COUNCIL

AGENDA

Meeting to be held

THURSDAY 20 JULY 2017

8.30AM

In the Manawatu District Council Chambers,
135 Manchester Street, Feilding

Dr Richard Templer
Chief Executive
MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson

Her Worship the Mayor, Helen Worboys

Deputy Chairperson

Deputy Mayor, Michael Ford

Members

Councillor Steve Bielski
Councillor Stuart Campbell
Councillor Barbara Cameron
Councillor Shane Casey
Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Councillor Phil Marsh
Councillor Andrew Quarrie
Councillor Alison Short
Councillor Howard Voss
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. MEETING OPENING

Graeme Turnbull, of St Pauls Presbyterian Church Feilding, will open the meeting in prayer

2. APOLOGIES

3. REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Her Worship the Mayor – 27 July to 4 August 2017
Councillor Phil Marsh – 24 September to 14 October 2017
Councillor Stuart Campbell – 4 October to 21 October 2017

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Draft resolution

That the minutes of the Council meeting held 22 June 2017 be adopted as a true and correct record.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Notification from elected members of:

5.1 Any interests that may create a conflict with their role as an elected member relating to the items of business for this meeting; and

5.2 Any interests in items in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest as provided for in the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968

6. PUBLIC FORUM

6.1 JESSICA PEASE

Recipient of a Representative Grant to compete in the International School Girls Netball Challenge held in Suva, Fiji on 16 to 20 May 2017 as a member of the Aotearoa Maori Netball International Secondary School Team.

6.2 TESSA WEBB

Representative Grant recipient to compete at the Oceania Athletics Area Championships held in Suva, Fiji from 28 June to 1 July 2017 as a member of the New Zealand Athletics Team.

6.3 DOUG CARTRIDGE

Proposed sale of tennis courts at 145 South Street, Feilding
6.4 STEVEN JOHNSON

Proposed sale of tennis courts at 145 South Street, Feilding

7. PRESENTATIONS

Update on Regional Sports Facility Plan from Doug Tate, Community Facilities Manager

8. NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEMS

Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting, that item may be dealt with at that meeting if:

8.1 The Council by resolution so decides; and

8.2 The Chairperson explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public the reason why the item is not on the agenda, and the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

9. MINUTES OTHER COMMITTEES

There are no minutes from other committees for consideration.

10. OFFICER REPORTS

10.1 PROPOSED SALE OF 145 SOUTH STREET FEILDING


10.2 COMMUNITY COMMITTEE ESTABLISHMENT AND CONFIRMATION


10.3 ENGINEERING STANDARDS FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT


10.4 MANGAWEKA BRIDGE – INDICATIVE BUSINESS CASE FINAL REPORT


10.5 WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT DIGESTER FOUNDATION VARIATION

10.6 ANNUAL REPORT ON DOG CONTROL 2016-17


10.7 PETITION – RENAMING OF ROAD


11. CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

12. PUBLIC EXCLUDED BUSINESS

COUNCIL TO RESOLVE:

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

| a) Confirmation of minutes re Building Services Contract | Section 7(2)(i) – enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) | Section 48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings would be likely to result in a disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding that information would exist, under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. |
| b) Appointment of Trustees – Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust | Section 7(2)(a) – to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons | As above |

c) Update on Plan Change 55 Districtwide Rules – Notices of Appeal | | |

That the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Grounds under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Update on Plan Change 55 Districtwide Rules – Notices of Appeal</td>
<td>Section 7(2)(g) Maintain legal professional privilege; and Section 7(2)(i) - Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as specified above.

13. **MEETING CLOSURE**
Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on Thursday 22 June 2017, commencing at 8.30am in the Manawatū District Council Chambers, 135 Manchester Street, Feilding.

**PRESENT:**
- Mayor Helen Worboys (Chairperson)
- Cr Steve Bielski
- Cr Barbara Cameron
- Cr Stuart Campbell
- Cr Shane Casey
- Cr Michael Ford
- Cr Phil Marsh
- Cr Andrew Quarrie
- Cr Alison Short

**APOLOGY:**
- Cr Howard Voss

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**
- Cr Hilary Humphrey

**IN ATTENDANCE:**
- Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
- Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
- Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
- Bridget Simpson (Acting General Manager – People and Culture)
- Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
- Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
- Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
- Paul Stein (Communications Manager)
- Chris Pepper (Senior Project Engineer)
- Stacey Bell (Economic Development Adviser)
- Debbie Fulton (Accounting Operations Manager)
- Kirsten Pike (Parks and Property Officer - Legal and Planning)
- Brook Rush (Community and Strategy Operations Officer)
- Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)
- Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)
- Malcolm Thomas (Consultant)

**MDC 17/183 MEETING OPENING**

Kevin Barron of the Feilding Bible Chapel opened the meeting in prayer.

**MDC 17/184 APOLOGIES**

**RESOLVED**

That the apology from Councillor Howard Voss be accepted.

**Moved by:** Councillor Alison Short

**Seconded by:** Councillor Phil Marsh

**CARRIED**
MDC 17/185 REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

RESOLVED

That Her Worship the Mayor be granted leave of absence from 26 June to 7 July 2017.

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED

MDC 17/186 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the extraordinary Council meetings held 10-12 May 2017, 18-22 May 2017 and 1 June 2017, and the meeting held 25 May 2017 be adopted as a true and correct record.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED

MDC 17/187 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Barbara Cameron – member of MidCentral District Health Board

Item 10.2 Adoption of Annual Plan 2017-18 – noted the list of previous declarations of interest in specific submissions, as declared at the 18-22 May 2017 extraordinary Council meetings, as follows:

- Councillor Alison Short – Submissions #0327, 0335, 0293, 0449, 0492, 0344.
- Councillor Michael Ford – Submissions #0319, 0052
- Councillor Steve Bielski – Submission #0316
- Councillor Andrew Quarrie – Submission #0499
- Councillor Barbara Cameron – Submission #0402
- Her Worship the Mayor – Submission #0344
- Councillor Stuart Campbell – Feilding to Palmerston North Cycleway
- Councillor Phil Marsh – Easter Trading Policy
- Councillor Shane Casey – Submission #0220

MDC 17/188 PUBLIC FORUM - FEILDING HIGH SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

Cameron Hislop, Jack Bagley and Francis Stapp, from the Feilding High School Robotics Team, spoke about their attendance at the Vex IQ Robotics World Championships held in Louisville, Kentucky USA on 23 to 25 April 2017. They thanked Council for the funding provided towards their trip.
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MDC 17/189 PUBLIC FORUM - ABBEY WEBB

Abbey Webb spoke about representing New Zealand at the Oceania Table Tennis Junior Championships held in Suva, Fiji from 13 to 16 April 2017 as a member of the New Zealand Junior Girls' Team, and the two silver medals that she brought home. She thanked Council for providing funding assistance towards her trip.

MDC 17/190 PRESENTATIONS - WHAT MAKES A STRONG RURAL COMMUNITY?

Katherine Gillespie, spoke about her research as part of the Kellogg Rural Leadership Programme 2016, at Lincoln University. Her research topic was “What Makes a Strong Rural Community”. She spoke about her findings through her research and noted the important role of community committees within the District’s rural communities. Her recommendations for growing a strong rural community were:

- Build quality leadership;
- Create conscious community;
- Development community; and
- Encourage collaboration.

She spoke about how her research helped her to understand why community is so important and to understand her journey with rural living. She spoke about the insight she gained into the effect of change in the communities over past decades and empathy for how people feel from the decline in their communities. She talked about how her research had given her a vision for bringing the whole community into the future and had motivated her to take the next steps into community leadership, and hoped other people will be inspired to take that next step too.

She advised she is happy for her research paper to be shared with other community committees. Council noted that she would be invited to present her paper at a combined meeting of the district’s community committees.

MDC 17/191 NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEMS

There were no items of late business notified.

MDC 17/192 MINUTES OTHER COMMITTEES

There were no minutes from other committees for consideration.

MDC 17/193 FIRE AND EMERGENCY NEW ZEALAND – TRANSFER OF RESPONSE ASSETS

Report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy dated 26 May 2017 seeking approval for the transfer to Fire and Emergency New Zealand of Manawatu District Council owned rural fire response assets, and noting the intention of the Chief Executive to negotiate a lease agreement with Fire and Emergency New Zealand for that organisation to occupy and use of a portion of the Council depot site at 139 South Street, Feilding.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council approves the transfer to Fire and Emergency New Zealand at no cost the Manawatu District Council rural fire response assets listed in Appendix A of the report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy.
2. That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to finalise and sign the transfer arrangement document attached at Appendix B of the report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy in order to give effect to the transfer to Fire and Emergency New Zealand at no cost the Manawatu District Council rural fire response assets listed in Appendix A of the report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy.

3. That the Council notes that the Chief Executive intends to negotiate a lease agreement with Fire and Emergency New Zealand for that organisation to occupy and use of a portion of the Council depot site at 139 South Street, Feilding.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED

MDC 17/194 ADOPTION OF ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18


RESOLVED


2. That the Chief Executive be authorised to approve any final edits required to the Annual Plan 2017/18 in order to finalise the document.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh
CARRIED

MDC 17/195 RATES RESOLUTION


RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council, in pursuance of the exercise of powers conferred on it by the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and any other empowering provisions, resolve to set the following rates, on rating units in the district for the financial year commencing 1 July 2017 and ending 30 June 2018:

All rates and amounts expressed are inclusive of good and services tax.

The following differential categories are used for the General Rate, Roading Targeted Rate and Parks and Sports Grounds Targeted Rate charges.
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Differential Category | Description
--- | ---
1. Feilding Residential | Being all rating units situated within the 2009 Feilding differential rating area used solely or principally for residential or farming purposes or is vacant, but excluding those rating units included in Category 2 and 3.
2. Feilding Rural | Being all rating units situated within the 2009 Feilding differential rating area being properties zoned Rural 1, Rural 2 or Flood Channel 2 under the Manawatu District Plan.
3. Feilding CBD | Being all rating units situated within the 2009 Feilding Central Business differential rating area, not used solely or principally for residential purposes.
4. Rural | Being all rating units situated outside the 2009 Feilding differential rating area excluding those rating units included in Category 5 and 6.
5. Industrial and Commercial | Being all rating units zoned Industrial under the Manawatu District Plan and used solely or principally for commercial or industrial purposes excluding those rating units included in Category 3 OR all rating units in the 2009 Feilding differential rating area used solely or principally for conducting a business but excluding those rating units in Category 3.
6. Utilities | Being all rating units situated within the Manawatu District that have been identified by the Valuer General as infrastructure utility networks.

