



**HOROWHENUA
DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

AGENDA

ORDINARY MEETING

HOROWHENUA DISTRICT COUNCIL

**9 JUNE 2010
10 JUNE 2010**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a meeting of the Horowhenua District Council will be held in the Horowhenua District Council Chambers, 126-148 Oxford Street, Levin, on Wednesday, 9 June 2010 and Thursday, 10 June 2010 commencing at 4.15 p.m.

Members of the Horowhenua District Council are:

His Worship the Mayor, Mr B J Duffy (Chair)
Cr D A Allan
Cr G G Good
Cr L E McMeeken
Cr A M Hunt
Cr B F Judd
Cr P K Keenan
Cr N D H Murray
Cr A D Rush
Cr R N Shaw

Reporting Officer: Mr D G Ward (Chief Executive Officer)
Meeting Secretary: Mrs K J Corkill

Business will be according to the attached Agenda.

Contacts

06 366 0999
Postal Address: Private Bag 4002, Levin 5540
Service Centre - Foxton - Main Street, Foxton Phone 06 363 8174
enquiries@horowhenua.govt.nz
www.horowhenua.govt.nz

AGENDA

9 and 10 June 2010

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

1. Apologies

An apology has been received from Councillor G G Good

2. Public Speaking Rights

Notification to speak is required by 12 noon on the day of the meeting. Further information is available on www.horowhenua.govt.nz or by phoning 06 366 0999

3. Late Items:

To consider, and if thought fit, to pass a resolution to permit the Council to consider any further items which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded.

Such resolution is required to be made pursuant to Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the Chairperson must advise:

- (i) The reason why the item was not on the Agenda, and
- (ii) The reason why the discussion of this item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

4. Members' Conflict of Interest

Members are reminded of their obligation to declare any conflicts of interest they might have in respect of the items on this Agenda.

5. Confirmation of Minutes - Ordinary Meeting 2 and 3 June 2010

These minutes will be circulated prior to the meeting

6. Matters arising

CONTENTS:

ITEM	PRECIS	FILE NO	PAGE
REPORTS			1
Item-1905	Electra Trust - 2010 Trustee Elections	4224	1
Item-1906	MWLASS Exemption from CCO Status	4222	4
Item-1907	Report on Draft 2010/2011 Annual Plan Submissions	4221	6
MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC			51
Item-1908	Former Countdown Building CONFIDENTIAL	4220	51
Item-1909	Property Issues CONFIDENTIAL	4223	51

REPORTS

Item-1905 Electra Trust - 2010 Trustee Elections

File No 4224

To: His Worship the Mayor and Councillors
Horowhenua District Council

From: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 9 June 2010

1. Purpose

- a. To decide Council's vote for two candidates for the Electra Trust election 2009.

2. Recommendation

- a. That Report 4224 be received.
- b. That this matters or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- c. That Council votes for and in the 2010 Electra Trust elections.

3. Background

- a. Each Electra account holder is an elector for the purpose of the Electra Trustee election. Council is the holder of 119 accounts, and is now in receipt of the same number of voting papers, which it may choose to cast for the 2009 Trustee election.
- b. Voting closes at 5pm on Friday, 11 June 2010.

4. Issues for Consideration

- a. The candidates for elections are:

Lynne Bailey
Mike Cardiff
Ann Chapman
Judy Keall
Terrence Killalea
David Scott
Ken Shirley
Brian TenHave

The candidate profiles are **attached** to this report.

- b. The method of casting Council's vote involves an open voting process whereby each member casts up to two votes, with the two highest polling candidates receiving the full number of the Council voting allocation.

5. Conclusion

- a. That Council, as a holder of 119 accounts, elects two candidates for the Electra Trust.

	Name and title of signatories	Signature
Prepared by	D G Ward Chief Executive Officer	
<u>Confirmation of statutory compliance</u>		
<p>In accordance with section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002, this report is approved as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. containing sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions; and, b. is based on adequate knowledge about, and adequate consideration of, the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision. 		

3. Attachments

- a. Candidate Profiles

Electra

TRUST

2010 TRUSTEE ELECTION – Candidates



BAILEY Lynne

I am absolutely committed to maintaining the Trust model of governance because of its tangible benefits to the local region. I offer a pragmatic, enthusiastic approach to the role of trustee, one that will represent a rational voice for a broad cross-section of Electra beneficiaries.

Serving as an elected representative on both the Horowhenua District & Horizons Regional Council for over a decade has given me a strong background in effective governance. This, coupled with twenty years in small business and over ten years experience in New Zealand's financial markets, makes me a suitably skilled candidate. Contact phone (06) 363 8060.



KILLALEA Terrence

I have been a resident on the Kapiti Coast for over 30 years and established a law practice in 1975 from which I recently retired. I continue to be an Honorary Solicitor to social and sporting organisations on the Coast.

My leisure time for many years was being involved with football and harness racing administration at local and national level and more recently with Rotary and golf.

The trust has over many years provided consumers with benefits unparalleled anywhere in New Zealand and I would like the opportunity to be part of the Trust in continuing its good work.



CARDIFF Mike

Mike is committed to the ongoing benefit of community ownership and a continuing discount to the 42,000 Electra share holders.

Electra has proved it is possible to run a no-frills lines company without the costs associated with larger retailers who are constantly increasing their prices.

Electra has not increased their fixed line charge since 2002 and he would work to see that this continues.

As a former senior local government manager with thirty years experience, and trained in budget, business and development management and he would work to support the continued efficiency of Electra for the benefit of its shareholders.



SCOTT David

We must maintain our annual power discounts and continue with local control. Electricity is a public good and an essential service for health and welfare.

I have represented the Greypower NZ Board and local committee for six years and am currently a district councillor. I have served on 'hospital transport' and 'health group trust' committees. I earned a NZ Doctorate and have used my skills in people helping activities for many years. Like you, I know that affordability and reliability are key issues I will serve without favouritism and will advance local network development without power bill heart-attacks.



CHAPMAN Ann

I am a longtime resident of Otaki, committed to maintaining community ownership of Electra. I have enjoyed participating in Electra Trust, ensuring that the healthy discounts we receive come back to the community 'owners' in Kapiti and Horowhenua.

I have had eighteen years of experience in community governance on the Kapiti Coast District Council and ten years on the MidCentral District Health Board. I have also been a business owner and understand the need for good management and governance in achieving a successful business.

I hope you will re-elect me as an experienced Trustee who will safeguard Electra's future.



SHIRLEY Ken

The result of ownership review has shown that you, the consumer, overwhelming want Electra and its subsidiary businesses to remain in community ownership.

The key role of Trustees is the appointment of competent directors to run these commercial businesses so that they continue to perform to a high standard.

I offer myself as a Trustee and pledge to work assiduously on your behalf to ensure that these commercial businesses continue their high performance.

I also pledge to support both local businesses and domestic consumers of our region through policies of competitive pricing and substantial discounts.



KEALL Judy

If re-elected, I will continue to support Trust ownership of Electra and payment of discounts at the highest possible level.

As a current Trustee my top priority has always been to protect the interests of consumers who receive their electricity through the lines which we own on your behalf. It is very important to make sure you continue to get your discount from Electra, our lines company, no matter which power company you purchase your power from.

We have good reason to be proud of the way the Trust has championed community ownership of Electra. Let's keep it that way.



TENHAVE Brian

Hello, I'm Bryan TenHave.

I'm in the fortunate position to be able to say that there is simply nothing more I could wish for in my personal life. "I am a happy 53 year old semi-retired apprentice entrepreneur!"

I am a founding member and vice president of Levin Ratepayers Association holding a strong belief in transparency and accountability. Electra is one of the few yielding investments that we continually benefit from and providing we nurture it responsibly, can pass down to our children.

The better this company performs the more we each benefit - today and tomorrow. Thanks, Bryan.



Item-1906 MWLASS Exemption from CCO Status

File No 4222

To: His Worship the Mayor and Councillors
Horowhenua District Council

From: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 9 June 2010

1. Purpose

- a. To inform Council of an issue being collectively discussed and resolved by each of the shareholder Councils with regard to the CCO status of our Company MWLASS Ltd, and a proposal from the Directors of that Company that we seek support from our shareholder Councils to pursue exempt status.

2. Recommendation

- a. That Report 4222 be received.
- b. That this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- c. Council has taken account of the matters in section 7(5) of the LGA and considers the organisation to be a small organisation; and
- d. Council exempts the small organisation under section 7(3) of the LGA, for the purposes of section 6(4)(i) of the LGA, from being a CCO.

3. Issues for Consideration

- a. At a recent meeting of MWLASS Ltd the issue of the Company and its CCO status – particularly around the cost of compliance were it deemed to be a CCO, were discussed.
 - b. At the request of the Directors the CE of MWLASS undertook some research which extended to appropriate legal advice around the status of exempted organisations.
 - c. The MWLASS will not be a CCO once exempt. Instead it will become a council organisation (refer section 6(4)(i)).
 - d. The cross reference between sections 6 and 7 of the LGA is untidy however, the effect of the provisions is clear. The local authority has the power to make a resolution with the effect of exempting a 'small organisation' from being a CCO.
 - e. The section 7(3) process does not specifically provide for situations where more than one local authority is a shareholder in a CCO. However, there would appear to be no policy reason why a 'small organisation' that may be exempted cannot include a 'small organisation' that is controlled by multiple local authorities. MW LASS will therefore, be exempt when each shareholder has passed a resolution to that effect. The exemption will take effect upon the last resolution being made.
 - f. It is not clear to me as to whether MW LASS is a 'small organisation' and can be exempted under section 7. Given that this is an aspect of the decision, the question as to whether or not MW LASS is a 'small organisation' can not be ignored.
 - g. Exempting MWLASS under the LGA generally means that Part 5 of the LGA no longer applies to it. There are two exceptions. As the company is still a 'council organisation'
-

sections 57 and 65(1) of the LGA continue to apply. Section 57 relates to the appointment of Directors (no change from current). Section 65(1) relates to performance monitoring requirements. While performance monitoring must continue, a 'statement of intent' is not required for an exempted organisation.

- h. This report was tabled as a late item at Council meeting 5 May 2010. Following general discussion Councillors, whilst acknowledging they were unable to pass resolutions, agreed in principle with the proposal. I have since been advised that all of the shareholder Councils in MWLASS Ltd have agreed with the recommendation.

	Name and title of signatories	Signature
Prepared by	D G Ward Chief Executive Officer	
<u>Confirmation of statutory compliance</u>		
<p>In accordance with section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002, this report is approved as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. containing sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions; and, b. is based on adequate knowledge about, and adequate consideration of, the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision. 		

Item-1907 Report on Draft 2010/2011 Annual Plan Submissions

File No 4221

To: His Worship the Mayor and Councillors
Horowhenua District Council

From: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 9 June 2010

1. Purpose

- a. To provide staff comments on matters raised in submissions to Council's draft 2010/2011 Annual Plan, to assist in discussions.

