

# **Annual Plan & Co 2026/27 – Hearing of Submissions**

## **Hearings booklet – Collated submissions**

## Contents – Submissions in Order of Speaker

<b>Sub No.</b>	<b>Submitter Name and Organisation</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
14	Taihape Playground Group	3
26	Jock Stratton - Erewhon Rural Water Scheme	5
27	Peter Kipling Arthur - Taihape Heritage Grandstand Sub Committee	7
34	Gill Duncan - Taihape Grandstand Restoration Committee	11
35	Gill Duncan - Taihape Community Board	15
46	Daniel Duxfield	21
20	Ian Rae - Taihape Community Development Trust	23
21	Ian Rae - Taihape Development Trust	25
13	Helen Koster	27
24	Jo Rangooni	31
36	Ian Strahan & Laura Morrison – Federated Farmers	33
40	Jennifer Lamm – Alcohol Healthwatch	41
41	Felicity Wallace – Interested Residents of Marton & Rangitikei	47
43	Peter & Darryl Cousins	52
31	Tim Matthews	58

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 6 April 2026 9:30 PM

Creation Time: April 7, 2026 1:41 PM

---

**Ingoa/Name:**

Charity

**Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?**

Yes

**Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):**

Taihape Playground Group

**Kāinga noho/Address:**

**Īmēra/Email:**

**Waea/Phone:**

**Would you like to speak to your submission:**

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

**How did you hear about this consultation?**

Meeting

**Which statement best reflects your view?**

Unsure / need more information

**Why did you choose this option?**

I am the president of Taihape Playground Group and have already sent through submissions for toilets to be added to the LTP. We have seen the draft plans presented by the Grandstand committee and we are happy with the layout.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

Please remove the existing toilets. Our group would like council to pay for the toilets according to the draft on the Grandstand draft design.

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

Yes

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

Town/community (Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Faster decision-making

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Which principle matters most to you?

Keeping rates predictable year to year

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Partially

Why/why not?

Which statement best reflects your view?

Depends on the service.

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

Partially

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

14 April 2026

Erewhon Rural Water Scheme  
Rangitikei District Council  
Chairperson: Jock Stratton

To the Rangitikei District Council - info@rangitikei.govt.nz

**RE: Submission to the Rangitikei District Council Annual Plan.**

Erewhon Rural Water Scheme is seeking an amendment to their draft 2026/27 Annual Plan budget, as they require an increase to their capital programme of work from \$406,525 to \$5,000,000 in order to carry out capital work, pipeline replacement initiatives. The three projects of highest priority are as follows;

1. Mangaohane stage two, 1300 meters, PE-Steel, 150mm, 32 bar, Est, \$ 692,500
2. Mangaohane Stage three, 600 meters, steel, 100mm 25-40 bar, est \$ 334,328
3. Pipe Bridge to Gilberts cattleyards including 1100 meters on Matawhero Road,  
Steel, 25-40 bar, est \$ 1,963,866

The committee have been working with Mr Andrew van Bussel (Water Supply Specialist) of Rangitikei District Council to confirm the requirements of the programme over the last twelve plus months. They have also met with the Chief Executive, and members of the Finance team to confirm the impact on their budgets and the best way forward.

The committee now has a clear understanding of the programme of work and is planning to go to tender to confirm the cost of this programme of work (anticipated to be around \$5million), subject to Council approving this submission.

The committee realise the timing may span a number of years, however, in order to go to market, the committee requires their scheme capital budget to have an approved budget by Council to the total value of \$5,000,000 in order to maximise the best procurement and timing opportunities. Currently the capital programme of work for the 2026/27 year is \$406,525 (excluding GST) and including a CPI adjustment, this level of

planned expenditure is reflected for each year of the current long term plan through to 2033/34.

The scheme holders are seeking Council approval to amend the 2026/27 budget to a total value of \$5,000,000 for the 2026/27 to meet their procurement goals. This will remove the need to budget the current \$406,525 per annum in the next long term plan by essentially bringing this expenditure forward relative to the current long term plan.

Assuming Council approve this budget for the 2026/27 year the committee will go to market to seek the best price and most efficient/effective way of carrying out this work. Once the timing of the programme if work is understood, the committee plan to work with the Finance team of Rangitikei District Council to phase this work across the year or years as per the accepted tenders' recommendations, recognising this may require carry forward of un-spent funds into future years.

The request to increase the 2026/27 capital programme of work will not increase the revenue required in the 2026/27 year, therefore no increase to the rates being sought by Council, however the committee recognises that in the 2027/28 year they will need to increase their water supply charges to cover the cost of debt repayment, interest costs, and increased insurance. Some of these operational costs will be covered by reduced maintenance costs.

The committee welcomes the opportunity to come and speak on this submission, currently scheduled for 6 May 2026.

Yours sincerely

Jock Stratton and the committee members.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 16 April 2026 14:48

Creation Time: April 17, 2026 9:29 AM

---

**Ingoa/Name:**

Peter Kipling Arthur

**Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?**

Yes

**Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):**

Taihape Heritage Grandstand Sub Committee

**Kāinga noho/Address:**

**Īmēra/Email:**

**Waea/Phone:**

**Would you like to speak to your submission:**

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

How did you hear about this consultation?

Meeting

Which statement best reflects your view?

Acceptable to maintain essential services

Why did you choose this option?

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

Yes

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

Town/community (Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Keeping strong local decision-making, Better quality infrastructure and services, Greater resilience in emergencies

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Which principle matters most to you?

Costs should be shared broadly to keep services affordable

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Yes

Why/why not?

Which statement best reflects your view?

Depends on the service.

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

Yes

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

\*Please include more pages if required:

TOILET UPGRADE.docx, 0.02MB

Anything else?

The Heritage Trust Grandstand Sub-Committee request that funding be allocated in the 2026 Annual Plan budget for the installation of new toilet facilities at the Taihape Grandstand. This upgrade is essential to enable full use of the green space, as approved by the Council, supporting the development of the new Taihape Playground.

SEE attached file

# Request for Funding Allocation for Taihape Grandstand Toilet Facilities Upgrade

That funding be allocated in the 2026 Annual Plan budget for the installation of new toilet facilities at the Taihape Grandstand. This upgrade is essential to enable full use of the green space, as approved by the Council, supporting the development of the new Taihape Playground.

## Justification for Upgrade

The existing toilet block is currently unsafe for children, does not adequately serve individuals with mobility challenges, and the stalls are too small for general use. Setting aside budget funds for this necessary service renewal at the Park's end is vital for the Playground project's success and aligns with the Community-wide goals of the Grandstand upgrade.

## Reference to Annual Plan Consultation Document

This request is supported by the Annual Plan Consultation document (p.16), which emphasizes the importance of:

- Parks and Reserves
- Replacing old parks and reserves equipment
- Investing in parks, open spaces, and play parks in accordance with the Parks, Open Spaces, and Sporting Facilities Strategy
- Upgrading existing playground equipment

## Community and Collaborative Approach

The document also highlights the need to implement renovations and improvements as outlined in the Property Review and Maintenance Schedule 2023. It encourages the creation, facilitation, and contribution to collaborative and community-led partnerships. Additionally, it underscores the importance of celebrating and developing our cultural identity, heritage, and history by promoting and showcasing the district's history and culture.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 17 April 2026 11:20

Creation Time: April 28, 2026 9:13 AM

---

## Ingoa/Name:

Gill Duncan

## Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?

Yes

## Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):

Taihape Grandstand Restoration Committee

## Kāinga noho/Address:

C/- 102 Hautapu Street, Taihape, Manawatu-Whanganui, 4720, NZL

## Īmēra/Email:

## Waea/Phone:

## Would you like to speak to your submission:

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

How did you hear about this consultation?

Website, Meeting

Which statement best reflects your view?

Acceptable to maintain essential services

Why did you choose this option?

We acknowledge that Council has an obligation to rate for it's services and the reduction of the forecast average rate increase from 10.75% to 6.4%.

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

Communication is key to good governance.

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

Yes

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

Town/community (Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Keeping strong local decision-making, Better quality infrastructure and services, Faster decision-making

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Which principle matters most to you?

Costs should be shared broadly to keep services affordable

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Why/why not?

Which statement best reflects your view?

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

\*Please include more pages if required:

BQH10144 - Memorial Park - Granstand Refurbishment, New Amenities & Structural Upgrade  
- Bud 01.pdf, 0.91MB

Anything else?

Separate document sent to Kezia Spence for submission as I could not attach here.

Thanks, Gill Duncan

Submission 034 Annual Plan Gill Duncan – Taihape Grandstand Restoration Committee  
Additional submission information received via email to staff:

RDC Annual Plan Submission 2026/27  
Taihape Grandstand Restoration Committee

Dear Councillors,

We request \$256,000.00 be put into the 2026/27 budget to build the required new Public Toilet facility in the Taihape Grandstand footprint.

Taihape Grandstand Restoration Committee (TGRC), formed in 2025, is a sub-committee of Taihape Memorial Park (the Park), User Group.

We are a targeted group addressing the scheduled Grandstand restoration with LTP 2021-2031 allocated \$1Mil funds and using a “Community Led, Council Owned Facility Upgrade Agreement”. As a community group and subgroup of the Taihape Community Development Trust, we can access external funding, complementing Council's.

TGRC supports RDC's, Parks, Open Spaces, and Sporting Facilities Strategy, welcoming the opportunity to partner in restoring the Heritage listed, category 2, Grandstand. This multi-code sports and Area School outdoor sporting gallery is still the loved home of Rugby, their “Marae”, that needs future proofing to fulfil its purpose on the Park, from practical, cultural and Heritage perspectives.

