COUNCIL

AGENDA

Meeting to be held

THURSDAY 22 JUNE 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
   Kevin Barron of the Feilding Baptist Church will open the meeting in prayer

2. APOLOGIES

3. REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE
   Her Worship the Mayor – 26 June to 7 July 2017

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
   Draft resolution
   
   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.

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 FEILDING HIGH SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM
   Representatives from the Feilding High School Robotics Team will speak about their attendance at the Vex IQ Robotics World Championships held in Louisville, Kentucky USA on 23 to 25 April 2017.

   6.2 ABBEY WEBB
   Abbey Webb will speak 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.

7. PRESENTATIONS
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 **FIRE AND EMERGENCY NEW ZEALAND – TRANSFER OF RESPONSE ASSETS**


10.2 **ADOPTION OF ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18**


10.3 **RATES RESOLUTION**


10.4 **LOAN BORROWING 2017-18**


10.5 **SETTING OF FEES AND CHARGES 2017-18**


10.6 **ADOPTION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN**


10.7 **CCO EXEMPTIONS**

10.8  MANAWATU COMMUNITY TRUST – STATEMENT OF INTENT


10.9  SECTION 17A REVIEW CONFIRMATION


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
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>a) 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, under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.</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.

13.  MEETING CLOSURE
Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Council held on Wednesday 10 May 2017, commencing at 9.15am 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 Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Cr Howard Voss

IN ATTENDANCE: Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Ross Wheeler (Strategic Accountant)
Maria Brenssell (Executive Assistant – Mayor)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
Kirsten Pike (Parks and Property Officer – Legal)
Cameron Brown (Parks and Property Cadet)
David McMillan (Solid Waste and Recycling Officer)
Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)
Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)
John Jones (Roading Assets Manager)
Glenn Young (Utility Projects Manager)
Chris Pepper (Senior Projects Engineer)

MDC 17/128 MEETING OPENING

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting open.

MDC 17/129 APOLOGIES

RESOLVED

That apologies for lateness be accepted from Councillor Alison Short.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED

MDC 17/130 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Michael Ford – Submission #0319 Feilding Little Theatre Players
Councillor Steve Bielski – Submission #0316 Rangiwahia Community Committee
Councillor Hilary Humphrey – Submission #0457 Nikki Speedy
Councillor Barbara Cameron – Submission #0402 MidCentral District Health Board

MDC 17/131 ACCEPTANCE OF LATE SUBMISSIONS

Late submissions received after the close of submissions were tabled for Council consideration.

RESOLVED

That the following submissions received after the close of submissions be accepted as late submissions:

0496 – Lynne Devonshire
0497 – Joshua Brown
0498 – Sandra Pinfold and Phillip Whanga
0499 – Te Kawau Memorial Recreation Centre
0500 – Susan and Richard Skelton
0501 – Nichole Wells
0502 – Feilding Croquet Club

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford

CARRIED

MDC 17/132 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

The Strategy Manager, Tracey Hunt, gave a presentation outlining the consultation undertaken and providing an analysis of the submissions received.

The General Manager – Community and Strategy and the Chief Financial Officer gave a presentation regarding the revenue policies, how the policies fit together and what drives Council’s revenue requirements and funding decisions.

The meeting adjourned at 10.05am and reconvened at 10.25am.

Councillor Short joined the meeting at 10.25am.

SUBMISSIONS #0015, #0199 and #0202 - HIMATANGI BEACH COMMUNITY TRUST INC – GEORGE ANNEAR

George Annear spoke in support of the submissions from the Himatangi Beach Community Trust Inc seeking funding from Council towards the annual cost of putting up the Community Christmas lights in time for the annual “Light Up Himatangi” festival.
being held from 3 to 5 June 2017. They also sought upgrade of the mens urinals in the beach community hall advising that the urinals were very noisy, and interfere with use of the hall. He spoke about their request to place a concrete deck at rear fire escape at hall, to improve wheelchair egress from the hall. They also sought funding to complete the resealing of the carpark.

Mr Annear spoke in support of his submission regarding the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan noting he was against kerbside recycling for Himatangi beach. He believed the current recycling station worked well, especially for their large non-resident population and daytrippers.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0019 – MANAWATU BLOKART CLUB

Robert Deighton, of the Manawatu Blokart Club, thanked Her Worship the Mayor and Councillors for their support to date. He acknowledged the road frontage he had submitted about had already been dealt with. He spoke about trees on southern boundary that he would like to have removed, and suggested improvements to the entrance way. He gave a short video presentation.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0016 - JOHN SEIFERT

John Seifert spoke in support of his submission seeking additional street lighting to be installed in Blenheim Place, Feilding. He noted the current level of lighting caused problems with visibility and safety.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

Councillor Ford left the meeting at 11.18am and returned at 11.21am.

SUBMISSION #0457 – NIKKI SPEEDY

Nikki Speedy spoke in support of her submission seeking a fenced playground to be provided in Feilding for under five year olds. She gave examples of parks in other regions that cater for this age group and suggested completing the fencing for the under five’s playground at Kowhai Park, and subletting space for a coffee cart at that park. Another suggestion could be fundraising within the community to provide such a facility.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0131 – JAMES BEARD

James Beard spoke in support of his submission regarding the border between the Manawatu District and Palmerston North City District.

He advised that he had been in his property for 32 years, and had been lobbying for the border between Palmerston North City and the Manawatu District to be changed so that his property could be within the Manawatu District, rather than part of Palmerston North City. It was noted that prior to the 1989 amalgamation, his property had fallen within the Kairanga County Council area.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.
The meeting adjourned at 11.51am and reconvened at 1.00pm

SUBMISSION #0132 – AWAHURI FOREST-KITCHENER PARK TRUST – GEOFF LOVEGROVE

Trustees Geoff Lovegrove, Jill Darragh, and Chris Symonds spoke in support of their submission highlighting a key issue for the Trust which was the need for public toilets to be installed in Awahuri Forest / Kitchener Park.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0153 – ADELE L GIBB QSM

Adele Gibb spoke in support of her submission regarding the potential of the Manawatu Garden Festival being held in the future, and how this could be organised. She proposed that if the event was run again that it should be held at Manfeild.

She then spoke in support of her submission to the Waste Minimisation Management Plan, advising that she believed better value would be gained by educating people rather than providing a kerbside collection of food scraps. She spoke about the Camellia Walk which she felt had gone into decay. Lastly she spoke in support of retaining both the native and the exotic aviaries.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0001 – MANAWATU AVICULTURAL SOCIETY

Yvonne Green spoke in support of the submission from the Manawatu Avicultural Society, noting the society’s disappointment in the level of maintenance of the aviaries and seeking advice on where the birds would be relocated to should the aviaries be closed.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0220 - HALCOMBE SCHOOL

Halcombe School Principal Sue Simpson and four students spoke in support of their submission and gave a powerpoint presentation outlining their concerns about the lack of safe parking options surrounding Halcombe School.

Following questions, they were thanked by for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSIONS #0211 AND #0213 - TREVOR WITT

Trevor Witt spoke in support of his submission, outlining examples of good family friendly play ground facilities in other areas, for example Palmerston North, Levin and Tauranga. He also spoke regarding his submission to the Waste Management Minimisation Plan, applauding the proposal to recycle compostable waste.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0304 - GEORGIA JENKINS

Georgia Jenkins spoke in support of her submission regarding the future of the property formally known as the Kimbolton Playcentre at 4 Lind Street. She noted the building was
listed as an education building and that Ruahine Kindergarten Association staff were enthusiastic to open it for use as a Kindergarten.

She advised they would be making a formal proposal to the board later this month, then they plan to present this information to Council. Have contacted people already with 18 children listed, 19 families, could have 20 kids per day and a further 10 children registered under two who would use it in the future.

Members of the Manawatu Rural Support Services were in attendance and advised that the proposed Kindergarten would follow the national curriculum including bi lingual and cultural aspect of formal childhood learning, which is unique for a kindergarten.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

The meeting adjourned at 2.45pm and reconvened at 3.00pm

SUBMISSION #0172 – PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR GRANT SMITH

Palmerston North City Council Mayor Grant Smith spoke in support of his Council’s submission. He acknowledged that both Councils work well together. He noted the valuable contribution the Manawatu District Council makes to the regional museum at Te Manawa, which was used by people from the Manawatu district. He encouraged Manawatu District Council to continue their contribution towards Food HQ, noting it was a point of difference in our area and a worthy organisation. He spoke about the long term benefits of CEDA. He felt that the Palmerston North to Feilding cycle way needed a combined effort made by the city and district and suggested a joint approach to NZTA.

With regard to the Materials Recovery Facility, he would like Manawatu District Council to look at saving costs by utilising the Palmerston North facility at the Awapuni landfill. He also spoke about the changes to Civil Defence coming at a national level, acknowledged Manawatu District Council was very strong in that area and encouraged Manawatu District Council to stay engaged with Civil Defence at regional level.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0260 – TIMONA PARK ORCHARD TRUST

Barbara Robson and members of the Timona Park Orchard Trust were present to speak in support of their submission. She spoke about the work undertaken by the Trust, noting there were three divisions of the trust focusing on planting trees to provide fruit, regenerating bush, and working with Council on the wetlands. She advised that planning was going well for winter fruit trees. They aimed to remove exotic trees which don’t provide food. Members thanked the Council Parks team for all the work that has been done, including removal of willow tree and successful weed spraying programme. The Trust would like to see spraying continued, clearing of pond floor and adding clay to bottom of the pond for water retention and contouring banks of wetland.

Barbara Robson also expressed concern about flooding and sewage, noting that flooding had been bad prior to 2004 but nothing to that extent, and that recent clearing had helped, however there were still some problems that need to be addressed.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.
**SUBMISSION #0243 – IAN BAYLIS**

Ian Baylis spoke in support of his submission regarding the Kowhai Park Aviaries.

He suggested establishing a “Friends of Kowhai Park” group that could work together with Council, community, organisations and companies to fundraise to support the aviaries.

Jude Drake from the Aviaries spoke in support of Ian Baylis’s submission, advising that she had looked after the birds at the park for four years, and previously raised and released birds from SPCA.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

**SUBMISSION #0383 – FEILDING HIGH SCHOOL**

Principal Martin O’Grady and teachers from Feilding High School spoke in support of their submission seeking consideration of a multipurpose facility, noting there were inadequate facilities for Feilding sporting clubs. They asked that the Council commission a feasibility study.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

**SUBMISSION #0409 - ASHLEY BURROWES**

Ashley Burrowes spoke in support of his submission, advising that he regarded the aviaries at Kowhai Park as a heritage asset as well as an educational resource and tourism asset, and did not support the aviaries being closed. He offered to undertake a cost vs benefit analysis for keeping the aviaries. He proposed promoting the aviaries as more of a tourist attraction to bring in sources of income and grants.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

**SUBMISSIONS #0293 AND #0492 - MANAWATU YOUTH AMBASSADORS – HANNA GRACE AND ALEX SHORT**

Manawatu Youth Ambassadors Hanna Grace and Alex Short spoke in support of their submissions.

Hanna spoke about the gap for youth wanting to travel in New Zealand or abroad and the difficulty in fundraising for expensive trips. The Manawatu Youth Ambassadors would like to be able to administer a discretionary fund of $2000 that would help provide the opportunity for students to go on trips to come back more intelligent, educated individuals. They would like to be able to inspire young people to reach for their dreams despite financial implications.

Alex Short spoke in support of her submission seeking additional public toilets at Timona Park, and suggested providing user pays shower facilities as well.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

**SUBMISSION #0352 - MIKE STONE**

Mike Stone spoke in support of his submission, advising that he was a new resident and had been involved with the national wildlife centre trust. He felt there was an opportunity for revitalisation at Kitchener Park.
Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0486 – COMMUNITY AND STRATEGY GROUP

General Manager - Community and Strategy Brent Limmer spoke in support of his submission, providing clarification on:

- joint Library and Makino card;
- item 4.7 Makino Precinct – Skatepark and Development;
- Item 2.1 Long Term Plan 2018-28;
- Item 2.2 Spatial Plan;
- item 4.3 Asbestos Management Plan;
- item 5.2 Maintenance of Halls.

SUBMISSION #0484 – CORPORATE AND REGULATORY GROUP

General Manager - Corporate and Regulatory Shayne Harris spoke in support of his submission, noting that updated figures for implementation of the Electronic Document Records Management System (JARVIS) would be available at the end of the month. He also provided clarification about the recruitment of an additional building officer.

SUBMISSION #0485 – INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP

General Manager – Infrastructure Hamish Waugh spoke in support of his submission noting a late addition to his submission 'Pohangina Road Resilience Project. He advised that it was requested to increase the Subsidised Renewals budget (Sealed Pavement Rehabilitation) by $671,664 in the 2017/18 financial year. This project will attract 53% funding from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) through their newly create Resilience Work Category resulting in a local share of $315,682. The project site is located 16 kilometres north of Pohangina on the west side of the Pohangina Valley Road. Erosion at the site became apparent during the 2004 Flood Event when one lane was lost to an underslip. At that time, Council reinstated the culvert, shifted the road away from the escarpment, restored both lanes, and installed a permanent steel safety barrier. Council has continued to monitor the site and observed that on average erosion is continuing at an approximate rate of 100mm per year, estimating approximately 12 months left on the road.

It was asked that photos of the affected area of Pohangina Road be provided for deliberations.

MDC 17/133 MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 5.40pm, to reconvene Thursday 11 May 2017 at 8.30am in the Council Chambers 135 Manchester Street, Feilding.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:
Minutes of a reconvened extraordinary meeting of the Council held on Thursday 11 May 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 Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Cr Howard Voss

IN ATTENDANCE: Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Doug Tate (Community Facilities Manager)
Rachel Carr (Parks and Property Officer)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
Kirsten Pike (Parks and Property Officer – Legal)
Brook Rush (Community and Strategy Operations Officer)
Ross Wheeler (Strategic Accountant)
Claire Stewart (Planning Officer)
Cynthia Ward (Senior Policy Planner)
Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)

MDC 17/134 MEETING OPENING

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting open.

MDC 17/135 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS - CONTINUED

General Manager – Community and Strategy advised that if elected members had any questions that had arisen following the Hearing of submissions on Wednesday 10 May, that he was happy to take those now or members could provide them in writing.

SUBMISSIONS #0415 AND #0416 - CHELTENHAM COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Keith Robertson, Chair of Cheltenham Community Committee, Committee members Dave and Pauline Scott, and owners of Cheltenham hotel were in attendance to speak to their submissions. They circulated information regarding the drainage problems in Cheltenham. Regarding the Waste Minimisation Management Plan, most of the committee were happy to continue bringing their recycling to the Kawakawa Road recycling station, and did not support paying additional fees. However they would
support a mini recycling centre being located in the village as a better option for their community.

Regarding their submission on stormwater, Keith spoke about how stormwater had been a long-standing problem within the village. He referred to the circulated photographs. They asked that a survey be undertaken for the whole of the village to understand the stormwater flow, and then formulate a cohesive plan.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0465 – GREEN TEAM, MANCHESTER STREET SCHOOL

Students from the Green Team at Manchester Street School spoke in support of their submission asking for a public toilet to be provided at Kitchener Park.

They spoke about how they love the park and had been helping to plant trees in Kitchener Park, some of which they had grown from seeds given to them by Mr Scott. However because there were no toilets at the park, their planting time needed to be short and they did not want to leave the park as they enjoy planting time so much. They also enjoy learning about birds and insects and how Maori used the plants as medicines.

Their school is an Enviroschool and they try to take positive actions to care for the environment. Being at Kitchener Park had shown them how special being in the bush is and they enjoy nature and fresh air. Helping their community is important to them. By growing and planting trees, they feel they are doing a useful service for the community and they take pride in what they do in Kitchener Park.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0438 - HIMATANGI BEACH COMMUNITY PATROL

Members of the Himatangi Beach Community Patrol, Chris and Brian Roswell, Marty O’Fee and Renee van de Beer spoke in support of their submission. They asked for funding assistance towards providing a secure garage for their community patrol vehicle. They also sought assistance with the running costs of the community patrol vehicle.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0437 - HIMATANGI BEACH COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Marty O’Fee, from the Himatangi Beach Community Committee, spoke about their community plan and thanked Council for allowing them to progress the things that make the community a much better place for residents and visitors.

With regard to their community committee funding, he asked that the unspent funding be carried forward to 2017-18 financial year.

He also spoke about the need for funding for resurfacing and draining of the car park area.

With regard to the recycling centre, the committee supported continuing with the current recycling centre that works well for part time residents and full time residents. They felt that changing to kerbside removal of recyclables would be detrimental to the community, for example due to weather conditions, part time residents leaving the area.
on Sunday night. They also asked for completion of the Himatangi Street footpath, which was in the work programme for the 2015-16 year and had not eventuated. They asked that the mini putt course next to tennis courts be removed, and replaced with a grassed area that could have barbecues and a water fountain installed. They would like the tennis court upgrade to be included in the long-term plan, as this had the potential to be used more fully if the surface condition was improved.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

The hearing adjourned at 9.50am and reconvened at 10.14am

SUBMISSION #0429 - FEILDING BAPTIST CHURCH

Eleanor Keyte-Bailey spoke in support of their submission regarding improvements to green spaces and aesthetics within the town. She felt that parking needed to be provided within the town centre. Grateful for recent increased parking in Bowen Street, another opportunity for increased parking for shoppers and patrons and during special events. She referred to the current green space behind the Baptist Church and Archives Central, noting that green spaces add to the health and aesthetics of a town. She believed that this area set out well had the potential to be a great multipurpose green space, with plantings, and a car park for everyday use. She gave the example of permeable grass paving between Archives and Hobson Street which would enable parking but in an aesthetic way.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0364 AND #0365 - ANN FULLERTON

Ann Fullerton spoke in support of her submission regarding kerbside recycling opposing changes to the current system. She believed it would be a big expense for no real gain within the village.

She then spoke in support of her submission to the draft Annual Plan. She would like rates increases ended and a sinking lid policy to staffing levels. She felt there was a problem with government offloading responsibilities to local government and felt Councils should stand up to the government on this.

She also spoke about organic control of introduced pest plants and suggested that Council ask Lincoln University to research the use of tagetes minuta for pest control.

She spoke about the benefit of using gypsum to improve viability of soil and its ability to absorb water and carry it away. She suggested providing sacks of gypsum to those that need it to sprinkle on their berms, which she felt would help prevent flooding and ponding.

She also spoke about her concerns about a proposal for Singapore to share the Ohakea base.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0368 - JOHN KEY

John Key spoke in support of his submission regarding the Feilding Wastewater Treatment Plant and the digester that Council intended purchasing.
He also expressed concern with the transparency with which Council does its business.

John Key then spoke about District Plan Review, expressing concern with the length of time the review is taking and how it is being funded.

He was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

_Councillor Ford left the meeting at 11.16am and returned at 11.18am._

**SUBMISSION #0400 - OVATION NEW ZEALAND LTD**

Alistair Bayliss spoke in support of their submission on the proposed trade waste charges which were proposed to come into effect from 1 July 2017. He highlighted their concern about the level of increase in the proposed charges noting the impact on their business would be severe.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

**SUBMISSION #0369 AND #0370 – CANCER SOCIETY OF NEW ZEALAND**

It was noted that representatives were no longer able to attend to speak to their submission due to unforeseen circumstances.

_Meeting adjourned at 11.52am and reconvened at 12.55pm._

**SUBMISSION #0288 - MARY READER**

Mary Reader spoke in support of her submission against the proposed Waste Minimisation Management Plan and circulated a copy of additional information to support her information. She believed the current recycling system in Himatangi Beach worked well and did not need changing.

**SUBMISSION #0169 – SUE TRAYLING AND JIM COOK**

Sue Trayling and Jim Cook gave a presentation regarding suggestions for improving the Kowhai Park aviaries.

They suggested relocating the aviaries to Kitchener Park where a walk through aviary that could hold most of the birds at Kowhai Park could be built.

They were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

**SUBMISSION #0360 - JUDY HOWATSON**

Judy Howatson spoke in support of her submission against the proposed recycling collection at Himatangi Beach. She felt the current recycling centre worked well and was concerned about the possibility of recycling bins being left outside properties with no one able to bring the bin back inside the property. Although the kerbside collection would be a good idea for cities, she did not believe it would work well in a holiday beachside community.

She was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.
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SUBMISSION #0294 – LYNNE AND EVAN KROLL

Evan Kroll spoke in support of the submission from himself and Lynne Kroll, opposing changes to the current recycling system proposed for Himatangi Beach. He noted that they own a holiday home, and are only there on weekends. They would not like see a change to their current system.

Following questions, they were thanked by Her Worship the Mayor.

Councillor Bielski left the meeting at 1.44pm and returned at 1.46pm

Councillor Marsh left the meeting at 1.44pm and returned at 1.47pm

SUBMISSION #0239 AND #0240 - PARA KORE MARAE INC

Urs Signer and Ripeka Goddard spoke in support of the submission from Para Kore Marae Inc. Ripeka noted she came to Council last year to speak about kerbside recycling and the Para Kore initiative.

Urs spoke to his presentation regarding waste minimisation. Para Kore means zero waste. He spoke about using recyclable kete to gather kai moana, growing kumara with no food miles involved. He spoke about problems with waste in industries digging up oil and coal, resource depletion. With regard to plastic waste in our oceans, by 2030 it was estimated there would be more plastic in the ocean than fish. Para Kore is a solution to the problems we all face regarding problems in the environment. He showed images of where Para Kore came from. Para Kore was launched in 2009 and they have more than 175 plus Para Kore marae currently in the programme. He noted they would be applying to the Waste Minimisation Fund with a goal of having this programme available in our rohe starting from early next year.

The application to the Waste Management Fund would be for a three-year project, currently building relationships so if successful with their fund application they could roll this out early next year. His submission to Council was for moral and financial support so we can start this and work with our marae to implement Para Kore.

It was asked that Para Kore be invited to make a presentation to Nga Manu Taiko Manawatu District Council.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0439 - HIWINUI COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Brenda Lee, Principal of Hiwinui School, representing adults of community, Hiwinui Community Committee, accompanied by pupils from Hiwinui School, representing children, spoke in support of their submission. She thanked Council for what they have continued to do for their community towards keeping the people in their community safe. She noted that their carpark is no longer large enough for their increasing roll, advising there were no buses and it was not safe for the children to walk to school. They believed the proposed walkway would remove 45 students from using the carpark, as they would be able to walk home as they lived within 1 km of the school. The walkway would give their young people their independence, resilience and problem solving abilities and would increase their fitness and wellbeing.
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Luke presented noting he is in year 6 and lives 300m from school. He said he would like to walk or cycle to school but it is too dangerous as there is no room on the side of the road. With a walkway, they would have a safe way of walking or cycling to school.

Piper spoke noting she lives on Reids Line East and is only 500m from school and would like to walk to school but it is too dangerous without a footpath. There is a ditch on one side and a bank on the other. When they are walking with the walking bus, they all wear hi vis vests and if a car comes, they have to jump into the ditch. Their parents will not let them walk or run on the side of the road, as it is too dangerous.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0334 - MANFEILD PARK TRUST

Julie Keane spoke in support of the submission from the Manfeild Park Trust, regarding the gap in funding of events and development of Manfeild land. She asked that a regionally focussed major events fund be established that could be contributed to by both Palmerston North City Council and Manawatu District Council.

She also spoke about Kowhai Park development, noting that reconfiguration of that entrance was required. She felt that reconfiguration of the entrance would make it less confusing between the Manfeild Park entrance and the Kowhai Park entrance.

Following questions, she was thanked for her attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0422 - COLIN DYER

Colin Dyer spoke in support of his submission, noting he supported Council’s attempt to confine rates to 3.6% increase. Regarding the Feilding Civic Centre, he would like to see that facility restored. He asked Council to review and moderate the upgrade planning to be able to retain the Kowhai Park aviaries without such a large amount of expenditure.

He also spoke about road safety at the North Street, Pharaazyn Street, Kimberston Road junction in Feilding. He advised that the growth in housing development in that area has increased traffic flow and improvements needed to be made to improve safety of that intersection.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

The meeting adjourned at 3.02pm and reconvened at 3.25pm.

SUBMISSION #0246 – FEILDING COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Sandra Crosbie, accompanied by members of the Feilding Community Committee, spoke in support of the committee’s submission. The committee embraces active citizenship and supports development of a Feilding Community Plan as soon as possible. The plan is for the entire Feilding community, their visions and ideals and can set direction for all their community groups. They believed it would be a valuable document that would help Council with decision making and potential future cost savings e.g. the community plan process can get feedback and information from the community.

Regarding the Kowhai Park aviaries, their submission was based on community feedback. They noted support from the community to be included in upgrade work, which could reduce the burden on ratepayers. There was a lot of support for keeping
the aviaries and upgrading them, and many people wanting to work with that project alongside Council.

The committee believed the native bird aviaries should be closed and native birds rehoused at Mount Bruce.

She also spoke about the Timona Park toilets, identifying some projects for Timona Park and expressed concern at the delay in toilet upgrade. They would like to also see public showers put in at this park.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

_Councillor Hilary Humphrey left the meeting at 3.30pm._

SUBMISSION #0469 AND #0470 - RONGOTEA COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Margaret and Murray Giles spoke in support of their submission opposing the proposed change to recycling facilities in Rongotea. They would like the Council to undertake more education about recycling in their community, i.e. what can be recycled, the need to wash and squash. Also information for the rural community for disposing of plastic poison containers, and what to do with baling wrap. They noted that many people were asking for inorganic collection a couple of times a year. They spoke about how you can’t “Throw anything away” because there is no “away”.

Regarding Annual Plan submission, they would like hot mix cover for covered play area in Te Kawau Park. Also sealing of north end of Avon Street to assist a blind person who has moved to the area with getting to the shop and elderly people with walkers. Regarding proposed village walkway, they would like to highlight historical places in Rongotea with upstands. These could be joined up with footpaths to make a town walkway leading to the Waitohi walkway that they are progressing.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0267 – FEILDING AND MANCHESTER LIONS

Ron Tunnicliffe, accompanied by members of Feilding and Manchester Lions, spoke on behalf of their submission, asking that the exotic aviary be retained and noting their organisation was prepared to assist Council by providing their services and resources. He noted their organisation had recently spent $26,000 on installing barbecues in Kowhai Park.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

_Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting at 4.23pm._

_Councillor Bielski left meeting at 4.23pm and returned at 4.26pm._

_Councillor Campbell left meeting at 4.23pm returned at 4.26pm._

SUBMISSIONS #0346 AND #0347 – SANSON COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Paul Brown and Daniel Hirst spoke to their submission, highlighting the following requests:

- Pool funding, asks that Council funds their local pool costs of $5,000 per year;
Toilets and playground, noted funding set aside for public toilets and a playground. Asked that if the Sanson Hotel development did not go ahead that the money be applied for intended use. Noted the school playground needed upgrade and repairs and suggesting making improvements to existing playground at the school.

Bus shelters - would like that considered if Sanson Hotel development went ahead. Currently between 30-50 school children shelter under the awning of the hotel building while waiting for their school buses.

Liaison and consultation – noted the Del Parker walkway going ahead. Talked about using the Domain as a better location for celebrate Sanson day and noted a bigger grass area was needed for town events.

Regarding consultation on waste management, they would like to see a longer period of consultation as recent communication did not give sufficient time. They were happy to keep the existing mobile recycling centre.

Drainage – would like the open drains closed in and asked for a town wide review of stormwater to develop a solution for the town.

Footpaths and crossings – sought funding for more footpaths noting that 25% of their population can’t cross the road in a controlled way. Have been lobbying NZTA with no success and would also like a reduction in speed limit on approach to town.

Following questions, they were thanked for their submission by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0309 – GARY BARNETT

Gary Barnett spoke to his submission regarding the Kowhai Park aviaries and free entry for staff and elected members to Makino Aquatic Centre. He spoke in support of closing the aviaries, and asked that Council review the policy of free entry for staff and elected members to Makino Aquatic Centre.

Following questions, he was thanked for his attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0045 – GREG JAGGARD

It was noted the submitter was no longer able to attend, but had asked that his additional information be tabled. The Council read through and noted his additional comments.

The meeting adjourned at 5.25pm and reconvened at 6.28pm

SUBMISSION #0247 - POHANGINA VALLEY COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Liz Besley, accompanied by members of the Pohangina Village Community Committee, spoke in support of their submission, giving a presentation on point 5 of their submission regarding the development of the Pohangina Valley recreation reserve, known locally as “The Domain.” She discussed the results from their survey that showed 89% of respondents wish to use the reserve for recreation. They asked that Council sponsor a reserve landscape and recreational plan to increase public use, noting that the Community Committee could make a partial contribution from their capital funding. The provision of public toilets was a priority to support recreation.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.
SUBMISSION #0316 - RANGIWAHIA COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Mary Bielski spoke in support of their submission showing photos of the Rangiwahia Scenic Reserve. She introduced Jim Rainey from Kawatau Valley, a member of the Wellington Conservation Board who was supporting them during this time. She advised that confirmation had been received from the Department of Conservation that until the process is finished they would not need to remove track signage. Their request is to include this reserve in Council’s annual plan and have this reserve come under Council’s control.

They were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0323 AND #0324 – TANGIMOANA COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Margaret Angus and Bryce Ebert spoke in support of their submission opposing the proposed kerbside recycling collection. They also spoke about their concerns with lack of progress with the village drainage scheme in Tangimoana.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0350 AND #0351 – HALCOMBE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

Rachel Lane accompanied by Richard Bain, Jeanette Henderson, Jade Gilmour and Karen Gilmour spoke in support of their submission and gave a presentation outlining the following points:

- District Plan review – questioned the need to fully rewrite the District Plan;
- Council Place carpark - support as understands the need for better parking at pool;
- Community Planning – sought understanding of how the Feilding Community Committee and Feilding and District Promotion would work together;
- Kowhai Park aviaries – prefer to see the aviaries remain open;
- Feilding to Palmerston North cycleway – supports and talked about need for Manawatu District Council to push for NZTA funding;
- Precinct 4 – questioned whether this is the best place for growth due to flooding;
- Community – sought a better understanding of Feilding and District Promotions role and how they work with other community groups, also clarification of funding for toilets at Timona Park;
- Expressed concern about $2.4 million deferred spending, mostly in Infrastructure projects, drawing comparison with Auckland and the need for the district’s infrastructure to keep up with the district’s growth.

They then discussed their specific requests for Halcombe, including carry over funding and gave an update on projects the Community Committee had undertaken.

Richard Bain spoke about the need for a water table in streets in Halcombe to carry away water and prevent gravel being washed away. He spoke about the need for a stormwater strategy. With regards to water, they did not support putting in a water treatment plant at Halcombe and wanted more community consultation on that proposal.
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They spoke about problems with the capacity of Halcombe village infrastructure and asked for Council to be their advocate on this. Noted that they were working with MP Ian McKelvie on the cellphone issue but needed Council be their advocate as well as this was an impediment to growth.

They outlined their long term thinking and summarised their priorities.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by Her Worship the Mayor.

MDC 17/136 MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 8.03pm to reconvene at 8.30am Friday 12 May 2017, in the Council Chambers 135 Manchester Street, Feilding.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:

CHAIRPERSON

DATE
Minutes of a reconvened extraordinary meeting of the Council held on Friday 12 May 2017, commencing at 8.30am in the Manawatū District Council Chambers, 135 Manchester Street, Feilding.

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Michael Ford (Chairperson)
Cr Steve Bielski
Cr Barbara Cameron
Cr Stuart Campbell
Cr Shane Casey
Cr Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Cr Howard Voss

APOLOGY: Her Worship the Mayor

IN ATTENDANCE: Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Doug Tate (Community Facilities Manager)
Rachel Carr (Parks and Property Officer)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
Kirsten Pike (Parks and Property Officer – Legal)
Brook Rush (Community and Strategy Operations Officer)
Cynthia Ward (Senior Policy Planner)
Lisa Thomas (Policy Adviser)
Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)

MDC 17/137 MEETING OPENING
Deputy Mayor Michael Ford declared the meeting open.

MDC 17/138 APOLOGIES

RESOLVED

That the apology from Her Worship the Mayor be accepted.

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

CARRIED
MDC 17/139 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS – CONTINUED

The General Manager – Community and Strategy Brent Limmer spoke, seeking any requests for clarification and asked that any requests be emailed through to the Governance Team Leader.

SUBMISSIONS #0336 – FEILDING BUSINESS PROMOTION

Wayne Short and John Cotton spoke in support of the submission from Feilding Business Promotion, asking that there be no deferment of any upgrades or developments, especially in regards to roading. They felt this would end up costing more long term and would see Council incurring higher maintenance costs. They talked about Earthquake Prone buildings, and relationship with CBD targeted rate. They noted that for lessees of buildings, who were already paying extra in rates, they would not like to have to pay an extra rate to subsidise the building owners’ responsibility to upgrade their buildings.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by the Deputy Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0336 – FEILDING AND DISTRICT PROMOTION INC

Jason Smith and Jo Payton spoke in support of their submission, making the following points:

- the need for community planning;
- Kowhai Park aviaries – suggested relocating to another destination e.g. Mt Lees Reserve or Kitchener Park;
- Increase in motor home travellers;
- Need for public toilets to be located next to playgrounds, and to include nappy changing facilities;
- Developments at the former railway station which will be the new location for the Information Centre;
- level of service re level of rates – general level of comfort but concerned about proposals to defer application of funding
- Cycleways - district linking cycleways and walking routes, and suggestion to link Cheltenham and Kimbolton with walkways, which would be good for tourism and possibly an alternative to a cycleway to Palmerston North.

