

Council

Tabled Documents

31 August 2017

Item 7:	Chairs Report
Item 7:	Correspondence from Rebekah Gribbon
Item 8:	Portfolio Update Cr Ash
	Portfolio Update Cr Aslett
Item 9:	Administrative Matters – Appendix 2
Item 11:	Developing the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – progress update, August 2017

Report

Subject: **Mayor's Report**

To: Council

From: Andy Watson
Mayor

Date: 31 August 2017

- 1 At Council we spend a huge amount of time lobbying Central Government to try and gain extra funding or to appeal changes that that the Government may make to legislation such as the earthquake legislation bills. Central Government has an enormous effect on our cost of business and hence, rates. In a month's time there will be a new Government and whether it is a returned party, or a new party, or more likely some sort of amalgamation of parties, there will be change. All of the parties are making promises for new funding strategies and new levels of compliance. Whatever we have planned for in the way of consents or expenditure to meet environmental standards may be effectively out of date next month. This uncertainty is perhaps our largest business risk and may mean that the lobbying we have done needs to start afresh. Roll on the election!
- 2 Recently I attended both the Blue Tie Ball and the Wear-A-Bull Arts on the same night, both are amazing events well supported by the public and a huge credit to the organisers. The ball raised around \$40,000 for the rescue helicopter on the back of very generously donated goods, that were auctioned off.
- 3 I missed one of the long term plan workshops days to attend the initialling of the treaty settlement for Ngati Rangi in Wellington. This will be our second Iwi to settle with the Crown and my congratulations go to the negotiating team, it is a marathon task completed well within a record time and we look forward to working with them in the areas of economic development and co-governance of the water ways.
- 4 Last Saturday night I attended a double gold star awards night in Taihape. This award to John Collings represents 50 years of service to the fire brigade. That in its self is a stunning service to the community but what is even more remarkable is that if you take the combined years of service of his family it is just short of 240 years. It was also pleasing to see the Chief Executive of FENZ there at the function.

Andy Watson
Mayor

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 7.
on 31 August 2017.

Rebekah Gribbon
60 Hendersons Line
Marton, 4710

24th August 2017

Rangitikei District Council
High Street
Marton, 4710

To whom it may concern,

RE: Rangitikei District Council Scholarship

Last year I received the Rangitikei District Council Scholarship at the Rangitikei College end of year Prize giving, this was to assist me with the costs associated with my studies.

I have continued my education through UCOL in Palmerston North by enrolling in the Bachelor of Exercise and Sports Science degree. I am now into the second semester of the year after passing the first semester with very good grades. I am thoroughly enjoying my time at UCOL in Palmerston North and I have had many awesome experiences. Many of the skills I am learning at UCOL I put into practice while I continue to teach Highland Dancing and have used while employed as a Swim Instructor earlier this year.

I would like to thank you for contributing towards my education. Your support has been greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully



Rebekah Gribbon

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 7.
on 30 August 2017.

Portfolio Report. Cr Ash. Youth engagement, Samoan engagement, Environment.

August 2017

Youth Development

Youth Awards - It is evident that we have some inspiring young people in our communities, and with the recent youth awards it was fabulous to see the virtues of strong leadership and community spirit be recognised and celebrated. The overall winner, Aaron Mulligan is very deserving. I have come to know this young man over the last few weeks, With his aspirations and great attitude he has a very bright future ahead of him. I look forward to seeing his progress over the coming years.

Youth Forum. There is to be a youth forum in Taihape this year, led by Gillian Bowler from the Youth Zone, Marton with the support of Bronwyn Meads.

Future Leaders, Festival of the Future Trip – The trip to Auckland was a successful opportunity for the young adults to experience discussions and future thinking, beyond anything that had been offered previously in their surroundings. Topics of interest were “Creating Leadership” “The why and how of creating Social Enterprise” “Future thinking for environmental solutions” “Telling our stories through film” and the political party debates”

With 16 young people attending we have an opportunity to continue to develop groups of youth, and support them with their aspirations and initiatives. So far many of the young ones have shown enthusiasm to give back and participate within the community, enter into civic leadership roles, facilitate social wellbeing opportunities through their local school, as well as develop social enterprise to benefit both community and cause.

We were incredibly fortunate to have generous sponsorship through many of the local organisations, such as RDC, Marton Christian Welfare and Marton Rotary, without which we would not have been able to make this happen.

