

**Date:** Tuesday 23 January 2024 at 3.00PM  
**Venue:** Council Chambers, 63 Miranda Street, Stratford

### Present

The Deputy Mayor M McKay (the Chairperson), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors: S J Beck, G W Boyde, A M C Dudley, J M S Erwood, A K Harris, E E Hall, V R Jones, W J Sandford (*part meeting*) and M J Watt.

### In attendance

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director – Assets Mrs V Araba (*part meeting*), the Director – Corporate Services – Mrs T Radich, the Director – Community Services – Ms K Whareaitu, the Director – Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the HR & Governance Advisor – Mrs C Reynolds, the Communications Manager – Ms G Gibson, the Corporate Accountant - Mrs C Craig (*part meeting*), the Parks and Reserves Officer – Mrs M McBain, the Projects Engineer – Mr O Mabumbo (*part meeting*), the Services Asset Manager – Mr J Cooper (*part meeting*), the Graduate Roding Engineer – Mr F Hick (*part meeting*), the Sustainability Advisor – Ms V Dombroski (*part meeting*), the Community Development and Engagement Lead – Ms A Crane (*part meeting*), the Roding Manager – Mr S Bowden, the Graduate Asset Engineer – Ms K Van Hout (*part meeting*), the Projects Manager – Mr S Taylor, the Communications Advisor – Mrs S Clarkson (*part meeting*), the Planner – Connor Marner (*part meeting*), the Finance Officer – Mrs J Mack and two members of the media (Stratford Press and Taranaki Daily News (*part meeting*)).

### 1. Welcome

The opening karakia was read.

The Deputy Mayor welcomed the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff, and the media.

The Deputy Mayor reiterated the health and safety message and emergency procedures.

### 2. Apologies

An apology was received from Councillor C M Tongaawhikau

#### Recommendation

THAT the apology be received.

ERWOOD/WATT  
Carried  
P&S/24/1

### 3. Announcements

There were no announcements.

### 4. Declarations of members interest

Elected members were asked to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda. There were no conflicts of interest.

### 5. Attendance Schedule

The Attendance schedule for Policy and Services Committee meetings, including Hearings, was attached.

## 6. Confirmation of Minutes

### 6.1 Policy and Services Committee –28 November 2023 (Hearing) D23/48292 Page 15

#### Recommendation

THAT the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting, to hear and consider submissions to the Draft Beauty Therapy, Tattooing and Skin Piercing Bylaw and Code of Practice, held on Tuesday 24 October November 2023 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

HARRIS/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/2

### 6.2 Policy and Services Committee –28 November 2023 D23/48069 Page 18

#### Recommendation

THAT the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 28 November 2023 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

SANDFORD/VOLZKE  
Carried  
P&S/24/3

## 7. Matters Outstanding D16/47 Page 31

#### Recommendation

THAT the Matters Outstanding be received.

JONES/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/4

The Director – Environmental Services noted the Ariel Steet numbering is currently being looked into.

## 8. Information Report – Reserve Balances and Movements 2022/23

D23/47870 Page 32

### Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

DUDLEY/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/5

The Corporate Accountant noted the following points:

- Currently there are two reserves in deficit, roading and water supply. There is concern that there is not enough funds to fund water supply from reserves. It was noted all renewal is reserve funded, which is not realistic from an empty reserve, however there is a report coming up with proposed loan funding to move forward.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Hall sought clarification on point 2.2 of the Executive Summary. She questioned if the dates were correct. It was noted the dates should be 30 June 2022 and 1 July 2023 respectively.
- Councillor Boyde questioned if the water supply reserve was for water only, not wastewater. It was confirmed this is correct.
- The District Mayor questioned if the 2023/2024 over budget spend of \$1,000,000 for roading outlined on page 35's opening paragraph, was expected to be remedied over one year or a longer time period. It was noted in the current financial year roading will be over budget and there is discussion to be had on what to do regarding an overdrawn reserve, what rate should be used to attempt to refill the reserve. It was noted this is not addressing the fact that roading has become more expensive and roads continue to need to be maintained.

*The Services Asset Manager and Sustainability Advisor joined the meeting at 3.12pm*

- The Mayor questioned if depreciation funding of the pool was double dipping. It was noted if you build a new pool and fund the depreciation, and at the same time fund the loan from rates, the current ratepayers will be paying for the current asset but also paying for a future pool. Therefore, the approach of funding the loan from the depreciation ensures ratepayers only pay for one facility at a time, and once free of the loan servicing cost the full amount benefits the depreciation reserves.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned if the depreciation amount is taken off the loan repayment. It was noted if depreciation is rate funded, the loan repayment comes out of reserves, which means the use of the asset comes from rates, rather than the payment of the asset.

## 9. Decision Report – Communications and Engagement Strategy Review 2024

D24/570 Page 38

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/6

2. THAT the reviewed *draft* Communication and Engagement Strategy be released for public feedback with the amendments noted in discussion.

MCKAY/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/7

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde made the observations that throughout the strategy different census dates and information were being used. He noted there were 2013 and 2018 census information used. It was noted 2018 census was the most up to date public information, and the 2013 referral is in 2020 Communications & Engagement Strategy.

- The District Mayor noted on page 56 under 5. District Profile, reference is made to Egmont National Park, which needs to be updated.
- The District Mayor noted on page 56 under ethnicity, the totals do not add up to 100%. It was noted this will be looked into and resolved.
- The District Mayor noted on page 58, the second to last bullet point states “the promise that the public’s contributions will influence the decision”. He believes this implies that if the contributions from the community were one way or the other, this might influence Elected Members to go down that track and that is not always what happens. He suggested there could be another word to suggest contributions could influence, but don’t always determine the outcome. It was noted the bullet points are extracted from the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Core Values, therefore the bullet points could not be updated, however could be removed if not considered suitable.
- The District Mayor noted he did not see any reference to how Council will process communication from the community in forms of Facebook anger and misinformation. He questioned how Council responds to that in terms of community engagement. It was noted this could be addressed in the strategy, however there is an internal social media engagement policy for these situations, as well as a policy on how Council interreacts with the media.
- The Deputy Mayor noted page 63 possibly covers council staff behaviour. It was noted it does, and staff guidelines are also being worked on.
- Councillor Sandford questioned if the bullet points on page 58 were being taken out, as he believes they have very significant wording, and he doesn’t want to see someone use them against council.
- Councillor Hall noted she had listened to what others had noted and believes ‘influence’ does not mean the decision needs to go the group wants them to go. It could mean the discussion was influenced by others contributions before the decision is made, not influencing the outcome.
- Councillor Sandford reiterated his question regarding the removal of the bullet points. Ms Gibson suggested that these bullet points could be put in italics so it is more obvious the points are from somewhere else. It was noted it could be reformatted and the words included that council acknowledges the core values are important which would be an acknowledgement and not an adoption.

## 10. Decision Report – Significance and Engagement Policy Review

D23/41012 Page 67

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/DUDLEY  
Carried  
P&S/24/8

2. THAT the *draft* Significance and Engagement Policy and statement of proposal is released for public consultation in accordance with section 82 and 82A of the Local Government Act 2002.

Hall /HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/9

### Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Harris referred to page 85 and the list of Strategic Assets, and questioned if there was a discussion to call Housing for the Elderly something different. She requested it be called something different, and be named that everywhere.
- Councillor Harris questioned why the Centennial Restrooms and TET Stadium were not listed under strategic assets, when the War Memorial Centre was. It was noted the War Memorial Centre was on the list as it was a more diverse facility, and currently housed Civil Defence, where the TET was like any other sporting facility. It’s removal would not impact the wider community, only a few sports groups.
- The District Mayor questioned why the Council farm was not listed as a strategic asset. It was clarified that the farm is not a strategic asset, it is not an important asset to the wider community and is not crucial in what Council provides.

- The Deputy Mayor referred to page 81 in the table beside Financial Cost, and questioned what would trigger in terms of significance and engagement. It was noted nothing would go over 5% of total council expenditure without a decision being made which would have been identified as significant which would trigger community consultation.