They thanked Council for its continued support and noted they were enjoying working with Council and CEDA representatives. They also noted it had been great being housed temporarily in the library while they develop their new premises.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by the Deputy Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0381 – TE ARAROA MANAWATU TRUST

Gill Absolon, Frank Goldingham, Graeme Teehan, and David Stroud of Te Araroa Manawatu Trust expressed concern that the proposed shared walkway and cycleway between Feilding and Palmerston North had been deferred yet again, noting the heavy traffic on this road and danger to cyclists. They outlined the background of the shared pathway noting it had been in the pipeline for many years.
Graeme Teehan spoke, noting the number of walkers they get out at Mt Lees, with many of them coming from overseas. He suggested an interim safety measure could be mowing the road berms to give people a safe place to walk off the road.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by the Deputy Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0333 – HORIZONS REGIONAL COUNCIL

Matthew Smith and Ramon Strong, along with Cr Colleen Sheldon of Horizons Regional Council, attended to answer any questions that Council may have arising from their submission.

Questions were asked relating to:

- The need for further dialogue with Horizons Regional Council on stormwater issues noting the large number of submissions Council received on this topic;
- Precinct 4 – Horizons submission about ensuring planning for stormwater discharges was undertaken;
- Feilding to Palmerston North cycleway and how Council could work with Horizons to progress this, noting Horizons Transport Team were keen to progress this as an alternative to cars;
- Commitment to working with Tangimoana residents and Council on flooding issues in the village;
- Service delivery to coastal communities re surf lifesaving, community patrols with suggestion for Horizons and Manawatu District Council to work collaboratively on those matters;
- Regional facilities e.g. beaches and Manawatu Gorge, need for lines of communication to be kept open.

They were thanked for their attendance by the Deputy Mayor.

SUBMISSION #0278 – BAINESSE AND DISTRICTS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

Ailsa Halford, Colleen Sheldon, Eddie Millard, Murray Jacobs, and Sue Tuke spoke in support of their submission seeking funding towards a feasibility report for construction of a city to sea rail trail to provide an integrated regional shared pathway from Longburn to Himatangi Beach.

Following questions, they were thanked for their attendance by the Deputy Mayor.

MDC 17/140 MEETING CLOSURE

The Deputy Mayor declared the meeting closed at 9.56am.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:
Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Council held on Thursday 18 May 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 Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Cr Howard Voss

IN ATTENDANCE: Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Doug Tate (Community Facilities Manager)
Rachel Carr (Parks and Property Officer)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
Kirsten Pike (Parks and Property Officer – Legal)
Brook Rush (Community and Strategy Operations Officer)
Lisa Thomas (Policy Adviser)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
Peter Shore (Property and Parks Support)
Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)
Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)

MDC 17/141 MEETING OPENING

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting open.

MDC 17/142 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

MDC 17/143 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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 Hilary Humphrey – Submission #0457
Councillor Phil Marsh – Easter Trading Policy
Councillor Shane Casey – Submission #0220

MDC 17/144 CHANGE TO ORDER OF BUSINESS

It was agreed that item 4.2 would be taken as the next item of business.

MDC 17/146 CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS – DRAFT WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN

Report of the General Manager – Infrastructure dated 12 May 2017 seeking consideration of submissions made on the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. It was noted that a service for recycling at Cheltenham would be investigated and improvements to the Kimbolton site would be trialled.

RESOLVED

1. That Council does not implement the Feilding kitchen waste kerbside collection initiative.

2. That Council does not extend the kerbside recyclable collection to the villages within the district.

3. That Council installs Mobile Recycling Centres (MRC’s) in Halcombe and Apiti.

4. That Council initiates the targeted education to facilitate greater levels of off-farm solid waste disposal and recycling of inorganic agricultural wastes funded by the Waste Levy.

5. That Council undertake to further inform and engage with the community and various sectors within the community to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of our communities’ needs and to better explain Council’s drivers with respect to waste management and minimisation.

6. That the need for any further waste initiatives be included as part of, or in parallel with, Council’s consultation on the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

7. That the final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, incorporating changes agreed to by the Council, be presented for adoption by Council on 14 June 2017.
Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED

MDC 17/147 CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS – DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18


1. KOWHAI PARK AVIARIES

Submissions #0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006, 0007, 0008, 0009, 0010, 0011, 0012, 0013, 0018, 0020, 0024, 0028, 0030, 0031, 0032, 0052, 0065, 0097, 0116, 0119, 0119, 0120, 0128, 0140, 0169, 0176, 0213, 0217, 0243, 0246, 0256, 0267, 0275, 0277, 0284, 0289, 0303, 0309, 0312, 0326, 0327, 0329, 0338, 0344, 0350, 0366, 0375, 0407, 0409, 0410, 0422, 0427, 0445, 0452, 0461, 0476, 0496 and 0497.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council closes the current native aviaries, rehomes the native birds, but retains exotic aviaries, establishes a community focus group to look at what community support there was for upgrades required to exotic aviaries, and whether there was future potential for a new native aviary.

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh
CARRIED on the casting vote of Her Worship the Mayor

Councillors Short, Bielski, Ford, Quarrie and Casey recorded their vote against the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 10.03am and reconvened at 10.20am

2. COUNCIL PLACE CARPARK

Submissions #0028, 0119, 0122, 0125, 0154, 0213, 0224, 0246, 0289, 0329, 0350.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council construct the one carpark on the southern side of Council Place, providing ten carparks, and reduce the budget allocated in the 2018-19 Draft Annual Plan from $80,000 to $64,000.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED
3. FEILDING TO PALMERSTON NORTH CYCLEWAY

Submissions #381, 333, 289, 213, 185, 169, 125.

_Councillor Campbell declared an interest, took no part in the discussion, and did not vote._

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes that the project has been deferred to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan and would continue with developing the Indicative Business Case.

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

CARRIED

4. FEILDING CIVIC CENTRE REFURBISHMENT

Submissions #0130, 0153, 0169, 0224, 0327, 0329, 0350, 0422.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council supports the redevelopment of the Feilding Civic Centre and is willing to make a contribution as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

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

CARRIED

5. FEILDING WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

Submissions #0153, 0169, 0329, 0333, 0335, 0338, 0368, 0402.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms the proposed investment in a second digester as part of the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED
6. EASTER TRADING POLICY

Submissions #0049, 0125, 0153, 0263, 0335, 0350, 0363, 0441.

Councillor Marsh declared an interest, took no part in the discussion and did not vote.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes that a draft policy and consultation document would be prepared and the community’s feedback would be sought.

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

7. AWAHURI FOREST / KITCHENER PARK TOILETS

Submissions #0027, 0100, 0132, 0142, 0171, 0399, 0465.

RESOLVED

That the funding for toilets at Awahuri Forest / Kitchener Park be brought forward into 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh
CARRIED

8. TURNERS ROAD EXTENSION

Councillor Marsh left the meeting at 11.33am

Submissions #0125, 0130, 0172, 0263, 0329, 0335, 0350.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes that the Turners Road Extension would be considered as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
CARRIED
9. FEILDING AND DISTRICT PROMOTION

Councillor Marsh returned to the meeting at 11.35am.

Councillor Short declared an interest, took no part in the discussion and did not vote.

Submissions #0153, 0246, 0327, 0329, 0350.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms funding for Feilding and District Promotion Inc as part of the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey

CARRIED

10. DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

Submissions #0169, 0213, 0335, 0344, 0350, 0368.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms its 2017-18 budget of $500,000 to enable the District Plan review to continue over the next year and Council to meet its legal obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 11.44am and reconvened at 11.50am

11. SMOKEFREE OUTDOOR POLICY

Submissions #0115, 0168, 0322, 0369, 0402.

RESOLVED

That Manawatu District Council notes the submissions and will increase proactive signage in Council assets.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 12.06pm and reconvened at 12.46pm
12. ALMADALE WATER TREATMENT PLANT AND MAIN TRUNK LINE

Submissions #0169, 0327, 0329, 0338, 0402.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes that expenditure had been deferred until 2018-19 whilst a Strategic Water Assessment for the Feilding Water Supply was being completed.

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

13. TIMONA PARK TOILETS

Submissions #0189, 0213, 0246, 0327, 0350 and 0492.

MOVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms that the Timona Park toilets project would be deferred to year 1 of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

AMENDMENT

That the motion be amended with the addition of:

“To allow time for further investigation of options”

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford
CARRIED

The SUBSTANTIVE motion was put as follows:

That the Manawatu District Council confirms that the Timona Park toilets project would be deferred to year 1 of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan to allow time for further investigation of options.

CARRIED
14. COMMUNITY COMMITTEE FUNDING CARRYOVERS

Submissions #0223, 0247, 0350, 0372, 0437.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council approves the carryover of all unspent community committee funding.

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

15. MAKINO PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT / BOWEN STREET UPGRADE

Submissions #0246, 0335, 0350, 0419, 0429.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes the submissions made on the Makino Precinct Development Project and these will be considered as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

That the Manawatu District Council notes the submissions made on the Bowen Street Upgrade and confirms the carry forward of funding to 2019-2020.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

CARRIED

16. ROADING BUDGET INCREASES

Submissions #0263, 0289, 0335, 0338, 0344, 0350.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council supports the funding and confirms the changes to the Council’s roading budget as described in the draft 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED
17. GROWTH PRECINCT 4

Submissions #0148, 0153, 0327, 0333, 0350.

Resolved

That the Manawatu District Council confirms that water and sewerage services for the Roots Street East area would be delivered in 2019-20.

That the Manawatu District Council would continue to work with Horizons Regional Council to ensure adequate flood protection was in place for Feilding’s growth areas.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

18. ROADSIDE SPRAYING / WEED CONTROL

Submissions #0012, 0224, 0365, 0392.

Resolved

That the Manawatu District Council notes that it uses chemicals sparingly and as per industry guidelines and confirms that residual chemicals are not used by Council.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh

CARRIED

19. EARTHQUAKE PRONE BUILDINGS

Submissions #0153, 0263, 0335, 0350.

Resolved

That the Manawatu District Council notes that it has established an Earthquake Prone Building Working Party that includes a balanced group of people from a cross section of business people, everyday consumers, the Council and experts.

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

CARRIED
20. LEVEL OF SERVICE VS LEVEL OF RATES

Submissions #0246, 0327, 0335, 0350.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council thanks the submitters and notes that levels of service and rates would be reviewed as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan development.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski
CARRIED

21. PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH KINDERGARTEN IN KIMBOLTON

Submissions #0270, 0304, 0321, 0501 supporting the Ruahine Kindergarten’s proposal to establish a kindergarten in Council’s property located in Lind Street, Kimbolton.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes that officers were currently in negotiations with the Ruahine Kindergarten Association to lease / purchase the Lind Street property in Kimbolton, for the purposes of establishing a kindergarten.

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

22. MANGAWEKA BRIDGE

Submissions #0327, 0333, 0350 regarding the Mangaweka Bridge project.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes that the Mangaweka Bridge project would be considered as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan in partnership with Rangitikei District Council and New Zealand Transport Agency.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski
CARRIED
23. HALCOMBE WATER TREATMENT PLANT

Submissions #0329, 0350, 0354.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council notes the submissions and would be consulting on options with the community as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

24. FEILDING LIBRARY UPGRADE

Submissions #0028, 0246, 0350 regarding upgrade of the Feilding Library.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms that the options for a library development would be included in the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

CARRIED

25. POHANGINA VALLEY PARKS ISSUES

Submissions #0070, 0150, 0247.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council supports the redevelopment of the Pohangina Recreational Reserve Landscape and Recreation Plan up to $5,000 with funding to come from the 2017-18 Community Planning budget.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Her Worship the Mayor

CARRIED

26. ROAD SEALING REQUESTS - KIMBER STREET, KUKU ROAD, AVON STREET, PEARCE STREET, GILBERT STREET, CASSAN STREET, GODLEY STREET

Submissions #0098, 0190, 0354, 0247, 0350, 0469.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council has limited funds available for seal extensions and footpaths and these are prioritised according to district need.
Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

27. RESOURCE RECOVERY CENTRE

Submissions #0130, 0172, 0239, 0329.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms that the $750,000 allocated for the Resource Recovery Centre would be carried forward to the 2018-19 year and considered as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED

28. COMMUNITY PLANNING

Submissions #0246, 0327, 0350.

RESOLVED

That the Manawatu District Council confirms $30,000 be included in the 2017-18 Annual Plan for completion of a Community Plan for the Feilding Community Committee.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey

CARRIED

29. TRADEWASTE DISPOSAL CHARGES, PLUS WATER AND WASTEWATER CHARGES

Submissions #0400, 0474, 0329.

RESOLVED

“That the Council notes the concerns raised in submissions #0400 and #0474 relating to the increase in the trade waste disposal charges. Council will work with major trade waste customers to explore ways they could pre-treat their waste to reduce the fees and charges they will incur.”

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski
That the Manawatu District Council authorises the Chief Executive to negotiate an alternative trade waste regime with major trade waste customers and notes that any reduction in trade waste fees must be covered by rates.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford

Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED

MDC 17/148 MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 3.19pm, to reconvene Monday 22 May 2017 at 8.30am in Council Chambers.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:

Chairperson ____________________________ Date ____________________________
Minutes of a reconvened extraordinary meeting of the Council held on Monday 22 May 2017, commencing at 8.30am in the Manawatu 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 Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Cr Howard Voss

IN ATTENDANCE: Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Doug Tate (Community Facilities Manager)
Rachel Carr (Parks and Property Officer)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
Kirsten Pike (Parks and Property Officer – Legal)
Brook Rush (Community and Strategy Operations Officer)
Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)
Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)

MDC 17/149 MEETING OPENING

Her Worship the Mayor declared the reconvened meeting open.

MDC 17/150 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

MDC 17/151 CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS – DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18

30. FENCED PLAYGROUND FOR UNDER 5S

Submissions #0246, 0457 recommending that Council consider the installation of a fenced playground for under five year olds.

_Councillor Humphrey declared an interest, took no part in the discussion and did not vote._
RESOLVED

That consideration of a fenced playground be included as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED

31. ENVIROSCHOOLS

Submissions #0289, 0333 regarding commitment to the Enviroschools programme.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submissions and will continue to support the Enviroschools programme at the current level of funding.

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

CARRIED

32. SANSON WATER TREATMENT PLANT

Submissions #0329 and 0402.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submissions and confirms that the Sanson Reticulation Network upgrade will be considered as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

CARRIED

33. NEW PLAYGROUND IN SANSON

Submissions #0346 and 0419.

RESOLVED

That the Council approves up to $4,000 in the 2017-18 Annual Plan for a safety upgrade of Sanson School playground in discussion with the Sanson School Board of Trustees and will consider associated maintenance costs of approximately $2,700 per annum as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Her Worship the Mayor
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
CARRIED

34. HIMATANGI BEACH HALL

Submission #0015 requesting funding for the upgrading of the Himatangi Beach Hall urinals, rear fire escape and concrete path to incorporate concrete deck area at rear of the hall.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission and approves funding of up to $2,800 in the 2017-18 Annual Plan for upgrade of the urinals in the Himatangi Beach Hall.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

35. HIMATANGI COMMUNITY CHRISTMAS LIGHTS

Submission #0015 seeking funding towards the annual cost of putting up the Community Christmas lights in time for the annual “Light up Himatangi” festival being held 3 to 5 June 2017.

RESOLVED

That the Council approves up to $2,200 funding for the cost of putting up the Community Christmas lights in time for the “Light Up Himatangi” festival 3-5 June 2017 from the community committee fund.

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

CARRIED

36. DUKE STREET PUBLIC TOILETS

Submission #0246 requesting the Duke Street public toilets remain open for public use.

RESOLVED

That the Council will ensure the Duke Street public toilets are open for public use seven days per week and approve an additional $5,952 of operational funding to ensure daily cleaning.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh

CARRIED
37. RAUMAI RESERVE

Submission #0247 supporting planned stage 2 development of the reserve that would open up a second view shaft and make more of the area useable by the public.

RESOLVED

That the Council supports the submission from the Pohangina Valley Community Committee regarding ongoing enhancement and maintenance Raumai Reserve.

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

38. MAINTENANCE OF LAND NEXT TO RANGIWAHIA MEMORIAL HALL

Submission #0251 requesting that Council begin maintaining the portion of road reserve and land next to the Rangiwahia Memorial Hall.

RESOLVED

That the Council includes annual maintenance costs of maintaining the portion of road reserve and land next to the Rangiwahia Memorial Hall in the mowing programme.

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford

CARRIED

39. CAMPING GROUNDS IN FEILDING

Submission #0255 noting lack of a quality camping ground or holiday park available for visitors to Feilding for events and general recreation.

RESOLVED

That the Council has no intention of developing a council camp ground but is open to working with developers on a Feilding Camp Ground / Holiday Park.

Moved by: Her Worship the Mayor
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford

CARRIED
40. TIMONA PARK ORCHARD TRUST

Submission #0260 providing Council with an update of the Trust’s activities and successes with Council’s support over the past twelve months.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks and congratulates Timona Park Orchard Trust for their ongoing contribution to the park and community.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
CARRIED

41. TE KAWAU RECREATION CENTRE

Submission #0499 requesting operational funding support for the centre and funding towards the repair of the ceiling in the gymnasium.

Councillor Quarrie declared an interest, took no part in the discussion, and did not vote.

RESOLVED

That the Council funds the fire costs of up to $5,000 for Te Kawau Recreation Centre from new operational funds for the 2017-18 Annual Plan and that both renewal and operational costs be considered as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

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

42. JOHNSTONE PARK CROQUET CLUB GROUNDS

Submission #0502 requesting Council to consider providing operational funding for the operation and maintenance of their croquet lawns.

RESOLVED

That the Council declines the request from Feilding Croquet Club for operational funding towards the operation and maintenance costs of their croquet lawns.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
CARRIED
43. LACK OF AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES FOR CLUBS IN FEILDING

Submission #0272 raising concern about the lack of facilities for clubs in Feilding noting the proposed demolition of the Grandstands at Manfeild Park.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission and notes that officers would continue to liaise with Manfeild on the implications of the demolition of the grandstands with the affected clubs.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10.00am and reconvened at 10.18am

44. FEILDING HIGH SCHOOL – INDOOR AND OUTDOOR SPORTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Submission #0383 requesting Council undertake a feasibility study on the need for provision of outdoor and indoor sports needs for the Manawatu District.

Councillor Bielski returned to the meeting at 10.22am.

RESOLVED

That the Council requests the Chief Executive to negotiate with Feilding High School and Sport Manawatu to undertake a Recreation Needs Assessment of sports needs in the Manawatu District and utilising previous work that was undertaken and that this be funded by up to $20,000 in the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

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

CARRIED

45. DISPOSAL OF OHAKEA HALL

Submission #0234 seeking to initiate discussions with Council and the community on the disposal of the Ohakea Hall.

RESOLVED

That the Council progress discussions with the Ohakea Hall Committee and community on options for disposal of the Ohakea Hall for inclusion in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED
46. CYCLE PARKING

Submission #0154 seeking sheltered / secure cycle parking to be provided at Makino Aquatic Centre.

RESOLVED

That the Council includes options providing secure cycle parking at the Makino Aquatic Centre as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

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

CARRIED

47. FEILDING LITTLE THEATRE

Submission #0319 requesting that Council carry over funding for the Little Theatre project.

_Councillor Ford declared an interest, took no part in the discussion of this item, and did not vote._

RESOLVED

That the Council approves the carry over of funding for the Feilding Little Theatre Project to the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey

CARRIED

48. RANGIWAHIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION RESERVE

Submission #0316 from Rangiwahia Community Committee requesting that the Rangiwahia Scenic Reserve, currently managed by the Department of Conservation, be included in the Manawatu District Council’s Annual Plan and come under the control and management of the Manawatu District Council’s Parks and Property Team.

_Councillor Bielski declared an interest and did not vote._

RESOLVED

That the Council has ongoing dialogue with the Department of Conservation regarding the Rangiwahia Scenic Reserve, bringing back possible options to Council as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

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

That the discussions include the community and Horizons Regional Council as well as Department of Conservation

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford

CARRIED

The SUBSTANTIVE motion was PUT and CARRIED as follows:

That the Council has ongoing dialogue with the Department of Conservation the community and Horizons Regional Council regarding the Rangiwahia Scenic Reserve, bringing back possible options to Council as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

49. SANSON POOL

Submission #0346 seeking Council funding towards the costs of running the Sanson Community Pool.

RESOLVED

That the Council declines the submission from Sanson Community Committee regarding funding towards the costs of running the Sanson Community Pool.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

50. MANAWATU GARDEN FESTIVAL

Submission #0153 noted the new management committee had folded and discussed future management of the festival.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission.

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

CARRIED

51. STAFF AND ELECTED MEMBER ACCESS TO MAKINO AQUATIC CENTRE

Submission #0309 asking that free entry to Makino Aquatic Centre for staff, elected members and their families be discontinued.

Councillors Casey, Humphrey, and Cameron declared an interest, and did not vote.
RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission and that free entry to Makino Aquatic Centre for staff, elected members and their families continue.

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

52. PROMOTING NATIVE PLANTS TO RESIDENTS

Submission #0365 encouraged Council, in conjunction with Horizons Regional Council, to grow and supply native seedlings of original unmodified DNA, free to ratepayers.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks the submitter and notes that seedlings will not be provided free to members of the public, but may be provided to communities for community plantings as budgets allow.

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

53. SUNSMART POLICY

Submission #0370 asking Council to adopt a Sunsmart Policy.

RESOLVED

That the Council supports the Cancer Society’s Sunsmart approach and that this be included in future parks and recreation planning. In addition the Council will conduct a shade audit of its current significant facilities.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh
CARRIED

54. SAFE COMMUNITY ACCREDITATION

Submission #0402 asking Council to seek accreditation as a Safe Community.

Councillor Cameron declared an interest, took no part in the discussion and did not vote.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks the submitter however will not seek accreditation as a Safe Community.
Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey

CARRIED

55. RATA STREET WALKWAY

Submission #0052 noting the positivity of having the Rata Street walkway open and requesting upgrade of the walkway.

_Councillor Ford declared an interest, took no part in the discussion, and did not vote._

RESOLVED

That the Council notes that planning for this project is underway, with construction expected late in the 2017 calendar year, in conjunction with the Kowhai Park carpark and paths and Greenspine walkway project and that Council would carry forward funding to the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

56. STREET TREE MAINTENANCE

Submission #0430 asking Council to inspect and check the suitability, shading and safety of the District’s street trees.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes that it provides for annual tree inspections for Council trees, and clears branches from intruding into vehicle, footpath and line spaces in its parks contract with Recreational Services.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 12.15pm and reconvened at 12.21pm

57. RE-SURFACING OF CARPARK AREA OUTSIDE HEALTH CLINIC AND LIBRARY AT HIMATANGI BEACH

Submission #0437 requesting resurfacing of the carpark area outside the Health Clinic and Library at Himatangi Beach.
RESOLVED

That the Council provides new funding in the 2017-18 Annual Plan for the drainage and resurfacing of the car park area outside the Health Clinic and Library at Himatangi Beach up to $34,000.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh

CARRIED

58. HIMATANGI BEACH MINI PUTT COURSE, BBQS AND SHELTER

Submission #0437 requesting removal of the old mini putt course and reinstating the area with grass.

RESOLVED

That the Council accepts the submission and advises the removal of the mini putt course and reinstatement with grass would be undertaken as part of the project to resurface the car park area outside the Health Clinic and Library at Himatangi Beach, with an addition of up to $6,400 in the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh

CARRIED

59. HIMATANGI BEACH TENNIS COURT UPGRADE

Submission #0437 seeking an upgrade of the Himatangi Beach tennis courts.

RESOLVED

That the Council considers options for the upgrade or replacement of the Himatangi Beach tennis courts in the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

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

CARRIED

60. HIMATANGI BEACH COMMUNITY PATROL

Submission #0438 seeking assistance towards the construction of a garage to house the community patrol vehicle. The Council noted that they could apply for a partnership fund grant towards the running costs of vehicle, and suggested that they contact the Council’s Community Development Adviser for assistance with application.
RESOLVED

That the Council provide funding of up to $4,000 from existing community development funding towards the construction of a garage to house the community patrol vehicle, subject to the community patrol securing remaining funding.

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

61. PUMP TRACK TIMONA PARK AND UPGRADE RANFURLY ROAD MOUNTAIN BIKE TRACK

Submission #0449 seeking a new pump track at Timona Park and an upgrade to the Ranfurly Road Mountain Bike Track.

_Councillor Short declared an interest and did not vote._

RESOLVED

That the Council provides up to $7,500 for an upgrade of Timona Park bike track and further considers additional pump and mountain bike track upgrades as part of the Recreational Needs Assessment to be undertaken in the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED

_The meeting adjourned at 1.04pm and reconvened at 1.45pm_

62. TE KAWAU PARK COURTS AND HERITAGE SIGNAGE

Submission #0469 requesting Council seal the courts at Te Kauwau Park and noting they would like to install historical signage around Rongotea.

RESOLVED

That the Council will consider sealing of the court areas as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan and encourages the Community Committee to seek funding for the installation of historical signage.

Moved by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford
CARRIED
63. YOUTH AMBASSADORS GRANT FUND

Submission #0293 requesting Council to provide a grant of $2,000 for Youth Ambassadors to manage for opportunities for youth to travel for school, work or representing the district.

_Councillor Short declared an interest, took no part in the discussion and did not vote._

**RESOLVED**

That the Council thanks the Youth Ambassadors for their submission however declines to provide a grant fund as requested.

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

64. COORDINATED / MANAGED APPROACH TO MEETING RESIDENTS SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL NEEDS

Submission #0302 asking Council to consider the social and emotional needs of residents when addressing the priority of operational needs, and noting the importance of real and effective communications to the district’s communities.

**RESOLVED**

That the Council notes the submission.

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

65. EVENT FUND – MANFEILD PARK TRUST

Submission #0334 requesting consideration of additional funding in the events area.

**RESOLVED**

That the Council supports a Regional Event Fund and is currently working with PNCC and CEDA to establish one.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short  
Seconded by: Her Worship the Mayor  
CARRIED

66. SANSON COMMUNITY PLAN

Submission #0346 asking Council to liaise with the Sanson Community Committee prior to and during implementation of projects contained within their community plans.
RESOLVED
That the Council notes the submission and advises that Council staff will continue to consult with the Sanson Community Committee.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie
CARRIED

67. KOWHAI PARK REDEVELOPMENT AND ENTRANCEWAY TO MANFEILD
Submission #0334 requesting Council make provision for the redevelopment of the eastern entry to Kowhai Park, adjacent to the South Street entry to Manfeild Park.

RESOLVED
That the Council consider the Kowhai Park Redevelopment and Entranceway to Manfeild as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED

68. IMPROVEMENTS FOR SANSON RECREATION RESERVE
Submission #0019 regarding the Sanson Recreation Reserve.

RESOLVED
That the Council consider the improvements for Sanson Recreation Reserve as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh
CARRIED

69. STREET LIGHTING – BLENHEIM PLACE, FEILDING
Submission #0016 requesting additional street lighting to be installed in Blenheim Place, Feilding to improve visibility and safety.

RESOLVED
That the Council approves additional streetlighting for Blenheim Place for the 2017-18 Annual Plan to be funded from existing budgets.

Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
70. IMPROVE EAST/WEST ROADING LINKS

Submission #0125 highlighting the need for a mid-block East-West link on the north side of Feilding.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission.

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

CARRIED

71. IMPROVED BUS SERVICES FOR FEILDING

Submission #0125 asking Council to work with Horizons Regional Council to see if Feilding’s bus service could be improved to make the Makino Aquatic Centre more accessible.

RESOLVED

That the Council will pass this request on to the relevant officer at Horizons Regional Council.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

CARRIED

72. PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENTS / CROSSING POINT ON GREY STREET

Submission #0154 asking that a crossing point for pedestrians from the Makino Aquatic Centre be provided outside 30 Grey Street, especially for use by school children, and supporting removal of parking from outside that property to allow children to walk more safely to the pool.

RESOLVED

That the Council will review pedestrian access to the Makino Aquatic Centre as part of the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED
73. ROAD SAFETY – KIMBOLTON ROAD / DERBY PLACE AND KIMBOLTON ROAD / PHARAZYN STREET

Submissions #0212, 0422 seeking improvements to road safety.

RESOLVED

That the Council will consider this in consultation with NZTA as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

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

74. ROAD SAFETY – MONTEITH AND WILLOUGHBY ROADS, HALCOMBE

Submissions #0220, #0350 seeking improvements to visibility and safety issues at the corner of Monteith and Willoughby Streets in Halcombe.

Councillor Casey declared an interest, took no part in the discussion and did not vote.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks Halcombe School and Halcombe Community Committee for their submissions and will work with them to resolve the safety issues as part of the 2017-18 Annual Plan

Moved by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie
Seconded by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
CARRIED

75. ROAD SAFETY – HALCOMBE ROAD / STANWAY ROAD / MT BIGGS ROAD INTERSECTION

Submission #0350 seeking road safety improvements.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks Halcombe Community Committee for its submission but will not be making any significant changes in the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh
CARRIED

Councillors Casey, Bielski and Short recorded their vote against the motion
76. FOOTPATHS – FINNIS ROAD, SANSON, HIMATANGI STREET

Submissions #0247, 0346 and 0437 seeking installation of footpaths.

RESOLVED

That the Council has an annual budget for new footpaths and these requests will added to the list.

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

CARRIED

77. CITY TO SEA RAIL TRAIL

Submission #0278 requesting funding towards a feasibility report for establishing the City to Sea Rail Trail from Longburn to Himatangi Beach.

RESOLVED

That the Council approves the request for $6,000 towards a feasibility report.

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

CARRIED

78. SHARED PATHWAY REIDS LINE EAST AND WATERSHED ROAD

Submission #0439 seeking funding towards the construction of a pathway down Reid Line East from the intersection with Watershed Road immediately past the “Galpins” subdivision, as well as down Watershed Road to Waiwiri Way.

RESOLVED

That the Council considers funding this project as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan once the Hiwinui Community Plan has been completed.

Moved by: Her Worship the Mayor
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

79. SANSON BUS SHELTER AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Submission #0346 regarding provision of bus shelters and pedestrian crossings in Sanson.
RESOLVED

That the Council pass the requests to the relevant officers at Horizons Regional Council and NZTA.

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

CARRIED

80. UNDERGROUNDING POWERLINES ON STATE HIGHWAYS, SANSON

Submission #0346 regarding undergrounding of powerlines in Sanson.

RESOLVED

That the Council consider a targeted rate for Sanson to fund this as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan.

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

CARRIED

81. WATER TANKS

Submission #0153 regarding installation of water tanks for new homes.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes that new and existing home owners can install water tanks but has no intention to make it compulsory.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED

82. STANWAY HALCOMBE WATER SCHEME

Submission #0367 providing suggestions for Council to consider regarding future proofing and extending the Stanway Halcombe water scheme.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks the submitter and notes that the community will be consulted before any final decisions are made.

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

CARRIED
83. DRAINAGE – SANSON, TANGIMOANA, CHELTENHAM, HALCOMBE AND REDUCING BERM FLOODING, STORMWATER DISCHARGES

Submissions #0224, 0346, 0324, 0416, 0350, 0365 and 0333.

RESOLVED

That the Council in partnership with Horizons Regional Council where applicable, will conduct a stormwater assessment of all villages of the district as part of the 2017-18 Annual Plan from existing budgets. This will lead to the development of stormwater schemes as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie
CARRIED

84. FLOODING HAZARDS

Submission #0333 from Horizons Regional Council advising they would like to work collaboratively with the Manawatu District Council on initiatives to address flood hazards facing Feilding.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks Horizons Regional Council for their submission and will work collaboratively with them to address flooding hazards.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford
CARRIED

85. SANSON – LOCAL TENDERS SOUGHT FOR LOCAL PROJECT WORK AND CONSULTATION PRIOR TO CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Submission #0346 asking that local tenders be sought for any local project work in Sanson and that the community be consulted prior to any capital expenditure in Sanson.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission however tenders are sought in line with the Council’s procurement policy which does not discriminate on location.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
CARRIED
86. OHAKEA AIRBASE – EFFECT OF PROPOSED USE BY SINGAPORE AIRFORCE

Submission #0365 expressing concern about perceived negative effects on the nearby township of Sanson from proposed use of Ohakea Airbase by the Singapore Airforce.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission.

Moved by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councillor Phil Marsh

CARRIED

87. LOAN FUNDING, NUMBER OF STAFF, GST, FINANCIAL REPORTING

Submission #0454.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission.

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

CARRIED

88. MASSEY UNIVERSITY WILDBASE HOSPITAL AND CENTRAL ENERGY TRUST WILDBASE RECOVERY REHABILITATION CENTRE

Submission #0172 noting there could be an opportunity for Manawatu District Council to sponsor the Wildbase facility in Palmerston North should the Kowhai Park Aviaries be removed.

RESOLVED

That the Council acknowledges the submission but will not be making a contribution.

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

CARRIED

89. BETTER PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT BY COUNCIL

Submission #0289 seeking more proactive public engagement by Council, informing people about what Council does and making suggestions for how to do this.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission.
Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short
CARRIED

90. MANFEILD PARK

Submission #0026 expressing concern about noise from Manfeild and benefit to the community.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes that Manfeild is operated under a resource consent which includes noise limits.

