

**MINUTES OF THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN SUBMISSION DELIBERATIONS  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIA ZOOM,  
2 NORMAN KIRK DRIVE ROLLESTON  
ON TUESDAY 7 JUNE 2022 BETWEEN 9.00AM AND 5.00PM**

**PRESENT**

Mayor S T Broughton, Councillors, M A Alexander, S Epiha, J A Gallagher (*via Zoom*), D Hasson, M P Lemon, S G McInnes, G S Miller, R H Mugford (*via Zoom*), & N C Reid

**ATTENDEES**

Messrs. D Ward (Chief Executive), K Mason (Group Manager Organisational Performance, D Marshall (Group Manager Property), M Washington (Group Manager Infrastructure), S Hill (Group Manager Communication and Customers), T Harris (Group Manager Regulatory and Environmental Services) A Mazey (Asset Manager Transportation), M England (Asset Manager Water Services) and; Mesdames, D Kidd (Group Manager Community Services and Facilities), N Smith (Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive) and Ms T Davel (Committee Advisor).

**APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Bland and Councillor Lyall for absence, and from Councillor Hasson for lateness.

**Moved** – Councillor Lemon / **Seconded** – Councillor Reid

*'That the Council receive the apologies in respect of Councillors Bland and Lyall for absence and for Councillor Hasson for lateness.'*

**CARRIED**

**OPENING COMMENTS**

Mayor Broughton opened the noting that today Council comes together to review the views of the community and assess whether any change direction from what was proposed is required.

Mr Ward noted that the outcome of today's deliberations will be to finalise the Draft Annual Plan for 2022/2023 for adoption by Council at its 22 June 2022 Council meeting.

## CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### 1. Minutes of the 2022 / 2023 Draft Annual Plan Submission Hearings, held in the Council Chambers on Monday 30 May 2022

**Moved** – Councillor Mugford / **Seconded** – Councillor McInnes

*'That the Council confirms the minutes of the 2022 / 2023 Draft Annual Plan Submission Hearings held on Monday 30 May 2022, as circulated.'*

**CARRIED**

## DELIBERATIONS

The Group Manager Organisational Performance spoke to his paper, noting that Council has received 140 written submissions with 28 of those being oral submissions – less than 1% of our rating units.

It was noted that the Asset Manager Water Services has an amendment to the water race closure to be discussed later in the meeting.

### 1. FUNDING PROPOSAL FOR THE HORORĀTĀ COMMUNITY HUB

Councillor Alexander agreed it was important that Council confirm that this is subject to a satisfactory Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). He said it was important that the community understood this building will be transferred and that Council will not take responsibility for operations and maintenance costs going forward. A MoU is the way to go so that all parties have explicitly agreed to this.

Councillor Epiha said that he largely agreed with the comments made so far and is in support of this recommendation being subject to a MoU. He asked about the transfer of the \$1m but also the total value of build and land. He said the discussion will continue and the MoU will drill down into these requirements.

Councillor Lemon commented that the point has been reached where we have to push go. The MoU is crucial and needs to come back to full Council for approval. He said the MoU must cover all the details including the maintenance and depreciation costs as these tend to be forgotten about – Council does not want to pass over a white elephant. He said this was possibly the best outcome.

Councillor Reid said that she felt uneasy about this. She said she can see from the Hororātā point of view that there has been a lot of work put into this. From a community perspective, this is going to be put into the Trust but down the track, if there is an issue with the trust, it would be unsure what would happen. The community needs to know there is a back stop. They have the money, enthusiasm and plans, but what if the unexpected happens.

Councillor McInnes commented that she agreed with what has been said already.

Councillor Miller said he has a different view and thinks it is a suboptimal outcome for the community. He said they are sick of dealing with the Council which has a policy of building brand new facilities on reserves, but when it comes to a community that is not growing as fast, this does not happen. He said he support this as he has heard from the community that they accuse Council of not listening.



Councillor Miller said that in his view, the community is saying they will get behind this in the absence of a better alternative. He said the community has been worn down by Council. He commented that in three years' time, the community will be satisfied with the outcome – Council could have made a better long term decision, but took the easy path instead.

Councillor Mugford said that he agreed with some of what Councillor Miller had to say. He agreed there is an element of the community feeling worn down. Councillor Mugford referred to the journey that the community has been on including having approval in the previous LTP (\$4.2m). When COVID happened, the Council took \$1m out. He asked what other projects Council took 40% out of like they did for the Hororātā project. He then noted that a Committee of Councillor Gallagher, Councillor Bland, himself and a staff member was formed to work through the matter. The committee thought they had found the answer, but then then Council made it go through the Draft Annual Plan process.

Councillor Mugford stated that Council should be supporting this. He said a precedent had been set in a building in Lincoln when Council gave considerable amount of money to the building. He said he has a lot of faith in this community. He also noted that Prebbleton has the same type of committee and they get paid insurance and power and Council is telling Hororātā that it is not going to do the same.

Councillor Gallagher said that she seconded and agreed wholeheartedly with the comments made by Councillor Mugford. She referred to the trials and tribulations and that the community is keen to move on. She said she believes this is the best outcome for them.

Mayor Broughton reconfirmed the need to ensure that a MoU is drawn up, with the Group Manager Property speaking briefly to the process of drawing this up.

## **2. CLOSURE OF PARTS OF THE UPPER ELLESMERE WATER RACE NETWORK**

The Asset Manager Water Services spoke to this item referring to a slide which set out which small section is not being closed for the time being to allow a submitter to deal with their water issues.

Councillor Miller asked about the dry sections of the race, and did it need to be closed if it was dry, as landowners must have found alternative sources already. To this staff responded that the further you travel down the line, the more likely the race is to dry out.

Councillor Miller then noted his support saying it had been in the Draft Annual Plan for several years in a row. He noted that he continues to hear people referring to these as amenity, stating that they are stock water races, not amenity races.

Councillor Alexander said he was happy with amended proposal.

Councillor Epiha said he was happy to support the closure given the majority of submitters were in favour.

Councillor Lemon referred to the points which had been made, and noted his support for the staff recommendation.

Councillors Reid, McInnes, Gallagher and Mugford all noted their support.

### **3. RATING FOR WATER RACES**

The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted strong support from the community on this item.

Councillor McInnes said that overall she support staff comments, noting it is difficult to make everybody happy but support.

Councillor Miller noted that he is happy in general terms, however would prefer to have the water race rate and land drainage rate integrated into one rating factor and make it district wide. Thinking about the one water strategy, he said Council should signal this as a transition rather than an actual outcome. He said it is worth reflecting on the Ashburton experience where there was significant flooding and a small number of ratepayers provided protection for the whole district. In general terms, he said Rolleston is protected by the Catchment in Malvern and other measures to keep water away.

Councillor Alexander supported the rate saying it is a good idea.

