #15 believes that Council should become transparent and implement the learnings that the former CEO put forward regarding the Bulls town centre building, which is still consuming ratepayers money by at least \$1000/week.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted. Council has dedicated project managers leading the delivery of significant infrastructure projects, this ensures there are formal processes in place to capture cost, timeframes, and risks to all projects. Updates on projects are provided monthly to Council and available on the Council website.

## Topic 5 Assets

### Submitter and submission numbers

Samantha Scott (#04), Horizons Regional Council (#17), Hunterville Community Committee (#20), No Name (#23).

### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #04 states that they have already made their feelings clear on spending 20 million or more on a new council building when there's rate payers who cannot afford rent, food, or heat.

Officer Analysis: Council has a budget of \$19million for the establishment of a community hub, emergency operations centre and administration building. The redevelopment of existing buildings is needed as current buildings are not fit for purpose, require extensive maintenance, and do not meet earthquake strengthening requirements. Council considered a wide range of options for the redevelopment of its buildings and decided on the redevelopment of the site at 46 High Street as the option that would achieve the best outcomes for the community.

This project includes the construction of an emergency operations centre (to proceed first) on the western portion of the site. The second stage will be the redevelopment of the remainder of the site where the library will be relocated and developed into a community hub and administration offices will be developed. Council notes the need to ensure this project is completed as cost-efficiently as possible.

Submitter #17 notes that Council owns two dams that are subject to the dam safety regulations. The submitter encourages Council to ensure the annual plan budget covers the costs associated with preparing a dam safety assurance programme for both dams in order to meet Council's obligations under the Dam Safety Regulations.

Officer Analysis: This work is in progress and expected to be completed before the end of the 2024/2025 financial year.

Submitter #23 states that they cannot see any reference to projects for the Hunterville community.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comment is noted. The Annual Plan consultation document provides details of the major projects across the district but does not describe all the capital works projects in detail. There are substantial upgrades to the Hunterville Wastewater Treatment Plant and Hunterville storm water upgrades planned for the 2025/26 financial year.

Submitter #20 acknowledges the planned investment in the annual plan for the treatment plant and stormwater upgrades for Hunterville. The submitter is pleased to see spending on vital infrastructure for Hunterville and asks that the community committee is kept up to date on these works as they progress.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comments are noted. Council staff report on all major projects to the Assets and Infrastructure Committee and full Council meetings and also have regular updates made available on our website. Unfortunately, we do not report on all projects we undertake during the year due to resource constraints but can provide updates on any particular project when requested.

Submitter #05 states that the swimming pool needs to have a sensible cost wise solution. Submitter #13 would like Council to investigate development options for the pool as it is a significant community asset. The submitter states that development plans should include a holistic assessment of location, geotech advice, and optimal and potential relationships with other community facilities.

Officer Analysis: At the Council meeting held Wednesday 30 April 2025, Council opted to complete repairs to get the pool open as soon as possible. These repairs will include replacing the roof, earthquake strengthening the Marton Swim Centre building to a minimum 67 percent of New Building Standards, and replacing or upgrading assets that are nearing end of life. Council's preference is also to look at new innovations, such as replacing the iron roof with one that lets daylight into the facility, whilst maintaining the structural integrity of the building.

[News: May 2025 - Future of Marton Swim Centre decided: Rangitikei District Council](#)

## Topic 6 3 Waters

### Submitter and submission numbers

Nicole Wells (#05), Gregory Smith (#14).

### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #05 would like to see water being a priority.

Officer Analysis: Council is making significant investment in water supply in the district. For Marton this includes the implementation of the Marton Water Strategy which seeks to find a new water source and construct a new treatment plant. Council has recently completed testing of a trial treatment plant which simulated how treatment of water from the new bore water source will function. The Bulls water treatment plant and raw water bores upgrades has also been included in this 2024 – 2034 Long Term Plan.

Submitter #14 states that land-based discharge is fraught with a lack of goal oriented measurement processes, and if the lake at Ratana does not improve, who has truly won? The submitter does not believe that it will improve all lakes in the Rangitikei as there is another factors in play.

Officer Analysis: Land based discharge is a common approach for improving environmental outcomes for waterways across New Zealand and is currently directed as the preferred method under the One Plan. Council has designed the proposal for the discharge of treated wastewater for Ratana based on community aspirations and directions under the One Plan.

## Topic 7 Essential services and projects

### Submitter and Submission numbers

Paul Bakker (#03), Rob McCullough (#08), Taihape Community Board (#12), Robert Snijders (#15), Marton Community Committee (#18),

### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #08 believes the Annual Plan is full of issues that are not essential. Given current cost of living Council should be working to reduce household costs. Not undertaking work that is not essential or reflects the wants of the noisy minority.