Over the coming weeks we will speaking with each of these organisations, to give an overview of things we learnt, and what are opportunities we wish to pursue going forward.

Snap shot of Feedback

...“Thankyou so much Cath! This has been an amazing experience and I am so grateful for everything you have some this weekend and leading up to the event. Was truly an inspiring weekend!! I have made so many new friends and connections through this event and I Thank you for making it happen”

Just wanted to say a huge thank you for the amazing experience this weekend! Your hard work and organization did not go unnoticed We all learnt heaps in what was such a valuable opportunity.

A massive thanks to you for organising this last weekend. I can honestly say I have never seen the boys fizzing so much about an outside training opportunity! Both of them have been raving about various elements of the weekend, and the advice and thoughts provided by some wicked speakers. If they haven't said thank you, I do want to pass it on, as you have a couple of big fans in Jake and Finn.

I have no doubt they would have taken something from the weekend that will change the way they approach their lives.

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 8
on 31 August 2017

Jess had an amazing time away in Auckland she is still talking about it and loved meeting a variety of different people. I hope she keeps in touch with the group it will be good for her to maintain some contact with different people outside of school.

Thank you so much for the opportunity and should anything else like this come up again please let me know.

I just wanted to say thank you for very much for having Marama and Jesse on your trip, they both absolutely loved the weekend and got heaps out of it. Marama said it was the best thing she has ever done in all her schooling, She is meeting with the Dep Principal of St Peters, to tell him all about it and to promote the cause.

They both said you were lots of fun and also enjoyed the group as a whole

Samoan Community Engagement.

Samoan Sports day – On the back of the success of their Samoan Independence day, the United Samoan Churches of Marton are currently planning more opportunities for their community to join together and celebrate their strengths and identity within the community. Currently they are working on another combined day, to be held on October. With sports as the focal point of the day this is sure to be a lively and joyful occasion, and will again ensure the entire Samoan community engages, fostering a strong cohesive community.

I would like to acknowledge the work that young Samoan leader Mary Laki is doing within the college environment to celebrate the Samoan Culture through the events she has been undertaking at Rangitikei College. It is vitally important that from a young age these children learn to be proud of their heritage, and look for opportunities to celebrate it, continue to understand it and embrace it.

Amongst all the stress of the housing shortage in Marton it has been heartening to hear of a few local Samoan families securing their place in the community with house purchases. Housing does however remain a challenge for our local Samoan families, with many families still facing crisis as their rentals go on the market and sell, eliminating their current housing option.

Environment.

Climate change and environmental degradation are without doubt the biggest issues we are facing for the future. We can not continue business as usual without dire consequences locally, nationally and globally. There are multiple and broad reaching facets to the issue, from severe weather pattern changes, shortage of fresh water, extinction of species, to health hazards through pollution. Each one of these, by the very nature of environment and ecosystems, are intrinsically linked, therefore if we are to degrade one area it will surely impact on another, by the same token, should we focus and work to alleviate degradation in one area, we will be surely benefitting other areas.

We have an opportunity to lead in this area, we can choose to have **Protecting our Environment** as a bottom line in all of our policies and operations.

LGNZ have developed a high level position statement on climate change, and rightly state “...Councils are well-positioned to lead and co-ordinate communities to reduce their emissions, both directly as a provider of infrastructure and service, and indirectly, through their influence over activities responsible for emissions.”

It never ceases to sadden me when I see community members violate the environment without so much as a thought, whether that is fly tipping, burning of old tyres, or ignoring obvious water leaks. While sometimes such acts are just trying to avoid costs, many other times it is a lack of awareness and education. We, as council, can lead by example, by education and well-focused advocacy. With council leading in this role, it raises the awareness within our community that protecting the environment is an issue for everyone to be mindful of.

While hindsight is a great thing, and previous works met the need of the community then, we now have the benefit of scientific knowledge, technology and importantly an opportunity to correct previous errors: The installation of our reservoir many years ago saw the flow of the Tutaenui decrease dramatically, affecting not only the aesthetic appeal of the stream, but the very life that lived in it. We continue to add insult to injury by discharging waste water further down the stream. I welcome the pressure that Horizons is placing on us to consider other options for discharge, as well as the opportunity to consider how best to get the flow running again, through the discussion within the Tutaenui Rural Water working committee. While there are price tags to both of these developments, we have an obligation and responsibility as guardians of the district to ensure we protect the land for generations to come.