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

91. DEPRECIATION ACCOUNT AND FUNDING OF CAPITAL PROJECTS

Submission #0335 seeking understanding of how Council’s depreciation account was being utilised to fund capital projects and the sustainability of that practice.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission and will ask an officer to provide an explanation to the submitter.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski
CARRIED

92. CBD TARGETED RATE, TARGETED RATES, FEILDING RATES DIFFERENTIAL, PROPORTION OF SANSON RATES SPENT ON FEILDING

Submissions #0335, 0263, 0230, 0344, 0365, 0224, 0174, 0346, 0422.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submissions and advises that the revenue and financing policy will be reviewed as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
CARRIED
93. HALCOMBE VILLAGE INFRASTRUCTURE AND LONG TERM PROJECTS

Submission #0350 asking that plans be made for addressing infrastructure issues in Halcombe, and seeking development of long term projects.

RESOLVED

That the Council thanks the submitters for their comprehensive submission. The items raised will be considered as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan. In addition, Council officers will continue conversations with Powerco to try and resolve issues around transformers.

Moved by: Councilor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councilor Steve Bielski
CARRIED

94. BOUNDARY CHANGES

Submission #0131 seeking a boundary change to enable their property to be included in the Manawatu District area.

RESOLVED

That the Council notes the submission.

Moved by: Councilor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by: Councilor Stuart Campbell
CARRIED

95. PARA KORE WASTE MINIMISATION EDUCATION PROGRAMME FOR MARAE

Submission #0240 seeking funding towards the delivery of a waste minimisation education programme to be delivered to local marae.

RESOLVED

That the Council approves support for Para Kore Waste Minimisation Education programme at $2,200 per year from existing waste levy for the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councilor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councilor Alison Short
CARRIED

96. CARRY FORWARDS – ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUESTS – INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP

Submission #0485 detailing carry forwards and additional budget requests from the Infrastructure Group.
RESOLVED

That the Council approves the carry forwards and additional budget requests for the Infrastructure Group for the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
CARRIED

97. CARRY FORWARDS – ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUESTS – CORPORATE AND REGULATORY GROUP

RESOLVED

That the Council approves the carry forwards and additional budget requests for the Corporate and Regulatory Group for the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey
CARRIED

98. CARRY FORWARDS – ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUESTS – COMMUNITY AND STRATEGY GROUP

Submission #0486 detailing carry forwards and additional budget requests from the Community and Strategy Group. It was noted that the amount of the Community Committee carry forward request should read $66,000.

RESOLVED

That the Council approves the carry forwards and additional budget requests for the Community and Strategy Group for the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Steve Bielski
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron
CARRIED

MDC 17/152 MEETING CLOSURE

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 4.22pm.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:
Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on Thursday 25 May 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 Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Cr Howard Voss

IN ATTENDANCE: Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Doug Tate (Community Facilities Manager)
Carl Johnstone (Parks and Property Team Leader)
John Jones (Roading Asset Manager)
Cynthia Ward (Senior Policy Planner)
Maria Brenssell (Executive Assistant to the Mayor)
Lorraine Thompson (Executive Assistant to General Manager Corporate and Regulatory)
Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)
Allie Dunn (Governance Team Leader)

MDC 17/154 MEETING OPENING
Sarah McMenamin of the Anglican Parish of Oroua opened the meeting in prayer.

MDC 17/155 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

MDC 17/156 REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE
There were no requests for leave of absence.
MDC 17/157 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Council meeting held 20 April 2017, be adopted as a true and correct record.

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

MDC 17/158 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Humphrey – submissions on Trade Waste Charges
Councillor Cameron – member of MidCentral District Health Board
Councillor Ford – item 10.3 – Plan Change 52 agent for landowner
Councillor Campbell – submissions on Trade Waste Charges

MDC 17/159 PUBLIC FORUM - MANCHESTER STREET SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

Representatives from Manchester Street School spoke about their attendance at the Vex IQ Robotics World Championships held in Louisville, Kentucky USA on 23 to 25 April 2017 and showed photos from their visit. They thanked Council for their financial assistance towards their experience.

MDC 17/160 PUBLIC FORUM - VANESSA STORY

Vanessa Story spoke about representing New Zealand at the World Masters Indoor Track and Field held in South Korea, Daegu from 19 to 25 March 2017. 200, 400 and 800 entered. Won first race in 200 heat and came second in final. 800m, came 4th. 400m came 3rd. She thanked Council for their financial assistance towards her attendance at the event.

MDC 17/161 PUBLIC FORUM - CHERYL, STEPHEN, BRYCE & DARREN HIRSCHBERG

The Hirschberg family spoke about representing New Zealand and competing at the World Age Group ITU Triathlon Championships held in Cozumel, Mexico on 18 September 2016. Bryce came second. They thanked Council for their financial assistance towards their attendance at this event.

MDC 17/162 PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations scheduled for this meeting.

MDC 17/163 NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEM – SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND CHANGES FROM COUNCIL’S DELIBERATIONS ON DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18 SUBMISSIONS

Her Worship the Mayor advised that officers had completed a summary of changes and impacts following Council’s deliberations on the submissions to the draft Annual Plan 2017-18. She asked that Council accept as a late item of business, consideration of the
summary of changes and impacts for further discussion. This matter cannot be delayed to a subsequent meeting due to the need to produce a final Annual Plan for the 2017-18 year for adoption prior to the end of June.

RESOLVED

That the item “Summary of Impacts and Changes from Council’s Deliberations on Draft Annual Plan 2017-18 Submissions” be accepted as a late item of business.

Moved by: Her Worship the Mayor
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

MDC 17/164 RECOMMENDATIONS AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE 19 MAY 2017 – THIRD QUARTER REPORT


RESOLVED

That the Council receives the Third Quarter Report to 31 March 2017.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

MDC 17/165 TANGIMOANA BEACH MOTOR CAMP LEASE

Report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy dated 3 May 2017 seeking approval of Council to enter into a lease with Spiny Dog Limited for the Tangimoana Beach Motor Camp for a period of two years.

RESOLVED

That the Council enter into a lease with Spiny Dog Limited for the Tangimoana Beach Motorcamp for a period of two years from 1 July 2017.

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councillor Andrew Quarrie

CARRIED

MDC 17/166 PROPOSAL TO GRANT LICENCE TO OCCUPY – SANSON RECREATION RESERVE

Report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy dated 7 April 2017 seeking approval from Council, both as the administering body of the Sanson Recreation Reserve and under their Delegated Authority under the Reserves Act 1977, to grant a Licence to
Occupy to Manfeild Park Trust to occupy part of Sanson Recreation Reserve for a hoarding, subject to not receiving any sustained objections following public consultation.

RESOLVED

1. That Council grants approval to enter into a Licence to Occupy with the Manfeild Park Trust for a term of 10 years at the Sanson Recreation Reserve for the purpose of an advertising hoarding, subject to not receiving any sustained objections from the Community.

2. That Council, under Delegated Authority from the Minister of Conservation, approve the Licence to Occupy in accordance with Section 54(1)(d) of the Reserves Act 1977, subject to not receiving any sustained objections from the Community.

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

MDC 17/167 PLAN CHANGE 52 – PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES FOR 1579 WAUGHS ROAD FEILDING

Report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy dated 9 May 2017 updating Council on an agreement reached with the owners of 1579 Waughs Road, Feilding (The Waugh Family/ Kaiweka Holdings Limited), in light of Plan Change 52 (to the Manawatu District Plan, as to the future development and landscape approach for the property, and seeking Council adoption of the agreed Property Development Guidelines for 1579 Waughs Road to enable the application of the Guidelines to the property in terms of Plan Change 52.

Councillor Ford declared an interest, took no part in the discussion, and did not vote.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council receive the report for information and note the agreement reached between Council and The Waugh Family as to future development of land at 1579 Waughs Road Feilding, in light of Plan Change 52 to the Manawatu District Plan.

2. That Council adopt the Property Development Guidelines for 1579 Waughs Road, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, to enable the application of the Guidelines to 1579 Waughs Road, in terms of Plan Change 52 to the Manawatu District Plan.

Moved by: Councillor Shane Casey
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short
CARRIED
MDC 17/168 SALE OF FONTERRA SHARES


RESOLVED

That the Council approves the disposal of Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited shares within the timeframes required by the company and delegates the Chief Executive to negotiate the timing of the sale and the sale price.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED

MDC 17/169 DELEGATIONS MANUAL UPDATE

Report of the General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory dated 16 May 2017 seeking Council approval to adopt the Manawatu District Council delegations manual. An updated version of the Delegations Manual was tabled, noting that some corrections to reflect previous decisions of Council would be made under delegated authority of Chief Executive.

Councillor Ford left the meeting at 9.58am and returned at 10.00am.

RESOLVED


Moved by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Seconded by: Councillor Alison Short

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10.09am and reconvened at 10.25am.

MDC 17/170 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEM - SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND CHANGES FROM COUNCIL’S DELIBERATIONS ON DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18 SUBMISSIONS


The Council discussed reviewing the resolution made in regards to Trade Waste Disposal Charges.
RESOLVED

That the Council resolve that an extraordinary meeting of Council be held on 1 June 2017 at 8.30am to consider any alterations or revocations of decisions on submissions made at the extraordinary Council meeting held 18 and 22 May 2017.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Hilary Humphrey
CARRIED

MDC 17/171 PUBLIC EXCLUDED RESOLUTION

RESOLVED

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

a) Feilding Civic Centre Trust – Appointment of Trustees

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>a) 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, under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.</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 went into public excluded session at 11.17am and resumed open session at 11.21am. For items MDC 17/172 to MDC 17/174 refer to public excluded minutes.

MDC 17/175 RESOLUTIONS CONFIRMED IN OPEN SESSION

The following public excluded resolutions were confirmed in open session:

FEILDING CIVIC CENTRE TRUST – APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES

That the Council:

1. Reappoints Stuart Osborne, Lindsay Taylor and Tony Chapman as Trustees to the Feilding Civic Centre Trust for a further term of three years, commencing 31 October 2017 and expiring 30 October 2020; and

2. Formally appoints Johanna Wood as Trustee to the Feilding Civic Centre Trust for a term of three years, commencing 31 October and expiring 30 October 2020, as per the Council’s Appointment of Director’s Policy.

MDC 17/176 MEETING CLOSURE

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 11.22am.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:

---------------------------
CHAIRPERSON
---------------------------
DATE
Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Council held on Thursday 1 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 Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Cr Andrew Quarrie
Cr Alison Short

LEAVE OF ABSENCE:
Cr Howard Voss

IN ATTENDANCE:
Richard Templer (Chief Executive)
Shayne Harris (General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory)
Brent Limmer (General Manager - Community and Strategy)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Tracey Hunt (Strategy Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Michael Hawker (Project Delivery Manager)
Paul Stein (Communications Adviser)
Danielle Balmer (Communications Officer)
Janine Hawthorn (Community Development Adviser)
Maria Brenssell (Executive Assistant to the Mayor)
Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)

MDC 17/177 MEETING OPENING

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting open.

MDC 17/178 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

MDC 17/179 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Item 4.1 Councillor Humphrey – submissions on Trade Waste Charges
Item 4.1 Councillor Campbell – submissions on Trade Waste Charges

MDC 17/180 ALTERATION OR REVOCATION OF PREVIOUS RESOLUTION

Report of the Chief Executive dated 26 May 2017 regarding revocation or alteration of a resolution made at the 18-22 May 2017 extraordinary Council meeting.

RESOLVED

That the following resolution made at the extraordinary Council meeting of 18-22 May 2017 be revoked:
“That the Manawatu District Council authorises the Chief Executive to negotiate an alternative trade waste regime with major trade waste customers and notes that any reduction in trade waste fees must be covered by rates.”

And the following resolution be made in its place:

“That the Council notes the concerns raised in submissions #0400 and #0474 relating to the increase in the trade waste disposal charges. Council will work with major trade waste customers to explore ways they could pre-treat their waste to reduce the fees and charges they will incur.”

Moved by: Councillor Michael Ford
Seconded by: Councillor Steve Bielski

CARRIED

RESOLVED

1. That the Council notes that the decisions on submissions made at the extraordinary Council meetings held 18 to 22 May 2017 and 1 June 2017 be used to finalise the budgets and incorporated into the Annual Plan 2017-18, and form the basis for written responses to submitters.

2. That the Council meeting previously scheduled for Wednesday 14 June 2017 at 8.30am be rescheduled to Thursday 22 June 2017 and the Council notes that the final Annual Plan 2017-18 will be presented for adoption at that meeting.

Moved by: Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by: Councillor Shane Casey

CARRIED

MDC 17/181 UPDATE OF DELEGATIONS MANUAL


RESOLVED

The Council adopts the Manawatu District Council Delegations Manual dated 29 May 2017 subject to the amendment of the following items:

Item 61.1 Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) addition of:
MWLASS
Awahuri Forest Kitchener Park

Moved by: Councillor Alison Short
Seconded by: Councillor Michael Ford

CARRIED
MINUTES | EXTRAORDINARY MEETING | TIME  
---|----------------------|------
COUNCIL | THURSDAY 1 JUNE 2017 | 8.30AM  

MDC 17/182 MEETING CLOSURE

Her Worship the Mayor declared the meeting closed at 8.55am.

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:


CHAIRPERSON

DATE
What Makes a Strong Rural Community?

Katherine Gillespie
Kellogg Rural Leadership Programme 2016
Executive Summary

The aim of this research was to explore ways to strengthen rural communities in New Zealand. The research focuses on the three small rural communities of Kimbolton, Apiti and Rangiwhia, all located in the northern Manawatu.

Six households were chosen from each community and invited to participate in the project. The participants were given a survey and interviewed in their homes. The survey questions covered the following things: participants’ understanding of a sense of community, rural change, community facilities and social groups, community involvement, understanding of community governance, and access to technology.

Alongside the interviews, a literature review has been done. This explores the importance of community, the concept of social capital and examines research done into communities facing change in relation to a changing rural environment.

In interviewing the participants, it was evident that community meant more than a physical or geographical location or connection. Everyone involved in the interviews talked about relationships and connections, and supporting community members, i.e. social capital.

Participants were asked to score their own community on a scale from 0 = no sense of community, to 5 = strong sense of community. The scores ranged from 1-4, with the majority sitting around 3. The desire for a strong sense of community was expressed and participants were keen to discuss what could be done to improve this.

It was evident in discussions on community governance, that all communities needed to have a more visible community vision and strategic direction. The foundation for this has been provided by work done on community planning with the Manawatu District Council. The drive now needs to come from within each community.

Participants were asked about rural change over the last ten years, and its effect on individuals and on the community. Relative newcomers to the communities talked about recent changes, while well-established members went back over 40 years to discuss the effects of dramatic change.

The importance of good infrastructure was evident. Good roads, access to fast, affordable internet and reliable cell phone coverage were all deemed essential to the communities’ wellbeing and development. For example, the recent sealing of a country road has made travel easier for residents and has also opened the area for tourist exploration.

All participants were heavily dependent on technology for social interaction, information and research, i.e. Google, business interactions and the ability to access technology for use on farms etc. Several participants talked about access to fast internet being vital in promoting the area to both a domestic and international audience. Several participants felt limited by expensive, and still unreliable, internet in the area.
Cell phone coverage remains a problem in places, particularly out on farms. Safety and ability to communicate for business needs were listed as high concerns.

The smallest community, Rangiwahia, appeared to have the highest social capital and community engagement. This is perhaps because counter-urbanisation is minimal and the community is still predominantly made up of farming families. There are very few lifestyle blocks and minimal urban influence. However, this is a community that is forward thinking, action based, and innovative with a high level of social capital.

The communities with the least cohesion had many transient farm staff and several people looking for very affordable housing and an alternative lifestyle.

The challenge here lies with successfully integrating non-rural community members into a traditional farming community. It is evident that larger communities face perhaps the most complex challenge with diverse individual and community needs.

The conclusion drawn from the research and literature review is that building strong social capital is necessary for a strong sense of community and sense of belonging.

This report concludes with four broad recommendations for actions that can be taken to support and strengthen New Zealand’s rural communities.

These are:

1. Create Conscious Community - build social capital
2. Build Quality Leadership - support, train and encourage
3. Encourage Collaboration - with other local communities
4. Community Development - social, economic and environmental

The challenge to our modern day rural communities is to embrace change and to continue to evolve. This is required to meet the needs of the 21st Century rural community. For this to be possible, communities need strong leadership, an inclusive and engaged community and the ability to think outside the box.
Foreword

There are several personal factors that have led me to want to study the strong rural community.

My husband and I, along with our three children, have lived in our current rural community for ten years. Even within this time we have witnessed a slow deterioration in community spirit. An area that used to be known for its vibrant community and local spirit, now struggles for people to engage and connect in the community.

I see that our community has great potential, firstly to connect, secondly to meet the needs of our community members and thirdly to offer support to our wider community, to our rural industry and beyond.

I have embarked on a quest to discover ways to strengthen my local community. Through this, I am hopeful that in identifying key factors of community strength, my research will be applicable across all rural communities in New Zealand.
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1.0 Introduction

Historically New Zealand has been built on strong rural communities, and country living has occurred around a well-founded community hub. Over the last 50 years, countless changes have seen dramatic depopulation of rural areas, a decrease in services provided, and a marked change in the makeup of people in our rural communities.

Rural communities of the past were synonymous with farming communities. The social networks worked to support farming families and events were often calendared around the farming lifestyle.

The challenges of the modern rural community are vastly different from the communities of old. While the challenges are different, the needs remain the same. This being to provide strong networks between community groups and support for all community members, local businesses and industry.

The aim of this project is to look at what makes a strong rural community. In the fast-changing world that we live in, I believe there is a need for rural communities to be continually evolving. This is vital if we want our communities to endure into the future and meet the needs of our modern day rural areas.

For our communities to do this, it is first necessary to understand the historical context, to acknowledge the changes that have occurred and then to identify what is necessary for communities moving forward. Doing this allows us to embrace what has shaped our community, to celebrate our rural history and to plan for the future of rural New Zealand.

The information gathered in this study is qualitative, and the number of community members interviewed was not extensive enough to incorporate statistical analysis of the data. The study was done in one small geographical area and was limited to three local communities. The nature of qualitative research has allowed the author insight into a small window of rural New Zealand and to make recommendations based on this.
2.0 Methodology

Data used in this study were gathered from in-depth interviews with individuals and families from three local communities in the Northern Manawatu. The communities were chosen due to their close proximity, their similar historical settings, and their ability to provide examples of communities with different character.

Interview questions were formulated carefully to gain a good understanding of the perceived strength of each community. Participants were asked what “a sense of community” meant to them and were then asked to score their local area’s sense of community.

Questions relating to changes witnessed over the years were important to gain insight into what the community used to look like. They also showed participant’s perceptions of what the changes have meant for them individually and as a community. Participants’ knowledge of local governance and their perception of its effectiveness were also obtained.

Participants’ community involvement (both formal and informal) was explored and then used to determine their level of community involvement.

The survey questions covered knowledge of community groups, and access to technology such as internet and cell phone access.

Lastly, participants were asked what they thought could be done to increase community wellness.

Survey questions are listed in Appendix 2.

Initially three families in each community were selected and then, as further connections were made, additional participants were approached. Of all the people approached, only one family declined the invitation to be involved.

Consideration was given to the selection of individuals and families to ensure that the people involved could reflect the range of the community and give different insight and perspective on their community. A total of eighteen households were interviewed, with six households from each community.

The survey participants were all given a letter introducing the project and an explanation of why it was being carried out. They were informed that their responses would be anonymous and that they would not be identifiable in the final report. This was considered essential due to the nature of the small communities studied.

The letter of introduction is found in Appendix 1.

Survey participants were emailed an 11 question survey and asked to consider the questions prior to the interview. Interviews were held around the kitchen table over a cup of tea, allowing a semi-structured informal interview. Interviews ranged in time from 45
minutes to 2½ hours, this varied due to a number of factors. Valuable information, not necessarily pertaining to the survey questions was gathered in this setting.

When analysing the information gained, the method of thematic analysis was applied. The information was then collated and analysed for recurring themes and trends. This qualitative analytic method is recognised as a structured way of looking for themes in qualitative research (Braun & Clarke, 2006 & 2013).
3.0 Community Background

For this study, I have chosen to look at three local communities to gain insight into a small window of rural New Zealand. Located in the northern Manawatu lie Rangiwahia, Apiti and Kimbolton.
Due to its isolation and poor accessibility, the northern Manawatu was settled relatively late in New Zealand history. The area was challenging for the first settlers and its stories bring images of isolation, harsh geographical and physical conditions, and of the strong pioneer spirit essential to survival.

Special settlements took place under the Land Act of 1877. “This enabled the Governor to “set apart out of any rural lands such blocks of land as he shall think fit, and declare them open for special settlement”. The provisions for special settlements also allowed for deferred payment of up to 90% of the purchase price, and a further Crown Grant conditional on the land being subject to “permanent improvement” (i.e. a certain amount of bush had to be cleared over a certain period of time)” (Lusk, 1988).

The purpose of the new Land Act 1877 was to open up the country to settlement, with the goal of putting the small people on the land. This provided an exciting opportunity not available for the settlers in their country of origin. The land was subdivided into 100 or 200 acre blocks and the blocks were allotted by ballot (Lusk, 1988).

**Rangiwahia** means “piercing the sky”, “cloud piercer” or “opening in the heavens”. Its name came about because the site was a natural clearing of approximately 100 acres in amongst the tall trees of the virgin bush. The settlement of the Rangiwahia area began in 1885 (Rangiwahia Community Plan, 2015).

**Apiti** is a Maori word meaning the narrows, or the gorges. This is a fitting description of where Apiti sits, located between two river gullies and high hills. The first European settlers arrived in Apiti during July 1886. Access to the area was difficult with the first bridge across the Oroua River not built until 1896 (Apiti Community Plan, 2014).
Kimbolton was settled at the same time as the more remote areas of Rangiwhia and Apiti. Access to the Kimbolton area was significantly easier and, as it was the closest settlement to Feilding, soon Kimbolton soon became the largest township (Kimbolton Community Plan, 2013).

Over the years, the settlements all rapidly became bustling townships, supporting the needs of their farming communities. Each area hosted a healthy township of hotels, boarding houses, taverns, dairy factories, creamery, maternity homes, schools, blacksmiths, and other support businesses, post offices and numerous churches.

Like all new settlements, communities were reliant on helping one another to work the land to its best potential. Community networks and community strength were essential for supporting the early settlers.

In 1906 the Wanganui Chronicle is quoted as reporting “Rangiwhia is one of the rapidly growing inland towns of the West Coast” (Rangiwhia Community Plan, 2015). This was indicative of the general growth in the Kiwitea County.

The townships boomed in their early days, however as early as 1916 evidence can be seen of a slowing of trade. In 1916 in Kimbolton the manager of the bank reports that “Local trade in this district has gone back, due to the introduction of the motor car, the farmers making Fridays, sale day in Feilding their market day” (Lusk, 1988).

Two years later he reported that “business is not likely to improve owing to aggregation (of land) and our adjacency to, and convenience in reaching Feilding, which is the market of this district” (Lusk, 1988).

The main source of income over the years has been dairy and sheep farming, forestry and some cropping, e.g. potatoes. Diversification occurred in the late 20th Century which saw the introduction of deer and, more recently, hospitality and tourism to the area.

Over the last 50 years the three communities have seen much change and the dramatically decreased population reflects this. These changes have included amalgamation of farms, conversion from sheep and beef to dairy, centralisation of rural service and urbanisation.

Kimbolton remains the largest village and contains a memorial hall, heritage library building, café, preschool, school, a bowling green, native bush reserve, rugby grounds, tavern, domain and rhododendron gardens and nurseries. Kimbolton is only 20 minutes’ drive from Feilding. This makes it attractive for residents to commute to Feilding. It is also attractive as
a retirement area. The school roll sits at around 80 students and plays an important role in the area. The primary production remains farming and cropping along with a large plant nursery, public gardens and other small businesses that help service the area, e.g. garage, café, pub, artists, upholsterer, etc.

Apiti remains predominantly a farming community, although the last 10 years has seen an increase in people looking for affordable housing and an alternative lifestyle. Apiti contains a memorial hall, heritage library, museum, school, native bush reserve, tavern and domain. The school roll sits between 22-30 students and remains a valuable part of the community.

Rangiwahia has perhaps seen the biggest change, with little left of the bustling township. The focus now is on the community hall, church and native bush reserves. The community saw the closure of its school in 2014. However, the community spirit has remained strong and this is particularly evident in this area.

Local residents of the northern Manawatu remain fiercely proud of the district's history, and its heritage is cherished. The desire for strong community is evident.
4.0 Findings and Discussion

4.1 Literature Review

To help understand the concept of a strong rural community, this literature review will look at the concepts of “community”, “sense of community” and “social capital”. It will also review literature found discussing change in our rural setting and the implications for rural society.

What is community?

The Oxford Living Dictionary has a total of five sub definitions of “community”. For the purpose of this report, the following two are particularly helpful, these will be used to provide the framework definition of community.

1. A particular area or place considered together with its inhabitants. For example, ‘a rural community’.

2. The people of a district or country considered collectively, especially in the context of shared social values and responsibilities; society (Oxford Living Dictionary, 2016).

“Community is built on common beliefs, values, concerns and interests” (Debertin, 1997). Sometimes, as with a purely geographical community, members are less likely to have many of these in common but are joined in community by the area they live in.

What is sense of community?

This term was first used by psychologist Seymour B. Sarason in 1974. From his research Sarason concluded, “sense of community is everywhere, and lack of sense of community contributes to human misery” (Fremlin, 2016). Research at the time was exploring the idea of linked benefits to members, such as increased physical and psychological health. Since then, further research has been done to explore and develop this theme (Pinker, 2014), (Putnam, 2000), (Wiseman, 2008).

The following definition is widely used. “Sense of community is a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to be together” (McMillan, 1976).

Why is community important?

The need for relationships and connection is real and has been with us since the beginning of human existence. Humans are social creatures and inherently we strive to live in community.

Current research confirms that our individual health and wellbeing is intricately tied to the health of our communities and our interactions with others.
When talking about her book “The Village Effect”, Canadian Clinical psychologist Susan Pinker states that “We are intensely social creatures,” “We’ve evolved to live in groups. Surveys of what drives human satisfaction are pretty consistent: we’re happiest when we feel we belong …. Social contact and the drive to belong is a powerful physiological appetite, like hunger.” (www.vancouversun.com, 2014)

Pinker also talks about how life expectancy changes according to human contact, “If you’re surrounded by a tightly connected circle of friends who regularly gather to eat and share gossip,” Pinker writes, “you’ll not only have fun but you’re also likely to live an average of 15 years longer than a loner” (Pinker, 2014).

Research indicates that “varied, in-person social contact is a more powerful predictor of health, happiness, learning, and longevity than anything else within our control — better than exercise, better than quitting smoking or drinking, better than breathing clean air” (Pinker, 2014).

Brene Brown is a well-known and respected research professor at the University of Houston. “Connection is why we’re here. It’s what gives purpose and meaning to our lives. This is what it’s all about. It doesn’t matter whether you talk to people who work in social justice, mental health and abuse and neglect, what we know is that connection, the ability to feel connected, is neurobiological, that is how we’re wired—it’s why we’re here” (Brown, 2010).

Numerous studies have shown that as our social connectedness or sense of community diminishes so does our individual wellbeing (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004).

The importance of community in the rural setting is amplified due to the complications of living remotely and its resulting isolation (Sampson et al, 2007).

Social Capital

What is social capital and why is it important?

The main theme of social capital is that community networks have value. Expanding on this, many definitions refer to the value of social networks, bonding similar people and bridging between diverse people, for the benefit of all involved.

“Social capital refers to the collective value of all "social networks" (who people know) and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other ("norms of reciprocity")” (Putnam, 2000).

How does social capital work?

The term “social capital” captures a picture of a social network with a wide variety of specific benefits that flow from the trust, reciprocity, information, and cooperation associated with social networks. Social capital works to increase community strength by improving a number of factors. It creates value for the people who are connected and for the community where the connections occur (Putnam, 2000).
“In both rural and urban communities, social capital refers to the institutions and mechanisms whereby residents relate to and interact with each other to solve problems for the common good” (Debertin, 1997).

There’s much debate over the various forms that social capital takes. Putnam categorises the links into three groups:

1. Bonds: Links to people based on a sense of common identity (“people like us”) such as family, close friends and people who share our culture or ethnicity.
2. Bridges: Links that stretch beyond a shared sense of identity, for example to distant friends, colleagues and associates.
3. Linkages: Links to people or groups further up or lower down the social ladder.

For a truly strong community to exist it is necessary to have varied and multiple interactions utilising each of the three links (Putnam, 2000).

There appears to be no consensus on how to measure social capital in terms of scientific research (Claridge, 2004). However, for the purpose of this report, the following will be used as an indication of high social capital.

- People spend more time in community organisations
- There are more volunteers
- People are more likely to be engaged in community
- People spend more time socialising with family, friends and neighbours
- Individual and community needs are being met

In a study done for The Young Foundation (UK), report authors concluded that there is a growing body of evidence to suggest that neighbourliness helps to build positive social capital and contributes to the improved wellbeing of communities, families and individuals (Hothi, Bacon, Brophy & Mulgan, 2011).

New Zealand’s Mental Health Foundation is interested in the relationship between social capital and its potential to support flourishing communities and to improve positive mental health (www.mentalhealth.org.nz, 2016). In a report for the Foundation, the New Zealand Families Commission is quoted as saying “the more social capital that exists in a community, the greater the capacity of that community to build further stocks of social capital for the wellbeing of the collective.” The commission references work done by Goodrich & Sampson, 2008 (Bradley, 2012).

On the other hand, it is evident that the symptoms of a community with low social capital include a depressed community spirit, apathy, hopelessness and a sense of being powerless to change things.

In the age of online connection and social media, it is argued that today’s rural community has the advantage being part of much larger and diverse online communities. While online social media has its benefits, a controversial conclusion made by Susan Pinker is that technology alone is not enough to grow social capital. In today’s social media culture, she
says that the connections are not strong enough to affect human wellbeing. We need face to face relationships and a wide range of connections to maintain wellness (Pinker, 2014).

It is recognised internationally that social capital has decreased due to changes in urban and rural society. There is less community, in general, happening internationally.

"Modern community lacks social cohesion and strength because social capital built in the past is no longer being constructed" (Putnam, 2000).

However, Richard Reeves suggests that community has not disappeared but has changed in its appearance. “Putnam overlooks construction sites of new social capital, including informal friendship networks as well as virtual communities created and maintained in cyberspace. The biggest hole in his analysis is the role played by work in the creation and maintenance of community” (Reeves, 2001).

**Rural change in New Zealand and its effects on rural community**

The study of rural change and its effects has been undertaken by numerous authors.

Reports on rural change discuss many factors that have affected New Zealand’s rural communities.

Factors include: declining farm incomes, increasing farm debt, farm sales, conversion from sheep and beef to dairy, primary sector unemployment, farm amalgamation, change from family-owned farms to larger corporate farms, demographic changes, centralisation of rural services to the regions, urbanisation and counter-urbanisation. These have all contributed to the depopulation of our rural communities, resulting in decreased social capital, increased isolation, and the decline of rural wellbeing (Sampson et al, 2007) (Mackay et al., 2009) (Smith, 2010).

“Changes in the economic base (in farming and other businesses) which have increased time pressures and reduced people’s availability for voluntary and community work and social activity, together with demographic changes (particularly the hollowing out of 20-34 year olds in rural communities) create new challenges for maintaining the service infrastructure and social networking” (Pomeroy, 2011).

It is of interest that older papers report patterns and issues that continue to be a problem for rural communities today. Of note is the 2011 report “Rural Community Resilience and Climate Change”, by Ann Pomeroy. This paper references and quotes papers from the early to late 1990s addressing the effects of change in the rural community. Many of these are still issues that communities struggle to successfully tackle today.

“With many rural communities losing people (particularly the out-migration of young adults), and the change in work patterns, fewer people were (and are) available to run community services. Fewer leaders and people with the skills to manage and administer community organisations make it difficult to get new projects started. When enthusiastic newcomers started projects, then left, long-term community members were faced with completing them.
Many rural volunteers consequently suffered overload and burnout. This was compounded by people feeling pressured to keep services operating locally so that the same people ended up on the different committees (Liepins 1998, Taylor et al 1998)” (Pomeroy, 2011).

“Farming is harder, more people are working off farm and more intensive farming is necessary to make a living. Taylor et al also found that dairying brought a mobile population: “the great majority of newcomers had been in the area less than ten years” (Taylor et al 1998). Most of the local dairy farm women had been on their current property only four years and some had shifted four times in the previous ten-year period. This gave little time for them to contribute locally and few had close social ties. Taylor et al commented that dairy farming families tended to socialise with other dairy farming families as their work patterns were similar. While dairying had brought 12 new families into the area “they do not always have the time, or feel welcome to take part in community activities” (Taylor et al 1998)” (Pomeroy, 2011).

As the rural population has decreased there is a greater need for collaboration to occur between community members that have little but geographical location to bind them together. This requires considerable leadership awareness and skill.

“As the size of the community becomes smaller, there is less likelihood that social capital will be built around networks of people with similar educational levels, income and housing, and a greater likelihood that people of widely varying education, income and employment skills will meet and interact in social networks. If the rural community is small enough, it is possible that nearly the entire community will function as a single social capital network. This one feature makes rural communities inherently different from urban settings and if the rural community is small enough, people of all income levels and housing values will likely be living in close proximity” (Debertin, 1997).

Overall it is agreed that the huge changes seen by rural New Zealand over the last 50 plus years have significantly impacted rural communities. Rural communities need to continue to evolve and find a new norm, one that will allow them to meet the needs of a diverse range of community individuals.
4.2 Community Case Studies: Community Interview Findings

Snapshot of the Kimbolton Community

Kimbolton is a rural village and farming area. It has moderate urban influence (NZ Statistics, 2004). Kimbolton is bucking the national trend of decreasing populations in rural centres. It has recently seen an influx of new residents to the village. Because of its affordable housing and location, Kimbolton has attracted people who commute for work, it is also a quiet village for retirees and has an English country village feel to it. There is a new subdivision in progress and several new houses being built, there are very few houses for sale or to rent. The area is known for its stunning views, its rhododendrons and its community village feel.