To re-establish the Grandstand's multi-use purpose, the TGRC request RDC budget put against essential replacement toilets, for Playground and general public, situated within the Grandstand footprint; allowing for the entire RDC allocated green space for the new proposed playground equipment.

With the Grandstand scope being prepared for plans and costing, we ask that a provisional figure of \$256,000.00 is allocated for new Public Toilets, as in the BQH QS updated 5-Oct-25 (attached), until quotes for this work can be obtained.

Thank you,

TGRC Membership: Crs Piki Te Ora Hiroa – Council representative, Cr Wong, Taihape Rugby – Kurt Ball, Utiku Rugby – Taine Knight, Taihape Playground – Charity Davis & Charlotte Oswald, Taihape Heritage – Peter Kipling-Arthur, NWRU representative and Financial Advisor – Alan Thomas; Chair/“project manager” - Gill Duncan.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 17 April 2026 11:32

Creation Time: April 28, 2026 9:13 AM

---

**Ingoa/Name:**

Gill Duncan

**Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?**

Yes

**Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):**

Taihape Community Board

**Kāinga noho/Address:**

**Īmēra/Email:**

**Waea/Phone:**

**Would you like to speak to your submission:**

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

How did you hear about this consultation?

Website, Meeting, Facebook

Which statement best reflects your view?

Acceptable to maintain essential services

Why did you choose this option?

Council has a responsibility to set a rate that covers its daily services. TCB supports a good level of service at a reasonable cost.

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

As we progress through Local Government changes, changes to water providers and services and projects within communities there has to be a reliable, clear and transparent conversation with Communities.

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

Yes

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

Town/community (Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Keeping strong local decision-making

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Water CCOs must be protected from eventual privatization.

Which principle matters most to you?

Costs should be shared broadly to keep services affordable

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Why/why not?

Which statement best reflects your view?

Fees should generally recover the full cost of providing a service where the service is used by an individual or identifiable group.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Charging more for Kokako Street Hall, when maintenance is not done and the facility continues to decline, is unfair and unreasonable.

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

\*Please include more pages if required:

TCB Submission to AP.pdf, 0.06MB

Anything else?

Document also sent to Kezia Spence for inclusion if unsuccessful here.

Thank you, Gill Duncan

## Taihape Community Board      Annual Plan Submission 2026/27

15<sup>th</sup> April 2026

The Taihape Community Board (TCB), thanks the Rangitikei District Council for the opportunity to submit on the 2026/27 Annual Plan.

TCB values democracy through local voice, representing our community and advocating to Rangitikei District Council (RDC), about local issues, including environment, land use, water use, roading and infrastructure, business support and grants and facilities such as libraries and parks. Civil Defense must also be a focus.

We support fair Rates increases that reflect rising costs on essential services and acknowledge the lower than forecast rate of 6.4% vs 10.75%

TCB Request from Rangitikei District Council:

1. Maintenance of Kokako Street Hall kitchen, reglazing and toilet facilities;
2. Urban growth measures include Taihape;
3. TCB is kept up to date with Communication around Taihape Wastewater remediation for property owners and Council look to break down costs on CDW when known to share with the Community.
4. Continue to support community events and creative works through grant funding;
5. that RDC allocate AP 2026/27 budget against the need for replacement toilets for the Playground and general public, that are situated within the Grandstand footprint;
6. use Community Boards to reach local voice and further Council understanding.
7. Locate CD Trailer in Taihape.

**Community** -The Taihape Town Hall project is long awaited. This building is the civic heart of Taihape; provides social connection, shelter and cultural expression. With the project being pushed out to 2027, the Kokako Street Hall continues to take up the slack and needs upgrades to deliver well, such as an adequate kitchen for users, reglazing of broken windows and hygienic toilet facilities. (1)

TCB supports our Youth Council, welcoming attendance at our meetings and looking to stimulate governance-curiosity and skills in our Youth.

**Environment** -The TCB supports the diversion of 1,200 tonnes of waste away from landfill and more sustainable waste management. More efficiency vs expansion is desirable.

**Land use** -The successful ‘plan stop’ exemption from Government is a positive that allows for progress of urban growth. Taihape would like to see more housing for businesses looking to expand that are held back by insufficient accommodation. (2)

**Water use** - Taihape wastewater network improvements for efficiency are important to the town. The TCB are keen to support the communications around how households, who are directly affected, are enabled to address remediation on private property. That the new and separate charges for water from Central Districts Water are broken down and communicated with communities as soon as possible. (3)

The TCB supports the new WDW CCO water entity “Central Districts Water”. However, with water Boards and governance moving further away from local delivery, we expect Boards, such as TCB, to be enabled to provide that much needed link to communities and lived experience. (6)

**Roading** -Thanks must go to Downers NZ for the delivery of service that has seen local improvements already. The maintenance of the Gentle Annie Road has high importance for Taihape with many of our youth travelling away to schools, stock movements, fuel and everyday goods taking this route. TCB thanks RDC for the installation of the Flagtraks that will add to travelers’ and local experience of our town and activities.

**Business** -BA5 events are welcome and well attended in Taihape. The new maps and revitalization plans are important to enable our towns to be positive in harder times.

**Grants** -Funding for our events, creative endeavours and vital communications, such as ‘Talk up Taihape’, are essential tools of encouragement. Taihape has no periodical, is limited by isolation and has a wide demographic within a smaller population. We need all the support we can get to connect and boost our people. Re-gifting this small percentage of rates is important. (4)

**Libraries** -Taihape Library is an everyday tiny jewel poked into Taihape’s current RDC office. It particularly shone when the Valentines weekend weather event took out our power, cellphone connections and closed our roads. Thank you to all Customer Experience staff and supporters!

**Parks** -Memorial Park (the Park) has been rated only second in the North Island for Equestrian events. The consistently great condition of the grounds for sporting events is also of great importance: thanks to RDC Parks and Reserves Team for your expertise and hard work in maintaining this facility.

TCB supports the Community/Council collaborative projects that matter so much to Taihape; The Hautapu River Parks Project that is delivering an outstanding natural asset so

close to our CBD and SH1, creating a recreational destination and opportunity for fun, cultural heritage and learning; The Taihape Grandstand Restoration project that will see our Heritage listed and much loved home of Rugby, that they call their “Marae”, Memorial Park sport and Taihape Area School outdoor sporting gallery, future proofed and fulfilling its purpose on the Park.

And the Taihape Playground Group’s proposed new facility that perfectly aligns with RDC’s Parks, Open Spaces, and Sporting Facilities Strategy. To further this project, in step with the Grandstand project, the TCB request that there is RDC budget put against the need for replacement toilets for the Playground and general public that are situated within the Grandstand footprint to allow for the entire RDC allocated green space to be used for the new proposed playground equipment. (5)

**Civil Defense (CD)** - CD responsiveness has been a focus for the District, and now with the recent Valentines Weekend weather event reminding us of our shortfalls. TCB requests that RDC support a stronger Taihape response plan, addressing such things as storage for the CD Trailer to be located in Taihape for such events. (7)

If we could give one piece of advice to RDC, as it finalizes the 2026/27 Annual Plan, it would be for greater use of Community Boards to reach local voice and further Council understanding. Communication is the key that unlocks good governance. We have the key. (6)

## IT'S EASY TO MAKE A SUBMISSION

Anyone can make a submission on this consultation document by filling out the form online at: [www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco)

Submission forms are available from:

- **Marlon Head Office**
- **Marlon Community Hub**
- **Te Matapihi - Bulls Community Hub**
- **Taihape Community Hub**

**Freepost to:** Rangitikei District Council - 172050  
Private Bag 1102, Marlon, 4741

**Email:** [submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz)

Use this QR code to make a submission online, just open your camera and hold it over the QR code, a link will pop up, click on it and it will take you to our online form.



FOLD HERE

## NEED MORE INFORMATION?

To find more information on any part of this process, or this document, you can

- Visit our website [www.rangitikei.govt.nz](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz)
- Contact our Council staff by calling **0800 422 522**
- Email us at [info@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:info@rangitikei.govt.nz)
- Attend one of our community engagements



## KÖRERO MAI

We need to receive your feedback by 5pm on Friday, 17 April 2026



FOLD HERE / TAPE AT TOP

Rangitikei District Council  
Annual Plan & Co  
Att: Strategy Manager  
Private Bag 1102  
Marlon 4741



## SUBMISSION FORM

### KÖRERO MAI

We need to receive your feedback by 5pm on Friday, 17 April 2026



Have your say on 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei?'

**Kei whea rā te Māhere ā-tau i tēnei wā? Me hoki whakamuri, kia anga whakamua. Tēnā, tukuna mai tō kōrero.**

Submissions close at 5pm Friday 17 April 2026.

## IT'S EASY TO MAKE A SUBMISSION

Anyone can make a submission on this consultation document by filling out the form online at [www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco) or by completing this submission form.

Submission forms can be delivered to:

- **Marlon Head Office**  
46 High Street, Marlon, 4710
- **Marlon Community Hub**  
31 High Street, Marlon, 4710
- **Bulls Community Hub**  
Te Matapihi, 4 Criterion Street, Bulls, 4818
- **Taihape Community Hub**  
102 Hautapu Street (SH1), Taihape, 4720

**Mailed freepost to:**

Rangitikei District Council - 172050  
Private Bag 1102, Marlon, 4741

**Emailed to:**

[submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz)

## YOUR DETAILS

Name/Ingoa: Daniel Duxfield

Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?  Yes  No  
*(If yes, this confirms you have the authority to submit on the organisation's behalf)*

Organisation/ Tōpūtanga (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Address/Kāinga noho \_\_\_\_\_

Email/ Īmēra: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone/Waea: \_\_\_\_\_

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings tentatively scheduled for 6 May 2026. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

**How did you hear about this consultation?**

- Newspaper  Website  Facebook  Other  
 Mail  Meeting  Poster/Flyer

### Please note:

Submissions for Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei? are public information and your name, organisation and submission will be made available to the public as part of deliberations. Your contact details will remain private.

Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei?' process and will be held by Rangitikei District Council at 46 High St, Marlon 4710. You may access the information and request its correction, if required.



### ANNUAL PLAN 2026/27

Read more on page 8 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

The proposed average rates increase for 2026/27 is 6.4%.

Which statement best reflects your view?

- Acceptable to maintain essential services
- Too high, even if it means delaying projects or reducing services
- Too low if it risks higher costs later
- Unsure / need more information

Why did you choose this option?

Council should be making cuts to spending, including layoffs, delays to community projects to get spending under control.

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

Encourage people and businesses to move to the region to increase the rate payer base.

Decisions need to be made faster, delays cost money. The bureaucracy needs to have a "can-do" attitude. Not hide behind policy & process.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

Read more on page 18 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you? (Select up to two)

- Keeping strong local decision-making
- Lower long-term costs
- Better quality infrastructure and services
- Faster decision-making
- Greater resilience in emergencies

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

- Town/community (Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)
- The wider district (Decisions are made by people representing the whole Rangitikei District, covering several towns and communities)
- The wider region (Decisions are made by people representing the whole Horizons region)

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Stop being so risk-averse.

The "back office" needs to be customer focused not job preservation focused.

### & CO

### REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY

Read more on page 19 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Council is proposing changes to how some services are funded (rates vs fees vs targeted rates).

Which principle matters most to you?

- People who benefit most should pay more
- Costs should be shared broadly to keep services affordable
- Keeping rates predictable year to year

Why/why not?

People who live rurally - outside of town - should not be paying for in-town services like sewage and water.

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

- Yes
- No
- Partially

### & CO

### SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES

Read more on page 20 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Council charges fees where services are used by individuals or an identifiable group rather than the wider community.

Which statement best reflects your view?

- Fees should generally recover the full cost of providing a service where the service is used by an individual or identifiable group
- Fees should be subsidised to keep them affordable.
- Depends on the service

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Please explain. Building consent fees need to be removed.

### & CO

### RATES REMISSION POLICY

Read more on page 20 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

- Yes
- No
- Partially

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

**KŌRERO MAI**

We need to receive your  
feedback by 5pm on  
Friday, 17 April 2026

**SUBMISSION FORM**

Have your say on 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei?'

Kei whea rā te Māhere ā-tau i tēnei wā? Me hoki whakamuri,  
kia anga whakamua. Tēnā, tukuna mai tō kōrero.

Submissions close at 5pm Friday 17 April 2026.

**IT'S EASY TO MAKE A SUBMISSION**

Anyone can make a submission on this consultation document by filling out the form online at [www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco) or by completing this submission form.

Submission forms can be delivered to:

- **Marton Head Office**  
46 High Street, Marton, 4710
- **Marton Community Hub**  
31 High Street, Marton, 4710
- **Bulls Community Hub**  
Te Matapihi, 4 Criterion Street, Bulls, 4818
- **Taihape Community Hub**  
102 Hautapu Street (SH1), Taihape, 4720

**Mailed freepost to:**

Rangitikei District Council - 172050  
Private Bag 1102, Marton, 4741

**Emailed to:**

[submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz)

**YOUR DETAILS**

Name/Ingoa: Ian Rae

Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?  Yes  No  
(If yes, this confirms you have the authority to submit on the organisation's behalf)

Organisation/ Tōpūtanga (if applicable): Taihape Community Development Trust

Address/Kāinga noho: \_\_\_\_\_

Email/ Īmēra: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone/Waea: \_\_\_\_\_

- Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings tentatively scheduled for 6 May 2026. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

**Please note:**

Submissions for Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei? are public information and your name, organisation and submission will be made available to the public as part of deliberations. Your contact details will remain private.

Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei?' process and will be held by Rangitikei District Council at 46 High St, Marton 4710. You may access the information and request its correction, if required.

**How did you hear about this consultation?**

- Newspaper  Website  Facebook  Other  
 Mail  Meeting  Poster/Flyer \_\_\_\_\_

**Submission, for 2026 – 2027 Annual Plan****TAIHAPE HOUSING SUPPORT**

We request that Rangitikei District Council, ensure that staff support housing in Taihape, in line with the first priority stated in Council's 2024 Spatial Plan, and the previous three annual plans.

Currently, the township is in decline, and while there are number issues affecting the town, the main cause of its demise, is lack of housing.

This lack of housing is impeding business and natural growth.

Council's 2024 Spatial plan specifically indicated that Taihape needed another 200 houses by 2050, or seven houses per year going forward. But despite housing being further prioritised in earlier Long-Term Plans, housing in Taihape is not being supported, by council, hence the stated priority is not being achieved.

**KÖRERO MAI**

We need to receive your  
feedback by 5pm on  
Friday, 17 April 2026

**SUBMISSION FORM**

Have your say on 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei?'

Kei whea rā te Māhere ā-tau i tēnei wā? Me hoki whakamuri,  
kia anga whakamua. Tēnā, tukuna mai tō kōrero.

Submissions close at 5pm Friday 17 April 2026.

**IT'S EASY TO MAKE A SUBMISSION**

Anyone can make a submission on this consultation document by filling out the form online at [www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco) or by completing this submission form.

Submission forms can be delivered to:

- **Marton Head Office**  
46 High Street, Marton, 4710
- **Marton Community Hub**  
31 High Street, Marton, 4710
- **Bulls Community Hub**  
Te Matapihi, 4 Criterion Street, Bulls, 4818
- **Taihape Community Hub**  
102 Hautapu Street (SH1), Taihape, 4720

**Mailed freepost to:**

Rangitikei District Council - 172050  
Private Bag 1102, Marton, 4741

**Emailed to:**

[submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz)

**YOUR DETAILS**

Name/Ingoa: Ian Rae

Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?  Yes  No  
(If yes, this confirms you have the authority to submit on the organisation's behalf)

Organisation/ Tōpūtanga (if applicable): Taihape Development Trust

Address/Kāinga noho: \_\_\_\_\_

Email/ Īmēra: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone/Waea: \_\_\_\_\_

- Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings tentatively scheduled for 6 May 2026. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

**Please note:**

Submissions for Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei? are public information and your name, organisation and submission will be made available to the public as part of deliberations. Your contact details will remain private.

Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitikei?' process and will be held by Rangitikei District Council at 46 High St, Marton 4710. You may access the information and request its correction, if required.

**How did you hear about this consultation?**

- Newspaper  Website  Facebook  Other  
 Mail  Meeting  Poster/Flyer Councillor.

Submission, for 202~~6~~<sup>6</sup> – 2027 Annual Plan

### TAIHAPE WEST SLIP ZONE

We request that Rangitikei District Council budget up to \$250,000 to engage Consulting Engineers to design a suitable drainage system to mitigate the likelihood of major slipping of the “Taihape West Slip”, and to assign a member of staff, to co-ordinate all communications in respect of the Slip Zone.

This slip zone runs approximately 750 metres west of Taihape Hospital Grounds and extends from Kiwi Road, southwards, to the Otaihape Stream, and is reported to affect some 206 properties.

The slip was first identified in 1971, with the first failure occurring in 2004, with the collapse of Otaihape Valley Road.

Test bores and monitoring were duly set up, by the then Taihape Borough Council, soon after, but discontinued by this Council some 2 – 3 years ago.

In 2016, a report was subsequently prepared by Geotechnical Engineers, Tonkin & Taylor Ltd and presented to Council and to EQC (now the Natural Hazards Commission), resulting in defined risk zones.

That report detailed the technical aspects of the slip and recommended that monitoring of test bores be resumed, **and that a suitable drainage system be designed to stabilize the area.**

However, after nearly 10 years, Council have not actioned either recommendation, and aside from the obvious risk, is now impacting insurance of properties within the zones.

Consequently, there was a public meeting in August last year, arranged by Councillor Wong, after which I wrote to the CEO, on behalf of the affected property owners. This resulted in my meeting with the mayor, earlier this year on the 15<sup>th</sup> January, however nothing was achieved

It is noted that the Geotechnical report advised that further movement could be triggered by prolonged rainfall events, or an earthquake, unless recommended actions are taken.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 5 April 2026 6:47 PM

Creation Time: April 7, 2026 1:41 PM

---

**Ingoa/Name:**

Helen Koster

**Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?**

No

**Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):**

**Kāinga noho/Address:**

**Īmēra/Email:**

**Waea/Phone:**

**Would you like to speak to your submission:**

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN RANGITIKEI?

## How did you hear about this consultation?

Website

## Which statement best reflects your view?

Too high, even if it means delaying projects or reducing services

## Why did you choose this option?

Water is an essential service. It is essential for life. Since the first time I purchased property in Marton (2022 at 7 Terrace Street, Marton) until now I can say that the water is not drinkable or even acceptable to bath in. Irrespective of whether or not the water passes safety tests, I don't believe it is water that you put in the centre of the table at council meetings. I personally believe that council is in breach of its duty to provide drinkable water, irrespective of tests that show it is safe. For this reason I do not believe that council has any right to increase rates until such time that the water issue is resolved. To be honest, I believe that people have the right to refuse to pay their rates until such time that the issues is suitable resolved. I don't believe that council is meeting its legislative requirement.