*The Services Asset Manager left the meeting at 3.45pm.*

- The District Mayor questioned what is Councils definition of climate change, and when is that triggered? It was noted the list is not triggers, triggers would be decided at the time. The Deputy Mayor noted she is mindful of the term climate change popping up more and more, however it has not been discussed what climate change means for the Stratford District. Councillor Hall noted she would like it left in there to help encourage discussion on what climate change means for this council. It was noted this discussion is likely to be had regardless, however this policy will not be brought back to council for review for another three years. It was noted if it is not put in the policy in some form it will not be discussed in future reports.
- Councillor Boyde noted he disagreed that the Council farm is not a strategic asset. It was noted strategic assets are defined in the Local Government Act 2020, that the farm has always been seen as an economic return which helps reduce rates. It was noted if the farm was sold and money reinvested it would not have an impact on council's service delivery.
- Councillor Hall noted there is a report to decide on earthquake strengthening, and noted the decision made there may have an impact on the list of strategic assets. Councillor Harris questioned if the strategic assets can be amended once the policy comes back from consultation. It was confirmed there were other avenues to update the list.
- The Deputy Mayor noted she is happy with the policy, however, would like climate change removed and put under environmental. She believes that if climate change is included there is the expectation that Council is considering climate change, however at this stage it is not clear what it means for Stratford District Council. Councillors Beck and Watt agreed with the Deputy Mayor. Councillor Hall noted her concern that removing climate change means the discussion will not happen. She noted she would be in agreeance from her if there was an assurance the conversation will be had, otherwise she would like to see it kept in there. It was noted there is a plan to create a policy which shows Councils position on climate change, which will be before Councillors for debate this year.

*The Sustainability Advisor and the Community Development and Engagement Lead left the meeting at 4.04pm*

## 11. Decision Report – Administration Matters for Long Term Plan 2024-34

D24/1121 Page 93

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/ERWOOD  
Carried  
P&S/24/10

1. THAT the draft Long Term Plan 2024-34 (LTP) be amended to incorporate the three waters activities for the full ten years of the LTP, noting the government's intention to repeal the Water Services Entity Act 2002 ("the Act").

2. THAT approval be given, subject to repeal of the Act, that the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2024-34 is not required to be audited.

3. THAT the timeframe for the adoption of the Long Term Plan 2024-34 by 30 June 2024 continue to be the preferred date for adoption, however allowing some flexibility by agreeing that the LTP shall be adopted no later than 31 July 2024.

VOLZKE/WATT  
Carried  
P&S/24/11

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/DUDLEY  
Carried  
P&S/24/12

4. THAT the application of the Forestry Differential be expanded to include areas within a rating unit, of which are no less than 10 hectares, and used for exotic forestry (excluding indigenous and protected forests), where the rating unit is not currently classified as having forestry as the primary use under the Valuer-General rules

BOYDE/DUDLEY  
Carried  
P&S/24/13

3. THAT the amount collected under the Forestry Differential on the Rooding Targeted Rate be increased to \$350,000 (exclusive of GST), taking into account the increased costs of remediation works on council's rooding network as a result of forestry operations.

VOLZKE/BOYDE  
Carried  
1 against  
P&S/24/14

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following points:

- There has been a Forestry Differential for two years, which was increased this current year. Presented today are options to increase the differential for next year.
- There are three things to look at today:
  - First decision is regarding the differential on properties where forestry is not their main activity, however still have substantial forestry blocks. Currently the option is set at 10 hectares as there are not many under 10 hectares which will come under this.
  - Is the option of 10 hectares sensible?
  - What rate do you want to charge the differential at?
- If the decision goes through today, a letter to the potentially affected ratepayers will be sent out explaining the proposal and questioning if the estimated amount of forestry is correct.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Jones sought clarification regarding page 105, paragraph three which states "If the application of the differential is extended to parts of a rating unit, the forestry portion of these properties would likely come under the forestry differential from the 2024/25 rating year". He asked what the defining parts of a rating unit are, and what is the rest of the rating unit? It was noted each portion would be given a value for example if a farm is half forestry it would be divided into 2, and charged half as forestry.
- Councillor Jones questioned if land was pastoral and changing to forestry, would that be better or worse for Council?
- Councillor Boyde noted he supported the 10 hectare limit and did not believe it should be any higher. He questioned where the data was collected? It was noted Council's imagery from 2022 was used, along with information from Taranaki Regional Council on forestry consents, they have given information in terms of property ID, which we have then used to find information. This information has not yet been verified.
- Councillor Boyde questioned if this activity will need to be consented when Council writes its District Plan. It was noted this was something which would have to be considered.

*The Communications Advisor left the meeting at 4.15pm.*

- The District Mayor noted there is a chance for an anomaly in the rating system if only information from TRC guides where to look for properties, when those within the Horizons region could potentially be missed. It was noted this is just a preliminary draft list, and is still a work in progress,

however then the visual was done, this included Horizon District properties. It was noted the Horizons data will be double checked.

*The Projects Engineer left the meeting at 4.17pm.*

- The Director- Corporate Services advised the plan is to send a letter to the identified farms noting the information collected and they can supply evidence this information is incorrect. Effectively they default onto the list, and they have to prove that they should not be.
- Councillor Harris noted she can see three Horizon District properties which have been captured. She enquired if letters were going to be sent to existing properties outlining the differential increase. It was noted there would not be, it would be treated as any other rates rise.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned why 10 hectares was the limit, and how many properties fall under this limit? It was noted that anything under 10 hectares may be random planting, rather than those for harvesting which is where the significant damage comes from.

*The Planner left the meeting at 4.23pm.*

- The Deputy Mayor questioned if the percentage which is applied to the property value, does the QV show the overall value of the farm, and then divide by the ten hectares, or do they value forestry differently. It was advised it would be treated as a separate property. It would be requested QV do this, which is covered in our current fee.
- Councillor Beck sought clarification if the ten hectares proposed included lots of little one hectare blocks or one single ten hectare block. It was advised it could be multiple stands of trees that make up ten hectares. Currently the information has been collected, and now questions would be asked from property owners who would then give their feedback, a final decision would then be made.

*The Finance Officer joined the meeting at 4.25pm.*

- Councillor Boyde noted he agreed with the increase as the cost of emergency roading is a major issue which is taking away from already planned roading. It was advised the unsealed budget this year was approximately \$600,000 which should be used for all unsealed roads, however most of this has been spent on forestry related road damage or preventative work. The budgets are being redirected to forestry damage instead of general maintenance which means there is no preventative maintenance elsewhere.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned if reimbursement the following year of the cost spent on repairing forestry roading could be looked at? It was advised we are essentially doing this by bringing the differential rate closer to the cost of maintenance. The Deputy mayor enquired if Council could be more open with ratepayers, clearly saying to them that Council is seeking reimbursement of the cost. It was advised that under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 we can budget for the next year to charge rates, if reimbursement is sought it is more like an invoice than a rate.

*The Roading Manager left the meeting at 4.34pm.*

- The Deputy Mayor wondered if there would be more ownership from the ratepayers if they knew they were going to be paying for it the following year. She questioned if there is a way to forecast the budget and set the targeted rate for the forestry blocks, which will mean transparency that Council is trying to cover the cost from that specific rate. Councillor Hall questioned how Council could relate the forestry rate to the differential rate.

*The Graduate Asset Engineer left and the Roading Manager joined the meeting at 4.36pm.*

- Councillor Boyde noted he believes what council is currently using the right approach. The Challenge is Council doesn't know how much is coming out, how often and the impact it is having on the road.

*The Director – Assets left the meeting at 4.39pm.*

- Councillor Beck questioned if the roads are being more damaged in the winter than the summer. It was confirmed they were. Councillor Beck then questioned if there could be a premium on harvesting in the winter, and other Councils have times of year when the roads are closed. It was advised it was unlikely to be able to close roads for specific usage types.
- The District Mayor noted it is very clear how much is being spent on roads, and we are currently retrospectively funding this which is allowing Council to cover this.