The following sections contain information from the interviews and discussions with Kimbolton area residents. They highlight the responses of participants.

Sense of Community

“A feeling of belonging”
“An underlying sense of care between residents”
“General feeling of safety”
“Knowing your neighbours”
“Pride in appearance of the town”
“A willingness to pitch in”
“People looking out for neighbours”
“Utilising skills within district before going out of the district, e.g. for tradesmen”
“People who are looking out for others”
“We came because we liked the feel of the community”

Strength of community
Survey participants scored the sense of community in Kimbolton 3-4.
(0 = no sense of community, 5 = strong sense of community)

The consensus was that Kimbolton was a large community, fragmented in many smaller groups and that there was room for improving the overall sense of community.

Rural Changes and Effects
This section highlights the rural changes in the Kimbolton area as discussed by the interview participants.

Police presence:
Kimbolton has recently had a police officer return to living in the area.

“Police presence is very important to have in Kimbolton, it keeps crime down, petty crime that can become bigger = local kids etc.”
“Traffic has slowed down”
“Perception of safety and wellbeing has improved”
“It is nice to know the personal side of the police force, we are really lucky to have him living here”

An increase in new people in the community:
“New people have breathed fresh air into the community as they seem to be positive and upbeat people who have made a conscious choice to move to Kimbolton”
“Lots leave the village for work so are not involved in day to day activities”
“There is a greater turnover of families at school, parents are busy working either on farms or travelling to town to work and this affects fundraising support at school and parental involvement in school activities”
“Not all established residents welcome new people but I think this is getting better”

Loss of petrol bowsers from local garage:
“Inconvenience to locals and passing traffic”

Changes in availability of preschool care:
Preschool “Little Ark” is set up. “Great start to school (well-adjusted kids) and wonderful opportunity for mums to make new friends especially for new families to the district.”
“Kids were with other local community children every day, this helped with starting school”
“Little Ark helped connect the families”

Closure of Little Ark Preschool after eight years, closure of Kimbolton Playcentre, along with the Plunket services now being based in Feilding.
“Travel for childcare, less convenient and kids are not getting as many days of education”
“Children no longer as socially connected to their community and other local children”
“There is nowhere for parents to meet other local families”
“Increased isolation felt by new parents and families new to the area”
“It has made it really difficult for some families to get their children to preschool”

Amalgamation of the local rugby club with town club:
“Less games played at Kimbolton, fewer social activity for locals”
“Farmers’ social life used to be going out to the rugby at Kimbolton”
“The amalgamation of the club occurred because of a lack of young men in district, amalgamation of farms, or farms not being economic to keep sons at home. As well as dairy farming hours not being conducive to playing sports.”
“Rugby used to bring the local area and surrounding area together, like church used to”

Local Governance - Kimbolton Community Committee
The northern Manawatu falls under the umbrella of the Manawatu District Council. As part of the Council’s Community Development Plan, each area has a Community Committee.

*Notes on the Manawatu District Council Community Committees Policy are available in Appendix 6.

The Kimbolton Community Committee is made up of a diverse group of community members and generally has 14+ people attending each meeting plus the Council Liaison Councillor.
The Committee is highly visible in the community and takes responsibility for organising social community events as well as providing strategic direction. It appears to have a high energy for social events and getting things done. It is evident that the Committee collaborates a little with other committees in the region.

Comments made about the committee included:
“*They do a good job, fun events for the community*”
“*Need a strong committee to be a squeaky wheel to the Manawatu District Council*”
“*We need someone to work and persist on keeping the community plan moving*”
“*They need more “people relationships” to interconnect social networks throughout the area.*”
“*The revamped Fowlers Reserve is a great space for the community*”

The Committee communication online is done through the school newsletter http://www.kimbolton.school.nz/newsletters, and the “We are Kimbolton” Facebook page. Committee minutes can be found at the Manawatu District Council website. http://www.mdc.govt.nz/Living_Leisure/Community_Committees/Kimbolton

The Committee is working to build Kimbolton’s online presence and promote the area.

**Internet and Cell Phone Coverage**

Access to affordable internet has become widely available in the area. Cell phone coverage has improved dramatically in the last five years with a new tower situated just outside the village. However, there remain areas on local farms with little to no reception.
“*We still don’t get cell phone coverage all the way to town*”
“*Safety and general communication both need better reliability in the hard to reach places*”

Community members use the internet for social connection, business, advertising and researching.

**Participants’ ideas to increase community wellbeing.**

- Monthly community dinners
- Encourage people to join Neighbourhood Support
- Increase communication to community
- Increase awareness of community needs
- More community events
- Something to interlink community groups and social groups
- Events that join our neighbouring communities
Snapshot of the Apiti Community

Apiti is a small rural community with a small central village. It has low urban influence (NZ Statistics 2004). The area still has a large farming influence with some multi-generation family farms in existence. Apiti has recently seen a portion of farms change hands, bringing new families into the area. Cheap rentals and affordable house prices in the area have attracted people looking for an alternative lifestyle. The village has seen two homes built and people choosing to move into the area for their retirement. There is a large range of socioeconomic layers within the community. A number of community members commute for work in Feilding and Palmerston North. The area is known as “The Gateway to the Ruahines” and has stunning scenery and multiple outdoor activities available.

The following sections contain information from the interviews and discussions with Apiti area residents. They highlight the responses of participants.

Sense of Community

“A sense of belonging, sense of family”
“Belonging somewhere and having a place”
“An enlarged family network”
“Friendship and being there for each other, community networks, support for community events”
“It is the people in the community that bring it together. People who are willing to be the drivers behind events, communication, building community”
“Having a list of phone numbers on the board and kids knowing they can call if they need”
“Genuine connection, relationship and care between people, centred around one or more commonalities such as geographic location or interest”
“Local people working together and helping each other “
“A gathering is stronger than each individual strength”

Strength of community

Survey participants scored the sense of community in Apiti 1-3. (0 = no sense of community, 5 = strong sense of community)

The consensus here was that things have been better and that there is something missing from community connections.

Rural Changes and Effect
This section highlights the rural changes in the Apiti area as discussed by the interview participants.

Amalgamation of farms:
“There used to be lots of farms on our road. We would get together for family potluck teas. I have seen six households disappear just on my road”
“Men use to stand at the boundary fence and roll a cigarette and catch up”
There is a need to go further now to meet social needs, “less chance of bumping into people in the community”
“There are less people around my age. I feel lonelier” - loss of friends and neighbours as farms have sold and been amalgamated.

Change in diversity of population: More people in the area are not farming.
“When my kids were at school, everyone was from a farm.”
There are more “transient people on dairy farms, they don’t do anything for the community”
“Apiti seems to attract different people”

Decline in community spirit: “the community is fractured”
“School families are unwilling to participate in community”
“Lack of awareness of needs”
“We don’t have big community events anymore”
“There are a fair few people that are left out, and are practically invisible”
“It is more isolating, there is fracture between older generation and younger”
Here the older generation discussed that they feel the younger people don’t want to know them.

Apiti Tavern: Introduction of drink driving campaigns in the 1980s changed the patronage of the tavern. “People are more likely to drink at home, with or without friends”. Increased financial pressures mean that some cannot afford to eat out or drink at the tavern. These changes have made it financially difficult for pub owners. During the last 10 years the Apiti Tavern has seen multiple management and ownership changes and in the last five years has been closed intermittently for variable lengths of time. The stop-start nature of the tavern in recent years is seen as detrimental for the community.

When discussing the tavern’s importance in the community, both extremes were heard. From “The Apiti Tavern is a lifeline” to “We don’t need a pub to keep us together”. Most however agreed that when the Tavern is open there is a common meeting place for the community and that this is invaluable.

The Tavern is seen as a place for informal connections.
“When the pub has been closed, people lose a place where they can talk about issues like porina, grass grub, the crap weather … where the men can just touch base and have a support network”
“Rub shoulders and share issues on farm”
“Invaluable for people to know that they are not the only one dealing with a problem”
“Helps keep things in perspective”

Community members also spoke of finding it difficult to meet new people without the regular community dinners hosted by the Tavern.

Community Groups and Community Involvement

- Strong Rural Volunteer Fire Brigade
- Apiti Tavern and Eatery
- Apiti Playcentre
Apiti School - School BOT and fundraising committee  
Apiti Golf Club  
Apiti Community Committee  
Apiti RSA  
Apiti Show Committee  
Ladies Group  
Indoor Bowls  
Pool Club 

All community members interviewed take part in community in an informal way. A minority stated that they were on committees and were involved in groups on a regular basis.

Local Governance - Apiti Community Committee
The northern Manawatu falls under the umbrella of the Manawatu District Council. As part of the Council’s Community Development Plan each area has a Community Committee.

*Notes on the Manawatu District Council Community Committees Policy are available in Appendix 6.

The Committee is very small and is run by a small group of long standing citizens. The number of people attending meetings is about 5-10, plus the council Liaison Councillor.

Community engagement is very low and the survey results indicated that community knowledge of the Committee is weak. Numerous people stated that they know that it exists but do not have a good understanding of its role.

"I have no idea what they do"
“Lack of connection with the community”
“Sense of fatigue and lack of interest/value in community committee”
“Lack decisive leadership”
“I went to the community planning meetings but what is being done now?"
“The community plan needs someone to drive it, is it responsibility of the community or the Council?”

Committee members feel that they are working alone with minimal engagement from the community and with little interest from people willing to step onto the committee.

“No-one wants to help”

There is a high degree of apathy in the community and it is not evident what has caused this to develop. There is no “succession plan” in place and there is little motivation for younger community members to participate in meetings.

Communication from the Committee is minimal. Meeting dates are listed in the “Community News” section of the school’s online newsletter and the minutes can be found on the Manawatu District Council Website www.apitischoolnewsletter.blogspot.co.nz/p/community-notices
www.mdc.govt.nz/Living_Leisure/Community_Committees/Apiti
Internet and Cell Phone Coverage

Access to affordable internet is becoming more available in the area. There remain some houses with limited options and, because of cost, often these households go without. There is mutual feeling that it should be easy for the area to get great internet access but that the priority for this remains low. “The more difficult areas to get good internet access are often the areas that would benefit the most, through improved social connections.”

All agree that fast, affordable internet is something that the community needs and several asked why the community does not collectively campaign for this.

Those that do have internet access use it for “everything”.

Cell phone coverage has improved dramatically in the last five years with two new towers in place. However there remain areas with little to no reception. Usually the areas are where communication for safety is seen to be most important.

Participants’ ideas to increase community wellbeing.

- Cohesion - something that links the smaller groups together
- Something that connects the young and old
- Casual informal get-togethers
- More frequent social gatherings
- Greater shared vision and sense of identity
- A community newspaper or newsletter independent of school
- Fuel and basic groceries
- A community van for transport to town
- Monthly health team visits to the area
Snapshot of the Rangiwahia Community

Rangiwahia is a small rural community with minimal urban influence (NZ Statistics, 2004). The region remains predominantly farming, with several fourth-generation farms in the area. There are few non-farming households and “people who settle here have chosen to live a remote country lifestyle”. A small percentage of the population commute for work, either within the Manawatu, e.g. Feilding, Palmerston North or travel north into the Rangitikei District. There is a strong sense of community, pride in the area’s natural beauty and history, along with forward thinking and innovative community members.

The following sections contain information from the interviews and discussions with Rangiwahia area residents. They highlight the responses of participants.

Sense of Community

“Small communities are not stale stagnant ponds of nothingness”
“An awareness of others' needs, we know people on a personal level”
“Community means that we experience others’ generosity and help”
“Heightened sense of awareness to other people’s vulnerability in situations”
“Gratitude when people come to your aid”
“Networks are strong like a family”
“Joy of mixing with others”
“Knowing that you can ask for help but not needing to ask because it is already offered”
“Looking out for each other, people are not afraid to ask for help”
“Welcoming environment, with people of similar values and interests, a place where you can connect and where people care for each other.”

Strength of community

Survey participants scored the sense of community in Rangiwahia 3-5. (0 = no sense of community, 5 = strong sense of community)

There was a consensus that the community had a moderate to strong sense of community and all stated that more that could be done to build on this.

One community member stated “To have a strong community you need feisty women with a get it done attitude and four or five good men willing to step into roles of leadership.” It would appear that the community of Rangiwahia has just that.

Rural Changes and their Effects

This section highlights the rural changes in the Rangiwahia area as discussed by the interview participants.

Amalgamation of farms and a change in the culture of farming:
“We just don’t have as many neighbours/friends here anymore”
Changing culture of dairy farms from family-run farms to large corporate businesses with high staff turnover and immigrant workers. Perception is that the purpose of these farms is to make money and that staff are unwilling to be involved or contributing to community. “There are only two big dairy farms but they have affected the area”

**Increased value in the land**

“Has made it more difficult to farm profitably and has made families have to work harder”
“It is very difficult for new blood to buy into the area.”
“Impossible for the kids to come home to the farm”
“More women are off farm to work and this changed the community in lots ways.”

**School Closure:** The decision to close the school was influenced by Ministry of Education action, however it was a community decision. Roll numbers in 2013 meant the MoE allocated one teacher funding for 2014. Funding previously had been allocated for two teachers. (The school had approximately 25 children in the area but not all attended the local school.) Following this decision, numbers dropped rapidly with families opting to send children to other larger schools, either in the area or to boarding school. The decision to close was made when there was only one family left attending school.

This divided the community with many strong feelings on both sides. Impact from this division is still felt today but community members surveyed stated that this was becoming less evident. “Some people stopped engaging in the community but this is improving”.

The school provided regular community events during the year as part of its calendar. These included a Christmas concert, Lamb and Calf Day, fundraisers etc. “These were a good excuse for the community to get together”

Members of the local community supported the school and numerous people had volunteered their time over the years, e.g. to teach Te Reo, cheese making, art, assisting with reading etc. This is missed by those who were involved.

Several people said that they miss the school newsletter and that they used to look forward to reading it. “Because children now go to school outside of the area it is more difficult to keep track of their achievements at school and beyond”. “We have lost that family community feel”.

The long-term consequences of losing the school are yet to be seen. Questions remain in terms of farmers employing staff and attracting staff with families and how the closure will affect future land sales. However, one thing that people are quick to point out is that “losing our school has not meant the end of our community”.

**Community Groups and Community Involvement**

- Strong rural volunteer fire brigade
- St Barnabas Church - services help once a month and annual Christmas Carol Service
- Friends of St Barnabas - active fundraising group
- Rangiwhia Playgroup
- Ruahine Rangiwahia Collie Club
- Rangiwahia Home and Garden Club
- Book Club
- Rangiwahia Community Committee
- Rangiwahia Educational Arts Centre REACT

Rangiwahia community has a strong online presence and actively communicates and promotes the area. [http://www.irongates.co.nz/](http://www.irongates.co.nz/), [http://rangiwahiacommunity.weebly.com/](http://rangiwahiacommunity.weebly.com/), Facebook; Friends of St Barnabas, Rangiwahia community pages, etc.

Most community members surveyed belong to numerous groups and all take an active part in the community.

**Local Governance - Rangiwahia Community Committee**
The northern Manawatu falls under the umbrella of the Manawatu District Council. As part of the Council’s Community Development Plan each area has a Community Committee.

*Notes on the Manawatu District Council Community Committees Policy are available in Appendix 6.*

All the of survey participants stated that they are either on the Committee or that they attend the meetings. The Committee has a high level of community engagement with meetings attracting around 20 attendees. New members to the community are encouraged to participate and attend meetings.

The Committee organises social events, coordinates fundraising, implements infrastructure development, e.g. renovated public toilets, as well as providing some strategic direction for the community.

The community appears to have a high level of understanding of the role of the Committee.

During the interview process, it appeared that communication from the Committee to the community was informal but effective. However, when an internet search was performed, the author found an entire weebly site dedicated to the Rangiwahia Community ([www.rangiwahiacommunity.weebly.com](http://www.rangiwahiacommunity.weebly.com)), with a significant amount of information available for local community and the public. Interestingly, not one of the survey participants mentioned this form of communication.

The following are some examples of the community’s resilience and forward thinking:

- One family have pushed for the District Council to improve roading. This was done not only to improve conditions and accessibility for locals, but also with the idea of promoting tourism in the area. This has been achieved and now the area has its own "Manawatu Scenic Road" bringing visitors off State Highway 1 at Mangaweka with options to drive right through to Palmerston North or Feilding.

- The Rangiwahia Community Hall is one of the best in the region and the community take great pride in it. The Hall is well maintained and resourced and it is a real
community asset. Until recently, the Committee needed regular Council grants to pay for the basic running costs of the Hall. The Committee have upgraded the grounds of the Hall and domain to include a septic dumping station and power points for motor homes. By providing low-cost parking spots and facilities, the Hall is now financially self-reliant.

- Friends of St Barnabas: This group was formed when it appeared that the area would lose its last church as operation costs were not being met by the parish. “We saw the value in keeping the church in the community.” This group has strong community support and annually fundraise to keep the church. A factor significant in the success of fundraising is the ability to draw people into the area for the events, i.e. money comes from outside of the community.

- The local Fire Brigade and Playcentre took over the organising of a community Christmas function.

- The Rangiwahia ANZAC Day Service has started since the school’s closure. The committee responsible for organising this formed naturally when it was decided a service was needed. The service has been scheduled to fit between two local services so as not to detract for long standing local events.

**Internet and cell phone coverage**

Affordable internet has only recently come to the area. It is the author’s understanding that the neighbouring community of Kawatau Valley were responsible for getting the company “Inspire” into the area and that Rangiwahia has benefited greatly from this.

Households still struggle if they do not have line of sight to a receiver and there remains frustration on the expense and lack of options available. Inspire provides free Wi-Fi to the community hall. Interview participants all agreed that superfast reliable internet is essential to building businesses and community.

Cell phone reception remains unreliable, Vodafone has no reception and Spark has variable service. The consensus is that the lack of cell phone coverage means the community is disadvantaged in numerous ways including safety and communication on farm, implications for businesses and increased social isolation.

**Participants’ ideas to increase community wellbeing:**

- More local groups, e.g. walking or craft groups
- Incentives from Regional Council, e.g. currently costs to use the community hall are prohibitive to using the hall for small gatherings.
- More frequent social gatherings
- More quality community engagement, e.g. community newsletter, phone tree, support from wider community.
4.3 Discussion on Research Findings

When setting out to research “What makes a strong rural community?”, I was expecting to find that infrastructure and resources rated highly in potential impact on a community’s strength. I was hoping to be able to campaign for rural communities to receive more from the Government and therefore be aided to grow stronger.

Very early on in my research process I saw in my reading that without strong social capital, communities struggle (Putnam, 2000, Pinker, 2014, Pomeroy, 1998). I also gained a greater understanding of why I feel connection and community is so important.

Along with this, I realised that the development of rural communities needed to come from within the community, with strong leadership and a strong support team with an action focus and innovative thinking.

With this newly gained insight, it is perhaps not surprising that in my own research I found evidence that backs social capital and community ownership as having the greatest impact on strength.

I discovered that the smallest community with the least amount of infrastructure was identified as having the strongest sense of community. This has been counterintuitive to my initial thinking on the subject and has resulted in a fundamental mind shift for me.

Themes seen in the findings

Strength of “Sense of Community”

When questioned about the strength of their community, all participants talked in some form about whether the community could meet the needs of individuals. They talked about being part of something bigger than themselves and of belonging.

This is consistent with McMillan’s definition for “sense of community”, a sense of community is a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to be together” (McMillan, 1976).

Those who scored their community poorly described unmet needs, loneliness, feeling invisible, uncared for. They also described a sense of division and lack of cohesion, along with a lack of leadership and direction.

Where the needs of individuals were met and the principle of caring for others was actioned, people felt that there was strong sense of community.

Members of the Rangiwahia community talked about the older members of the community often having people call in to check on them or help with gardening etc. They spoke of a general awareness of needs and of a community willing to act on this awareness.
Social capital

“In communities where social capital is accumulating, residents increasingly work with each other to identify problems, share ideas and identify solutions to problems which benefit the entire community” (Putnam, 2000).

This is evident in the Rangiwahia community where social capital was high prior to the closing of the school. Because of this, I believe that the area has treated this event as a sad moment in their history rather than letting it define the community and its future.

Following the closure of the school, other community groups identified the need to continue some of the events traditionally organised by the school. The Rangiwahia Playgroup and Fire Brigade picked up the end of year Christmas Party. A subgroup of the Rangiwahia Community Committee organised the area’s first Anzac Day Service. The community has also been more proactive in organising social gatherings to maintain social connections.

It was also identified by community members that it may be more difficult for new people to feel part of their community. This can be a negative effect of high social capital.

Apiti appears to have suffered a significant drop in social capital. This is evident with the lack of community engagement in the community council as well as the struggle to get people on board different groups. Recently it was decided not to hold a Jubilee to celebrate Apiti School’s 125 years. The decision was made due to only three people attending the second attempt to form a committee. I believe this is indicative of the lack of social capital and community cohesion.

Commitment to volunteering

One of the components of social capital is the active community volunteering (Putnam, 2000). Volunteering has been a big part of the rural of New Zealand in the past.

“Changes in the economic base (in farming and other businesses) which have increased time pressures and reduced people’s availability for voluntary and community work and social activity, together with demographic changes (particularly the hollowing out of 20-34 year olds in rural communities) create new challenges for maintaining the service infrastructure and social networking” (Pomeroy, 1997).

From my research, it remains unclear of why some communities face this challenge successfully when others don’t.

It was evident that those highly involved in their community had a greater sense of belonging. They also scored their area’s “sense of community” more favourably than those with little or no community commitments.

There is a danger in smaller communities of burnout, the same people taking responsibility for everything. Community members spoke of a sense of fatigue in the Apiti community, it is possible that this comes from a sense of burden in those that “do it all”.


Inclusion through bridging and linking

The communities with the least cohesion have a section of transient farm staff and several people looking for affordable housing and an alternative lifestyle. They also have a large number of non-farming families. The challenge here lies with successfully integrating non-rural community members into a traditional farming community.

The larger community of Kimbolton has numerous strong social and community groups. This works well to meet the needs of group members. In order for the entire community network to be strengthened it is necessary for bridging relationships to be put in place.

Well established residents in each community referred to the transient nature of dairy staff and rental house tenants. The overall impression was that there is a need for inclusion and acceptance for these people. Perhaps a mindset shift is required to look past social economic differences and values that don’t align with what has been a traditional farming area. The area generally is slow to accept these differences.

“For the established community, the failure to integrate and draw on new people represents a missed opportunity for social renewal. Community development in its broader sense is needed to help new populations turn diversity into community vigour” (Pomeroy, 1997).

I believe that the sense of inclusion can be increased by more opportunity for different groups to interact, i.e. social capital bridging and linking. When groups of people with diverse views come together, there are greater opportunities for people to be aware of others’ values and opinions. “The opportunity to understand where others are coming from can ease tensions and build stronger more resilient communities” (Pomeroy, 1997).

Strong Leadership and Vision

Having a vision for the future is a strength that appears to be essential for community strength.

It was evident that the Rangiwahia Community had a commitment to looking ahead and making things happen. They invite people into their area and proudly show off the natural beauty as well as talk with passion about their rich history. Their future focused thinking is evident in many situations, the following is just one example.

“To show Manawatu District Council why Main South Road should be tarsealed, Steve videoed the route from Mangaweka to Apiti. Then Mary put together a DVD. They presented the video to Council in May 2011 and it made a big impact. They listened, as they realised that tar sealing this eight kilometres of metal road would open up the northern Manawatu for visitors and tourists, allowing them to enjoy a scenic route, which would take them through to the Pohangina Valley and to Feilding via Kimbolton” http://www.irongates.co.nz/ (2016).

The word “Altruism” was used by a community member, when discussing the need for good leadership. Someone who is altruistic looks beyond their own needs to the greater good of the community. When community leaders are without ego and have the best for the community at heart there appears to be a strengthening of community.
The stronger communities also had a large proportion of community members engaged in the Committee meetings. It is important for all community members to feel they have a voice. By engaging on this level there is room for individuals to feel they have been part of decision making for their community.

Both the Rangiwahia and Kimbolton Committees take leadership in organising community events, and it is evident that these are beneficial for maintaining connectedness and community strength.

Grief and Loss

For those community members who have seen the changes over the last 40 years, there was an overwhelming sense of sadness. This related to what has been lost from the community over this time. A sadness that the next generation are not coming home to the family farm, a sadness of loss of community and friendships over the years.

The impression of sadness was evident in all three communities studied and I feel that it is important to acknowledge this. There is a need for established residents to feel that their grief is recognised and shared. I believe that this may enable communities to move forward more freely.

Final Thoughts

“Symptoms of a depressed or disadvantaged rural community include apathy and a sense of helplessness, why bother?” “Many people have low self-esteem and any suggestion of effecting change is greeted with any number of reasons as to why it won't work” (Matthews, 2001). The statements above have helped me look at struggling communities in a new light. Perhaps it is not because of these attitudes that a community lacks cohesion but that these attitudes come because of weakness in a community.

I continue to be puzzled by the concept that “a community can be thought of as the womb in which social capital grows. Without communities, there would be no social capital (but without social capital community disintegrates?)” (Debertin, 1997). My question is which comes first, and how do you build them?

How is it that some rural communities succeed in building and maintaining strong social capital while others struggle? Is a loss of social capital related purely to changes in rural society or does something happen in the community that precipitates such a loss and the ensuing battle to regain it?

When looking forward, I feel that a big question remains in my mind … “How do we kick start the building of social capital, is it enough to raise community awareness and one by one start making a difference?” Time will tell, as I put this to the test in my local community.
5.0 Recommendations

The importance of community strength for the wellbeing of rural living has been highlighted in this report. I believe that it is vital to be actively developing our communities and consciously building social capital and community.

It is essential to have an understanding and an appreciation of where our communities have come from and just how much they have changed. This helps highlight what the changes have meant for the appearance and needs of our communities today.

From here we can use this knowledge to build strong rural communities and create a strong vision moving into the future.

My recommendations are as follows:

1. **Create Conscious Community**
   - Strive to cultivate community that is open minded, inclusive, engaged, and forward thinking. Encourage awareness of community needs and flexibility in thinking when addressing these needs.

2. **Build Quality Leadership**
   - Build local leadership skills and recognise importance of leaders with a future focus and skills in governance and strategic planning. Ensure that community leadership and vision is visible and accessible to all.

3. **Encourage Collaboration**
   - Empower communities to engage and collaborate with other local communities. Share knowledge, ideas, problem solving, community event planning; draw on others knowledge and expertise.

4. **Community Development**
   - Endeavour to become a community actively involved in improving its own social, economic and environmental situation. Engage with local government to ensure that community development is resourced and sustainable.
6.0 Conclusion

Rural New Zealand has seen much change in the last 50 years. Transition has occurred from predominately farming communities to neighbourhoods diverse in their people and businesses. Urbanisation and rural depopulation have influenced our rural areas greatly.

These changes are well researched and it is not difficult to find information on this. What is more difficult to find is research and evidence of how we can strengthen our rural communities of today.

My research is a step in this direction. I have investigated what it is that makes a rural community strong. In doing so I have identified factors that are vital for strength, and have highlighted factors that are important for moving forward.

It is apparent through my literature review and community research that the importance of social capital cannot be ignored. I see potential for strengthening our local communities through raising the awareness of the value of community relationships and networks.

Research shows that when a community is able to meet the needs of individual members, the sense of community is strong. To be able to do this it is crucial that social awareness present and social connectedness is well networked. I believe that these are areas that can be grown in all communities.

A healthy strong community has passionate leadership and a strong support team - where team members volunteer, collaborate, network and assist one another. The strong community has access to resources, is innovative and forward thinking.

The potential for strong rural communities is there. The community of today does indeed look different from the community of the past. However, the diversity and differences should be seen as assets as much as challenges. The inclusion of people, with different attitudes, values, and skill sets can be a building block for the foundation of the new look rural community.
7.0 Suggestions for Further Research

Due to constraints in time and resources, this research has been confined to three rural communities in a small geographical area. The researcher was limited to interviewing a small number of community members. The result of this being that the information may not be indicative of a typical New Zealand rural community.

For this research to be truly representative of rural New Zealand, it would be necessary to interview community members from a much broader cross section of rural New Zealand.

Participants from each community were chosen to achieve a broad community perspective. However, they were also chosen for their community awareness and their ability to articulate their thoughts clearly. This resulted in very successful interviews with maximum information imparted to the interviewer.

To give a clearer picture of how the majority see their community, it would be necessary to interview a greater percentage of each community. This would allow the data to be statistically analysed and would give a clearer indication of the strength of each community.

Further questions suggested by survey participants:

- What are the hindrances of a strong of community?
- How can local/regional council help support and develop local community?
- How could big business groups like dairy companies, meat processors etc help? What role do they play?
- What are the benefits to a family living in a rural community?
- How do we get more community engagement from a wider cross section of the community?

Further questions suggested by the author:

- What have other communities done to increase community strength?
- What have other communities done to bring business into their area, e.g. events, shops, tourism and hospitality, health retreats?
- How can communities integrate “non-farming” community members into what has typically been a tight-knit farming community?
- Look further at community governance with particular interest in communication between the local governance group and their community.
- What measures could be used to measure the quantity and quality of social capital in a rural community?
- Specifically, how do these vary across communities large and small?
- Are measures of social capital also measures of the sustainability of rural communities?
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Cover Letter

Kellogg Rural Leadership Programme Research Project

Katherine Gillespie
Contact: 06 328 4747
027 296 5917
lh.kjgill@farmside.co.nz

Dear Community Survey Participant,

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this research project.

My aim in this project is to identify commonalities within strong rural communities that contribute to a strong sense of community and community wellbeing. By doing this I hope to show how best we can support and strengthen rural New Zealand well into the future.

I am surveying a number of community members from our three local communities Rangiwahia, Apiti and Kimbolton and will analyse survey participants’ responses to look for themes, features, characteristics, services and community infrastructure held in common.

All survey responses will be confidential and I will ensure that community members are not able to be identified in my final report.

Ideally, I would like to discuss the survey with you in person and will be in touch to make a time to do this. Alternatively, if this is not possible we can arrange a telephone conversation.

If you have any questions or concerns, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely

Katherine Gillespie
Appendix 2: Survey Questions

What Makes a Strong Rural Community?

Rural Case Study Interview Questions

Age-20-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71+
Male/Female
Length of time living in the community?

1. What does a sense of community mean to you?

2. 0 = no sense of community and 5 = strong sense of community
0-5 On this scale how do you feel about the sense of community in your area?

3. (a) What are the main changes you have seen in your community over the last 5-10 years?
   (b) How have they affected you?
   (c) How have they affected your community?

4. What local community groups exist in your community, e.g. volunteer fire service, community committees, community “service/event” groups, e.g. Apiti Show Committee, school, playcentre/playgroup, church?

5. What community involvement do you have?

6. What local governance is in place in your community?

   How effective do you see these groups being in supporting your community?

7. Internet:
   (a) Do you have access to the internet? Dial up, broadband, wireless, satellite.
   (b) What do you use it for?
   (c) In your opinion is your community’s internet reliable, affordable and accessible?

8. Cell phone reception:
   (a) Do you have access to this in your home/farm/ work/community?
   (b) How does this affect you/ your business/ the community?

9. What do you think could be done to improve community wellbeing in your area?

10. What services would you like to see available in your area?

11. Are there any questions not asked in this survey that you think are important?
Appendix 3: Table of Survey Participants

The table below provides an overview of the families taking part in the study.

Table 1: Household Types Included in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>Total family members in household</th>
<th>Length of time in community</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Community Involvement</th>
<th>Rating for strength of community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New to township</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;3 years</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farming</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt;40 years</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm employees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;3 years</td>
<td>Skilled labour</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township empty nesters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle block</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;3 years</td>
<td>Outside employment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township empty nesters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;40 years</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural renting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Outside employment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>Outside employment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Skilled labour</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Specific recommendations for Northern Manawatu communities studied

Recommendations from the research are as follows:

- Embrace our area heritage and acknowledge the history that has influenced the area and the community.
- Develop a greater shared vision and sense of identity. This can be done by communication from the Community Committees to the wider community.
- Initiate another community meeting regarding the Community Plan.
- Cultivate community through well planned activities and events. Facilitate regular opportunities to come together.
- Community Connector - Development of a community connection strategy for introducing and including new people to the area.
- Community Care Team - a network of people that are willing to be the confidential link to support when things are tough, e.g. new baby or illness, bereavement, loneliness, stress, depression etc.
- Support local businesses!
- Continue to push for fast and affordable internet and more reliable cell phone coverage. Is there something that the communities could do collectively to gain better services?
- Continue with regional tourism agencies to promote the area and develop new attractions
- Community Committee suggestions:
  - Invite people personally to attend the Community Committee meetings. With increased attendance, obviously, there will be a greater awareness of the role of the Committee, as well as potentially more people willing to be on the Committee. We can no longer assume that people will just come to things like this, invite them!
  - Create or maintain a culture in which a diversity of opinion and perspective is welcome.
  - Combined meetings for the three community committees. Find out what is happening in other communities. Share ideas and solutions to problems.
  - Instigate regular community events.
  - Communicate, communicate, communicate with the wider community.
  - Allow for a two-way flow of communication, e.g. a community-wide survey, community discussions etc.
  - Expect and ask for community help; the Committee should not be the only ones “doing”.
- Keep driving the Community Plans with support from the Manawatu District Council.
- Brainstorm for new ideas and welcome young people to the Committee meetings.