## If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

WRT water, focus on key infrastructure that delivers results in the upcoming financial year.

## Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

Yes

## What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

The wider district (Decisions are made by people representing the whole Rangitikei District, covering several towns and communities)

## When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Keeping strong local decision-making, Better quality infrastructure and services

## Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

There should be a ban on private/public partnerships within Councils around the country (currently happening in the Waikato region). I believe that Council should remain a public service with full transparency to its rate payers. In Albany, Ohio a private/public partnership has seen public money used for private entities and absent of disclosure to its rate payers. I would not approve of that in New Zealand.

## Which principle matters most to you?

Costs should be shared broadly to keep services affordable

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Why/why not?

Which statement best reflects your view?

Fees should be subsidised to keep them affordable.

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Services should be subsidised. In the building industry, this helps with presenting advantage/desire to undertake work in the region. Rangitikei needs to attract more people. The advantage would be collection of more rates once building works is complete. I am sure there are many other good examples.

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

\*Please include more pages if required:

Anything else?

# SUBMISSION FORM

## KŌRERO MAI

We need to receive your feedback by 5pm on Friday, 17 April 2026

Have your say on 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitīkei?'

**Kei whea rā te Māhere ā-tau i tēnei wā? Me hoki whakamuri, kia anga whakamua. Tēnā, tukuna mai tō kōrero.**

Submissions close at 5pm Friday 17 April 2026.



## IT'S EASY TO MAKE A SUBMISSION

Anyone can make a submission on this consultation document by filling out the form online at [www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/wheres-annualplan-andco) or by completing this submission form.

Submission forms can be delivered to:

- **Marton Head Office**  
46 High Street, Marton, 4710
- **Marton Community Hub**  
31 High Street, Marton, 4710
- **Bulls Community Hub**  
Te Matapihi, 4 Criterion Street, Bulls, 4818
- **Taihape Community Hub**  
102 Hautapu Street (SH1), Taihape, 4720

Mailed freepost to:

Rangitīkei District Council - 172050  
Private Bag 1102, Marton, 4741

Emailed to:

[submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz)

RECEIVED

16 APR 2026

To: *[Signature]*  
File: .....  
Doc: .....

## YOUR DETAILS

Name/Ingoa: To Rangooni

Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?  Yes  No  
(If yes, this confirms you have the authority to submit on the organisation's behalf)

Organisation/ Tōpūtanga (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Address/Kāinga noho

Email/ Īmēra:

Phone/Waea:

- Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings tentatively scheduled for 6 May 2026. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

### Please note:

Submissions for Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitīkei? are public information and your name, organisation and submission will be made available to the public as part of deliberations. Your contact details will remain private.

Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the 'Where's Annual Plan & Co @ Rangitīkei?' 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.

### How did you hear about this consultation?

- Newspaper  Website  Facebook  
 Mail  Meeting  Poster/Flyer

Other

*picked up at  
Te Matapihi*

# ANNUAL PLAN 2026/27

Read more on page 8 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation. document

The proposed average rates increase for 2026/27 is 6.4%.

Which statement best reflects your view?

- Acceptable to maintain essential services
- Too high, even if it means delaying projects or reducing services
- Too low if it risks higher costs later
- Unsure / need more information

Why did you choose this option?

Important

but with people unemployed/not fed difficult?

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

You need to balance needs of 'your' community against the needs of the whole community plus demands from central Govt. Effective succession plans for younger councillors.

## & CO

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

Read more on page 18 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you? (Select up to two)

- Keeping strong local decision-making
- Lower long-term costs
- Better quality infrastructure and services
- Faster decision-making
- Greater resilience in emergencies

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

- Town/community  
*(Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)*
- The wider district  
*(Decisions are made by people representing the whole Rangitikei District, covering several towns and communities)*
- The wider region  
*(Decisions are made by people representing the whole Horizons region)*

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Govt making demands without consultation - maybe demand from lobbyists.



## REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY

Read more on page 19 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Council is proposing changes to how some services are funded (rates vs fees vs targeted rates).

### Which principle matters most to you?

- People who benefit most should pay more
- Costs should be shared broadly to keep services affordable
- Keeping rates predictable year to year

### Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

- Yes
- No
- Partially

### Why/why not?

*It helps to think of whole community rural / town rich / poor healthy / unhealthy old / young*



## SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES

Read more on page 20 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

Council charges fees where services are used by individuals or an identifiable group rather than the wider community.

### Which statement best reflects your view?

- Fees should generally recover the full cost of providing a service where the service is used by an individual or identifiable group
- Fees should be subsidised to keep them affordable.
- Depends on the service

### Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Please explain.

*Proposed changes appear reasonable*



## RATES REMISSION POLICY

Read more on page 20 of 'Where's Annual Plan and Co @ Rangitikei' consultation document.

### Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

- Yes
- No
- Partially

### Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

*proposed changes look reasonable*

### Why/why not?

# SUBMISSION



TELEPHONE

| WEBSITE [WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ](http://WWW.FEDFARM.ORG.NZ)

---

To: Rangitikei District Council

Submission on: Draft Annual Plan 2026-27

Date: 17 April 2026

From: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

**Ian Strahan**  
**PROVINCIAL PRESIDENT**  
Manawatu -Rangitikei Federated Farmers

**Laura Morrison**  
**ACTING PROVINCIAL PRESIDENT**  
Whanganui Federated Farmers

Address for Service: **Peter Matich**  
**REGIONAL POLICY TEAM**  
Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
**P**  
**E**

## SUBMISSION ON RANGITIKEI DISTRICT COUNCIL DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2026-27

### 1. Introduction

1.1 Federated Farmers welcome the opportunity to submit on the Rangitikei District Council's Draft Annual Plan 2026-27. Rates and other local government fees and costs make up a significant portion of farm business expenses. As a result, Federated Farmers are very concerned with the transparency of rate setting and the overall cost of local government to agriculture.

1.2 Our submission covers the following points:

- Rate increases for farms
- Revenue and Financing Policy
- Roothing
- Funding for *Community Leadership* activities
- Fees and charges for working dogs

### 2. Key submission requests

- The Council should reduce expenditure to avoid the need for rates increases above the national rate of inflation. (3.1% in December 2025, projected to rise to 4.1% by July 2026). Rapid increases in the price of crude oil globally since the start of March 2026 are now expected to increase inflation rapidly. This will impact on the Council previous budget assumptions, and it is vitally important for the Council to reduce any unnecessary expenditure moving forward.
- The Council should adopt the maximum amount of 30% of total rate revenue allowed to be allocated to the UAGC under section 21 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, where rateable properties get an equal benefit from Council services. This includes community leadership activities and the district's road network.
- The Council should make use of differentials less than 1.0 for rural farm properties to more equitably collect rates from high value rural properties which do not receive a proportionately higher rate of service from the general rates collected.
- The Council should clearly identify funding sources for rural road maintenance in the Annual Plan and Revenue and Financing Policy. More transparency is required to show the road funding split where NZTA's Funding Assistance Rate and cash reserves will be applied alongside targeted rates and general rates. Farmers are seeing a higher rate increase than many other ratepayers, and it is not clear how this money is being spent.
- The Council should fund *community leadership* activities related to Urban growth (Plan Change 3), and implementation of actions from the *Climate Change Strategy* and from *Rangitikei Tomorrow – Economic Strategy and Action Plan*, including *community leadership* costs for economic, social and cultural wellbeing associated with these activities - from a targeted rate on urban and 'future urban' properties that receive benefits from those services, and not from any general rate.
- The Council should set a discounted dog registration fee somewhere between \$35 to \$45 per working dog. This should be discounted to a flat fee for 5 or more working dogs, because farmers do not get a rising benefit if they pay for each subsequent dog.

### 3. INAPPROPRIATE RATES INCREASES

- 3.1 Federated Farmers understand the Council is endeavouring to reduce rate increases. Nevertheless, whilst the proposed average rates increase of 6.4%<sup>1</sup> for 2026/27 is lower than the 10.75% increase set out in the Council's 2024-34 Long Term Plan, significant economic headwinds are developing this year, including rapid increases in the price of crude oil globally since the start of March 2026. This means the Council need to eliminate expense and only do the bare minimum.
- 3.2 It is disconcerting that the Council's proposed rate increases for farm properties are higher than the 6.4% district-wide average. Many farms are in the 7-8% bracket. One of our members who runs a 493ha sheep and beef farm located within half an hour from Marton can expect a rates increase of 11.36%. Bigger hill country sheep and beef farms would see in the order of a staggering \$11,277 higher than last year's rates for large farms<sup>2</sup>. This is blatantly unfair. In dollar terms, farmer's rates increases are a lot more than urban rates increases, even though for many Council services, the benefits that farmers get are less than the benefits urban ratepayers get.
- 3.3 As recently as March 2026, BLNZ's economic service has reported "a high degree of uncertainty with geopolitical risks on many farmers' minds, including the US tariffs situation and the ongoing conflict in the Middle East"<sup>3</sup>. This is significant here because sheep and beef farms make up 77% of farms in Rangitikei District.
- 3.4 Against this backdrop, the Council's proposed rate increases for farms look more like one step forward and two steps backwards. Rating increases eat into farm earnings. Farmers cannot simply raise taxes to solve inflationary woes. Instead, farmers must make sacrifices, cut expenses and find innovative solutions to survive. The Council should do likewise instead of resorting to rates increases.
- 3.5 We accept that monetary inflation may mean the Council has to increase rates somewhat to cover existing debt servicing and essential operating costs. Our expectation is that this would be indexed to NZ's forecast CPI inflation rate (3.1% in December 2025<sup>4</sup> and predicted to rise to 4.1% by July 2026) and certainly be no higher than this, and lower if possible.
- 3.6 This may involve postponing or abandoning expenditure on nice-to-have projects or activities", such as upgrades or new facilities for public transport infrastructure, libraries, swimming pools, public urban development, arenas, reserves and community centres. In these economically challenging times, we prefer that the Council focus only on core services, sharpen its pencils and reduce expenditure, rather than choosing to increase rates.