2. Recommendation

- a. That Report 4221 be received.
- b. That this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- c. That submissions No.1 to 128 to Council's Draft 2010/2011 Annual Plan be received.

3. Issues for Consideration

- a. Attached to this report are staff comments on matters raised by submitters. In some instances further technical information has been sought by Councillors. This information will be forwarded prior to tonight's meeting.

	Name and title of signatories	Signature
Prepared by	D G Ward Chief Executive Officer	
<u>Confirmation of statutory compliance</u> In accordance with section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002, this report is approved as: <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. containing sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions; and,b. is based on adequate knowledge about, and adequate consideration of, the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.		

4. Attachments

- a. Staff Comments on submissions 1 to 128 in order of subject.
-

1. Parks and Reserves

1.1 Issue(s): Increases to Cemetery Fees and Charges

Submissions 12 and 13 from local funeral directors oppose increases.

Submissions 6, 8, 39, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99 oppose fee increases.

Submission 26, Federated Farmers, supports making maximum use of fees and charges.

Analysis:

It is proposed the increase for a burial in the Districts Cemetery will increase by \$800 from \$1,200 to \$2,000.

Finance and Revenue Policy

Fees and charges increases are proposed to meet the Revenue and Financing policy for Cemeteries of private good of 50 – 60%. Year to date actual income for the 2009/10 year is estimated to only reach 42% this year. It is proposed to bring the cost recovery for the 2010/11 year to 57%.

It should be clearly emphasised that the rationale for proposed increases to fees and charges is not about gaining parity with neighbouring districts. It is clearly about achieving the Revenue and Financing Policy. Prices from neighbouring districts are given simply as a comparison for Councils information.

While the proposed cemetery fees and charges increases are high, stepped increases have been required for the last 3 years, at up to or greater than 100% each year to bring the districts charges closer to the Revenue and Financing policy. Prior to increases beginning 3 years ago, no increases had been made for over 10 years.

Should this final large increase be approved, at this time it is likely to be the last significant increase, other than annual inflation adjustment for some time.

If fees and charges increases are reduced, and subsequently income is reduced, the reduction in income will need to be sourced from the general rate. The increases in proposed fees and charges were proposed to offset the proposed rate increase.

An option for Council to consider would be continuing to step increases to cemetery fees and charges, rather than making one final significant increase. Again any reduction in income, would need to be offset by the general rate over time.

The majority of submissions oppose increases.

Income and Charges

Income received from all plot purchases, including reservations and interments offsets the costs of maintenance of the districts cemeteries and interments and operations aspects (e.g. governance, staff time, specific cemetery administration programmes, etc). Development, such as projects and land purchase, also adds to the costs of cemetery

operations. A grant from internal affairs is also provided from internal affairs to assist with the maintenance of Returned Service Areas.

Council has no 'reserve' of funds from reserved plots or excess income, therefore no interest or extra income is derived from reserved plots. As an income deficit has existed for so long, all income offsets the shortfall of the funding policy which is otherwise sourced from the general rate.

Officers as part of the 2009/10 LTCCP and now 2010/11 Annual Plan have set budgets from a zero base. There is no additional or expenditure contained within the budgets. Any reduction in expenditure would require a reduction in the level of service provided.

Reserved Plots

Across the district there are some 539 reserved plots, many of which will likely never be used. This is due to a number of factors such as family members passing, remarrying or moving, reserved plots now being located in older, inaccessible and undesirable cemeteries or locations within the cemeteries. Reserved plots significantly decrease the life of cemeteries, forcing early development and expenditure of funds for development. There is also the ongoing cost of grounds maintenance.

Foxton Cemetery is an example where over 330 reserved plots exist, particularly in newly developed areas forcing early development of adjoining land.

A report was tabled and adopted by Council at its 2 April 2008, meeting amending the policy for reserved plots from being able to openly purchase plots, to only being able to purchase one adjoining plot at the time of purchase.

In order to discourage the reservation of plots, reserved plots are currently sold at 200% of the purchase price. Since the introduction of the new reserved plot policy and 200% plot purchase price, the reservation of plots has significantly decreased.

Funeral Director Bad Debt

Local funeral directors suggest that continuing to increase cemetery fees and charges will increase bad debt to their business.

Officers have addressed this issue directly with Funeral Directors in the past. Legally, as the Funeral Director is the agent on behalf of the family, the Director is responsible for the costs of all arrangements that are made on the families' behalf. Officers made a number of suggestions to funeral Directors in 2008 of reducing the 'risk' of bad debt including the use of debt recovery, finance institutions and payment up front from families.

Clearly however, it is not Council's business or responsibility nor does it have any ability to manage the risk of debt to private companies and businesses.

Level of Service provided

Officers believe that the level of maintenance provided to customers of cemetery grounds is excellent. Regular comment on the grounds neat and tidy condition, are regularly received.

In regards to levels of service, Council do not provide mats specifically around the open grave during the interment. Council does however place mats over exposed soil that may be heaped next to the grave. The request to provide mats specifically for Directors has not been requested recently and is a request that Officers in conjunction with Funeral Directors and contactors could explore. Obviously any purchase would require a payback period and associated fee for the mats depreciation and use.

Kapiti Coast District Council supply mats, however apply an additional charge for use of the mats is applied – it is not included in their interment fees.

During a burial, a sexton is on site at all times, like other local cemeteries to ensure that should something occur during the burial, response is instant.

Options for Low income families

Council offers a number of lower cost or free remains disposal options in the district. These include free ash scatter at the Avenue, low cost ash walls at Foxton and ashes gardens at Foxton and Levin. It is recognised however that a full burial is the most expensive option available.

Indigent Funerals

In circumstances where the deceased has no available funds for a funeral, a maximum grant of \$1,820.08 from Central Government is available depending on the deceased’s estate. In these circumstances, Council receives no income as the entire grant usually subsidises the Funeral Directors costs. In these circumstances, Council sustains the loss.

Relativity to Neighbouring Districts

Increased fees and charges are still relatively comparable to those of the Far North District Council, on a deprivation index comparison; and neighbouring Councils. Again comparison is for interest only.

Comparative Council charges are:

Council	Burial Fee	Burial Plot Fee	Grounds maintenance fee	Total
Far North District Council (current)	\$750	\$715	\$140	\$1,605
Horowhenua District Council (current)	\$500	\$700	\$0	\$1,200
Horowhenua District Council (proposed)	\$1,150	\$850	\$0	\$2,000
Kapiti Coast District Council *Proposed from 1 July	\$895	\$1,170	\$0	\$2,065

Flower Holders in ashes Gardens

During the construction of ashes gardens at the Avenue Cemetery it was not Council’s intention to install flower holders.

The intent during the gardens construction and implementation was that adornments and flowers would not be permanently placed on the ashes garden plot, the garden would be the natural adornment. Obviously the informal placing of flowers would still be permitted.

If flower placement and adornment was desired, Directors at the time of interment should direct families to ashes lawn plots, not garden plots.

Options

1. That proposed cemetery fees and charges for the 2010/11 year are adopted without amendment.
2. A stepped increase over three years be considered.

1.2 Issue(s): Development of Foxton Cemetery

Submission 38 from the Foxton Community Board requests that funding be bought forward for the Foxton Cemetery development.

Submissions 39, 90, 92, 96, 98 and 99 supports the Foxton Community Boards request for cemetery development.

Verbal submission 39 from David Roache questioned the reasons for uplifting road on the new lawn at Foxton Cemetery.

Analysis:

Funding is requested to begin the development of adjoining land owned at Foxton Cemetery for plot development. Development would principally involve the construction of a vehicle crossing, and the flattening and consolidation of a sand dune to allow for the development of cemetery plots.

Currently funding of \$100,000 is provided in years 13/14 of the LTCCP for the adjoining lands development. The Board have requested that this funding be bought forward a year to years 12/13.

From current levels of uptake and remaining plot development available within the cemetery, it is expected that the remaining life for new plots in the existing cemetery is some 3-4 years.

Bringing funding forward would allow for greater consolidation of the new cemetery site and reduce any risks of plot non-availability should the new area be required earlier.

The lifting of the road over the new lawn area is an option to significantly increase the life of the cemetery by another 2 years. The road is only a gravel track that has a light coat of seal. The road is already breaking up.

Officers have met with the Chair of the Foxton Community Board and local funeral director Kevin Anderson and will present back to the Board a report on the provision of additional plots in the existing cemetery before the end of the year.

Recommendation(s):

That funding of \$100,000 for the development of new land at Foxton Cemetery be brought forward one year in the LTCCP from years 2013/14 to 2012/13.

That Officers prepare and present a report to the Foxton Community Board on opportunities to extend the life of the existing cemetery.

1.3 Issue(s): Half Pipe Project – Holben Reserve

Submission 38 from the Foxton Community Board, verbally requested funding for a half pipe skateboard ramp at Holben Reserve funded from the Foxton Beach Free holding account.

Analysis:

The Foxton Community Board have determined that a half pipe at Holben Reserve is required.

The board have requested that a ply half pipe, covered in aluminium is funded from the Foxton Freeholding Account. The Board estimated the cost as between \$20 - \$25,000.

Officers recommend that a timber and aluminium half pipe is not suitable for the beach. Maintenance of similar structures elsewhere in the district deteriorate significantly quicker than concrete half pipes and result in significantly higher maintenance.

Officers recommended that a concrete half pipe is instead constructed, at slightly greater cost as part of the construction, but lower long term maintenance costs.

Recommendation:

That funding of \$30,000 sourced from the Foxton Beach free holding account is committed to the construction of a concrete half pipe at Holben Reserve.

1.4 Issue(s): Petanque Horowhenua – Request for building funding

Submission 10 – Petanque Horowhenua request funding for the completion of their clubrooms.

Analysis:

Petanque Horowhenua operate clubrooms from the pavilion located at Western Park in Levin. While Council owns the pavilion, a significant amount of improvements from funding made available by the Horowhenua District Council and sourced or raised by Petanque Horowhenua have been made by the club.

Petanque Horowhenua have requested funding to insulate and line the ceiling of the pavilion. This work was not undertaken following the fire that completely gutted the building in the early 2000's. At the time Council only enclosed the building to an empty shell.

The cost of the project as a 'turn key' style project was estimated by the club as part of their submission was \$12,000. The club are willing to make a contribution of \$2,000 towards the project. As part of their verbal submission however, the club have re-estimated the costs to be in excess of \$20,000.

The club have had good support from Council in the past, and should be congratulated on the significant improvements made to the park and building. The club note future initiatives that the upgraded roof may assist in contributing to, including continued services for aging and youth initiatives.

Council can contribute in other ways to club projects, including providing letters of support to funding organisations, assisting with project management or consent applications. Council has contributed positively to a number of projects in this manner – the most recent being the Cenotaph upgrade.