Points noted in discussion:

- Councillor Jones noted he is not happy with the jump as it is still uncertain what properties are going to be charged.
- Councillor Hall noted she disagreed with Councillor Jones and would be happy with over \$400,000 for recommendation three reflective of the fact that the cost of the road sat above \$350,000. The District Mayor noted he would also like to see an increase. She noted it is easy to get caught up on the \$380,000 however it is important to look at the bigger picture where it cost over \$900,000 however NZTA contributed to the cost. She noted this meant other projects are not getting completed because Council is utilising NZTA's subsidy for damage from forestry.
- Councillor Harris advised she is mindful of the increase, particularly the newly identified properties, and also of the fact that some identified will become ineligible which will dilute the pool, however she agrees with the recommendation.

*The Director – Community Services joined the meeting at 4.45pm.*

- Councillor Sandford noted it has taken years for Council to be brave enough to create this differential. He suggested identifying the properties to receive the rate, accept the \$350,000 recommendation and get going. Councillor Erwood agreed with Councillor Sandford.
- The District Mayor called a point of order, noting he moved the recommendation, any other Councillors who wish to put through an change to the motion should put forward an amendment.

### Recommendations

3. THAT the amount collected under the Forestry Differential on the Roding Targeted Rate be increased to \$400,000 (exclusive of GST), taking into account the increased costs of remediation works on council's roading network as a result of forestry operations.

HALL/NO SECONDER  
Lapsed  
P&S/24/15

- As there was no seconder the motion lapsed.

*The Director – Assets joined the meeting at 4.50pm.*

### 13. Decision Report – Revenue and Financing Policy

D24/1096 Page 110

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report and attachments be received.
2. THAT the draft Revenue and Financing Policy in **Appendix One** to this report, is approved to be released for consultation with the Long Term Plan 2024-34 Consultation Document.

ERWOOD/HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/16

ERWOOD/VOLZKE  
Carried  
P&S/23/17

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following points:

- There will be amendments which include adding in page numbers.



Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The Deputy Mayor questioned the definition of prudent in relation to page 112, 7.2.3. It was advised it is defined in the act, however it would be something along the lines of not putting council in a worse situation in ten years that could not be recovered from.
- The Deputy Mayor noted this policy sounds like it is opening the gates to lean more heavily on borrowing. It was advised this policy is allowing more flexibility for council to decide what is more financially prudent.

14. Decision Report – Housing for Elderly Policy

D23/19380 Page 137

**Recommendations**

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/MCKAY  
Carried  
P&S/24/18

2. THAT the Committee approves Option Three of the report as the preferred method for setting rental charges

HALL/WATTS  
Carried  
P&S/24/19

- 3 THAT the Draft Housing for the Elderly Policy be released to collect feedback from the key stakeholders.

HARRIS/BECK  
Carried  
P&S/24/20

The Projects Manager noted the following points:

- Table three shows the comparison of current rental charges to New Plymouth District Council and South Taranaki District Council however the South Taranaki District Council charges do not include their increases.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Hall questioned if there has been any investigation into what support is available for elderly. It was advised Work and Income New Zealand do have a supplement available, but this does not give a full reimbursement for the rental.
- Councillor Jones questioned the 80% rationale. It was advised this was a social activity, that 91% would cover the cost however this will fluctuate. Councillor Beck noted this had been talked about recently, and 80% was set which would allow the remaining to be the social activity of Council.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned what percentage of cost the current rates cover. It was confirmed 45% of the cost. She then enquired what percentage it would be if it is brought up. It was noted it would cover 90% of the cost.
- Councillor Watt questioned how many people are currently on the waiting list. It was noted there are currently 50 people on the waiting list and a letter is sent every year confirming they would like to remain on the waiting list. It was advised the Policy is looking at removing the second list as there are too many people on the eligible list.
- Councillor Harris questioned if the decrease in the applicants assets is part of the criteria. It was noted this will bring the Policy in line with New Plymouth District Council and South Taranaki District Council.

Points noted in discussion:

- The District Mayor noted option 3 reflects what has been discussed in previous workshops. He noted he is conscious of the original bequest and does not believe this needs to be discussed every year, the target can be set and then officers can make changes based on market value. He noted

his support for option 3. The Deputy Mayor noted her support for the District Mayor especially considering a deficit was made in the previous year.

*One member of the Media (Taranaki Daily News) left the meeting at 5.20pm.*

- The District Mayor supported the update of removing the secondary list, and the other proposed changes across the board. He questioned if the weekly income is still the appropriate figure, as minimum wage works out to be around \$47,000, which with no cost except rent would leave you doing well and with approximately \$900 per week. The Deputy Mayor noted she would support seeing that reduced. Councillor Hall questioned how much superannuation is currently. Councillor Dudley noted she knew someone living alone who receives \$496 per week. The District Mayor advised the whole point of the conversation is all of these people will be receiving superannuation and by giving reference to minimum wage it is giving scope for those who have investments over and above their income and if they have that amount coming in, they are not poor. The list needs to be shrunk to make sure it is only those who truly need it.

*The Director – Community Services and the Director – Corporate Services left the meeting at 5.24pm.*

- It was agreed to change Eligibility Criteria 2.5 to “that does not exceed the adult minimum wage for a 30-hour week”.
- The District Mayor requested that Other Conditions of Rental 3.1 and 3.2 have a provision that a when a person moves into a unit and their needs change (for example for health reasons) it does not obligate Council to facilitate that need. It was noted 3.2 is an attempt to cover this. Councillor Harris questioned if 3.2 allows Council not to accommodate the new need, does it prohibit the tenant for making those improvements. It was noted the decision would be made at the time.
- It was agreed to add in the clause that Council is not required to accommodate individual needs into the conditions and bring back before adoption.

*The meeting adjourned at 5.33pm and reconvened at 5.45pm.*

*The Corporate Accountant and the Finance Officer in attendance had left the meeting and the Director – Community Services, the Director – Corporate Services and the Graduate Assets Engineer rejoined the meeting.*

## 15. Decision Report – Fees and Charges 2024/25

D24/1117 Page 154

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/21

2. THAT the proposed Fees and Charges for 2024/25 be approved, with any amendments made, to be released for public consultation with the Long Term Plan 2024-34 (LTP) Consultation Document with amendments

HALL/HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/22

Points noted in discussion:

Aerodrome strip hire fee

- It was agreed to include the Aerodrome strip hire fee.
- Councillor Boyde noted he did not mind the increase, however the bins need some work. Councillor Harris questioned if the bins that are there are included in the fee or are they additional and how often are the bins being used before Council should start charging them? Councillor Boyde advised the bins are being used. Councillor Harris questioned if it could not be ascertained when the bins are being used, can it be ascertained when the strip is being used? It was confirmed it could.

#### Aerodrome ground lease fees

- The Deputy Mayor noted she believed the amount of \$4.49 for proposed ground lease rental had been agreed on. It was advised there should be a maximum increase per annum set, it as suggested not going straight to \$4.49 but for it to be staggered over 3-4 years. It was noted the smallest charge is currently \$0.82 per square metre and the largest is \$3.30 per square metre, it is about stepping those to \$4.49. It was noted if it is going to be in fees and charges there needs to be a fixed amount, and everyone needs to be on the same amount. The Deputy Mayor questioned if it was too complicated to have in fees and charges. It was noted once the issue is resolved it will be simple. Councillor Hall noted even if you are paying \$0.82 and then being asked to pay the same as others there is no argument to be had as you have already received the benefit of a lower rate for years.
- Leave the option blank, come back and have a \$4.49 guideline with options to what will happen each year with a uniformed approach.

#### Cemetery Increase

- Councillor Sandford noted he believed the increases were moving in the right direction. The District Mayor noted the internment fee increase still leaves Council below their neighbour, could this be increased to \$2,100. Councillor Erwood agreed with the Deputy Mayor
- Increase interment fees to \$2,100.

#### Transfer station – addition

- No objections to the addition to add e-waste.

#### Roading - Removal

- No objections.