A GENERAL RATES

Under section 13(2) and 14 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, a general rate is made on every rating unit, assessed on the capital value of all rateable land in the district and on a differential basis, in accordance with Council’s Funding Impact Statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential Category</th>
<th>Differential</th>
<th>Rate in the $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feilding Residential</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feilding Rural</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feilding CBD</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.00201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rural</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Industrial and Commercial</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.00143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Utilities</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.00143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B PARKS AND SPORTS GROUNDS TARGETED RATE

Under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, a targeted rate is made on every rating unit, assessed on the capital value of all rateable land in the district and on a differential basis, in accordance with Council’s Funding Impact Statement:
**Differential Category** | **Differential** | **Rate in the $**
---|---|---
1. Feilding Residential | 1.00 | 0.00053
2. Feilding Rural | 0.30 | 0.00016
3. Feilding CBD | 2.75 | 0.00146
4. Rural | 0.30 | 0.00016
5. Industrial and Commercial | 1.50 | 0.00080
6. Utilities | 1.75 | 0.00093

### C ROADING TARGETED RATE

Under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, a targeted rate is made on every rating unit, assessed on the capital value of all rateable land in the district and on a differential basis, in accordance with Council’s Funding Impact Statement:

**Differential Category** | **Differential** | **Rate in the $**
---|---|---
1. Feilding Residential | 1.00 | 0.00100
2. Feilding Rural | 0.65 | 0.00065
3. Feilding CBD | 2.75 | 0.00274
4. Rural | 0.65 | 0.00065
5. Industrial and Commercial | 1.50 | 0.00150
6. Utilities | 1.75 | 0.00175

### D UNIFORM TARGETED RATES

Targeted rates for specified activities set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on every separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Uniform Targeted Rate 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Strategy</td>
<td>181.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Regulatory Management</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Halls and Recreation Complexes</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Sports Grounds</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Conveniences</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>694.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E MAKINO AQUATIC CENTRE AND LIBRARY TARGETED RATE

A targeted rate for the Makino Aquatic Centre and Library set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on every separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, assessed on a differential basis described below:
**F**  
**FIELDING CBD REDEVELOPMENT TARGETED RATE**

A targeted rate for the Feilding Central Business District (CBD) Redevelopment set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

- 0.00190 cents rate in the dollar of capital value on all rating units situated within differential category 3 (Feilding CBD).

**G**  
**FIELDING CBD SECURITY TARGETED RATE**

A targeted rate for Feilding CBD security, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

- $286.00 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit situated within differential category 3 (Feilding CBD).

**H**  
**KERBSIDE RECYCLING TARGETED RATE**

A targeted rate for the kerbside recycling collection service, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

- $121.00 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit to which the kerbside recycling collection service is available, excluding vacant land.

**I**  
**ULTRA-FAST BROADBAND TARGETED RATE**

A targeted rate for the Ultra Fast Broadband in the industrial area, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

- $898.00 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is capable of being connected to this service as it runs past the rating unit.

**J**  
**RURAL LAND DRAINAGE TARGETED RATES**

Targeted rates, based on land value, for properties that are part of the scheme, for the maintenance and development of land drainage schemes, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bainesse drainage district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainesse Class A</td>
<td>0.000380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainesse Class B</td>
<td>0.000180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainesse Class C</td>
<td>0.000160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makowhai drainage district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makowhai Class A</td>
<td>0.000250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makowhai Class B</td>
<td>0.000170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makowhai Class C</td>
<td>0.000030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K  STORMWATER TARGETED RATES

Targeted rate for each rating unit differentiated in accordance to where in the district the land is situated set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

Within Feilding Differential Rating Area  $96.00
Zoned as Rongotea Village in district plan  $83.00
Zoned as Sanson Village in district plan  $92.00

L  WATER SUPPLY – URBAN

For rating units not charged for water by meter, a differential targeted rate for water supply, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

Water Supply - Connected  $385.00
Water Supply - Serviceable  $192.50
Water Supply - Restricted  $308.00

"Connected" – A charge for each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is connected to a Council operated water supply, excluding restricted service or extraordinary connection or those that have chosen volumetric charging.

"Serviceable" – 50% of the connected charge for each rating unit that is capable of being connected to the Council water supply as the supply runs past the rating unit.

"Restricted" – 80% of the connected charge for each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is connected to a Council operated water supply, receiving a restricted service. This includes Mount Taylor and Sanson.

M  VOLUMETRIC WATER CHARGES

Rating units that have opted for water volumetric charging and extraordinary users of the water scheme under Council’s bylaw have their water consumption metered and charged quarterly based on the pipe size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Size</th>
<th>Every Three Months</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 mm to 20 mm</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mm</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 mm</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mm</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N WATER SUPPLY TARGETED RATES - RURAL

Targeted rates, set under section 19 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, for the rural water supply treatment, reticulation and supply of water per unit allocated or supplied to each participating property in the following schemes.

- Stanway/Halcombe – per unit charge $196.00
- Waituna West – per unit charge $323.00
- Kiwitea rural water – per unit charge $207.00
- Kiwitea rural water – per additional unit supply $269.10

O WASTEWATER DISPOSAL TARGETED RATES

A targeted rate, excluding properties where volumetric wastewater charges are applied, differentiated based on availability of service for the reticulation, treatment and disposal of sewage and trade effluent, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, of:

- Wastewater disposal - Connected $714.00
- Wastewater disposal - Serviceable $357.00
- Wastewater disposal - Restricted $571.00

"Connected" – A charge for each toilet or urinal, that is connected to a Council operated wastewater scheme, excluding restricted service or those that have chosen volumetric charging. Any separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is used exclusively or principally as a residence will be charged for one toilet for each residence.

"Serviceable" – 50% of the connected rate for rating unit that is capable of being connected to a Council wastewater scheme as the reticulations runs past the rating unit.

"Restricted" – 80% of the connected rate for each toilet or urinal, or each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is connected to a Council operated wastewater scheme, receiving a restricted service. Any separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is used exclusively or principally as a residence will be charged for one toilet for each residence. This includes Mount Taylor.

P HIMATANGI BEACH WASTEWATER SCHEME – CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION TARGETED RATE

Where the ratepayer elected in the connection agreement to pay their capital contribution over a set term, a targeted rate, for the Himatangi Beach Wastewater Capital Contribution, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.
Q  RONGOTEA WATER SUPPLY – CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION TARGETED RATE

Where the ratepayer elected in the connection agreement to pay their capital contribution over a set term, a targeted rate, for the Rongotea Water Supply Capital Contribution, set under section 16(3) and 16(4) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Targeted Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five year term, 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2018</td>
<td>$2,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten year term, 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2023</td>
<td>$1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty year term, 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2033</td>
<td>$923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R  RATES INVOICE AND PENALTY DATES

Rates are to be set for the year commencing 1 July 2017 and ending 30 June 2018.

Rates will be payable in four instalments and must be paid by the due date. Payment can be made using on-line banking, direct debit, credit card through internet or at the Council Office situated at 135 Manchester Street, Feilding between the hours of 8.00am and 5.00pm, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday – 9.00am and 5.00pm Wednesday.

If annual rates are paid in full by 24 November 2017, penalties charged for instalment one will be remitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instalment One</th>
<th>Instalment Two</th>
<th>Instalment Three</th>
<th>Instalment Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Date</td>
<td>1 August 2017</td>
<td>1 November 2017</td>
<td>1 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment Due Date</td>
<td>25 August 2017</td>
<td>24 November 2017</td>
<td>23 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Date</td>
<td>30 August 2017</td>
<td>29 November 2017</td>
<td>28 February 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volumetric Water charges will be invoiced at the end of each quarter and are due for payment on the last working day of the following month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter One</th>
<th>Quarter Two</th>
<th>Quarter Three</th>
<th>Quarter Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Date</td>
<td>30 September 2017</td>
<td>31 December 2017</td>
<td>31 March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment Due Date</td>
<td>31 October 2017</td>
<td>31 January 2018</td>
<td>30 April 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S INSTALMENT PENALTY

Under section 57 and 58(1)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, a 10% penalty will be added to any portion of the current instalment that remains unpaid after the due date.

T ADDITIONAL ARREARS PENALTY

Under section 57 and 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, an additional 10% penalty will be added in 1 July 2017 and 1 January 2018 to any rates remaining unpaid from previous financial years.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED

MDC 17/196 LOAN BORROWING 2017-18

Report of the General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory dated 30 May 2017 seeking approval to enable the Council to borrow to fund the programmes identified in the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to borrow up to $10,257,522 for the projects identified in the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

2. That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to borrow to refinance existing loan facilities as they fall due. Loans can only be refinanced within the terms of the original loan approval.

3. That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to negotiate and agree the terms, interest rate payable, type of loan facilities or issues of stock that make up the borrowing and to execute any agreements, documents and certificates in respect of such loans, facilities or stock on behalf of the Council.

4. That the borrowing be secured by a Debenture Trust Deed over all rates made from time to time by Council under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

MDC 17/197 SETTING OF FEES AND CHARGES 2017-18

RESOLVED

That the Council approves the activity fees and charges for the financial year commencing 1 July 2017 and ending 30 June 2018 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report of the General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory dated 31 May 2017.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

CARRIED

MDC 17/198 ADOPTION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN


RESOLVED

That the Council adopts the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan as attached to the report of the General Manager – Infrastructure dated 7 June 2017.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED

MDC 17/199 CCO EXEMPTIONS

Report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy dated 6 June 2017 seeking the renewal of exemptions granted to the Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, Manawatu-Whanganui Local Authority Shared Services Ltd (MWLASS) and Heartland Contractors from being a Council Controlled Organisation in accordance with section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002.

RESOLVED

That the Council:

1. renews the exemption from being a Council Controlled Organisation granted to the Feilding Civic Centre Trust under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act for a further three year period expiring 19 June 2020; and

2. renews the exemption from being a Council Controlled Organisation granted under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 to the Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust for a further three year period expiring 16 October 2020; and

3. renews the exemption from being a Council Controlled Organisation granted under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 to Manawatu-Whanganui Local Authority Shared Services Ltd (MWLASS) for a further three year period expiring 30 June 2020; and
4. renews the exemption from being a Council Controlled Organisation granted under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 to Heartland Contractors for a further three year period expiring 30 June 2020.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

MDC 17/200 MANAWATU COMMUNITY TRUST – STATEMENT OF INTENT


RESOLVED

That the Council receives the Manawatu Community Trust’s 2017/18 Statement of Intent for the year beginning 1 July 2017 and ending 30 June 2018.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

MDC 17/201 SECTION 17A REVIEW CONFIRMATION


RESOLVED

1. That the Council agrees:

   a. That the following services are exempt by Council under s17A(3)a (where there is an existing contract commitment or the service is required by legislation):

      • Property
      • Parks and Sportsgrounds
      • Cemeteries
      • Public Conveniences
      • Governance and Strategy (incl. District Plan Policy)
      • Economic Development
      • Solid Waste

   b. That the following services are exempt by Council under s17A(3)b (where the cost of undertaking a review outweighs the benefits):

      • Environmental Health and Monitoring
      • District Planning (Consents)
      • Animal Control
      • Community Development
• Libraries
• Makino Aquatic Centre (reviewed in mid-2015)

c. To the outcomes of the full reviews:
• Building Control – seek renewal of existing contract with Palmerston North City Council.
• Civil Defence – seek new contract with Horizons Regional Council.

2. That the Council notes that the following services are still to be considered:

• 3 Waters (reticulation networks already reviewed in mid-2015)
• Roading (maintenance and professional services)
• IT Support and
• Insurance, Electricity and Valuation services.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

MDC 17/202 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

There were no late items for consideration.