Options:

1. That Council not fund the roof lining.
2. That Council offer to the club support for any future funding applications or assist in the submission of funding applications associated with sourcing funds for the lining and insulation of the ceiling at the pavilion at Western Park.
3. That Council supports a grant application of \$5,000 for these projects.

1.5 Issue(s): Cricket – Proposed Fees and Charges

Submissions 106 and 107 – Horowhenua Kapiti Cricket Association and Weraroa Cricket Club oppose fee and charges increase.

Analysis:

A proposed cost recovery of 3% is proposed for the 2010/11 year – the Finance and Revenue Policy states a 3 – 5% cost recovery for sports grounds.

Submission 106 from the Horowhenua Kapiti Cricket Association (HKCA) oppose the proposed increase in junior cricket fees and charges from \$150 to \$350. By omission of Officers, the proposed increase was not removed from working documents and should read \$150 not \$350. **Therefore no increase to Junior charges is proposed.**

Submissions 106 and 107 oppose the introduction of an increased fee for twilight cricket. Both submitters believe that should prices increase, that there will be negative impacts to cricket generally, and will likely make twilight cricket financially unviable.

While twilight cricket blocks have been charged out historically, no fee has been detailed in the schedule of fees and charges in the past – hence this is a new fee. Currently the cost per twilight cricket block is \$200 per block.

The proposed increases for twilight cricket to \$350 aims to recover the costs of additional maintenance on turf blocks required from additional mid week use. The fee includes the use of the artificial wickets also, which will shortly require re-carpeting, a cost to Council of approximately \$18,000.

The average turf cricket block costs \$7-8,000 per annum to prepare and maintain and is usually re-levelled every 4-5 years at a cost of \$4-5,000 per block.

Submission 202 states that HKCA pay Council for the preparation of all cricket grounds, therefore twilight cricket should not be charged for ground use. There are three artificial wickets that the association principally use for twilight and junior cricket. In the current financial year, Council have also had to renovate a retired block at Western Park to cope with the addition demand for the short twilight period at an additional cost of \$3,500.

A new fee for the 2010/11 financial year is a one off cricket ground hire. This fee is applicable where grounds are hired for casual or a one off game by out of district teams or associations. Two out of district games were held in the current financial year. Submission 106 opposes the new cricket fee.

Kapiti Coast District Council, which the association also work under, charge rates between \$419 and \$946 for cricket wickets depending on their grade and size. There is no charge for Junior cricket.

The current fee for Cricket in the Horowhenua for a Grade 1 – Representative Block is \$600. The level of service, condition and availability of the grounds that Horowhenua District Council provide is also higher than that in Kapiti.

Recommendation(s):

That the fee for junior cricket for the 2010/11 financial year is not increased from \$150 to \$350.

Options:

1. That the increased fee of \$350 per block for twilight cricket is adopted.
2. Making no increase to twilight cricket fees or a smaller increase of \$250 per block.
3. That the new fee for casual cricket use of \$50 is adopted.

1.6 Issue(s): Gladys Taylor Park - Playground Upgrade

Submission 33 from Greypower proposes that funding of \$77,000 for the upgrade/renewal of the Playground be deferred until the economy picks up again.

Analysis:

This particular site is one of the most popular and heavily used playgrounds in the District. With up to 120,000 people using the adjacent pool each year (and a large proportion of

these being children), as well as a large number of events that are geared around pre school and school age groups.

This playground is a well used site.

However, it is over 15 years old and is past its ideal renewal period. Furthermore, the undersurface matting is now non compliant with Playground standards, and there is insufficient shade for the site.

Recommendation:

That funding is retained for this Project.

2.1 Issue(s): Shannon Water Wheel

Submission 22 verbally questioned the Shannon Water wheel project.

Analysis:

This project is a Shannon Progressive Association Project, that is funded and managed by the association.

Council purchased land on State Highway 57 specifically for the project.

There are split views in the Shannon Community on the project on where the wheel should be located.

Recommendation:

That a report be bought back to Council to fully update them on the background and a way forward for the water wheel project in Shannon.

3.1 Issue(s): Netball Hoops in Parks

Submission 104 proposes that Netball or similar type ball shooting facilities be placed in neighborhood parks to provide more variety with play and skill development facilities.

Analysis

There is good merit in this request and Officers agree that Playgrounds should provide a variety of play options to cater for both boys and girls, and to provide a range of age and skills challenges. These types of facilities are relatively inexpensive and are common place in many Communities. Funding for assets like these could come from the LTCCP allocation for "District Play equipment".

This is considered to be a relatively inexpensive exercise and would only happen at few local parks. Cost is approximately \$1500 each.

Recommendation:

That two "shooting hoops" at a value of \$1,500 each be provided next year and funded from the District Play equipment allocation for 2010/11.

4.1 Issue(s): Parsons Avenue Kindergarten – request for additional land

Submission 108 from Parsons Avenue Kindergarten ask Council to consider granting additional land for use.

Analysis:

Parsons Avenue Kindergarten leases reserve land at Parsons Avenue which its building, car park and surrounds are situated on.

The current lease on the site expires in June 2010 and Officers have written to the Wellington Free Kindergarten Association's Land Manager notifying them of this. It would be opportune at this time to include additional lands into the lease. At the time of writing Officers also asked the association if they were interested in purchasing the site, identified during the development of the Land Acquisition and Disposals Strategy.

Recommendation(s):

That Officers continue to work with the Wellington Free Kindergarten Association in renewing the lease, with a view to offering additional lease land and the site for disposal.

5.1 Issue(s): Oxford Street Plane Trees

Submission 37 comments that the maintenance of the Oxford Street Plane trees should be changed.

Analysis:

The Oxford Street Plane trees are notable trees and protected under the Horowhenua District Council Operative District Plan 2000. Protection under the District Plan is provided to the trees of any adverse effects within the drip line or the tree itself.

The current maintenance regime in place on the planes, includes epicormic growth removal and crown thinning. The most recent crown thinning was undertaken in mid 2009. This is complimented with regular gutter cleaning of shop properties to mitigate leaf fall during peak times of the year.

Significant management of Plane Trees is proposed in the 2010/2011 year. Council holds a resource consent to undertake this maintenance and plans to undertake this work from existing budgets.

The submitter suggests that the plane trees should be low pollarded each year to mitigate leaf fall. Council's consent clearly identifies the extent to which Council are able to prune the Planes and low pollarding is not permitted.

The cost of gutter clearing on private properties is \$5,500 per year that Council undertakes. Officers believe that the amenity benefit to the community outweighs the cost of maintenance.

Outside of the annual plan process, Officers will liaise with the submitter to make them aware of the gutter cleaning service provided.

Recommendation:

That submission 37 is noted.

6.1 Issue(s): Heating Foxton Pool

Submission 102 – rates should pay for heating Foxton Pool and opening the facility all year round, not activities in Levin.

Analysis:

Rates for Foxton Pool are sourced through a targeted rate for the Foxton area, ensuring that funds sourced by the targeted rate for Foxton are spent at Foxton Pool.

The increased level of service required to heat and have Foxton Pools open year round is not cost effective. Foxton Pools consistently held higher water temperatures than the Levin Aquatic Centre this summer, however did not attract high patronage.

Recommendation(s):

That submission 102 is noted.

7.1 Issue(s): Swimming Lessons and Drowning Prevention

Submission 123 requests that consideration is given to Swimming Classes to encourage drowning prevention.

Analysis:

The Horowhenua District Council through its operational arm – Horowhenua Aquatics are already working alongside Water Safety New Zealand and Charitable Trusts to implement such a programme.

Officers will liaise with Mid Central Health on the project.

Recommendation:

Officers liaise with Mid Central Health Staff on the proposed project.

8.1 Issue(s): Provision of Playgrounds

Submissions 22, 48, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, and 84 object to the provision of a playground in Te Maire Park.

Submission 85 and 86 support the provision of a playground in Te Maire Park.

Analysis:

Funding of \$40,000 is provided in the Annual Plan, which is not specifically nominated for Shannon.

The Te Maire Park reserve management plan recommended the provision of a Play ground in the Park, supporting the southern community of Shannon and providing an additional attraction for visitors being close to Plimmer Terrace.

There appears to be little enthusiasm currently within the Shannon community for a play park at the southern end of Te Maire Park, with objectors raising the State Highway as an issue and the proximity of the Hotel (some mentioning the loss of Hotel parking)

Only two submissions mention the positive outcomes of the proposed playground.

There are a number of sites throughout the District that warrant a playground and an alternative "District" site be identified for this coming year.

The site can be reassessed in the future as the \$40,000 is currently provided every second year 2 of the LTCCP for the renewal (or provision) of "generic" District wide playgrounds.

Recommendations:

That funding for the provision of a playground in Shannon be revisited as part of the LTCCP.

9.1 Issue(s): Waitarere Beach General, Dune Management, walkway/cycleway development and general recreational asset upgrades

Submission 31

Analysis:

Submitter(s) request more funding of dune maintenance, walkway/cycle way development and general recreational asset upgrades (tennis courts, skate facilities etc).

Officers agree that an increased dune maintenance program is now required at Waitarere. There are now significantly more dune encroachment issues, and blow outs occurring now than in previous years. These same dunes were relatively stable and manageable for a number of years but the pressures of increased recreational use and residential housing has resulted in an increased number of blowouts and changes in the form and cover of the dunes. It is proposed that this issue in part will be addressed over the next 12 months as part of the District Coastal Management Plan of which Council has resolved, as part of the 2010 LTCCP, to allocate \$45,000 towards the project.

Currently, there are a number of properties where owners are willing to undertake public works at their own cost to mitigate the effects of sand encroachment through stabilization and planting exercises. Council however does not however at this time hold a resource consent to implement such works. The priority of funding to take advantage of this opportunity should be a priority for Council.

It is anticipated that annual funding of up to \$15,000 pa will be necessary to manage the Waitarere foredunes for the purposes of:

- Eradication of Pest plants (e.g. Acacia Longifolia)
- Transition of dune reactive plantings from Marram to native grasses of Kauwhangatara (Spinafex) and Pingao, allowing natural, low lying dunes to form.
- Future and current encroachment of dunes onto private properties.
- Mitigating damage to dune fields and dune vegetation from off road vehicles, motorbikes or inappropriate activities.
- Protection of coastal biodiversity.

10.1 Issues: Deterioration of Donnelly Park Netball Courts and future commitment to Netball

Submissions 14, 32 and 105 raise concerns regarding the condition of the courts surfaces, including the relative danger of the courts currently, and the future maintenance of these assets.

The Otaki players verbal submission suggest that there is not a health and safety issue, repairs to the courts are simply to improve their competitive nature.

Analysis:

Officers acknowledge that the surface of the Donnelly Park Netball Courts has deteriorated much faster than anticipated and is now causing concern for the administrators, umpires and players alike. Officers have already met with the club on a number of occasions and undertaken maintenance work this year repairing joint separation of the some of the courts to mitigate the effects.