- Community website – to allow easy communication to people interested in the area, new to the area, as well as current members of the community.

Sections to include:

- History of the community
- Area calendar
- List of local businesses in the wider community
- Volunteer opportunities e.g. rural fire service, working bees, helping at school
- Education – school and playcentre information and contacts
- Social and interest groups
- List of service providers that come to the area
- Communication from Community Committee
- Local areas of interest e.g. gardens, walks, horse trekking, cycling, native bush reserves
- Accommodation and hospitality
- Area Civil Defence Plan
- Support agencies e.g. Manawatu Rural Support Trust, Feilding Health Care
- Community Plan

- Regional Governance Support

- Manawatu District Council to continue to support the Community Committees.
- Potential to facilitate an annual combined meeting of the three committees.
- Community plans these have been initiated well. The community goal needs to now be to keep focused and action based. Support from the Council is crucial to achieve this.
- There is opportunity to grow community leaders in their roles by providing training and support.
- Incentives for local businesses.
Appendix 5: Community Governance

The three communities fall under the umbrella of Manawatu District Council. As part of the council Community Development Plan, each area has a Community Committee.

Information on this page comes from the Manawatu District Council http://www.mdc.govt.nz/Living_Leisure/Community_Committees and is taken from “The MDC Community Committee Policy”.

“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.”

“Each Community Committees is supported by a Liaison councillor appointed by the Council. The role of the Liaison councillor is to assist the Committee and advice on Council processes and to communicate 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.”

Community Committees Policy

Over the last three years the Council has worked with each community to develop individual Community Plans.

The Community Planning Programme supports communities to develop a shared vision for their village. It provides a mechanism for collaboration between communities, Council and other agencies to implement improvements.

The programme’s objectives are:

- To set clear strategic direction for villages, reflecting each community’s unique characteristics.
- To provide a pathway for village community’s vision and priorities to be reflected in Council’s and other agencies strategies and work plans.
- To grow village community spirit, attract and retain residents.
- To enable village residents to create the communities they want.
- To further develop constructive working relationships between councillors, village residents, businesses and council staff.
Transfer of Rural Fire Response Assets from Manawatu District Council to Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Purpose

To seek council approval for the transfer to Fire and Emergency New Zealand of Manawatu District Council owned rural fire response assets

To note 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.

Significance of Decision

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

Recommendations

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.

2. That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to finalise and sign the transfer arrangement document attached at Appendix B 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.

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.

Report prepared by:
Brent Limmer
General Manager - Community and Strategy

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 In New Zealand, local government has had a long history of providing rural fire response services to rural communities. Since the establishment of the Fire Service Commission and the National Rural Fire Authority in 1975, local government entities as local Rural Fire Authorities (RFAs) have played a key role in the suppression of fires in rural areas. From 1989, the Manawatu District Council as an RFA has had responsibility for delivering this service within the boundaries of the District.

2.2 From 1 July 2017, Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) will be the entity responsible for the providing both urban and rural fire fighting capability and response. The ability to utilise rural fire response assets from 1 July 2017 is necessary for FENZ to undertake its functions. The transfer and/or use of rural fire response assets is a key step in the establishment of FENZ.

3 Discussion and Options

3.1 Manawatu District Council (MDC) as a Rural Fire Authority currently owns a range of rural fire response assets. These include vehicles (4), trailers (4), water pumps, radios and a variety of other smaller items. A list of all response assets is attached at Appendix A.

3.2 All but one item (Nissan Nivara Ute registration GPU549) have zero book value. The Nissan Nivara Ute has a residual value of $15,000.

3.3 FENZ has provided two options for MDC to provide for the use of the response assets. The first is a use agreement where the ownership remains with the Council and FENZ are granted permission to use the assets. The second option is to transfer the ownership of all response assets to FENZ.

3.4 I am recommending to Council the second option as the way to proceed – transfer to FENZ at no cost all MDC owned rural fire response assets listed in Appendix A.

3.5 The reason for supporting a transfer over a use agreement is that a transfer is the cleanest option for MDC and FENZ. A transfer will allow FENZ to have full control and make operational decisions based on need, and to allocate response assets most effectively for the benefit of rural communities. Also, it is somewhat nonsensical for MDC to retain ownership of assets for
use by a third party entity (FENZ) for a service that MDC no longer has statutory responsibility to provide.

3.6 In addition to the above, if MDC retains ownership, the Council will eventually be left with the burden of disposal when the assets reach the end of their operational life. It is unlikely that any value beyond for parts or scrap will remain at this point.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 Should the transfer of response assets proceed as recommended, there are no operational implications resulting from this decision.

4.2 Council should note that FENZ do wish to continue to use a portion of 139 South Street, Feilding as their rural fire operational base. The MDC Chief Executive will enter into negotiation with FENZ to agree lease arrangements suitable to both parties.

5 Financial Implications

5.1 The changes to the MDC asset register and subsequent write off of $15,000 will be actioned in the current 2016/17 financial year and the cost will be met from existing rural fire activity budget.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Approving the transfer of response assets and authorising the Chief Executive to sign the Transfer Agreement attached at Appendix B is within Council’s power under the Local Government Act 2002 and is consistent with the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017.

7 Delegations

7.1 Council has authority to decide on the recommendations set out in this report.

8 Consultation

8.1 Council staff have consulted with FENZ over the possible transfer of assets. FENZ is supportive of the recommendations contained in this report.

9 Conclusion

9.1 In order for the continuity of the rural fire services to be maintained, FENZ requires the use of the Council owned rural fire response assets. The most effective means of providing for this use is to transfer the MDC owned response assets to FENZ. As noted in the report, a transfer will allow FENZ to have full control and make operational decisions based on need, and to allocate response assets most effectively for the benefit of rural communities.

10 Attachments

- Appendix A – Asset Schedule (Fleet) Asset Schedule (Equipment)
- Appendix B – Transfer Arrangements – Response Assets
## Asset Schedule (Fleet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Type of Vehicle</th>
<th>Make/Model of Vehicle</th>
<th>Reg. Number</th>
<th>Vehicle Photo (if available)</th>
<th>Amount (excl GST)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>First expiry date</th>
<th>FENZ to insure</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Transfer / Use (1 Jul 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Rural Pump</td>
<td>Isuzu JCS420</td>
<td>KR9248</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Support Ute</td>
<td>Toyota Hi-lux</td>
<td>AJE360</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Support Ute</td>
<td>Nissan Navara</td>
<td>GPU549</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Smoke Chaser</td>
<td>Toyota Hi-lux</td>
<td>CEK295</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Stiletto</td>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>NE12N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lease Details - if applicable

Appendix A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Type of Vehicle</th>
<th>Make/Model of Vehicle</th>
<th>Reg. Number</th>
<th>Vehicle Photo (if available)</th>
<th>Amount (excl GST)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>First expiry date</th>
<th>FENZ to insure</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Transfer / Use (1 Jul 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Stiletto</td>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>P632F</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Hooper - IMT Trailer</td>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>BMUC</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Homemade - Equipment Trailer</td>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>NB192</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Asset Schedule (Equipment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station/Location</th>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>FENZ to insure</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Transfer / Use (1 Jul 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Aqualite</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>5000lt Dam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>2200lt dam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>2200lt dam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Wajax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Wajax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Firemaster 6.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Honda GX160-WB30XT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>5000lt Dam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Wajax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Aqualite</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Wajax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Hand held Radios x 9 VHF, 1 x UHF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu VRFF</td>
<td>Chainsaw x 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manawatu District Council</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This schedule is inclusive of Asset equipment with a singular value of greater than $1,000, the intent is also to use and transfer all other minor equipment and response assets.
Transfer Arrangement – Response Assets

[Transferor]

New Zealand Fire Service Commission
PARTIES

[Transferor] (Transferor)

New Zealand Fire Service Commission (NZFSC)

Background

A The Transferor owns the Transferred Assets.

B The NZFSC is a Crown entity established under the Fire Service Act 1975 and, under section 8 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 (FENZ Act), is to become Fire and Emergency NZ on Day One.

C Clauses 8 and 16 of Schedule 1 to the FENZ Act contemplate that transfer arrangements may be agreed to transfer Response Assets to Fire and Emergency NZ.

D The parties wish to record their agreed arrangements regarding the transfer of the Transferred Assets to Fire and Emergency NZ.

OPERATIVE PART

1 Definitions set out in Reference Schedule

1.1 The terms defined in the Reference Schedule of this transfer arrangement have those meanings throughout this transfer arrangement.

2 Transfer of Response Assets to Fire and Emergency NZ

2.1 In consideration of $1.00 plus GST (if demanded), the Transferor agrees with the NZFSC to transfer the Transferred Assets to Fire and Emergency NZ on the terms set out in this transfer arrangement.

2.2 Unless otherwise stated in this transfer arrangement, ownership in the Transferred Assets will transfer to Fire and Emergency NZ at midnight falling at the close of 30 June.

2.3 Possession of and risk in the Transferred Assets will pass to Fire and Emergency NZ on the transfer of ownership in the Transferred Assets.

2.4 The Transferor and the NZFSC agree that only the Transferred Assets will transfer to Fire and Emergency NZ.

3 Identification of additional Response Assets

3.1 If, before Day One, any Response Assets of the Transferor are identified which are not listed in the Asset Schedule to this transfer arrangement, the Transferor and the NZFSC will seek to agree whether those Response Assets are to be transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ. If the Transferor and the NZFSC agree that the Response Assets are to be transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ, the Transferor and the NZFSC will update the Asset Schedule to this transfer arrangement.
3.2 If, on or after Day One, any Response Assets of the Transferor are identified which are not listed in the Asset Schedule to this transfer arrangement, the Transferor and Fire and Emergency NZ will seek to agree whether those Response Assets are to be transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ. If the Transferor and Fire and Emergency NZ agree that the Response Assets are to be transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ, the Transferor and Fire and Emergency NZ will update the Asset Schedule to this transfer arrangement.

4 Damage or destruction before transfer of risk

4.1 If, before risk in a Transferred Asset passes to Fire and Emergency NZ under clause 2.3, any of the Transferred Assets is destroyed or is damaged so as to be untenantable (in the case of a building) or irreparable (in the case of any other Transferred Asset):

(a) the Transferor will notify the NZFSC (if before Day One) or Fire and Emergency NZ (if on or after Day One) as soon as reasonably practicable after becoming aware of the destruction or damage including details of the date and cause of the destruction or damage;

(b) that Transferred Asset will not be transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ (unless agreed otherwise).

4.2 If, before risk in a Transferred Asset passes to Fire and Emergency NZ under clause 2.3, any of the Transferred Assets is damaged but is not destroyed or rendered untenantable (in the case of a building) or irreparable (in the case of any other Transferred Asset):

(a) the Transferor will notify the NZFSC (if before Day One) or Fire and Emergency NZ (if on or after Day One) as soon as reasonably practicable after becoming aware of the damage including details of the date, cause and nature of the damage, whether the Transferor holds insurance for the damage, the likely timeframe for repairs to the Transferred Asset and whether the Transferor will repair the damage or reimburse Fire and Emergency NZ for the cost of repairing the damage;

(b) that Transferred Asset will, despite the damage, transfer to Fire and Emergency NZ (unless agreed otherwise);

(c) unless it is agreed that the Transferred Asset will not transfer to Fire and Emergency NZ, the Transferor will either repair the damage at its cost as soon as possible after the damage is caused or reimburse Fire and Emergency NZ for the cost of repairing the damage; and

(d) if the Transferor makes an insurance claim for the damage, the Transferor will actively progress that insurance claim but the progression of that claim will not delay the Transferor’s obligations under subclause (c).
5 Additional provisions relating to transfer of Land

5.1 The parties recognise that land transfer dealings will be required to transfer the Transferor's ownership in the Land to Fire and Emergency NZ. To enable the transfer of the Land:

(a) the NZFSC will instruct its lawyer to prepare, sign, certify and submit for registration the dealings and documents required to transfer the Land to Fire and Emergency NZ and will sign all necessary documents consenting to the NZFSC's lawyer acting for both parties for registration of the transfer; and

(b) the Transferor will instruct the NZFSC's lawyer, on behalf of the Transferor, to sign, certify and release all required documents to effect the transfer of the Land to Fire and Emergency NZ, and will sign all necessary documents consenting to the NZFSC's lawyer acting for both parties for registration of the transfer.

5.2 The parties will complete the above matters expeditiously, with a view to the transfers being submitted for registration on Day One. The Transferor will hold the Land on trust for Fire and Emergency NZ until the land transfer dealings are completed.

5.3 Where the issue of a separate computer freehold register is required for the Land:

(a) the NZFSC (if before Day One) or Fire and Emergency NZ (if on or after Day One) will prepare all required documents (including any required subdivision consent applications, survey plans and orders for new computer freehold registers) to obtain a separate computer freehold register for the Land;

(b) the Transferor will, in its capacity as landowner, sign and release all documents required to obtain the separate computer freehold register;

(c) where a subdivision consent is required for the issue of a separate computer freehold register for the Land, the parties will consult in good faith with a view to agreeing whether to object to, appeal or accept any subdivision consent conditions;

(d) the NZFSC (if before Day One) or Fire and Emergency NZ (if on or after Day One) will be responsible for any physical works required as a condition of any subdivision consents obtained; and

(e) the parties will complete the matters specified in clauses 5.1 and 8 for the particular Land immediately following the issue of a separate computer freehold register for that Land.

6 Existent leases and licences for Transferred Assets

6.1 Where the Asset Schedule identifies that a Transferred Asset is held under a lease or licence, the Transferor's interest in that lease or licence will be transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ in conjunction with the Transferred Asset.
7 **Manuals, warranties and other documents**

7.1 Immediately following signing of this transfer arrangement, the Transferor will transfer or make available to Fire and Emergency NZ all manuals, drawings, records, information or documents it holds in relation to the Transferred Assets, including all warranties, guarantees, covenants, bonds and existing leases, licences and other arrangements.

7.2 By Day One, the Transferor will provide to Fire and Emergency NZ the contact details for any third party interested in the Transferred Assets, along with copies of any material correspondence between the Transferor and the third party.

8 **Notice of transfers**

8.1 A reasonable time before Day One, the NZFSC will procure that its lawyers prepare and forward to the Transferor notices of sale of the Land which accord with the requirements of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002. On or promptly following Day One, the Transferor will forward the notices of sale to the relevant territorial authorities and, if required, the relevant regional councils.

8.2 On or promptly following the transfer of ownership in Transferred Assets to Fire and Emergency NZ, the Transferor will advise any affected third parties of the transfers.

8.3 Where any Transferred Asset is situated on land which is not owned by the Transferor but where no property right exists for the Transferred Asset:

(a) the Transferor will advise the owner of that land of the transfer to Fire and Emergency NZ; and

(b) Fire and Emergency NZ will be responsible for obtaining any required lease or licence for the retention of that Transferred Asset on that land.

9 **Conduct pending transfer**

9.1 The Transferor will continue to operate and maintain the Transferred Assets to the standard of a reasonably prudent rural fire authority and to the standards, as at the date of this transfer arrangement, of the National Rural Fire Authority until the earlier of:

(a) the completion of transfer of the Transferred Assets to Fire and Emergency NZ; and

(b) Fire and Emergency NZ commencing use of the Response Assets under a use arrangement.

10 **Confirmations**

10.1 Each party confirms to the other party that it has the right, authority and full power to enter into and perform the obligations under this transfer arrangement.

10.2 The Transferor confirms to the NZFSC at signing of this transfer arrangement and repeats the confirmations on from Day One to Fire and Emergency NZ that:

(a) the RFA is the owner of the Transferred Assets;
(b) the Transferred Assets are transferred to Fire and Emergency NZ free of any charge or debt;

(c) all leases, licences, warranties, guarantees and other agreements and arrangements transferred as part of the Transferred Assets are valid and are not liable for cancellation or termination for any reason, and the Transferor has complied with its obligations under each document;

(d) all amounts payable under or relating to the Transferred Assets have been paid by the Transferor up to the transfer of ownership to Fire and Emergency NZ;

(e) all information transferred or provided by or on behalf of the Transferor to the NZFSC or Fire and Emergency NZ is complete and correct;

(f) the Transferor is not aware of any breaches of any statute or other law governing or relating to the Transferred Assets or their use; and

(g) the Transferor has advised the details of any Transferred Assets which were gifted to the Transferor and the terms of those gifts.

11 General

11.1 Further assurances: Each of the parties will sign, deliver and do all deeds, documents, acts and things as may be reasonably required to effectively carry out and give effect to the terms and intentions of this transfer arrangement.

11.2 No merger: The warranties, undertakings and obligations under this transfer arrangement will not merge or be treated as discharged on the Effective Date but will remain enforceable to the fullest extent.

11.3 Costs: Each party will meet their own costs in the negotiation, entry into and implementation of this transfer arrangement.
EXECUTION

Signed for and on the behalf of the Transferor by its authorised signatory in the presence of:

________________________________________________________________________
Signature

________________________________________________________________________
Full name (please print)

________________________________________________________________________
Witness signature

________________________________________________________________________
Full name (please print)

________________________________________________________________________
Occupation (please print)

________________________________________________________________________
Address (please print)

Signed for and on behalf of the New Zealand Fire Service Commission by its authorised signatory in the presence of:

________________________________________________________________________
Signature

________________________________________________________________________
Witness signature

________________________________________________________________________
Full name (please print)

________________________________________________________________________
Full name (please print)

________________________________________________________________________
Occupation (please print)

________________________________________________________________________
Address (please print)
## REFERENCE Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day One:</th>
<th>1-Jul-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land:</td>
<td>Any Transferred Asset which comprises any land (including any registered estates and interests in land, such as registered leases and easements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Assets:</td>
<td>The meaning set out in clause 1 of Schedule 1 to the FENZ Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred Assets:</td>
<td>(i) The Response Assets identified in the Asset Schedule to this transfer arrangement as being transferred (rather than identified as being available for use); and (ii) All equipment and other personal property owned by the Transferor which is located at or used in conjunction with any of the Response Assets identified in the Asset Schedule to this transfer arrangement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council

Meeting of 22 June 2017

Business Unit: Community and Strategy
Date Created: 30 May 2017

Adoption of Annual Plan 2017/18

Purpose

To present for adoption the Annual Plan 2017/18.

Significance of Decision

The contents of the 2017/18 Annual Plan was considered significant and the community was consulted in accordance with section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Recommendations


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.

Report prepared by:
Tracey Hunt and Colleen Morris
Strategy Manager and Chief Financial Officer

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 The preparation of the Annual Plan 2017/18 was undertaken in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, and was based on year three of the Long Term Plan 2015-25.

2.2 The Annual Plan 2017/18 Consultation Document and Supporting Information document included the material differences from what was agreed to in the Long Term Plan 2015-25.

2.3 Council undertook consultation with the community about the proposed variations in accordance with section 82 of the Local Government Act. Consultation occurred from 28 March to 28 April, with 151 submissions on the Draft Annual Plan being received. Of those who made submissions, 48 submitters attended hearings held from 10 to 12 May 2017 to speak to their submissions.

2.4 At its extraordinary meetings held 18 and 22 May 2017, and 1 June 2017, the Council deliberated on matters raised by submitters and made changes to the draft Annual Plan and budget as a result.

2.5 The Annual Plan 2017/18 Consultation Document and Supporting Information document have now been combined to form a single Annual Plan 2017/18, reflecting the changes agreed by Council during its deliberations.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 Annual Plan proposals included a range of changes such as funding increases for existing projects, addition of new projects, delays to projects to allow for further investigation to take place, and savings. Budgets have been adjusted to reflect these changes.

3.2 In summary, the Council agreed the following changes as a result of submissions:

- Close native bird aviaries, keep and upgrade exotic bird aviaries - allocated $18,000 to establish a focus group and undertake preliminary design;
- Council Place Carpark – reduced budget from $80,000 to $64,000;
- Funding for construction of toilets at Awahuri Forest / Kitchener Park - $111,000;
• Funding for redevelopment of the Pohangina Recreational Reserve Landscape and Recreation Plan - up to $5,000 funding from 2017/18 Community Planning budget;

• A grant to the Sanson School for a safety upgrade of playground – up to $4,000;

• Upgrade of urinals at Himatangi Beach Hall - $2,800;

• Public toilet access and daily cleaning costs – Duke Street $5,952 per annum;

• Fire costs Te Kawa Recreational Centre - $5,000;

• Recreation Needs Assessment - $20,000;

• Drainage and resurfacing carpark Himatangi Beach - $34,000;

• Removal of mini putt course and reinstatement of turf Himatangi Beach - $6,400;

• Upgrade Bike Track Timona Park - $7,500;

• Feasibility report for City to Sea Rail Trail - $6,000;

• Para Kore Waste Minimisation Education Programme - $2,200 pa funded from existing waste levy;

• Carry forward all unspent Community Committee funding - $58,000;

• Carry forward unspent capital expenditure and associated funding - $11,233,672;

• Carry forward of projects and unspent operational expenditure in Council’s Infrastructure, Community and Strategy, Economic Development and Corporate and Regulatory activities - $524,010;

• Cultural Adviser – budget increase of $36,771;

• Stormwater analysis required for the management of stormwater in rural villages - $20,000;

• Mobile Recycling centres - $39,568 operational expenditure, $38,910 capital expenditure;

• Pohangina Resilience Programme $671,664 – local share $315,682. The project is to protect a portion of the Pohangina Road from erosion;

• LED Streetlight project $432,104, offset by a subsidy from NZTA with the balance from depreciation reserves;

• Building Control Officer (via Palmerston North City Council contract) - $80,000 funded from additional expenditure;
• Himatangi Beach Community Patrol contribution towards building a garage to house the Community Patrol vehicle - $4,000;

• Asbestos Management Plan - Council is required by 1 April 2018 under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 to have an asbestos management plan in place to manage the risk of asbestos at all of its properties - $71,000;

• Bunnythorpe Hall carry forward of commitment - $240,000.

3.3 As a result of all changes the total district wide rates increase in 2017/18 will be 3.9%

4 Operational Implications

4.1 Operational implications have been considered during the preparation of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

5 Financial implications

5.1 Budgets prepared for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 forecasted a 4.5% average rates increase in 2017/18. However, adjustments to projects including savings, delays, and the introduction of new projects and subsidies have resulted in a 0.6% decrease on the initial figure. The total district wide rates increase for 2017/18 will be 3.9%. This increase will enable Council to complete the projects and programmes of work as outlined in year three of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and the changes in the Annual Plan 2017/18.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 All documentation and processes are in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, Sections 82 and 95.

7 Delegations

7.1 The Council has the responsibility for setting the Council’s strategic direction, which includes adoption of the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

8 Consultation

8.1 The Draft Annual Plan was open for consultation from 28 March 2017 to 28 April 2017. During this time, public information sessions were held in Kimbolton, Feilding and Rongotea. Annual Plan information was also presented to Nga Manu Taiko and the Annual Hall Committee and Community Committee meeting. Elected Members and staff members also attended the Feilding Farmers Market to share information about the Annual Plan.

8.2 Published information about the Annual Plan included:

• Four articles in Our District News

• Two letters to the editor

• Four Stuff articles
220 consultation documents

130 Support information documents

20,000 Annual Plan Summaries (included in the Feilding Herald)

8.3 Annual Plan documents were provided online using Council’s “Have Your Say” website. Promotion of issues was completed via the Council’s Facebook page and posts.

8.4 On site signage regarding the proposal to close Kowhai Park bird aviaries was erected in Kowhai Park.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There were no specific cultural considerations associated with the Annual Plan 2017/18. However, an information session on the 2017/18 Annual Plan was provided to Nga Manu Taiko.

10 Conclusion

10.1 The preparation of the 2017/18 Annual Plan has been accordance with the Local Government Act 2002. Consultation has occurred with the community, proposed changes have been provisionally agreed to and the final 2017/18 Annual Plan is now presented for formal adoption.

11 Attachments

• Annual Plan 2017/18
Rates Resolution 2017/18

Purpose

To set rates for the financial year ending 30 June 2018 as required by the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

Significance of Decision

This issue is considered significant in terms of Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. This item was included in the Annual Plan consultation process. The appropriate decision-making and consultation requirements have been met.

Recommendations

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feilding Residential</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feilding Rural</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feilding CBD</td>
<td>Being all rating units situated within the 2009 Feilding Central Business differential rating area, not used solely or principally for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rural</td>
<td>Being all rating units situated outside the 2009 Feilding differential rating area excluding those rating units included in Category 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<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>0.00053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feilding Rural</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feilding CBD</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.00146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rural</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Industrial and Commercial</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Utilities</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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>0.00100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feilding Rural</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feilding CBD</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.00274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rural</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Industrial and Commercial</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Utilities</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>

### 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:

- **Within Feilding Differential Rating Area** $282.00
- **Outside the Feilding Differential Rating Area** $201.00

### Feilding 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).

### Feilding 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>
<tr>
<td>Maire drainage district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maire Class A</td>
<td>0.000270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maire Class B</td>
<td>0.000090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maire Class C</td>
<td>0.000130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maire Class D</td>
<td>0.000200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroua Downs drainage district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroua Downs Class A</td>
<td>0.000770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroua Downs Class B</td>
<td>0.000380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroua Downs Class C</td>
<td>0.000240</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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply - Connected</td>
<td>$385.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply - Serviceable</td>
<td>$192.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply - Restricted</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“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>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>
<tr>
<td>50 mm</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mm</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 mm</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$920.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should consumption exceed the water usage of 380 cubic meters within the rating year, an additional consumption charge of $1.40 per cubic meter will be charged.

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
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Targeted Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater disposal - Connected</td>
<td>$714.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater disposal - Serviceable</td>
<td>$357.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater disposal - Restricted</td>
<td>$571.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“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.

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.

<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>

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>Three year term, 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2018</td>
<td>$1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five year term, 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2020</td>
<td>$966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten year term, 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2025</td>
<td>$564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty year term, 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2035</td>
<td>$374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Instalment One</th>
<th>Instalment Two</th>
<th>Instalment Three</th>
<th>Instalment Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment Due Date</td>
<td>1 August 2017</td>
<td>1 November 2017</td>
<td>1 February 2018</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Date</td>
<td>25 August 2017</td>
<td>24 November 2017</td>
<td>23 February 2018</td>
<td>25 May 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>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Quarter One</th>
<th>Quarter Two</th>
<th>Quarter Three</th>
<th>Quarter Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment Due Date</td>
<td>30 September 2017</td>
<td>31 December 2017</td>
<td>31 March 2018</td>
<td>30 June 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.

Report prepared by:
Beth Harker
Senior Finance Officer - Rates

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*

- Manawatu District will improve the natural environment,
- The Manawatu will attract and retain residents,
- Manawatu district develops a broad economic base,
- Manawatu and its people are connected via
- Manawatu’s built environment is
- Manawatu District Council is an agile
stewarding the district in a practice aligned to the concept of kaitiakitanga.

| ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

from its solid foundation in the primary sector. quality infrastructure and technology. safe, reliable and attractive. and efficient organisation.

2 Background

2.1 With the adoption of the Annual Plan for 2017/18, the Council now needs to adopt the rates resolution to fund the activities that Council has agreed to.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 The total rates revenue increase in 2017/18 is 3.9%. This is lower than forecast in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan.

3.2 The setting of rates as stated in this paper is consistent with the Revenue and Financing Policy, and the Funding Impact Statement as adopted in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan and the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

4 Operational Implications

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

5 Financial implications

5.1 The passing of resolutions as set out in this paper will enable Council to fund its activities as set out in the adopted Annual Plan 2017/18.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, Council must set rates and due dates for rates for any particular year by passing a resolution of Council. This paper sets out the resolution necessary to enable Council to set and collect rates to fund its operations for the 2017/18 financial year.

7 Delegations

7.1 The Council has the authority to set rates. The Council is not able to delegate this authority.

8 Consultation

8.1 As part of the Annual Plan process, the Council consulted with the community on material differences from what was agreed to in the Long Term Plan 2015-25. Council considered submissions made by ratepayers and other interested parties prior to the adoption of the Annual Plan. The setting of targeted and general rates is based on the level of rates revenue as set out in the Annual Plan.
9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this paper.

10 Conclusion

10.1 Council is required to set rates and due dates for any particular year by passing a resolution once it has adopted the Annual Plan. Adopting the recommendations outlined in this report will fulfil these requirements and meet Council's statutory obligations.

11 Attachments

- There are no attachments.
Loan Borrowing 2017-18

Purpose

To seek approval to enable the Council to borrow to fund the programmes identified in the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

Significance of Decision

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

Recommendations

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.

Report prepared by:
Colleen Morris
Chief Financial Officer

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 The borrowing programme is detailed in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan, with variations documented in the 2017/18 Annual Plan, and sets out the borrowing requirements for the 2017/18 financial year in order to fund the capital works programme for that year. The funding required is $10,257,522.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 In order to finance capital works, the maximum term of the loan is the shorter of the expected life of the asset being acquired/constructed or thirty years. However, the current practice is to utilise loan facilities for shorter periods (e.g. up to 16 years) and then refinance as required within the maximum term of the original financing required for the capital works.

3.2 Council has a loan facility with the BNZ of up to $10m that is available for short term funding prior to borrowing from the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) or for emergency funding in the event of a disaster.

3.3 Loan borrowing will be in accordance with the Liability Management Policy.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 There are operating expenditure associated with borrowing have been included in the Annual Plan.

5 Financial implications

5.1 The resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocations.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 There are no statutory requirements associated with this report.

7 Delegations

7.1 The Council has authority to decide this matter.
8 Consultation

8.1 Consultation was carried out as a part of the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this matter.

10 Conclusion

10.1 A resolution of Council is required to authorise the Chief Executive to borrow funds to meet the borrowing requirements for the capital works programme for the 2017/18 financial year.

11 Attachments

- There are no attachments
Council

Meeting of 22 June 2017

Business Unit: Corporate and Regulatory
Date Created: 31 May 2017

Setting of Fees and Charges 2017/18

Purpose

To set by resolution fees and charges for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.

Significance of Decision

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

Recommendations

That the Council approve 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.

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 The Council has the ability to set fees and charges for all of its activities, except those that are set by regulation.

2.2 Fees and charges are calculated to recover the costs of providing those services in accordance with the funding split agreed to in the Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy.

2.3 The Council adopted the Animal Control Fees for the 2017/18 year at its extraordinary meeting on 22 March 2017.

2.4 The Council adopted draft District Planning fees and charges, and draft Food Act fees and charges for consultation on 22 March 2017. There were no submissions received as a result of the consultation.

2.5 The Council is now asked to adopt the proposed fees and charges for its remaining activities to take effect from 1 July 2017.

3 **Discussion and Options considered**

3.1 A summary of the fees and charges to be adopted by Council are set out below. The proposed fees and service charges that are not set by regulation have been adjusted by inflation and rounded to the nearest dollar to ensure recovery of costs incurred.

- Alcohol Licensing Fees - these fees are set by the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 2013.

- Building Services - Building Services fees and charges have been set according to the Building Act 2004. They enable Manawatu District Council to recover the costs associated with processing applications, undertaking inspections and related work.

  Infringement fees are determined by the Building (Infringement Offences, Fees and Forms) Regulations 2007.

- Camping Grounds - Camping ground fees for the costs of overnight stays at Council’s camping grounds.

- Cemeteries - Fees and charges relating to interments at the district’s cemeteries.

- District Planning - Planning Services charges have been set according to the Resource Management Act 1991. These enable Manawatu District Council to recover the costs of processing applications, monitoring consents and for notice of requirement designations and private District Plan changes.

  Under Section 36 (2) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Council was required to use the Special Consultative Procedure to fix administrative charges in relation to the Resource Management Act 1991. Consultation was undertaken from 28 March 2017 until 28 April 2017. There were no submissions on the proposed charges.

  Infringement fees are determined by the Resource Management (Infringement Offences) Regulations 1999.
Environmental Health - Environmental Health fees and charges have been set to recover the costs of processing applications, compliance and monitoring and undertaking inspections.

Under Section 205 (2) of the Food Act 2014, the Council was required to use the Special Consultative Procedure to fix fees to recover the direct and indirect costs of registration, verification and compliance monitoring functions under the Act. Consultation was undertaken from 28 March 2017 until 28 April 2017. There were no submissions on the proposed charges.

Feilding Library Charges - Fees and charges for library services.

Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 Fees - Fees and charges relating to requests for official information, Land Information Memoranda, and Property Enquiries.

Makino Aquatic Centre - Fees and charges for use of the swimming pools, equipment hire and the range of swimming programmes provided.

Parks, Reserves and Playgrounds - Fees and charges related to the use of parks, reserves and sports grounds.

Roading - Fees for stock crossing and vehicle crossing consents, and engineering inspection for stock underpass.

Solid Waste - Fees and charges for solid waste services.

Stormwater - Fees for stormwater connection and capital contribution.

Wastewater - Fees and charges for wastewater services including wastewater connection and usage fees, capital contributions and trade waste charges.

Water Supply - Fees and charges for Water Supply services including rural water schemes managed by Council, capital contributions, connection and disconnection fees.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 The fees and charges proposed have been set to ensure that the revenue split as set by the Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy can be met.

5 Financial implications

5.1 The financial implications have been taken into account through the adoption of the Annual Plan 2017-18.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 The power for local authorities to prescribe fees and charges is set by a number of statutes, including:

- Local Government Act 2002 – section 12 “status and powers”
• Local Government Act 2002 – section 150 “fees may be prescribed by bylaw”
• Building Act 2004 – section 219 “territorial authority may impose fee or charge and must collect levy”
• Resource Management Act 1991 – section 36 “administrative charges”
• Dog Control Act 1996 – section 37 “territorial authority to set fees”
• Impounding Act 1955 – section 14 “poundage fees and sustenance charges”
• Food Act 2014 – section 205 “territorial authority to set fees”

7 Delegations

7.1 Council has delegated authority to make a decision on this matter.

8 Consultation

8.1 The special consultative procedure was followed to consult on proposed fees and charges for District Planning Services, and proposed Food Act fees and charges. There were no submissions received regarding those proposed fees. The remaining fees and charges not already adopted by Council can be set by resolution without the requirement for community consultation.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this paper.

