

---

Monday, 14 February 2022

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Agenda

---

*Te Rā Hui:*  
Meeting date: **Monday, 14 February 2022**

---

*Te Wā:*  
Time: **2.00pm**

---

*Te Wāhi:*  
Venue: **Council Chamber  
Ground Floor  
Civic Administration Building  
Lyndon Road East  
Hastings**

---

*Te Hoapā:*  
Contact: **Democracy and Governance Services  
P: 06 871 5000 | E: [democracy@hdc.govt.nz](mailto:democracy@hdc.govt.nz)**

---

*Te Āpiha Matua:*  
Responsible  
Officer: **Transportation Manager - Jag Pannu**

---

**Watch Council meetings  
streamed live on our website  
[www.hastingsdc.govt.nz](http://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz)**

## Hastings District Rural Community Board – Terms of Reference

The Community Board is a separate entity to the Council. The role of the Community Board is set out in Section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Council is authorised to delegate powers to the Community Board.

### **Membership (6 members)**

Chair (elected by the Board)

Deputy Chair (elected by the Board)

4 Elected Community Board Members

1 Mohaka Ward Councillor

1 Kahuranaki Ward Councillor

**Quorum** – 4 members

### **DELEGATED POWERS**

#### **General**

1. To maintain an overview of services provided by the Council within the Community Board's area.
2. To represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of the community represented.
3. To consider and report on all matters referred to the Board by the Council, or any matter of interest or concern to the Community Board.
4. To communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community;
5. To undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the Council.
6. To appoint a member of the Community Board to organisations approved by the Council from time to time.

### **LONG TERM PLAN/ANNUAL PLAN/POLICY ISSUES**

7. Authority to make a submission to the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan process on activities, service levels and expenditure (including capital works priorities) within the Board's area or to make a submission in relation to any policy matter which may have an effect within the Board's area.

### **ROADING AND TRAFFIC**

8. Authority to exercise the Council's powers and functions in relation to roads within the Board's area under the following sections of the Local Government Act 1974:
  - Section 335 (vehicle crossings);
  - Section 344 (gates and cattle stops);
  - Section 355 (overhanging trees).
9. Authority to exercise the Council's statutory powers (including any relevant powers conferred by bylaw) over roads within the Board's area in respect of:
  - (i) Road user behaviour at intersections;
  - (ii) Controls on stopping or overtaking
  - (iii) Controls on turning
  - (iv) Pedestrian safety,
  - (v) Footpath maintenance and improvements.
  - (vi) Accident investigation studies, lighting and other safety works
10. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this delegation authorises a Community Board to deal with a matter, in the exercise of delegated authority, in a manner which is conflict with any policy or decision of the Council or any standing committee of the Council in relation to the same matter.

---

Monday, 14 February 2022

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Agenda

---

*Heamana*

**Chair:** Nick Dawson

*Mematanga:*

**Committee Members:**

Marcus Buddo, Sue Maxwell and Jonathan Stockley  
Councillors Tania Kerr (Deputy Chair) and Sophie Siers

Youth Council appointee: Vacancy

---

*Tokamatua:*

**Quorum:**

4 members

---

*Apiha Matua:*

**Officer Responsible:**

*Kaiwhakahaere Rōpū*

Transportation Manager: Jag Pannu

---

*Te Rōpū Manapori me te*

*Kāwanatanga:*

**Democracy &**

**Governance Services:**

Louise Stettner (Ext 5018)

---



## *Te Rārangi Take*

# Order of Business

---

### **Apologies – Ngā Whakapāhatanga**

- 1.0** At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.  
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.
- 

### **2.0 Conflict of Interest – He Ngākau Kōnatunatu**

Members need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as a Member of the Council and any private or other external interest they might have. This note is provided as a reminder to Members to scan the agenda and assess their own private interests and identify where they may have a pecuniary or other conflict of interest, or where there may be perceptions of conflict of interest.

If a Member feels they do have a conflict of interest, they should publicly declare that at the start of the relevant item of business and withdraw from participating in the meeting. If a Member thinks they may have a conflict of interest, they can seek advice from the General Counsel or the Manager: Democracy and Governance (preferably before the meeting).

It is noted that while Members can seek advice and discuss these matters, the final decision as to whether a conflict exists rests with the member.