Through the expectations and aspirations placed on us through Accelerate 25 to double our primary sector GDP, it seems the people speaking to this immediately consider land “optimisation”. It concerns me that this could be merely a euphemism for further intensification. While doubling GDP is a desirable outcome, at what cost is this acceptable? And ultimately who pays?

The most basic of my concerns are 3-fold.

- 1) Water is not “spare water” it is all part of a cycle, it is never “surplus to requirements” It is required somewhere, for some purpose other than human directed wants. i.e. if we take from “here”, then “there” will be missing out.

(Can we not place as much emphasis and education on protecting, and conserving water as we do with using and consuming it?)

- 2) No one has been able to give me the science behind how much water is actually available, or do aquifers actually recharge, or at what rate. That is because no one actually knows, therefore surely dumping huge financial resources into developing reticulated irrigation system would seem to me to be excessive, if the possibility that the source will be depleted in a year, or 5 or even 50. (And if we should deplete it, what state does that then leave our environment in? How much irreparable damage will we have caused.)
- 3) Simple maths: More irrigation (regardless of whether it is for cropping or dairy) equals more run off and leaching of chemicals, nitrates and sediment into our waterways and accumulated within our soils.

Biodiversity. While I sincerely applaud the recommendations recently released by LGNZ in the report addressing biodiversity and acknowledge they have covered some fundamental challenges facing implementation of “Pest Free 2050” around leadership and nationally coordinated approaches, I do question whether they go nearly far enough and whether they could have addressed methods used in the delivery of programmes, and whether the programmes themselves are sufficiently protective of the very ecosystems they are mandated to protect. LGNZ report attached.

Addressing New Zealand's biodiversity challenge: five recommendations for change

Our native flora and fauna is a Taonga that does much to define us as a nation and the time is right to tackle the big questions around its future management. Good progress is being made in some areas, aided by effective new technology and greater public, corporate and philanthropic attention to and investment in the environment. But business as usual will not be good enough if we are to maintain our unique indigenous biodiversity. It is under threat, and we are losing ground in many cases. We have considered how we could better manage our indigenous biodiversity, with a particular focus on the role and work of regional councils.

Five recommendations for change:

1. The need for strong leadership and clarity of roles and responsibilities;
2. The need to agree where we should focus our efforts at national, regional and local level;
3. The importance of a national plan and delivering joined-up action across all players;
4. The need to understand what success looks like, and how to measure it; and
5. The need for modern, fit-for-purpose frameworks, including legislation, to help achieve our goals.

**We are.
LGNZ.**

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 8
on 31 August 2017.

< The thinkpiece suggests five ‘shifts’ that we believe will make the greatest difference. Underlying these is the urgent need for active management, including more predator control, and recognition that only a co-ordinated and tenure-neutral approach will succeed against threats to biodiversity. The focus is on leveraging the expertise of regional councils, who are already active in this space, particularly in partnership with private landowners. >

Shift 1 – Stronger leadership and clearer lines of accountability

Why

We need clear leadership for biodiversity, particularly off public conservation land. Clear boundaries are needed about roles and responsibilities of different parties; this will improve accountability. New Zealand’s biodiversity management system requires better leadership.

How

Promote investigation of options for new national leadership models for biodiversity management including a National Biodiversity Management Authority comprising all major statutory and financial stakeholders (including local government and iwi representation) with:

- A governance role (including recommending and overseeing the changes required to enhance performance and ensure on-going clarity of roles and direction); and
- A limited management role. (Establishing priorities and co-ordinating delivery against those priorities; raising awareness of, and financial support for, biodiversity across all sectors; and overseeing the national response to monitoring biodiversity.)

Ensure that any new biodiversity leadership entity has clear mandate from, and is accountable to, government Ministers, preferably through the entity and its roles and function being recognised in statute.

Develop leadership arrangements at the regional level that encourage collaboration in the undertaking of biodiversity responsibilities, including in the planning, prioritisation and implementation of specific projects (using Nature Central as potential model).

Shift 2 – Building on what regional councils do best

Why

Regional councils are regarded by the government, private sector and communities as expert authorities in working with private land owners and iwi in planning and undertaking operational management to achieve “on the ground” action that furthers biodiversity objectives.