It is possible that the cost of rectifying the surface could be in the region of \$150,000. At this stage there is no absolute understanding of what has caused this problem and what is the best method of fixing it without further investigation.

Officers have met with representatives of netball and propose to work collaboratively over the next 12 months to identify the exact nature of the problem and what has or is causing it. This will also involve trialling some options, and reaching agreement on the best option(s) for repairing the courts.

There is a mutual desire to work together and provide options that are achievable within the LTCCP. It is therefore highly likely that a joint request for renewal funding will be sought as part of the next LTCCP review.

Should an opportunity exist to rectify the court situation earlier and fund the renewal from the sports grounds depreciation fund during the 2010/11 financial year, Officers will report back to Council. It is likely that any major funding for replacement will be sourced in conjunction with the Levin Netball Club and the Horowhenua Netball association.

The resurfacing of the courts is not a competitive advantage matter as suggested by submitter 14. There are serious faults with the court surface.

Recommendation:

That Officers work with the Levin Netball Club to determine the best options for repair or renewal of the courts; and that Officers report back to Council as part of the LTCCP review process with recommendations and accurate renewal requirements.

That Officers report back to Council with funding options, should an opportunity exist before the next LTCCP review to rectify the Courts faults.

11.1 Issue(s): Levin BMX Club

Submission 18 from the Levin BMX Club requests maintenance funding for the BMX track at Donnelly Park

Analysis:

The club is requesting \$10,000 per annum for ongoing maintenance and development of the BMX track. This is in part due to the fact that the Club underestimated the popularity of the track for casual use and the amount of funding required for maintaining it. It is also due to the fact that the Club wishes to further develop the track and the membership.

The Club has been operating for almost six months and has provided an extremely popular facility for the wider community (albeit younger people). The Club has not been able to provide accurate estimates of the number of users per week/month etc, or an accurate breakdown of what this funding is required for and how the money would be administered.

Officers have subsequently met with and had discussions with BMX officials and propose that Council provides \$2000 pa from rates funding towards track maintenance, to be administered by the Councils Parks and Recreation Activity; and furthermore, assists the Club with annual funding applications to meet the balance of their capital and operational needs.

Recommendations:

That Council provide \$2000 per annum from rates funding towards track maintenance, to be administered by Council's Parks and Recreation activity, and furthermore, assists the Club with annual funding applications to meet the balance of their capital and operational needs.

12.1 Issue(s): Manakau Soccer

Submission 15 from the Manakau District Community Association support the Manakau United Football Club.

Submission 19 from the Manakau United Football Club request assistance and funding for field development at Manakau Domain.

Analysis:

The Soccer Club is seeking funding to reroof and repaint the Manakau Domain Pavilion, and for the provision of a children's playground.

Manakau United Football Club is a recently established club of enthusiastic and energetic sports people who have started a Soccer Club on Manakau Domain. The Club is in its first year of operation and it is suggested that there needs to be more time to assess whether the Club will grow significantly, and (if so) what possible future assistance Council may (or may not) be able to provide before investing in the Domain.

Council hold a lease on the site with the Manakau Sports Club. Before the United Football club proceed with any further renovation or work to the grounds, the revision of the lease and the relevance of the Manakau Sports Club needs to be ascertained. Council has a legal responsibility to ensure that any work undertaken on its land, whether electrical, building or other does not present any risk or harm to people or property.

Council have recently adopted the Physical Activity Strategy, LTCCP and AMP's which clearly focus on centralising sports grounds to achieve maintenance and code activities. All of Councils recent sports club works has focused on amalgamation and consolidation in 'sportsville' type projects. Council needs to consider the impacts of varying from plans and strategies, when the wider context of sport bodies also needs to be considered.

Officers have previously assessed the value of the site against a list of community values criteria based on the criteria set during the Land Acquisitions and Disposal Strategy. Given the development of the club and the regular use that the site is now getting it is imperative that the site is revalued. However at no stage has there been any decision that Council would dispose of this site without prior and extensive community consultation. The site is also a gazette reserve and therefore subject to the conditions of the Reserves Act 1977.

Recommendation:

That Council funds \$2000 towards paint and roofing materials and assists that club and other potential users of the domain with funding applications.

That no action is to be taken with respect to disposal of the Manakau Domain, and Officer's re evaluate the Domain in view of the interest in its present use.

13.1 Issue(s): Manakau Playground

Submission 19 requests that Manakau Domain is considered for the first Council owned Manakau Playground at Manakau Domain.

Analysis:

Councils view on the provision of playground equipment has been to maximize sites where playground equipment already exists to achieve the greatest overall outcome for the community.

There needs to be considerably more regular use made of this site before Officers recommend funding a children's playground on a site that may get 30 children per Saturday for several months each year.

In 2009 Council granted \$7,500 to Manakau School and donated old safety matting towards their playground refurbishment project, acknowledging its integral location in the village. There is no rational sense to provide equipment if it already exists within the village.

Recommendation:

That submission 19 is noted and the provision of playground equipment is reviewed as part of the next LTCCP review for Manakau.

Recommendations: Officers support providing the Club with paint and roofing material to assist tidying up the facility.

14.1 Issue(s): Pistol Club Site

Submission 20 from the Levin Pistol Club is seeking Council support for assessing the suitability of Target Reserve, Foxton as a potential site for a Pistol Club range.

Analysis:

There is little or no cost to Council in exploring this opportunity, officer time principally. Council has met previously with the club and believe that there are a number of small sites within the reserve that could potentially accommodate a proposition like this at very little opportunity cost.

Issues for consideration that the club will undertake include consultation, safety concerns, and any consent processes.

This is a straight forward request that Council should further investigate. The fact that the Club is only asking for support to initiate the project, and that they will need to go through a consent process, means that many of the potential concerns can be addressed without Council making any commitment other than Officer time.

Recommendations:

That Council support the Pistol Clubs request.

PROPERTY

15.1 Issue(s): Foxton Memorial Hall Upgrade

Submission(s): 38, 39, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99

Analysis:

The Foxton Community Board requests that \$60,200 that had been identified in year 3 (2011/2012) of the LTCCP be brought forward to year 2 (2010/2011)

The Horowhenua District Council deleted \$34,400 of the \$60,200 as part of the Council annual plan workshops. Funding had been identified for interior painting and repairs to the main hall. This work was programmed for year 3 and therefore was not going to influence this coming year's rates demand.

The Foxton Memorial Hall has significantly increased in bookings over the last 12 months by up to 40%. In the current financial year work has been undertaken upgrading the hall entrance, providing disabled toilet facilities and upgrading the existing mens and womens toilets.

The necessity for work to be undertaken on the main hall is evident when on site. Damaged sound attenuation panels, failing paint and moisture intrusion and rotting windows are present.

Funding is currently unspent in the current financial year in the properties portfolio. It is suggested that funding could be provided from the current year, to offset any increase in rates reinstating funds removed by Council during workshops.

Recommendation:

That Council reinstates an amount of \$34,000 into 2010/11 for interior refurbishment of the Memorial Hall, and that Officers find this funding from existing property funds.

16.1 Issue(s): Pinewood Motor Camp Development

Submission 100 objects to a suggestion that the Board may push for a name change to the Motor Camp from Pinewood to an alternative name. The submitters also request better community consultation over any capital investment in the Camp.

Analysis:

Currently the Foxton Beach Motor Camp registered name is the Pinewood Motor Camp, however has been trading under the name Foxton Beach Motor Camp for a number of years now. Reasons for this include practically understanding where the camp is located.

There has been no indication from the Board that they are currently pursuing a name change.

Officers have consulted with the Manawatu Estuary Management Plan Committee twice and met with the Manawatu Estuary on site and will continue to liaise with the committee on the project. Further consultation will be undertaken with the Community as plans are further refined.

Excess income from the Foxton Beach Motor Camp is held in a reserve fund at Horowhenua District Council. Currently excess income of some \$16,000 is in the reserve fund and is offsetting the development cost of the motor camp project.

Recommendation:

That submission 100 is noted.

17.1 Issue(s): Churchill Street Pensioner Flat Sale

Submission 109 objects to the sale of the old timber Churchill Street Pensioner Flats in Shannon

Analysis:

Council resolved to dispose of the Churchill Street Pensioner Flats in 2005 as part of the Pensioner Flat Upgrade Project. The 4 blocks of two units were excluded from the redevelopment project, due to the significant extent of work that was required on the blocks inside and out.

Council has no registrations on the 'waiting list' for flats at Churchill Street. Officers have also spoken with Housing New Zealand Representatives and they have expressed that there is no great demand for housing in Shannon either.

Recommendation:

That submission 109 is noted.

18.1 Issue(s): Pensioner Flat Fee Increases

Submission 8 verbally questioned the increases of \$10 to all pensioner Flats.

Analysis:

This was an Officer error. No increases to pensioner accommodation fees and charges are proposed as part of the Annual Plan process.

19.1 Issue(s): Levin Hall Charges

Submission 35 makes comment that Council are pricing the cost of hall hire out of peoples reach.

A verbal submission made by the submitter requested greater consultation during proposed renewal works.

Analysis:

Small increases have been proposed to Hall and Community Centre hire charges to reflect the impact of inflation.

Council offers concessions to hall hirers based on community benefit criteria and a reduced rate for community and non profit organisations. It is proposed that a 30% cost recovery will be achieved for the 2010/11 financial year – achieving the Financial Policy of 15 -30%.

Full day hire charges of the facility has not been increased with only separate room hire inflated for the financial year.

In circumstances where fees may change over a hire period, where Council has quoted customers a price for a 12 month period, Council will honour the quote.

Where appropriate, Officers will consult with specific users of facilities, however for general maintenance as proposed Council Officers will notify users of the proposed maintenance works only.

Recommendation(s):

That submission 35 is noted.

20.1 Issue(s): Toilets in Shannon

Submissions, support the retention of public toilets in Balance Street.

Submissions support the provision of public toilets in Te Maire Park.

Analysis:

Council in the 2010/11 year proposed funding for new toilets and their refurbishment District Wide. No where in the annual plan is there reference to Council building toilets in Te Maire Park or Shannon.

Council in the 2010 LTCCP provided funded for the provision of toilets specifically in Shannon. These were removed as part of the 2010/11 annual plan workshops.

The comment provided by the Shannon community on the provision of toilets in Shannon has been valuable. However, when Council comes to a time to refurbish, re-build or provide additional toilets in Shannon a robust community consultation process will be undertaken.

Specifically on Te Maire Park however, the original Te Maire Park management and landscape plan (which had huge community support) advocated the provision of a small public toilet in the Reserve. This was seen as an opportunity to further develop Te Maire Park and the main business district area, and to cater for anticipated public demand. It was proposed that the new toilets be located at the Railway Station end of Te Maire Park, constructed in a 'colonial style' to match the historic Shannon Railway Station and character buildings of Shannon's main street.

