

KÖRERO MAI

We need to receive your feedback by 5pm on Sunday, 7 April 2024

SUBMISSION FORM

HAVE YOUR SAY ON OUR LONG TERM PLAN

He aha tō tirohanga whakamua mō Rangitīkei?

Submissions close at 5pm, Sunday 7 April 2024.



Your Details

Name/Ingoa: John Bligl

Organisation/ Tōpūtanga (if applicable): _____

Address/Kāinga noho: 207 Tricketts Road Blk

Email/ Īmēra: _____

Phone/Waea: 06 322 0881

- Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on 18 April 2024. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

Please note:

Submissions on this LTP are public information and your information and submission will be made available to the public as part of deliberations, unless you tick below requesting your contact details to remain private.

Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the LTP process and will be held by Rangitīkei District Council at 46 High St, Marton 4710. You may access the information and request its correction, if required.

PRIVACY ACT 2020

Please note that submissions are public information. The content on this form including your personal information and submission will be made available to the media and public as part of the decision making process.

- Please tick here if you want your contact details to remain private.

DO YOU AGREE WITH OUR PREFERRED OPTIONS?

KEY CHOICE 1 | MARTON POOL

👉 Should we open the Marton pool all year round? (see page 14)


I prefer...

Option 1* 
The Marton pool would remain only open on a season basis.

Option 2
From 2024/25 the Marton pool would open all year round.

Something else


Comment: _____

 Please include more pages if required.

KEY CHOICE 2 | KERBSIDE COLLECTION

👉 How do you want to roll out the kerbside collection requirements? (see page 16)


I prefer...

Option 1* 
We roll out three bin kerbside collection services in one go starting January 2027.

Option 2
We use a staggered approach and roll out the bins one at a time over the prescribed time period.

Something else

Comment: _____

 Please include more pages if required.

* Councils preferred option

KEY CHOICE 3 | MARTON MAIN STREET UPGRADE

 Should we revitalise the Marton Town Centre? (see page 18)


I prefer...

Option 1* 
Streetscape revitalisation for Marton.

Option 2
Status quo - Do not invest in streetscape revitalisation for Marton.

Something else

Comment: _____

 Please include more pages if required.

ANYTHING ELSE?

That a fully independent review
of Civil Defense Be carried out
of Councils systems and publish in
bill for the protection of District.

 Please include more pages if required.

TIM MATTHEWS
SUBMISSION on 2024-2034 LONG TERM PLAN
RANGITIKEI DISTRICT COUNCIL

DATE: 6 April 2024
ADDRESS for SERVICE: 316 Ohaumoko Road
R D 7
Wanganui 4577
Email: matthews.tj@xtra.co.nz

SUBMISSION

1. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this year's Long Term Plan document. This is my personal submission and may not represent the views of other organisations I may represent from time to time.
2. The Plan summary document outlines the issues the Council and District are facing in terms of the challenges facing District businesses and farmers, despite recent good returns. The Council has been forced to make hard choices in terms of what it can afford, and the unprecedented level of rate rises proposed for the next year. The 10 year projections are alarming in that most Council cost centres will require more than double the rates or user-pays sums budgeted for this coming year in 2033-34! Added to this is the Three Waters Saga and its ongoing implications for Council.
3. The District Revaluation has added its usual curved balls in terms of 20 to 30% rate rises for some ratepayers, myself included, and reinforces that property valuations on a 3 yearly basis is becoming less and less correlated with a rate-payer's use of Council services. Despite three Government enquiries in my lifetime, we are no further forward in terms of matching Council spending with ratepayer ability to pay, but returning GST on rates to each Council would be a good start.

SPECIFIC SUBMISSION POINTS

4. KEY CHOICE 1. Marton Pool Opening Hours
 - 4.1 The Marton pool should remain open on a seasonal basis, as determined by a usage threshold versus daily cost of remaining open, given that pool admission charges do not cover the full cost providing the facility. Option 2 is not realistic given the marginal cost of opening daily could exceed \$357 000 each year. It would be more practical to assist with a mini-bus hire to Feilding or Whanganui on a thrice-weekly basis during the "off-season.