---

### **Confirmation of Minutes – Te Whakamana i Ngā Minitī**

- 3.0** Minutes of the Hastings District Rural Community Board held Monday 29 November 2021.  
*(Previously circulated)*
- 

- 4.0 State of the Environment Report 2015-2019** **7**
- 

- 5.0 Rural Community Recycling Facilities Update** **9**
- 

- 6.0 Dog Control Fees from 1 July 2022** **15**
- 

- 7.0 Rural Transportation Activity Report** **23**
-

---

**8.0 Update - Representation Review 2021/22**

**29**

---

**9.0 Minor Items – *Ngā Take Iti***

---

**10.0 Urgent Items – *Ngā Take Whakahihiri***

---

---

Monday, 14 February 2022

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

**Item 4**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
From: **Junior Tuakana, Environmental Planner (Policy)**

---

*Te Take:*  
Subject: **State of the Environment Report 2015-2019**

---

## **1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Rural Community Board to receive the 'State of the Environment Report 2015-2019' (The Report). The Report was adopted by the Council at the 14 December 2021 Council meeting. The Council also resolved that The Report be presented to the Rural Community Board for information.
- 1.2 The Report addresses Council's obligation under Section 35 of the Resource Management Act to monitor the state of the environment of its district and to make available to the public a review of the results of its monitoring. The purpose as set out in the Act is to enable the public to be better informed of the duties, powers and functions of Council and to enable the public to participate effectively under the Act. This is the third edition of The Report.
- 1.3 While The Report is a statutory requirement, it is a very useful documentary resource for signalling where policy amendments may be needed as a result of evolving or changing trends in the environment over time. In 2021 The Report was instrumental in informing the completion of the Eco District Strategic Overview and identifying several potential issues within the Hastings District Plan.
- 1.4 The Report also contributes to achieving the goals set out in the 2021 – 2031 Long Term Plan under the Environmental, Cultural, Social and Economic Wellbeings.
- 1.5 **The Report will be circulated separately to the agenda.**

## **2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga***

That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled State of the Environment Report 2015-2019 dated 14 February 2022.

### **Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.

---

Monday, 14 February 2022

---

Item 5

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

**Nā:** Danny McClure, Solid Waste Operations & Contract Manager  
**From:** Angela Atkins, Waste Planning Manager

---

**Te Take:**  
**Subject:** Rural Community Recycling Facilities Update

---

## **1.0 Executive Summary – Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on current rural recycling site behaviours and initiatives including the Christmas/New Year period and relative contamination levels.
- 1.2 This is to ensure the Rural Community Board are up to date with what is working and what is not in their respective community areas.

## **2.0 Recommendations - Ngā Tūhunga**

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Rural Community Recycling Facilities Update dated 14 February 2022.
- B) That the Rural Community Board note the initiatives outlined in this report including Maraekākaho, Pukehamoamoā, Poukawa, Waimārama, Tūtira, Henderson Road and Blackbridge and provide feedback. The success of any trial or initiative will be measured on participation, contamination and illegal dumping at the site.
- C) That the Rural Community Board notes that officers are continuing to work with the rural communities to identify suitable recycling site options and reinforce community education about recycling.

## **3.0 Background – Te Horopaki**

- 3.1 Rural recycling facilities provide a drop off service for common recyclables; glass, plastics, cans, paper and cardboard.

3.2 Eskdale - With the recent re-engagement with the Eskdale community to highlight potential sites, the community will identify what they believe to be an adequate site. The HDC Solid Waste Operations and Contract Manager will review and mock up a site plan/s and present to relative compliance personnel and the RCB for suitability/approval. Due to the Christmas/New year period, it has been relatively quiet from the community. HDC Solid Waste Operations and Contract Manager will re-engage with the community when Council highlight the Plastics no.5 initiative.

- Consultation with Napier City Council (NCC) would be required as NCC residents would also utilise the facility with a financial contribution from NCC being negotiated. An update will be provided at the next meeting.
- The reasons provided from the community for this facility have been discussed in the previous report to the Rural Community Board:

3.3 Waipātiki Beach Community will have a permanent site established, with planning underway based on a very successful 12 month trial. Imagery is provided below for reference.



3.4 All other Rural Recycling Sites – update:

3.4.1 Maraekākaho – The community are proactively reporting contamination, with one recent incident that identified incorrect product was place into the wrong container, this was highlighted to the contractor who successfully removed the contamination prior to offloading.

3.4.2 Pukehomoamoā – very minor, but consistent contamination (images below) reported by the contractor and the site has still been relatively free from significant illegal dumping practices. HDC are in regular contact with their community champion.