Councillor Epiha said he supports this rate, and acknowledges all of those who are opposed to it as well. He would like to see this amalgamated into the new rate.

Councillor Lemon said this was a step in the right direction and is as elegant a solution as can be achieved at this stage. He noted it was a compromise, but it is important that Council do something this time as it has been in previous Long Term Plans.

Councillor Reid stated her support as did Councillor Gallagher.

Councillor Mugford said this was a great start and Council should continue to look at this in the future.

The Mayor referred to the 2024 timeline and that having an answer and a package going forward is important, noting that the One Water Strategy will help with that. He noted that these two waters are sitting outside the three waters proposal.

Councillor Miller stated that the real urgency to his mind is the actual identification and documentation of the residual network. He asked what was stopping Council from telling its community what the residual network will be.

### **4. LAND DRAINAGE RATING AND ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENT TARGETED RATE**

Councillor Reid said that Forest and Bird requested that Council look at a district-wide ecological rate in the future. She noted her support for this rate.

Councillor McInnes noted her support as well. She said she agreed with Councillor Miller's previous comments that it needs to come into the One Water Strategy. She also noted the consequences of closing races saying it can be an issue with flooding resilience.

Councillor Miller said that the rate is a small amount, but Council is getting into ECan territory. He said he would like clarity around ensuring Council is not stepping into their space or duplicating effort. He said that a theme in the submissions is around rating affordability and that once a rate is put in place it tends to be there forever.



Councillor Miller said that with regards to land drainage, there are real winners and losers around this package. The underlying theme is that for those who have managed and rated their scheme appropriately, they do not feel that their rated cash should be put into the bucket and that those funds should be ring-fenced. He said he is still of the view that this is only a step in the right direction.

Councillor Alexander said he supported these changes and that when Council changes rates there are always winners and losers. He said that Council needs to sit down with ECan before their next LTP regarding rating issues, including unrated rivers as this could be an Ecan function rather than a Council function. This gives Council an 18 month timeframe.

Councillor Epiha agreed and said he also agrees with Councillor Miller's comments about amalgamation of these rates. He asked what percentage of this rate is for biodiversity.

Councillor Lemon said he takes the points about equity of those committees. Any district-wide rate has to deal with that. He said he likes the idea of ring-fencing but that does not answer the deficit budgets which will come back to Council to deal with. He said he supported the ecological rate and going forward reasoned discussions can be had with all players. He said that Council does not have a regional or national approach to follow and will have some quite heavy obligations under the NPS for Biodiversity. He said the entire discussion around how we fund biodiversity as being ratable or not is a discussion Council needs to have.

Councillors Mugford and Gallagher both noted their support.

Mayor Broughton said there are winners, there will be losers, and if everyone was a winner it would not be a difficult discussion. He noted that a programme of works going forward will be completed.

Councillor Lemon stated that he understands that if a committee has a reserve account or surplus funds, it will stay with them, but that from this point on, it will be put into one bucket.

Councillor Miller referenced the L2 committee which has a significant budget around desilting activities, and noted they had just bought a new weed boat. He said their desire was to desilt the river from lake to source following the earthquake, but have not been able to do that. They are now taking a scientific approach, and that money will be earmarked for this.

## **5. RATES**

Councillor Lemon said that Council needs to be mindful of rates. He noted the work being done around investment portfolio – and that this will continue. He referred to submissions on SUIPs and referred to the previous subgroup work undertaken looking at this. He stated that it was time to look at this again. It was extremely difficult to strike a balance. But with the rise of tiny homes and multiple dwellings, Council may need to look at this again on how it is managed outside of Selwyn and that some national direction may be required.

Councillor Reid seconded Councillor Lemon's comments saying that the SUIP discussion did not produce a cut and dry solution. She said she understands where people are coming from, but there is no easy solution. She asked if there is something on the LIMS or a trigger at consent stage stating that extra rating may be applicable.



Councillor McInnes stated that the increase in rates is unfortunate. She said she tries to reflect on paying more for insurance than rates, stating that she knows what she get for her rates. Councillor McInnes supports taking another look at SUIPs due to different types of dwellings.

Councillor Miller referred to Mr Noble's submission which he thought was good. He said it is hard not to feel sympathy, but when the subgroup tried to find a solution, they could not come up with one. He said that Mr Noble makes very good points and said that within the rating factors there is some ability to manipulate some of them. Councillor Miller said that the best thing we could do is to give management the right to make exemptions. He referring to the four wellbeings and that having an elderly relative living with you does not seem like a rating issue and that it does not feel right.

Councillor Alexander referred to people thwarting the system. He said people were building granny flats, with some renting them out. He added a warning that the DPR is far more permissive on second properties. He said he agrees there are inequities to items such as solid waste and water (where there is one water supply) and Council could come up with exemptions – but that with any system there are always inequities. He said Council receives the same complaints from people having to pay for facilities they do not use. He said it would be good to review at the next LTP, but stated that allowing staff more discretion within a good set of guidelines is the right way to go.

Councillor Epiha said that rates continue to go up. He stated that a wise investment portfolio is a big contributor to subsidising rates and that he is looking forward to doing this more on the next term.

Councillor Mugford stated that rates are a factor, and that Council does the best it can for its communities to keep rates down, while also supplying everything that is needed. He said he does not think there is an easy answer to this. He referred to examples of second dwellings and the need to have exemptions.

The Environmental and Regulatory Manager stated that family flats are disappearing from District Plan. He said the government's agenda for intensification is a valid one and these issues will come up a lot more. As such his view is that coming up with a set of guidelines for exemptions is the pragmatic way forward.

The Chief Executive stated that Council is 15 months away from reviewing rates. Council has a fairly traditional rating model, but it is time for that to be reviewed. He said that undertaking a rating view is a bit of a balloon-squeezing exercise. He said where pressure comes off some areas, it goes onto others and that exemptions have an impact.

Mayor Broughton said that Council has looked at changing rates invoices to show greater clarity of where rates sit and where investments have been assigned.

*Councillor Hasson arrived at 10.00am.*

The Group Manager Organisational Performance said that Council needs to take a broader view of this. He said there has been a lot of pushback from ratepayers who do not want to contribute to development which clouds the ability to provide exemptions and makes things quite tricky. He said discretion is given to some ratepayers in certain circumstances, but the challenge is at what level this should occur. Guidance may be useful, but may not cover all circumstances.



Councillor Miller said that Council needs to make sure the person is getting all their entitlements from WINZ, and that rental agreements should be formalized.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted that this would be a useful point and will form some of the discussions. He said there are some genuine cases, whereas others may be pushing the boundaries. In regards to Councillor Hasson's comments regarding how Council deals with an exemption process and verification process and being lenient around relatives living in second dwellings – he said this would lift administration costs, but a full review will be done.

Mayor Broughton said that Council will continue to treat with compassion and use discretion where it can. A review will be conducted as part of the next Long Term Plan, including the rules around intensification.