#### Sports Ground/Parks and Reserves Increase

- The Deputy Mayor questioned how many will be affected by the 100% increase per year. It was confirmed approximately 3 bookings per year.
- There were no objections to the increase.

#### Stormwater Connection - Increase

- No objections.

#### Trade Waste – No Change

- No objections.

#### Transfer station – addition

- No objections.

*Councillor Sandford left the meeting at 6.10pm.*

#### Venue hire increase

- It was noted there is a proposed blanket increase across the board, with a decision to be made on introducing a refundable vs a non-refundable deposit.
- The Deputy Mayor acknowledged there were options given for increases and decreases, and there has been feedback from the community that the current prices could discourage usage. She questioned if the proposed 0.2% rise for the War Memorial Centre was to align with community feedback. It was noted it was an attempt to get back lost customers. Councillor Dudley noted there was an \$80,000 loss on cancellations, and noted she would like to see that decreased. She advised she liked the flat rate to hire the whole facility for the whole weekend.
- It was clarified the proposal is to keep the 10% non refundable deposit at the time of booking (to be updated from bond) and the refundable bond. Councillor Hall recalled a conversation around at the time of booking something had to be paid, it was confirmed this would be the non refundable deposit. Councillor Harris noted she would like a non refundable deposit, which may prevent cancellations and discourage those who book as a back up plan but then cancel the plan at the last minute.
- The District Mayor explained the situation where someone hires the stadium and pays \$30 per hour for a few hours, which requires a \$300 bond which is more than the hire fee itself. He questioned the practicality of the bond and how often it is not refunded. It was advised approximately one booking per year. Councillor Hall noted the bond would be there to pay for any damage or cleaning required, however this would unlikely be needed for a 2-hour booking. It was advised the requirement is when food and drink are consumed, no matter the time frame.
- It was agreed to change the top line to 10% non refundable deposit at time of booking.

- Councillor Harris questioned if there could be any discretion on this charge as there would be some groups who are applying for funding and may not have the funds available at the time of booking. It was noted the Chief Executive has discretion for all fees and charges.
- Councillor Hall questioned if there was confidence the proposed costs will not equate to lost bookings. It was advised a lot of time was spent on comparing the charges and this is where it landed, however this is for Councillors to determine.
- The whole complex hireage is reduced to \$1,000 per day.
- The whole weekend charge is increased to \$2,500.
- The bond is removed and 10% non refundable deposit at time of booking introduced.

*The Roading Asset Manager left the meeting at 6.33pm.*

Library – No change

- No objections.

Wai o Rua Stratford Aquatic Centre – proposals to be confirmed.

- The proposed changes were tabled as discussed at the workshop earlier in the day.
  - School Groups
    - Councillor Harris advised she would like the charge to be \$2.00. Councillor Boyde disagreed and believed \$2.50 per child is a very fair price.
    - It was agreed to increase the charge to \$2.50 per child.
  - Swimming Sports Fees
    - It was noted the swimming school fee was removed when simplifying the fees. It was recommended to apply a discount rather than add a new charge line as having a swimming sports fee will introduce problems, for example some would complain they already received this price this year, why can it not be applied again?

*The Roading Asset Manager joined the meeting at 6.42pm.*

- Councillor Hall noted she had been thinking about the issues raised in the workshop. She noted she had come to the conclusion if Council looks at providing discounts to schools, the impact of this discount on the facility is insignificant to the overall running costs, however makes a big difference to the schools. She noted she would like to see something that reflects the feedback received from schools, and that it is about finding the balance between what is needed to run the facility, and getting children in the pool. Councillor Boyde questioned if Councillor Hall was suggesting what Councillor Erwood had recommended at the workshop. Councillor Hall noted that is not necessarily what she is saying, as she is also listening to the staff and does not want make things harder.
- The District Mayor noted if the lane hire fee was dropped to 50% only \$5,000 per year of income is missed. Councillor Dudley noted that if a lane hire fee was not charged, the schools may be more likely to come back for more fun days.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned if schools are booking in swimming sports, would they not say how many lanes they want booked? Councillor Dudley questioned how many people would be put out if lanes were out of action for two hours.
- Councillor Hall noted the suggestions are offsetting a new charge, but is not addressing the issue. Councillor Erwood agreed that the issue is getting over complicated. He suggested adding a new school swimming sports charge with something like \$5 per child and if the whole complex is required then more is charged. Councillor Hall noted \$5 per child is more than the current charges.
- Councillor Boyde noted all the other new charges are fairly straightforward, is there the possibility to come back to this with more options. It was advised there was no more information to supply, so the decision is ready to be made.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned if based on the communication from the schools, is the lane hire fee the issue? It was confirmed this is the main complaint as it is based on the perception. It was recommended that a blanket fee with no lane hire that would be better received. The District Mayor reiterated there is the perception of double dipping. He suggested a price of \$4-\$4.50 per child would be right. It was noted the fees and charges will be included in the consultation, so schools will give their feedback.
- Councillor Hall questioned if there would be a \$2.50 charge per child for a fun day, but a different charge for swimming sports.
- Councillor Harris questioned if no matter what figure was defined, whether the schools could use all 8 lanes? It was advised there would have to be a Policy on how many children per lane.

3. THAT a 'school swimming sports' fee of \$4 per child is introduced into the fees and charges. To be available to each school in the District, once per year with a maximum of four hours per day.

ERWOOD/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/23

- Councillor Boyde questioned if the swimming sports fee could offer a solution to the club and carnival days. It was noted the carnival days are too frequent to fit this solution. The District Mayor advised to offer consistence there could be a carnival fee at a higher level, along with a time limit as they have the same issues as the primary schools. He noted they generally need 8 lanes and a warmup area.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned what the feedback from the clubs had been. It was noted they were also upset about the double dipping of the entry fee. Councillor Hall suggested one fee which incorporates all the fees, and discounted. It was advised the choice could be to go to lane hire only. The Deputy Mayor suggested they wanted to book the programme pool and the main pool and could pay both per lane costs but not pay the entry fee.
- Councillor Hall questioned what fees Taranaki Swimming make? It was noted that this information would be presented back to the committee at a later date.

#### Animal Control – Increase

- Councillor Harris noted she did not agree with the increase, referencing where it is suggested there will be an increase will increase the amount of unregistered dogs, which she agrees with. Councillor Dudley agreed with Councillor Harris.
- It was noted a certain portion of revenue needs to come from user charges, and last year this was not achieved, therefore dog control is the only place that charges can be increased.
- Councillor Harris questioned if there were optics into the expenditure which comes from dogs which are unregistered, are those who register their dogs covering those who do not? It was advised the biggest increase in expenditure is after hours dog control. Councillor Harris questioned if the after hours costs are recovered from the dog owner. It was advised the impound fees partially offset the cost, however it is not a direct transaction per callout.
- There were no objections to no change in dog registration costs.

#### Bylaws – Increase

- No objections

#### Health and Safety Licenses – Additions / Increases

- No objections

#### Mobile Trade shops bylaw – No change

- No objections

#### Tattoo and Beauty Therapy – No Change

- No objections

#### Resource Management – Increase

- No objections

#### All corporate services

- No objections

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.  
HARRIS/DUDLEY  
Carried  
P&S/24/24
2. THAT the Committee approves Option 3 for the Wall Memorial Centre.  
HALL/ERWOOD  
Carried  
P&S/24/25
3. THAT the Committee approves Option 4 for the TET Multi Sports Centre.  
HALL/DUDLEY  
Carried  
P&S/24/26
4. ~~THAT the Committee approves Option 3 for the Clock Tower.~~

#### Points noted in discussion:

##### War Memorial Centre

- The Deputy Mayor noted there are 25 years before being non-compliant, and that there are mentions of insurance benefits, but questioned if the decision was made today to do something in 24 years where would that lead Council to. It was advised that if there was an earthquake there is the possibility to be in trouble with WorkSafe, as well as insurance for natural disasters increasing. The Deputy Mayor questioned if there was no decision made today, but the issue revisited in ten years, would that be considered doing nothing? It was advised it was the same, as Council would not have done everything in its power to make everyone safe.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned if over the next 10-25 years Council could work on replenishing reserve funds to complete the work. It was advised Council could start rating for a capital project and set the money aside to pay for something in the future, or do it now and repay it which reduces the risk of something happening if it is not done now, and the cost of inflation.
- The Deputy Mayor requested a comparison between the War Memorial Centre and the TET Multi Sports Centre and how often they are both booked and utilised. It was noted this information would need to be sought. The Deputy Mayor pondered if it would be better to redirect funds into one facility. It was advised currently there are two Civil Defence facilities, it was unlikely the War Memorial Centre will ever reach the required Civil Defence level so the advice would be to move it all to the TET Multi Sports Centre, however that is for Councillors to decide.