#### Recommendation

- **That the Council reduce expenditure to avoid the need for rates increases above the rate of inflation.**

<sup>1</sup> P8 Rangitikei District Council Draft Annual Plan 2026-27 consultation document

<sup>2</sup> P65 [Rangitikei District Council Draft Annual Plan 2026-27](#)

<sup>3</sup> <https://beeflambnz.com/news/farm-profitability-continues-rebound-uncertainty-horizon>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/consumers-price-index-december-2025-quarter/> accessed 17 March 2026

## 4. REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY

### Uniform Annual General Charge ('UAGC')

- 4.1 Federated Farmers strongly supports councils that make full use of the 30% UAGC allowable under section 21 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 where rateable properties get an equal benefit from Council services. A uniform per-property charge ensures that all property owners make a reasonable contribution toward the cost of these services.
- 4.2 Where a Council is aware that they have not reached their maximum 30% UAGC allowance and choose not to rectify the situation then they are actively choosing to disadvantage groups such as the farming community.

### Targeted Rates

- 4.3 Where rates cannot be apportioned to a UAGC, or where services are only supplied to particular properties (for example: connections to sewerage disposal or public water supply) Federated Farmers supports targeted rates.
- 4.4 The cost of particular services can be targeted to those that benefit – for example hospitality businesses can pay a targeted rate for tourism promotion, or a farmer can pay a targeted rate for pest management in rural areas. Rates collected on a targeted rate should be used for that particular purpose.
- 4.5 The Council's Revenue and Financing Policy<sup>5</sup> describes Urban water and Wastewater as having a *General* distribution of benefit. This is incorrect. The distribution of benefit for these services is specific to those properties which receive connections to urban water supply and wastewater disposal. The rates for these services should be targeted rates on those properties. Rural properties with no connection to these services receive no benefit from them and should not be contributing to the funding for these services. In fact, many farmers pay for their own wastewater disposal and water supply, with no subsidy from the Council.

### Need to establish rural rate differential less than 1.0

- 4.6 Federated Farmers has previously expressed concern that there are no rural rate differentials being applied within Rangitikei District. A change to the Council's Revenue and Financing Policy is required to achieve this. The Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 allows modifications to property value through use of differentials.
- 4.7 A differential is a ratio that adjusts the rateable value of property and can be used to balance the relative contributions of urban and rural properties, or to increase the contribution from the commercial and industrial sector.
- 4.8 Differentials can be read as a percentage applied to the general rate, or targeted rates, within a rating system. For example, a 0.7 (70%) differential on rural land would mean a \$5m (CV) farm would only pay on \$3.5m of the property value, a differential of 1.0 (100%) for urban properties means a \$750,000 section would pay on the full \$750,000, and a 1.2 (120%) differential for commercial properties would see that a \$5m supermarket would pay on \$6m.

---

<sup>5</sup> P9 [Rangitikei District Council Revenue and Financing Policy 2026/27 Annual Plan](#)

- 4.9 Relying more on the General Rate can exacerbate affordability concerns, because this rating tool is vulnerable to fluctuations in property value. This could leave all ratepayers with higher bills when their property value increases. This increased property value is unrealised unless the owner sells, meaning that ratepayers are not seeing the extra value in their bank accounts, but only on paper.
- 4.10 The Council has focused on rates affordability for residential and small commercial ratepayers, but their solution is shifting more costs onto rural ratepayers instead. This means that farms with high capital value will pay more towards activities like libraries, the community centre and visitor information, even though these are equal benefit for all ratepayers.
- 4.11 Farming requires extensive landholdings but farmer ability to pay rates is based on income from farm produce (and not property value). A farm owner should not be forced to sell off their farmland to pay rates that are higher than they can afford from farmer income – that would defeat the aim of setting a sustainable rate.
- 4.12 Furthermore, rural land that is *highly productive* cannot be subdivided under the *National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land* (unless the Council identifies it as necessary for urban development under the *National Policy Statement for Urban Development*<sup>6</sup>). As such, most farmland in New Zealand cannot be used for anything else but farming.
- 4.13 We note that the Council has a rates remission policy for considering instances of Financial Hardship. We think that setting a differential for rural properties will be far more efficient than having to consider endless applications for rates remissions arising from financial hardship. We strongly implore Rangitikei District Council to make use of differentials to more equitably levy rates from rural properties.

#### **Recommendations:**

- **That the Council adopt the maximum amount of 30% of total rate revenue allowed to be allocated to the UAGC under section 21 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 where rateable properties get an equal benefit from Council services.**
- **That the Council make use of differentials less than 1.0 for rural farm properties to more equitably collect rates from high value rural properties which do not receive a higher rate of service from the general rates collected.**

## **5 Funding of rural roads**

- 5.1 Of all the Council's services and activities, maintenance and improvement of the rural road network is the most important activity for farmers and is virtually the only Council activity that farmers get a direct benefit from. The economic significance of farming in Rangitikei District makes road maintenance vitally important. Federated Farmers are concerned about the proportion of rates farmers are being asked to pay for roading compared to the general rate. Our membership has confirmed that their burden for general rates is almost equal to the burden for roading, yet farmers only derive benefit from the roading component.

---

<sup>6</sup> See clauses 3.4, 3.7 and 3.8 of the [National Policy Statement for High Productive Land 2022](#).

- 5.2 Further, Federated Farmers note that 'roading and footpaths' are expected to make up 38.56% of the Council's operating expenditure in 2026/27 yet account for only 24.1% of the Council's rates.<sup>7</sup> The Council's draft annual plan supporting documentation is somewhat unclear on Council rate funding sources for roading, although it mentions a combination of a roading reserve budget and 'existing cash reserves'. The 'greater-than/less-than percentages in the funding split guidelines for roading in the Council's Revenue and Financing Policy seem to us to be indicative of a 'slush fund' approach to managing roading revenue and expenditure. This probably is not the most appropriate way of managing what is a significant cost activity.
- 5.3 Federated Farmers further note that the Council's road maintenance and upgrading targets for the previous year have not been met, with only 4% of sealed road network resealed in 25/26 (compared to a target of 6%) and only 9,113 cubic metres re-metalling of unsealed roads achieved in 25/26 (against a target of 12,000 cubic metres). And that was on the back of a previous rates increase in the 2025/26 Annual Plan of 7.9%.
- 5.4 While Federated Farmers applaud the Council reducing rates increases in the coming year (compared to what was initially planned for the same period in the 2024-34 Long Term Plan), we are aware that most farmers will see higher rates increases than 6.4%. We are reluctant to endorse proposed rates increases for farmers when road maintenance and upgrading targets have not been met for the last lot of rates raises farmers had.

**Recommendation:**

- **The Council should clearly identify funding sources for rural road maintenance in the Annual Plan and Revenue and Financing Policy. More transparency is required to clearly show the road funding split where NZTA's Funding Assistance Rate and cash reserves will be applied alongside targeted rates and general rates, with the maximum of 30% allocable to a UACG under section 21 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 where all ratepayers get an equal benefit from roading.**

**6. Funding for Community Leadership Activities**

- 6.1 The Council's Funding Impact Statement in the Draft Annual Plan for this activity shows both an absolute increase in, and an increasing reliance on, the general rate for funding this activity.<sup>8</sup>
- 6.2 Federated Farmers understand this increase in funding is intended to improve Council performance in several aspects related to community leadership, including improving customer satisfaction ratings, implementing actions from the Council's Climate Change Strategy, and implementing the Economic Strategy and Action Plan.
- 6.3 There is no indication of the split between these funding sources for this activity, yet there is an apparent decrease in sourcing this activity from targeted rates.
- 6.4 Federated Farmers encourages the Council to use a UAGC to the maximum allowable 30% for funding community leadership activities, with the balance of funding sources being a combination of targeted rates and the general rate. This is because community

<sup>7</sup> Page 9 [Draft Annual Plan 2026-27 Supporting Information](#)

<sup>8</sup> Page 12 [Draft Annual Plan 2026-27 Supporting Information](#)

leadership benefits everyone equally, and therefore the fairest way of allocating the cost of this is if every property owner pays the maximum allowable UAGC.

- 6.5 As to the funding split between targeted rates and general rates, where there is a specific benefit, such as 'economic development', this aspect of community leadership should be funded by those property owners who derive a benefit from such activity, such as commercial property owners and visitor accommodation operators. Farmers get no benefit from the likes of visitor information centres and studies of vacant commercial and office space land, nor from the Council studying climate change implications for urban growth planning in urban areas. Therefore, farmers should not have to pay for these services through the general rate. Rather, such activities should be funded from a targeted rate on commercial and tourist oriented businesses and affected urban property owners.
- 6.6 Where farmers need to study the economic development implications or climate change implications for agriculture, farmers pay separately for research services related to this through Government mandated farming industry levies (the likes of Beef & Lamb NZ and Dairy NZ). Funding of these activities is not a burden on the ratepayer at all. This is fair and just because ratepayers who are not farmers derive no benefit from these activities.
- 6.7 In a similar vein, we would expect any ratepayers (including farmers) not to be burdened with Council's service costs where ratepayers derive no benefit. Farmers certainly derive no benefit from commercial or office building refurbishment in urban areas nor from tourism nor figuring out the climate change implications of urban growth planning.
- 6.8 Moreover, if the various community groups that the Council deals with are not satisfied with the Council's customer services, then those services need to continually strive lift their game and improve their customer interaction. Federated Farmers does not support simply throwing more money at community leadership in an attempt to solve these problems. In fact, increasing rates to try and solve this may be tantamount to throwing good money after bad, which we suggest would have the opposite effect on the Council's customer satisfaction ratings.