## **6. LEESTON HEALTH AND AGED CARE**

Councillor Epiha thanked staff for comments and for being supportive, however Council is non-committal at this stage. He said a lot has been done to provide facilities that cater for younger families, however there is a lack of services in the rural areas where a lot of people live. He said he seeks a commitment to a feasibility study.

Councillor Lemon referred to the commentary in the papers, and is supporting of continuing with a feasibility study stating that now is the time. He commented that he had recently attended the AGM of the Friends of the Ellesmere Hospital saying that it was noted that the current building has a finite life. Councillor Lemon said that Council has a relationship with the medical profession built by Councillor Miller and staff, and a replicable model which can be taken across the district and maybe Canterbury, and although this is in the Ellesmere Ward, it is not just an Ellesmere discussion. Council has Rūnanga support, and with a new health entity coming in - this is a once in a lifetime opportunity. He said it could also be extremely beneficial to Council as an investment going forward.

Councillor Reid said this is an interesting position to be in at the moment and with the relationship Council has with the DHB with regards to the Health Hub in Rolleston. Council can look at that and be proud. She said she sees the potential with what has been raised from Councillors Miller, Lemon and Epiha about Leeston and age care and agreed there is an aging population who are going to be needing this care now and into the future. However she did state her concern that Council has no idea how the new health authority is going to land. She does support Council helping with the feasibility study, but is cautious about the unknown environment going forward as it is different to the current DHB model.

Councillor McInnes stated that overall she supports finding out more about how this proposal could become fully formed. She noted her agreement with Councillor Reid around the transition time with the new health entity, but agrees the proposal is needed. She said she would love to see a wider range of services provided for issues such as diabetes, chronic conditions, and that it would be good to look at this if this gets built, to fit as many units on there as possible.

Councillor Miller stated that Councillor McInnes had hit the nail on the head with her comments – and it is a wider issue than just aged care and there are opportunities for mental health, dental, optometry etc. He said that whilst it is important to support people to live in their own homes, there is a point where they need additional care and he did not want to see Council undersell its communities. He referred to the work undertaken in Kaikoura and Akaroa.



Councillor Miller said the catchment is key – there is a large area from Rakaia, Malvern down to Rolleston. He said Council should be in this space and advocating – challenge is although CDHB and Council has a good relationships, each has a slightly different outcome in mind. Councillor Miller said he did not health service provision in Rolleston if finished either. He noted that he is very supportive of this project and that now is the time to proceed.

Councillor Alexander noted his support for a feasibility study and asked if it was going to involve staff time and funding saying there needs to be a definitive statement of what is needed. He said that Council wants the best for its communities but health care is the responsibility of Health NZ, as Council is not a health department.

Councillor Alexander said that Council can help building the infrastructure, but not the provision of healthcare. He said it needs to be clear that Council will be the supporter on a commercial basis, but not the provider. It will be a topic for the next LTP as it is a big decision.

Councillor Hasson referred to other facility in Leeston, being Abbeyfield, and said that the process that was undertaken may be of help.

Councillor Gallagher noted her agreement with Councillor Lemon's comments that now is a good time to look into this. Council should look after our communities so this needs to be looked at. She noted her support.

Councillor Mugford referred to this association with the Friends of Darfield Hospital and said that if they kept throwing money into a hospital then it will stay there, but at the moment it would help if Council could coordinate with CDHB to see what the services will be in the future on a Selwyn-wide basis over the next ten years.

Mayor Broughton said Council knew there needed to be more medical services and referred to Council stepping into projects such as Izone and the Health Hub to kick start things. We are not the provider of the services, but Council should advocating for services as there is a lot of uncertainty about what Health NZ would do especially in the rural communities.

Council being in this space is good, and would be keen to have clarity about the role of parties, resources and budget.

The Chief Executive referred to how Council could continue to advocate on health matters on behalf of its communities. He noted the need to draft a Terms of Reference for the feasibility study, including resourcing by key council staff, Rūnanga, and the community-at-large, and then brought back to Council by end of the year so planning can commence in 2023/2024.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance said that it was largely staff time at this point, only discussion now, not what a building, the services, or an investment return might look like. With regards to the new health provider – Council would need to know what their strategy was for rural health.

It was agreed that discussions with the new entity is important, while at the same time, working with the local community, Friends Groups of both hospitals and the Rūnanga to understand what their health needs are.



The Group Manager Property referred to the relationship with Darfield around the medical centre there. He said staff and Council are unsure where Health NZ are going to sit on this. He said Council needs to understand that if this proposal is good for the Selwyn community, and how it might link into the plan for Leeston Park, medical centre and library space. It was noted that the work that had been led by the Friends of Ellesmere Hospital is very helpful. Staff can come back to Council with the proposal and what it means financially. This could be a very good space for Council to get into, but with its eyes wide open.

Councillor Miller noted that clarity is required and that Council is good at providing the infrastructure to enable services. He said it was a long term exercise and needs time to work through and that if the building blocks were in place by the end of this year that would be a good start. He said it was key to facilitate discussions with CDHB and ensure they do not walk away from their responsibilities.

Mayor Broughton referred to the key messages for staff and Councillors being the support for the continuation of health services in rural communities; no lessening of the investment and the funds and budgets currently in place; but that future provision might not be different to what we provide now. Council would be looking to the best health outcomes for those communities.

*The meeting adjourned for a break at 10.40am, and recommenced at 11.00am*

## **7. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND RESERVES**

Councillor Hasson thanked staff for the supplementary report which made the issue clearer. She asked about discretionary funding for community groups, saying at present if they apply for an allocation for a project, they might not get enough – referring to a funding shortfall. She asked if bollard placement could be added to Council's works programme - in relation to the recent spate of ram raids – as there is not enough in the fund to provide these for Council's business ratepayers.

Councillor Epiha talked about lighting at the Leeston Dog Park and said it was good for security. He also endorsed Councillor Hasson's previous comments about security.

Mayor Broughton spoke to the items set out in the report saying that staff are aware of each of these projects. He said that some will come up soon, others further out, and some may need to be considered in the next Long Term Plan.

Councillor Hasson asked if the \$1k per annum funding can be rolled over as she had received requests from some committees to do that.

Councillor Lemon said there were a number of concerns about the venue hire for Committees especially around the six meetings per year limit. He noted that the discretionary fund had ceased quite rightly due to COVID, but that Council has not responded appropriately to new requests. He said Council needed to consider the amount of times these committees meet and 6 times was minimal and should be lifted. He also noted comments from the Dunsandel Community Committee which clearly wants a relationship with Council.

Councillor Lemon commented that some of the other issues on the list are being dealt with elsewhere. He referred to Sandy Knolls where staff wrote in their comments that submitters should contact staff but it should be the other way around. He said that the Foster Park Homestead matter should come back to Council as the information provided was not nearly enough to make a decision.