MDC 17/203 PUBLIC EXCLUDED BUSINESS

RESOLVED

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

a) Confirmation of minutes
b) Building Services Contract

That the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Grounds under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of minutes re Feilding Civic Centre Trust – Appointment of Trustees</td>
<td>Section 7(2)(a) – Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons.</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings would be likely to result in a disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding that information would exist,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General subject of each matter to be considered</td>
<td>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</td>
<td>Grounds under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Building Services Contract</td>
<td>Section 7(2)(i) – enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as specified above.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey

Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10.13am and resumed at 10.33am.

The meeting went into public excluded session at 10.33am and resumed open session at 10.55am. For items MDC 17/204 to MDC 17/207 refer to public excluded minutes.

MDC 17/208 MEETING CLOSURE

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 10.56am.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:

----------------------------------------  ----------------------------------------
CHAIRPERSON                                                                 DATE
Proposed Sale of 145 South Street, Feilding

Purpose

To seek the resolution of Council, to determine whether or not to dispose of Council’s real property at 145 South Street Feilding.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations

That the Council thanks the submitters for their submissions on the proposed sale of 145 South Street, Feilding.

If Council choose to abandon the sale of the property:

That the Council confirm that it wishes to retain the ownership of 145 South Street Feilding, noting that the proceeds from the sale of ‘other’ property assets as detailed in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan will not be achieved;

Further, that the Council enters into an agreement with the Feilding Tennis Club for the occupation of part of 145 South Street Feilding, with the details of the agreement to be confirmed and executed under the Chief Executive’s delegated authority.

If Council wish to defer the decision:

That the Council confirm that it wishes to defer the sale process of 145 South Street Feilding at this time, until the completion of the strategic sports review;

Further, that the Council enters into an agreement with the Feilding Tennis Club for the occupation of part of 145 South Street Feilding, until such a time as a decision is made, with the details of the agreement to be confirmed and executed under the Chief Executive’s delegated authority.

If Council choose to dispose of the property:

That the Council confirms its willingness to sell its property at 145 South Street, Feilding, and directs council officers to negotiate the details of a contract for sale and purchase with the Developer and to present this contract to Council at a future Council meeting for consideration and a decision.
1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatu – the best rural lifestyle in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Background

2.1 145 South Street was included in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan as a property identified for disposal. The proceeds from the disposal of the property have been included in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

2.2 The property had not been planned for disposal till year six of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan, however a request from a local property developer seeking a location for a local business saw the option to dispose of 145 South Street, accelerated in the disposal programme.

2.3 The Developer requires approximately 5,000sq/m of land for a local business to relocate into. The Developer had unsuccessfully endeavoured to find a suitable site in Feilding. If the business cannot find land in Feilding, the business is expected to relocate to new purpose built premises on land available in Palmerston North.

2.4 145 South Street is zoned industrial and is a freehold property acquired by Council through a freehold subdivision. The site was previously used by Saturday morning netball until they relocated to the Duke Street Netball Courts.

2.5 The Tennis Club had previously leased the land from Council at a peppercorn rental, undertaking the maintenance of the courts. In 2014, negotiations with the club fell over with the club unwilling to pay a proposed rental of $2,500, considerably less than the rental of 5% of the Land Value identified in the Community Leasing Policy.

2.6 In accordance with Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002, Council undertook to consult on the proposed sale of 145 South Street, recognising that while the land had no
Reserve Act 1977 restrictions and was fee simple, it had been used principally as a recreation area in the past.

2.7 Five submissions were received, principally from members or associates of the Feilding Tennis Club. All of the submissions oppose the sale of the land.

2.8 This report presents information to Council to determine whether they wish to proceed with the disposal of the property or to retain the property.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 In preparation of this report, Officers have met with the Feilding Tennis Club President. The club have proposed that Council retains ownership of the courts with the club seeking a lease for the courts again. While they would like a peppercorn rental, they would be willing to take a lease on with an annual rental of $2,500 + GST per annum and to then take on the general maintenance of the courts. There would still be the balance of the area and general areas that Council would be required to maintain, including the wind structure to the South of the courts.

3.2 While the surface of the courts does not require upgrading at this time, resurfacing is likely to be required in the next 10 to 15 years. There is no funding identified in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for any maintenance at the courts.

3.3 The submitters note that the retention of the courts are critical to the ongoing success of Feilding Tennis, and provide a number of reasons for the courts to be retained, including the possibility to have the courts for the future growth of the club.

3.4 Discussion with the Tennis club notes that the courts at 145 South Street are not fully utilised during the summer season, with Sundays and some week nights not being used at all. Currently Juniors also train at other locations including the High School wet turf, where there are seven courts marked out for use.

3.5 The land proposed to be sold, has a current assessed market valuation (June 2017) of $750,000 plus GST (if any).

3.6 Council has identified a total of $1.084m of ‘other’ property to be sold the first six years of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan, $784,000 of this in the first three years of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

3.7 In the event Council proceed with the sale of 145 South Street, combined with the anticipated sale of the Sanson Hotel proceeds, Council will exceed the proposed total of $1.084m of proceeds anticipated at the end of Year 6 of the Long Term Plan to repay debt.

3.8 Should Council choose not to proceed with the sale of 145 South Street Feilding, Council will be $334,000 under the proposed proceeds anticipated to be gained by the end of the first three years of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. The result of this is that $334,000 of debt is not repaid.

3.9 There are three possible options for Council to consider:

Option 1: Retain the property and lease to Tennis
- Council retains ownership of the property abandoning the sale at this time.
- A lease is established with the Tennis club for the use of the courts.
Option 2: Defer the Sale
• As part of the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan funding has been set aside to undertake an initial sports review project to identify need and future assets for sports.
• The disposal of the property is deferred until such a time as Council has better strategic guidance on sports need.

Option 3: Proceed with the Sale
• Council proceeds with the sale of the courts, using the funds to repay debt.
• The Club are encouraged to work with the High School to make use of their turf courts for Juniors at Feilding High School.

3.10 It is at Council’s sole discretion whether it chooses to dispose or retain the property.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 In the event that Council wishes to retain the courts, there will be minor operational implications with the Club likely to request operational funding to undertake other maintenance associated with the site. There is no operational budget set aside for this location.

5 Financial implications

5.1 There are financial implications as a result of Council’s decision, regardless of whether the property is sold or not.

5.2 By the end of year three of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan, Council had projected to achieve $784,000 of proceeds from the sale of ‘other’ assets. A further $300,000 of proceeds is proposed in Year 6 of the Long Term Plan. The assets included for sale include 145 South Street, Feilding and the former Junction Hotel in Sanson. To date no proceeds from the sale of assets have been achieved.

5.3 If the sale of 145 South Street proceeds, it is anticipated that combined with the possible sale of the Junction Hotel, Council will be $634,000 ahead of the proposed proceeds anticipated at the end of Year 3 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. If the sale occurs, Council will also achieve $66,000 more in proceeds than proposed from the sale of ‘other’ property during the term of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. The proceeds from sales will be used to repay debt.

5.4 In the event that Council does not proceed with the sale of 145 South Street Feilding, Council will be $334,000 under the proposed proceeds anticipated to be gained by the end of Year 3 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. The impact of this is that $334,000 of debt will not be repaid, incurring additional debt borrowing costs.

5.5 The land in question is currently non-rateable. If the land is sold, it will become rateable and as a result, will have a positive impact on rates for ratepayers, spreading the total costs of operating the District across another ratepayer.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Council was required under Section 138 of the Local Government Act to consult on the proposed sale of any ‘park’. The act defines a park as being:
park -

(a) means land acquired or used principally for community, recreational, environmental, cultural, or spiritual purposes; but

(b) does not include land that is held as a reserve, or part of a reserve, under the Reserves Act 1977

6.2 Council has met its requirements under Section 138 of the Local Government Act.

6.3 A resolution of Council is also required for the disposal of ‘real’ property.

7 Delegations

7.1 Council cannot delegate its authority to dispose of real property.

7.2 In the event Council chooses to not sell the property and to formalise Feilding Tennis Clubs occupation of 145 South Street, due to the land’s legal status the Chief Executive has delegated authority to enter into such as agreement in accordance with Councils Delegations Manual.

8 Consultation

8.1 Council undertook a public consultation process in accordance with Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002.

8.2 Five submissions were received. All five submissions oppose the sale of the land.

8.3 Prior to the preparation of this report, Officers also met with the President of Feilding Tennis Club to discuss the content of their submission and discuss possible ways forward.

8.4 A summary of the submissions are provided in the table below and the submissions included as an attachment to this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Key Issues/Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Promac Tennis      | - Is Head Coach for Tennis Club  
- Courts are regularly used, many from Feilding, as well as travellers. Used for warm up courts during tournaments and rep fixtures  
- Uses the courts lots for squads and Juniors  
- Losing courts will be detrimental to tennis community and Feilding |
| 2. Feilding Tennis Club| - Club had historically rented courts, new lease fell over because club and Council were unable to commit to term and did not want to pay rental demanded ($2,500)  
- Courts are used primarily for Junior tennis, overflow for business house and during tournaments and rep fixtures.  
- Propose that the club enter into a new lease, paying for maintenance of courts  
- Club does not lock gates, allowing players to use either their courts or public courts. If courts are sold, courts may have to be locked to protect club interests  
- There are no other free tennis courts in the District  
- Club own some infrastructure on land |
| 3. Stephen Johnson    | - Council has not encouraged public use of Courts – i.e there is no signage  
- Any development on the site may impact parking and would have an impact of traffic safety  
- Council should be encouraging people to partake in physical activity, including the use of the courts  
- There is plenty of commercial land available in Feilding |
| 4. Tennis Manawatu    | - Courts are used for interclub, local tournaments and junior representative fixtures  
- If courts are not available they will be unable to run tournaments or representative fixtures as their will be insufficient courts for players  
- Will affect local club. They will have to reduce the number of interclub players that can play |
| 5. Liz Giesen         | - Local Club member and provides a petition with 26 signatures in support of keeping courts  
- Courts are used daily in summer, as overflow for squads, public use and club use on weekends  
- Trying to build tennis in the region, plan is on having more people play tennis  
- Community needs courts on a Saturday/Wednesday afternoon when club courts are full due to interclub play  
- Would like to work with Council to improve the surface of the courts. Could get more competitive tournaments to Feilding in Councils courts were in better condition  
- Have a large number of junior and other players |
9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations to be taken into account in this decision.

10 Conclusion

10.1 It is at Council’s sole discretion as to whether or not it wishes to proceed with the sale and disposal of 145 South Street Feilding.

10.2 In the instance that Council proceeds with the sale, it is possible that combined with the sale of the Junction Hotel in Sanson the gross proceeds from their sale will provide for debt to be repaid earlier than anticipated in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

10.3 In the event Council wishes to retain the ownership of the site, Council will not achieve the expected proceeds from sales of other property anticipated in the 2015-2025 Long Term plan, but will however provide for sporting opportunity in the Feilding Community.

11 Attachments

Submissions from:

1. Promac Tennis
2. Feilding Tennis Club
3. Stephen Johnson
4. Tennis Manawatu
5. Liz Giesen
Submission 1: Promac Tennis

Promac Tennis
Feilding Lawn Tennis Club
Feilding

8th June 2017

To Manawatu District Council,

Please accept my submission against the selling of the SOUTH STREET TENNIS COURTS.

I am the head coach at FLTC and use the FLTC facility daily almost all year round. I see your courts being used regularly by many from Feilding and the surrounding district plus a lot of travelling players as practice courts when passing through or as warm up courts before and during tournaments and rep fixtures.