##### *The Parks and Reserves Officer left the meeting at 7.34*

- Councillor Hall advised she supports the recommendation as there is a liability and risk to life and Council now have the knowledge of that risk. She also noted if something is not done now, it will cost a whole lot more money in the future. She advised she would like to see option three adopted. Councillor Erwood agreed with Councillor Hall, noting Council cannot put their head in the sand.

##### TET Multi Sports Centre

- Councillor Hall noted she had thought about the cost and when an Civil Defence Emergency happens it would be fantastic to have a facility for the community to utilise.

##### Clock Tower

- Councillor Boyde noted he supports Option 4 and recommended it should be put in Prospero Place.
- Councillor Harris requested a confirmation on the estimate to strengthen to 67%. It was advised it would cost another \$20,000 to get further costings for the three options. Councillor Harris questioned if the amounts were estimates. It was confirmed the consultant was reluctant to put his name next to the prices without further investigation, and required another two months.

- Councillor Harris queried the report saying demolish and rebuild for option four, rather than relocate. It was advised it would not be able to be relocated as there is the old concrete structure inside.

THAT the Committee approves Option 4 for the Clock Tower.

BOYDE/JONES  
Motion Lost  
P&S/24/27

- Councillor Jones noted he supported Option 4 if it went out for consultation. It was advised whatever option is chosen will go out for consultation. Councillor Harris noted she struggles with the amount as it is a similar price to a building which is actually used. She noted her support for option four if it goes out for consultation. Councillor Erwood also noted his support for option 4 and questioned if a smaller, more economical version could be built.
- The District Mayor disagreed and noted he could not find any justification in a \$1,000,000 - \$3,000,000 cost to move it across the road. He advised he supports option 2 with it being put into year 2035 to be completed, noting there is no more risk than any other building or veranda on Broadway and is not an occupied building. Councillor Dudley noted she agreed with the District Mayor, that spending that amount of extra money is ridiculous. She noted she also does not like the idea of moving the clock tower as it is iconic and you can see it when coming into Stratford.

THAT the Committee approves Option 2 for the Clock Tower.

VOLZKE/BECK  
Carried  
1 Against  
P&S/24/28

- Councillor Boyde voted against the motion.

*The meeting adjourned at 7.54pm and reconvened at 8.02pm.*

17. [Decision Report – 2024/2034 LTP Capital Projects](#)  
 D23/47571 Page 189

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/DUDLEY  
Carried  
P&S/24/29

2. THAT Council approves Option 3 – Consider each project per Activity as outlined in **Appendix 1** of this report with supporting Business Cases in Appendix 2 and approve as necessary for information in the community consultation document with the amendments as noted in discussion.

DUDLEY/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/30

The Projects Manager noted the following points:

- The total dropped from the budget this morning was \$8,000,000 over ten years, with year one decreasing by \$445,000 and year two decreasing by \$1,200,000.

Points noted in discussion:

Clock Tower – Structural Strengthening

- Moved to year 9 and 10.

TET Stadium – Structural Strengthening

- Leaving as is.

War Memorial Centre – Structural Strengthening

- Move to year 2027/2028 and 2028/2029.

Demolition of the TSB Pool

- Remove the \$50,000 and move \$430,000 into year one.

War Memorial Centre roof

- It was noted an assessment will be completed after water blasting. It was advised if structural strengthening was not going to be completed until 2027/2028 then the roof may need to be completed sooner.
- It was decided to move this out to 2027/2028 to align with the strengthening, however can be changed with more detail after water blasting and change before being adopted.

Demolition of the Municipal Building and associated reinstatement.

- Remove the \$50,000 in the first year.

War Memorial – Stadium Lighting

- Move to 2027/2028.

War Memorial Centre – Resurface Stadium Floor

- Move to 2027/2028

*The Communications Manager left the meeting at 8.15pm.*

Survey Drones

- Remove

Library Development of seating areas/meeting spaces

- Update funding source to grants.
- Condense \$25,000 into year one and three.

Replacement of all Heritage Signs – Stratford to Tangarakau

- Councillor Harris noted she believes this is a nice to have, not a requirement as all the ones she has seen there is nothing wrong with. She enquired if this could be grant funded.
- Move to year 5.

Street Tree and tree surrounds replacements

- Councillor Erwood noted he does not believe this is a requirement. The Deputy Mayor advised these needed to be replaced, the alternative option is to take the trees out.
- Leave as is

Replace red brick monument wall with old bricks – Pioneer Cemetery

- Updated to Grant funding

Seating to pump track area

- Updated to Grant funding

Lighting at the Bike Park

- Updated to Grant funding

King Edward Park – Completion of the lime chip path

- Move to year 2.

Replacing lime chip path to concrete – Netball Courts to Rhododendron Dell

- Move to year 2.

Lighting and power box in Rhododendron Dell

- Move to year 1

*The Communications Manager joined the meeting at 8.34pm.*

*The meeting adjourned at 8.35pm and reconvened at 8.38pm.*



#### Ice Bath/Plunge

- Councillor Boyde noted he would like this removed. Councillor Beck agreed.
- Remove.

#### On-site Café – Tea and Coffee facilities

- Councillor Boyde noted he believed a coffee machine should not be considered. He noted he has no problem with someone else coming in and opening a café. Councillor Hall disagreed noting money would be made from it, so it should be a no brainer. Councillor Boyde noted it would be an overhead cost, including staff training, as well as businesses in town saying no to the proposal. Councillor Dudley noted her agreement with Councillor Hall as other cafes in town close at 2.30pm which means they will be closed after school, which is when most customers attend.
- Councillor Harris noted she would like to see the pool operating smoothly first and then pick up the café later down the line. The Deputy Mayor agreed, noting she sees the value in the opportunity to extract revenue from spectators, but does not believe now is the right time.
- Councillor Beck noted he does not want to see a café in there, he sees the opportunity for a coffee cart or similar operating out the front.
- Councillor Watt noted looking at the business case he does not believe it will make a profit, so would like the line removed.
- Councillor Jones noted the pool needs its ducks in a row before investing in a café, however sees the opportunity for a cart to go out front to see how that is customised before investing.
- Move to year 2027/2028.

#### Spin Bikes

- Councillor Hall questioned if 2026/2027 is the correct year for this. It was confirmed this funding was to purchase additional bikes, however TOI are inviting an application this year for wellbeing for the pool.
- Move to 2024/2025 along with Pilates – Reformers, Mirrors installation in fitness room and Total bars

#### Footpath Renewals and Walking and Cycling

- The Deputy Mayor sought clarification that Cordelia Steet has been identified as not needing a new footpath as it was already wide, could this be accommodated so it could be shared with cycling. It was advised currently when a footpath is replaced they are made 1.5 metres wide, however if it was on the main cycle route it could be made to 2.4 metres wide.
- The Deputy Mayor questioned what the walking and cycling budget is currently for. It was advised as Transport Choices is gone, it now sits in the Connecting Communities strategy. The Deputy Mayor questioned what the budget would look like if the plan was revised with shared use in mind when replacing the footpaths. It was advised footpath replacement comes from depreciation, and cycle ways comes from loan funding. The current footpath replacements could come from depreciation funds, with the extra to make it to 2.5 metres could be loan funded.
- Councillor Beck noted he believed the plans for Transport Choices were gone. It was advised the Connecting Communities Strategy was adopted before Transport Choices. The core of Transport Choices already existed, the funding has gone, but the intent is still there. Councillor Beck reiterated his understanding he believed it was gone. It was confirmed it existed before, but had received a significant funding boost.
- The Deputy Mayor noted she would be interested in the specifics of what is happening each year and that it would be nice to take a step back and look at the right priorities. It was advised the first five years would be taken up with Stratford Primary School and Portia Streets etc. It was noted that NZTA need to approve any plans in order to get subsidies, along with a safety audit from them. Projects will then come back to Council to reprioritise. Councillor Harris questioned for these projects to be subsidised they needed to be in the long term plan. It was noted if it is not on the list it would not get funding.