Councillor Reid referred to the community fund asking if there is some ring-fenced fund that community committees can apply to for township projects. She said that the advantage with township committees was committees could pay for things. It was noted by Councillor Reid that Council needs to look at the spending of those funds and the accountability of the funding. She referred to funding of smaller projects such as those posed by the Lake Coleridge community. Councillor Reid would also like the Foster Park report to come back to council as it needs a good basis for any decisions its makes on an ongoing financial perspective.

Councillor McInnes spoke about community funding and said as far as bollards are concerned, the question is who owns the land, as if it is not Council, then the landlord might need to consider this. She noted her frustration around community committee funding, and noted that recently Council had put on a community funding workshop which she attended in part, and did not see any community committee members in attendance. With regard to Foster Park Homestead, Councillor McInnes noted that she is interested in hearing what people want to use it for.

Councillor Miller stated that he feels sorry for the Kirwee Bowling club who has put the infrastructure in where they thought it should go. He said he supports some urgency being put in place to sort this situation out. With regards to the railway replica he said that it sounds like a Kiwirail project.

Councillor Miller said the big issues was expanding the funding for community committees. He referred to Council trying to consolidate committees, to have less, but operate more effective. He said he is hearing locally that committees are still totally confused, and have not received any written advice from council. Councillor Miller referred to funding for flags in Lincoln, which no longer exists and asked if this is going to be picked up by Council, as there is no funding over \$1k for the community committees. He stated that amalgamation of committees started out as an admirable idea but the community committees feel there is a better chance of things happening, if they are a committee of council. He said he does not support the way it is heading, and supports some sought of reinstatement of funding.

Councillor Alexander noted that he has a great deal of sympathy for what Councillor Miller is saying. He said get on with the lighting at Kirwee Bowling Club. He said it should be noted that there is a pump track being built in Rolleston with no Council funding.

Councillor Alexander referred to the Lake Coleridge projects as all being worthy and also said that the Darfield Aquatics work will be needed sooner rather than later. He said he would like to have an additional item noted regarding the recording of the oral history of some areas including discussions with the older residents about their early memories – if they are not captured them, they will be gone. Agreed that Council needs to look further at Foster Park Homestead.

Councillor Alexander commented Community Committees should be allowed funding for up to 11 meetings per year and ending at 9pm (not 8pm). He said that Service Level Agreements with committees should set out that Council will provide a meeting room and discretionary funding and set out what is expected of them. By doing this, Council will build good productive relationships.



Councillor Gallagher said she is concerned about the small works in communities which need to be done if there is no committee looking after it. She asked if Council staff will come and check each community to see what needs to be done. Regarding funding, she said that Council has not thought this through properly and a number of committees are upset. Agrees with lighting updates and likes the comment around history being kept from around the smaller areas.

Councillor Mugford said from feedback he has received from the meetings he attends, Community Committees would like to continue and keep funding for 11 meetings and retain the roving secretarial services. He said there are many committees looking at raising funds for lighting and security, which would have happened anyway under the old funding model.

Mayor Broughton noted that there is general agreement that the 24 committees in a previous Council report would have funding for a secretary; that the \$1k per year be continued; allow Committees to apply to the community fund; and allow meeting room hire up to 11 meetings per year.

The Group Manager Community Services and Facilities spoke about the 24 committees and said Council decided to let the 24 committees decide for themselves if they wanted to be committees of Council. She said that to date, 11 committees have said they would like to continue as residents groups independent of Council and four have confirmed they wish to remain a committee of Council. She said that until Council understands the position of all committees it would have been premature to develop a policy. The intent is now to develop a Policy in regards to that. In terms of funding, she confirmed that there is no allocation for some of the funds beyond 30 June 2023.

The Group Manager Community Services and Facilities said that in terms of the comments around Sandy Knolls, there is an opportunity to discuss that idea further. She then commented, that on that basis staff are still waiting for nine of the committees to decide which they want to be – they have their current entitlements up to June 2023.

The Chief Executive said the journey of community committees would always be emotive, noting that this has been ongoing for two years now. He said that if committees are no longer in the communities then members of the community would contact Council directly. The Chief Executive agreed that staff needed to contact the submitters in Sandy Knolls directly. He then spoke to the required feasibility studies for several projects listed in the Deliberations report.

Councillor Alexander said Springfield didn't ask for a feasibility study as they had already done that. He said there was no DC funding in the Malvern Ward labelled for this project so would have to come from the reserve rating budget. He asked if Council wishes to fund this or not.

The Group Manager Property said it would cost about \$400k to have an asphalt track laid – as to get the rolling effect asphalt would need to be laid. He said that about \$10k was spent in Kirwee for material and an excavator. A feasibility study is required to figure out how much money it would cost. Until the Prebbleton track is finished it will be difficult to see how it works.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance said the staff recommendation is that the projects in the Annual Plan remain as is, and as projects come up staff look at bringing these into the plan following appropriate due diligence. Staff didn't see anything significant that needed to be changed to the Annual Plan.



Councillor Miller said the perception by committees is that better engagement is needed on the process and that they might feel better as enduring committees of council. He said that the 11 who decided to become Residents Associations did so because of funding. The remainder should go back to the original funding model or provide an alternative funding stream.

Mayor Broughton then referred to each project as set out in the staff report, and the desired way forward being:

- (a) Lighting improvements and Kirwee Bowling Club and Leeston Dog Park – staff will continue to work with those submitters during the normal process
- (b) Springfield Pump Track – no new funding will be allocated to this project at present with a suggestion that it is put forward to the next Draft Annual Plan. Councillor Alexander asked if Council could offer the project some money to which the Group Manager Property said he would look at something inhouse.
- (c) Lake Coleridge Projects – to be managed by staff during normal processes.
- (d) Darfield Aquatics – look at the plan for spend in current Annual Plan, but Council does not want to over-capitalize.
- (e) Darfield Pond – as per maintenance on reserve work.
- (f) Sandy Knolls replica railway station – overall Council is supportive of project but Kiwirail needs to be part of it the discussion. Council will not be contributing any funds. Council staff will work with the submitter to develop a proposal for a project to be included in the 2023/2024 Draft Annual Plan for funding.
- (g) Foster Park Homestead – this is subject to a future report to Council. It is acknowledged that work us to be done around the financial and other impacts.

Councillor Reid referred to the submission from R Green with regards to an earthquake memorial for Darfield. Mayor Broughton noted that perhaps something could be installed for the 15/20<sup>th</sup> year memorial and form part of the Annual Plan process for next year. Councillor Alexander asked if this could be a project for the community Board, to which Councillor Gallagher gave some background information.

Councillor Lemon asked is there a timeframe on producing an action plan for the above projects as a follow up. The Chief Executive said that the timeline is the end of the calendar year.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted that staff are preparing some great strategies which is where these projects will be included and Council needs to stay true to these strategies.