2/11/21



29/11/21



10/12/21



4/1/22



3.4.3 Poukawa – Only one incident reported by the contractor, images were sent through and a letter was sent to the resident who was identified on some of the packaging.

10/12/21



3.4.4 Waimārama – This site remains challenging, with regular contamination issues including food waste.

26/11/21



7/12/21



31/12/21

13/1/22



- Waimārama will continue to be reviewed and an update provided at the next Rural Community Board meeting.
- The 3rd seasonal bin placed onsite at Waimārama (from mid-December to early February) for the plastics and cans, this will be removed after Waitangi weekend – week commencing the 8th of February.

3.4.5 Blackbridge has seen increased usage from the Havelock North community and with that increased levels of contamination, which will be monitored with some letters being sent to residents as mail/labels on packaging were found.

16/1/22



3.4.6 Tūtira site remains relatively good with no significant issues reported over the festive season.

3.4.7 Henderson Rd recycling centre continues to be very good, based on the location within a manned Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) environment, however some minor contamination was reported.

#### 4.0 Discussion – *Te Matapakitanga*

- 4.1 In the 2014/2015 Annual Plan, Council resolved to proceed with the development of rural recycling facilities, looking at a potential eight sites across the district. Since then five permanent sites have been established.
- 4.2 In 2019 a new recycling service contract was procured and this new contract allows for additional sites to be serviced under the contract.
- 4.3 The current annual budget for servicing the seven rural recycling sites is \$65,000 pa. There are sufficient funds to cover estimated additional servicing costs in the 2021/22 budget for rural recycling.
- 4.4 The Waipātiki trial has been a success with a permanent site to be established. This would consist of a concrete pad in the road reserve and a fixed platform design for ease of servicing. Planning is currently underway.
- The funds to establish the Waipātiki site would come from the Waste Minimisation fund and we would seek approval from the Group Manager – Asset Management.
  - Once permanently established, the site would continue to significantly benefit the community.
  - This would consist of a concrete pad in the road reserve and a fixed platform design for ease of servicing.
  - Estimated costs to establish a permanent site would be circa \$25,000 as a one off cost. No consents are required as land is owned by HDC and the site is already established in the road reserve area.
- 4.5 There has been some recent engagement with the Eskdale community to highlight potential sites which will require consultation, as NCC residents would also utilise the facility.

#### 5.0 Options – *Ngā Kōwhiringa*

Option One - Recommended Option - Te Kōwhiringa Tuatahi – Te Kōwhiringa Tūtohunga

- 5.1 Continue to work with the Eskdale Community to highlight any potential site options, as previously agreed
- 5.2 Engagement with NCC to establish their respective interest and preparedness to co-fund.
- 5.3 Report back to the Rural Community Board recommending the most suitable site.
- 5.4 Advantages
- Provides a recycling service to residents in the Eskdale and wider rural community.
- 5.5 Disadvantages
- Risk of contamination of product within bins with visitors using site/bin as dumping ground for rubbish (as it is unmanned).
  - The site may have to be closed if contamination levels become a problem in line with the decision-making framework to temporarily close rural recycling facilities endorsed by the Rural Community Board, 30 November 2020

Option Two – Status Quo - Te Kōwhiringa Tuarua – Te Āhuetanga o nāianeī

- 5.6 The investigation is not supported and residents are required to continue to utilise current facilities that are out of their normal travel route and/or discard recyclables in the waste stream.

## 6.0 Next steps – *Te Anga Whakamua*

Officers to provide mock-up of Waipātiki Site for reference (see below)



### Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This proposal promotes the local public services environmental wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future by supporting a community which wastes less.

---

### Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

This initiative will have no direct impact on the Māori community, over and above the wider community.

---

### Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

The establishment of rural recycling facilities aligns with Action 4E of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 -2024: Expand recycling drop off stations to communities where feasible.

---

### Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

Nil financial considerations at this stage – time involved of council officer to investigate options:

---

### Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This decision/report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being not of significance.

---

---

### Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*

Consultation regarding rural recycling facilities was undertaken as part of the 2014/2015 Annual Plan, no further consultation is required.

---

### Risks

Opportunity: to extend rural recycling services in line with action 4E of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

| REWARD – <i>Te Utu</i>   | RISK – <i>Te Tūraru</i>   |
|--|---|
| Increased accessibility to recycling facilities to support the aims and targets of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, to increase recycling by 20%. | There is a risk that the site may be subjected to dumping of rubbish or contamination of recyclable material. There is no higher risk at this site than any other rural recycling site. The community will be responsible for the management and oversight of use on a daily basis.<br>Additional cost to service may exceed existing budget. |

---

### Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hāpori*

This report is being presented to the Rural Community Board for consideration.