How

The core biodiversity management roles of regional councils should be clearly defined and promoted as:

- Investors in, and/or deliverers of, and/or supporters and enablers of operational programmes to protect and improve the ecological integrity of a network of sites off public conservation land that, in combination with sites on the public conservation lands, represent the full range of habitats and ecosystems;
- Regulators of many (but not all) of the activities that effect freshwater and marine habitats; and
- Regulators of activities that affect terrestrial habitats where that role is not undertaken by territorial authorities (with territorial retaining the default role).

Regional councils to promote legislative change that more clearly articulates their role as outlined above.





Shift 3 – Better information for better management

Why

Information on the overall state of New Zealand's biodiversity is poor. At the national level, indicators are not fit-for-purpose and at a regional level monitoring is patchy, with variable indicators used. In the absence of quality, reliable information regional councils and other stakeholders cannot properly target or "size" their intervention, potentially leading to a misallocation of resources. We need to move from piecemeal/case study/ anecdotal information to the use of comprehensive, robust indicators within a systematic monitoring framework.

How

Regional councils agree on the pan sector adoption of a spatial prioritisation tool and on the protocols for the consistent use of that tool to ensure consistency across the sector in the identification of the regional network of sites. (Note that the Zonation software tool is the leading contender having been already used by a number of councils.)

Regional councils promote the use of the same spatial prioritisation tool (and protocols for use) on public conservation land.

Regional councils and DOC effectively and consistently communicate the concept of, and principles underpinning, prioritisation to ensure all stakeholders understand the strategy and its importance in optimising outcomes for New Zealand as a whole.

In developing and funding biodiversity monitoring programmes promote the principles that:

- Those responsible for managing the threat should also be responsible for monitoring the effect of that management intervention (conversely those not responsible for managing the threat ought not be responsible for monitoring the outcome); and
- If an outcome is nationally important then it is important to monitor the achievement of that outcome nationally.

Implement the 18 recommended indicators for terrestrial biodiversity monitoring (including, regardless of the outcome of action 6 below, ensuring monitoring includes adequate state and condition monitoring for all key biodiversity sites).

Consider further the value proposition of investing in the completion of a Tier 1 (broad scale) monitoring system if there is confirmation of:

- Government's long term commitment to a corresponding system on public conservation land; and
- a contribution of the cost of the programme from national agencies that reflects the value of the information for national reporting (relative to any benefits that accrue regionally).

Further develop the regional biodiversity monitoring programme to cover freshwater and marine habitat in a manner similar to that taken for terrestrial environment.

Consider further the feasibility of establishing a data commons for biodiversity information.

Shift 4 – Planning and delivering joined-up action

Why

New Zealand needs to focus on managing threats to a network of sites that represents the full range of ecosystems and habitats and in so doing provides the best chance of maintaining the full range of species. A consistent approach to prioritisation across regional councils and with other players is needed. We need to achieve a strategic shift from the current fragmented and inconsistent approach to help "NZ Inc" invest optimally and achieve maximum benefit from available resources.

How

Prioritise sites for operational management across the region taking a tenure-neutral approach (in conjunction with the Department of Conservation).

Develop operational plans for the management of the regional network sites and projects in collaboration with the Department of Conservation, iwi and community and private sector players. In doing so identify opportunities for synergies and efficiencies in achieving management objectives.

Operate and invest in such a way as to secure an overall increase in the level of funding for biodiversity investment.

Advocate for new biodiversity/conservation planning mechanisms (such a species and habitat management/recovery plans) that take a tenure neutral approach to the identification of required actions and which specify roles for all relevant agencies.

Support and encourage the development, commercialisation and uptake of new technology for more effective and efficient pest management.

Shift 5 – Modern, fit-for-purpose frameworks

Why

The current legislative framework for biodiversity management comprises a patchwork of statutes from different eras and philosophies. There is a lack of coherence, an absence of focus on biodiversity maintenance as a driving purpose and a lack of clarity about respective functions. The legislative framework should provide for clear leadership for biodiversity management and expressly acknowledge and encourage partnerships and collaboration between parties.