Councillor Lemon noted that it is the role of Councillors to receive good ideas and those good ideas may not be the ones that they would have thought off. He said this is where the report back in six months' time will be valid. He said, it is not about adding or fiddling, it is about understanding the action plan.



## **Community Committees Discussion**

Councillor Miller stated that the reason groups have not made a decision yet is they still wondering about the 'why' and what Council is trying to achieve. They think they are doing good things but the whole thing is driven by funding. It is being taken away from the committees as a COVID measure and we intended to bring it back afterwards. At the moment committees are offered \$1k and after that they cannot apply for community funding. He said that for groups with a lot of passion for their community he feels it is very dismissive. He referred to opening up a community fund grant and in the absence of this he would like funding reinstated as per before COVID.

The Group Manager Community Services and Facilities said that if it is the will of the Council, then funding could be given consideration within the policy as could minute taking services and venue hire. She suggested that, given the process underway is not yet concluded, making these decisions halfway through the process would leave Council with no option to go back and start the process again. It was noted that some residents groups did see the funding as an incentive but also valued some independence from the rules and obligations of Council, and being able to advocate and submit to Council.

The Group Manager Community Services and Facilities stated that an earlier draft Policy had been prepared and that this was a key component of the engagement with Committees in 2021. Once the decisions of Committees are communicated to Council, a further Policy will be developed if the Committee decisions support continuance of Community Committees of Council. Such a Policy may give consideration to resourcing, minute taking services and hall hire, without specifically stating what that will look like.

Mayor Broughton referred to the amount of detail. He said that the key part is that Council provide provision in the budget for a possible outcome, but not land on the policy today.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted that staff will need to rework some parts of the plan but that \$1k per committee is manageable as is the roving secretarial services.

The Chief Executive stated that Council cannot resolve to do anything today, but can signal what they would like staff to assess the cost of, including servicing requirements, secretary, resourcing, and how it will be funded. He noted this would lead to increase the rate. He said clarity is required.

Councillor McInnes said the discretionary fund is one component and that it is also about representation and committees being able to articulate well. She said that some have done it well in the past, and others have not and many committees have not been representative of its community. She said that if communities have a good idea to use money, then they should tell Council and the chances are they will get a straight run through the community funding process. Councillor McInnes said she does not think it is wrong to ask Committees to justify how they are going to spend their money, noting there have been cases where certain committees have asked acted as a gatekeeper and do not take account of people who come and talk to them. She said the old model needs to change.

Councillor Alexander said that the old formula was \$2.50 per resident but does not suggest that that is what Council should go back to. With regards to making a provision in the Annual Plan he suggested putting in \$100k subject to how it is to be allocated. He referred to the Rolleston Residents Association stating that the original purpose of the discretionary fund was for projects that the community needed which did not make it into the Annual Plan process.



He said we need to treat these committees with respect and acknowledge their passion for their communities.

Councillor Lemon stated some committees did not want to make a decision because they do not understand the outcome and the direction. He referred to Dunsandel and Doyleston as good examples of combining committees in the community and have good representation. He said that Council has to sort out that feeling of distrust saying he does not have his community behind him at the moment in this regard.

Councillor Hasson said that most of the committees she is on have been amalgamated. She said that Council is told time and time again that \$24k is a drop in the bucket. These projects are community projects and ratepayers benefit from them – and gives them a sense of pride in their community. Selwyn is made up of a lot of little communities. Councillor Hasson said that \$1k is a minimum until Council sorts out a process of where the funds can be secured from, but she would like to see being something substantial. She would also like to see roving secretarial services reinstated as well as free hire of halls for community committees.

Councillor Epiha said he supported the discretionary funding reinstated saying that the committees and volunteers need to be fostered. He said there he feels there is a sense of impending doom with the journey of the communities and this not helped by the communications and its tone. He noted that Council needs to support them afford them the dignity and respect they deserve.

Mayor Broughton noted that the conversation is clear and that Council does support community committees as they do a lot of good things in the community, but they are not necessarily just Committees of Council. He said that the conversation comes down to what it means to be a committee of council because which are important and part of the fabric of Selwyn. He said that in order future and certainty of committees is what Council has been discussing the past two years.

The Chief Executive said that Council needs to be clear about what Council is putting forward and that if funding is increased, this would push the rates up. The question is, does Council want to do that. He also referred to resourcing requirements.

Councillor Alexander commented that Council is asking staff to make provision and then have a discussion the quantum. The Chief Executive asked Councillor Alexander if he would be willing to support a rating increase to allow that to happen to which he said he would because Council has seen those requests from communities. The Chief Executive responded that staff are currently assessing projects and that Council has already signed off on a full work programme for the next year.

*The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.33pm. Councillor Epiha left the meeting.*

*The meeting reconvened at 1.15pm.*

When the meeting reconvened the Group Manager Community Services and Facilities provided a brief update on the process to this point, and noted the draft policy May 2021 future committees was earlier developed and the subject of the Committee engagement in 2021. The policy propose eight community committees based on geographical spread. Engagement occurred and the report on 8 December 2021 reported back on the engagement and the Report's recommendations were a response to the engagement findings.



The Group Manager Community Services and Facilities spoke about how a number of committees wanted to behave in a way that was not in accordance with the obligations on a committee of council, and this was explained in the report. She confirmed that was an attempt to provide a model through the residents groups to allow the groups some autonomy and also provided them with some resourcing and access to facilities. It was at that Council meeting in December, after some discussion, Council finally decided to let the committees themselves have the choice.

Mayor Broughton said that \$1k will continue, as will the minute taking services and that 11 free meetings a year will continue. He said the change today could be around funding and that may be resolved by opening the community fund up to the 24 committees, or finding another way to address the funding shortfall.

Councillor Alexander responded that it still leaves Council in the same place where it is today for the next 12 months, and that is no more Discretionary Fund. He said the Community Grants Fund is all well and good, but you have to be more organized to apply for it, which is why some committees do not apply. He said that Discretionary Fund was much simpler. He would like to see some Discretionary Fund reinstated, but if this is an interim measure for the next 12 months, then he said he would live with it. Mayor Broughton responded by saying that policy will consider the funding piece.

Councillor Mugford said the smaller committees would want \$1k and then would be happy to approach Council for assistance. He referred to the 'use it or lose it philosophy', and that the needs to be a good, accountable way of spending ratepayer money.

Councillor Reid concurred with Councillor Mugford's comments, saying that there needs to be some review and boundaries of how the money is spent. She said her understanding is it that there would be committees approaching staff, and putting more work on them if Council wants go back to the old model. She said that Council needs think of a new model going forward, but noting it will be different if we go back with less committees.

Councillor Alexander stated he wanted the minutes to reflect this is not just for the next financial year, but also for the future. The intention is to be on an ongoing basis.