Submitter #03 asks Council to stop wasting money on empire building vanity projects.

Submitter #18 asks why are some projects mooted when the general view was, were they actually necessary?

Officer Analysis: Officers note that the submitters believe some projects should not go ahead. The projects in the Annual Plan reflect those agreed to through the development of the 2024-34 Long Term Plan. Officers note that every year when budgets are reviewed as part of the Annual Plan development process, areas for potential savings are investigated. The re-development of buildings (e.g. Taihape Town Hall and Marton Community Hub and Administration Building) are needed to meet earthquake strengthening requirements and continue to provide fit for purpose services for the community.

Submitter #15 states that major projects are well behind schedule and money has been wasted on 'pie in the sky' projects like the rail hub.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comments are noted. Council invested in the plan change process for the Marton Rail Hub as a project that could provide significant economic value to the district through the introduction of new business. External funding was also secured to support the project from the Provincial Growth Fund which reduced the investment required from Council.

Key infrastructure projects such as wastewater projects are being made more challenging by the need for significant investment in consenting processes and changes to legislation (e.g. freshwater standards and wastewater standards). Progress is being made on community build projects, with designs being undertaken for the Taihape Town Hall and Emergency Operations Centre in Marton.

Submitter #12 believes that Council is endeavouring to meet the needs of the community in a time of increasing costs and reduced government funding.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comments are noted.

## Topic 8 Comments on Council and the Consultation

### Submitter and submission numbers

Paul Bakker (#03), Samantha Scott (#04), Roy Lewis (#10), Carolyn Bates (#19).

### Submitter Comments and Officer Analysis

Submitter #04 believes that Ben has greatly improved delivering information to ratepayers.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's appreciation is noted.

Submitter #03 would like Council to say no to ideological wokeness and stop feathering your own nests.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's comments are noted.

Submitter #19 notes they are happy with the level of communication they see on the RDC Website, and the video clips which Ben publishes.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's acknowledgments are noted.

Submitter #19 acknowledges that the Front Desk Team are great at helping.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's acknowledgments are noted.

Submitter #19 states that the requests for service system has improved and is working very well compared to previous years.

Officer Analysis: The submitter's acknowledgments are noted.

Submitter #19 does not believe the consultation document has a clear indication of the proposed plans for future work, and mentioned little on topics such as the pool. Considering the indicated cost they had expected at least a sentence as the work seems to be anticipated to be happening in the coming year.

Officer Analysis: The submitters feedback is noted. The consultation document was adopted prior to workshops and any decisions made by Council on the Marton Swim Centre. Page 17 of the Annual Plan & Co consultation document provided a short update. This was the most up-to-date information at the time of preparing the consultation information.

Since consultation, Council has progressed this work and has opted to complete basic repairs to get the pool open as soon as possible. More information can be found here: [News: May 2025 - Future of Marton Swim Centre decided: Rangitikei District Council](#)

Submitter #10 suggests some improvements for future consultation documents to make them easier for the public to understand and engage with including a concise list of bullet-points as they do not want to read a complete plan.

*Officer Analysis:* The submitter's feedback is noted. Council's consultation document seeks to balance providing enough detail so that the community has an understanding of key projects, while remaining concise and readable. Additional supplementary materials are created in support of the consultation document to provide information in diverse and digestible formats (i.e. newsletters, posters, public meetings, website materials, mailbox drops, social media). The suggestion to distribute a bullet-pointed summary is taken onboard for future consultations.

## Officer Recommended Actions

Staff will investigate, with the Hunterville Community Assets Trust, improvements required to enable the required parking space and wheelchair access onto the footpath for the Hunterville Pool.

## Recommendations

That Council agrees/does not agree [delete one] that officers apply to the Director of Land Transport to extend the 50km/h zone on Wellington Road to Hawkestone Road.

That Council does/does not [delete one] agree to fund improvements to enable off road parking at McPhersons Reserve to the value of \$46,000, and that this shall be funded as a new capital expense in the Urban Reconstructions cost centre.

That Council does/does not [delete one] agree to fund a covered area with BBQ facilities for the Taihape Playground to the value of \$67,249, and this will require additional rate funded operational expense in the Parks and Reserves cost centre.

That Council does/does not [delete one] agree to fund the feasibility study for the Gorges To See Cycle Trail to the value of \$[insert value], to be funded as an additional rate funded operational expense as part of the District Promotions cost centre.



## Which projects or services would you like to hear more about?

Submitters were asked to identify what groups of Council's activities they would like to hear more about. The purpose of this question was to identify how communications could be improved by keeping the community up to date on the things that matter to them the most. The answers to these questions do not have an effect on the planned programme of work. Submitters were able to select as many groups of activities as they liked.

The results are provided in the figure below. Officers will take this onboard as they prioritise which areas to focus on providing more information and updates about.