Officers still believe that Toilets that encourage passing motorists to stop close to the area of greatest business activity, will provide the greatest overall benefit to the local community.

A current concern of the community in relation to the new toilets, is where trucks/passing motorists would likely park. It is arguable, what 'market' the toilets should be catering for - motorists willing to stop in Shannon as a destination or passing motorists/truck drivers as a convenience. It is suggested we should be encouraging people to stop and use the site as a destination, rather than catering for motorists that may not stop and contribute to the area.

The limitations with the existing toilet block site includes the fact that Council only own land directly in front and behind the toilet block - the amenity area located next to the toilets is privately owned.

The land the toilets are on is zoned commercial, therefore allowing neighboring properties to build directly on the boundary. Should development in Shannon occur to an extent where neighboring properties are developed with road frontages, the current toilets could be built out.

Should the building remain and be refurbished, any works requiring a building consent (pan relocation) would trigger the requirement of disabled facilities to be provided. It is arguable if these could be accommodated within the footprint of the current building.

The existing site is not gazetted reserve, and as such attracts rates to the site.

Recommendation(s):

That funding for the refurbishment and construction of toilets district wide be retained.

That submissions 8, 10, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85 and 86 are noted.

ROADING

21.1 Issue: Walking and Cycling

In submission No 11 Waitarere Progressive Association seeks increased provision of walking and cycling facilities in Waitarere and through to Waitarere Rise.

Submission 113 from Mrs Margaret Jeune supports the walking and cycling strategy with links to other districts.

Analysis:

There has been little uptake within the subdivision and therefore there is little need for facilities east of the village at this stage.

Recommendation:

That the submissions are noted.

21.2 Issue: Moutere Road extension

In Submission no 110 Mrs Ann Topp asks about the potential for forming a road between Hokio Beach and Waitarere Beach.

Analysis:

Although the cadastral map shows a road reserve running between Waitarere Beach Road and Hokio Beach Road west of the golf course, advice has been received from surveyors that this is in error and that part of the route is in private ownership.

Until now council has planned to form this road at an appropriate time in order to provide resilience and added capacity to the network. The land ownership issue rules out this project and it will be discussed by Council at the next review of the Roding AMP.

Recommendation:

That Mrs Topp is advised that there is no likelihood of this road being formed in the foreseeable future.

21.3 Issue: Taylor Street, Foxton Beach

In Submission no 34 Mr and Mrs Paton submit that the traffic exiting Taylor Street onto Seabury Avenue (and the traffic in the opposite direction) has increased with the development of Foxton Beach and that therefore the section between Seabury and Pratt should be upgraded.

Analysis:

Taylor Street is the last street to be improved after the Andrew St - Pratt Ave improvements.

Officers concur that an upgrade is desirable. Traffic islands and roundabouts are not recommended but seal widening, kerb and channel on both sides and a footpath on the eastern side as well as traffic control at the Seabury Ave intersection are considered to be appropriate. Funding is not available in this year's budget.

Recommendation:

That a project comprising the upgrade of the southern block of Taylor Street is prepared for Council and Community Board consideration in the context of next year's annual plan.

21.4 Issue: Motuiti Road extension to Round Bush

In Submission no 29 Mr Ivan George suggests forming a road from Motuiti Road intersection with SH1 through to Round Bush.

Analysis:

There is a 10 metre wide access strip from the Round Bush reserve to SH 1, a distance of 640 metres. The reserve is DOC's rather than Council's. It has road frontage on Wylie Road. Development of a vehicular access from the State Highway is not justifiable under current economic restraints. Anyone who wants to drive to the reserve can do so by going through Foxton to Wylie Road.

Mr George might consider proposing to DOC that they form a footpath from the highway to the bush.

Recommendation:

That Mr George is invited to consider proposing to DOC that they form a footpath from the highway to the bush.

21.5 Issue: Speed restrictions – Manakau School

In Submission no 15 Manakau District Community Association asks for speed restrictions outside Manakau School.

Analysis:

A Traffic Engineer's report has been received and will shortly be presented to Council with recommendations relating to all schools in the District.

Recommendation:

That Manakau District Community Association is advised that council is actively considering this matter, and that they will be advised of the outcome at the conclusion of those considerations.

21.6 Issue: Speed restrictions – District wide

In Submission no 15 Manakau District Community Association asks that all of the Districts roads be reviewed for setting speed limits lower than the 100kph default limit.

Analysis:

There is a formal process that we are required to go through and it would be prohibitively costly to have our entire network surveyed. If a specific road is identified officers will check it and determine whether it is appropriate to engage the Traffic Engineer to survey it.

Recommendation:

That Manakau District Community Association is advised that a district wide review is impractical, but that where they have concerns about specific sections of road, council will consider them.

21.7 Issue: Road safety targets

In Submission no 123 MidCentral Health suggests that performance targets around road safety should be adopted.

Analysis:

Officers are of the view that council has limited control over road safety, particularly when it comes to the State Highways where most of the trauma occurs, and that therefore performance targets in that area are of no practical benefit.

Recommendation:

That Council continues to support road safety initiatives through our Road Safety Co-ordinator, and through appropriate engineering solutions.

21.8 Issue: Road safety - Oxford Street, cycling

In Submission no 123 MidCentral Health notes the injury accident statistics relating to cyclists in Oxford Street.

Analysis:

This issue was addressed by Transit New Zealand who identified that there was a cluster in the Liverpool Mako Mako area. They provided an off-road cycle way from Liverpool Street, past the railway station to Hokio Beach Road.

The walking and cycling strategy provides for cycle lanes on Cambridge Street which may reduce cycle use of Oxford Street.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

21.9 Issue: Road safety - Active Transport

In Submission no 123 MidCentral Health submits that council adopt a target to complete at least one infrastructure project that improves the safety of cyclists, pedestrians or other people using active transport.

Analysis:

This suggestion may have merit and should be considered in the context of the next LTCCP, when funding constraints that we are currently under may be more manageable.

Recommendation:

That council give consideration to adopting a target to complete at least one infrastructure project that improves the safety of cyclists, pedestrians or other people using active transport in the context of the next LTCCP.

21.10 Issue: Otauru Stream Bridge

In Submission no 75, Mrs Marilyn Cranson has concerns relating to the narrow bridge over the Otauru Stream on Margaret Street, where the footpath is adjacent to the carriageway.

Analysis:

Arising from an earlier submission, this matter has been drawn to the attention of the Highway Authority, but they are unable to quantify benefits that would justify expenditure on the matter.

Recommendation:

That Mrs Cranson is invited to address her concerns directly to the New Zealand Transport Agency.

21.11 Issue: Otauru Stream Bridge

In Submission no 75, Mrs Marilyn Cranson considers that a No Entry sign should be placed on the Margaret Ballance Street intersection.

Analysis:

Arising from an earlier submission, this matter has been drawn to the attention of the Highway Authority. It is true that traffic travelling north into Shannon and turning right into Ballance Street have to cross oncoming traffic with a limited sight distance. However those who undertake this manoeuvre have not created a significant crash record at the site. Unless there is an actual issue rather than a perceived one council need take no action on the matter.

Recommendation:

That a No Entry sign as appropriate be installed following consultation with the New Zealand Transport Agency.

21.12 Issue: Ballance Street Lighting

In Submissions 47 and 78, Mrs O'Connor and Mrs Joanne Roache ask for an improvement in street lighting in Ballance Street.

Analysis:

Arising from earlier submissions, this matter has been discussed with the Highway Authority. NZTA has this on their three – year roading works programme.

Recommendation:

That the submissions are noted.

21.13 Issue: Ballance – Plimmer Intersection

In Submission no 75, Mrs Marilyn Cranson considers that barriers should be placed at the Plimmer / Ballance intersection to control pedestrians..

Analysis:

While there is a perception that such control is required, there is no record of accidents that would justify this treatment.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

21.14 Issue: Plimmer Terrace Facilities

In Submissions 85 and 86, Mrs Suzie Johnson and Mr Kiwi Johnson request increased signage, flowers and seating areas in Plimmer Terrace, Shannon.

Analysis:

Funding for this work has not been provided this year. Officers will continue to work with stakeholders to identify opportunities to undertake improvements where there are minimal funding requirements.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

22. FOOTPATHS**22.1 Issue: Foxton and Shannon – “opposite side’ paths**

In Submission no 25, Mr PJ McDonnell notes that there are footpaths only on one side of the streets in Foxton. In Submission no 2102, Mrs Jenny Forman submits that a footpath is required on the north side of Stout Street between 15 Stout Street and the intersection of Stout and Vogel in Shannon.

Analysis:

There is a footpath on the south side of Stout Street in Shannon. Comments were made by the speaker to the submission on the state of that path. Officers will investigate and commission any necessary repairs from existing budgets.

Council's objective is to provide a footpath on one side of all streets in the three towns (Levin, Foxton and Shannon). Until such time as this is met, council has no plan for the provision of footpaths on the second side. Indeed the other towns may warrant paths before the second side is considered.

It should be noted that there are no new footpaths funded this year.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

22.2 Issue: Rummel Street, Waitarere Beach

In Submission no 31, Mrs Raewyn Tate requests the formation of a footpath between Rua and Park Avenues in Waitarere Beach. This is the unformed part of Rummel Street.

Analysis:

There is no funding for this work. Waitarere Beach is not one of the communities in which the new footpath programme is implemented. This link is not included in the Walking and Cycling strategy.

Recommendation:

That the views of the Waitarere Progressive Association are sought and that consideration be given to the matter in the context of the next LTCCP.

22.3 Issue: Maintenance

In Submission no 8, Mrs Olwen Burberry notes that there are to be no new footpaths this year and wonders whether maintenance will be curtailed.

Analysis:

In Council's 2010/2011 budget, we have provided \$350,000 for footpath renewals and a further \$100,000 for general footpath maintenance works.

Recommendation:

That Mrs Olwen Burberry is advised that the funding provided for maintenance of footpaths in the 2010/2011 year is considered to be adequate to maintain the current level of service.

22.4 Issue: Balance Street, Shannon

In Submission no 47, Mrs Joanne Roache expresses concerns about the state of repair of the Ballance Street footpath in the vicinity of the toilet block.

Analysis:

This path is on the current renewal schedule and will be done during the next summer's construction season.

Recommendation:

That Mrs Roache is advised that the Balance Street footpath (north side, west end) is on the current renewal schedule and the works will be done during next summer's construction season.

23. WATER SUPPLY

23.1 Issue: Shannon upgrade

In Submission no 78, Mrs O'Connor suggests that the resolution of the Shannon Water Supply matter is high priority. In Submission no 46 Ms Rosa Gray submits that the upgrading of Shannon's water supply should take precedence over the Levin water upgrade, since the latter is subject to a permanent boil water notice.