5. KEY CHOICE 2. Kerbside Collection

5.1 Once again the Wellington bureaucrats have overstepped their ability to understand small town dynamics and imposed unnecessary costs on Districts such as Rangitikei. Surely we can come up with a scheme that achieves the same result with far less cost than what is proposed. That might acknowledge that most people can access cars to purchase groceries and other local goods, and where products are delivered the resulting waste could be “back-loaded” to where they originated from, which might also help retailers to minimise waste in the first place! Of course there will be situations, usually nearer the centre of towns, where transport assistance is needed, but a controlled skip-bin arrangement might suit within walking distance of most users. It is difficult to see why the Council should have to invest \$1.5 million in bins plus the collection system necessary to achieve something that might work in Auckland or Wellington.

6. KEY CHOICE 3. Marton Main Street Upgrade

6.1 This choice does challenge the Revenue and Financing Policy in terms of beneficiaries and exacerbators, and who should pay. It could be solved by rerouting State Highway 1 through Broadway but that is not going to happen, just as Taihape and Bulls benefit. I understand that co-funding using “encouragement funds” from the 3 Waters minister from the previous Government might be available for this purpose, but that might better be used removing the restrictive aspects of the Heritage Designations on the properties fronting the same area, if Heritage New Zealand is unwilling to put their money where their mouth is. The fact remains that buildings have a useful life depending on their designer’s ability to allow future modification or change of use, while meeting relevant building regulations, and some buildings, no matter how pretty, cannot achieve that sufficiently to generate an economic return for their current owners, particularly where the rentals do not achieve Lambton Quay levels.

7. OTHER SUBMISSION POINTS

8. **Introduction of a Forestry Differential.** I applaud the introduction of the Forestry differential, but the level of the current differential is insufficient to remediate or fully acknowledge the damage that loaded forestry traffic is imposing on the District’s ratepayers. Most of the District’s roads which provide access to the larger forests have not been designed, constructed or up-graded to carry the same loads or volumes of traffic as State Highways are required to handle. The Wairoa District Council court decision justified the imposition of a 4.0 times Rooding Rate differential and being familiar with many of the Wairoa District’s roads, they have very similar roading construction materials, costs and geology compared to Rangitikei’s roads.

9. I would have expected that the Revenue and Financing Policy would have included a more specific reasoning for its use in Rangitikei, but that opportunity has not been utilised this year. More particularly, the purchase and conversion of large tracts of

production forest to “Carbon Farming Forest” may cause a re-examination of the policy in the near future, because depending on government treatment of carbon credits, and market prices, those forests could be converted back to timber production.

10. I urge Council to set a Production Forest differential at least 4 times to more fairly acknowledge the impacts that forest development and harvesting causes on the roading budget of the Council.

11. Roothing Service Decline

The current year has seen a significant reduction in contractor service yet we continue to pay significant roading rates. There appears to be an unwillingness for the Council’s roading contractor to share the pain that its residents are experiencing, and my impression is that the contractor is receiving the same payments for less performance. In other words there is a significant decline in Service Potential as our roads suffer. Can we be assured that the Contractor is being held to the agreed performance standards and that Fletcher Group is not profiting from our rougher roads?

12. Roothing Measure Of Performance

This LTP introduces a unsealed road measure of performance for the first time, being the volume of metal applied annually – 12 000 m³. Unfortunately this is somewhat meaningless, as depending on the metal quality much can be lost by weather events or just being graded into the water tables. What would be better is to measure depth of metal cover over culverts or complaints regarding metal cover and traction loss or corrugations due to heavy vehicles. A better standard is needed to measure unsealed road condition, and more accurately define whether roads are actually being maintained.

END of SUBMISSION