We, club members, also use these courts for a lot of squads and junior tennis through the summer when the FLTC courts are fill due to fixtures etc. Losing them will be very detrimental to the tennis community and the town of Feilding.

Thank you and please feel free to contact me if you need more information.

Kind regards

Kurt McNamara
Submission 2: Feilding Tennis Club

Feilding Tennis Club
PO Box 105
Feilding

Manawatu District Council
Parks & Property Team
Manchester Street
Feilding
parksandproperty@mdc.govt.nz

Submission to Council regarding the proposed sale of 145 South Street Feilding

The Feilding Tennis Club (FTC) are formally opposed to the council's proposed sale of 145 South Street Feilding. The reasoning for the club's opposition to the sale is as outlined below. We invite the council to engage with the club to discuss the proposal further if required.

1. Background: Up until recently FTC had a long term lease of the property in conjunction with Feilding Netball. The clubs jointly funded the perimeter fencing and the floodlights, maintained the property, provided nets and line marking at their cost throughout the term of the lease while continuing to make the facility available to the public. In return the council did not charge a rental to the clubs. Prior to the lease expiring FTC approached the council to try to get agreement to the lease being extended for a reasonable duration on the same terms and conditions, this was rejected with the council unable to commit to a certain lease term and they demanded a rental be paid.

2. When the courts were leased FTC utilised the facility primarily for junior Saturday morning Tennis but over the years FTC also used the courts for overflow business house. There is the opportunity for FTC to again utilise this facility to grow tennis in Feilding providing the club has certainty of tenure of these courts. With this certainty FTC would again invest in the maintenance of the courts including provisioning nets and line marking and would commit to making the courts available to the public at no cost. It is estimated that FTC would spend up to $3,000p.a. to maintain and provision the courts.

3. FTC propose that the council again consider entering into a new lease of the property to FTC on the same terms and conditions as the now expired lease as summarised above.

4. Currently FTC utilise the courts at times during the season but primarily for junior and beginner players or during tournaments and rep fixtures both of which generate very minimal revenue to the club but are a benefit to the community for both accommodation and hospitality. Taking these courts away will disadvantage junior and beginner players and will affect the ability for the club to hold tournaments and rep fixtures which will be detrimental to the town.

5. FTC does not currently lock its gates or control access of non-members on the basis that non-members generally play on the Asphalt courts given this is a community facility. If the courts were sold the club may be required to invest in access control so that members are not disadvantaged.

6. There are no other free access tennis courts in Feilding. Taking away access to these courts is removing a benefit to all ratepayers and clearly showing that the council is not supportive of Tennis as a sport and the well-being benefits that result from playing the game. Not all residents can afford or want to pay a club membership yet we encourage them to take up tennis for the life benefits and social interaction that result.

7. FTC owns some of the infrastructure on the land i.e. the perimeter fencing and the lights – we would require compensation for these improvements if the property was sold.

Regards,

Doug Cartridge
Club President
0274555215
Submission 3: Stephen Johnson

Doug Tato

From: Stephen Johnson
Sent: Friday, 9 June 2017 11:50 AM
To: Parks and Property
Subject: Proposal to sell 145 South Street Feilding

I wish to oppose the proposal to sell 145 South Street Feilding. My reasons are:

1. Manawatu District Council (MDC) has not encouraged the use of the public courts by way of having any signage or website notification advising the public that the facility is available for general use. The general public would tend to consider the courts as part of the Feilding Tennis Club and therefore shy away from making use of the facility. MDC should advertise that the courts are available and allow at least one full season of tennis over the summer to monitor usage before any decision whether to sell the property is made.

2. Any development of the site may have a major impact on available car parking around the Feilding Tennis Club. During tennis season parking around the courts can be at full capacity and any loss of space would have a serious impact on traffic safety.

3. MDC should be encouraging people to take part in beneficial physical activities and the loss of an established facility would be a step backwards. MDC should explore opportunities with the Feilding Tennis Club and other sports groups to encourage the use of the courts.

4. No community recreational property should be sold when there is plenty of other land available for commercial development.

Thank you.

Stephen Johnson
Submission 4: Manawatu Tennis

To Whom It May Concern:

**Regarding:** The Council Courts on South Street.

Currently Tennis Manawatu utilizes the courts next to Feilding Lawn Tennis Club for Interclub, local Tournaments and Junior Representative Fixtures during the season of October-April. Without these courts we would be unable to run Tournaments and Representative Fixtures at Feilding Tennis Club, as there is not enough available courts for players and this will impact both Tennis Manawatu as then we will only have the use of 2 Palmerston North venues and none in Feilding and also it will effect both Accommodation and Hospitality in the town.

Most of all it will effect the players of Feilding and surrounding communities. Without the extra courts Feilding Lawn Tennis Club will have to reduce the number of interclub players they can enter into the local competition as you have to be able to host at least half of your home teams weekly so they would only be able to enter 16 teams where at the moment they have other that many teams and the club has grown numbers of the past financial year.

Please take into consideration our request to keep the council courts on South Street.

Any questions please feel free to contact me between 3pm and 7pm.

Kind regards,

Bridget Dickens
Executive Officer, Tennis Manawatu
0273338815
Lis Giesen
472 Pakihikura Road, REWA
0275393640 lisandgeorge@xtra.co.nz

8th June 2017

Manawatu District Council
Feilding

Dear Manawatu District Council,

REGARDING SOUTH STREET TENNIS COURTS

Please accept this submission opposed to the selling of the four tennis courts on South Street. I have attached a petition of signatures to support my submission.

I am a mother of five young children, all members at Feilding Lawn Tennis Club (FLTC). I am also an active member on the FLTC committee and the junior coordinator at the club. We are at the courts daily in the summer and every other day in the winter, with squad, interclub matches, tournaments, rep fixtures, hitting practice and business house.

The four council owned courts would be used daily in the summer, with over flow from squads, warm up courts for rep/tournament days, hitting from public, interclub on the week end and used by families like myself with young children when a main event is on at the club our young children can play all day long.

We are trying to build up tennis within the region, focusing on families and junior players. Once a very social, inexpensive and fun sport, however competition with so many sports available and other reasons the tennis had suffered. However, we have over the last few years been building the tennis community through funded squads for juniors, family days and tournaments. Our plan is to get more people playing tennis.

Without the south street court this will disadvantage these new tennis players in and around our region greatly as they need public courts to play on, on that nice
Saturday/Wednesday afternoon when it is prefect day to have a hit, but there is nowhere to play because the FLTC courts are full due to interclub play.

I also would like to think we as a club could work with the council to improve the surface of the courts, we could get a lot more competitive tournaments played in Feilding if they were in better condition.

We have a group of young Feilding players travelling and competing (successfully!) in tournaments all around the country regularly, so much so that Feilding has now got the potential to draw in players from all around New Zealand to come and play here. These tournaments are played over holidays/weekends so the benefit to our town is huge.

The number of signatures on the attached submission is only a small percentage as this month would be the quietest month on the tennis calendar. I am confident this would have been in the hundreds if mid-season.

Please contact me with any queries

Kind regards

Lis Gieson

Sincerely,

Your Name
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>CLUB MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Pratt</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mullan</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Anney</td>
<td>L. Anny</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Anney</td>
<td>K. Anny</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Anney</td>
<td>A. Anny</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Anny</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nielsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Nielsen</td>
<td>T. Nielsen</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Nielsen</td>
<td>J. Nielsen</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Beall</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Anney</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Petterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Petterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile Waugh</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam Waugh</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Waugh</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
<td>CLUB MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie McKay</td>
<td>McKay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella Marshall</td>
<td>ellagrnshill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Simpson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis Gressen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Committee Establishment and Confirmation

Meeting of 20 July 2017

Business Unit: Community and Strategy
Date Created: 06 July 2017

Community Committee Establishment and Confirmation

Purpose

To consider the inclusion of Bainesse/Rangiotu as a community of interest within Council’s Community Committees Policy and to appoint a Liaison Councillor for Bainesse/Rangiotu Community Committee.

To approve the Colyton Community Committee’s membership to extend beyond the maximum number allowed for in the current Community Committees Policy and to confirm the appointment of Councillor Phil Marsh as Colyton Community Committee’s Liaison Councillor.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations

That Council:

1. Confirms the inclusion of Bainesse/Rangiotu in the list of communities of interest within the Community Committees Policy.

2. Appoints a Liaison Councillor for the Bainesse/Rangiotu Community Committee.

3. Approves the Colyton Community Committee’s membership extending beyond the maximum number allowable in the Community Committees Policy.

4. Confirms the appointment of Councillor Phil Marsh as Liaison Councillor for the Colyton Community Committee.

Report prepared by:
Janine Hawthorn
Community Development Adviser

Approved for submission by:
Brent Limmer
General Manager - Community and Strategy
1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatu – the best rural lifestyle in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Background

2.1 Council adopted a policy for the establishment of Community Committees in 1990 with the purpose of providing a local link and point of contact for Council liaison. These Committees are elected at public meetings held on a triennial basis with Council appointing a Councillor to each Committee.

2.2 This policy was adopted shortly following the Local Government Reorganisation of 1989 which saw five separate authorities amalgamate into one. It also saw the closure of the former Council Offices and Service Centres located in the smaller villages so a community committee established in those villages was an informal way for continuing with the liaison with these communities.

2.3 These smaller villages had been identified within the policy as communities of interest within the district and although additional communities have been incorporated into the policy since its original adoption, this did not include the community of Bainesse/Rangiotu as there has previously been no interest in establishing a committee in that community.

2.4 Council has recently received an approach from members of the community of Bainesse/Rangiotu seeking Council’s support in establishing a Community Committee.

2.5 Colyton has been included as a community of interest in Council’s current Community Committee policy. Although there was some initial interest by residents in establishing a Community Committee in Colyton, there was not enough to progress this any further.

2.6 A public meeting for Neighbourhood Support was held in Colyton in May 2017 where an the possibility of establishing a Community Committee was raised. There appeared to be sufficient support at that meeting for progressing this further. A further meeting was held on 28 June 2017 where 18 residents were appointed to form a Colyton Community Committee.

2.7 Council’s Community Committee Policy allows for a minimum of seven and a maximum of ten to form a Committee. Council will therefore need to formally acknowledge its approval for the Colyton Community Committee’s membership to extend beyond the maximum number allowed for in the policy.
2.8 Councillor Phil Marsh had previously expressed an interest in being appointed as the Colyton Community Committee’s Liaison Councillor should a committee be established. As this expression of interest was made at a Council Workshop, Council needs to formalise his appointment.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 Council will need to include Bainesse/Rangiotu as a community of interest in its Community Committee Policy to allow for a Community Committee to be established.

3.2 A copy of the current policy is attached for Council Members’ information.

3.3 Council will also need to appoint a Liaison Councillor for Bainesse/Rangiotu Community Committee.

3.4 The Bainesse/Rangiotu community have requested that a public meeting be held on Wednesday, 2 August 2017 at 7.00 pm in the Rangiotu Hall which has been arranged and confirmed.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 There are no capital/operating expenditure implications or maintenance costs associated with this paper.

5 Financial implications

5.1 Both the Colyton and Bainesse/Rangiotu Community Committees will be eligible for annual project funding through the Community Committee Project Fund in accordance with the Community Committees Policy.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 There are no statutory requirements associated with this paper.