How

Advocate for a review of the institutional and legislative framework as it applies to biodiversity management, to ensure it is fit-for-purpose. Such a review should evaluate the value of integrated, single purpose biodiversity management statute, with a values-based purpose of maintaining indigenous biodiversity and with a full suite of functions, powers and tools to be exercised according to consistent principles and processes; and, in the absence of such a broad review:

- Promote reconsideration of how biodiversity is provided for within the Resource Management Act, with a key considerations being whether “the maintenance of biodiversity” ought to be a Part 2 matter rather than a function; and
- Ensure the Conservation Act establishes the “maintenance of biodiversity” as a purpose of the legislation and as a primary role for DOC – including, importantly off the public conservation land (in partnership with others).

Support regional councils being given a function in biodiversity management that transcends the Resource Management Act,

acknowledging the non-regulatory and operational focus of regional council’s intervention in managing threats to biodiversity maintenance and restoration.

A copy of the full thinkpiece document is available here:
www.bit.ly/LGNZ-Biodiversity



Portfolio Update Heritage and Tourism - Cr Richard Aslett - Aug 2017

1) Update on the Rangitikei Heritage Group Recent Activity –

Last Meeting Tuesday 8th August 2017 – 3.30 p.m. Hunters café, Hunterville.

Next Meeting - Tuesday 5th Sept 2017 - 1 p.m. Town Hall Boardroom, Hunterville.

The group was introduced to new administrator Ellen Webb-More, who has taken over the admin role for the group from Denise Servante.

Mayor Andy Watson attended and presented at the last meeting as part of the stakeholder engagement for the Long Term Plan. Following further discussion as a group afterwards it was decided to hold an additional 'Workshop' meeting to put ideas together for a submission to the LTP consultation process. This meeting will take place on Tuesday 5th September at 1 p.m. in the Town Hall Boardroom, at Hunterville Town Hall.

Also at the last meeting we had Neil Curgenven from History Federation, who gave a presentation on what his organisation could do to promote the group and help museums in the district. This was followed by Robert Wilson from Aon Insurance who gave advice on a potential 'joint' insurance scheme for the districts Museums.

2) UPDATE on Tourism

Rangitikei.com Website

Work continues with the Rangitikei.com website mainly by Bronwyn Meads and Gaylene Prince; Again I recommend reading the very interesting Web-Site report (which I can e-mail separately to anyone interested) which Bronwyn has produced, showing visitor stats, who has actually been looking at Rangitikei.com, and who has been using the website and for what, and the increase in 'hits' during April-June-July, interestingly many of these from people searching on-line in Germany! Work has also continued in earnest with the video testimonials, involving filming and editing to get these stories up on the Website. I was present at one set of filming in Mangaweka, and some of the footage that was captured on a drone from the River canyon there looked just stunning, and should be a great showcase for the district.

District Promotion for the Rangitikei

Currently Bronwyn (in particular) with assistance from Gaylene - and staff at the info centers etc - all seem to be doing a sterling job since the winding up of the Rangitikei Tourism committee and structure. As for the future, this was discussed at length in the most recent Council workshop, with some motivating ideas being put forward by attendees, and will be interesting to see what happens 'long term' going forward

Many Thanks, Richard Aslett
e-mail ; mangawekagallery@xtra.co.nz

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 8
on 31 August 2017

Breakdown of Service Requests for June 2017 - First Response

Service Requests Department	Compliance Overdue	Responded in time	Responded late	Grand Total
Animal Control	1	80	48	129
Animal welfare concern		4	1	5
Barking dog		12	5	17
Dog attack			3	3
Dog property inspection (for Good Owner status)		14	6	20
Found dog		10	5	15
General Enquiry		1		1
Lost animal		13	2	15
Microchip dog		2	5	7
Property investigation - animal control problem	1	3	1	5
Roaming dog		13	3	16
Rushing dog		1	4	5
Wandering stock		7	13	20
Building Control	1		1	2
Dangerous or unsanitary building			1	1
Property inspection	1			1
Cemeteries		1		1
Cemetery maintenance		1		1
Council Housing/Property		15	6	21
Council housing maintenance		6	6	12
Council property maintenance		7		7
Halls maintenance		2		2
Environmental Health		24	3	27
Abandoned vehicle		3	1	4
Dumped rubbish - within town boundary		1	1	2
Livestock (not normally impounded)		3		3
Noise		16	1	17
Untidy/overgrown section		1		1
Footpaths			1	1
Footpath maintenance			1	1
General enquiry	1		1	2
General Enquiry	1		1	2
Parks and Reserves	1	5		6
Maintenance (parks and reserves)	1	4		5
Water leak - parks and reserves only		1		1
Public Toilets		1	3	4
Maintenance (public toilets)		1	3	4
Roads	1	11	4	16
Culverts, drains and non-CBD sumps		1	3	4
Potholes		3		3
Road maintenance - not potholes	1	5	1	7
Road signs (except state highway)		2		2
Roadside Berm Mowing		1		1
Rural berm mowing (including Taihape - see map)		1		1
Street Cleaning		1		1
Street Cleaning - non CBD		1		1
Street Lighting				2
Street lighting maintenance				2

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 9 App 2
on 31 August 2017.