#### Brecon Road Bridge

- Councillor Jones questioned if there is a risk NZTA could say Council is not taking Brecon Road Bridge serious enough as it has been pushed down the line, could it be brought sooner so it can be determined if NZTA are going to fund it. The District Mayor agreed and would also like to see it moved forward. Councillor Jones suggested if the first year was moved into year three, it does mean it needs to be spent. Councillor Hall noted her support, which also shows the community Council is serious about the Bridge. It was advised it may show as a rates increase when the modelling was done.
- Councillor Boyde suggesting moving the projects to year four, five and six.
- There was no opposition to moving to year four, five and six.

It was noted that the meeting had now reached six hours which was the maximum duration of a meeting under the standing orders. Standing Order 4.2 allows for a resolution to continue or adjourn the meeting, transfer the remaining business to the next meeting or to an extraordinary meeting.

THAT the Committee will continue the meeting until the end of this report.

MCKAY/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/31

Bulk Discharge renewals

- Year one removed.

Safety Renewals

- Removing.

Pipework Capacity

- \$150,000 updated from year one to year three.

Toko Resource Consent

- Removed

Hydrants

- Updated to every second year one, three, five, seven and nine

Meter Renewal

- Removing years two and three.

Street work ridermains

- Updated to \$100,000

Toko bore review

- Removed.

Stratford Bore

- \$500,000 moved from year three to year four.

Stratford new Reservoir

- Moved to year five and six

Toko new Reservoir

- Year two \$20,000 and year ten \$12,000 removed.

Midhirst new Reservoir

- Removed.

Backflow prevention assessment and installations

- Removed.

Alternative power supply for Midhirst and Toko

- It was noted if there is no power supply in Midhirst there will be no water pressure as it is not gravity fed as the other water supplies, and a generator would help here.
- It was agreed to leave in.

THAT, in accordance with Standing Order 4.2, the Policy and Services Committee meeting will be adjourned to Tuesday 30 January 2024 to begin at 9.00am.

MCKAY/VOLZKE  
Carried  
P&S/24/32

*The meeting adjourned at 9.23pm.*

Date: Tuesday 30 January 2024 at 9.00AM (Reconvened)  
Venue: Council Chambers, 63 Miranda Street, Stratford

## Present

The Deputy Mayor M McKay (the Chairperson), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors: S J Beck, G W Boyde, A M C Dudley, J M S Erwood, A K Harris, E E Hall, V R Jones (*part meeting*), W J Sandford, and M J Watt.

## In attendance

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director – Assets Mrs V Araba (*part meeting*), the Director – Corporate Services – Mrs T Radich, the Director – Community Services – Ms K Whareaitu, the Director – Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the Committee Advisor and Executive Assistant – Mrs E Bishop, the Communications Manager – Ms G Gibson, the Corporate Accountant - Mrs C Craig, the Property Officer – Mrs S Flight (*part meeting*), the Projects Manager – Mr S Taylor (*part meeting*), the Roading Manager – Mr S Bowden, the Graduate Roading Engineer – Mr F Hick (*part meeting*), the Sustainability Advisor – Ms V Dombroski (*part meeting*) and two members of the media (Stratford Press and Taranaki Daily News)

## Welcome

The opening karakia was read.

The Deputy Mayor welcomed the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff, and the media.

The Deputy Mayor reiterated the health and safety message and emergency procedures.

## Apologies:

Apologies were noted from Councillor V R Jones (lateness) and C M Tongaawhikau

### Recommendation

THAT the apologies be received.

DUDLEY/HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/33

## 18. Decision Report – Section 17a Review – Building Facilities Maintenance Contract

D23/35352 Page 267

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received

BOYDE/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/34

2. THAT the Committee approves to further investigate option 4 – Combination of ~~Status quo~~ Contractor Panel and In-house service delivery (Cleaning and Caretaker), for the cost-effective delivery of the building facilities maintenance service.

BOYDE/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/35

The Property Officer requested that the recommendation be updated to replace *status quo* with *Contractor Panel* as per the option within the report.

*The Taranaki Daily News representative joined the meeting at 9.05am.*

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The District Mayor asked how the staffing requirements had been determined. Mr Taylor clarified that these had been estimated based on the hours that council needed, a full time electrician, plumber or builder may not be required but two full time cleaners and two part time cleaners would be to cover those disciplines. Mr Taylor noted that option 2 was not the preferred option as this would mean council had to continue to use external tradesmen to allow for situations where more than one person was required for the task for safety (as an example). Mr Hanne noted Option 2 was not a viable option and only included to show the full spectrum of options.
- It was clarified that Wai o Rua – Stratford Aquatic Centre cleaning was included within the full cleaning contract within the option (but not currently).
- The Deputy Mayor noted it appeared officers were not satisfied with the current level of service for cleaning and asked what the difference would be moving forward? Mrs Flight clarified that if the cleaning was brought in-house then it would mean the facilities could be kept up to scratch all the time, rather than one clean per day and jobs could be prioritised when needed.

*The Director – Assets joined the meeting at 9.08am*

- The Deputy Mayor asked that given the current satisfaction level, was continuing with the status quo a viable option? Mr Taylor noted there had always been a problem with the cleaning side of this current contract with one of the issues being this is subcontracted and therefore council is dealing with the middleman and does not allow the control officers would be looking for. The option to renew the contract is coming up and this discipline will need to be addressed each time. Mr Taylor clarified that by bringing the cleaning staff in-house there would be more direct control on the work undertaken and a lift in the sense of pride the staff would feel.
- Councillor Harris noted that legislation required a transfer of existing staff, she noted her concern that the current issues could transfer over if it was the same staff. Mr Hanne confirmed he would be required to work through the implications of a transfer as council was not this company's only contract therefore he would require further information of the requirements for a right of transfer requirements.
- It was clarified it was envisioned there would be two full time staff and two part time staff members, one of the full time positions would be in a supervisor role.
- Councillor Boyde noted his support for Option 4. He felt that there would always be inefficiencies with a subcontractor and this would allow council to have better control and set the standard it wanted. He noted councillors often received complaints regarding the level of service in the facilities.
- It was clarified that this option brought the cleaning and caretaker position in-house, with all trade requirements being through the contractor panel. The only option to retain the current contractor set up was Option 2.
- Mr Taylor clarified that the reason for having a caretaker position in-house was to undertake the smaller jobs, other janitorial type works and response works as there are often delays with tradespeople. There would be sufficient work to justify this position as it would be covering all civic amenities.

Points noted in discussion:

- The District Mayor clarified that the recommendation was for further investigation and not to commit to the option. He was happy to support investigation and requested further details be provided such as tool provision, storage, transportation etc.
- Councillor Beck noted he would like to see this work bring money back into Stratford rather than clipping the ticket of a multinational company. This option would tick that box.
- Councillor Sandford supported seeing a further breakdown as he felt this would be biting off more than council could chew. He noted cleaning vacancies are difficult to fill. It was confirmed this would be a 7 days a week requirement.

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received

DUDLEY/ERWOOD  
Carried  
P&S/24/36

2. THAT the Committee approves Option 1 – Status Quo, for the continued cost-effective delivery of the parks and reserves maintenance service.

ERWOOD/BECK  
Carried  
P&S/24/37

#### Questions/Points of Clarification:

- It was clarified that the 10 (mixed of full and part time) staff noted in 5.5 included the position of Parks and Reserves Manager.