## **8. PUBLIC TOILETS – KIRWEE AND COALGATE**

The Group Manager Property referred to a public toilet app. He noted that there are perfectly good toilets in Kirwee at present, and suggested that journeys need to be planned better. If a toilet was to go in the place being requested, it would also need a sealed carpark for accessibility purposes, and a safe truck pull-off would also be required, which makes it a lot more expensive at approximately \$200k.

Councillor Mugford noted that staff have been doing very well with securing funding and they should carry on as is and work according to priorities as set by Council.

Councillor Alexander referred to the request that there be increased signage if no toilet was provided and sees this as being helpful. He asked if there was some way to secure some joint funding from Waka Kotahi related to laybys off the State Highway.

Councillor Miller said he would like to signal to the submitter that we will do something, but that the timeframe may be different in order to get Waka Kotahi.



The Group Manager Property said he wouldn't want to give an unrealistic expectation, but that that it would take another two to three years. He noted that if Council funding was to be approved for the next Tourism Infrastructure Fund round, this may free up some capital for the toilet facilities. It was noted that there should be a connection put in for this facility as part of the Darfield / Kirwee wastewater pipeline project.

Mayor Broughton referred to toilets on the Coalgate reserve noting the staff view that it is desirable, but that it would need to be a vaulted system which would cost around \$100-120k mark. He said he understands the desire for these facilities but that adds up in the LTP maintenance budget.

Mayor Broughton referred to not many large reserves having an absence of toileting facilities, but that Council needs to think how it fund toilets going forward. Council also needs to think how it may spaces enjoyable to use. It is agreed to bring Kirwee and Coalgate toilets through the next LTP process.

## **9. HERITAGE**

Councillor Gallagher agreed that Council needs to do something to support heritage and complete the strategic plan.

It was noted that the Selwyn Heritage Strategic Plan is under development and the writer of this strategy is focusing on a diverse range of community input into ways to celebrate its history into the future. The Strategic Plan will be completed towards the end of the current calendar year. This will set the direction for future projects and funding of these.

*Councillor Epiha returned to the meeting at 1.38pm.*

Councillor Mugford noted the desire to put in a rate for groups to apply to.

Councillor Epiha notes he is supportive, and asked some further questions about the fund.

Councillor Alexander noted that there is confusion in the community around a heritage rate and that it needs to be addressed. A rate has not been agreed to but there are some councilors and committee members saying that district wide rate had been agreed to, and it has not.

Councillor Hasson referred to a submission from Lincoln and District Historical Society noting the use of history panels. She said these have been funded via community committees in the past and she thinks it is good that Council looks at updating them. She stated that hopefully the strategy provides for staff to work alongside these groups to put them in place.

Councillor Lemon recalled a resolution was not passed around this new rate.

Councillor Reid was pleased that Councillor Alexander brought up and the personal histories of people in the area as her and Councillor Bland realized how little was being recorded during their work on the Rolleston 150<sup>th</sup> celebrations. It was noted that since then, the Rolleston Residents' Association used some of their discretionary funding to write a book. She said it would be good to have a Selwyn Heritage Strategic Plan going forward.



The Group Manager Community Services and Facilities noted that Stories of Selwyn will be covered in her Council Report on Wednesday. She said the expectation within her department is not to gather physical items but rather work with community committees around the digitisation of heritage items. She also referred to requests for consistency around signage and noted that the Heritage Strategic Plan will assess if panels are the best way forward.

Councillor McInnes stated that she is looking forward to receiving the Strategy.

Councillor Miller said that Council must be careful to temper expectations that this has been resolved already and referred to the challenges of creating a strategy as it sets an expectation. He added that he did not think the Canterbury Museum does a good job of reflecting Selwyn's history.

It was agreed that there is new funding to be added at this time while the Strategic Plan is being completed.

## **10. ROADING**

Councillor Alexander said that he thinks Council needs to get onto developing the walking and cycling strategy. He referred to a walkway in Rolleston which is well used but is yet to be sealed as it has an easement over private property. He said there is no guarantee that they are going to do it and that if it cannot be sealed then at least could some gravel be put on it and get rid of the mud. He said he understands the property acquisition issues, but his situation is not good enough.

Councillor Alexander referred to the submission on Perymans Road and said he sympathises with the residents but asked what would be the impact if it was sealed which ended up putting more traffic out onto the highway. He referred to that seeming perilous and is not sure that Waka Kotahi would support it. He asked if left in-left out would be safer. He does not support the sealing of this road.

Councillor Miller said that while he sympathises with the residents of Rolleston waiting 15 years to have a footpath sealed, the Perymans Road issue has been going on for 50 years saying it has been promised to be sealed twice, and then the roading engineer of the day redirected the funding elsewhere.

Councillor Miller said it is apparent that the days of saying it is a side road and a small intersection is over. What is occurring is that people are looking for ways to get out of Tai Tapu into Christchurch and they are using Perymans Road and that it is safer to provide an alternate access to SH75 than the existing intersection at Lincoln Tai Tapu Road. He referred to the estimate of sealing the road in 2014 being \$30k. Councillor Miller then commented that residents are selling their houses because they cannot stand the dust anymore. This is an issue whose time has come and that there are no worse intersections to try and get out of on a Sunday afternoon. He said he would like to put this matter to bed – just get it done as it is never going to get any cheaper.

Councillor Hasson understands how long it has taken to get this work done. She said she would like to understand the option of creating a cul-de-sac with a walking and cycling pathway; a left in-left out option; and the safety issue if it is in-and-out. She said it is very important that Council understands what the safety issues are which are. Council needs to choose the most viable and safe option.



Councillor Epiha referred to the 50 year issue and said it is time that it is sealed; it is a cycleway as well; and dust and health issues are plaguing the township.

Councillor Lemon noted his sympathy for the Perymans Road residents. He then raised comments on page 339 regarding the Brookside substation. He said that he does not disagree with staff comments, but urges staff to go out and look at that intersection with the submitters including shading issues with the neighbouring property, visibility and lighting.

Councillor Reid said that she had travelled to Perymans road last evening and spoke of her experience. She said something needs to be done as cars are going through fences or into river when losing control on the gravel. She noted that as the road is going out onto the state highway, a discussion has to be held with Waka Kotahi to find a solution.

Councillor Reid then spoke about cycleways in general, is that it is good to see Council is to receive the updated walking and cycling strategy which includes looking at different travel modes. She noted that in the cycleway programme, some projects are long way out into the future. She said that the times people are living in, coupled with climate change ramifications, Council needs to have a mind shift around cycleway construction. She is not suggesting all are brought forward, but that Council needs to look at how they are doing these, and maybe they can be done cheaper to allow a narrower timeframe. Councillor Reid noted at least eight different submissions asking about footpaths and cycleways and said there should be an acceleration of cycleways due to intensification.

Councillor Reid referred to the Leeston Community committee submission which stated they wanted some trees planted alongside the walkway as well as getting the Leeston cobblestones cleaned.