7 Delegations

7.1 Council has the authority to establish Community Committees and to appoint Liaison Councillors to those Committees.

8 Consultation

8.1 An invitation will be sent to residents of Bainesse/Rangiotu community inviting them to a public meeting to be held on Wednesday, 2 August 2017 at 7.00 pm at the Rangiotu Hall.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this paper.
10 **Conclusion**

10.1 Following consideration of this report, it is recommended that Council includes Bainesse/Rangiotu as a community of interest in the Community Committee Policy and appoints a Liaison Councillor for the Bainesse/Rangiotu Community Committee.

10.2 Council is also being asked to confirm Councillor Phil Marsh’s appointment as the Colyton Community Committee’s Liaison Councillor as well as give its approval for membership of the Colyton Community Committee to extend beyond the maximum number allowed for in the Community Committees Policy.

11 **Attachments**

- Community Committees Policy - Adopted 17 December 2015
Purpose of this Policy

The purpose of the Community Committees Policy is to allow identified communities of interest within the Manawatu District to establish an advisory body in their community to assist the Council in its responsibilities to that community. They are an informal link between the Council and the community whereby an exchange of information, opinions, proposals, recommendations and decisions can take place.

The following are the communities of interest identified by Council. This however does not prevent other communities from being incorporated:

- Apiti
- Himatangi Beach
- Rangiwahia
- Cheltenham
- Hiwinui
- Rongotea
- Colyton
- Kimbolton
- Sanson
- Feilding
- Pakihikura
- Tangimoana
- Halcombe
- Pohangina
- Waituna West

What is the Role of a Community Committee?

Community Committees are part of Community Development, which is a key contributor to achieving Council’s vision and outcomes and is part of the District Development activity within Council’s Long Term Plan.

Community development is a means for Council to partner with community groups and not for profit organisations to encourage these groups to strengthen the interests and values of our district’s residents by encouraging active citizenship in identifying the issues they want to deal with and to generate local solutions that will deliver economic, social, ecological and cultural wellbeing of our District.

Community Committees are empowered to present comprehensive submissions to Council’s Annual Plans and Long Term Plans. The submission to align ideas for future proofing the community and the identified community projects arising out of Community Plans to Council’s strategic direction.

How are Community Committees Supported?

A Council member is appointed as a Liaison Councillor for each Community Committee. The Liaison Councillor’s key role is to assist the Committee and advise on Council processes and to provide updates on matters of interest at a local, regional and national level.

Liaison Councillors are there to listen to the community’s concerns and to clarify the process of engagement with Council and to give guidance to where the Committee can seek help on specific issues. They are not the Community’s spokesperson.

Council’s Community Development Adviser is the Committee’s main point of contact and support from within Council.
How are Community Committees Appointed?

Each Community Committee will be established at a public meeting to be called by Council.

The number of members to be elected to serve on the Committee shall, where practicable, be a minimum of seven and a maximum of 10 adults.

The term of the Committee shall coincide with Council’s term of office which is three years. Community Committees will therefore hold triennial meetings to re-elect their Committees following the Local Government Elections to be active.

Each active Committee is required to establish their own Terms of Reference based on a standardised template which would include when the Committee meets, how often and its administrative procedures.

Community Committee Project Fund

Council will provide annual funding to allow community committees to undertake small-scale, discrete projects within their communities that are not currently included in Council’s contracts or levels of service and can be aligned to Community Plans where a Community Plan exists. This annual funding is known as Community Committee Project Fund.

The Community Committee Project Fund has an annual budget to be distributed evenly amongst each of the Community Committees that are currently active. This funding is not available to those Committees that are in recess.

Each active Community Committee will be asked to submit a draft work programme by the end of December each year for the following financial year. This work programme lists projects in order of priority. Payment is upon receipt of invoices for agreed projects. Funds can be accumulated and carried over from one year to the next as long as they have been tagged for a specific project and must be used within the term of a Long Term Plan.

Hall Management

The Hall Management Policy will be incorporated into the Community Committee Policy once it has undergone a major review.
Engineering Standards for Subdivision and Land Development

Purpose

To adopt the Manawatu District Council Engineering Standards for Land Development.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report. Targeted consultation has been undertaken with the Development and Engineering community to engage and seek feedback on the draft Engineering Standards for Land Development.

Recommendations

That the Council adopt the Manawatu District Council Engineering Standards for Land Development as set out in Appendix 1 of this report.

That the Council authorise Council officers to make further minor changes to the Manawatu District Council Engineering Standards for Land Development without further recourse to the Council, where this is necessary to:

i. Fix identified minor errors and/or omissions.
ii. To re-format to ensure maximum usability (hard copy & online)
iii. Ensure continuity with other proposed provisions.

Report prepared by:
Glenn Young
Utilities Manager

Approved for submission by:
Hamish Waugh
General Manager - Infrastructure
1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

*Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatu – the best rural lifestyle in New Zealand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Background

2.1 At its meeting on 4 May 2017 the Strategic Planning and Policy Committee were presented with the draft engineering standards for land development within the Manawatu District for information and feedback.

2.2 Consultation has occurred which has resulted in a number of amendments to the standards.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 It is proposed to adopt unique standards for the Manawatu District, that are more reflective of local conditions and Council requirements. The standards are based on NZS4404:2010, with some specific amendments to apply for any land development or subdivision within the Manawatu District. They will also be regionally consistent with adjoining Councils.

3.2 The Engineering Standards for Land Development will be a stand-alone reference document rather than requiring users to cross reference to other documentation.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 There are no capital or operating expenditure implications, or maintenance costs, associated with this matter.

5 Financial implications

5.1 There are no unbudgeted financial implications associated with this matter.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 There are no statutory requirements associated with this matter.

7 Delegations

7.1 The Council have the authority to consider this matter.
8 Consultation

8.1 Targeted consultation was undertaken with the development and engineering community with submissions closing on Friday 26th May 2017. A well-attended meeting with developers, surveyors and engineers who operate in the Manawatu District was held with Council staff on 17 May 2017.

8.2 Feedback was received from Phil Pirie and Associates, Central District Surveys, Geoworks, A C Rutherford (J B Ware Contractors), and Truebridge Associates along with feedback from Council departments – Roading, Operations and Regulatory and Community and Strategy. A total of 188 discussion points were considered.

8.3 All feedback comments are attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

8.4 The response to each feedback point is attached along with whether the submission comments were accepted, noted or declined with reasons.

8.5 As a result of the feedback a number of amendments to the standards have been made. These changes reflect the working knowledge and practical issues that have been previously encountered in the District.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this matter.

10 Conclusion

10.1 Adoption of the Manawatu District Council Engineering Standards for Land Development will provide clarity for developers, surveyors and engineers undertaking development works within the District.

11 Attachments

- Appendix 1 - Manawatu District Council Engineering Standards for Land Development
- Appendix 2 - Feedback Points and Council Officer comments
Mangaweka Bridge - Indicative Business Case Final Report

Purpose
To present the findings and final recommendations of the Indicative Business Case for the Mangaweka Bridge Upgrade Project.

Significance of Decision
The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations
1. That the Council receives this report.
2. That the Council approves progression onto the Detailed Business Case of the single preferred option, which includes construction of a new bridge alongside the existing bridge.
3. That the Council approves the retention and maintenance of the existing bridge for pedestrian and cycle use.

Report prepared by:
Jim Mestyanek
Senior Project Engineer - Roading

Approved for submission by:
Hamish Waugh
General Manager - Infrastructure

1 Executive Summary

1.1 The Indicative Business Case (IBC) has been completed.

1.2 The IBC identifies the preferred option as a new bridge constructed alongside the existing bridge.

1.3 The IBC projects that a location approximately 40m downstream will probably be the most efficient both for bridge approach geometry and for land acquisition. However, the decision
on precise location will be one of the outcomes of the Detailed Business Case and Design, not the current IBC.

1.4 The IBC also recommends retaining the existing bridge for pedestrian and cycle traffic. This would include costs to inspect regularly and carry out appropriate minor repairs and replacements to ensure its integrity and suitability for this purpose.

1.5 The IBC recommends immediate progress to a Detailed Business Case to assess the strategic, economic, financial, managerial viability of the single recommended option. This would include hydrological and geotechnical investigations in preparation for design.

2 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

2.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Background

3.1 At the Council Workshop on 2 March 2017, Council accepted a proposal to develop an Indicative Business Case for a bridge replacement.

3.2 The Indicative Business Case has been completed.

3.3 The IBC report identifies the preferred option as a new bridge constructed alongside the existing bridge.

3.4 The report also recommends retaining the existing bridge for pedestrian and cycle traffic. This would include costs to inspect regularly and carry out appropriate minor repairs and replacements to ensure its integrity and suitability for this purpose.

3.5 The report affirms immediate progress onto the Detailed Business Case, which will assess the strategic, economic, financial, managerial viability of the single recommended option. This phase would include hydrological and geotechnical investigations in preparation for design.

3.6 On 22 June 2017, the costs for a Detailed Business Case (DBC) were formally allowed for in the Annual Plan 2017-18.

4 Discussion and Options considered

4.1 The Indicative Business Case considered the following options:
The table below includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option No</th>
<th>Option Description</th>
<th>Capacity (Tonne)</th>
<th>Remaining Life (years)</th>
<th>Rough Order Cost ($m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business as usual (do minimal)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minor strengthening</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Major strengthening</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>New bridge on existing alignment</td>
<td>53-80</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A*</td>
<td>New bridge alongside existing bridge</td>
<td>53-80</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>New bridge on new alignment (1.5km upstream)</td>
<td>53-80</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>$18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>$20-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The recommended option is 5A and has a Benefit Cost Ratio of 3. This means that the overall benefits of this option outweigh the costs by a factor of 3.

4.3 The IBC projects that a location approximately 40m downstream will probably be the most efficient both for bridge approach geometry and for land acquisition. However, the full analysis of benefits, costs, possibilities, and consequences of the final chosen location will be the subject of the Detailed Business Case and Design, not the current IBC.

4.4 Options considered for the existing bridge included the following:

1. Demolish
2. Decommission
3. Retain for pedestrian & cycle traffic... and continue to monitor & repair as required

The IBC recommends option 3 above. The costs of this work are represented by option 1 ($0.5-0.9m) and have been included in the costs of the remaining options 2, 3, 5, 6 identified in the table above.

4.5 Further details of the options assessment can be found in the IBC report.

5 Operational Implications

5.1 The Detailed Business Case will be developed within the context of normal Council operations during the 2017-18 financial year.

6 Financial implications

6.1 The anticipated costs for the Detailed Business Case (DBC) have been budgeted for in the 2017-18 Annual Plan ($100,000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate $200,000. MDC’s share is 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Business Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less NZTA FAR @ 53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7 Statutory Requirements

7.1 There are no statutory requirements at this stage.

8 Delegations

8.1 The delegated authority for this level of expenditure lies with the Chief Executive.

9 Consultation

9.1 Public Meeting 30 March 2017 - Approximately 300 people were invited to a public meeting on 30 March 2017 at Awastone Camp located at the eastern approach to the bridge. Eighty-Five people were present at the meeting, including Hon Ian McKelvie MP, both mayors, both deputy mayors, other Councillors, Council staff, local residents, and industry personnel representing sectors such as stock transport, forestry, heavy haulage, and emergency services. Ngāti Hauiti were invited but were unavailable due to heavy workloads in connection with their current Waitangi Tribunal hui.