10 Conclusion

10.1 In general, the fees and charges proposed for 2017/18 have been adjusted for inflation. Adoption of the proposed fees and charges will ensure Council is able to recover costs of providing the services in accordance with the funding split agreed to in the Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy.

11 Attachments

• Fees and Charges 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018
Alcohol Licensing Fees

Fee are set by the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (fees) Regulations 2013, effective 18 December 2013.

The fees for the alcohol licensing system involves assessing the risk that an operation might create, including the type of premises, the hours of operation and any enforcement issues over the past 18 months.

Further details of the assessment criteria of risks can be obtained from the Ministry of Justice website.

A premises’ fee category determines the application and annual fees that the licensee has to pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk fee category</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very low</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fee*</td>
<td>$368.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee</td>
<td>$161.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fee*</td>
<td>$609.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee</td>
<td>$391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fee*</td>
<td>$816.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee</td>
<td>$632.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fee*</td>
<td>$1,023.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee</td>
<td>$1,035.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very high</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fee*</td>
<td>$1,207.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee</td>
<td>$1,437.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* applies to applications for new licences, renewals of licences and variations to licences (including a redefinition of licensed premises)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees payable for other applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s certificate application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extract of register (ARLA or District licensing Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Club Charter (annual fee due on 30 June of each year and paid to ARLA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special licence application fees**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or two events covered by the licence that are of a ‘small size’</td>
<td>$63.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to 12 events covered by the licence that are of a ‘small size’, or one to three events that are of a ‘medium size’</td>
<td>$207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other special licences, including licences for events that are of a ‘large size’, 13 or more events that are of ‘small size’, or four or more events that are of ‘medium size’</td>
<td>$575.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Animal Control

The Animal Control fees and charges stated below have been set by Council under the authority of the Dog Control Act 1996, the Impounding Act 1955 and Manawatu District Bylaws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog Registration Fees</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted fee if paid by 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard fee if paid after 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutered/spayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted fee if paid by 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard fee if paid after 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working dogs / selected owners/gold card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted fee if paid by 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard fee if paid after 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous dogs classified under the Dog Control Act 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted fee if paid by 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard fee if paid after 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menacing dogs classified under the Dog Control Act 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted fee if paid by 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard fee if paid after 1 August 2017</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability Assist Registration                                                            | no charge|

Note: Infringements may be issued for all outstanding registrations after 1 September 2017

| Other Charges                                                                          |         |
| Replacement tag                                                                        | $4.00   |
| Application for preferred owner status/multi dog permit                                 | $63.00  |
| Exemption for distance to boundary for kennels                                         | $63.00  |
| Exemption for dog use at special/public events in dog prohibited areas                  | $319.00 |

| Impounding fees (during business hours)                                                  |         |
| Livestock - cattle/horses (per head)                                                     | $131.00 |
| Livestock - sheep/pigs (per head)                                                        | $32.00  |

| Dogs                                                                                     |         |
| First impound                                                                           | $131.00 |
| Second impound                                                                          | $183.00 |
| Third impound                                                                          | $236.00 |

| Impounding fees (after hours: Mon - Fri 5pm - 8am and weekends)                         |         |
| Livestock                                                                              |         |

| Actual costs - based on hourly rate per officer (including travel costs)                |         |
## Release fee (after hours: Mon - Fri 5pm - 8am and weekends)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sustenance fees (per head, per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livestock (excluding pigs and calves)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs and calves</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport of stock to pound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microchip dogs</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing dog at other facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking dog collar hire</td>
<td>Bond $100, $15 per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Animal Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application for more than 12 poultry</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for bees in urban areas</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for pigs in urban areas</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Hourly officer rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Officer</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Animal Control Officer</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fees determined by the Dog Control Act 1996


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A(2)</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(5)</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2)</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office specified as infringement offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wilful obstruction of dog control officer or ranger</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A(2)</td>
<td>Failure to supply information or wilfully providing false particulars about dog</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(5)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with any bylaw authorised by the section</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2)</td>
<td>Failure to undertake dog owner education programme or dog obedience course (or both)</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Failure to comply with obligations of probationary owner</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28(5)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with effects of disqualification</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(2)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with effects of classification of dog as dangerous dog</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(4)</td>
<td>Fraudulent sale or transfer of dangerous dog</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33EC(1)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with effects of classification of dog as menacing dog</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33F(3)</td>
<td>Failure to advise person of muzzle and leashing requirements</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36A(6)</td>
<td>Failure to implant microchip transponder in dog</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>False statement relating to dog registration</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41A</td>
<td>Falsely notifying death of dog</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Failure to register dog</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(4)</td>
<td>Fraudulent procurement or attempt to procure replacement dog registration label or disc</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48(3)</td>
<td>Failure to advise change of dog ownership</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49(4)</td>
<td>Failure to advise change of address</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(1)</td>
<td>Removal, swapping, or counterfeiting of registration label or disc</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52A</td>
<td>Failure to keep dog controlled or confined</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53(1)</td>
<td>Failure to keep dog under control</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54(2)</td>
<td>Failure to provide proper care and attention, to supply proper and sufficient food, water, and shelter, and to provide adequate exercise</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54A</td>
<td>Failure to carry leash in public</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55(7)</td>
<td>Failure to comply with barking dog abatement notice</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62(4)</td>
<td>Allowing dog known to be dangerous to be at large unmuzzled or unleashed</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62(5)</td>
<td>Failure to advise of muzzle and leashing requirements</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72(2)</td>
<td>Releasing dog from custody</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Services

Building Services fees and charges listed below have been set according to the Building Act 2004. They enable Manawatu District Council to recover the costs associated with processing applications, undertaking inspections and related work.

Fixed Fees - Fast track building consents (10 working days)

These fees incorporate scanning and digital storage charges. However in addition to the fixed charges are any bonds that may be applicable, any structural engineering checking fees, vehicle crossing processing and inspection fees and any legal or consultancy cost that Council may incur during the processing of the applications.

In addition to the charges prescribed by the Manawatu District Council, are levies imposed by the Building Research Association of New Zealand (BRANZ) and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE). The BRANZ levy of $1.00 per $1,000 and the MBIE levy of $2.01 per $1,000 is applied to all building consents that have building work valued at $20,000.00 or more.

e.g. work value = $35,000   BRANZ =$35.00   MBIE = $70.35

These levies are payable at the time an application for consent is lodged for processing.

These levies could be subject to change by the relevant authority.

Fixed fees (excluding fireplaces and minor building work) include a fixed planning fee of $50.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Type</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fireplaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 Freestanding fire</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 Inbuilt fire</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demolitions and Removal of Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 Residential</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 Commercial</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carports/Pergolas/Sheds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Carport, Pergola, Garden Shed</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proprietary Garages and Pole Sheds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Standard garage</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 Garage with plumbing and drainage</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 Garage with fire wall and plumbing and drainage</td>
<td>Fixed PIM fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed building consent fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fixed PIM fee</th>
<th>Fixed building consent fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 Temporary/Freestanding</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>$539.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 Other</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>$599.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conservatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fixed PIM fee</th>
<th>Fixed building consent fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Conservatory placed on existing deck</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>$754.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1 Conservatory placed on a new deck</td>
<td>$258.00</td>
<td>$896.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor building work (under $20,000 in value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fixed PIM fee</th>
<th>Fixed building consent fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 Grease trap installation</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Remove an interior wall</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Install external window/door</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 Install storm water drain</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 Install WC/shower</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$494.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Install hot water cylinder</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$681.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 Install on-site effluent disposal field</td>
<td>$214.00</td>
<td>$643.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applications where a PIM and/or Building Consent lodgement fee applies (20 working days)

An application lodgement fee is payable at the time the applicant lodges the Project Information Memorandum (PIM) and/or Building Consent application with Council. We will calculate the total fees including officer’s time, inspections, scanning, code compliance certificate, and any other charges applicable, less the prepaid lodgement fee when the processing of the consent is complete. Full payment of fees is required prior to the issue of the Project Information Memorandum (PIM) and/or Building Consent.

### Work Type

#### New residential dwelling (including sleepouts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lodgement PIM fee</th>
<th>Lodgement building consent fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1 0-$100,000</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
<td>$609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 $100,001 - $200,000</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
<td>$609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3 Above $200,001</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
<td>$719.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residential additions and alterations (including relocate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lodgement PIM fee</th>
<th>Lodgement building consent fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 $0 - $5,000</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 $5,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$332.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 $20,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 $100,001 - $200,000</td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 $200,001 - $500,000</td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$719.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 $500,001 - $1,000,000</td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$941.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Above $1,000,001</td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New commercial buildings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 Under $100,000</th>
<th>Lodgement PIM fee</th>
<th>$281.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 $100,001 - $200,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 $200,001 - $500,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$719.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 $500,001 - $1,000,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$941.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Above $1,000,001</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$1,162.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commercial additions and alterations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1 $0 - $5,000</th>
<th>Lodgement PIM fee</th>
<th>$139.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2 $5,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 $20,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 $100,001 - $200,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5 $200,001 - $500,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6 $500,001 - $1,000,000</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7 Above $1,000,001</td>
<td>Lodgement PIM fee</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodgement building consent fee</td>
<td>$1,162.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the charges prescribed by the Manawatu District Council, are levies imposed by the Building Research Association of New Zealand (BRANZ) and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE). The BRANZ levy of $1.00 per $1,000 and the MBIE levy of $2.01 per $1,000 is applied to all building consents that have building work valued at $20,000.00 or more.

e.g. work value = $35,000  BRANZ = $35.00  MBIE = $70.35
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These levies are payable at the time an application for consent is lodged for processing.

These levies could be subject to change by the relevant authority.

### Other Fees

These fees may be applicable to building consents or may be applied as a single charge.

### Fee Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scanning and Digital Storage (applies to all PIM and Building Consents other than fixed fee consents)</td>
<td>$ 46.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Warrant of fitness and compliance schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Compliance Schedule</td>
<td>$ 119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to existing compliance schedule</td>
<td>$ 71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Warrant of Fitness site audit/re-inspections</td>
<td>$ 192.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IQP Registration (initial)

Per charge set by Palmerston North City Council

### IQP Renewal (3 yearly) - submit applications to Palmerston North City Council (Private Bag 11034, Manawatu Mail Centre, Palmerston North 4442, (W) 06 356 8199, E-mail: info@pncc.govt.nz, Web: www.pncc.govt.nz)

Per charge set by Palmerston North City Council

### Copy of IQP list

$ 33.00

### Engineering checking

Structural engineering checking

Actual cost

Fire engineering documents sent to New Zealand Fire Service

As charged by the Fire Service

### Other fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Compliance Certificate - Residential</td>
<td>$ 102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Compliance Certificate - Commercial</td>
<td>$ 171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Sanitary (building work prior to 1992) - Third Party Report Approval</td>
<td>$ 235.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to building consent or code compliance certificate timeframes</td>
<td>$ 83.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exempt building work under schedule 1 part1(2) of the Building Act 2004

$100.00 lodgement fee, then charged at the actual cost based on hourly rate per officer

### Licensed building practitioner registration fee (per building consent)

$ 55.00

### Standard building inspection

$ 186.00

### Fencing of swimming pools monitoring inspection

$ 80.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Fee Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Acceptance</td>
<td>$650 non refundable deposit, then charged at the actual cost based on hourly rate per officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for amendment to building consent</td>
<td>actual costs based on hourly rate per officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate for Public Use</td>
<td>$100.00 lodgement fee, then charged at the actual cost based on hourly rate per officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver and modifications</td>
<td>actual costs based on hourly rate per officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool exemption hearing</td>
<td>$557.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Title</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of monthly report of building consents issued</td>
<td>$ 73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charges for Council Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Officer</td>
<td>$111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Officer</td>
<td>$148.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader Building Services MDC, Senior Building Officer and Advanced Building Officer</td>
<td>$169.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Manager</td>
<td>$233.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Where the fee per hour is stated, please note this should be read in full as “fee per hour or part thereof”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fees determined by Building (Infringement offences, Fees, and Forms) Regulations 2007.**

**General building offences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Failing to comply with the requirement that building work must be carried out in accordance with a building consent</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Failing to apply for a certificate of acceptance for urgent building work as soon as practicable after completion of building work</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85(1)</td>
<td>Person who is not licensed building practitioner carrying out restricted building work without supervision of licensed building practitioner with appropriate licence</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85(2)(a)</td>
<td>Licensed building practitioner carrying out restricted building work without appropriate licence</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85(2)(b)</td>
<td>Licensed building practitioner supervising restricted building work without appropriate licence</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Failing to comply with the requirement to obtain a compliance schedule</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108(5)(a)</td>
<td>Failing to display a building warrant of fitness required to be displayed</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108(5)(b)</td>
<td>Displaying a false or misleading building warrant of fitness</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108(5)(c)</td>
<td>Displaying a building warrant of fitness other than in accordance with section 108</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108(5)(d)</td>
<td>Using, or knowingly permitting the use of, a building for a use for which it is not safe or not sanitary</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108(5)(e)</td>
<td>Displaying a false or misleading building warrant of fitness</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116(1)(a)</td>
<td>Using, or knowingly permitting the use of, a building that has inadequate means of escape from fire</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116(1)(b)</td>
<td>Using, or knowingly permitting the use of, a building that has inadequate means of escape from fire</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116(1)(c)</td>
<td>Using, or knowingly permitting the use of, a building that has inadequate means of escape from fire</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Failing to comply with a notice, within the time out stated on the notice, requiring work to be carried out on a dangerous, earthquake-prone, or insanitary building</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128(2)</td>
<td>Using or occupying a building, or permitting another person to do so, contrary to a territorial authority’s hoarding, fence, or notice</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Failing to comply with a notice to fix</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314(1)</td>
<td>Person holding himself or herself out as being licensed to do or supervise building work or building inspection work while not being so licenced</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362D(4)</td>
<td>Failing to provide prescribed disclosure information</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362F(4)</td>
<td>Failing to provide prescribed checklist</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362T(4)</td>
<td>Failing to have a written contract as prescribed</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362T(4)</td>
<td>Failing to provide prescribed information or documentation to specified persons</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Using, or permitting use of building having no consent or code compliance certificate, or certificate for public use for premises for public use</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Wilfully obstructing, hindering, or resisting a person executing powers conferred under the Act or its regulations</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Wilfully removing or defacing a notice published under the Act or inciting another person to do so</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Services charges listed below have been set according to the Resource Management Act 1991. These enable Manawatu District Council to recover the costs of processing applications, monitoring consents and for notice of requirement designations and private District Plan changes.

### Fee Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notified and Limited Notified Applications and Public Works Designations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration lodgement</td>
<td>$ 965.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising lodgement</td>
<td>$ 431.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing lodgement (extra charge may be incurred in the conduct of a hearing)</td>
<td>$ 536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings when heard by Commissioners including drafting decision</td>
<td>At cost plus disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-notified Application lodgement fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled activities</td>
<td>$ 483.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use consent for relocation</td>
<td>$ 745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted discretionary activities</td>
<td>$ 693.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary activities</td>
<td>$ 803.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-complying land uses</td>
<td>$ 1,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of a relocated building</td>
<td>$ 210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Subdivision (the number of lots in a subdivision includes the balance lot)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Consent lodgement fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 1-7</td>
<td>$ 646.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 8-20</td>
<td>$ 861.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 21 plus</td>
<td>$ 1,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates under Section 226</td>
<td>$ 672.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval for cross-lease plans previously approved</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way approval (no sealing fee)</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey plan consent (sealing fee)</td>
<td>$ 226.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with District Land Registrar (LINZ)</td>
<td>$ 173.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Access Certificate (Sections 321 and 346 of the Local Government Act 1974)</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond preparation</td>
<td>$ 376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s224 approval (if applied for separately from s223)</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s223 and s224 engineering approval and inspections will be charged at the hourly officer rate for ‘technical and professional staff from all other units’ as listed in the “Council staff and decision-maker charges” section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications for District Plan changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgement for a District Plan change</td>
<td>$ 5,353.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous lodgement fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Compliance</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended resource consent applications/staged consents (s125)</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation of conditions (s127)</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates under the Overseas Investment Act</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing use certificates</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline plan of works</td>
<td>$ 560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver for a requirement for an outline plan</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Uplifting a designation
- $339.00

### Non-notified designation requirements, heritage orders and designation alterations
- $560.00

### Notified designation requirements, heritage orders and designation alterations
- $1,682.00

### Instrument creating esplanade strip/reserve
- $339.00

### Revocation of easements, building line restrictions etc when separate from a subdivision consent
- $339.00

### Easements not requiring a subdivision consent and not included as part of the subdivision consent
- $339.00

### Consideration, processing and issuing of certificates not itemised in this schedule
- $339.00

### Monitoring of resource consents
- Inspections charged hourly rate per officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District Plan - Plan Strategy and Rules</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu District Plan - Planning Maps</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road Stopping lodgement fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road stopping under the Public Works Act 1981</td>
<td>$561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road stopping under the Local Government Act 1974 - (extra cost may be incurred if a hearing is required)</td>
<td>$1,123.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Review of development contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing lodgement fee - extra cost may be incurred if a hearing is required</td>
<td>$561.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Inspection fees – Building Consents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New construction - housing, commercial and industrial</td>
<td>Actual costs based on hourly rate per officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations and additions - housing, commercial and industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory and farm buildings - includes alterations and additions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Act 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 73 Notification - Land subject to natural hazards</td>
<td>$629.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75(2) Certificate - Building over two allotments</td>
<td>$629.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Certificate of Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Title</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

1. The fee is a lodgement fee only for land use consent applications, subdivision consent applications, applications for alterations to designations, engineering approvals and inspections, review of development contribution, requests for plan changes and road stoppings. The lodgement fee is the amount required up front when lodging an application. Council will take no action on the application in accordance with Section 36(7) until this amount is paid.

2. Section 36 of the Resource Management Act enables the Manawatu District Council to charge additional fees. These are fees to recover actual and reasonable costs incurred where the actual and reasonable costs exceed the lodgement fee (fixed charge) paid. Council will charge any costs incurred through the engagement of external expertise to the applicant at cost.

3. Council will charge fees to cover actual and reasonable costs incurred. It will charge the applicable staff charge-out rate together with the costs associated with employing the services of professional consultants where necessary. It will
recover actual and reasonable costs associated with any required consent hearing from the applicant.

4. Where specialist peer-review reports are required, the applicant is required to pay a lodgement fee of $500.00 per report when lodging an application. The applicant then pays the full amount on the completion of the report/assessment.

**Council staff and decision-maker charges**

The Council will charge the following hourly rates for its officers and decision makers for the processing of consents, hearings, and designations etc that do not have a set fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Fee per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Committee – Administration Staff</td>
<td>$109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer/Monitoring Officer</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and professional staff from all other Council units</td>
<td>$166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Consents Planner/Consents and Monitoring Team leader</td>
<td>$166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Planning Advisor</td>
<td>$191.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Manager</td>
<td>$229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>At cost plus disbursements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees for advertising, consultants and solicitors associated with all work types including processing of a consent or certificate. (This includes specialist technical or legal advice and new notice of requirements, designation alterations, removal of designations and District Plan changes.) At cost plus disbursements

**Infringement fees determined by Resource Management (Infringement Offences) Regulations 1999.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence specified as infringement offence</th>
<th>General description of offence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(1A)</td>
<td>Contravention of section 15A (1) (dumping of waste or other matter from any ship, aircraft or offshore installation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(1B)</td>
<td>Contravention of section 15B (1) and (2) (discharge in the coastal marine area of harmful substances, contaminants, or water from a ship or offshore installation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(1)(a)</td>
<td>Contravention of section 9 (restrictions on use of land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contravention of section 12 (restrictions on use of coastal marine area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contravention of section 13 (restrictions on certain uses of beds of lakes and rivers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contravention of section 14 (restrictions relating to water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contravention of section 15(1)(a) and (b) (discharge of contaminants or water into water or onto or into land where contaminant is likely to enter water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contravention of section 15(1)(c) and (d) (discharge of contaminants into environment from industrial or trade premises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contravention of section 15(2) (discharge of contaminant into air or onto or into land)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 338(1)(c)</th>
<th>Contravention of an abatement notice (other than a notice under section 322(1)(c))</th>
<th>$ 750.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(1)(d)</td>
<td>Contravention of a water shortage direction under section 329</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(2)(a)</td>
<td>Contravention of section 22 (failure to provide certain information to an enforcement officer)</td>
<td>$ 300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(2)(c)</td>
<td>Contravention of an excessive noise direction under section 327</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 338(2)(d)</td>
<td>Contravention of an abatement notice for unreasonable noise under section 322(1)(c)</td>
<td>$ 750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environmental Health

### Registration of a new food premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Premises</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017/18 Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class A Premises</strong></td>
<td>High risk premises used for manufacture, preparation, heat treatment and sale of readily perishable foods on / off the premises (examples: restaurants, cafes, takeaways) includes Reg 5.7 premises, VIP/FCP, OTP premises</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class B Premises</strong></td>
<td>Medium-low risk food premises used for the sale/storage of prepackaged foods, including frozen goods. No cooking is taking place (e.g. dairy, service stations)</td>
<td>$336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class C Premises</strong></td>
<td>Premises used for the sale of sealed / wrapped goods only and food that is not readily perishable, at the discretion of Environmental Health Officer based on the risk and size of the premises</td>
<td>$263.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Renewal fees for food premises

#### Class A Premises
- Grade A – not more than three minor faults and no critical faults | $373.00 |
- Grade B – not more than five minor faults, no critical faults | $461.00 |
- Grade C – not more than 10 minor faults, some or all the criteria not up to standard. Minimal risk identified | $581.00 |
- Grade D – one or more critical faults are found | $740.00 |

#### Class B Premises
- Grade A – not more than three minor faults and no critical faults | $246.00 |
- Grade B – not more than five minor faults, no critical faults | $288.00 |
- Grade C – not more than 10 minor faults, some or all the criteria not up to standard. Minimal risk identified | $376.00 |
- Grade D – one or more critical faults are found | $488.00 |

#### Class C Premises
- Grade A – not more than three minor faults and no critical faults | $158.00 |
- Grade B – not more than five minor faults, no critical faults | $210.00 |
- Grade C – not more than 10 minor faults, some or all the criteria not up to standard. Minimal risk identified | $278.00 |
- Grade D – one or more critical faults are found | $356.00 |

### Application / request for re-grading
- $126.00

### Translator costs for food businesses
- Actual costs

### Extra inspection fee for food premises
- $110.00

### Mobile shops and stalls licence
- (vehicles and caravans selling or supplying food that is prepared, cooked or reheated on site (high risk). Meets the criteria of Class A premises and applicable grading) | $404.00 |

### Mobile shops and stalls licence
- (vehicles, caravans and stalls selling food that is prepared, reheated on site (low risk), such as coffee carts, vegetable and fruit vans, etc. Meets the criteria of Class B premises and applicable grading) | $310.00 |

### Renewal fees for premises other than food and registrations under Health (Registration of Premises) Regulations 1966 and bylaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping grounds</td>
<td>$263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral directors’/ mortuary certificate</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser premises</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile trader consent (other than those selling or supplying food) Grading does not apply</td>
<td>$147.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event food stall inspection and licence</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive trades licence (s54 Health Act 1956)</td>
<td>$263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saleyards</td>
<td>$263.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voluntary food control plan fees**

| OTP/VIP – registration and processing of application for voluntary food control plans from other base Territorial Authorities | $112.00 |
| OTP/VIP – verification and audit fees for voluntary food control plans of Class A premises. Based on a four hour audit and charged according to the premises grade. (Refer Class A premises renewal fees) | Class A premises Grade renewal fee plus time in excess of four hours is charged at $164.00 per hour or part thereof |

**Food Act 2014 fees and charges**

Note: Food premises subject to the requirements of the Food Act 2014 have up to three years to transition to the requirements of the Food Act 2014. Until they transition, such premises will be subject to the Council’s food premises fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee description</th>
<th>Fixed Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application for registration of Food Control Plans based upon a template or model issued by the Ministry of Primary Industries for businesses subject to a National Programme.</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal of registrations</td>
<td>$169.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee description</th>
<th>Fee per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to registration</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification (including site visits and compliance checks)</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance and monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee description</th>
<th>Fee per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaint driven investigation resulting in issue of improvement notice by Food Safety Officer</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for review of issue of improvement notice</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of food safety and suitability</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee description</th>
<th>Fixed Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amusement devices inspection (prescribed fee set by Amusement Devices Regulations 1978)</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications under Gambling Venue Policy</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing overgrown vegetation (Fire risk – LGA 2002)</td>
<td>Actual costs incurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing overgrown trees abutting public places (LGA 1974)</td>
<td>Actual costs incurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Fire permit</td>
<td>no charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish / fly tipping removal</td>
<td>Actual costs incurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of abandoned vehicle</td>
<td>Actual costs incurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street user permit (e.g. buskers, hawkers, appeals, stalls) Registered charity</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street user permit (e.g. buskers, hawkers, appeals, stalls)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other organisations</td>
<td>Actual costs incurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water chemical analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Testing - micro-biological (residential)</td>
<td>No charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of duplicate certificate/permit</td>
<td>$ 23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of ownership for a certificate of registration</td>
<td>$ 73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to claim seized equipment (RMA 1991, Sec336)</td>
<td>$ 115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to claim seized skateboard</td>
<td>$ 21.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff time</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent by staff searching for relevant material, abstracting, collating, copying, transcribing and supervising access, where the total time involved is in excess of one hour.</td>
<td>First hour free then $40.00 for each subsequent half hour (after the first hour) or part thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photocopying</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying or printing on standard A4 paper where the total number of pages is in excess of 20 pages.</td>
<td>$0.45 per page after the first 20 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All other charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed at an amount which recovers the actual costs incurred. This includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the provision of documents on computer disks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the retrieval of information off-site;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reproducing a film, video or audio recording;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arranging for the requester to hear or view an audio or visual recording; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing a copy of any map, plan or other document larger than A4 size.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The above charges are based on the Ministry of Justice Charging Guidelines endorsed by the Office of the Ombudsman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges may be waived or modified at the discretion of the Chief Executive or a General Manager authorised by the Chief Executive. Waivers will be considered in situations where payment may cause financial hardship to the requestor, where the charge may become an unreasonable deterrent to seeking information and is therefore working against the LGOIMA principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIM (Land Information Memorandum) Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property enquiries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying/copy of scanned documents onto paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A0, A1, A2</td>
<td>$ 11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>$ 0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>$ 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double sided A3</td>
<td>$ 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double sided A4</td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic download of data onto CD (per property)</td>
<td>$ 37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration costs will be charged for requests where the officer’s time exceeds 15 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feilding Public Library

Feilding Public Library is committed to incorporating new technologies into its service where appropriate, and is committed to providing a service that is responsive to current and future demands.

In addition to books, the library provides a collection of lending DVDs, online database systems and children’s programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of District Subscribers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual subscription reduced proportionately after each month in respect of new</td>
<td>$ 90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolments during the subscription period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overdue Fines</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First week</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second week</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third week</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: each overdue notice</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve charge (hold for seven days only)</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost book</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement library card (second replacement within 12 months)</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Book Bag</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier charge (A4 Black and White)</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier charge (A4 Colour)</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier charge (A3 Colour)</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing - A4 black and white</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Printer - Calculated on weight of filament (grams)</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loans to reciprocal libraries (per item)</td>
<td>$ 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loans to non-reciprocal libraries (per item)</td>
<td>$ 25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult and children’s DVDs - New releases</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult and children’s DVDs - Old releases</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet use (email, surfing per quarter hour)</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual issues to non residents (per item, in addition to existing charges)</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Makino Aquatic Centre

Makino Aquatic Centre (MAC) has heated indoor and outdoor pools providing safe, all year swimming for the community. The facility provides a wide range of swimming programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Swimmers Admission Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult swimmer</td>
<td>$ 4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School children</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool children</td>
<td>$ 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens/Community Services Card holder</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (1 Adult, three children or two adults, two children)</td>
<td>$ 11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua aerobics</td>
<td>$ 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua aerobics – Senior/Community Services Card holder</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Concession Cards                                                               |         |
| Adult - 10 visits                                                              | $ 40.50 |
| Adult - 30 visits                                                               | $ 115.00|
| Senior/Community Services Card holder - 10 visits                              | $ 36.00 |
| Senior/Community Services Card holder - 30 visits                              | $ 102.00|
| Aqua aerobics – 10 Visits                                                       | $ 55.00 |
| Aqua aerobics - Senior/Community Services Card holder – 10 visits              | $ 47.00 |
| Child - 10 visits                                                               | $ 31.50 |
| Child - 30 visits                                                               | $ 89.00 |
| Pre-School - 10 visits                                                          | $ 25.00 |
| Please note all concession cards expire 12 months from date of purchase         |         |

| Equipment Hire per hour             |         |
| Large inflatables                  | $ 65.00 |

| School Groups (school hours only – cost per school child)                      |         |
| Primary and Intermediate           | $ 2.00  |
| Secondary                          | $ 2.50  |

| School Lesson Programme            |         |
| Lessons for school programmes – per child per session (up to 3 instructors in a 30 minute period for 20+ children) | $ 4.00  |
| Lessons for school programmes – per child per session (up to 4 instructors in a 30 minute period for 30+ children) | $ 5.00  |

| Schools Flippaball Competition     |         |
| Per team - per term                | $ 200.00|

| Swimming Lessons                   |         |
| Babies – per term                  | $ 85.00 |
| Home School – per term             | $ 100.00|
| Preschool – per term               | $ 110.00|
| School age – per term              | $ 115.00|
| Child (one-on-one instruction) - per half-hour session | $ 40.00  |
| Adult (one-on-one instruction) - per half-hour session | $ 40.00  |
## Advanced lessons - per term
$115.00

## Private lessons pre-school - per term
$230.00

## Private lessons child - per term
$230.00

## Private lessons adult - per term
$230.00

### School Holiday Lessons
Cost calculated on number of sessions per relative fee

### Learn to Swim Block Sessions - on request
Cost calculated on number of sessions per relative fee

## Squad Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hour long sessions (1 session per week per term)</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior A - 5 sessions per week per term</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior B - 3 sessions per week per term</td>
<td>$270.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canoe Polo - Per term</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe Polo - Casual</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties - Option 1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties - Option 1 - extra child</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties - Option 2</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterplay - Specified timed programme - One pre-schooler and one adult swimming</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lane Hire (per lane per hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25m Lane hire (structured swimming, maximum of 10 per lane)</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25m Lane hire – Clubs and Schools (structured swimming, max of 10 per lane)</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50m Lane hire (structured swimming, maximum of 18 per lane)</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50m Lane hire – Clubs and Schools (structured swimming, max of 18 per lane)</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Complex Hire per hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire indoor Complex hire (All indoor pools and meeting rooms)</td>
<td>$255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire indoor Complex hire (All indoor pools and meeting rooms) - Clubs and Schools</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Complex hire (25m and Play Pool, excluding Learn to Swim Pool)</td>
<td>$137.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Complex hire (25m and Play Pool, excluding Learn to Swim Pool) - Clubs and Schools</td>
<td>$112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor 25m pool hire</td>
<td>$117.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor 25m pool hire - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$102.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makino Meeting Room 1</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makino Meeting Room 2</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to Swim Pool</td>
<td>$72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to Swim Pool - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$52.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Outdoor Pool Hire per hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Outdoor Complex Hire</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Outdoor Complex Hire - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$162.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 metre outdoor pool</td>
<td>$132.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 metre outdoor pool - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$102.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Dive Pool</td>
<td>$72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Dive Pool - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Play Pool</td>
<td>$52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Play Pool - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$ 30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council shall negotiate with users for periods of extended use and high profile events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Complex per hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pools and meeting rooms</td>
<td>$ 575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pools and meeting rooms - clubs/schools</td>
<td>$ 410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pool Staff - per hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to Swim Instructor</td>
<td>$ 45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquacise Instructor</td>
<td>$ 55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguards</td>
<td>$ 25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>$ 21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Guard</td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Out of hours bookings require two weeks’ notice as extra staffing needs to be organised.