Service Requests		Compliance		
Department	Overdue	Responded in time	Responded late	Grand Total
Water	1	21	1	23
Dirty drinking water		2	1	3
HRWS maintenance required		2		2
Location of meter, toby, other utility		4		4
Replace meter, toby or lid		6		6
Water leak - council-owned network, not parks or cemeteri	1	4		5
Water leak at meter/toby		3		3
Grand Total	8	160	68	236

Feedback Required (Multiple Items)

Service Requests Department	Feedback After hours	Email In	Lette	Telephone	Not	Grand	
Animal Control		1	14	1	21	7	44
Building Control					1	1	2
Council Housing/Property					1		1
Environmental Health	3			2		1	6
Footpaths					1		1
General enquiry					1		1
Parks and Reserves					1	1	2
Roads						1	1
Street Lighting						1	1
Water			2		2		4
Grand Total	3	1	16	3	28	12	63

Service Request Breakdown for June 2017 - Resolution

Service Requests Department	Compliance			
	Completed in time	Completed late	Current Overdue	Grand Total
Animal Control	69	60		129
Animal welfare concern	4	1		5
Barking dog	13	4		17
Dog attack	1	2		3
Dog property inspection (for Good Owner status)	12	8		20
Found dog	7	8		15
General Enquiry	1			1
Lost animal	12	3		15
Microchip dog	1	6		7
Property investigation - animal control problem	2	3		5
Roaming dog	11	5		16
Rushing dog	1	4		5
Wandering stock	4	16		20
Building Control		1	1	2
Dangerous or unsanitary building		1		1
Property inspection			1	1
Cemeteries			1	1
Cemetery maintenance			1	1
Council Housing/Property	15	6		21
Council housing maintenance	7	5		12
Council property maintenance	6	1		7
Halls maintenance	2			2
Environmental Health	21	4	1	26
Abandoned vehicle	2	2		4
Dumped rubbish - within town boundary	1	1		2
Livestock (not normally impounded)	3			3
Noise	15	1	1	17
Footpaths		1		1
Footpath maintenance		1		1
General enquiry	1	1	1	3
General Enquiry		1	1	2
Untidy/overgrown section	1			1
Parks and Reserves	4		1	6
Maintenance (parks and reserves)	3		1	5
Water leak - parks and reserves only	1			1
Public Toilets	1	3		4
Maintenance (public toilets)	1	3		4
Roads	9	1	6	16
Culverts, drains and non-CBD sumps	2	1	1	4
Potholes	1		2	3
Road maintenance - not potholes	5		2	7
Road signs (except state highway)	1		1	2
Roadside Berm Mowing	1			1
Rural berm mowing (including Taihape - see map)	1			1
Street Cleaning	1			1
Street Cleaning - non CBD	1			1
Street Lighting		1	1	2
Street lighting maintenance		1	1	2

Service Requests		Compliance			
Department		Completed in time	Completed late	Current	Overdue Grand Total
Water		21	2		23
Dirty drinking water		2	1		3
HRWS maintenance required		2			2
Location of meter, toby, other utility		4			4
Replace meter, toby or lid		6			6
Water leak - council-owned network, not parks or cemeteri		4	1		5
Water leak at meter/toby		3			3
Grand Total		143	80	1	12 236



Memorandum

To: Council

From: Katrina Gray

Date: 25 August 2017

Subject: Developing the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – progress update, August 2017

File: 1-LTP-4-7

1 Audit update

- 1.1 The Office of the Auditor General has released its overall approach to be take in auditing the 2018-28 Long Term Plan (and Consultation Document); Audit New Zealand will work through the detail for Rangitikei in October.

