

Simultaneous Consultation Submissions



making this place home

| Long Term Plan Submissions | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Submission number | Simultaneous consultation | Name and Organisation | Page number |
| SE #001 | Significance & Engagement Policy | Felicity Wallace Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei | 3 |
| SE #002 | Significance & Engagement Policy | Carolyn Bates | 5 |
| SE #003 | Significance & Engagement Policy | Lynne Sheridan | 7 |
| DC #001 | Development Contributions Policy | Gretta Mills | 9 |
| DC #002 | Development Contributions Policy | Carolyn Bates | 11 |
| DC #003 | Development Contributions Policy | Felicity Wallace Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei | 12 |
| DC #004 | Development Contributions Policy | Lynne Sheridan | 14 |

Submission on the Rangitikei District Council Draft Significance and Engagement Policy

To: Rangitikei District Council
info@rangitikei.govt.nz

Submitter: Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei
c/- Felicity Wallace
15 Bond Street
Marton 4710
Tel: 027 242 6060
e: felicity@inspire.net.nz

Introduction

1. Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (**IROMAR**) wish to be heard in support of its submission.
2. IRO-MAR advocates for a group of residents living in Marton and the wider Rangitikei district who hold a strong affinity and commitment to the land and people of Rangitikei district, its health and well-being.
3. We wish to see our district grow and flourish but not at the cost of the amenity and environment that make this area a special place to live.
4. We support environmentally-best practice development and protection of Rangitikei District, including its rural environment and communities, its flora, fauna, endangered species and soils.
5. We appreciate this opportunity to submit on the draft Significance and Engagement Policy.

Summary

6. We submit that the Rangitikei District Council requires further crucial detail added to the draft Significance and Engagement Policy in order to provide appropriate transparency regarding processes of District Council decision-making, and also to better inform Rangitikei communities of their rights within legislated consultation and engagement frameworks.
 - a. The draft policy is narrated via concept of "Have Your Say" which although amplifying the critical concepts of community engagement and consultation, does not adequately reflect the equal importance of spelling out the process of significance threshold analysis required for each decision the Council makes, and then commits communities to funding and/or supporting.
 - b. The components of the draft policy that specifically address determining significance of an issue, proposal, decision or matter brought before Council are very light on detail. We would expect inclusion of frameworks and examples that demonstrate clearly how the Council assesses significance in everyday decision-making, and what Rangitikei communities can expect when a significance threshold is triggered, not just standard requirements of section 82 of LGA 2002, but also the specifics of 82A, and also further detail of any special consultative process.

- c. Although as per LGA 2002 requirement, a list of Strategic Assets is provided it would be useful to identify any non-strategic assets the Council owns and explain parallel processes required under legislation.
- d. It would also be useful to include within the assessment process analysis of whether the issue, proposal, decision or matter is likely to generate wide public interest (beyond those potentially immediately affected) ie Rangitikei local, region-wide or of national interest; and finally, whether the degree to which the proposal/decision can be reversed.

Sally Patrick

On behalf of IROMAR

Dated: 07-04-24

Submission to RDC's Significance and Engagement Policy 2024

| | |
|---|---|
| From: Carolyn Bates, 7 Dalrymple Place, Marton 4710 setabac.cab@gmail.com / 021-342-524 | I am happy to come to answer questions regarding my submission. |
|---|---|

Significance

What is important to one person is not necessarily as important to another - I struggle with why there are not opportunities taken, to share plans before action is taken. It has seemed to me that RDC only do what they have to when it is absolutely necessary. Getting people on board would, in my mind result in a happier (or less disgruntled), more informed community.

Engagement

While the term is accepted as being part of the "Significance and Engagement Policy". What I feel is needed is a less formal approach / make more information **more easily** accessible.

Making information readily available is beneficial all round. Users easily/quickly find what they need/want, plus, staff do not have to spend time providing support.

I have mentioned (I feel too many times) in the past. Finding information on the RDC website, to me, ranges from not exactly easy to impossible.