#### **Recommendations:**

- **That the Council adopt the maximum amount of 30% of total rate revenue allowed to be allocated to the UAGC under section 21 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to fund Community Leadership Activities with the balance of funding sources being a combination of targeted rates and the general rate.**
- **That the Council use a targeted rate to fund community leadership activities related to Urban growth (Plan Change 3), and implementation of actions from the Climate change Strategy and from Rangitikei tomorrow – Economic Strategy and Action Plan, including community leadership costs for economic, social and cultural wellbeing associated with these activities.**

## 7. Proposed Changes to Fees and Charges for working dogs

- 7.1 Federated Farmers note the Council's intention to increase registration fees for working dogs. We support user pays and we support having a lower fees schedule for working dogs (compared to pet dogs). Farm working dogs are highly trained, obedient and always well-cared for and well-supervised. As such, farm dogs generally do not present any sort on 'animal control' problem for councils that require impoundment.
- 7.2 Nevertheless, we say that dog registration fees in Rangitikei District should be comparable with registration fees for working dogs in nearby districts to be considered fair and reasonable. In this regard, registration fees for working dogs in nearby districts are set out in the table below:

District	Fee per working dog	Late payment	Team of 5 (early payment)
Manawatu	\$45	\$61	\$225
Ruapehu	\$35	\$52.50	\$175
Taupo	\$42		\$210
Rangitikei	\$55	\$80	\$275

- 7.3 Based on the above, we cannot see how the Council can justify \$55 per dog and recommend reducing working dog registration fees somewhat so that Rangitikei farmers are not at a disadvantage compared to farmers in nearby districts.

### Recommendations:

- **That the Council set a dog registration fee somewhere between \$35 to \$45 per working dog, with a flat fee for a team of 5 or more working dogs, (because farmers do not get a rising benefit if they pay for each subsequent dog).**

## 8. FEDERATED FARMERS OF NEW ZEALAND

- 8.1 Federated Farmers of New Zealand is a primary sector membership organisation representing farming families and rural businesses throughout New Zealand. The economic importance of the agricultural sector to New Zealand's economy is well recognised. Its direct and indirect contribution to New Zealand's economy is about 15% and land-based primary sector exports comprise about 70% of New Zealand's total exports. Any regulation or additional cost which affects farm businesses also has the potential to impact on the New Zealand economy.

**Submission Ends**

**Federated Farmers wishes to be heard in support of this submission**

**Thank you**



**Submission on  
Rangitīkei District Council  
Draft Fees and Charges 2026-2027  
Alcohol Licensing Fees  
17 April 2026**

Tēnā koutou

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed fees and charges for 2026-2027. We are submitting specifically on alcohol licensing fees.

We would like the opportunity to speak to our submission.

If you have any questions on the comments we have included in our submission, please contact:

Jennifer Lamm  
Policy Advisor  
Alcohol Healthwatch

### **About Alcohol Healthwatch**

Alcohol Healthwatch is an independent national charity working to reduce alcohol-related harm and inequities. We provide a range of regional and national health promotion services such as providing evidence-based information and advice on policy and planning matters, supporting community action projects and coordinating networks to address alcohol-related harm such as the Cross-council Local Alcohol Policy Network.

### **Specific Comments**

1. The alcohol licensing fees listed on the Council's website<sup>1</sup> are those set by the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 2013<sup>2</sup>. However, while full cost recovery was envisaged by the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012<sup>3</sup>, the nationally fixed fees set under the 2013 Regulations have not kept pace with the costs incurred by councils, and it is anticipated that these fees will not adequately reflect costs till at least 2027.<sup>4</sup>
2. We are aware that the inadequacy of current fees in the 2013 Regulations was raised at the 2025 Local Government New Zealand Annual General Meeting,<sup>5</sup> and we are also

aware that the overall shortfall in revenue for administering alcohol licensing will be exacerbated if the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Improving Alcohol Regulation) Amendment Bill<sup>6</sup> is passed.

3. If the Bill is enacted, it is anticipated that the existing risk-cost formulas in the 2013 Regulations would change for clubs and restaurants<sup>7</sup>, and additional administrative requirements, such as matters relating to the standing of objectors, certification requirements, and related processes, will likely increase costs for councils and place additional pressure on staff resources, particularly licensing inspectors. Further costs, as yet unknown, may also arise as the Bill has left much to future Regulations made on the recommendation of the Minister.
4. The Council's *Summary of Information for the Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2026/27* states that "fees set by legislation (for example liquor licensing fees) have not changed, unless they were changed by central government".<sup>8</sup> However, rather than adhere to the 2013 fees and subsidise the costs associated with alcohol licensing, an increasing number of councils<sup>9</sup> have instead utilised their bylaw-making powers under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fee-setting Bylaws) Order 2013.<sup>10</sup> Through this process, councils can set realistic fees (usually 100% cost recovery) as a licensing authority, and in respect of inspection and enforcement functions.
5. **We strongly encourage the Council to also make a bylaw** that reflects the costs of licensing activities and recommend that the Council consider opting for 100% cost recovery, increasing fees incrementally until the bylaw is reviewed.
6. We further recommend that the Council conduct a comprehensive review of all the costs incurred with licensing, which includes costs associated with administration, monitoring and enforcement to ensure that these are met by the sector.
7. Reviewing fees in a timely manner would, we believe, meet the policy objectives of the licensing fees regime, namely:
  - (a) To recover the total reasonable costs incurred by the Council in administering the alcohol licensing system
  - (b) To ensure that those who create the greatest need for regulatory effort bear the commensurate costs
  - (c) To allow local circumstances to be reflected in the fees paid by operators and income received by the Council
  - (d) To minimise alcohol-related harm, to the extent that this can be achieved through a cost recovery regime.<sup>11</sup>

## Summary

8. The alcohol licensing regime and fee-setting is part of a package of measures which, when used comprehensively, can create safer environments and significantly minimise rates of hazardous drinking and subsequently alcohol-related harm. This includes Alcohol Control Bylaws, Local Alcohol Policies<sup>12</sup>, and other related plans and policies.
9. An alcohol licensing bylaw that sets fees that reflects the costs incurred with alcohol licencing is not only a harm reduction strategy, but it also supports community outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Rangitīkei District Council. Schedule of Fees and Charges - Ngā Utu Kaunihera. <https://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/files/general/Fees-Charges/Schedule-of-Fees-and-Charges-2025-26-Adopted-1.pdf>.
- 2 Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 2013. <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/secondary-legislation/pco-drafted/2013/452/en/latest/#DLM5708106>.
- 3 Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012. <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2012/120/en/latest/#DLM3339333>.
- 4 Ministry of Justice. Fee system for alcohol control. <https://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/key-initiatives/key-initiatives-archive/sale-and-supply-of-alcohol/licensing/fee-system-for-alcohol/licensing/>.
- 5 Local Government New Zealand. 2025 Annual General Meeting. Remit 3: *That LGNZ advocates for the government to update the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 18 December 2013 to account for inflation and include a mechanism for automatic annual inflation adjustments.*
- 6 Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Improving Alcohol Regulation) Amendment Bill. <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/bill/government/2026/262/en/latest/>.
- 7 The Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Improving Alcohol Regulation) Amendment Bill, if passed, will enable clubs to alternatively hold an on-licence (and an off-licence if held prior to 2012, pursuant to s28(4) of the SSAA), and restaurants will be permitted to also hold an off-licence.
- 8 Rangitīkei District Council. Summary of Information for the Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2026/27. <https://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/files/meetings/council-meetings/2026-03-12/Proposed-Schedule-of-Fees-and-Charges-and-Statement-of-Proposal-under-separate-cover.pdf>.
- 9 For example:
  - Hamilton City Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2025 <https://storage.googleapis.com/hccproduction-web-assets/public/Uploads/Documents/Bylaws/Hamilton-City-Alcohol-Fees-Bylaw-2025-final.pdf>.
  - Hastings District Council Alcohol Licensing Fees Bylaw 2024 <https://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz/assets/Document-Library/Alcohol-Licensing-Fee-Bylaw/Alcohol-Licensing-Fee-Bylaw.pdf>.
  - Hutt City Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2024 [https://hccpublicdocs.azurewebsites.net/api/download/83c4c58dfb9a4cb0a0d6a833cfa250f9/\\_policies/7afd8fe8245227494d4c9fe8a961a16d2063](https://hccpublicdocs.azurewebsites.net/api/download/83c4c58dfb9a4cb0a0d6a833cfa250f9/_policies/7afd8fe8245227494d4c9fe8a961a16d2063).
  - Kapiti Coast District Council Alcohol Licensing Fees Bylaw 2024 <https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/media/amgnzzqb/alcohol-fees-licensing-bylaw-2024.pdf>
  - Matamata-Piako District Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2025 <https://mpdc.govt.nz/filelink/fileman-files/CouncilDocuments/Bylaws/Alcohol%20Licensing%20Fees%20Bylaw%202025.pdf>
  - Porirua City Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2024 [https://storage.googleapis.com/pcc-wagtail-media/documents/Alcohol\\_Fees\\_Bylaw\\_2024.pdf](https://storage.googleapis.com/pcc-wagtail-media/documents/Alcohol_Fees_Bylaw_2024.pdf)
  - Tauranga City Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw <https://www.tauranga.govt.nz/Portals/0/data/council/bylaws/files/alcohol-licensing-fees-bylaw-2025.pdf>
  - Waipā District Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2024 <https://www.waipadc.govt.nz/our-council/bylawsandpolicies/bylaws>
  - Waitomo District Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2025 <https://www.waitomo.govt.nz/media/sv2lbgmn/waitomo-district-alcohol-fees-bylaw-2025.pdf>
  - Wellington City Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2024 <https://wellington.govt.nz/-/media/your-council/plans-policies-and-bylaws/bylaws/files/alcohol-fees-bylaw-2024.pdf?la=en&hash=E740BA23791C8CA8F55A230467299BE4F33FF9C0>.
  - Whangārei District Council Alcohol Fees Bylaw 2016 <https://www.wdc.govt.nz/files/assets/public/v/4/documents/council/bylaws/alcohol-fees-bylaw.pdf>
- 10 Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fee-setting Bylaws) Order 2013. <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/secondary-legislation/pco-drafted/2013/453/en/latest/>.