---

---

 Monday, 14 February 2022
 

---

Item 6

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*
**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**
*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

*Nā:*  
**From: John Payne, Regulatory Solutions Manager**

*Te Take:*  
**Subject: Dog Control Fees from 1 July 2022**

## 1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 Section 37 of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires – the dog control fees payable to a territorial authority shall be those reasonable fees prescribed by resolution for the registration and control of dogs.
- 1.2 This report analyses three options for funding dog registration. These options look at selected owners continuing to subsidise urban owners; selected owners and rural dog owners subsidising urban owners; or all dog owners paying equally.

## 2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Dog Control Fees from 1 July 2022 dated 14 February 2022.
- B) That the Board supports the following dog registration fees (inclusive of GST) from 1 July 2022:
- i. Selected Owners subsidising Urban dog owners

| Category       | Before 1 Aug 2022 | After 1 Aug 2022 |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Urban          | \$118.00          | \$176.00         |
| Selected Owner | \$80.00           | \$120.00         |
| Rural          | \$57.00           | \$85.50          |

OR

- ii. Both Selected and Rural Owners subsidising Urban dog owners

| Category       | Before 1 Aug 2022 | After 1 Aug 2022 |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Urban          | \$118.00          | \$176.00         |
| Selected Owner | \$65.00           | \$97.50          |
| Rural          | \$65.00           | \$97.50          |

OR

- iii. All dog owners pay equally

| Category       | Before 1 Aug 2022 | After 1 Aug 2022 |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| All Dog Owners | \$75.50           | \$113.00         |

- C) That the Board supports:

- i. Not to provide district wide dog doo bag dispensers

OR

- ii. To provide district wide dog doo bag dispensers and adding \$8.41 to each dog registration fee

- D) That the Board supports the following fees increased by inflation where considered appropriate:

| Category                                 | Current Fee  | Proposed Fee 2022 |
|--|--------------|-------------------|
| First impound                            | \$85.00      | \$90.00           |
| Second impound                           | \$127.50     | \$130.00          |
| Third & subsequent impound               | \$180.00     | \$185.00          |
| Sustenance (daily)                       | \$9.00       | \$9.00            |
| Adoption Fee                             | \$260.00     | \$265.00          |
| Animal Control Hourly Rate               | \$112.50     | \$115.00          |
| Application for Selected Owner Policy    | \$30.00      | \$30.00           |
| Application to Keep More than Two Dogs   | \$30.00      | \$30.00           |
| Destruction Fee                          | \$60.00      | \$60.00           |
| Micro-chip Fee (including chip)          | \$42.00      | \$45.00           |
| Relinquishment Fee                       | \$50.00      | \$50.00           |
| Replacement Tag                          | \$6.00       | \$6.00            |
| Seizure Fee                              | \$60.00      | \$60.00           |
| Vehicle Rate                             | \$0.83       | \$0.83            |
| <b>Impound charges relating to Stock</b> |              |                   |
| Deer                                     | \$40.00      | \$45.00           |
| Horses                                   | \$40.00      | \$45.00           |
| Cattle                                   | \$40.00      | \$45.00           |
| Pigs                                     | \$20.00      | \$25.00           |
| Goats                                    | \$10.00      | \$15.00           |
| Sheep                                    | \$10.00      | \$15.00           |
| Daily Sustenance                         | Actual Costs | Actual Costs      |

### 3.0 Background – Te Horopaki

- 3.1 Dog Control is a community safety activity which does not function to make a profit.
- 3.2 The current charging method has been determined based on breaking the costs into two components, **registration** and **enforcement**, then dividing the registration component equally amongst all dogs and dividing the enforcement component based on the level of work allocation.
- 3.3 This method has worked well, however the number of SOP (Selected Owner Policy) dogs has increased over the years and accordingly the urban category has significantly decreased. (Selected Owner Policy recognises responsible dog owners by providing a reduced fee.) This means the

amount calculated for SOP is spread over a much greater number and the amount calculated for urban dogs is spread over a much smaller number. This creates a significant discrepancy and the SOP fees have been increased to cover the discrepancy.