In speaking to submission 22 Mrs Drake drew attention to siltation that occurs on the pump station during flooding, which can lead to silt entering the pump station.

Analysis:

The upgrade of this water supply is dependent upon funding. There is still an expectation that central government funding will be come available again and that Shannon will be eligible for it.

Prior to price harmonization, the upgrading of the Levin supply was affordable for the Levin community while upgrading Shannon's was not. Levin therefore had priority. Changing to price harmonization was never intended to alter priorities and if it had been suggested that it would mean the further deferral of the Levin upgrade, the proposal for harmonization might not have been acceptable.

In the time between raising this matter and the deadline for this report officers have been unable to investigate the silting issue.

Recommendation:

That the submissions are noted.

That officers investigate issues relating to silt build-up around the Shannon Water Supply Intake and report their findings back to Council's July 2010 meeting.

23.2 Issue: Shannon trunk main renewal

In Submission no 123, MidCentral Health expresses concerns about the deferral of the replacement of the Shannon Water Supply Trunk Main.

Analysis:

Council is best placed to make this decision, since we hold the service information. The main has given no trouble to date and is on the replacement programme for prudence because of its importance. It is included in the LTCCP in order to enable us to replace it when it shows signs of deterioration.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted

23.3 Issue: Kuku Water Supply

In Submission no 123, MidCentral Health notes that they have always considered the Kuku Water Supply to be non-potable and seeks clarification.

Analysis:

Council has considered a report on this matter and has confirmed that the supply is to remain non-potable. An upgrade to potable standard was expensive and not needed by the consumers.

Recommendation:

That MidCentral Health is advised that the Kuku Water Supply is non-potable.

23.4 Issue: Rain water tanks

In Submission no 8, Mrs Olwen Burbery suggests that rainwater tanks should be installed as a supplementary source for watering gardens.

Analysis:

The cost of these tanks and associated plumbing and pumping can be around \$4,000 depending upon the size of tank chosen. Residents who are inconvenienced by the hosing restrictions required at present are able to invest in such tanks, but officers are not aware that any have done so.

Since it is not something that is occurring on a voluntary basis, it is hard to justify council forcing people to do it at least until our treatment plant capacity comes under significant strain.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

24. WASTE WATER

24.1 Issue: Exfiltration - Levin

Submission 4: Mr Fyfe Williamson notes that exfiltration of raw sewage is occurring in the Levin network, and suggests that this is a pathway for contaminants reaching the Lake.

Analysis:

Council has a substantial renewals programme which has the effect of reducing exfiltration as well as infiltration.

It is likely that any sewage that may 'exfiltrate' from pipes would be subject to natural soil treatment processes as it passes through the soil.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

24.2 Issue: Shannon WWTP upgrade

Submission 78: Mrs O'Connor suggests that the resolution of the Shannon Waste Water issues are high priority.

Submission 23: Horizons Regional Council look forward to receiving Council's application for resource consent for the Shannon Sewage Treatment Plant, and to continuing the good progress made to date in resolving what has been a complex issue for Shannon.

Submission 8: Mrs Olwen Burbery expresses concerns that the Floating wetlands at Shannon will give rise to odour.

Submission 124: DOC notes that the Shannon WWTP continues to discharge into the Mangaore Stream and observes that the system needs to be upgraded.

Analysis:

As a minor point of clarification it should be noted that the discharge is to Stansell's drain, which flows into the Mangaore Stream. It is not directly into the stream.

Some progress is being made on the waste water issues with the forthcoming upgrade of the treatment plant which will improve the quality of the discharged effluent. There will be consents required for further work at the disposal end of the plant. We aim to lodge the applications during 2010/11.

Council has commissioned works that can be done within the terms of the current consent and have consultants working on the necessary documentation for the other parts of the project for which consents will be required.

Officers consider that odour issues are highly unlikely to eventuate. There is no process occurring within the floating wetland that would cause odour.

This is one of the major projects currently in front of council's asset managers and operations team.

Recommendation:

That the submissions are noted.

24.3 issue: Waitarere WWTP development

Submission 123: MidCentral Health offers to assist Council in carrying out a Health Impact Assessment of the Waitarere Sewage project.

Submission 8: Mrs Olwen Burberry is concerned about the sudden unavailability of land for the Waitarere waste water treatment plant, and suggests that plans should have been put in place years ago.

Analysis:

It is not clear what, if any, relevance the Health Impact Assessment would have and what it would cost council to undertake it.

Council is taking action seven years before the lease expires, and will approach the issue in a well-planned manner.

Recommendation:

That MidCentral Health is invited to provide further information relating to their offer to assist council in carrying out a Health Impact Assessment of the Waitarere Sewage project. Particular information needed for Council to evaluate this proposal is what the relevance of the assessment would be to the existing Waitarere Scheme and future planning for the scheme, also what the costs would be to Council of carrying it out.

24.4 Issue: Levin WWTP relocation

Submission 23: Horizons Regional Council supports the long-term relocation of the Levin Sewage Treatment Plant.

Submission 40: Ms Michelle Raill on behalf of the Otaki Greens is concerned about the delay in the relocation of the Levin Waste Water Treatment plant. She also indicates some technologies that could be incorporated into the new treatment plant for Levin.

Submission 124: DOC expresses concerns about the deferment of the relocation works (especially with the Waitarere sewage being redirected into the Levin system). They observe that waste water continues to be discharged from the oxidation ponds to shallow groundwater and thence to Lake Horowhenua.

Analysis:

Council continues to make progress on this matter. The Annual Plan recognises the reality of the time it has taken to acquire the land to progress this matter. However the recent purchase of the Anderson Block has restored council's control on the programme and the timing now set out is sustainable.

We greatly appreciate the assistance given to Council by Horizons on this matter to date.

Officers agree that there are some exciting treatment options being developed both within New Zealand and overseas, and these will be canvassed when the design of the new WWTP is being considered. .

There is no discharge of wastewater from the oxidation ponds to groundwater. The oxidation ponds have been lined. In addition, the removal of the sludge drying beds (from which some water may have percolated) has also occurred over the last decade.

Recommendation:

That the submissions are noted.

24.5 Issue: Levin – Gladstone Green

Submission 23: Horizons Regional Council notes with concern the proposal to defer new wastewater reticulation to Gladstone Green.

Analysis:

This situation arises from the slow uptake of development.

Council will ensure that provision is made for appropriate management of wastewater when the rate of development increases.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted

24.6 Issue: Foxton WWTP upgrade

Submission 8: Mrs Olwen Burbery suggests that the land at Foxton Beach should be used for the disposal of Foxton waste water.

Analysis:

A range of potential sites was consulted on in 2009. Officers are currently investigating the way forward for Foxton Wastewater. Including Council's land holdings in the area.

Council will consult in due course.

It is not appropriate for Council to base any decision on this one submission since a more comprehensive and focused process is being carried out.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

24.7 Issue: Infiltration

Submission 34: Mr and Mrs Paton note the absence of budgetary provision for infiltration surveys in certain waste water schemes.

Analysis:

The schemes in question have recently had surveys completed. We are now in the phase of follow-up from those surveys. This includes maintenance work and a review of the renewals programme.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

24.8 Issue: Waste Water assessments

Submission 123: MidCentral Health submits that council assess non-reticulated communities for waste water.

Analysis:

Council in its 'Water and sanitary Assessment, January 2006' assessed the non-reticulated communities for wastewater. Provision of new reticulated wastewater systems is cost prohibitive for Council.

In the absence of funding from Central Government Council has no plans to engage in further such enterprises.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

25. SOLID WASTE

25.1 Issue: Waste minimisation

In Submission no 123, MidCentral Health notes that Council has responsibilities to meet with respect to the requirements of the Waste Minimisation Act and considers that Council should adopt a 'Zero Waste to Landfill' programme similar to that of other councils.

Analysis:

Council officers are familiar with the act and have the necessary work programmed. We welcome the offer of assistance from Public Health staff.

'Zero Waste to Landfill' is a vision statement rather than a practical objective for a local authority.

A full review and update of the waste management and minimisation plan is due by July 2012.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

25.2 Issue: Transfer Station gate fees

In Submissions 80 and 81, Mrs Rose and Mr Kevin Couling object to the increase in fees at the Shannon Transfer Station, and point out the likelihood of increased fly-tipping. In submissions 8, 101, 102 and 103, Mrs Olwen Burbery, Mrs Annette Martin, Mr PJ McDonnell and Barry and Kay Pearce object to the increase at both transfer stations.

Submission 80, 81 Mrs Rose and Mr Kevin Couling Would like to see no charge for greenwaste to be dumped in Shannon and council recycle greenwaste by chipping it and sell the resultant product.

Submission 102 Mr PJ McDonnell States Horizon Rates cover the cost of rubbish bags

Submission 103 Barry and Kay Pearce Objects to the councils clear rubbish bags and the cost to dispose of these

Analysis:

The fee increase is intended to move towards meeting the public/private split of 70% User Fees and 30% Waste Transfer Rates as set out in council's financial policy for solid waste. Actual cost recovery 08/09 was 34% User Fee and 66% Waste Transfer Rate. Proposed cost recovery will see an increase to 47% User Fee and 53% Waste Transfer Rate.

While there will be an increase in fly-tipping, it tends to be short-lived as people adjust to the new pricing levels by further reducing their waste stream.

Proposed charges are generally increasing at these facilities. Key factors influencing this are the need to meet policy and maintain reasonable parity with charges at other transfer stations in the district and neighbouring districts. Currently transfer charges in Foxton and Shannon are 20 – 30% lower than those of the Levin Transfer Station and Stations in Palmerston North and Kapiti.

There is a very small market for chipped greenwaste and the cost of producing and storing of the mulch would see the fees for general waste increase more to cover this process.

Horizon Regional Council does not contribute to the cost of rubbish bags and the associated collection and disposal costs. These costs are included in the price of the bag when purchased.

Council rubbish bags are now white in colour and are free to dispose of at HDC transfer stations as the cost of disposal is included in the purchase price.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

25.3 Issue: Recycling

In Submission no 47 Mrs Joanne Roache Objects to the way the kerbside recycling scheme was introduced and responsible residents incurring a \$1.00 per week charge to fund it through wheelie bin collection.

Analysis:

It is always the case that some people will greatly favour a service while others will find it unnecessary. Feedback received to date has been generally favourable. Mrs Roache's view seems to be in the minority, but it is helpful for us to be reminded that not everyone supports it. It is always the case that some people will greatly favour a service while others will find it unnecessary.

On the whole the uptake and response to kerbside recycling has been fantastic with an average of 70% of residents using the service and accepting the associated costs.

Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 we are responsible to reduce the waste stream to landfill. Kerbside recycling is helping us achieve our target of 1200 tonne of recycling material collected this year, current collection volume indicates in excess of 2000 tonne will be collected.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

25.4 Issue(s): Recycling Centres, Recycling Policy and review

Submission no 38 Foxton Community Board supports the councils recycling policy and looks forward to the review of policy

Analysis:

Officers will be reviewing the recycling policy and recycling station location in the near future.

Recommendation

That the submission is noted

25.5 Issue: Landfill Liner

Miss Delwyn Sanson seeks information relating to the landfill liner.

Analysis:

It is not necessary for any resident to wait for an annual plan round to seek information of this nature.

Officers will ensure that the information is forwarded to Miss Sanson.

Recommendation:

That the submission is noted.

26. Finance Issues

26.1 Funding for Infrastructure

Submission No.5

Recommendation

Council is unable to borrow from the Reserve Bank as is advocated without a major change in Government policy and legislation.

26.2 Targeted Rate for Foxton Community Board.

Submission Nos 30, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100,

This proposed rate was included in Council's Draft Annual Plan for consultation as a result of suggested outcomes from Rate Review meetings held during late 2009. The rate is proposed to recover those direct costs of the Foxton Community Board – salaries and meeting costs.

Those submitters identified above have all registered their opposition to this proposed rate.

26.3 Rates

Submission Nos.9, 11, 17, 24, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118

Each of these submitters raised matters of principle with regard to rating, referring to differentials, targeted rates, uniform charges, capital value vs land value and some other issues.

Council undertook a Rating Review during the latter part of the 2009 calendar year and is intending to undertake a similar review during the first half of the 2010/2011 year.

Those submitters who have identified rate related issues through this submission process will be invited to join the Rating Review process to further discuss their concerns and/or suggestion.

26.4 targeted rate for health centre in Foxton and provision of Health Centre

Submission Nos.21, 30, 34, 38, 103,

A targeted rate for health centre costs is legally able to be set. It must be done as an amendment to the Revenue and Financing policy and therefore an amendment to an LTCCP or with the next LTCCP. Presumably it will be applied to an area of benefit (not unlike the FCB rate). As with all such defined areas the properties near the borders will argue they receive little or no benefit.

In his submission and verbal presentation Mr Gimblett made specific comments with respect to the process to be followed in this matter which involves robust consultation with the communities of Foxton and Foxton Beach during the first part of the 2010/2011 financial year with a view to further work being undertaken in conjunction with the 2011/2012 Draft Annual Plan.

26.5 Property Valuation

Submission Nos 6 and 17

Analysis

The definitions that we use are those contained in the Valuation Rules 2008 (set in August) and are used by the valuers.

I believe that the Council should not determine use. This is the job of the independent valuer (in our case QV Rating) who must be seen to be independent for the same reason that council would not interfere with the valuation of the property. There is a review process enabling land use to be reassessed and a property can be reviewed at any time by contacting QV. However, the valuers would need to be convinced that a lifestyle block was in fact an economic farm not just for the current occupant but for any owner or occupier that may purchase the property. **Intensive farming operations, generally horticulture or poultry etc, would not be classified as lifestyle unless they were seen as uneconomic. However, the council is able to over-ride this criteria but I urge caution in doing so.**

Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Rating) Act this enables us (under clause1) to categorise properties on the basis of use. This use category is included in the District Valuation Roll (DVR) and is a very easy way that we can find a property and attach a rate type in our Rating Information database (RID). To depart from this simple approach would be administratively difficult and would increase costs.

The issue is that although a business may be operating from a property at present is the business the main source of income? If it was sold would the new owners continue to operate a business from the property? If we changed its designation to rural business our systems are not sophisticated enough to change if it was sold and used as rural residential in future. A change of use of this nature does not require resource consent we have no way of capturing such changes in use on these properties. We would have to ascertain from each new owner whether they plan to carry on with the business. Also what is to say that the current owner of any such property doesn't revert to rural residential use (i.e. the owner "retires") without informing Council.

What if Council wishes to alter the valuation use classification? The criteria to use could be:

1. **Whether the "business" is GST registered.** - How do we ascertain this or do we just rely on the applicant's integrity? Also, some frugal people maintain they can live (net of farm operating costs) on incomes below the GST threshold of \$60,000.
2. **Size of property- i.e. any property of greater than say 4Ha.** - is this a valid measure? Small properties with good soil types may be inherently more productive than those on poor soil types.
3. **Where farming is the main source of income.** How do we ascertain this? Is the owner also on a pension or some sort of benefit? Or are they also labour only contractors.
4. **If it passes the above criteria and is outside the Green Belt?** Under the District Plan Change 21.
5. **Is it able to be subdivided?** Under District Plan Change 20.
6. **Does the type of farming operation count?** ie is poultry more productive relative to size than sheep and beef. Can you run a profitable stud farm for say alpacas on a small holding?
7. **Do the owners require resource consent?** Although if resource consent were to be granted for intensive use the valuers would change the use from rural lifestyle in any case. We have had instances where a person has bought such a property and has not carried on with the intensive use.
8. **Is it better to give a rate remission?** (By amending our Rates Remission Policy) to allow applications to be made for remissions where they can prove they are a profitable farm. Such remissions would be applied for on an annual basis. This would shift the burden of proof (and the cost of administration) to the applicant. We would still need a list of criteria to be used to ascertain eligibility. The only problem here is that the new policy would need to go out for public consultation as a LTCCP amendment under S102 of the LGA. This could not be done in time for this next rating year.
9. Out of left field. Moving the all rural properties on to capital value would be another pragmatic solution that would achieve council's objective. Lifestyle properties capital value to land value ratio is higher than larger farm properties.

My experience has been that if you start making changes to use designations purely for rating purposes you will get a flood of people trying to exploit the loophole. That is why using the Valuation Rules (that Mr Cameron called blunt), was simple and was not subject to subjective decisions on behalf of staff.

Lifestyle land, generally in a rural area, where the predominant use is for a residence and, if vacant, there is a right to build a dwelling. The land can be of variable size but must be larger than an ordinary residential allotment. The principal use of the land is non-economic in the traditional farming sense, and the value exceeds the value of comparable farmland.

Recommendation

1. Do not depart from the Valuation Rules definition of rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle,
Or
2. Amend the Rates Remission policy to include a remission category for rural lifestyle properties used for economic farming businesses uses. The remission should only relate to Land Value based rate types.

27. Environmental Services Issues

27.1 Plan Change 20

Submission 23

Horizons Regional Council has expressed concerns on the proposed deferral of new waste water reticulation to the "Gladstone Green" area particularly as Plan Change 20 has not yet been finally adopted.

Analysis: Officers are aware of the concerns and do consult with the submitter in the normal course of events on any subdivision in this area. The submitter will then be in the position to comment directly on any specific application as part of the normal planning process.

Recommendation

1. That submission 23 in relation to Plan change 20 be noted.
2. That the Submitter be advised that officers will ensure that they consult with them on any subdivisions within the area of concern.

27.2 Rural Residential Developments

Submission 26

Federated Farmers has submitted on potential incompatibilities between Rural Residential developments and rural land use activities particularly in relation to potential reverse sensitivity effects.

Analysis:

Whilst the concerns expressed are legitimate they are a normal consideration in the processing of any such subdivision applications and are more appropriately dealt in that process.

Recommendation:

1. That submission 41 in relation to reverse sensitivity be noted.

27.3 Development Contributions Amendments.

Submission No. 111

There was only one submission on the Development Contributions policy. The submitter makes no comment in regard to the amendments proposed but suggests that a development contribution should only be payable at the time of any connection to infrastructure and that, in the absence of any services connection capability, there should not be a contribution required for it as in her case. There are no points raised in connection with the specific amendments on which submissions have been sought in the Draft Annual Plan (i.e. clarifying the definition of a sleepout and exemptions for certain rural buildings).

Analysis

Matters raised in the submission have previously been the discussion of extensive discussions in the Council following which the Council resolved on its current policy. That policy provides for three triggers for Development Contributions, being subdivision, construction of a dwelling and any new connection to services. It is the submitters' contention that only the latter should apply.

Officers do not support the submission for reasons set out in previous reports and are successfully implementing the policy as adopted. No further amendments are recommended. In the submitters particular case there would not, under the current policy, be any Development Contribution for reticulated services. It is recommended that she be advised of this in the response to her submission.

Recommendation:

1. That submission 111 from R Wilkie be noted.
 2. That the amendments to the Development Contributions policy proposed in the Draft Annual Plan 2010/11 be adopted as proposed in that document.
 3. That the Development Contributions policy not be amended as a consequence of the submission.
 4. That the submitter be advised of the breakdown of the current Development Contributions as they relate to her property.
-

27.4 Open Space Strategy

Submission No. 113 and 124

The submitters expresses support for the development of an Open Space strategy which is being done in conjunction with the District Plan Review currently being undertaken (ref page 26 of the Draft Annual Plan).

Analysis

No further officer comment is needed and it is recommended that the submission be noted.

Recommendation

1. That submissions 113 and 124 in relation to the proposed Open Space Study be noted.
-
-

27.5 Environmental Health Performance Targets.

Submission 123

Submitter 123 (Dr Robert Holdaway, Manager Public Health Services, MidCentral Health), does not believe the performance targets for Environmental Services are truly measures of performance, stating a number of issues are not considered or addressed, and makes a list of suggestions for Performance Targets that need to be addressed -

A. High Risk Food premises and those with a poor compliance history should be inspected more frequently than once per year. Although the performance target states these will be 'inspected at least once a year', greater clarity could be provided identifying those that need more frequent inspection.

Analysis:

The annual inspection process identifies these at the time of their inspection, and if they are identified as requiring additional inspections during the course of the year they get it. To pre-judge an outcome is not considered appropriate. The proposal to include this in the Annual Plan is not considered to add value.

B. Where serious non-compliance exists in food premises, these should be effectively closed, either through refusing registration or closure.

Analysis:

This matter is addressed through the HDC Food Hygiene Bylaw as an operational procedure. It is believed the inspection requirement is the actual performance measure to ensure all food premises are checked, and through that process take whatever operational responses are required. In the past premises have in fact been closed as and when appropriate.

C. Council has responsibility under the Health Act 1956 to ensure that nuisances are appropriately managed. The Annual Plan should include some statement about this legislative responsibility. Serious or urgent public health risks should be responded to immediately.

Analysis;

The suggestion is supported in part, i.e., that relating to all reported environmental health risks could have reference made to the Health Act 1956 legislation. The issue around responding immediately is not supported on the basis of resourcing - the measure is around the need to ensure matters are investigated as currently stated. Obviously a major Public Health matter may well be responded to immediately but in all probability under a different set of rules, e.g., Civil/National emergency.

D. Council facilitates a number of community events and festivals. A performance target for these should be that they are run in a safe and healthy manner.