All lane and pool hire is inclusive of admission charges.
Parks, Reserves and Sports Grounds

The Manawatu District provides parks, reserves and sports grounds for active and passive leisure pursuits. A range of properties makes up our parks, reserves and sports grounds. These include vacant rural land, large tracts of native forest or beach reserve as well as urban sections containing significant building assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Grounds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless otherwise stated the charge is per field for the entire season (20 weeks) and allows for one major playing day per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Johnston Park**
- Rugby: $475.00
- Cycling (Velodrome): $455.00
- Western Riding: $455.00
- Grandstand/Changing Rooms: $455.00
- Casual hire – field/area (per day) major codes (additional games, tournaments, etc) social clubs, service clubs, schools: $60.00
- Casual hire - Grandstand (per day): $75.00

**Timona Park**
- Athletics: $405.00
- Dog Training Club: $405.00
- Junior Soccer: $355.00
- Junior Rugby: $355.00
- Pony Club: $405.00
- Rugby: $475.00
- Soccer: $475.00
- Junior Cricket: $355.00
- Touch Rugby (per season all fields): $505.00
- Changing rooms - (per season): $305.00
- Casual hire – field/area (per day) major codes (additional games, tournaments, etc), social clubs, service clubs, schools: $60.00
- Casual hire - Timona Park south (per day): $75.00
- Casual hire - Timona Park north (per day): $160.00
- Casual hire - Timona Park north (partial) (per day): $75.00

**Victoria Park**
- Rugby: $475.00
- Junior Rugby: $355.00
- Touch Rugby (per season all fields): $505.00
- Softball: $355.00
- Pavilion/changing rooms/shed (per season): $455.00
- Casual hire – field/area (per day) major codes (additional games, tournaments, etc.), social clubs, service clubs, schools: $60.00
- Casual hire – pavilion/changing rooms (per day): $55.00

**Kowhai Park**
- Cricket: $475.00
- Casual hire - field/area (per day) major codes (additional games, tournaments etc), social clubs, services clubs, schools: $60.00
- Casual hire – pavilion (per day): $60.00
- Wedding ceremonies: Free
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rimu Park</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual hire – field/area (per day) major codes (additional games, tournaments, etc.), social clubs, service clubs, schools</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbolton Domain</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual hire – field/area (per day) major codes (additional games, tournaments, etc.), social clubs, service clubs, schools</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcombe Recreational Ground</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cemeteries

Council provides pleasant, attractive cemeteries of which the community can be proud.

Administering cemeteries involves ensuring interments are carried out to an acceptable standard and that cemetery grounds are maintained and enhanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot fees</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$1,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child under 13</td>
<td>$760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashes all sections</td>
<td>$810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA Burial or Ashes Plot</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interment fees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>$1,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child under 13</td>
<td>$610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Born</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashes</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other cemetery fees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra depth (more than one burial)</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking concrete</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday extra</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-district, per plot (additional to standard fee)</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterment</td>
<td>$1,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterment of ashes</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-interment (within same plot)</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monumental permit</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District-wide reservations (maximum of two adjoining plots at the time of interment) | 200% of current Plot fee |


Camping Grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults (per night)</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 12 years of age) (per night)</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Roading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Crossing Consent</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crossing Consent</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Underpass Engineering Inspection</td>
<td>$1,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight Permit (per application)</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Opening Request</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Solid Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse Bag Charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official refuse bags if purchased from Council</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Council rubbish bags - 60 litre volume or weight limit 10 kg</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse Transfer Stations and bulk collection charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Refuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelie Bin</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small load (car boot)</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium load - ute or trailer load (up to 350 kg)</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large load (351 to 500 kg)</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks and loads over 500 kg (per tonne)</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete with no reinforcing steel - per tonne</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenwaste</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse bag (each) - 60 litre</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelie Bin</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small load (car boot)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium load - Ute load (up to 350 kg)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large load (351 to 500 kg)</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks over 500 kg (per tonne)</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling at recycling centres (Council listed items)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of additional recycling bin 120L (includes kerbside collection)</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of additional recycling bin 240L (includes kerbside collection)</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of recycling of glass crate (includes kerbside collection)</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fly Tipping</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited litter of quantities up to 20 litres in a public place</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited litter of quantities up to 20 litres on private land without consent of owner</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited litter of quantities 20 litres to 120 litres in a public place</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited litter of quantities 20 litres to 120 litres on private land without the consent of owner</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited litter of quantities greater than 120 litres in a public place</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited litter of quantities greater than 120 litres on private land without the consent of owner</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited hazardous waste in a public place</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposited hazardous waste on private land without the consent of the owner</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Charges (each item)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste (household quantities 20 litres or 20 kg - Feilding only)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridges and Freezers - de-gassed</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware - except refrigeration</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave/small appliances</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV - CRT</td>
<td>$27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV - LCD and Plasma</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Waste Desktop/VCR/Fax/Scanners/Printers/UPS</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier - small to medium</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier - large</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyres - car</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyres - 4x4</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyres - light truck less than 50 kgs</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyres - long haul vehicle</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyres - tractor</td>
<td>$88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive oil - over 20 litres (per litre in excess of 20 litres)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas bottles</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorescent tubes</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco bulbs</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB (per kg)</td>
<td>$67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint 4 litre pail</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint 10 litre and over</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Collectors (per year)</td>
<td>$618.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated Goods Container, per year (1-20 containers)</td>
<td>$319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated Goods Container (Over 20 rate, each, in addition to the set fee of $316)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Stormwater

## Fee Description  

| 2017/18 |  
| --- | ---  
| **All schemes** |  
| **New connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee** | As charged by Contractor $275.00  
|  
## Capital Contributions - Units of Demand  

|  |  
| --- | ---  
| Cheltenham | $3,266.00  
| Feilding | $2,990.00  
| Rongotea | $2,850.00  
| Sanson | $2,290.00  
|  


# Wastewater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater connection fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties paying half wastewater rate in Feilding, Halcombe, Rongotea and Sanson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sewer connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee</td>
<td>As charged by Contractor $275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sewer connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee</td>
<td>As charged by Contractor $275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sewer connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee</td>
<td>As charged by Contractor $275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties paying half wastewater rate in Kimbolton and Cheltenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sewer connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee</td>
<td>As charged by Contractor $275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties not paying half wastewater rate after approval to connect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sewer connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee</td>
<td>As charged by Contractor $275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumetric Wastewater charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base charge per water meter connection - charged per three-month period includes 76m$^3$ of flow use per period</td>
<td>$187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater discharge consumption (not covered by Trade Waste charges) is calculated at 80% of the volume of water used, as measured by water meter</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection at sewer main</td>
<td>$1,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Capital Contributions - Units of Demand*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awahuri</td>
<td>$6,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>$7,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding</td>
<td>$5,481.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halcombe</td>
<td>$11,330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himatangi Beach</td>
<td>$24,653.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbolton</td>
<td>$7,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongotea</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanson</td>
<td>$5,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*typically per dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding Trade Waste charges calculated as per Trade Waste Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow per cubic meter (m$^3$)</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) per kg</td>
<td>$0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solid (TSS) per kg</td>
<td>$0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional charges may be levied in accordance with the trade waste consent for trade waste high in other contaminants including ammoniacal nitrogen or phosphorous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphorous (TP) charge per kg</td>
<td>$51.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) per kg</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankered Waste per cubic meter (m$^3$)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Waste administration charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Waste Consent application fees (includes first two hours of processing)</td>
<td>$215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent processing fee (cost per hour)</td>
<td>$106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Compliance monitoring</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance monitoring grease traps sampling (per inspection)</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-inspection fees (per inspection)</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual grease trap monitoring</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monitoring of oil interceptors (or similar devices)</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual monitoring of amalgam traps</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All schemes excluding rural water supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered water supply three monthly charges (includes 95m³ per period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15mm to 20mm</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mm</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 mm</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mm</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 mm</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mm</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 mm</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional water use per m³</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPZ (Reduced Pressure Zone Protector) inspection and test fee for meters up to 50 mm</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPZ (Reduced Pressure Zone Protector) inspection and test fee for meters larger than 50 mm</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency meters water use per m³ (minimum charge of $20.00 applies when water is used)</td>
<td>$5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection fees - per connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New connection to property boundary PLUS MDC Administration Fee</td>
<td>As charged by Contractor $275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disconnection fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe diameter up to 20 mm</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meter installation cost in addition to manifold costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizes up to 20 mm</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizes greater than 20 mm</td>
<td>Individual quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service restriction due to account issues (disconnect and reconnect)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or replace flow restrictor</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Contributions - Units of Demand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himatangi Beach</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding fringe</td>
<td>$6,103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stanway/Halcombe Rural Water Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital contribution (per unit)</td>
<td>$3,013.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection fee (owner pays all pipe work)</td>
<td>$1,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or replace flow restrictor</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase or decrease water allocation</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waituna West Rural Water Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital contribution (per unit)</td>
<td>$3,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection fee (owner pays all pipe work)</td>
<td>$1,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or replace flow restrictor</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase or decrease water allocation</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

183
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sanson Water Scheme</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital contribution (per unit)</td>
<td>$5,155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection fee (owner pays contractor directly) for MDC Admin</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or replace flow restrictor</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase or decrease water allocation</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Turners Road Water Filling Station</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water use per m³</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access key (refundable deposit)</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rongotea Water Scheme</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital contribution (per unit)</td>
<td>$7,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection fee (owner pays contractor directly) for MDC Admin</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adoption of Waste Management and Minimisation Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to adopt a Waste Management and Minimisation plan as statutorily required by the Waste Minimisation Act 2008.

Significance of Decision

The contents of the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan was considered significant and the community was consulted in accordance with section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Recommendations

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

Report prepared by:
Chris Pepper
Special Projects Manager

Approved for submission by:
Hamish Waugh
General Manager - Infrastructure

1 Executive Summary

1.1 Council has undertaken the process required by the Act, that is to assess waste, prepare a draft Plan, and undertake consultation with our community.

1.2 The draft Plan submissions have been considered by Council and recommendations adopted at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 18 May 2107.

1.3 The draft Plan has now been amended in accordance in the resolutions and the final version is now ready for adoption.
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 Waste Minimisation Act 2008 encourages a reduction in the amount of waste we generate and dispose of in New Zealand. The aim is to reduce the environmental harm of waste and provide economic, social and cultural benefits for New Zealand. It specifically clarifies the roles and responsibilities of territorial authorities with respect to waste minimisation.

3.2 The role of local government is ‘to promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within their districts.’ This is done through Waste Management and Minimisation Plans and waste disposal levy payments to territorial authorities.

3.3 The Act also set out the requirements for waste management and minimisation plans and the process territorial authorities need to follow to review them, what the levy payments are, how levy money is distributed to territorial authorities, and details of levy payments made since 2010.

3.4 A Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Must include:

- objectives, policies and methods for achieving effective and efficient waste minimisation and management within the district
- how implementing the plan will be funded (including how local authorities intend to use allocated waste disposal levy money).
- Local authorities must also:
  - consider the waste hierarchy
  - have regard to ‘The New Zealand Waste Strategy: Reducing harm, improving efficiency (2010)’ and their most recent waste assessment
  - publicly consult on the WMMP.

3.5 The pertinent New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 recommendations are: (note the numbering refers to the Waste Strategy)

2. Focus future effort to manage and minimise waste in the following areas.
2.1 Maintain and increase momentum in waste management and minimisation activity by local government through the development of and support for programmes to:

2.1.1 enhance the adoption of best practice

2.1.2 strengthen regional cooperation, where appropriate

2.1.3 draw on international best practice

2.1.4 expand existing services and increase participation in them

2.1.5 increase funding, and additional funding mechanisms, for waste minimisation initiatives.

2.3 Increase public awareness to drive greater community and householder action on waste minimisation.

2.4 Improve the management of priority waste streams as set out in the New Zealand Waste Strategy

Organics

2.4.1 Assist in the development and improvement of markets for reprocessed organic wastes, especially biosolids.

2.4.2 Improve organic waste diversion management, best-practice implementation and promotion of emerging technologies.

2.4.3 Improve the monitoring of organic waste streams.

4 Discussion and Options considered

4.1 Due to the commercial nature of the data private companies hold with respect to the amount of waste collected and disposed of, the waste assessment undertaken by Council was focused on the waste that is collected by our contractor.

4.2 This indicated that this waste was predominantly made up of recyclable material and food waste.

4.3 Work undertaken by the Ministry for the Environment and some regional councils also indicates that there is a significant environmental risk associated with farm dumps.

4.4 Therefore the draft plan reflected this in proposing initiatives to extend the recycling service, initiating a food waste collection, bringing the cost of 26 bags into the rates, and by proposing to start a programme to begin to lessen the use of farm dumps.

4.5 It is noted that the urban recycling bins and crates in Feilding collect approximately double the amount of material compared to the Mobile Recycling Centres, at a cost of 1.5 times per property serviced.

4.6 The financial analysis undertaken that if a household used council waste diversion services effectively, the overall waste and recycling costs per household would decrease, even though the rates would increase. This was not generally supported in the submissions received.
4.7 Council will continue to undertake the current activities undertaken.

4.8 Therefore the Council has resolved the following:

- That Council does not implement the Feilding kitchen waste kerbside collection initiative.
- That Council does not extend the kerbside recyclable collection to the villages within the district.
- That Council installs Mobile Recycling Centres in Halcombe and Apiti.
- That Council initiates the targeted education to facilitate greater levels of off-farm solid waste disposal and recycling of inorganic agricultural wastes funded by the Waste Levy.
- That Council undertake to further inform and engage with the community and various sectors within the community to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of our communities’ needs and to better explain Council’s drivers with respect to waste management and minimisation.
- That the need for any further waste initiatives be included as part of, or in parallel with, Council’s consultation on the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.
- That the final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, incorporating changes agreed to by the Council, be presented for adoption by Council on 14 June 2017 (with the date subsequently being rescheduled to 22 June 2017).

4.9 It is also suggested that the work be undertaken to manage sludge at the WWTP be incorporated into future Plans as this is a key part of the New Zealand waste strategy.

5 Operational Implications

5.1 The extra two Mobile Recycling Centres will be supplied, installed and maintained by Council’s waste contractor.

5.2 The farm dump education programme will be undertaken as part of Council’s existing waste minimisation activity.

6 Financial implications

6.1 The extra cost of two Mobile Recycling Centres is estimated to be $60,000.00 per year.

6.2 The farm dump education programme will be funded from the existing waste minimisation budget.

7 Statutory Requirements

7.1 The statutory requirements for adoption of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan are set out in sections 43 and 44 of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008.
8 Delegations

8.1 The Council has the authority to decide this matter.

9 Consultation

9.1 Consultation on the draft Plan was undertaken in conjunction with the draft Annual Plan. Staff attended the community meetings, advertisements were placed in local newspapers and a flyer was distributed to households to support the community meetings and advertisements.

9.2 The consultation generated 351 submissions with 26 in support and 325 in opposition.

10 Cultural Considerations

10.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this matter.

11 Conclusion

11.1 After consideration of the submissions, the Council has resolved to adopt two of the initiatives proposed and not adopt the others. There is scope to further develop proposals over the 2017/18 year.

11.2 The draft Plan has been amended to reflect Council’s decision and is presented for adoption by Council.

12 Attachments

- Waste Management and Minimisation Plan
Waste Management Minimisation Plan 2016
## Contents

Summary .......................................................................................................................................................... 2  
Introduction ................................................................................................................................................... 5  
1.1 Purpose of the plan ................................................................................................................................. 5  
1.2 Scope of plan .......................................................................................................................................... 5  
1.3 Current status of plan ............................................................................................................................ 6  
1.4 When the plan is to be reviewed ........................................................................................................... 6  
2 Policies, plans and regulation .................................................................................................................... 7  
2.1 Summary of guiding policies, plans and legislation that affect this WMMP ........................................... 7  
2.2 Other Government Policies ................................................................................................................... 7  
2.3 Considerations ....................................................................................................................................... 9  
3 Vision, goals, objectives, targets and principles ....................................................................................... 10  
3.1 Vision for the future ............................................................................................................................... 10  
3.2 Goals, objectives and targets ............................................................................................................... 10  
3.3 Council’s intended role ......................................................................................................................... 11  
3.4 Public health protection ...................................................................................................................... 11  
4 Assessment of waste in the Manawatu District ......................................................................................... 12  
4.1 Summary of the volume and composition of waste and diverted materials ........................................ 12  
4.2 Existing Council provided solid waste and recycling services .......................................................... 15  
4.3 Summary of District Specific Issues .................................................................................................. 18  
5 Proposed methods for achieving effective and efficient waste management and minimisation .......... 19  
5.1 Summary of key waste and diverted material streams and how they are currently managed .......... 19  
5.2 Initiatives Council considered but did not put forward ....................................................................... 20  
6 Funding the plan ....................................................................................................................................... 21  
6.1 How the implementation of the plan is to be funded ........................................................................... 21  
6.2 Waste minimisation levy funding expenditure .................................................................................... 22  
7 Monitoring and evaluation ....................................................................................................................... 23  
7.1 Reporting .............................................................................................................................................. 23  
8 Glossary .................................................................................................................................................... 24  
8.1 Key definitions ..................................................................................................................................... 24  
8.2 Other definitions and abbreviations ................................................................................................... 24
Summary

This Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) is Manawatu District Council’s second iteration. The first WMMP was produced in 2010.

The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) requires councils to assess their waste services. Manawatu District Council has identified a range of issues and options around collection, recycling and disposal of waste for our district. The plan that we are proposing aims to ensure waste related activities are effective, efficient, safe, reduce impact on the environment and are accessible to our communities.

As required by the WMA, a Waste Assessment was carried out, the important background information that it provides has guided the development of this draft WMMP.

The Council funds and provides a number of transfer stations, mobile recycling centres, refuse and recycling collection services to ensure efficient and effective management of household waste in the district. The Council is progressing well as currently the community diverts approximately 37% of household waste from landfill to be recycled or reused compared to 14% in 2006 and 22% in 2010. We do not yet know the full extent of commercial waste and recyclable material diverted from landfill as this data is not currently available to Council.

As illustrated above, there has been a negative trend for the percentage of waste diverted from landfill. This is predominantly due to reduced green waste volumes at the Feilding Refuse Transfer Station but regardless, more work could be done to increase recycling participation rates and thereby reduce waste sent to landfill. In particular commercial waste producers and non-Council funded waste collectors could be encouraged to divert waste from going to landfill.
This draft WMMP presented a number of initiatives for improving how our waste is collected and processed as well as ways that we could reduce the amount of waste produced and disposed to landfill.

**The proposed initiatives were:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside kitchen food waste - Feilding residential area</td>
<td>• Provide a kerbside kitchen food waste collection for Feilding&lt;br&gt;• Provide 26 Council blue refuse bags per year for Feilding urban to assist in the promotion and participation of the kitchen waste collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village kerbside recycling service</td>
<td>• Extend kerbside recycling service to villages (Sanson, Kimbolton, Himatangi Beach, Tangimoana, Rongotea, Pohangina, Halcombe and Apiti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional MRCs</td>
<td>• Provide rural Mobile Recycling Centres (MRCs) to Halcombe and Apiti – This new service would only be provided if the rural kerbside recycling initiative is not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off farm waste disposal</td>
<td>• Facilitate the implementation of best practice off-farm waste disposal for rural land owners who presently burn and bury inorganic wastes. E.g. plastic wrap and used agrichemical containers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of public submissions:

Written and oral submissions were heard by the Manawatu District Council throughout 10 – 12 May 2017 where members of the public were given the opportunity to state their views on the proposed initiatives.

Manawatu District Council met on 18 May 2017 to deliberate on and consider all submissions and formally resolved which initiatives will be implemented.

Selected initiatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional MRCs</td>
<td>• Provide rural Mobile Recycling Centres (MRCs) to Halcombe and Apiti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off farm waste disposal</td>
<td>• Facilitate the implementation of best practice off-farm waste disposal for rural land owners who presently burn and bury inorganic wastes. E.g. plastic wrap and used agrichemical containers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications:

With the selection of these two initiatives only, putrescibles (kitchen waste) will continue to be sent to landfill. It is Council’s intention to trial a kitchen waste collection in Feilding to determine the acceptance and household usability of a kerbside kitchen waste collection. This trial will be funded from the waste levy and external funds from the Ministry for the Environment (if a funding application is granted).

Estimated costs of new initiatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Initiative</th>
<th>Cost per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional MRCs (Halcombe and Apiti)</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm waste disposal- facilitation</td>
<td>Waste minimisation levy funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the plan

The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) requires Manawatu District Council to adopt a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) for the purpose of enabling the effective and efficient management and minimisation of waste within this district.

The WMMP as a guiding document shows Council’s:

- present level of service
- new levels of service
- funding up to 2022

This draft WMMP has been developed following completion of a Waste Assessment. This considered current quantities and composition of waste and diverted materials in the district, existing waste services and predicted future demand for services and infrastructure.

1.2 Scope of plan

This WMMP considers waste and diverted materials in keeping with the order of priority stated in the WMA:

- reduce
- reuse
- recycle
- recovery
- treatment
- disposal

Specific new initiatives are included for Council-provided solid waste management and minimisation services.

This WMMP includes actions for the management and minimisation of waste and diverted materials for the following categories of activity:

- waste minimisation education and behaviour change
- commercial waste reduction
- refuse transfer stations - recycling services
- kerbside recycling collection services
- rural mobile recycling centres
- commercial waste recycling
- organic waste recovery (includes kitchen waste and greenwaste)
- treatment of hazardous waste
- kerbside residential refuse collection
- litterbin servicing
• collection and disposal of illegal dumping (fly tipping)
• closed landfill monitoring
• disposal of residual waste, and cleanfill
• farm dumps

1.3 Current status of plan

Manawatu District Council adopted its first WMMP in 2010. The current review is to address the requirements of the WMA.

The WMMP was finalised on 18 May 2017 following the consultation process and adopted by Council on 22 June 2017.

The intended term of the WMMP is for six years from 2016 – 2022.

1.4 When the plan is to be reviewed

In accordance with section 50 of the WMA this WMMP is to be reviewed every six years. While this Plan must be reviewed no later than 2022, additional reviews should occur if there is any significant change to the methodology of this plan.

A Waste Assessment under section 51 of the WMA must precede any review of the Plan.
2 Policies, plans and regulation

2.1 Summary of guiding policies, plans and legislation that affect this WMMP

The following guiding policies, plans and legislation direct this WMMP:

The New Zealand Waste Strategy (NZWS) – Reducing Harm, Improving Efficiency -2010

The NZWS is the Government’s strategic direction for the management and minimisation of waste within New Zealand.

The two goals of the NZWS are to:

- reduce the harmful effects of waste, and
- improve the efficiency of resource use

The NZWS provides direction for all levels of government, communities and the business sector. The strategy aims to coordinate the management and minimisation of waste, but provides sufficient flexibility to allow for unique situations that may be present in different locations.

The WMA (section 44) requires that Council “have regard to” the NZWS or other such policy which is subsequently developed, when preparing a WMMP.

Manawatu District Council Long Term Plan (LTP) 2015–25 - Part Two Solid Waste

The LTP describes Council’s activities, objectives and targets to achieve levels of service and how progress against these targets are measured. It also provides integrated decision-making and co-ordination of the various resources as well as long-term focus for the decisions and activities of Council. The LTP contains details of funding for Council provided waste services, which Council is committed to provide to the community.

2.2 Other Government Policies

Relevant government policy for local government over the last three terms (2009 - 2016) has focused on the following areas:

- fiscal responsibility, transparency and accountability
- efficiency, through service reviews, joint working and amalgamation
- sustainable procurement with particular focus on innovation and partnership working
- economic growth

The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA)

Territorial Authorities have an obligation under section 42 of the WMA to ‘promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within its district’.

To achieve the above obligation, the WMA also charges Territorial Authorities with the responsibility of providing and adopting by Council resolution a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

The WMA requires the plan to detail:

- methodology for collection, recovery, recycling, treatment and disposal services that are provided within the district
- information about the facilities used for the management and minimisation of waste
- waste activities which may also involve education or public awareness
- funding information
- the framework for any grants made by the Territorial Authority

When preparing a WMMP, section 44 of the WMA requires Territorial Authorities to consider and have regard to the New Zealand Waste Strategy.

**The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA)**

The LGA details the considerations that must be taken into account during the decision making process that often informs the development of a WMMP. Additionally, the LGA stipulates the consultation that must occur with regard to the WMMP, particularly when significant changes are proposed.

The LGA affords Territorial Authorities with the power to enact Bylaws for the purpose of regulating the management of solid waste activities.

**The Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO)**

The HSNO addresses the management of substances that pose a significant risk to the environment and/or humans from their manufacture to their disposal. The HSNO requires councils to handle and dispose of hazardous substances such as used oil, asbestos, agrichemicals, LPG and batteries in a safe manner.

**The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) as amended**

The RMA provides guidelines and regulations for the sustainable management and protection of the natural and cultural environment. It addresses waste management through controls on the environmental effects of waste management and minimisation facilities, through regional and local policies, plans and consent procedures. Under section 31 of the RMA, councils are responsible for controlling the effects of land use activities that have potential adverse effects on the natural and physical resources of the district. These include facilities used for collection, recovery, treatment and disposal of waste.

**The Health Act 1956**

The Health Act 1956 places obligation on councils (if required by the Minister of Health) to provide sanitary works for the collection and disposal of refuse, for the purpose of public health protection. It specifically identifies certain waste management practices as nuisances and offensive trades. The Health Act enables councils to raise loans for certain sanitary works and/or to receive government grants and subsidies, where available. The Health Act is currently under review.

**Climate Change Response Act 2002**

The Climate Change Response Act 2002 is the legislative document that provides the basis for the New Zealand Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).

This Act requires landowners to purchase and surrender emission trading units against methane emissions that are emitted. Landfill owners are under an obligation to surrender emissions credits against methane that is emitted from landfill. The cost of these credits is passed directly back to the landfill users Manawatu District Council who then pass that cost to RTS users. Future price increases for waste disposal are therefore inevitable.
2.3 Considerations

In preparing this WMMP, the Council has:

- given regard to the NZWS and adopted the strategy’s interim waste reduction goals
- considered the waste hierarchy
- considered the requirements of the LGA 2002 in assessing and making decisions on the practicable options for addressing the waste management needs of the community
- given regard to findings of its waste assessment when developing preferred initiatives
- considered the effects on existing services, facilities and activities of using waste levy funds for its waste minimisation initiatives
3 Vision, goals, objectives, targets and principles

Together the vision, goals, objectives and targets form the strategy of this WMMP.

3.1 Vision for the future

Manawatu District Council’s vision for waste management and minimisation is to:

“Provide sustainable waste management practices that protect the urban and rural environment for present and future generations by vigorously promoting waste management and minimisation activities to a reasonable waste reduction target.”

In the Manawatu District Council LTP 2015-2025, the Council sees the solid waste activity as contributing towards the following two community outcomes:

“A self-sufficient environment that preserves values and develops our natural resources.”

and

“A community that has access to effective services.”

3.2 Goals, objectives and targets

The Council’s goals for solid waste management and minimisation are:

“Waste Minimisation – to promote waste reduction in rural and urban communities through education, development and implementation of recycling, reuse and recovery methods.” and

“Waste Management - To deliver efficient and cost effective solid waste services to customers while safeguarding public health, taking into account cultural issues and minimising adverse effects on both the rural and urban environment.”

The various initiatives that were proposed, were to assist the district achieve its waste management and minimisation goals and waste reduction targets.

These are:

- You can expect access to waste management services
  - We will measure this by ensuring that 90% of rural residents have convenient Council refuse bag drop-off points less than 10kms from their homes
  - We will measure this by ensuring that mobile recycling centres are conveniently located within identified villages
- You can expect waste education programmes to encourage recycling
  - We will measure this by the delivery of waste education programmes that promote reduce, reuse and recycling by working with rural landowners to encourage them to look and accept the benefits of off farm disposal in particular inorganic waste
- You can expect cost effective solid waste services
  - We will measure this by monitoring solid waste service costs and comparing these with ¹neighbouring communities on a ‘like for like’ basis

¹ Neighbouring communities include Palmerston North City Council, Horowhenua District Council, Tararua District Council, Rangitikei District Council and Wanganui District Council.
Targets for the next ten years are:

- 90% of rural residents have convenient refuse bag drop-off points less than 10kms from their homes
- 100% mobile recycling centres are conveniently located within identified villages
- Two waste education programmes delivered per annum

3.3 Council’s intended role

Council’s general role is to provide guidance to individuals and communities to undertake sustainable waste management and minimisation activities. It will also foster relationships with businesses, neighbouring councils and waste industry companies operating in the District to ensure that Council meets its goals for waste management and minimisation. Council will also continue to play the role of direct service provider in the provision of household waste management and minimisation services such as kerbside refuse and recycling collections and refuse transfer stations.

Council will comply with all relevant legislative and regulatory requirements. It will continue to explore ways of forecasting demand for waste services in the District, develop, and implement initiatives to ensure that we meet demand.

3.4 Public health protection

The wide range of waste services available to Manawatu District, provided by Council or by private enterprise will ensure future adequate protection of public health. Although there are no landfill disposal facilities in the District, Manawatu will continue to have access to privately owned sanitary landfills that meet legislative requirements. Services for achieving waste minimisation will continue where proved economically viable. Council will also continue to promote access to hazardous waste disposal services and continue to manage illegal dumping (flytipping).
4 Assessment of waste in the Manawatu District

Manawatu District Council completed a Waste Assessment in 2016. The assessment is a stock-take of waste and diverted material services provided throughout the district, an estimate of demand for future services, and includes proposed new initiatives for increasing diversion to landfill and facilitation of off farm disposal of waste.

4.1 Summary of the volume and composition of waste and diverted materials

It must be noted that Council does not transport all of Manawatu’s waste to landfill. An unknown portion of the waste and diverted materials is currently recycled or disposed to landfill by private enterprise.

Data sourced from Council only provided and funded collections of waste and diverted materials shown below. This information is collated from data provided by Council’s contractors operating the collection services and transfer station facilities.

The figures are based on an averaged waste data. Note: Source of waste date is only from Council funded collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Waste</th>
<th>Average tonnes per year - WMMP 2010</th>
<th>Average tonnes per year - WMMP 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households, Feilding Refuse Transfer Station and Rural Transfer Stations</td>
<td>7,258</td>
<td>3,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclables collected from all sources (kerbside, mobile recycling centres, refuse transfer stations)</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>2,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwaste collected for composting</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Known averaged annual tonnages of waste and diverted materials in Manawatu District

![Pie chart showing 2012-16 Tonnages]

- Rural RTS Refuse 33
- Refuse Bag Collection 1,365
- Feilding RTS Refuse 2,425
- Greenwaste 495
- MRC Recyclables 265
- Recyclables Kerbside 1,189
- Recyclables RTSs 934
Solid Waste Analysis Protocol (SWAP) audit

The composition of the Council managed kerbside refuse collection was measured using an industry based Solid Waste Analysis Protocol (SWAP) audit in May 2016. The chart below shows Manawatu District’s rubbish bag waste composition (SWAP) results for 2016.

2016 SWAP

Putrescible waste (kitchen waste and greenwaste) makes up the largest portion (38%) of waste in our refuse bags.

From the previous WMMP 2010 data the community diverted approximately 22% of household waste from landfill to be recycled or beneficially reused compared in 2015-16 of a diversion figure of 37%

In 2015/16, this represented 2,400 tonnes compared to 1,780 tonnes 2007-08.
The amount of household waste to landfill per capita continued to reduce between 2000 and 2009 with a reduction of 10.0kg per person per year as illustrated.

From 2010 onwards, the waste to landfill per capita has steadied at 350kgs per capita. This plateau effect is expected since no new types of waste materials have been diverted out of the waste stream.

When more data from non-Council funded collections becomes available, the waste to landfill per capita will increase. This upward trend may be “softened” if commercially handled volumes of paper and metals could be factored into the data. The data for commercial volumes of waste and diverted materials is unavailable.
The individual composition of recyclable material collected in the Manawatu District from Council collections has been variable due to various contract changes but essentially the overall total volume of recyclables collected remains fairly constant (average over period - 2,560 tonnes per year). The red line is the approximate start date of the kerbside wheelie bin and crate collection in Feilding.

A noticeable element of the above graph is the decline in greenwaste tonnages. This decline is due to competition from commercial greenwaste operations. Council will reduce its greenwaste charges to complement its integrated waste services thereby allowing its various organic waste materials to be utilised in a more efficient and effective way.

4.2 Existing Council provided solid waste and recycling services

This section identifies key waste management and minimisation infrastructure, collection services, and education programmes that operate or are offered by the Council and commercial operators within the Manawatu District currently.

Council provides a range of waste collection, recycling, processing and disposal services in the district that are funded through targeted rates, user pays and waste levy funds. Private companies provide services to meet the additional requirements of the community.

Existing waste management and minimisation services and facilities provided in and available to the district – both by the Council and other providers include:

- waste minimisation education to schools
- kerbside collection of refuse and recyclables
- mobile recycling centres
- refuse transfer station operation for both household and commercial types of waste and diverted materials
- bulk rural refuse collection
- litterbin servicing and removal of illegally dumped waste (flytipping)
- processing of diverted materials
• landfill disposal
• cleanfill disposal
• monitoring of closed landfills
• greenwaste acceptance

With the exception of landfill disposal, the Council provides all these services and intends to continue providing these services.

Disposal

Council controlled waste is disposed of at Bonny Glen a privately owned landfill located in the Rangitikei District. This landfill was expanded considerably in 2015 and is expected to receive the region’s waste up to 2055.

Collection

Council provided kerbside refuse collection services are available to 80% of the district’s households.

Refuse Transfer Stations (RTS)

In addition to the Feilding Transfer Station, the Council operates two rural transfer stations that handle both waste and diverted materials (recyclables).

Bulk Rubbish

A bulk rural refuse collection service is provided by Council to those communities that do not have a readily available access to a conveniently located transfer station. Typically residents from these rural communities transport their items of waste to an advertised collection point and pay the RTS disposal rate to the attendant. This service is provided to Rangiwahia, Waituna West and Pohangina communities. A slightly modified level of service is provided to Himatangi Beach and Tangimoana. The typical frequency of collection is six monthly.

Litter Bins and Flytipping

A number of street and park litter bins are provided in handy locations throughout the district. Illegal dumping commonly referred to as “fly tipping” is also removed by Council contractors.

Recycling

Most of the Council-controlled diverted materials (recycling) are presently transported to the Feilding Transfer Station (RTS) for consolidation and processing in the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) in readiness for sale on the open market. In the future the sale of these baled recyclables may encounter difficulties if demand for these products collapses. Other methods of disposal will have to be found if markets are lost.