- 3.4 There are other factors that need to be taken into consideration for which the formula does not address and cannot be attributed to any particular category i.e.
- The figures are based on everyone paying, but in reality they do not
  - Some people pay at the penalty rate for late payment
  - Some people pay at another council and later transfer into the district. These owners are not required to pay
  - Some people only pay a pro-rata fee when the dog attains the age of three months during the registration year
  - Some people claim a refund (from the same revenue code) if their dog dies during the registration year
  - Unregistered dogs, the highest category of offenders, don't pay a fee.
- 3.5 A greater urban fee, due to the small number of urban dogs, is likely to result in higher degrees of non-compliance.

Table 1 - Current Registration Fees (incl. GST) 2021/2022

| Category       | Before 1 Aug 2021 | After 1 Aug 2021 | Total | Registered |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|------------|
| Urban          | \$115.00          | \$172.00         | 2,487 | 2,291      |
| Selected Owner | \$78.00           | \$117.00         | 4,549 | 4,549      |
| Rural          | \$56.00           | \$84.00          | 6,396 | 6,348      |
| Special        | Nil               | N/A              | 15    | 15         |

#### **Dog Doo Bag Dispensers**

- 3.6 On 26 January 2021, elected members were asked for direction on providing district wide dog doo bag dispensers, as currently these are only provided in Havelock North.
- 3.7 It was explained that initially we would need to procure about 48 stations at about \$1,000 each, \$48,000. There would also be installation costs of about \$20,000 and ongoing purchase and replenishing costs for bags \$45,000 PA.
- 3.8 A number of disadvantages were explained, including costs, and the fact that it may condition dog owners to leave home without a bag. Not all reserves would have a station installed.
- 3.9 Elected members, requested that the option to install the stations be brought back to Council through the 2022/2023 dog registration fee resolution process.
- 3.10 There would be an additional cost of about \$113,000 in the first year to purchase and install the stations. This equals to \$8.41 per dog, the cost being equally divided across all dogs. The costs would reduce to \$3.50 per dog the following and subsequent years, excluding any price increase.

#### **4.0 Discussion – Te Matapakitanga**

- 4.1 1<sup>st</sup> March 2021 the Rural Community Board questioned the rural dog registration fee increase. The fee had not increased in six years and went from \$48 to \$56 for rural dogs.
- 4.2 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021, through the Long Term Plan process, Federated Farmers also questioned the rural dog registration fee increase.

- 4.3 The Rural Community Board and Federated Farmers claim working dogs do not contribute as much to the complaints, however although this is true, the same argument can be applied across all categories of dogs.
- 4.4 The community determines the cost of dog control by how compliant or non-compliant they are. If staff need to patrol in pairs because there is a risk or threat from the public or gangs, then that impacts on the cost of productivity. Staff need to do the job efficiently and safely.
- 4.5 Elected members requested the fee structure be reviewed for the 2022/2023 registration year.
- 4.6 Currently working dogs are not separated out from rural dogs. This would be a mammoth task and very contestable because working dogs are not determined by breed under the Dog Control Act. Section 2 of the Dog Control Act 1996 states, in part, working dog means **any dog** kept solely or principally for the purposes of herding or driving stock.
- 4.7 Any rural dog owner could claim their dog, regardless of breed, is a working dog and this aspect would require evaluation, which would require additional resources and funding.

## 5.0 Options – Ngā Kōwhiringa

Option One - Status Quo - Recommended Option - Te Kōwhiringa Tuatahi – Te Āhuetanga o nāianeī - Te Kōwhiringa Tūtohunga

- 5.1 The operational budget for 2022/2023 is \$1,635,605 - Registration is 46% of expenditure less recoveries, less public benefit, and the balance split equally amongst all dogs.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Registration Expenditure (46%)           | \$752,378 |
| Recoveries 80% (infringements)           | \$155,859 |
| Public Benefit 10%                       | \$75,237  |
| Balance (left to fund by all dog owners) | \$521,282 |

\$521,282 divided by 13,432 (dogs registered 2020/21 year)      **\$38.80** per dog