At the public meeting, participants voiced a strong and united desire to have the bridge replaced. They cited a wide variety of the social, economic, and land use reasons why a bridge replacement is needed. We also discussed the possible options for retaining or strengthening or demolishing the existing bridge.

9.2 Workshops 6 April and 5 May - Council held two workshops to assist in developing the Indicative Business Case (IBC). Twenty key stakeholders participated in these workshops.

9.3 Media Release 22 May 2017 - Council issued a media release updating the general public on progress of the IBC. On 24 May, Council sent the same update via email to all who had been invited to the public meeting.

10 Cultural Considerations

10.1 For a project of this nature and size, the Local Government Act 2002 requires Council to include in the planning all possible iwi who may have interests in the project.

10.2 To identify the relevant iwi, we consulted both Te Puni Kōkiri and Jerald Twomey, Senior Policy Planner Iwi at Horizons Regional Council.

10.3 Te Puni Kōkiri identifies the primary mandated iwi holding mana whenua over this particular location as Ngāti Hauiti. Robert Martin is the delegated contact person. We made contact with him via email and face-to-face korero and invited him to have the iwi’s voice heard in the planning process. He circulated our invitation to the members of the runanga. Their response was that they would be content for the Councils to proceed without their input. They do not expect to raise any objections to the planned replacement.

10.4 We also asked Robert to circulate our invitation to the following related iwi/hapu in the Taihape/Moawhango regions.

- Ngāti Whitikaupeka
• Ngāti Tamākōpiri
• Ngai te Ohuake

The initial indication is that these hapū are content for Ngati Hauiti to represent their interests in respect to this project.

10.5 Te Puni Kōkiri also lists the following mandated iwi, with recognised rohe slightly further afield from the bridge location. We have made initial contact with them requesting korero.

• Ngāti Apa – (defers to Ngati Hauiti)
• Ngāti Raukawa
• Rangitane o Manawatu – (defers to Ngati Hauiti)

10.6 Finally, Jerald Twomey has identified three others which might have interests in the location. We have made initial contact with them via email.

• Ngāti Hinemanu
• Ngāti Paki
• Ngāti Tūwharetoa

10.7 On 13 June, staff updated both Nga Manu Taiko (MDC) and Te Roopu Ahi Kaa (RDC) on progress of the project.

11 Conclusion

11.1 The Indicative Business Case has identified the preferred option as a new bridge built alongside the existing. For a new bridge with a design capacity of 53-80 Tonnes, the anticipated costs are $8-10m.

11.2 The Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the preferred option is 3.

11.3 The IBC recommendation includes the retention of the existing bridge for pedestrian and cycle traffic... with provision for ongoing monitoring and maintenance for this reduced usage.

11.4 The Indicative Business Case recommends immediate progress to the Detailed Business Case to analyse further the single preferred option and prepare for design.

12 Attachments

• Executive Summary of the Indicative Business Case report
Manawatu District Council and Rangitikei District Council
Mangaweka Bridge Replacement (S250B)
Indicative Business Case
Version 1.1

July 2017
Executive summary

This Indicative Business Case has been developed as a collaborative exercise between the Manawatu District Council and Rangitikei District Council and representatives from freight industry and primary sector.

Mangaweka Bridge has provided a critical connection for the local and regional communities for over 110 years, is an important road asset for the local community, and is maintained by two local authorities – Manawatu District Council and Rangitikei District Council. It has provided access for local communities to schools, employment, markets for produce and goods as well as a lifeline access to hospitals and emergency services. There are growing tourism and recreation related activities in the region.

A detailed inspection in 2016 revealed a large increase in deterioration of the structure. Some upgrade work was carried out in 2016, and during this bridge closure, further investigation revealed widespread deterioration. This resulted in the severe restriction of 6,000-kilogram gross vehicle limit, with a maximum axle weight of 3,000-kilograms. This effectively restricted the bridge to cars, campervans and other light vehicles.

Problem Statements

To understand and define the problems and benefits an evidence base was developed. The evidence base was used to define the problem statements and reflects the discussions and communication with stakeholders. The problem statements related to Access, Safety, Travel Time and Maintenance:

Access

Long term access is compromised resulting in uncertainty and a disconnected community and regional economic impacts.

Safety

Bridge restrictions lead to increased crash exposure on alternative routes with increased heavy vehicle movements.

Travel Time

Weight limit restrictions on the Bridge force heavy commercial vehicles to use significantly longer alternative routes

Maintenance

The age, condition and weight restriction on the Bridge is contributing to increasing maintenance frequency and cost for both the Bridge and the alternative routes.

Benefits of Investment

Following development of the problems, stakeholders were asked to define what the ‘outcomes of success’ would look like if the problems were addressed (without considering what the solution could be). This prompted discussion and consensus around the following key benefits expected from investing:

- Improved freight access and productivity
- Reduced asset maintenance cost for the Bridge and wider road network
- Reduced crash exposure of local road network
• Long term reliable access across Rangitikei River
• Availability as an alternative route for State Highway traffic
• Improved access to recreational areas
• The community is connected and accessible
• Supports opportunities for primary sector growth

**Investment Objectives**

With a thorough understanding of the problems and corresponding benefits of investment, Investment Objectives have been developed for five areas:

**Form and Function**

Form and function considers Bridge vehicle weight limits, access and approach geometry, and design considerations/requirements.

**Safety Impacts**

There has been one death or serious injury crash on the existing and alternative routes over the last 10 years, which resulted in two serious injury casualties.

**Travel Time**

Maintain or improve travel time reliability (prior to 6 tonne weight restriction).

**Continuity of Access**

Maintaining access at Mangaweka Bridge or similar location, including during construction.

**Service Life**

Provide an enduring long-term access point at Mangaweka across the Rangitikei River.

**Development of Alternatives and Options**

Providing reliable access between the regions and a Rangitikei River crossing was assessed between Utiku (10 km north of Mangaweka) and Ohingaiti (10 km southwest of Mangaweka). The areas near the northern and southern alternative routes do not provide sufficient access for the districts. Improving access at or near these locations would require significant upgrades along the routes. When considering servicing the areas and providing similar or improved travel times for the district, it was assessed that access is best provided near the western end of Ruahine Road and Mangaweka Township.

Two overarching alternatives for access were identified:

**Maintain Existing Bridge**

Maintaining the existing bridge with a range of options ranging from ‘Business as Usual’ through to Major Strengthening.

**New Bridge**

New bridge with options for location, form and function. Any new bridge would be designed to Class 1 and include HPMV and designed to meet NZTA Bridge Manual HN-HO-72.

A long list of 9 options (3 stand-alone options and 3 options with two subsets – ‘A’ and ‘B’ for 9 options in total) were established. The long list options were displayed along with their preliminary assessment on a series of posters around the room during the second workshop. Participants were then asked to review the long list of 9 options and identify those for the short
list, together with those that they thought were pragmatic responses to the problems that could be implemented.

The long list of options included the following:

**Option 1: Business as Usual (Do Minimum)**

The Do Minimum option is considered 'Business as Usual' with increasing maintenance and inspection cycles required to retain the current 6 tonne limit. Regular assessments and inspections are required to maintain confidence in the bridge integrity. Scour protection maintenance and further investigation of unknown risks such as geotechnical, seismic and fatigue is also required as bridge deterioration is expected to increase the risk of collapse.

The do minimum option includes undertaking some of the critical work identified in previous structural assessment and inspection reports, and considers:

**Option 2: Minor strengthening of existing bridge (26T-30T)**

Replacement of timber decking, running boards, handrail and kerbs. Replace timber girder with a steel beam, corrosion removal and strengthening of the transom. Pre-cast concrete seal replacement. Repainting the bridge to extend steel member life.

**Option 3: Major strengthening of the existing bridge (35T)**


**Option 4A: New bridge on existing alignment (53T – 80T)**

The existing bridge is removed and a new bridge is built at the same location. No access across the Rangitikei River at this location during bridge construction.

**Option 4B: New bridge on existing alignment (80T – 100T)**

The existing bridge is removed and a new bridge is built at the same location. No access during bridge construction. The new bridge design to allow for future proofing for increasing truck width and mass. Specific engineered design.

**Option 5A: New bridge adjacent to existing bridge (53T – 80T)**

A new bridge built either upstream or downstream of the existing bridge and approach improvement. Existing access across the river is maintained during the construction.

**Option 5B: New bridge adjacent existing bridge (80T – 100T)**

A new bridge built either upstream or downstream of the existing bridge. Construction to occur while access is maintained. The new bridge design to allow for future proofing for increasing truck width and mass. Specific engineered design.

**Option 6A: New bridge on a new alignment (53T – 80T)**

A new bridge built on a new alignment near the rail viaduct connecting Cage and Kawhatau Valley Road. Existing access across the river is maintained during the construction.

**Option 6B: New bridge on a new alignment (80T – 100T)**

A new bridge built on a new alignment near the rail viaduct connecting Cage and Kawhatau Valley Road or similar location. Construction to occur while access is maintained and the new bridge would be design to allow for future proofing increasing truck width and mass.

Following stakeholder and project team assessment of the long-list options, the following options were short-listed:
1. Option 1: Business as Usual (Do Minimum)
2. Option 5: New bridge adjacent to existing bridge
   i) Sub-options for 5 included 5A: 53 – 80 tonne, and 5B: 80 – 100 tonne

**Recommended Project Option**

The recommended project option is a replacement single-lane vehicle bridge adjacent to the existing Mangaweka Bridge. Optimisation in design and bridge width will be determined during the Detailed Business Case design phase, guided by the NZ Transport Agency Bridge Manual 2016. Other factors that will be considered that will influence a new bridge dimensions include the maximum span and slenderness, and improvements to the approach roads geometry.

![Potential New Bridge Alignment (Downstream of existing)](image)

**Figure 1 Potential New Bridge Alignment (Downstream of existing)**

Constructing a new bridge has a key emphasis on protecting the community cohesion between Mangaweka and those located on the eastern side of the bridge in the Rangiwahia and Kawhatau Valley communities. Demolition of the existing bridge is likely to be contentious issue as the community place high value in the bridge for heritage. Retaining the existing bridge is preferred, pending feasibility assessment and consultation with the community as it has the potential to contribute to local and district heritage assets. The bridge may retain function as the primary walking and cycling crossing over the river.

**Recommended Option Assessment**

The recommended option was assessed using the NZ Transport Agency Investment Assessment Framework and includes assessment against the Investment Objectives:

**Form and Function**

The form and function of the new Bridge would be designed to meet NZ Transport Agency Bridge Manual requirements for a 7.3-metre one-lane bridge width under HN-HO-72. The approach alignments would be altered to meet the new bridge alignment and consider design speed and tracking geometry for a B-train design vehicle.

**Safety Impacts**

Provision of a viable access point adjacent to the existing bridge will remove provide users the option instead of being forced to use the alternative routes. This will reduce the volume of vehicles, in particular heavy vehicles, on the alternative routes reducing the crash risk exposure.