2 Stakeholder meetings

- 2.1 Since Council's meeting on 27 June 2017, stakeholder meetings have been held with:
- Federated Farmers (31 July 2017)
 - Mokai-Patea Services (1 August 2017)
 - Horizons Regional Council (3 August 2017)
 - Rangitikei Heritage Group (8 August 2017)
 - New Zealand Transport Agency (21 August 2017)

3 Workshop, 17 August 2017

- 3.1 The new topics covered during this workshop were:
- a) 3 waters activity management plan (excluding stormwater)
 - b) Revenue and financing policy (part 1)
 - c) Waste management and minimisation plan

TABLED DOCUMENT

Tabled at Council Item 11
on 31 August 2017

a) *3 water activity management plan*

Wastewater

- Mixed views on whether Council could afford the cost of consent compliance¹ over the current seven wastewater networks (including the proposed pipeline from Marton to Bulls so that there is a single treatment plant there) –
 - this service is a critical funding priority;
 - a need to secure central government funding (which largely funded the current plants, and which might be secured again in the interests of addressing greater visitor numbers);
 - consideration should be given to attracting partnerships with local industries (e.g. ANZCO Food's plants in Marton and Bulls);
 - essential to look at alternative/new technologies – preferably through a national centre of excellence which could provide expert advice.
- This range of views was reflected in the discussions on the levels of service. An increase in the level of service so that the discharge was potable would be prohibitively expensive. The key driver was (and will continue to be) changing (and stricter) consent rules for the receiving environment. Important to reduce flow (infiltration) and educate consumers about what not to dispose into the systems.
- Could Koitiata be linked to Ratana's system? Level of service might be reduced in smaller communities – but essential to have community involvement in discussing that.

Water supply

- A consensus that Council can continue to provide non-potable water to rural consumers (via the rural water schemes) but there needs to be publicity about farm owners' responsibilities (and possibly signage at each of the serviced properties).
- A consensus about maintaining the present levels of service but looking at alternative delivery mechanisms. Firefighting capability should follow legal requirements.
- A consensus supporting extending the Bulls and Marton water networks (particularly into rural living zones), in the interests of targeted growth and higher-value developments. However, it was unclear how such extensions would be funded and whether water meters were appropriate – Council policy needed on this.

Stormwater

- This was set aside for discussion during the 4th workshop (24 August), with particular consideration to the question of private and public drains.

b) *Revenue and financing policy*

- This shortened session addressed the statutory requirements for reviewing the policy and the key issues which Council would be asked to consider. The one activity addressed was roading.

¹ Likely costs, apart for the Marton-Bulls integration, were not discussed at the workshop.

- There was a consensus that:
 - the current funding mechanism of a separate value-based roading rate for the various activities within roading² (including urban footpaths) was a reasonable basis – being essentially a public benefit contributing to the District’s economic development as well as connecting people and communities;
 - investigation might be warranted for a differential to address substantial impacts on roads from volume and weight, especially if there are issues with forestry.
- Given the comparatively long life of bridges, a concern whether there is sufficient regard for intergenerational equity in using the same funding mechanism as for roads generally.

c) *Waste management and minimisation plan*

Current levels of service to the community

- Mixed view on whether to continue with non-council funded kerbside refuse collection (particularly if kerbside recycling implemented). No service currently provided in Mangaweka.
- Consensus in varying waste transfer hours during daylight saving – later opening, later closing times.
- Consensus on greenwaste facilities, although a desire to have cost reduced (currently ¼ the price of general rubbish) – currently taken to MDC to mix with sludge there.
- Litter bin servicing ok.
- Fly-tipping – consensus that it needs to be removed as soon as possible: a need for increased education and publicity.
- Consensus to see waste education increased – keep Enviroschools, target kitchen waste (currently substantial in the waste street to landfill). A potential option is a promotion with the supplier on compost bins.

Proposed initiatives

- On-farm waste management found favour –plastics (baleage and empty containers) a particular problem. Council could act as a depot for the collection of these plastics.
- Discouraging single-use plastic bags is really an issue for supermarket owners, although Council could promote and/or sponsor cloth bags.
- Kerbside recycling district-wide was supported for further research. It could be done in conjunction with MDC’s contractor to get economies of scale. Pricing would need to be investigated.
- Kerbside refuse collection – mixed views, as above, but a desire to investigate further.
- Upgraded waste transfer stations – main issue is with signage.
- Mobile recycling centres – potentially useful in smaller centres or for events so worth investigating (and clarifying costs).