- 11 Ministry of Justice. Regulatory Impact Statement for the Alcohol Licensing System. 2013, paragraph 4. <https://www.regulation.govt.nz/assets/RIS-Documents/ris-justice-frf-nov13.pdf>.
- 12 While approximately 80% of the New Zealand population is covered by a Local Alcohol Policy, Rangitikei District does not have a Local Alcohol Policy in force. See for example, [Horowhenua District Council Local Alcohol Policy](#), [Ruapehu District Council Local Alcohol Policy](#), [Stratford-New Plymouth District Councils Local Alcohol Policy](#), [Waitomo District Council Local Alcohol Policy](#), [Whanganui District Council Local Alcohol Policy](#).

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 17 April 2026 16:04

Creation Time: April 28, 2026 9:13 AM

---

**Ingoa/Name:**

Felicity Wallace

**Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?**

Yes

**Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):**

Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitīkei

**Kāinga noho/Address:**

**Īmēra/Email:**

**Waea/Phone:**

**Would you like to speak to your submission:**

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

How did you hear about this consultation?

other: from a friend

Which statement best reflects your view?

Unsure / need more information

Why did you choose this option?

refer attached submission

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

refer attached submission

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Which principle matters most to you?

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

No

Why/why not?

Refer submission

Which statement best reflects your view?

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

\*Please include more pages if required:

IRO-MAR Submission RDC AP 2026 FINAL.pdf, 0.05MB

Anything else?

**Submission on the Rangitikei District Council Annual Plan 2026-2027****Year 3 of the Long Term Plan 2024-2024**

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

**Submitter:** Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei  
c/- Felicity Wallace

**Introduction**

- 1 Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (**IRO-MAR**) 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 take part in the Annual Plan 2026/2027 process.

**General comments:**

1. IRO-MAR notes that the 2026-2027 Annual Plan Consultation Document " Where's Annual Plan & Co Rangitikei? has well designed graphics with a positive aspect; however this document is lacking in substance or any responsible information to residents and rate payers.
  - (i) The title is flippant and *where is* the Annual Plan?
  - (ii) The key consultation topics are not clearly set out in the Annual Plan: IRO-MAR responds to the following:

- i) **Proposed rates increase:** IRO-MAR is UNSURE as insufficient information is provided.
- ii) **Proposed Changes to funding: Revenue & Finance Policy**  
IRO-MAR does NOT SUPPORT the proposed changes to the Revenue & Finance Policy as the reasons for the proposed changes are not clear and transparent.
- (iii) There is no clear information in the Consultation document about how the Annual Plan is progressing items in the LTP or previous AP.
  - There are no figures for projects
  - There are no real and valued updates on projects
  - There are no Budget adjustments or debt comparisons to work programmes
  - Work programmes are not compared to the LTP, there are no milestones and no projects of significance completed.
  - There is no alignment of the forecast programmes compared to actual delivery; and hence alignment to debt forecasting.
- (iv) Last year the 2025/2026 RDC Annual Plan published the following description about what constitutes an Annual Plan, yet this is not provided:

*What is an Annual Plan?*

*The Annual Plan is Council's plan for the up-coming financial year. Council produces an Annual Plan in the years in which a Long Term Plan is not produced. The Annual Plan is prepared according to section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002. Its purpose is to:*

- *Contain the proposed annual budget and funding impact statement for the year to which the Annual plan relates; and*
  - *Identifying any variation from the financial statements and funding impact statement included in the local authority's long-term plan in respect of the year; and*
  - *Provide integrated decision making and co-ordination of the resources of the local authority;*
- and*
- *Contribute to the accountability of the local authority to the community.*

**This submission wishes to comment specifically on the following items:**

1. IRO-MAR requests clear information regarding Council's plan for the upcoming financial year, specifically:
  - (i)
 

What roading projects are forecast for the year? This is highlighted as the most costly item on Council's rates breakdown.

    - The AP suggests that 16,000 vehicles move through the district on average per day using local roads, ie at ratepayers expense. In fact State Highways take the bulk of that traffic and at no direct cost to ratepayers/RDC.
  - (ii) What Budgets have been spent & are available for the Marton to Bulls wastewater centralisation project?

- (iii) What Budgets have been spent & are available for the Marton Water Strategy project?
  - i) The Annual Report for 2023/24 states that “ Construction of the new plant will start in the new financial year” ie 2024/2025. An article in the Manawatu Standard dated 17 April 2026 now states this work will not go ahead and that Council has other options. What funds have been spent on this project that hasn't gone ahead?
- (iv) What is Council's plan for re-organisation and restructuring when Water Done Locally comes into effect?
- (v) Asset management/development should be aligned with recent Consultant prepared models: 3 Waters Strategy Growth Assessments (1-4) for each of the Rangitīkei urban centres and also the associated flood modelling scenarios prepared for Council.
- (vi) Council commissioned a comprehensive report on the Marton Swim Centre yet selected the least preferred option and ignored the report findings that capex over a number of years would be required to bring the centre up to the required standard. What progress has been made on this project?
- (vii) What is the status of the proposed Council Building modernisation project taking into account Central Government intent and directives?
- (viii) What progress has been made on the Marton Streetscape proposal and what costs have been spent to date?

**Conclusion:**

2. IRO-MAR requests Council provide transparency to residents and ratepayers and clearly outlines progress and work programmes aligned to budgets, with reference to the Long Term Plan and previous Annual Plans.
3. The diagram of the Planning Cycle on p3 of the Annual Plan Consultation document 2026/27 shows a circle going round and round and never achieving anything: it is time for the Rangitīkei District Council to get in line with its obligations, be transparent and accountable to the community.

Felicity Wallace

**On behalf of IRO-MAR**

Dated: 17 April 2026

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN RANGITIKEI?

Submitted By: Anonymous user

Submitted Time: 19 April 2026 15:15

Creation Time: April 28, 2026 8:21 AM

---

**Ingoa/Name:**

Peter & Darryl Cousins

**Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation?**

No

**Tōpūtanga/Organisation (if applicable):**

N/A

**Kāinga noho/Address:**

**Īmēra/Email:**

**Waea/Phone:**

**Would you like to speak to your submission:**

Please tick this box if you would like to speak to your submission at the Council Hearings on early May 2025. Someone will contact you to confirm this.

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

How did you hear about this consultation?

other: Council Staff

Which statement best reflects your view?

Unsure / need more information

Why did you choose this option?

I'm not aware of how fees & charges are calculated

If you could give one piece of advice to Council as it finalises the 2026/27 Annual Plan, what would it be?

Does retaining local decision-making matter to you?

Yes

What does 'local decision-making' mean to you?

Town/community (Decisions are made by people representing my town or community)

When councils work more closely at a regional level, what matters most to you?

Anything else you'd like to add about government reform?

Focus on Council's core business

Which principle matters most to you?

People who benefit most should pay more

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Revenue & Financing Policy?

Why/why not?

Don't know

Which statement best reflects your view?

Fees should generally recover the full cost of providing a service where the service is used by an individual or identifiable group.

Are there any specific fees or charges you think are unfair or unreasonable?

Yes, swimming Pool Inspection fees. These need to relate to the time taken to complete the inspection + admin to file required reports. There may be room for

# WHERE'S ANNUAL PLAN & CO @ RANGITIKEI?

some vehicle travel costs but not staff costs as these are covered by rates. My pool inspection took 5 minutes but I am being asked to pay \$1000 / hr for this inspection

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Rates Remission Policy?

Why/why not?

Is there any situation you think should qualify for remission but currently does not?

\*Please include more pages if required:

Anything else?

Submission 043 Annual Plan Peter & Darryl Cousins

Additional submission information received via email to [submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@rangitikei.govt.nz):

Good morning

I wish to add some additional comments to my original submission for oral hearing

Wednesday 6 May 2026

1:30 pm – 1:40 pm

Council Chambers

46 High Street, Marton

These comments relate to how Council Staff interact with us

I attach letter dated December 03 2025 – please circulate

The points I wish to raise are –

- Letter is not helpful to a pool owner making them aware of NZS8500 ( the compliance standard )
- Maybe a link to NZS8500 so pool owners could download
- Doesn't advise of critical sections of NZS8500 requiring attention

3 December 2025

Mr PW & Mrs BD Cousins

REF: 1345010600/SW248

Dear Peter & Barbara

**Swimming pool audit at :**

As of 1 January 2017, an amendment to The Building (Pools) Act (Act) was passed to strengthen pool safety compliance and reduce accidental drowning. To ensure that residential pools are safe, the Rangitikei District Council (Council) must inspect a residential pool at least once every three years to determine whether the pool barriers comply with the Act.