#### Points noted in discussion:

- The Deputy Mayor noted this had been an interesting report as this was a consistent element of the feedback received to council. It was important to investigate if bringing this in-house would improve the level of service but the figures did not weigh up for the cost to the ratepayers. She noted her support for Option 1 but would encourage officers to be clear on the expectation for the level of service.
- Mr Hanne clarified that Option 1 (Status Quo) did not require further investigation as officers know the costs, therefore this recommendation was a decision. If another option was preferred then further investigation would be required.
- Councillor Boyle noted he would like to see more coming in-house, however the ratepayers could not afford this. He noted the comments regarding the level of service for these areas were received in the customer satisfaction survey every time.
- The District Mayor noted that if this was brought in-house there would be new problems incurred. He questioned if the complaints around the appearance of parks and the cemetery was in relation to the lack of performance in relation to managing the contract rather than the contract itself. He felt the best way forward was ensuring the contractors deliver on what they are meant to be. He noted the cost of setting up and buying the equipment was substantial, therefore Option 1 was the only option. He requested some emphasis be put on ensuring the cemetery is maintained to a standard that people expect, however there has been a conscious effort to improve.
- It was noted the current contract expires on 30 June 2024 with a renewal option for a further two years to 2026.
- It was clarified that the contractor has a local depot with Taranaki local staff. It is a bigger company that works throughout New Zealand but this also allows efficiencies with equipment. Mr Taylor noted that this company also holds the contract with South Taranaki District Council which adds the benefits of the equipment being more readily available for Stratford's contract needs, concern was noted that the South Taranaki contract could be given priority as it was bigger however this had not been the case so far.
- Councillor Beck supported Option 1 but would like to see council make it easier for local individuals to submit proposals as focus to see locals getting the work. Mr Hanne noted that council had split the tender process in the past to allow for hard copy tenders which was requested by them, however not a single tender in this format was received and he felt this was largely because the contract was so broad locals were not able to fulfil it. He noted there is a buy local term within the procurement policy which allowed a higher, but local, tender to be successful. Mrs Araba also noted that it was a requirement that the contractors base themselves in Stratford.
- Councillor Beck noted it was probably not the contract that was at fault but the enforcing of the contract and that officers needed to make sure it is upheld. Mr Hanne reminded the committee an option to lift the maintenance contract up was presented to elected members a year ago and they chose not to fund it to the higher level. Contractors can only deliver what they are paid to do.
- Councillor Harris supported the status quo but acknowledged this exercise provided some good insight and comparison for costs which will help ensure council is across what is being tendered.

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

HARRIS/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/38

2. THAT Council considers the following options in relation to the Draft Speed Management Plan. The options to consider are:

**Option 1** - Continue with the implementation of draft Stratford Speed Management Plan. This would be a discretionary decision rather than mandatory.

**Option 2** - Wait for the new Setting of Speed Limits Rule to become law to reduce speeds on local roads which have an increased crash rate related to speed, like Opunake Road.

**Option 3** - Do not continue with the *draft* Stratford Speed Management Plan.

HARRIS/HALL  
Carried  
P&S/24/39

- ~~3. THAT Council adopts Option 3 of the draft Stratford Speed Management Plan.~~

### Questions/Points of Clarification:

- It was clarified that the Taranaki Regional Council had confirmed they were not progressing with implementing a speed management plan for the region.
- Councillor Boyde asked what the costs associated with this work had been as he noted these decisions by central government come at a cost. He noted the ratepayers were not in favour of this plan and he supported Option 3 to not continue. His only concern was what the new government would bring in and what it would look like. Mr Bowden noted that there had been no costs associated with the speed management plan other than officer time. It is clear that the minister will present a revised version next year and he suggested that if problems arise then those areas be addressed at that time. The regional council was not pursuing a region wide speed management plan and New Plymouth District Council was looking to implement some varied speeds in high density areas but these are isolated locations rather than a district wide approach.

### *Councillor V R Jones joined the meeting at 9.40am.*

- Mr Bowden noted that funding was still secured with Waka Kotahi for the safety improvements planned for State Highway 3 (Hawera to New Plymouth) but was not sure if these plans were going to be implemented.
- Councillor Harris noted that council had gone out with this speed management plan and received submissions, including submitter requests to speak to their submission. She questioned if this was a breach of process to not give them the opportunity to speak to council? Mr Hanne noted that to continue with a hearing would require a genuine willingness from council to proceed with the plan as presented.
- Mr Bowden clarified that Option 2 meant waiting for the new rule to be presented, Option 3 was to not continue with the speed management plan. The new rule may be very similar, but it was not known if it would look at the whole region or particular areas.
- Councillor Hall asked for insight on the feedback received on the reduction of speed on Opunake Road? Mr Bowden noted there had been 34 submissions in favour of this and 32 opposed to it. His officer recommendation was to reduce the speed limit due to the number of crashes along this piece of road (52 in 5 years with three that were fatal). He noted that there had been no crashes on this road since the speed was reduced in 2022.
- Councillor Hall noted her support for Option 2 as she felt this gave council more scope. She noted there was frustration around the table when decisions were forced on council from central

government and councillors would prefer to make the decisions for their community and option 2 would provide more scope for this.

- The District Mayor noted that this was a unique situation where the goalposts had been shifted halfway through a process. The blanket set rules have now been removed and it is not known what we will be moving towards or trying to achieve. It would make sense to stop the process completely as the whole principle of the plan was a blanket set rule across the region. But he agreed there are problem areas. He noted one third of submitters were supportive across the board but the negativity was relating to the blanket rule but noting there were areas needing consideration. He supported stopping the process and continuing if a problematic area is identified on a case by base basis. He felt both Option 2 and 3 would achieve this.
- Mr Hanne clarified the information will not be disposed of and will be utilised for further analysis. He felt it would be viable to pause and wait until further instruction is received from the government to check it against the new directive and feedback received.
- Councillor Beck noted his support for Option 3. He considers it undesirable committing public money for policies which are not council's policies. The road to zero is not the new governments policy and is not his either.
- Councillor Harris agreed that Option 2 and 3 achieve a similar result but that she was keen to pause what had already been done, address any problem areas if they arise and wait for the new rules. Mr Hanne confirmed that council can look at a problematic area at any time with either option. Mr Bowden noted that the Setting Speed Limits Bylaw is still in place which will govern what council can do.
- Councillor Harris noted her concern that Option 3 felt very final and supported Option 2.
- Councillor Boyde noted he would support Option 3 knowing council still had the tools to address problem areas.

### Recommendations

3. THAT Council adopts Option 2 for the draft Stratford Speed Management Plan.

HARRIS/HALL  
*Division*  
*For 6*  
*Against 5*  
Carried  
P&S/24/40

*A division was called.*

*Those voting for the motion: Councillors: Dudley, Harris, Hall, Sandford, the Deputy Mayor and the District Mayor.*

*Those voting against the motion: Councillors: Beck, Boyde, Jones, Erwood and Watt.*

### Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/McKAY  
Carried  
P&S/24/41

2. THAT this Committee approves to the disposal of surplus properties below:

- a) 577 Beaconsfield Road (PtS 41 Blk XIV SD Huiroa and Lot 1 DP398529) - Stanley Road as per Option 2.

VOLZKE/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/42

- b) ~~31 SH3 / Mountain Road (PtS2 Blk XIII SD Huiroa) as per Option 2.~~

ERWOOD/BECK  
Withdrawn  
P&S/24/43

- a) 31 SH3 / Mountain Road (PtS2 Blk XIII SD Huiroa) as per Option 3.

BOYDE/SANDFORD  
Carried  
P&S/24/44

- b) Lot 2 DP1688 (85 Regan Street) as per Option 2.

HALL/SANDFORD  
Carried  
P&S/24/45

The Projects Manager noted that officers had met with Stratford on Stage to let them know this report was being presented to council. They had requested council be reminded that this property was currently no cost to council as they pay the rates and maintenance as part of the lease agreement. They have expressed their desire to purchase the building.

#### Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted his support for the officer recommendations, he asked if a real estate agent was required to be engaged for these sales or if council approaches neighbouring property owners? Mr Hanne noted that the policy requires council to be competitive, transparent and open. However he acknowledged there could be deviations such as the Stratford on Stage property which was for community benefit. He noted there has been contact from interested parties regarding Beaconsfield Road and officers have committed to notifying them when it goes on the market.
- The District Mayor noted that the disposal of the Beaconsfield Road property was understandable, however he felt the land on Mountain Road was of no value to anyone other than the grazing it is currently being used for and he asked what the alternative options were if they did not choose to purchase it. He also noted the Stratford on Stage property was not costing council anything and they want to continue to use the building so why was council wanting to sell this?

*The Sustainability Advisor joined the meeting at 10.10am.*

- Mr Hanne noted it was important that council reviews the surplus property list. The Stratford on Stage property could be put to the open market but council needed to weigh up the community benefit in deciding this. He noted that the group currently struggles to get external funding for the building as they did not own it. He clarified that Option 2 was to sell it to Stratford on Stage but



noted this would need to be open-ended in terms of the timeline to allow the group to put themselves the right legal and financial situation, he noted Option 1 to do nothing did not stop the group approaching council to purchase it and he felt that going to the open market could be seen as a threat. Mr Taylor noted that going to the open market would also mean officers would have to explore council's legal obligations in terms of the current lease.

- Councillor Sandford noted this had historically been the Stratford Band clubrooms and asked if it had been gifted to council as he thought this should be part of the consideration. Councillor Beck agreed and questioned the history of the land as there are sports clubs with club rooms on council land and that the group wanted to formalise this for funding purposes.
- It was clarified that mortgages were not held against properties and that the purchase of the additional cemetery land had been purchased from the Assets Proceeds Reserve so the sale of Beaconsfield Road would replenish this reserve.
- It was requested that a deep dive investigation on the Stratford on Stage land be undertaken on the history of the ownership prior to a decision being made on the purchase price and sale. Approval would be sought in this report to breach the asset disposal policy in regards to selling the land directly to the Stratford on Stage group.

*The Graduate Roding Engineer joined the meeting at 10.18am.*

Points noted in discussion:

#### Beaconsfield Road

- The District Mayor noted his support to place this property on the open market to maximise the benefits.

#### Mountain Road

- Councillor Sandford noted the farmer currently grazing this land has told council he will not purchase this land.
- The District Mayor supported pursuing Option 3.
- Councillor Harris supported Option 3. She noted it was disappointing the farmer grazing the land had not engaged in a license to occupy.
- It was clarified that if the market value was not achieved, as per option 3, then council could explore the options if there was a buyer at a lower price.
- Councillor Jones supported Option 3 but suggested the property should be fenced. Mr Taylor confirmed the property was not fenced and this would need to be considered if the adjoining owner did not want to purchase it.
- The Deputy Mayor noted her preference to see the land planted in native trees if the adjoining land owner did not want to own the land.
- It was clarified that due to the shape of the land it was highly unlikely that a house could be put on it.

#### Regan Street

- Councillor Hall supported Option 2 as it supports a local group and allows for flexibility in the timeline of purchasing the land. She felt this was in line with council's values and core priorities.
- Councillor Beck supported Option 2 as long as the deep dive into the historical ownership of the land is completed. Mr Hanne clarified that if Option 2 is agreed upon then officers will communicate with Stratford on Stage and get the land valued. The current lease was expiring in 2028 but a continuation of the lease could be arranged if they were not at the position to purchase at that point. To delay the decision for further information would need an alternative option.

#### Forest Road

- It was clarified nothing further was required for this land as the crown had removed it from council ownership.

*The Taranaki Daily News left the meeting at 10.29am.*

## 22. Monthly Reports

### 22.1 Assets Report D23/48257 Page 316

#### Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

HALL/HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/46

*The Services Asset Manager joined the meeting at 10.32am.*

#### Questions/Points of Clarification:

- It was clarified the break on the water main was on the old trunk main.
- It was noted it was still unknown why the phosphate levels are rising at the Oxidation Pond.
- Councillor Boyde noted production at the farm was currently 6% ahead on a monthly basis and 1% ahead on a yearly basis with 10 less cows.
- The review on the hydrological effects on the two playing fields in Victoria Park was being undertaken to get to the bottom of why some of the work undertaken has not been successful and so officers can get a clear understanding of what is happening in the soil.
- Councillor Sandford noted he had received feedback that the cemetery had never looked so good as it is now.

*The Services Asset Manager, the Property Officer, the Sustainability Advisor and the Project Manager left the meeting at 10.33am.*

### 22.2 Community Services Report D23/48052 Page 341

#### Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

DUDLEY/McKAY  
Carried  
P&S/24/47

#### Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted the Lightning Five Hockey Tournament was being held 10-11 February 2024.
- It was clarified no further discussion had been held with the Stratford Business Association regarding its relationship with council, this would be postponed until the desired outcomes of Economic Development are defined.
- The District Mayor noted the Mayors Taskforce for Jobs registrations highlights the demand and need for this service. He noted that there were 30 job seekers registered in November but not any new businesses or employers. A meeting was held last week with the administrator from Wellington who made comments regarding the requirement to spend the allocated funds, failure to do this may result in the funding being reduced. He noted one of the biggest problems is that some of the success stories do not count towards council's performance indicators such as finding work for a young person outside of the Stratford boundaries. He confirmed work in Eltham did not count as it was not in the Stratford district.

**Recommendation**

THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/BOYDE  
Carried  
P&S/24/48

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- It was confirmed that councils are still operating under the current Resource Management Act.
- Councillor Jones sought clarification on the amendment process for building consents as he had received complaints especially with the time it is taking to go back to the designers to make small changes. Mr Sutherland noted that amendments are required to highlight the change in the project from when it was consented and keep an accurate record of what the building project is. He would need to seek clarification on the specific level of change that triggers an amendment requirement.
- It was clarified that the building complaint numbers were in relation to formal complaints only.

**Recommendation**

THAT the report be received.

BOYDE/HARRIS  
Carried  
P&S/24/49

The Director – Corporate Services noted the property rating sale on Swansea Road should be advertised by the end of February. This was approved by council approximately six years ago and officers have been trying to work with the property owner during this time. The ratepayer has made payments on occasion but has fallen further and further behind so all other means have now been exhausted. The court has been communicating with the ratepayer to give final opportunities and fully explain the consequences.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- It was noted that de-escalation training for elected members had been booked for 20 February 2024.
- It was clarified the property rating sale had been presented to elected members. There have been a range of scenarios and a lot of engagement with the property owner. It was clarified that once a rating sale is conducted the debt to council is cleared with the remaining funds going to the property owner. Properties do not go to a rating sale if there is a mortgage on the property, in the instance of a mortgage council writes to the bank and the outstanding rates are put on the mortgage. The rate remission policy for the remission of penalties is not applicable for reoccurring instances such as this one.
- The District Mayor noted his concern that three items of expenditure were already significantly over budget (Roading, Aquatic Centre and 3 Waters). It was noted that a lot of these were fixed costs, such as the roading maintenance monthly expense, and these will worsen. This is why there has been quite a jump in Year 1 of the Long Term Plan budgets.
- Councillor Boyde noted the overspend at Wai o Rua – Stratford Aquatic Centre and that elected members were still waiting for the Section 17a review on the facility. Given that the 12 months was completed in October he felt it should be showing the synergies and cost costing exercises by now. He expressed his concern how much of a cost this is for the ratepayers as well as most of the expenditure being in the red.
- Councillor Harris noted the expenditure associated with the transport choices and asked if there was any way to claim those costs? Mr Bowden noted that council was currently waiting for a decision from the minister on the allocation of unclaimed pre-implementation funds which could potentially be a funding source to apply for.

### 23. Questions

There were no questions.

### 24. Closing Karakia

D21/40748 Page 375

The closing karakia was read.

*The meeting closed at 10.55am*

M McKay  
**Chairman**

Confirmed this 27<sup>th</sup> day of February 2024.

N C Volzke  
**District Mayor**