Things I've **not** found:

- **Anything to do with David Engwicht** - I wanted the Marton Town Centre Plan, but as David's name does not appear to be in the file, perhaps that is why searches failed. Considering what David was contracted to produce / had been paid - I was surprised, searching found nothing.
- **Anything to do with Cobber Kain (Avenue)** - to research the improvements there.
- **Pavement use** - An information Sheet for use of the pavement was compiled several years back outlining parameters as to how high hanging signs should be, plus, how wide clearance needed to be on pavements. A search for "Pavement" seemed a good start, I expected a range of options, to find the only result was: "Stock Droving and Grazing Bylaw 2013", that comes nowhere close to what I'm after.

When I know there is background information and I fail to find it, how would anyone else find information when they are in the category of "they don't know what they don't know"?

That said, I expect you will get the standard response from staff "We are revising the website" that has been going on for over a decade from my point of view with no improvement in the level of "searchability" for users!

I do like the more recent video's which Ben from the Comms Team produces - I have found quite a few funny while sharing relevant information on many topics. They certainly have got folk talking.

It is a reasonable assumption to me that there will be an organisation chart, if that is available that would be useful, to simply have the six Group Managers and CEO does not exactly make it easy to find who is say the Parks or Roading Manager, when searching for those positions produces **no** relevant detail.

The table below highlights aspects of concern in the consultation documentation:

| Page | Text | My input |
|------|---|--|
| 3 | [list them by name here] | Information appears to be missing? I would have expected a list. How can anyone comment on something which is not known / stated? |
| 4 | “being flexible about how your views can be shared” | RDC should take input for Annual or Long Term Plans at any time. Then the claim to be listening to affected parties / ratepayers views would be more relevant. |
| 4 | ensuring access to any documents or information needed | Note my earlier comments regarding finding information. |
| 4 | Input of Māori to decision-making | The lack of attendance at meetings of relevant councillors is a concern, I am pleased I am not on the Maori Roll. |
| 6 | An SCP must also allow at least one month for submissions to be received. | Many groups / clubs only meet once a month, to afford them only one month to give input is not helpful. Also when RDCs Community Committees and Boards meet alternative months, the opportunities to provide input is far from ideal. Depending on timings, I’m not surprised that some people have the view that RDC actively works to hide what they do. |

If you have any questions do not hesitate to give me a call: 021-342-524.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>To;</p> <p>Rangitikei District Council, 46 High Street, Marton. 4710</p> | <p><u>Significance and Engagement Policy</u></p> <p><u>Submission from;</u></p> <p>Lynne Sheridan 289 Bryces Line Marton 4788</p> <p>Phone; 06 327 5980</p> <p>Email; lynne.s@farmside.co.nz</p> |
|--|--|

| |
|--|
| <p><u>Suggestions;</u> Page 3. <u>Section 80. Local Government Act 2002</u> Deviating from the policy – Whilst Section 80 does not specify any register to record these deviations from policy or whether Council needs to share this with our communities – How will ratepayers and our community learn when and what has occurred. This currently does not promote transparency and integrity of decision making. There needs to be appropriate wording in this Significance and Engagement Policy and possibly a new policy (Deviations from Policy) created to ensure the recording of any deviation to a policy is brought to our communities’ attention. I appreciate that sometimes deviating from a policy may be needed. However, if it is a deviation to the Significance and Engagement Policy, it is in itself is ‘significant’ surely. As a consequence there needs to be a mechanism to ensure that this is carried out transparently. This is not an exclusive issue to the Significance and Engagement Policy either and could be compiled as a register tagged either to each policy or as a general register (Deviations from Policy Register). The register should be accessible to our community to explain why actions /processes have not occurred in line with the policy – it would provide a transparent record. The Resolution number will record the decision</p> |
|--|

and requirements required by section 80 (Local Government Act 2002) and will be derived from meeting minutes.

Ensuring our community is aware of the deviations from policy could be posted on the website.

Suggestion for a Deviations from Policy Register is created and updated as a living document, to ensure that Council is meeting the requirements of section 80 Local Government Act 2002.