- 5.2 Enforcement is 54% of expenditure, less recoveries, less public benefit. The balance being divided according to the percent of work allocation, identified as 55% urban, 15% Selected Owner and 30% rural.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Enforcement Expenditure (54%)                            | \$883,227 |
| Recoveries 20% (prosecutions, infringements, impounding) | \$38,965  |
| Public Benefit 40%                                       | \$353,290 |
| Balance (left to fund)                                   | \$490,972 |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Urban x 55% = \$270,034 divided by 2,487 (Urban dogs)       | \$108.57 |
| Selected Owner x 15% = \$73,646 divided by 4,549 (SOP dogs) | \$16.19  |
| Rural x 30% = \$147,291 divided by 6,396 (Rural dogs)       | \$23.02  |

|                                  |          |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Urban \$38.80 + \$108.57         | \$147.37 |
| Selected Owner \$38.80 + \$16.19 | \$55.00  |
| Rural \$38.80 + \$23.02          | \$61.82  |

- 5.3 Given the formula anomalies (see clause 3.4) and enforcement issues (see clause 3.5) the urban fee has been reduced and the SOP fee has been increased to help subsidise the urban fee.

Table 2 – Proposed fees, current formula (with inflation)

| Category       | Before 1 Aug 2022 | After 1 Aug 2022 |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Urban          | \$118.00          | \$176.00         |
| Selected Owner | \$80.00           | \$120.00         |
| Rural          | \$57.00           | \$85.50          |

#### Advantages

- The registration fee is a similar fee to the current fee

#### Disadvantages

- SOP dog owners have subsidised urban dog owners

#### Option Two –Te Kōwhiringa Tuarua

- 5.4 Both the SOP and Rural dog owners could equally subsidise the urban dog owners and the shortfall.

Table 3 – Proposed fees, SOP and Rural subsidy (with inflation)

| Category       | Before 1 Aug 2022 | After 1 Aug 2022 |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Urban          | \$118.00          | \$176.00         |
| Selected Owner | \$65.00           | \$97.50          |
| Rural          | \$65.00           | \$97.50          |

#### Advantages

- The registration fee decreases for SOP, as they are no longer the only category subsidising urban owners and the shortfall

#### Disadvantages

- Creates about a 15% increase for rural dog owners

#### Option Three – Te kowhiringa Tuatoru

- 5.5 The simplest funding method is to subtract ‘recoveries’ and ‘public benefit’ and split the balance equally amongst all dogs.

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Total Expenditure                                    | \$1,635,605 |
| Recoveries (prosecutions, infringements, impounding) | \$194,823   |
| Public Benefit at 27%                                | \$441,613   |
| Balance to fund                                      | \$999,169   |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| \$999,169 divided by 13,432 (total dogs 2021/22 year) | <b>\$74.39</b> |
| Plus inflation 1.5%                                   | <b>\$1.20</b>  |
| <b>Per Dog</b>  | <b>\$75.50</b> |

#### Advantages

- Every dog owner is paying an equal share
- Urban registration decreases by about 35%
- SOP registration decreases by about 5%

#### Disadvantages

- Rural registration increases by about 31%

- 5.6 In summary the relative impact of the options presented in this report (both before and after 1 August 2022) are:

| If Paid Before 1 Aug 2022 |          |          |          |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Category                  | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| Urban                     | 118.00   | 118.00   | 75.50    |
| Selected Owner            | 80.00    | 65.00    | 75.50    |
| Rural                     | 57.00    | 65.00    | 75.50    |

| If Paid After 1 Aug 2022 |          |          |          |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Category                 | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| Urban                    | 176.00   | 176.00   | 113.00   |
| Selected Owner           | 120.00   | 97.50    | 113.00   |
| Rural                    | 85.50    | 97.50    | 113.00   |

## 6.0 Next steps – *Te Anga Whakamua*

- 6.1 The options supported by the Rural Community Board will be identified in the report to Council 31 March 2022 seeking the fees be set by resolution.

### Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This proposal promotes the performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of reducing public nuisance and threats to public health and safety through appropriate animal control activities for the wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

---

### Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

No known impacts for mana whenua / iwi / tangata whenua above and beyond the general community population.

---

### Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

Fees are charged each year pursuant to section 37 of the Dog Control Act 1996 to reflect the costs associated with the Animal Control activity.

---

### Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

Fees are reviewed annually.

---

### Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This report has been assessed and does not trigger the threshold of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

---

---

**Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho***

N/A:

---

**Risks**

Opportunity:

| REWARD – <i>Te Utu</i>   | RISK – <i>Te Tūraru</i>  |
|--|--|
| The revenue from registration fees funds the majority of the dog control activity. | Insufficient funds would result in a drop in the level of service which would likely have a negative impact on community safety. |

---

**Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori***

This report is presented to the Rural Community Board. Almost half of the district’s dogs are in the rural communities.