Councillor McInnes agreed with Councillor Reid's comments around more shared paths being created sooner rather than later. She agreed that the Buckleys Road intersection is nasty and that if there are some quick wins there to improve visibility then this would be great. As far as Perymans Road was concerned, she said she sympathises, but worries that quite often when a road is sealed, traffic increases, but the road is not necessarily made safer. She said if you seal it, more trucks will use it, and there is a higher chance of being struck as more people use it as a short cut. Councillor McInnes referred to the state highway bridge at Tai Tapu saying, there is no way for pedestrians or cyclists to use it safely.

Councillor Mugford stated that this is in the hands of Councillors as there is funding available to do it.

Councillor Gallagher stated that, after hearing how long it has been going on for, she would say seal it and get it done. She noted her support for cycleways with saying that some of them are a long way out in the plan.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted that there have been a number of valid points made around roads and cycleways and that a plan has been developed within the scope of the funding. A change in priority is a decision for Councillors to come up with, with alternative being an increase in rates to come up with the funding.

The Group Manager Infrastructure noted that this was an interesting discussion. He confirmed the Walking and Cycling Strategy was signed off several years ago, and it is spread over 30 years and reflects available funding and the need to space projects out to enable Council to be able to afford to fund them. He referred to sealing roads as being uneconomic as it relates to the return on their investment.



The Group Manager Infrastructure then referred to the road sealing policy. He spoke to the 50 year time period regarding Perymans Road saying it is a low priority due to low use road. He noted that staff have had dealings with the submitter for a number of years. Staff worked through a funding proposal but that at the end of the day the residents did not accept the funding model put forward by Council.

Staff noted that the options put forward by Councillor Hasson need to be considered: cul-de-sac; left in or left out; and involve Waka Kotahi. This could be put on a work programme with Waka Kotahi noting the other Tai Tapu roading and bridge issues.

Mayor Broughton referred to the review of walking and cycling strategy is being completed and will be updated soon. He said there is a need to copy a lot of what other districts have done.

Councillor Reid asked if there could be an investigation conducted into a cheaper way of constructing paths, so it can get done quicker, as 2050 is too far away for construction. She said Council needs to be seen to be looking at all of the issues if it is serious about climate change and transportation mode shifts.

The Group Manager Infrastructure said that choices have been looked about gravel tracks, chip seal and asphalt, but it comes to usage. Recreational paths can be chip seal; high use asphalt; and gravel is fine for off road. Asphalt is more expensive to build and maintain. When the strategy comes back later this year, it is expected that there would be some robust discussion around funding sources, surfacing and widths.

Councillor Lemon said that if Council has approved to do this in the past, it makes him uneasy that it has not yet been done. He said Council has an obligation to do it.

Staff noted that it has not been promised in the last ten years and that staff has tried to work with the locals to come up for funding models, but they have not been accepted.

The Asset Manager Transportation said that Perymans Road has a long history but that something needs to be done to get it sorted out. He said that Councillor McInnes was right about her concerns that if a section of road is sealed it will be used more. Staff concerns are around the increased use of that intersection, noting that it is 50m away from existing Lincoln Tai Tapu intersection. He said that from Waka Kotahi's point of view, they saw this as being the main access through to Lincoln and that some sort of agreement with Waka Kotahi was reached 10-12 years ago stating that they want the intersection closed. It was noted that the road could be sealed and turned into a cul-de-sac.

Councillor Miller referred to a privately commissioned report being prepared previously. He said the intersection is the key and that left in-left out is an option with the potential left in being very close to the Lincoln Tai Tapu intersection.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance referred to budgeting comments made by Councillor Miller saying that Council is unable to budget for flooding.

Councillor Alexander commented that sealing the road will increase the traffic which is not a safe outcome. He would support sealing it and turning it into a cul-de-sac and cycling access way to the Highway, but not sealing it and putting traffic right out onto the highway. He said that Council would need to consult with Waka Kotahi and there is no budget for the work. Unless Council bumps something that has been consulted on, it will be looking at a rates increase.



Councillor Alexander said he did not support the knee jerk reaction to seal this piece of road when the expenditure has not been consulted on, and we have no budget for it. He suggested putting it in the 2023/2024 DAP. Councillor Alexander referred to the lights in Rolleston (page 211) as having already being consulted on.

Councillor Hasson said there may need to be some trade-offs here. She said she sees where Councillor Miller is coming from. She liked the idea that we look at this going into the 2023/2024 discussions with regards to it actually being sealed and that, the Road needs to be sealed, but Council needs to figure out what the trade-off is.

The Chief Executive stated that staff have provided an answer and that it matters what Waka Kotahi thinks. Staff will report back to Council in three months.

**Moved** – Councillor Miller / **Seconded** Councillor Lemon

*That Perryman's Road be sealed / upgraded as part of Annual Plan 2022/2023.*

**CARRIED**

Mayor Broughton referred to the resolution put up saying it is difficult to agree to this here today if there is project and cost uncertainty. The District has 2,500km of unsealed roads and Council submissions every year of people wanting their roads sealed. Council needs to understand what the project looks like and what the resolutions look like before it can agree to seal it.

The Chief Executive asked how funding is going to be addressed to which Councillor Miller called for a point of order. Mayor Broughton agreed that Council needs to understand today how the work is going to be funded. Further, Councillor Hasson said it needs to be clear as to the priority of the upgrade that is needed for that intersection.

Staff said the scope of the project is unknown and is complicated by the section in question only being 5m wide. If it was to be sealed it, the worry would be that sealing only 5m wide, the road would not cope. However if the road was to be widened and sealed, at the same time then the cost would be in the region of \$100k. The Group Manager Organisational Performance noted that a budget would also need to be allocated for maintenance.

Councillor Alexander noted his support for the decision, but expressed the same concern about how we fund this. He suggested it would be more than \$100k saying that sounds light for widening the road as well. He is happy for a report to come back to Council, but remains concerned that Council did not consult on this and that is going to have to come out of general rate funding. He noted this was very late and unexpected.

Mayor Broughton queries what other two or three items at the bottom of the list could be delayed. He said there is an approved budget and approved funding for undergrounding in Tai Tapu which is about \$330k but that maybe the conclusion is that sealing this road is more important than the undergrounding.

Councillor Alexander said that if this is the case, then he would move that the lighting project stays in and that it is fairer for Tai Tapu to switch out the undergrounding work.

The Chief Executive noted that Council has now resolved to seal Perymans Road. He said it would be prudent to ask staff to consider and bring a report back rather than talk about trade-offs.



Staff agreed with the Chief Executive saying a final decision needs to come after the investigation with the issues of the intersection is undertaken. There was also a worry expressed that by doing this, Council would not be satisfying the needs of the community or that they would be happy with this outcome.