Suggested amendment to the Significance and Engagement Policy, – “deviations from the Significance and Engagement Policy” is listed in **level of significance for all decisions**, list on page 3. Significance and Engagement Policy.

page 4. Policy. I would like to suggest the following words (in yellow below) to ensure clarity, as to the potential opportunities for engagement. “Engagement is where the Council provides opportunities for you to ‘have your say’ as an input to decision making (ie., this might be before and /or after the draft document is compiled)”

page 117. Draft LTP 24-34

The words need to reflect more truly what happens in order to be transparent on this process;

“This Policy outlines how and when you can have input into the decision-making processes of the Council and covers two things:

- 1. Significance; and*
- 2. How the Council will get your input to decision-making (participation)”*

I suggest that item 2. Be amended to read;

- 2. How and whether, the Council will get your input to decision-making (participation).*

LTP 2024-34 Simultaneous Consultation
Rangitikei District Council
Private Bag 1102, Marton 4741

Email: info@rangitikei.govt.nz

Gretta Mills

7 April 2024

Oral Submission- *I wish to speak to my submission*

Long Term Plan 2024-34 Simultaneous Consultation:

Draft Development Contributions Policy

2. Policy

2.1 Council's policy is to not require development contributions.

I strongly object to this policy of not requiring development contributions

3. Explanatory Comment

3.1 This policy reflects

(i) the extent of the development occurring in the District

A great deal of housing development has already occurred in our District and no development contributions have been required.

Every new development requires Infrastructure access: 3 waters, roads, bridges, footpaths, transport services, internet access, power supply etc. More concrete is poured, natural drainage of the land is impaired and more run-off ends up in our streams and rivers which then are more likely to flood. The people who buy these new houses also require and expect services- playgrounds, sports fields, schools, halls, library, swimming pool and community activities.

Why should those who already live here subsidise 'development businesses' whose development actions put more pressure on existing infrastructure that is paid for by existing ratepayers. Existing residents are also expected to pay higher rates for the 'intergenerational borrowing' that the RDC commits us to.

and (ii) the view that such a policy might give the District a comparative advantage in attracting developers.

If 'developers' are attracted to the Rangitikei so that they don't have to contribute a local development charge then we do not welcome them. They are freeloading at the expense of residents who already pay and contribute to local facilities and services. Local ratepayers are often unaware of ratepayer monies being misused when our Council is

magnanimous with public money that they haven't earned. It amounts to a bribe to developers and is inappropriate (see below)

Council's current network infrastructure is unlikely to need significant expansion to cope with projected residential or business demand.

This statement is a sad joke for the residents of Marton- or those who know the truth about this particular local 'business development' process that they have paid for!

Marton Rail Hub - the so-called 'Marton Rail Hub' is actually a rail siding project that the Rangitikei District Council invented to attract 'free' development funding from the government by linking it to an earlier 'land rezoning' proposal.

The original project is actually a 'rezoning' proposal that dates back to 2019 when the RDC decided to very quietly 'rezone 219ha of rural land to industrial.'

The Council has completely funded this rezoning proposal using ratepayer funding. They have acted as the Developer on behalf of anonymous 'overseas' and local interests who to this day remain hidden and who have not contributed a 'cent' to the development process.

This 'industrial project' on the eastern edge of Marton requires: 3 waters, safe roads and bridges, a large increase in truck and other vehicle traffic and a substantial power supply. Our council proposes that these anonymous developers can just 'plug into' Marton's existing 3 waters infrastructure! There is insufficient power available in Marton for such a development so a couple of bio-mass plants are proposed...

If this industrial development proceeds as proposed, much concrete will be poured and large industrial multi-story buildings and waste vents will operate 24/7. Our roads will become much more hazardous with multiple truck movements from SH3 and SH1 across railway lines SH3 and through key Marton roads. Natural drainage of the land will be impaired and more run-off will end up in our streams and rivers which will then be more likely to flood.

Development contributions must be demanded from all developers arriving to do 'business' in the Rangitikei!

Submission to RDC's Development Contributions 2024

From: Carolyn Bates, 7 Dalrymple Place, Marton 4710
setabac.cab@gmail.com / 021-342-524

I am happy to come to answer questions regarding my submission.

My input is simple (as it stands), **what the heck is this to do with**, having read the document several times, I am still at a loss as to figure out who would be paying who!

Does Contribution = Money?

- ❖ If RDC pays, why then are there Rates Remissions, or would this apply as well?
- ❖ If RDC receive, what would the \$\$\$ off set? Is there not already a fee for connecting to existing services?

I am supportive of development in the District, but from this document I wonder what level of transparency anyone could expect when this policy fails to clearly state its purpose.