**Travel Time**

The new bridge will reduce travel time to pre-weight restricted bridge – full operating conditions.
Continuity of Access

The new Bridge at Mangaweka adjacent to the existing, constructed within 5 years will provide reliable and continuous access. This includes during construction utilising the existing bridge.

Service Life

The new bridge will be designed to provide an access point at Mangaweka across the Rangitikei River with a service life of 100 years.

Investment Assessment Framework Assessment

An assessment using the NZ Transport Agency Investment Assessment Framework was undertaken involving rating the recommended project option across three factors, being the:

- Strategic fit of the problem, issue or opportunity that is being addressed;
- Effectiveness of the proposed solution; and
- Economic efficiency of the proposed solution.

An assessment profile of H-H-M was been determined for the project.

Strategic Fit

Replacement of the existing Mangaweka Bridge with a new Bridge is considered to have a High strategic fit rating as the problems and opportunities identified involve journeys for employment, economic and social opportunities, tourism and freight and was considered to have a significant gap in the customer service levels. In particular:

Journey time reliability

In absence of a reliable connection across Mangaweka Bridge, the alternative route is approximately 20 km increase from the Kawhatau Valley Road junction on Ruahine Road to State highway 1.

Resilience (including lifelines)

During a significant weather event, slips, mudslides and failures commonly occur on the alternative routes. Without reliable access at Mangaweka Bridge location, this contributes to a significant limitation in the ability for the network to cater to the consequences of disruptions and reduce the impacts of disruptions for the community.

Mismatched capacity and demand resulting in capacity constraints

The current 6 tonne weight limit does not meet the demand requirements for agricultural produce and forestry freight movements.

Effectiveness

An effectiveness assessment was undertaken with an overall rating considered to be High. This was assessed as the recommended option is considered an outcome that is focussed, integrated, correctly scoped, affordable and timely.

Economic Efficiency

Benefit and cost appraisal assessment considered the recommended option value for money.

For the existing Bridge there is an estimated refurbishment cost to address immediate issues and monitoring. In combination with the refurbishment cost for the existing bridge, the overall cost estimated for the recommended option is $9,922,000
For improvements to local roads and with the economic assessment undertaken, a benefit-cost ratio of 3.0 was achieved resulting in a Medium rating based on a BCR ≥ 3 and < 5.

**Funding Arrangements**

New Bridge cost will be through a joint funding arrangement between Manawatu District Council, Rangitikei District Council and the NZ Transport Agency. Cost share and funding assistance rates for each Council is outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Partner</th>
<th>FAR (%)</th>
<th>Estimated cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,331,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Transport Agency (Manawatu District Council FAR)</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>$2,629,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitikei District Council</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,835,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Transport Agency (Rangitikei District Council FAR)</td>
<td>63 %</td>
<td>$3,125,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>$9,922,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total NZ Transport Agency funding estimate from funding assistance rates: **$5,754,760**

**Commercial and Management**

Delivery of a new Bridge will be procured using Manawatu District Council’s ‘Procurement Policy’, which sets rules for planning procurement, approaching the market and contracting, and represents the Council’s standards of good practice for the procurement of goods and services.

Project management will be carried out by Manawatu District Council Infrastructure Shared Services staff. Procurement of suppliers for both professional services and physical works will be in accordance with established Procurement Policies of both Councils. Suppliers will be asked to issue twin invoices, one to each Council, reflecting a 50:50 cost share agreement.

**Detailed Business Case Scope**

The Detailed Business Case will be completed before commencing detailed design, property acquisition (if required), and consenting. It is assumed the following scope tasks will be included in the Detailed Business Case:

- Engagement and consultation with stakeholders and the public including the community, Horizons Regional Council, Iwi, Fish and Game, and major road users.
- Investigate potential land and property requirements.
- Early contractor consultation to discuss structural form options and to assess commercial viability. This is likely to include assessment of options constructability. Detailed Business Case phase will consider several structural configurations for consultation with suitable contractors. Consultation will include construction methodology, constructability and safety in design, availability of specialist plant and workforce, and timeframes.
- Preliminary geotechnical assessments: The Preliminary Geotechnical Appraisal will likely include a site visit and walk-over survey followed by a desktop study of the project area to establish the likely stratigraphy of the area and specific areas of geotechnical interest that may impact the project.

Following this a schedule of recommended geotechnical testing is to be prepared. This will include recommendations for critical testing required to progress design to a level of detail where any key geotechnical risks are managed. The schedule, where possible, will be staged to allow better understanding of the stratigraphy, more accurate positioning of testing and optimisation of the Client’s testing allocation.
The location of testing may be influenced by discussions with contractor(s) regarding span configurations, foundation locations and also in consultation with Horizons Regional Council, Manawatu District Council and Rangitikei District Council.

- Design development of the recommended option to sufficient design to provide an acceptable level of understanding around the risks and uncertainties to enable decision makers make an informed choice for the option to be taken forward to implementation.
- Assessment of impacts: a detailed appraisal of the impact of options using qualitative and quantitative techniques and analysis.
- Develop a scheme estimate: detailed analysis of the total public sector cost of options including investment costs, operating and maintenance costs.
- Risk and uncertainty: detailed analysis of risk and uncertainty associated with the options.
- Obtain independent peer reviews as required.
- Develop and refine the strategic, economic, financial, management and commercial aspects of the business case building on the outcomes of the Indicative Business Case.
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Digester Foundations Variation

Purpose

To approve an increase of the contingency amount for contract C4/16058 for the supply and installation of a new digester tank.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations

That the Council approves the increase in the contingency amount for contract C4/16058 by $150,000.00 (exclusive of GST), following the geotechnical investigations recommendations for the installation of a new digester tank at the Feilding Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Report prepared by:
Chris Pepper
Special Projects Manager

Approved for submission by:
Hamish Waugh
General Manager - Infrastructure

1 Executive Summary

1.1 The geotechnical investigations for the digester tank have revealed that more ground improvement works are required for the digester tank than originally anticipated at the time the contract was let. These improvement works are to provide seismic resistance to allow the tank to continue functioning after a major earthquake.

1.2 This requires an increase in the contingency amount of $150,000 to install a 2.0 metre deep gravel pad reinforced with geo-textiles to protect the tank.
2 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

2.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatu – the best rural lifestyle in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Background

3.1 The existing digester tank is at the end of its design life and the initial seismic assessment has revealed the need for a detailed seismic assessment on the existing tank. The first stage of the renewal is to acquire a new tank of a capacity of 2,000m$^3$. The new digester will also provide the Council with more flexibility and the ability to provide a back-up system to the anaerobic lagoon, to produce more gas, to utilise the gas better and to receive waste from new commercial businesses.

3.2 A contract with Reliant Solutions Ltd. for the supply and installation of a new digester tank, roof and mixing system at the Feilding Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is in place. The value of the contract is of $854,643.95 (exclusive of GST), plus a $100,000.00 contingency amount.

3.3 Because of the high Importance Level (IL4) of the digester, indicating it has special post-disaster function, the foundation must be appropriately designed for.

3.4 Cost for the foundation and civil works were estimated and were dependent on the geotechnical investigations.

3.5 The geotechnical interpretive report recommended four possible foundation options comprising either a pad, gravel raft, reinforced concrete or piled foundation. Due to the presence of fill, weak alluvial soils and shallow groundwater table a pad footing foundation would require a significant depth of ground treatment to ensure the settlement and stability requirements for the tank foundation were achieved.

3.6 The gravel raft with geogrid reinforcement was proposed as a foundation solution that would reduce the depth of any ground treatment required and would prove more cost effective than a deep foundation comprising of either driven or screwed steel piles. A reinforced gravel raft is designed to provide sufficient stiffness to limit undulations, tilt and uneven ground surface subsidence during a seismic event.

3.7 The anaerobic digester tank geogrid reinforced gravel raft foundation for the Feilding WWTP has been designed to comply with the applicable standards, procedures and codes listed below:

- AS/NZS1170.4 – 2002 ‘Earth Retaining Structures’ for the geotechnical design of soil nail wall; and
3.8 Reliant Solutions Ltd.’s quote for the ground works below the concrete slab and footings is of $199,997.00 exclusive of GST. This is in excess of the contingency amount allowed at the time of tender award.

4 Discussion and Options considered

4.1 Considering the ground conditions at the location of the future digester tank and the Importance Level of the digester post-disaster, the most cost-effective foundation solution is a geogrid reinforced gravel raft. Other solutions would require a significant depth of ground treatment to ensure sufficient settlement and stability.

4.2 The Engineer’s estimate for the digester ground works, based on rates for the septage receiving facility at the entrance of the Feilding wastewater treatment plant, is of $221k.

4.3 Reliant Solutions Ltd.’s quote of $199,997.00 exclusive of GST is below engineer’s estimate.

4.4 If approved, Reliant Solutions Ltd.’s contractor can start the foundation works immediately.

4.5 Another advantage on contracting Reliant Solutions Ltd. for the subgrade works and foundation is that the supervision would be done by Reliant Solutions Ltd. ensuring an integration with the installation of the digester tank already part of their contract.

5 Operational Implications

5.1 The digester has special post-disaster function. The design of the geogrid reinforced gravel raft ensures the digester is still operational after a disaster or seismic event.

5.2 There is no operating expenditure implications or maintenance costs associated with the foundation works for the new digester tank.

6 Financial implications

6.1 The project budget for asset renewals in the LTP is $1,325,000 of which $955,000 were committed.

6.2 The current breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feilding WWTP digester cost estimate as of July 2017</th>
<th>LTP Budget</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digester mechanical refurbishment</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digester structural refurbishment</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digester roof refurbishment</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Digestion Project Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,325,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of digester equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>855,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>100,000 + 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,325,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,105,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The value of the proposed digester contract is $854,643.95 (exclusive of GST). An increase of the contingency amount to $250,000.00 (exclusive of GST) is requested.

This funding is allocated within the WWTP renewals budget.

7 Statutory Requirements
7.1 There are no statutory requirements.

8 Delegations
8.1 The value of the variation requested requires the approval of the Council.

9 Consultation
9.1 There are no community consultation requirements associated with this matter.

10 Cultural Considerations
10.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this matter.

11 Conclusion
11.1 The process undertaken highlights the need for subgrade and foundation works. The most cost-effective solution identified is a reinforced geogrid gravel raft. Reliant Solutions Ltd., with whom a contract for the supply and installation of a new digester tank is already in place, has supervised the geotechnical investigations and reinforced gravel raft design. Their proposal for the subgrade works is of $199,997.00 (exclusive of GST). This proposal should be accepted and the contingency amount for contract C4/16058 should be increased by $150,000.00 (exclusive of GST).

12 Attachments
Nil.
Annual Report on Dog Control 2016-17

Purpose

To present the Annual Report on Dog Control for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017 to Council for adoption.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations

That Council adopts the Annual Report on Dog Control for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017 pursuant to section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Report prepared by:
Allie Dunn
Governance Team Leader

Approved for submission by:
Karel Boakes
Acting General Manager - Corporate and Regulatory

1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatu – the best rural lifestyle in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2  **Background**

2.1  Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires that the Council in respect of each financial year, report on the administration of its Dog Control Policy adopted under section 10; and its dog control practices.

2.2  The Council must give public notice of the report and within one month after adopting the report, send a copy of the report to the Secretary for Local Government.