---



Monday, 14 February 2022

Item 7

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
From: **Adam Jackson, Transportation Operations Manager**

---

*Te Take:*  
Subject: **Rural Transportation Activity Report**

---

## **1.0 Executive Summary – Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga**

- 1.1 This report is to update the Rural Community Board with the Rural Transportation Programmed Project Status and Activities Report.
- 1.2 This report concludes by recommending that the report be received.

## **2.0 Recommendations - Ngā Tūhunga**

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receives the report titled Rural Transportation Activity Report dated 14 February 2022.
- B) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board recommends that the Council submit a proposal to the Ministry of Primary Industries to request increased advance notice where forestry activity will affect areas outside of the land parcel and to allow use of forest quarry aggregate on territorial authority roads.

## **3.0 2021/2022 Major Works Programme**

- 3.1 The 2021/22 financial year is the first portion of the 2021-24 Long Term Plan programme.
- 3.2 The following is the status of the final Area Wide Pavement Treatment programme for the 2021/22 financial year and beyond.

| Road            | Section                      | Status/Impact  |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|
| Kererū Road     | Kererū Road – Section 3      | Deferred until 2022/23.  |
| Mt Erin Road    | Crystall Road to School Road | Design complete. Contract being tendered during September. Expect construction to commence in November |
| Kahurānaki Road | Km7 to km9                   | AWPT project. Survey and design has been commissioned. Build planned for 22/23.                        |
| Kahurānaki Road | Last 3km                     | Design complete. Project to be delivered in March/April 2022   |
| Waimārama Road  | Before quarry hill           | AWPT project. Survey and design has been commissioned. Build planned for 22/23.                        |

3.3 The following is the status of the low cost/low risk (old minor safety) programme for the 2021/22 financial year.

| Road                             | Section                          | Status/Impact   |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Taihape Road                     | Various sites                    | Three bridges have been identified as requiring guardrail upgrades.   |
| Taihape Road corner improvements | Various                          | Several sites identified through CRS, or Engineer visits being improved. Construction commenced in January 2022.              |
| Huiarangi Road                   | Hill section                     | Upcoming logging activity required road improvements for pavement strengthening and widening. Work completed in January 2022. |
| Maraekākaho Road                 | Maraekākaho / Stock Intersection | Design complete. Project issued to maintenance contract and will commence in March.   |
| Kererū Road                      | Various                          | Crash reduction study outcomes  |
| Dartmoor Road                    | Various                          | Crash reduction study outcomes  |
| Kahurānaki Road                  | Various                          | Crash reduction study outcomes  |
| Network wide                     | various                          | Delineation improvements following outcome of delineation review  |

## 4.0 Bridge Update

- 4.1 Tawa Bridge and Heays Gorge Bridge Strengthening works have been tendered and construction works will begin in February. The works are expected to be complete July 2022.
- 4.2 There are design works underway for Peach Gully Bridge (Waimārama Road), Kaiwaka Bridge (Waipunga Road), Arapaoanui Bridge (Arapaoanui Road), Rossers Bridge (Rossers Road), Awanui Bridge (Te Aute Road) and Lambs Hill No.1 (Ōkaihau Road). The design stage is expected to be complete by the end of June 2022.

## 5.0 Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017

- 5.1 The regulations in place are having unintended adverse effects on Council's roads, and unless amendments are made Council is unable to mitigate them. The issues currently identified are notification and forestry quarry material.
- 5.1.1 **Notification:** Currently there are standard notice dates in the regulations that require notice to be given 'at least 20 but no more than 60 working days' before the activity is to begin. There are times where Council requires increased notice in order to investigate, or manage the effect of activity done in this regulation.
- 5.1.2 **Forestry Quarry Material** cannot be carted on public roads further than 2km away from the forest. The unintended result of this has been twofold:
- Quarries on farms with material which historically has been used extensively on local roads are being converted into forests and the forest owners read this clause as being prevented from using existing quarries for road aggregate.
  - During harvesting, the damage done cannot be remedied by using quarry resources from the forests.
- 5.1.3 We recommend that Council submit a proposal to the Ministry of Primary Industries to allow District Plans to request increased advance notice where activity will affect areas outside of the land parcel and to allow use of forest quarry aggregate on territorial authority roads.