Analysis: The majority of events and festivals are not facilitated by Council, with the only involvement being knowing an event/festival is occurring and any subsequent licensing and inspection needs. These matters are addressed through normal operational procedures. Despite registration, licensing and any inspection needs, we have no control over whether these events are

run in a safe and healthy manner, this responsibility being that of the organiser. The proposal is not supported.

E. There should be a performance target for non complying resource consents.

Analysis: The submitters point in relation to non complying resource consents is not clear. The Council does employ staff, outside the Environmental Health team, for the purpose of ensuring compliance with resource consents. It is recommended that Environmental Services staff contact the submitter for clarification and any further action that may be required at an operational level.

Recommended:

1. That submission 123 from Mid Central Health be noted.
 2. That the submitter be advised that Council considers most of the matters raised in relation to Environmental Health to be legitimate concerns that are best managed at an operational level.
 3. That Environmental Services staff liaise with the submitter over any concerns in relation to non compliance with resource consents. "
-

27.6 District Plan Review

Submission Nos. 23, 123 and 124

These submitters all support the District Plan Review process and seek to be involved in it.

Analysis:

It is recommended that the submissions be noted and that the submitters be advised that the submission in relation to the District Plan Review will be referred to officers for further investigation within that project.

Recommended.

1. That submissions 23, 123 and 124 in relation to the District Plan review be noted.
 2. That the submitters be advised that the submission insofar as it relates to the District Plan Review be referred to officers for further investigation within that project.
-

27.7 Manawatu Estuary.

Submission 124

The submitter suggests that the Manawatu Estuary be added to the list of 'diverse environments' on page 19 of the Draft Annual Plan. Officers support the submission.

Recommended

1. That in response to submission 124 from the Department of Conservation the Manawatu Estuary be added to the list of 'diverse environments' on page 19 of the Draft Annual Plan 2010/11.
-

27.8 Environmental Health Fees

Submission 127

The submitter requests clarification on the need for an individual food stall licence of \$22.50 to be introduced, suggesting that this could affect the number of stall holders at events.

Analysis

The proposed fee in no way replaces Event Licences as currently available and nor is the proposal suggesting that each stall holder at an event must be individually licensed. The proposal is only to rectify current procedures in that the \$22.50 has always been charged where appropriate but was described as a 'Hawkers' fee. In addition, the fee only applies where no Event Licence is taken out. (For Fund Raising activities or charitable organisations officer discretion on applying the fee is applied).

Recommendation.

1. That proposed Environmental Health fees not be amended as a result of the submission received.
 2. That officers advise the submitter of reasons for this fee as stated above.
-

28. Levin Business Association Funding Request

Submission 41

The Association has sought funding assistance as set out in an attachment to their submission.

Analysis:

In consideration of the submission staff are identifying whether there may be any alternative sources of funding available for this request for a grant. In doing so it is acknowledged that there is a need to consider the objective of any fund provided. We will also consider the objective of the grant, whether it is sustainable and how outcomes will be delivered to the community. Once this work has been completed it will be considered by a grants subcommittee.

Recommendation.

1. That submission 41 in relation to a request for a grant be noted.
2. That the CEO engage with Levin Business Association to consider options for viable funding sources and definite outcomes.

29. Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Centre.

Submission 125

The submission advises the Council of the establishment of the Resource Centre and the approval of funding for a six year multi million dollar study to restore and enhance coastal ecosystems. Details were tabled at the hearing.

Analysis: The study will be of great value to the submitter and the whole District and the submitter is to be congratulated on obtaining access to the funding.

Recommended:

1. That Submission 125 be noted.
 2. That the submitter be congratulated on obtaining the funding and advised that the Council looks forward to being able to assist as and when appropriate.
 3. That Council undertake a site visit.
 4. That Councillors and Senior Staff meet with the submitter to understand the governance role of the proposed Centre.
-

30. Funding Requests

30.1 Submission No.1

The Raukawa District Maori Wardens Association (RDMWA) is seeking \$15,400 from the HDC, as this District's share of the costs of establishing and operating over the next twelve months a regional base for Maori Wardens. It is intended that the base be in the Highbury area of Palmerston North. From this base the Maori Wardens will be able to provide a range of services to the Palmerston North city and to the Rangitaane and Raukawa Maori Warden Districts (inclusive of the Horowhenua District).

Analysis

Generally Council has not supported capital projects outside the Horowhenua District through any of the grant schemes Council has at its disposal. Nor does it allocate grants for operational costs outside the district. However, it should be noted that Council does fund the Horowhenua Neighbourhood Support Group, which delivers services outside the District, namely Otaki.

Recommendation(s):

Council declines the request for funding from RDMWA for \$15,400, but requests the Chief Executive refer the matter to the new Community Well Being Committee when it considers the Horowhenua Social Development Strategy.

30.2 Submission No.27

Suggesting that Council introduce a grant applicable for a new event or tourism based incentive which assists with seed capital.

Analysis

Council's Major Events Marketing Grant and Horowhenua Strategic Grant seems to meet the needs that the submitter has identified.

Recommendation :

The Chief Executive advise the submitter the purpose and criteria for the Major Events Marketing Grant and Horowhenua Strategic Grant.

30.3 Submission No.28

Seeking assistance in the promotion of reasons to visit the area, through a more hands on approach in the Horowhenua region in regard to Tourism and Economic Development .

Analysis

As an accommodation provider for tourists in the region it would be useful to consider the thoughts of the submitter when Council reviews the Economic Development service delivery this year.

Recommendation:

Council notes the submission and undertakes to consult with the submitter when the Economic Development services review is undertaken in 2010.

31. Te Awahou Nieuw Stroom Project

Submission No. 33

The submitter questions the wisdom of Council's involvement in the proposed Te Awahou Nieuw Stroom project in Foxton. The submitter seeks assurances from Council that there will be no risk attached to this form of involvement and invites Council to state publicly how will the investment be protected.

Analysis

Further information and consultation with the community will be undertaken by the Te Awahou Nieuw Stroom Trust as specific details are developed around the design, costs , funding, resource consents and ongoing management

As a key stakeholder in the project Council will ensure its investment, in whatever form, is prudently managed on behalf of the community. The means to do this will be presented to Council and the community as further details around the project are developed.

As a key stakeholder in the Horowhenua community Grey Power should be availed of the details of the project.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Grey Power be fully briefed on the Te Awahou project and be kept up to date on any future developments.

32. Levin War Memorial Hall

Submission No. 35

Supports the proposed refurbishing of the Levin Memorial Hall, but expresses concern about the fees.

Recommendation

That the submission be noted.

33. Foxton War Memorial Hall

Submission Nos 39, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99

Supports the refurbishment, interior repairs and decoration at the Foxton Memorial Hall.

Recommendation

That the submissions be noted.

34. Service at Shannon Library

Submission Nos 80, 81

Recommendation

That the submissions be noted and the submitters concerns be forwarded to the Horowhenua Library Trust for their response.

35. Submission No.127

Number 2: Community Support

To have clear criteria on who could receive a reduce rate of hiring the local community halls. This would assist small leisure/ recreational groups to arrange local events and would impact the reality if events are implemented or not.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the criteria for discounts available for Hall hireage be circulated to the submitter and posted on Council web site.

Community Support – Expenditure Programme -Grants

Number 3: Reference Page 47

To stimulate new money in the district rather a redistribution of money already circulated from existing local events. There is a need for a grant applicable only to profit making businesses, to plan and implement attractions aimed to stimulate visitors that come from outside the Horowhenua. This grant would be very valuable to assist with start up costs besides marketing components. The

aim of such projects would be to create demand for visitors to stay in accommodation sources located in the Horowhenua.

I wonder if there would be room within the Strategic Grant for this.

Analysis

The local events marketing grant, major event marketing grant and strategic grant are all available to profit making businesses for their respective purpose.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission be noted.

Community Support – Tourism and Economic Development.

Number 4: Reference Page 44

To have clarity on what the success factors and reasons for maintaining a formal financial connection with Nature Coast rather than putting financial resources and effort into a specifically branded Levin, Foxton, Shannon and Ohau (Horowhenua) tourist / business development organisation.

Analysis

The matter the submitter raises will be considered when Council undertakes a review of the Economic Development service over the next 6 months.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission be noted.

Community Support – Expenditure Programme –Grants

Number 5: Reference Page 47

To create greater clarity on the criteria demands for existing funding grants. Who can apply and what the funding will be used on etc. There is a need for further criteria information on the application forms.

Recommendation

It is recommended that more detail on the criteria for each grant classification be posted on Council's web site

Accounting Policies page 69.

Number 7: Reference: The environmental affects of the waste deposits in the Levin/Hokio land fill. To gain full confidence in the system there is a need for further information on the company involved in the making/ maintaining the lining at the Levin/Hokio land fill which is aimed to protect the environment. Plus further information in regard to the resource consent and testing standards, in conjunction with Horizons Regional Council. This is to ensure that the company uses environmentally sound practices for the safety of our citizens, land, water, animal and plant life.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission be noted.

Submission No.36 – Horowhenua Youth Voice in their submission to Council stated that “Youth of Horowhenua need to be doing the right thing and having their say in the decision making process”.

In this submission the Youth Voice proposed that their minutes be passed at full Council meetings, that they have a member present at each Council meeting to express concern/(comment) on behalf of the Youth Voice and in turn Councillors could talk to the Youth Voice to give a greater understanding of local body process and proceedings.

Analysis

The Horowhenua Youth Voice was established in 2009. It has been an outstanding success, with a committee of dedicated enthusiastic energetic young people who are looking to involve themselves in the affairs of our community at youth level.

The objective in establishing the Youth Voice was to enable significant issues of importance to that part of our community which clearly represents our future to be brought to the attention of council – and vice versa.

The Youth Voice meet on a regular basis (monthly). They are supported at executive level by the CEO and at an administrative level by Group Support Officer (Colette) and our Community Development Policy Analysis (Monique).

There is very real value to Council in promoting a more inclusive approach to the Youth Voice. This approach will ensure that their concerns are heard but, more importantly, that Council has a strong communication line with a credible group of people in our community that we have often struggled to engage with.

It would be prudent in the first instance to incorporate a report from the Youth Council into the agenda of each monthly Council meeting. Within such a report I would envisage copies of minutes, reference to items of importance to the youth of our district and, where sought, formal responses to information requests from Council.

Recommendation

That Council asks the CEO to incorporate a report from Youth Voice on the agenda for future Council meetings.

MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

“THAT the Horowhenua District Council pursuant to Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, resolves that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act or Section 6 or Section 7 or Section 9 of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may require, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public.”

Item 1908 - Former Countdown Building
Item 1909 - Property Issues

Reasons for Confidentiality

These Reports are **CONFIDENTIAL** in accordance with Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, which permits the meeting to be closed to the public for business relating to the following grounds: -

48(1a) That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.

Subject to sections 6, 7 and 17 of the Local Government Official Information Act 1987, the withholding of the information is necessary to:

7(2a) Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons.

7(2i) Enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).

7(2j) Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.