Private enterprise is a significant player in the collection and disposal of waste. Commercial waste operators are responsible for the collection of waste and diverted materials (recyclables) from a number of businesses and households in the district. The quantities, components and source of this waste are not yet fully known. However, it is known that these operators transport waste and diverted materials out of the district for disposal and processing at facilities in neighbouring council areas. Once the proposed Council Waste Collector Licensing Scheme is up and running additional waste data will likely become more available.
Closed Landfills

Three closed landfills in the Manawatu District require ongoing resource consent monitoring and annual maintenance. There are also three other closed landfill sites that Council owns that do not require a consent as they are considered to pose little health or environmental risk.

Cleanfill

Council is consented by Horizons Regional Council to use the Feilding closed landfill for cleanfill disposal. This will provide cleanfill storage up to 2025. Cleanfill acceptance generally requires supervision to reduce contamination by non-permitted materials. For that reason most of the cleanfill is taken to the Feilding RTS where it is weighed and stored until sufficient quantity is attained for transporting to the closed landfill.

Education

Waste minimisation education is funded and provided by Council to schools who request this service. In 2015-16 seven schools and three Early Childhood Centres (ECC) participated in the Horizons facilitated Enviroschools programme. Seven schools and one ECC requested a visit from Zero Waste Education in 2015-16, this is also a Council funded education program.

*Image courtesy of Manchester School (2016)*
### 4.3 Summary of District Specific Issues

A number of issues and challenges face the district. These will drive future waste management and minimisation service provisions. These include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/opportunity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected population growth projection</td>
<td>- Projected growth in household numbers of 13% by 2021 - Feilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large amount of putrescible waste in refuse bags</td>
<td>- The SWAP audit shows putrescible or kitchen waste makes up 38% by weight in kerbside rubbish bags. This waste could be diverted to become compost and thereby reducing waste to landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend kerbside recycling collection</td>
<td>- The accessibility and convenience of rural recycling would be improved by extending kerbside recycling collections to all villages (Sanson, Himatangi Beach, Tangimoana, Rongotea, Kimbolton, Pohangina and Apiti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling services limited in some rural communities</td>
<td>- Additional mobile recycling centres will be provided to Apiti and Halcombe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of data about commercial collection of waste and diverted materials</td>
<td>- Commercial waste tonnage data is needed to assess and ensure that sufficient collection services and infrastructure are available for the district’s waste management and minimisation needs. The 2015 Council waste bylaw will go some way towards securing this data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On farm disposal of waste</td>
<td>- Historically the agricultural sector in New Zealand has largely been left to their own disposal options, typically burning and burying of waste. This method has the potential to generate leachate that may cause toxic contamination of soils. Discussions with the agricultural sector about the future acceptability of these historical methods of disposal should be entered into. Regional bylaws prohibiting the burning of all plastic and tyre waste would be required to move more landowners towards recycling as has successfully occurred in Southland and other regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Council will adopt a proactive and collaborative approach working with the regional council and private sector parties on matters relating to inorganic agricultural waste management by providing leadership and coordination thereby addressing the potential for adverse community health and environmental effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Proposed methods for achieving effective and efficient waste management and minimisation

It is anticipated that with no major changes to the current laws, services and facilities relating to waste in the District, that a short-term period of reduced waste per capita will give way to a plateauing or a slight decrease of waste diversion to landfill. Significant improvements would require direction from central government, enabling a more nationally coordinated and effective approach to waste diversion to landfill. There is however some medium scale initiatives as outlined in this WMMP that would increase diversion to landfill.

This section summarises current waste management and minimisation activities in the District and puts forward new initiatives for the district’s future management of waste and diverted materials.

5.1 Summary of key waste and diverted material streams and how they are currently managed

The current processes in the District for managing waste and diverted materials streams are summarised in the table.

Current waste management and minimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Stream</th>
<th>How these are currently managed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household waste</td>
<td>• Kerbside refuse bag collection, refuse transfer station drop-off for refuse bags, private hireage of wheelie bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household diverted materials (recyclables)</td>
<td>• Kerbside recycling collection, refuse transfer station and mobile recycling centre drop-off for recyclables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kerbside colour sorted bottle glass is reused to make new bottles and jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plastics and cans are currently processed at the Council funded materials recovery facility (MRF) and sold on various national and international markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cardboard and paper are recycled into lower grade paper products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green waste</td>
<td>• Refuse transfer station drop-off of greenwaste, private enterprise collection and processing to mulch and compost. Council greenwaste is used in the composting of sewage sludge. Some schools and a number of residents have their own putrescible composting operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and illegal dumping</td>
<td>• Litterbin servicing and removal of illegally dumped waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inorganic waste</td>
<td>• Waste dropped off at Feilding transfer station and two rural transfer stations. Bulk rural refuse collection for remote rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste</td>
<td>• Refuse transfer station drop-off (small quantities) and referral to commercial providers of hazardous waste disposal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanfill materials</td>
<td>• Deposited at Feilding closed landfill and a privately owned cleanfill site on Halcombe Road Feilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial waste and diverted materials (recyclables)</td>
<td>• Feilding Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) and privately owned RTS at Palmerston North, landfills and materials recovery facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation education and promotion</td>
<td>• Education programme provided for primary schools via a private company – Waste Education NZ and the Horizons Regional Council facilitated program – Enviroschools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm dumps - agricultural waste</td>
<td>• Mostly burning, burying and bulk storage of waste. Studies indicate 80% of agricultural waste is buried or burnt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Initiatives Council considered but did not put forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Other initiatives considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside rubbish bag collection service</td>
<td>Provide 52 Council funded rubbish bags to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen food waste diversion</td>
<td>Promotion and part funding of home composting bins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6  Funding the plan

The WMA section 43 requires that Council include information about funding the implementation of this Plan, as well as information about any grants made and expenditure of levy funds.

6.1  How the implementation of the plan is to be funded

Council intends to fund the actions provided for in this Plan as set out in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk rural refuse collection</td>
<td>Targeted rate and user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed landfill maintenance and upgrades</td>
<td>Targeted rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial waste and diverted materials</td>
<td>User charges and waste levy funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwaste collection and processing</td>
<td>Targeted rate and user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste management</td>
<td>Targeted rate and user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside recycling collection - Feilding residential</td>
<td>Targeted rate and waste levy funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill disposal</td>
<td>Targeted rate and user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter bin servicing and removal of flytipping</td>
<td>Targeted rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td>Targeted rate and user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse transfer stations</td>
<td>Targeted rate and user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural refuse transfer stations and mobile recycling centres</td>
<td>Targeted rate, user charges and waste levy funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of organic waste collection and processing</td>
<td>Targeted rates and waste levy funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation education and facilitation</td>
<td>Targeted rate and waste levy funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council annually sets the user charges that apply at the refuse transfer stations and for the bulk rural refuse collection throughout the District.

Grants or sponsorships for waste management or minimisation may be made to various community events on a case by case basis. Grants may also be made available for educational purposes such as Enviroschools and district schools on application.

The Manawatu District Council LTP 2015-25 outlines the operation and maintenance costs for the District’s key solid waste management contracts. Note: The present Solid Waste Services contract expires in 2019. However the contract allows for an extension of upwards of 6 more years.
6.2 Waste minimisation levy funding expenditure

The WMA requires that all waste levy funding received by Council must be spent on matters to promote waste minimisation and in accordance with this waste management and minimisation plan.

Waste levy funds can be spent on existing waste minimisation services, new services or a combination of both. The funding can be used to provide grants for education purposes, to support contract costs or as infrastructure capital, a waste minimisation resource, farm dump mapping and kitchen waste collections.

The District will receive, based on population, its share of national waste levy funds from the Ministry for the Environment. It is estimated that the Council’s share of waste levy funding will be approximately $100,000 a year. In addition, the Council may make application for contestable waste levy funds from the Waste Minimisation Fund either separately or with another council or party.

The Council intends to use this money on continuing waste minimisation education programmes in schools as well as promotion of waste minimisation and management to commercial, industrial and agricultural sectors, improving greenwaste recovery/processing, organic waste collection, refining the current and future recycling processes, event recycling assistance and associated infrastructure projects and procurements.
7 Monitoring and evaluation

The Council’s LTP 2015 - 2025 sets out levels of service, performance measures and performance targets for waste minimisation and provision of solid waste services.

The Council intends to monitor and report on progress regarding the WMMP and will develop and implement a clear, transparent monitoring and reporting system. Accurate information on how services are performing is essential for monitoring progress and planning for future demand. Additional monitoring may be included in future LTPs.

Key areas that require monitoring include level of service, compliance (with legislative requirements and regulations), waste reduction and diversion. Data will be gathered through community satisfaction surveys, Council records (Call Centre records, KPIs, etc.) data from Council’s waste and recycling contractor, Solid Waste Analysis Protocol audits (SWAPs), agreements with landfill operators and commercial waste providers (through bylaw licensing provisions to supply tonnage data). Progress will be reported through Council publications, website and the annual reports.

The current Solid Waste contract is due to expire in 2019. Before this date the service will be reviewed in accordance with S17A of the Local Government Act 2002 to ensure optimum benefit to ratepayers.

7.1 Reporting

The Council will report progress of the WMMP implementation through:

- Annual Reports
- Council’s Bulletin page of the Feilding Herald
- Council’s website

The Council will also provide annual progress reports of expenditure of its waste levy funds to the Ministry for the Environment.
8 Glossary

8.1 Key definitions

**Recover** - Process to produce new substances, products, or components that can be used.

**Recycle** - Process so the material can be used again in the same cycle, including composting.

**Recyclables** - Used to describe the inorganic materials that are commonly diverted from household refuse for recycling: paper, cardboard, glass, plastics 1-6, steel cans, aluminium cans, glass bottles and jars.

**Recycling** - Often used interchangeably with recyclables; also used to describe all inorganic materials being diverted and recycled, such as: scrap metal, whiteware, tyres, e-waste, plastics, bottle glass, paint and organic material such as paper and cardboard.

**Reduce** - To use less material, use more efficiently, and use products that generate less waste.

**Residual waste** - Waste that has no further use. Typically waste disposed from MRF processing.

**Reuse** - Further use of material in its existing form.

**Dispose** - The final (or more than short-term) deposit of waste into or onto land set apart for that purpose, or incineration of waste.

**Diverted material** - Any material that is reused, recycled or recovered, instead of disposed of or discarded. A term used to distinguish between diverted material and residual waste.

**Treatment** - Process to ensure no harm to environment.

**Waste** - Anything that has no further use and is disposed of or discarded. Types can be defined by composition or source e.g. organic waste, electronic waste, construction and demolition waste. Includes any component or element of diverted material that is disposed of or discarded.

**Waste hierarchy** - Internationally accepted waste reductions in descending order of importance.

**Waste minimisation** - Reduction of waste for disposal. Reuse, recycling and recovery of waste and diverted material. Waste minimisation activities may affect both the waste and diverted materials streams.

8.2 Other definitions and abbreviations

**Farm dump** - An unlined pit for the containment of agricultural waste.

**HAIL** - Hazardous Activities and Industries List.

**Landfill** - Tip or dump.

**LTP** - Long Term Plan.

**Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)** - A processing plant for sorting and baling of saleable diverted materials (recyclables).

**MGB** - Mobile Garbage Bin (wheelie bin).

**MRB** - Mobile Recycling Bin (wheelie bin).
**MRC** - Mobile Recycling Centre: Converted shipping container located in rural communities for the acceptance of recyclables.

**New Zealand Waste Strategy** - A document produced by the Ministry for the Environment that sets out the Government’s long term priorities for waste management and minimisation.

**Organic waste** - Waste largely from the garden - hedge clippings, tree/bush pruning, lawn clippings and/or food waste comprising of any food scraps - from preparing meals, leftovers, scraps, tea bags, coffee grounds.

**Putrescible** - Organic kitchen scraps.

**Refuse** - Waste or rubbish that currently has little other management options other than disposal to landfill.

**Refuse Transfer Station (RTS)** - Where waste can be sorted for recycling or reprocessing, or is deposited and then put into vehicles for transportation to landfill.

**Rural Refuse Transfer Stations** - Facilities located in rural areas for the drop off and consolidation of refuse and recycling.

**Solid Waste Analysis Protocol (SWAP)** - Audit of the composition and volume of waste and/or diverted materials.

**Tonne** - (metric) - one thousand kilograms.

**Waste** - Anything we no longer want - can be ‘diverted material’ through recycling or composting, or able to be reused by someone else, or is ‘refuse’.

**Waste Assessment** - A document summarising the current situation of waste management in the Manawatu District, with facts and figures, as required under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008.


**WMMP** - Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, also sometimes referred to as the “Plan.”
CCO Exemption - Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors

Purpose

To consider the renewal of exemptions granted to the Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors from being a Council Controlled Organisation in accordance with section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002.

Significance of Decision

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

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. renews the exemption from being a CCO 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 CCO 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 CCO granted under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 to MWLASS for a further three year period expiring 30 June 2020; and

4. renews the exemption from being a CCO granted under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 to Heartland Contractors for a further three year period expiring 30 June 2020.
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 Under section 6(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) a Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO) means a council organisation that is:

(a) a company with 50% or more of the shares owned by one or more local authorities; or

(b) an organisation that one or more local authorities have the right to appoint 50% or more of the trustees.

2.2 Under the above definition the Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors Limited are all CCOs.

2.3 Section 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 authorises a local authority to exempt a small CCO (that is not a council-controlled trading organisation) from the statutory requirements to prepare a Statement of Intent and undertake monitoring and reporting in accordance with Part 5 of the Act.

2.4 Such an exemption can only be granted by resolution of Council after taking account of section 7(5):

a) the nature and scope of the activities provided by the organisation; and

b) the costs and benefits, if an exemption is granted, to the Council, the CCO and the community.

If an exemption is applied the organisation would still be a Council Organisation (CO).

2.5 Exemptions can only be granted for a three year period and can be revoked at any time. Council has an obligation to review any exemptions within a three year period of it being granted.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 In accordance with section 7 of the Act, the following Council Organisations have previously been exempted and are now due for reconsideration:
a) **Feilding Civic Centre Trust** - The Feilding Civic Centre Trust became a Community Trust on 8 July 2004. Charitable status was also subsequently approved. Exemption of the Trust under section 7 of the Act was renewed in 2007, 2011 and 2014. The current exemption expires on 19 June 2017. There have been no changes to the nature and scope of the activities of the Trust in the interim.

b) **Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust** - Council established the Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust in July 2014. The Trust operates as both a Charitable Trust and a Council Controlled Organisation. The current exemption is due to expire 16 October 2017. There have been no changes to the nature and scope of the activities of the Trust since establishment.

c) **MWLASS** – Manawatu-Whanganui Local Authority Shared Services Ltd (MW LASS) was created in 2008 to provide a platform for collaborative projects between eight councils in the Horizons Region. Council first exempted MWLASS from being a CCO in conjunction with agreement from other member Councils in 2008. The current exemption expires on 30 June 2017 and is due for reconsideration. There have been no changes to the nature and the scope of the activities of the Trust.

d) **Heartland Contractors Limited** – Heartland Contractors Limited is a 100% owned subsidiary of the Manawatu District Council. The company has been inactive for a number of years and does not provide any services to the community. The company has accumulated tax losses that may be beneficial in future years. Council first exempted the company from being a CCO in 2003 and renewed this exemption in 2007, 2011 and 2014. The current exemption expires 30 June 2017.

2.7 At the Workshop Committee meeting of 1 June 2017, the Council was advised of the following options:

1. Exemptions previously granted under Section 7(5) of the Local Government Act for Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors Limited be renewed for a further three-year period; or

2. Some or all of the exemptions previously granted under Section 7(5) of the Local Government Act **not be renewed** for a further three-year period.

3.2 Subsequent to presentation of the above options, Council requested that a formal report be submitted to the Council meeting of 22 June. Exemption of Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors Limited under section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 is presented to Council for their consideration and formal resolution.

4 **Operational Implications**

4.1 There are no operational implications.

5 **Financial implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications.
6  **Statutory Requirements**

6.1 The recommendations are in accordance with Council's Statutory Requirements as set out in Section 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.

7  **Delegations**

7.1 Council has the authority to decide on the exemption of the Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors Limited from the statutory requirements of CCOs under Section 7 of the Act.

8  **Consultation**

8.1 The CCOs will be informed of the resolution of Council subsequent to Council consideration. No further consultation is required.

9  **Cultural Considerations**

9.1 There are no cultural considerations.

10  **Conclusion**

10.1 The recommendation to renew the exemptions granted under Section 7(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 for Feilding Civic Centre Trust, Awahuri Forest-Kitchener Park Trust, MWLASS and Heartland Contractors Limited for a further three-year period is presented to Council for their consideration.
Manawatu Community Trust 2017/18 Statement of Intent

Purpose

To present to Council the Manawatu Community Trust’s Statement of Intent for the 2017/18 financial year. The purpose of the Statement of Intent is to:

- Publicly state the Trust’s activities and intentions for the coming year, and the objectives to which these relate;
- Provide opportunities for shareholders to influence the direction of the Trust; and
- Provide a basis for accountability for the performance of the Trust.

Significance of Decision

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

Recommendations

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.

Report prepared by:
Stacey Bell
Economic 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 The Manawatu Community Trust is a Council Controlled Organisation. Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, the Trustees must present a draft Statement of Intent to Council each year. Council then has the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on the draft Statement of Intent. The Trust must then consider Council’s comments and then deliver the final document to Council before the 30 June each year.

2.2 The Trust’s 2017/18 draft Statement of Intent was discussed at Council’s workshop on 4 May 2017 with the final draft presented to Council’s workshop on 1 June.

2.3 The Manawatu Community Trust has finalised their Statement of Intent which is now presented to Council for consideration and resolution.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 The following options are available to Council:

- Option 1: Council agrees to receive the Manawatu Community Trust’s 2017/2018 Statement of Intent; or

- Option 2: Council does not agree to receive the Manawatu Community Trust’s 2017/2018 Statement of Intent and requests the Trust make changes.

3.2 The Manawatu Community Trust’s 2017/18 Statement of Intent is consistent with its constitution and complies with statutory requirements.

3.3 The Manawatu Community Trust’s 2017/18 Statement of Intent is now formally presented to Council for consideration and resolution.

4 Operational Implications

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

5.1 There are no financial implications associated with this decision.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, Part 5 (Council – Controlled Organisations and Council Organisations), section 64 (Statement of Intent), Manawatu Community Trust has a statutory obligation to provide Council with a Statement of Intent for the coming financial year that is consistent with its constitution.

7 Delegations

7.1 Council has authority to formally receive the Statement of Intent for the Manawatu Community Trust for 2017/18.

8 Consultation

8.1 Required consultation between the Trust and Council as Settlor of the Trust has been satisfied.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations.

10 Conclusion

10.1 The Manawatu Community Trust’s 2017/18 Statement of Intent is consistent with its constitution and complies with statutory requirements, and is formally presented to Council for consideration.

11 Attachments

- 2017/2018 Manawatu Community Trust Statement of Intent
Manawatu Community Trust  
2017/2018

STATEMENT OF INTENT

PURPOSE

The purpose of this statement of intent is to

(a) state publicly the activities and intentions of this council-controlled organisation for the year and the objectives to which those activities will contribute; and

(b) provide an opportunity for shareholders\(^1\) to influence the direction of the organisation; and

(c) provide a basis for the accountability of the directors\(^2\) to their shareholders for the performance of the organisation.

This Statement of Intent covers the year 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNCIL CONTROLLED ORGANISATION

1. Section 59 of the Local Government Act 2002 provides:

   Principal objective of a council-controlled organisation

   (1) The principal objective of a council-controlled organisation is to

   (a) achieve the objectives of its shareholders, both commercial and non-commercial, as specified in the statement of intent; and

   (b) be a good employer; and

   (c) exhibit a sense of social and environmental responsibility by having regard to the interests of the community in which it operates and by endeavouring to accommodate or encourage these when able to do so; and

   (d) if the council-controlled organisation is a council-controlled trading organisation, conduct its affairs in accordance with sound business practice.

   (2) In subsection (1)(b), good employer has the same meaning as in clause 36 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.

---

\(^1\) 'Shareholders' include any partners, joint venture partners, members or other persons holding equity securities in relation to the organisation. In this case the shareholders will be the Mayor and the Councillors of the Manawatu District Council.

\(^2\) 'Directors' and the 'Board' include trustees, managers or office holders (however described in the organisation).
NATURE AND SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

Nature
The Nature of the Trust is to promote and provide housing and wellbeing services that are relevant and meet long term community needs.

Scope
The Trust is a robust, professional, and viable organisation that is providing a modern healthy living environment, up to date, good quality, sustainable housing and health facilities that address the needs of the community to enhance the long term wellbeing of Manawatu residents.

OBJECTIVES OF THE MANAWATU COMMUNITY TRUST

The objectives of the Manawatu Community Trust as identified in its Deed of Trust are:

1. Any charitable purpose within the Manawatu District

2. To create a fund to be used for:
   2.1 The promotion of any purpose or purposes within the Manawatu District for the relief of poverty and for the benefit of the residents of the Manawatu District.
   2.2 The promotion and provision of housing for the elderly and disabled residents of the Manawatu District.
   2.3 The promotion of health services for the residents of the Manawatu District.
   2.4 The promotion of wellbeing services for residents of the Manawatu District – these services shall include services promoting the improvement of the lifestyle, health and welfare of residents in the Manawatu District and creating a sense of community for the benefit of the residents of the Manawatu District.
   2.5 To accept gifts and grants of whatever description, provided that any private benefit conferred on any individual is incidental to the above purposes.

GOVERNANCE

Five Trustees have been appointed by the Manawatu District Council to the Trust with terms as set out below.

- **John Culling**, Chairperson reappointed, 3 years July 1 2017 – 30 June 2020
- **Mary Ann Baskerville-Davies**, reappointed, 3 years July 1 2017 – 30 June 2020
- **Colin McLanett**, reappointed, 3 years from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2018
- **Tony Murphy**, appointed for 3 years from 1 July 2016 – 30 June 2019
- **Tyson Schmidt**, appointed for 3 years from 1 July 2016 – 30 June 2019

The Trust meets on a regular basis with the Trust Manager to conduct the Operational business of the Trust.
ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNT OR PROPORTION OF ACCUMULATED PROFITS AND CAPITAL RESERVES THAT IS INTENDED TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE SHAREHOLDERS

The Trust uses accumulated profits and capital reserves for the development of and to increase assets, therefore there are no accumulated profits and capital reserves intended to be distributed to the shareholders.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS AND OTHER MEASURES BY WHICH THE PERFORMANCE OF THE TRUST MAY BE JUDGED IN RELATION TO ITS OBJECTIVES:

1. A housing portfolio that provides a modern, healthy living environment for the elderly and the disabled
   a. Refurbishments

   **Objective:** The promotion and provision of housing for the elderly and disabled residents in the Manawatu district

   **Baseline:** from year ending June 2016: 6 flats refurbished

   **Measure:** Carry out refurbishment or upgrade on flats to ensure that they meet appropriate standards

   **Target:** 8 flats per annum.

   b. Additional Housing Stock

   **Baseline:** Stage 1 planning and Initial QS estimate completed

   **Measure:** Investigate the estimated cost for developing the vacant land in Beattie Street for 12 additional units

   **Target:** An accurate estimate of cost.

2. Be responsive to urgent maintenance requirements or resident health and safety needs

   **Objective:** The promotion and provision of housing for the elderly and disabled residents in the Manawatu district

   **Baseline:** from year ending June 2016: Monthly average of requests for maintenance 21.5

   **Measures:** 1. Maintenance requirements requests are responded to within 48 hours.
                  2. Resident safety needs are responded to within 12 hours.

   **Targets:** 1. Average monthly requests 22
                  2. Response times are met.

3. Maintain a high occupancy level

   **Objective:** The promotion and provision of housing for the elderly and disabled residents in the Manawatu district

   **Baseline:** from year ending June 2016: 94%

   **Measure:** Annual average occupancy level

   **Target:** 95% per annum.
4. Facilitate the redevelopment of Clevely Wing Duke Street to accommodate the expansion of Feilding Health Care

**Objective:** The promotion of health services for the residents of the Manawatu District

**Baseline:** New build Feilding Health Care fully operational

**Measure:** The redevelopment of Clevely Wing

**Target:** Clevely wing operational

5. The Manawatu Community and Development

**Objective:** The promotion of wellbeing services for residents of the Manawatu District – these services shall include services promoting the improvement of lifestyle, health and welfare of residents in the Manawatu District and creating a sense of community for the benefit of the residents of the Manawatu District.

a. **Community Partnership**

**Baseline:** from year ending June 2016: Community and Social Services Encouraging change report recommendations considered

**Measure:** Pursue direction set by report.

**Target:** Facilitate collaboration across social services groups.

**ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

**Objective:** Comply with all legislative and regulatory provisions relating to its operations and performance.

The Trust will comply with current accounting policies;

a. Ensure that a positive financial return on investment in line with the nature and condition of the trusts’ assets in achieved for re-investment and repayment of Capital Loans.

**Baseline:** from year ending June 2016 - 46% of rental income was spent on capital improvements.

**Measure:** Actual percentage of rental income for the year spent on capital improvements and major maintenance

**Target:** The level of rental income for the year to be spent on capital improvements and major maintenance to be 45%

b. Provide financial Reporting to the Manawatu District Council as required. The Trust will apply the PBE SFR-A (PS) Public Benefit Entity Simple Format Reporting - Accrual (Public Sector).

**Baseline:** from year ending June 2016: Annual report submitted on 25 September 2016. 6th monthly report submitted on 29 February 2016.

**Measure:** Each report is prepared and presented before due date.
Target: Report as at 30 June 2017 and as at 31 December 2017 reported by 30 September 2017 and 31 March 2018 respectively.

c. Maintain the percentage of consolidated Trust funds in relation to total assets be no less than 60%

Baseline: from year ending June 2016 – 63.5%

Measure: Actual percentage as evidenced in the annual financials as at the 30 June 2017.

Target: The percentage of consolidated trust funds in relation to total assets be no less than 60%

John Culling
Chairperson
Manawatu Community Trust
Service Reviews

Purpose

This report forms part of the service review process required by Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002.

Significance of Decision

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

Recommendations

1. That 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 Sportgrounds
      - 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 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.
within its district or region for good quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions”.

2.4 A full s17A review determines for each service the cost-effectiveness of funding, governance and service delivery that best meet the needs of communities. Options are considered for each service being reviewed and must include the following mandatory options - Council Controlled Organisation (CCO), shared service and contracting out.

2.5 Not all services will require a ‘full’ review. At Council’s discretion service reviews are not required where:

- Council is legally obliged to deliver the service
- Council has a binding contract that has more than 2 years to run
- Council has recently carried out a review that considers the mandatory options
- Council considers that the costs of undertaking a review outweigh the benefits, such as:
  - Small service area operating costs
  - Contract value below a determined threshold
  - No workable alternatives.

2.6 For those services not exempt for any of the above reasons Council is required to carry out a full detailed review. The review must consider the mandatory options and any other reasonable option including:

- In-house governance, funding and delivery
- In-house governance and funding, but
  - delivery by a CCO, whether wholly owned by the local authority, or a CCO where the local authority is a part owner
  - another local authority
  - another person or agency (for example central government, a private sector organisation or a community group)
- Responsibility for governance and funding is delegated to a joint committee or other shared governance arrangement, with delivery options as set out in b).

2.7 The Society of Local Government Managers good practice template has been used as the basis for each review process.

2.8 The Local Government Act 2002 does not define the services or what is considered ‘significant’. The Significance and Engagement Policy provides Council with guidance on significance.


3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 A series of Council workshop sessions have taken place to consider initial s17A review material prepared by Council staff. Options were presented regarding which services should:

- Proceed to full s17A service reviews
- Maintain the current delivery model, or
- Be exempt from the review process at this time.

3.2 Full reviews have been completed for:

- Building Control
- Emergency Management
- IT Support.

3.3 Council undertook some service reviews during 2014/15 and 2015/16. These earlier reviews were triggered by the expiry of contracts, the establishment of a CCO and as part of other service reviews that occurred including:

- Economic Development Review – s17A options were considered as part of the assessment of options that resulted in the establishment of Central Economic Development Agency.
- 3 Waters reticulation – An external contract that exceeded the contract threshold expired in June 2016 and Council considered the required s17A options. Council resolved that the services delivered through the contract should be brought in-house.
- Service delivery options were considered as part of the upgrade to the Makino Aquatic Centre.
- Council considered s17A options as part of the procurement process for the new parks and property service contract established in 2015/16.

3.4 A summary of the options for each service is included in the table below. If Council sought an alternative option it could choose to revisit the review material and options provided and instruct staff to undertake further full reviews. However it should be noted that the full review process takes time to complete and it is unlikely that any additional full reviews would be complete by the legislative deadline of 8 August 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Workshop date</th>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Full Review</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health and Monitoring</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b - the cost of undertaking a review outweighs the benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planning (Consents)</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b - the cost of undertaking a review outweighs the benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b - the cost of undertaking a review outweighs the benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Sportgrounds</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Yes                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b and renew the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3) - service is required by legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Conveniences</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b and renew the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>26 January 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Yes                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b and renew the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Strategy (incl. District Plan Policy)</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b and renew the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Yes                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b and renew the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
<td>CCO</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No                                                                 uestion under s17A(3)b and renew the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Workshop date</td>
<td>Current Model</td>
<td>Full Review</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No Proposal to exempt the service from review under s17A(3)b - the cost of undertaking a review outweighs the benefits and there are no current practicable alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>No Proposal to exempt the service from review under s17A(3)b - the cost of undertaking a review outweighs the benefits and there are no current practicable alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td>4 May 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes The existing contract model with Horizons was assessed as being the most efficient delivery model. This is effectively a form of shared services with Horowhenua, Rangitikei and Horizons. The review highlighted the need to expand the contract and increase levels of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire</td>
<td>4 May 2017</td>
<td>Service transferred to FENZ 2017/18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No review required as functions transferred to FENZ (Fire and Emergency New Zealand) as of 1 July 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>4 May 2017</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>No Proposal to exempt the service from review under s17A(3) - an existing contract is in place until December 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Operational Implications

4.1 There are no direct operating or capital expenditure implications from this report.

4.2 The operational implications of any service model changes are considered as part of each individual s17A review. Currently there are no decisions resulting from the reviews that impact on operational budgets.

5 Financial implications

5.1 The service reviews were carried out as part of the business as usual operating budgets of Council.

5.2 There are no unbudgeted financial implications from any matter raised in this report.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 requires that councils periodically undertake a formal review of how they deliver their services. This was enacted as part of the August 2014 amendments to the Local Government Act 2002.

6.2 Council is required by Local Government Act 2002 s17A (1) to review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district or region for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions.

6.3 The Local Government Act 2002 s17A (4) states that each service review must consider options for the governance, funding, and delivery of infrastructure, services, and regulatory functions, including, but not limited to, the following options:

(a) responsibility for governance, funding, and delivery is exercised by the local authority:
(b) responsibility for governance and funding is exercised by the local authority, and responsibility for delivery is exercised by —
   i. a council-controlled organisation of the local authority; or
   ii. a council-controlled organisation in which the local authority is one of several shareholders; or
   iii. another local authority; or
   iv. another person or agency:

(c) responsibility for governance and funding is delegated to a joint committee or other shared governance arrangement, and responsibility for delivery is exercised by an entity or a person listed in paragraph (b)(i) to (iv).

6.4 Under Schedule 1AA of the Local Government Act 2002, Council must complete a review of all services by 8 August 2017. After this date, further reviews must be carried out for individual services within six years. A review is also triggered where a major change is planned to levels of service in an activity, or where a significant contract is due for re-tendering. Changing the
way an activity is governed, funded or delivered also requires a review of options as set out in s17A.

6.5 There is no audit process for this process.

6.6 There is currently no case-law on this process. Good practice guidelines by Society of Local Government Managers recommend that Council should formally resolve the outcome of each service review. These decisions will give Council management direction regarding the delivery models for Council services until the next s17A service review.

6.7 There are four groups of services remaining for Council to consider prior to 8 August 2017 legislative deadline. These are 3 Waters, Roading (maintenance and professional services), IT Support, and Insurance, Electricity and Valuation services. These remaining services are scheduled to be considered by Council on 6 July.

7 Delegations

7.1 Council is required to review all services as part of the s17A process under the Local Government Act 2002.

7.2 It is recommended that Council formally adopt the outcomes from the review process included in this report.

8 Consultation

8.1 The decisions being made by Council as part of this process are governance decisions based on an internal process set by legislation. The process is about how Council governs, funds and delivers each service, not about the levels of service.

8.2 If Council decided to implement a significant change to the governance or funding of an activity then consultation would likely be required. Decisions that change the type of service delivery model are unlikely to require consultation, but Council could choose to do so.

8.3 Residents can make submissions on any of these matters as part of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan process.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations as a result of this report.

10 Conclusion

10.1 This report summarises Council’s progress to date in meeting legislative requirements under s17A of the Local Government Act 2002. The reviews and background material discussed by Council at workshops in 2016/17 support the current arrangements for governance, funding and service delivery across Council activities.

10.2 Council previously resolved in late 2015/16 to change the delivery of water, wastewater and stormwater reticulation maintenance services from a contracted out model to an in-house service.
10.3 Other reviews in 2014 and 2015 were undertaken as part of procurement processes for significant contracts (Parks and Property), increases in levels of service (Makino Aquatic Centre) and changes to governance arrangements (Economic Development and the establishment of CEDA).