## 6.0 Contract CON2017086 Extension

- 6.1 The road maintenance contract requires Council to offer a one year extension to the current contractor before 31 January in the year the contract is due to expire. Several conditions are required to be met in order for this extension to be offered which includes continued good performance.
- 6.2 Fulton Hogan have met these requirements and the offer of a one year extension has been put to them. Their acceptance is pending at time of writing this report.
- 6.3 The extension provides Council with a further year of highly competitive rates, and allows for an extended future procurement process to maximise any possible improvements in contract form, or procurement model. Officers have already begun the rewrite of the next contract that will commence in July 2023.

## 7.0 Programme Risks

- 7.1 Several factors are putting significant pressure on the Transportation team's ability to carry out all the required functions on our network. The most influential factors are underfunding by our funding partner (Waka Kotahi), contract escalations, and price increases over and above contract escalations. More detail on each of these are below.
- 7.2 Funding from Waka Kotahi. Council's request of \$89.46M for the LTP period only received \$67.78M. This equates to a 25% reduction in available funding from our preferred programme. The effects of underfunding the maintenance and renewal of transport infrastructure at this time is compounded by inflationary pressures (material and labour) and that there has been considerable underfunding in this arena for over 10 years. This will lead to following issues:
- Decline in levels of service across multiple objectives – access, resilience, reliability, safety and efficiency
  - Decrease in safety of road users
  - Increased public dissatisfaction and complaints

- 7.3 Contract Escalations: Funding of our LTP included a 3% escalation figure per annum for local share funding but Waka Kotahi only budgeted for a 2.5% escalation increase per annum throughout the LTP. The actual increase in the first 6 months of the 21/22 financial year alone is sitting at 3.3% and 3.7% for reseals. The effect of this compounds the effects noted in item 7.2 above. It further limits our available funds available to spend on our ageing infrastructure. Whilst final escalation figures are not going to be known for another 2.5 years of this current LTP – there are warning bells ringing that budgeted escalation will not match the actual escalation figures.
- 7.4 Contractor costs over and above escalation. Culvert pipes and steel costs are currently 30-50% above what they were in January 2021. Increased labour costs on top of this is resulting in many other elements of our contracts including aggregates becoming significantly more expensive than what escalation only allows for. The impact is that tender prices across will continue to grow at a rate higher than escalation. The effect of this further compounds the effects noted in item 7.2 above.

## 8.0 Works Update

- 8.1 Attachment 1 (**to be circulated separately**) will provide the Board with a photographic snapshot of activities undertaken between November 2021 and February 2022.

### Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This report promotes the performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of providing safe, reliable and efficient transport networks.

---

### Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

No known impacts for tangata whenua over and above the impact on the rural district as a whole.

---

### Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

This is a progress report and sustainability issues are not addressed.

---

### Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

The works identified within this report are within existing budgets.

---

---

**Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga***

This report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being of minor significance. Individual projects will have been addressed under the significance and engagement policy during the planning and decision making phase of those projects.

---

**Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho***

No consultation is required as part of this report.

---

**Risks**

Risk management and mitigation issues have been addressed in project planning and organisational health and safety policies.

---

**Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori***

The Rural Community Board will have an interest in the operations and transportation activities within the DRA2 rating area.

---



---

Monday, 14 February 2022

---

Item 8

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
**From: Vicki Rusbatch, Senior Advisor Democracy & Governance Services**

---

*Te Take:*  
**Subject: Update - Representation Review 2021/22**

---

## **1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Board on the Representation Review. At its last meeting the Board was advised that because the Final Proposal contains proposals for representation which are outside the stipulated range of +/-10%, Council is required to refer the proposal to the Local Government Commission (LGC) regardless of whether or not any appeals are received. Following the close of the appeal period, Council forwarded the two appeals received and other relevant information to the Local Government Commission for determination. The Local Government Commission is required to issue its decision by early April 2022.
- 1.2 At the time of writing this report, the Local Government Commission (LGC) have advised:  
  
The Hearing will be held via Zoom Webinar on Friday, 18 February 2022, starting at 10.30am. It will be held in the HDC Council Chamber, with the Local Government Commission Commissioners and Officers participating via Zoom. The proceedings will be livestreamed to the LGC website and YouTube site.  
  
Council representatives involved will be the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, Chief Executive and relevant Council officers.  
  
Appellants and other parties will be invited to speak.  
  
Iwi representatives have also been invited.  
  
The Local Government Commission will provide more detailed information in due course.
- 1.3 This report is for information and the only recommendation is it be received for information.

## **2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga***

That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive for information the report titled Update - Representation Review 2021/22 dated 14 February 2022.

### **Attachments:**

There are no attachments for this report.