² i.e. pavements, bridges traffic services, stormwater drainage and vegetation management

4 Workshop, 24 August 2017

4.1 The new topics covered during this workshop were:

- a) Economic development
- b) Stormwater and the Stormwater Bylaw

a) Economic development

Desired outcomes

- A range of outcomes were identified as key for what Council is aiming to achieve. In particular, the areas in the following table were identified as areas for improvements and/or increases.

Economic development	District Promotions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resilience – business diversity• Number of jobs and a reduced rate of unemployment• Partnerships with iwi/big businesses• Number of residents• Number of rateable units• Capital value• Council reputation• Number of students attending local schools• Value per unit• New businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visitor nights• Spending• Events and attendance at events• Council's brand• Population• Rangitikei.com• Provision of information to business – e.g. One Stop Shop, land use capability• Promotion of all opportunities – e.g. visitors, business, residential• Attractive towns• Proactive information centres

- There was consensus that baseline data is required to inform, and be able to measure the outcomes.

Focus areas

- Elected members identified a number of activities, either activities Council is currently engaged with and should keep doing, or activities which Council should be involved with. These activities were rated for importance – with yellow dots representing an activity that was essential to undertake, and green dots as activities of importance³. The activities are listed in priority order in the following table.

³ Each elected member was given two yellow dots and 8 green dots.

Economic development	District Promotion
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maori economic development (2 yellow, 4 green) 2. Town centre enhancement – public and private land (2 yellow, 3 green) 3. District development board (1 yellow, 9 green) 4. Sustainability (1 yellow) 5. Regulatory reputation – business friendly (8 green) 6. Improved town entrances (7 green) 7. Central government advocacy (5 green) 8. Accelerate 25 (4 green) 9. Free wifi (3 green) 10. Tutaenui Rural Water Supply (3 green) 11. Mayor relationship with business (3 green) 12. Improved systems – between staff, Council and business (3 green) 13. Increased public transport – advocacy (1 green) 14. Increased information – land use capability (1 green) 15. Retirement options (1 green) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase promotion/marketing (6 yellow, 10 green) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Website improvements ○ Promotion of resources – business, agriculture, education ○ Promotion of opportunities – cost of living, land availability, business opportunities, spare infrastructure capacity ○ Promotion outside of the District ○ Radio advertising 2. Collaboration – including staff resources and building relationships e.g. CEDA (6 yellow, 7 green) 3. Branding (2 yellow, 5 green) 4. Welcome pack (New residents/Businesses) (2 yellow, 2 green) 5. Youth experience/expo with Council and businesses (9 green) 6. Trade shows (4 green) 7. Increased use of Council land near tourism hubs (2 green) 8. Trade training support (1 green) 9. Cycleways (1 green) 10. Optimisation of reserves – memorial park (0) 11. School support (0)

Budget for economic development

- There were mixed views on whether Council should have a separate (and additional) economic development budget, or re-prioritise activities within current budgets. The majority of elected members (10-2) requested a separate (and additional) budget for economic development activities is developed.

b) Stormwater

Levels of Service

- There was general consensus that the current level of service needs to be improved to provide a consistent level of service throughout the urban areas, with the main purpose of addressing problems (e.g. flooding). There is a need to identify critical drains which need improvement, with improvements being completed through a prioritised list under a set budget. Further investigation was requested about the costs and extent of the private drainage network.

Levels of service for stormwater small villages (Scotts Ferry/Koitiata)

- There was consensus that further investigation is required on two aspects:
 - The works required
 - Associated costs
- Concerns were raised about the affordability of improving the stormwater systems for the small villages. Any changes to the levels of service need to be driven by issues raised by the community.

Should public stormwater networks in urban areas become public?

- There were mixed views on whether Council should take over maintenance of the urban stormwater network as follows:
 - Once a private waterbody feeds into a public drain, the rest of the watercourse becomes public.
 - Private drains in urban areas should be managed by the land owners, but with Council providing clear expectations on required maintenance. Council should have the authority to complete maintenance work if required, and charge the property owner.

Responsibility for flooding

- There was consensus that Horizons should be responsible for the management of streams to address flooding issues.

Stormwater Bylaw

- There was consensus that the Stormwater Bylaw is now at a stage where it should be finalised

5 Recommendation

- 5.1 That the memorandum 'Developing the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – update, August 2017' be received.

Katrina Gray
Senior Policy Analyst/Planner