Councillor Miller stated that he does not believe that the lighting should be paid for by Council, when the developers will be paying for it. It was noted by staff that DCs are not available for this particular work. With the Asset Manager Transportation and the Group Manager Property giving further background to funding and safety around the need for lighting in this area.

Councillor Miller said that it seems that Council is happy for the wider ratepayers of Selwyn to pick up the cost of streetlights, but when there is a project in a smaller town, then another project has to be chopped to get it done.

Councillor Alexander noted that Council is one of the landowners on Lincoln Rolleston Road and it has been identified as being unsafe. He then gave further context to this frontages on Dunns Crossing Road, Brookside Road and Burnham School Road housing. Further discussion was held regarding this.

## **11. UNDERGROUNDING WORK**

Councillor Alexander referred to staff response to the Glentunnel Community on page 438 [of the deliberations booklet] with regards to undergrounding work, and also referred to the staff response on 173 about undergrounding on Brookside road. He said that Council promised that we would use the \$3m Orion fund to upgrade the older parts of district townships to the same level as new parts of the district.

Councillor Alexander referred to the \$3m fund being inadequate, and that it is never topped up. He asked for staff report about the use of the Fund. He said Council does not have a long term plan for lifting the amenity value of townships across the district.

The Group Manager Infrastructure stated that Council had agreed through the initial stages of the Annual Plan process to drop Glentunnel out of the \$3m available as the cost to complete the work was too high. It was agreed that staff would bring back the undergrounding policy to Council review later this year. He said that spending it all in one project did not make sense. It was agreed that staff will bring back a report on the Undergrounding Policy.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance concurred saying that if Council was to use the fund it can only use the interest amount.

Staff then suggested perhaps Council could utilise the interest from the Underground Account to cover the Tai Tapu undergrounding project.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

Councillor Lemon referred to the request from the Leeston community committee on cleaning of their cobblestones. He asked if there was budget in place, and if not, should it form part of ongoing maintenance. The Group Manager Property referred to the way forward, and it was asked that this be reflected back in the commentary back to the committee.



Councillor Mugford stated that Glenntunnel has missed out on undergrounding work with the community being told that they would be the next to have their undergrounding done. He said now there is talk about putting that funding somewhere else.

The Group Manager Infrastructure confirmed that the intent to finish that project off, however the reality is that the cost has gone from a couple of hundred thousand, to over \$2.5m and it does not have a logical funding source at this point.

Councillor Mugford confirmed that the people that complained still live there, and are in a separate area of Kirwee, and were told under there was enough accrued in the fund to do the work. He noted that Glentunnel should be at the top of the list.

## **RECEIPT OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations were received and adopted as follows:

**Moved** – Councillor Lemon / **Seconded** – Councillor Hasson

### **Funding Proposal For The Hororātā Community Hub**

1. *'That Council proceed with the Hororātā Community Hub proposal being:*
  - a) *transfer ownership of the hall and land to a local community entity which will be responsible for upgrading and renewing the existing building.*
  - b) *That Council will provide a contribution of \$1 million to the Hororātā Community Hub subject to a satisfactory feasibility study of the proposal and*
  - c) *Preparation of a Memorandum of Understanding acceptable to both parties to be completed outlining the transfer and future relationship.'*

### **Closure Of Parts Of The Upper Ellesmere Water Race Network**

2. *'That Council will as proposed close parts of the Upper Ellesmere Water Race Network over a 5 year period, as in the amended proposal.'*

### **Rating For Water Races**

3. *'Council will amend as proposed targeted rating for water races on properties of less than 0.5 hectares in area and for land areas greater than 500 hectares in area.'*



## Land Drainage Rating And Ecological Enhancement Targeted Rate

4. *'That Council reduce as proposed the land drainage rating structure from 33 different rating structures to 4 standardized rating factors:*
- a) Land drainage minimum charge per rating unit \$70*
  - b) Per hectare charge (first 4 hectares) \$30*
  - c) Per hectare charge (above 4 hectares) \$7*
  - d) Ecological Enhancement rate per rating unit not currently paying the above charge \$10.'*

## Rates

5. *'That the council adopts the proposed rates charges as set out in the Draft Annual Plan 2022/23.'*

## Leeston Health and Aged Care

6. *'That Council:*
- a) continues to support the Friends of Ellesmere Hospital feasibility study and will lead the facilitation of discussions with key stakeholders; and*
  - b) considers how the Council's proposed medical facility may complement the vision of the Friends of Ellesmere Hospital.'*

## Community Facilities and Reserves

7. *'That Council:*
- (a) resolves that there be no change to community facilities and reserves cost and funding in the proposed draft annual plan; and ask management to reconsider these initiatives for inclusion subsequent financial years.*
  - (b) request staff to report back to Council on the following items in December 2022:*
    - i. Lighting improvements at Kirwee Bowling Club and Leeston Dog Park*
    - ii. Springfield Pump Track*
    - iii. Various Lake Coleridge projects*
    - iv. Darfield Aquatics*
    - v. Darfield Pond*
    - vi. Sandy Knolls replica railway shelter*
    - vii. Foster Park Homestead; and*
  - (c) Allow the application of Community Committees to the Community Grants fund; and agree to:*
    - i. \$1,000 discretionary fund per year to continue until 30 June 2023;*
    - ii. provision of secretarial support to continue until 30 June 2023;*
    - iii. free meeting room hire be allowed for up to 11 meetings per year until 30 June 2023; and*
    - iv. requests staff to prepare a Policy about community committees for future Council consideration.'*



## Public Toilets – Kirwee and Coalgate

8. *'That Council:*

- (a) Resolves that there be no change to the proposed draft annual plan to include construction of public toilets in Kirwee or Coalgate; and*
- (b) ask management to reconsider this project at the next LTP.'*

## Heritage

9. *'That Council notes the submission with the Heritage Strategic Plan being completed by the end of 2022, which will set the direction for future projects and any funding of those projects.'*

## Roading

10. *'That Council requests that the Walking and Cycling strategy be reviewed over the next 12 months, with acceleration of these projects to be considered as part of this process.'*

## Undergrounding

11. *'That the Underground Policy be discussed with a report to be brought back to Council.'*

**CARRIED**

## Additional Roothing Recommendation

**Moved** – Councillor Miller / **Seconded** – Councillor Lemon

12. *'That Perymans Road be sealed as part of the 2022/2023 Annual Plan.'*

*(five in favour, and four against)*

**CARRIED**

## CLOSING COMMENTS

The Chief Executive thanked all attendees for their contributions today noting that considerable progress had been made. Today has allowed staff to commence to finalise the Annual Plan for adoption on 22 June 2022. The Chief Executive also thanked staff for their hard work.

The Group Manager Organisational Performance also thanked Councillors for their contribution and engagement.



The deliberations closed at 3.29pm on 7 June 2022.

DATED this day 29 of 6 2022

MAYOR

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized, cursive letters, positioned above a horizontal line.