3  **Discussion and Options considered**

3.1  Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 states that the report must include:

(a)  the number of registered dogs in the territorial authority district;

(b)  the number of probationary owners and disqualified owners in the territorial authority district;

(c)  the number of dogs in the territorial authority district classified as dangerous under section 31 and the relevant provision under which the classification is made;

(d)  the number of dogs in the territorial authority district classified as menacing under section 33A or section 33C and the relevant provision under which the classification is made;

(e)  the number of infringement notices issued by the territorial authority;

(f)  the number of dog related complaints received by the territorial authority in the previous year and the nature of those complaints; and

(g)  the number of prosecutions taken by the territorial authority under the Dog Control Act.

3.2  The information required by the Dog Control Act 1996 is reported in the Annual Report on Dog Control to 30 June 2017, attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

4  **Operational Implications**

4.1  There are no capital or operating expenditure / maintenance costs associated with this matter.

5  **Financial implications**

5.1  There are no financial implications associated with this matter.

6  **Statutory Requirements**

6.1  Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires Council to adopt the annual report on dog control.
7 Delegations
7.1 Council has delegated authority to make a decision on this matter.

8 Consultation
8.1 There are no community consultation requirements associated with this matter.

9 Cultural Considerations
9.1 There are no cultural considerations to be taken into account in association with this matter.

10 Conclusion
10.1 The report on Dog Control for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017 in Appendix 1 to this report sets out the information required by the Dog Control Act 1996 to be reported on, and is provided to Council for adoption.

11 Attachments

- Annual Report on Dog Control to 30 June 2017.
Annual Report on Dog Control

1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017
PART 1 – Dog Control Policy and Practices

Dog Control in the District
The focus of dog control has been on responding to service requests and complaints within the timeframes set by Council through its Long Term Plan and Annual Plan.

Animal Control Officers have, in this period, made concerted efforts at being pro-active in the detection of offences. This was specifically targeted at dogs that were un-registered, and also dogs that were allowed to wander. This strategy significantly reduced both the instances of un-registered dogs and also wandering dogs.

Pro-active efforts were also made to ensure that all dogs were classified correctly in accordance with the provisions of the Dog Control Act 1996.

A joint service agreement is provided in partnership with the Rangitikei and Manawatu Districts. A Senior Animal Control Officer is based between the two areas and two Animal Control Officers are based in Feilding.

Animal Control Officers respond to priority one calls after hours. Priority One calls include dog attacks and secured wandering dogs.

Nuisance from dogs
Animal Control Officers have visited every property within the district known to have had a dog, and where none was registered. As a result and on locating dogs, owners were ultimately infringed if the dog(s) remained unregistered, and in some cases dogs were impounded. Animal Control maintain a list containing all dogs classified as menacing, this relating to classification by either the provisions of sections 33A and/or 33C of the Dog Control Act 1996. Physical checks have occurred within this period to ensure that all dogs classified as menacing, regardless of the reason why, comply with the requirements of the classification.

Prohibited public places, dog on leash areas and dog exercise areas
There are specific areas within the Manawatu District Council area designated for exercise, lead only and prohibited areas.

Animal Control Officers approach any breaches of these requirements in an educational manner, with any issue of infringements undertaken as a last resort.
Fees for Dog Control and Registration

The registration fees for the 2016-17 financial year were made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Discounted fee if paid by 1 August 2016</th>
<th>Standard Fee if paid after 1 August 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General registration</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$145.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutered / spayed</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working dogs / selected owners / gold card</td>
<td>$31.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous dogs classified under the Dog Control Act 1996</td>
<td>$145.50</td>
<td>$218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing dogs classified under the Dog Control Act 1996</td>
<td>$145.50</td>
<td>$218.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Assist registration</td>
<td>No charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council's approach to owners of unregistered dogs is that the Animal Control Officers conduct property inspections, owners are issued verbal or written warnings followed by the serving of an infringement notice, and as a final measure if absolutely necessary, impounding.

Classification of owners and dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Type</th>
<th>Number of Dogs as at 30 June 2016</th>
<th>Number of Dogs as at 30 June 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General registration</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected owners</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>1,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutered dogs</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous dogs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working dogs</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>1,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability assist dogs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing dogs</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Card</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education relating to dogs

Manawatu District Council provides an education programme that is conducted in schools, pre-schools and Kohanga Reo on an annual basis. The goal of this programme is to deliver educational services to all schools within the district.

Animal Control Officers make themselves available to assist owners with help or advice on dog obedience and courses available. Animal Control Officers regularly provide advice and guidance in relation to specific behavioural matters.
## PART 2 – Statistical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>For Period 01 July 2015 – 30 June 2016</th>
<th>For Period 01 July 2016 – 30 June 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Registered Dogs</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>7,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Probationary Owners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disqualified Owners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dangerous Dogs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dangerous by Owner Conviction Under s31(1)(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dangerous by Sworn Evidence s31(1)(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dangerous by Owner Admittance in Writing s31(1)(c)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dangerous Dogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menacing under s33A(1)(b)(i) – i.e. by behavior</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menacing under s33A(1)(b)(ii) by Breed Characteristics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menacing under s33C(1) by Schedule 4 Breed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Menacing Dogs</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Infringement Notices issued</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Complaints Received issued</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attacks – People</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attacks – Animals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Barking</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Roaming</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Rushing/Aggressive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Inspections</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Found/Secured</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Registration/Request for Information</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Animal Complaint/Welfare</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Prosecutions Taken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renaming of Memory Lane to Reighton Lane

Purpose
To present for Council consideration a petition to rename “Memory Lane” to “Reighton Lane”.

Significance of Decision
The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations
That the Council accepts the petition from residents of Memory Lane, Ashhurst and agrees to rename Memory Lane to Reighton Lane, subject to the petitioners meeting all costs associated with renaming of the road.

OR

That the Council declines the petition from residents of Memory Lane, Ashhurst and the road continue to be named Memory Lane.

Report prepared by:
Allie Dunn
Governance Team Leader

Approved for submission by:
Shayne Harris
General Manager - Corporate and Regulatory
1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

*Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatu – the best rural lifestyle in New Zealand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatu District will improve the natural environment, stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.</th>
<th>The Manawatu will attract and retain residents.</th>
<th>Manawatu district develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatu and its people are connected via quality infrastructure and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatu’s built environment is safe, reliable and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatu District Council is an agile and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Background

2.1 Council has received a petition from residents of Memory Lane, Ashhurst, asking that this road be renamed to “Reighton Lane”.

2.2 The petition has been signed by the required number of property owners for presentation to Council for consideration.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 Memory Lane in Ashhurst is a private right of way off Colyton Road, next to the boundary with Palmerston North City. Refer Figure 1 below:

![Figure 1 - Location of Memory Lane](image)

3.2 The residents of the road have requested that the name of their road be changed from “Memory Lane” to “Reighton Lane.” A copy of their petition is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
3.3 The Council has an internal policy for Road Naming, which includes the procedure to be followed when officers receive a request to rename an existing road. This procedure sets out the following requirements for such requests:

1. The request takes the form of a petition signed by at least 80% of the owners and occupiers whose properties front the road;

2. The name suggested by the applicants must meet the criteria for selection of road names set out within the policy; and

3. The applicants or petitioners agree to meet all costs and disbursements incurred by Council (including costs of name blade, renumbering, and administration).

3.4 The name proposed by the petitioners meets the criteria for selection as a road name, including not duplicating any existing road names with the Manawatu District and Palmerston North City areas.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 The Council’s Road Naming Policy requires the applicants or petitioners to meet all costs and disbursements incurred by Council in renaming the road, including the costs of name blade, renumbering and administration.

5 Financial Implications

5.1 As set out under 4.1 above, the costs associated with renaming the road are to be met by the applicants or petitioners.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Section 319 of the Local Government Act 1974 sets out the general powers of Councils in respect of roads. Section 319(1)(j) gives Council the power “to name and to alter the name of any road and to place on any building or erection on or abutting on any road a plate bearing the name of the road.”

6.2 Under section 319A of the Local Government Act 1974, if the Council names any road for the first time, or alters the name of a road, the Council must as soon as practicable send a copy of the relevant resolution to the Registrar-General of Land and the Surveyor-General.

7 Delegations

7.1 The authority under section 319A of the Local Government Act 1974 to approve road names proposed by subdividers is delegated to the Council’s Land Administration Officer.

7.2 However where a request is received to rename an existing road, the applicant is asked to obtain support of 80% of the owners or occupiers of the road in question and present their request to Council for consideration.
8 Consultation

8.1 There are no community consultation requirements associated with this matter. The applicant has indicated that 80% of land owners have signed the petition to rename the road. The renaming two pending owners (titles yet to be transferred) have also signed the petition to show their support.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this report.

10 Conclusion

10.1 The owners of the properties in Memory Lane, Ashhurst, have asked that their road be renamed and have suggested “Reighton Lane” for the new name.

10.2 The proposed name meets all of the criteria followed by officers for naming of roads within the Manawatu District.

10.3 The Council is asked to either approve the change in name from Memory Lane to Reighton Lane, or to decline to rename the road.

11 Attachments

• Petition to rename Memory Lane, Ashhurst
Sue Williams  
Technical Business Support Officer – Land Info  
Manawatu District Council  
Private Bag 10 001  
FEILDING 4743

Dear Ms Williams

RE – MEMORY LANE

Please find enclosed a new petition for the renaming of Memory Lane to Reighton Lane.

As indicated by you in your letter of 13 June 2017, the suggestion of Reighton Lane would be the option most likely to be acceptable to Council. We also feel this name would be acceptable to Mr Williamson (the developer) as Reighton is the birth place of his grandmother (or mother?).

We are lodging this objection to the name of ‘Memory Lane’, for the following reasons:

- At the time of first development and purchase of the first three sections, Mr Williamson made it very clear that his intention was to name the right-of-way ‘Reighton Gates’. He showed residents at the time a drawing showing a proposed brick entrance way with the name ‘Reighton Gates on it.’

- The name ‘Memory Lane’ is better known as a colloquial saying referring to an act of remembering – rather than a place that actually exists, and therefore, in our opinion is not appropriate for naming a road. Anecdotally, people have commented that the name Memory Lane is a ‘joke ‘and have also commented they wouldn’t like to live in a property named Memory Lane. Our concern is that being called Memory Lane would be detrimental to the resale of our properties.

- The proposed name does not have any local significance, nor does it reflect the character of a modern subdivision.

- A Google search and a Wises street search did not show any other Memory Lanes in New Zealand (in fact, only one other was found in US). This clearly shows that Memory Lane is definitely not a common choice and/or it does not conform to many other Council street naming policies.

We provide the following signatures of the current residents/land owners of the subdivision in support of this application for review. As you can see this petition is signed by at least 80% of the landowners of the properties that front the road in question.
1443B Mr Danny McKenna
1443C Mr Paul Greig
1443E Mr Martin Hughes
1443F Mr Grant Wackildene
1443G Mr Ross Judd

The remaining two pending owners (title yet to be transferred) have also signed this petition showing their support. This indicates we have 100% support for a name change from current and pending landowners.

1443D Mr Daryl June
1443H Mr Corey Walton

Please feel free to contact me at any time on , or . Again, we respectfully ask that the Council seriously consider the alternative name we have put forward. We look forward to your favourable response.

Yours faithfully

Danny McKenna – on behalf of land owners.