There are two options as to how you can have your pool inspected; you can opt to:

- Engage an IQPI (Independent Qualified Pool Inspector) that must be registered with MBIE (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment)
  - If an IQPI inspects a pool to determine its compliance status with the Act, the inspector must, within 3 working days of the date of inspection, give written notice to the relevant territorial authority of the decision.
- If you choose to have an IQPI carry out the inspection, Council requires your pool to be inspected by **Friday 30<sup>th</sup> January 2026**.

**OR**

- have the Council carryout the pool inspection. A pool inspection fee of \$255.00 will be charged; this inspection will include:
  1. one pool inspection
  2. pool inspection report (property owner's copy and Council property file copy)

If you opt to have Council carry out your inspection, this will occur between **Monday, 9 February to Friday, 13 February 2026**, as per Section 222 of the Act.

Upon completion of the initial pool inspection, you will receive:

- a copy of this audit report and whether any concerns where identified.
- if concerns are identified, a re-inspection will be required within 12 months or as stated on the report, to confirm remediation of issues has occurred.

Please note: if your swimming pool is non-compliant at the first inspection, further inspections will incur fees. Please visit Council's website [www.rangitikei.govt.nz](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz) to view the current Schedule of Fees and Charges.

If you have any queries regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me on 06 327 0099 or 0800 422 522.

Yours sincerely

Building Compliance Officer

**TIM MATTHEWS**  
**SUBMISSION on 2026-27 ANNUAL PLAN**  
**RANGITIKEI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**DATE:** 16 April 2026

**ADDRESS for SERVICE:**

Email:

**SUBMISSION**

1. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this year's Annual Plan document. This is my personal submission and may not represent the views of other organisations I may represent from time to time.
2. This submission is a response to the increased rates I am likely to face if the proposed Annual Plan and Amended Revenue and Financing Policy are not changed to make the General rate fairer for all ratepayers. The current proposal will see my rates increase by \$1 540.69 or 9.51% for one property and \$1 256.52 or 11.36% for the other property that does not have houses on it. These increases are out of line for both the Council's rates comparison (P 64 and 65 of Supporting Documents section of the Plan) and with Council's estimates of inflation anticipated over the next 14 months.
3. When the proposed rates calculations are combined with a particularly optimistic Capital Value assessment from Quotable Value in August 2023, when 2 neighbouring forestry properties were purchased by some of NZ's largest Corporates ostensibly for Carbon offsets, the effects on my annual rates bills have been substantial. Along with on-farm cost inflation and high interest rates, the viability of steep hill country farming is not guaranteed, and with regular climatic events causing expensive damage, making a profit is not easy.
4. Trying to make sense of this year's Annual Plan has not been easy, because information that should be there and historically has been there, is not there. For example, there is no breakdown of expenditure for each group of activities. How much does RDC spend on Civil Defence? There is no information that I can find that gives that detail, yet we are being asked to agree to a Targeted rate specifically for Civil Defence, in addition to a General Rate that includes Civil Defence, and which may form part of the UAGC calculation too!

5. Once upon a time, the Valuation Department would give a break down of values between sectors, be they dairy farms, cropping farms, forests, orchards, industrial , commercial or residential, when they completed a 3-yearly revaluations. This was then available in the Rating Information Database that could be inspected by the public. Presumably that information is still available, as it must be essential for compiling the rates spreadsheet that determines every property's rate impost. Why is it not publicly available each year? Its publication would help the public understand who pays what rates, and who actually funds the services they want.
6. Roothing is not divided between sealed, unsealed, bridge repairs, street furniture or unsubsidised rooding expenditure. We don't know how much is spent on maintenance of halls, parks, cemeteries, or public toilets. Published Council minutes or order papers, or the Annual Report give no clues unless there is a specific request or variation, and one hopes that Councillors are not operating in the vacuum that the public and ratepayers are subject to. Is this because managers are afraid to be tied to budgets, or is it just easier to run a Council when the public don't know what is in each category of expenditure.
7. Page 21 of the Supporting Documents does not show or record what income will be received from rooding rates but a process of deduction suggests that it is \$9.117 million. Presumably that line dropped out of the spreadsheet, or did it? Can we blame A. I.? How much expenditure is unsubsidised by the FAR rate, being footpaths or street furniture, or lighting? Last year we failed to meet our target for metaling unsealed roads – was that the fault of the contractor, the rooding managers or poor budgeting? The poor residents of those affected roads, who have no satisfactory measure of roughness, safety or satisfaction with Council's management of their road must live with the consequences, as the metal disappears under mud, the watertables become higher than the road and the overhanging vegetation is trimmed by their stock trucks.
8. Once upon a time the Council overheads that appear in each "Activity" could amalgamated together in a separate section so that we could see what the cost of running the Council actually is. Such information could be quite important if we ratepayers and residents were to consider amalgamation with a neighbour or two.
9. It is difficult to make an informed appraisal of what the Council is doing when the information is not in plain sight. If I cannot easily determine why my rates are increasing by 10 % per annum, then the Council is not doing its job, even if the Auditor General is happy to put his or her signature to a Draft Plan. I have an advantage in that I have been looking at this and other Council's Plans for at least 36 years now, but if the relevant information is not in plain sight, do I have to make an Official Information request to understand my rates bill?

## SPECIFIC SUBMISSION POINT

### 10. Amending the Revenue and Financing Policy

Council needs to review the General Rate and the Uniform Annual General Charge to achieve a fair and equitable basis for apportioning rates between the various types of public expenditure and private benefit. There is not sufficient rigour in the existing or amended Policy that sees the intent of Section 101 (3) of the Local Government Act being carried through as rating policy. The distinction between private and public benefit is not clear enough, and it leads to questions about affordability between ratepayer groups, or assumptions that some groups can afford to fund activities that are more closely described as private goods or benefits to others.

Council needs to be careful not to predetermine an outcome of the statutory process in order to achieve a desired outcome, and all decisions must be transparent and defensible. Decisions on modifying rating outcomes to achieve affordability for particular sections of the community need particular rigour, and rating differentials can be used more often than they have in the past. Council needs to have policies that can deal with large swings in valuation of different sectors creating perverse differences between years, particularly with new revaluations.

The legislation has been in use long enough now that there are models that can cope with the variations thrown at Councils. Council should be mindful that apportionment of benefits should stand up to scrutiny so that policies are transparent and appear fair. It may help to include wider members of the community than just staff and councillors in the development of these policies to help develop a robust and better understood Revenue and Financing Policy.

11. Attached is a worksheet showing the effect of the current proposed policy, and the way in which unloading the UAGC to “maintain affordability”, can cause disproportionate effects on the General Rate impost on higher valued properties. While the Council can have regard for affordability amongst groups, it is not its job to redress perceived inequalities in the way it apportions rating liability.

END of SUBMISSION

## RANGITIKEI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2026/27

## General Rate Examples

PROPERTY	CAPITAL VALUATION at 1 Aug 2023	2025/26 GENERAL RATE	2025/26 UAGC RATE	TOTAL GENERAL RATES	2026/27 GENERAL RATE	2026/27 UAGC RATE	TOTAL GENERAL RATES	GENERAL RATE INCREASE	PERCENT INCREASE
		0.0008830	\$719.67	2025/26	0.001330	\$765.73	2026/27		
Low House Value	\$250 000	\$220.75	\$719.67	<b>\$940.42</b>	\$332.50	\$765.73	<b>\$1098.23</b>	<b>\$157.81</b>	<b>16.78%</b>
Average House Value	\$428 000	\$377.92	\$719.67	<b>\$1097.59</b>	\$569.24	\$765.73	<b>\$1334.97</b>	<b>\$237.38</b>	<b>21.63%</b>
High House Value	\$600 000	\$529.80	\$719.67	<b>\$1249.47</b>	\$798.00	\$765.73	<b>\$1563.73</b>	<b>\$314.26</b>	<b>25.15%</b>
Average Lifestyle Value	\$754 000	\$665.78	\$719.67	<b>\$1385.45</b>	\$1002.82	\$765.73	<b>\$1768.55</b>	<b>\$383.10</b>	<b>27.65%</b>
Low Farm Value	\$3 000 000	\$2649.00	\$719.67	<b>\$3368.67</b>	\$3990.00	\$765.73	<b>\$4755.73</b>	<b>\$1387.06</b>	<b>41.18%</b>
Medium Farm Value	\$6 000 000	\$5298.00	\$719.67	<b>\$6017.67</b>	\$7980.00	\$765.73	<b>\$8745.73</b>	<b>\$2728.06</b>	<b>45.33%</b>
High Farm Value	\$9 000 000	\$7947.00	\$719.67	<b>\$8666.67</b>	\$11970.00	\$765.73	<b>\$12735.73</b>	<b>\$4069.06</b>	<b>46.95%</b>

This table shows how the Council's choice of low Uniform Annual General Charge can be tough on higher value properties, even though they may be only supporting a single family.

The use of a Targeted Rate for services such as Community Leadership, Civil Defence, Non-subsidised Rooding, Cemeteries, Halls, Health, Public Toilets, Dog and Stock Control, and Refuse Collection, is much fairer where those services are used by individuals or families, and largely independent of the size of the property being rated.