This is, yet another instance of, how difficult can RDC make communication with ratepayers!

What do other councils have in place and what works or not for them which should be taken as a learning for RDC to use?

Encouragement of Developers needs to go hand in hand with ensuring any affected community is kept informed of plans for their area(s). I do not agree with situations, which have happened in the past, where simply because there is no need to tell residents, those affected are kept in the dark. Getting buy in is much better than annoying those in the vicinity.

Transparency and Communication are vital.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to give me a call: 021-342-524.

Submission on the Rangitikei District Council Draft Development Contributions Policy

To: Rangitikei District Council
info@rangitikei.govt.nz

Submitter: Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei
c/- Felicity Wallace
15 Bond Street
Marton 4710
Tel: 027 242 6060
e: felicity@inspire.net.nz

Introduction

- 1 Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (**IROMAR**) wish to be heard in support of its submission.
- 2 IRO-MAR advocates for a group of residents living in Marton and the wider Rangitikei district who hold a strong affinity and commitment to the land and people of Rangitikei district, it's health and well-being.
- 3 We wish to see our district grow and flourish but not at the cost of the amenity and environment that make this area a special place to live.
- 4 We support environmentally-best practice development and protection of Rangitikei District , including its rural environment and communities, its flora, fauna, endangered species and soils.
- 5 We appreciate this opportunity to submit on the Draft Development Contributions Policy

Summary

- 6 We submit that the Rangitikei District Council needs to amend the current Development Contributions Policy to require financial contributions by developers:
 - (a) The current policy is unfair to existing residents, who should not shoulder additional cost incurred by additional load on services created by new residential or new industrial and commercial developments.
 - (b) What evidence does the Council have to support the statement that "Council's current network infrastructure is unlikely to need significant expansion to cope with projected residential or business demand"?
 - (c) It is concerning that this Council continues to make secret financial arrangements with developers, while at the same time raising rates for our small communities. A clear and consistent policy of developer contributions needs to be established and published on the Council website.

- (d) Developer contributions are common throughout New Zealand, and are fees charged to developers to recover a share of the cost of infrastructure for a new development. These contributions also support additional demand on public amenities created by new developments.
- (e) The Rangitikei District struggles to attract developers with any substantial funds. Continuing to require a relatively small number of ratepayers to subsidise development for developers profits, perpetuates a downward cycle. The Council must require that developers pay their way and contribute towards better services for our region.

Felicity Wallace

On behalf of IRO-MAR

Dated: 07-04-24

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>To;</p> <p>Rangitikei District Council, 46 High Street, Marton. 4710</p> | <p><u>Development Contributions Policy</u></p> <p><u>Submission from;</u></p> <p>Lynne Sheridan 289 Bryces Line Marton 4788</p> <p>Phone; 06 327 5980</p> <p>Email; lynne.s@farmside.co.nz</p> |
|--|--|

Suggestion; That Council establish an active Development Contributions Policy instead of having development contracts with Developers.

This policy should apply to all new housing subdivision, industrial and commercial developments in the district.

A Development Contribution should be applied to all Council key infrastructure services, Water, wastewater, stormwater and roads that the Developer connects to.

Should the Developer require a new service or a service in excess of what Council can supply – the Developer will pay Council the cost of increasing the supply of that service (*assuming the service can be increased*) or the Developer may choose to develop their own service.

Why; For transparency and the integrity of Council's reputation.

A policy of what is expected by Developers should be established, so that existing ratepayers and our community can feel secure in knowing that there has been a fair contribution towards the assets that belong to our community. They will also have an understanding of the cost for a Developer to take advantage of simply connecting up to existing service supplies.

In the last few years there have been a number of new housing developments in this district and maybe there will be more development – the ratepayers and our community have no way of

knowing the extent of any contribution by Developers, to connect up to existing service supplies.

There needs to be transparency around the Development Contributions Policy.

This policy needs to show integrity.

The current Policy may well have helped to entice development – the situation has changed now, and the ratepayers and community need to feel assured that their assets are being supported by Development contributions.

The amount (\$) of the Development Contribution

Analysis of what other Councils use to calculate this is required.

Our Council needs to share with the community how they have come to this decision as part of the public consultation with the Community on a revised Development Contributions Policy.