Draft Community Engagement Policy 2021: Summary of feedback

To support hearings and deliberations 11 & 12 May 2021

Table of contents

1. Summary of feedback received

Public consultation on the draft Community Engagement Policy 2021 was undertaken from 19 March to 19 April 2021. Three submissions were received on time. There were no late submissions.

One submitter indicated they wanted to be heard on their submission form

2. Key topics

Submitters were asked whether they supported the policy as presented.

Option	Number of responses
Yes – support the policy as presented	3
No – do not support the policy as presented	0

Submitters were also asked which parts of the policy they agreed with and which parts they disagreed with.

2.1. Policy which is agreed with

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
Eason, Ed	1	Submitter agrees with: • Supports policy as presented • Agrees with plain English and less jargon • Engagement needs to be more user friendly	Noted
Price, Selwyn	2	Submitter agrees with • Supports policy as presented • Use of Te Reo • Recognition of Maori as mana whenua • Recognition of Hakatere Marae Komiti	Noted
White, Kate	3	Submitter agrees with: • Supports policy as presented • the use of Te Reo in the document • explanations on pages 12-14 (significance criteria, significance thresholds and significance and engagement scale)	Noted

2.2 Policy which is disagreed with

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
Eason, Ed	1	Submitter disagrees with: • Does not think Te Reo translation is necessary and creates a divide between communities	Noted. While some believe that including a Te Reo translation creates a divide, others believe that not including a Te Reo translation creates a divide. It makes sense for this translation

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
			to be included, as this section of the policy directly relates to mana whenua.
Price, Selwyn	2	Submitter disagrees with • No mention being made of other ethnic groups and how Council proposes to engage with them • PDF on Council's website does not display most of the figures fully • Trigger points for drinking water, wastewater and transportation • policy implications for "Front page test" and the "Social media test"	Section 2.10 addresses how Council will engage with diverse communities. Ethnicity is one important aspect of diversity and this is specifically acknowledged in Section 2.10. We have not listed specific ethnicities in the policy in order to be as inclusive as possible. The 2018 census records that people living in Ashburton district included people born in 39 different countries overseas including countries in Africa, Asia, the British Isles, Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, North America and the Pacific. The issue with the PDF of the Policy was not picked up until after submissions closed, and officers apologise for this. However the full policy was also included in the consultation document therefore these figures were still available to view. Officers note that the policy treats water, wastewater and transportation assets as a whole for the purposes of defining strategic assets. This prevents Council from having to do an LTP amendment if it opted to close a short length of road or other minor work. Under reasonable application of the policy, transfer of large parts of any of those networks would be expected to require consultation. The 'front page test' and the reference to social media are in the assessment criteria table alongside part 4.5 of the Policy. These references are included to give an indication to the community and guidance for officers about the sort of information to be considered when making judgements about community interest when determining significance. In the final analysis, this is one of seven criteria and the score from all seven criteria, weighted against fit with officers' "assessment in the round" is the decisive factor.

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
White, Kate	3-4	Submitter disagrees with: • gap regarding community engagement after a decision has been made. Does council engage AFTER a decision is made to evaluate the success of decisions/projects? How do they do so? • Engagement takes place on Council's terms - when Council decides it is necessary; on topics of Council's choosing. Council should create an avenue for community feedback or concerns or to ask questions Submitter notes that the Cass Street cycleway/walkway is completely useless/ impractical for cyclists, despite earlier consultation. Council has engaged an agency to evaluate that project. Residents, cyclists, pedestrians and motorists should have the opportunity to be part of that process.	The focus of this policy is on ensuring that Council has given appropriate consideration to community views when decision-making. Hence the focus is on views before a decision is made to undertake a project, rather than the aspects of co-design and evaluation raised by the submitter. Nevertheless, the submitter makes valuable points. Community input into the evaluation of council service performance is essential and council provides a number of channels to enable this dialogue including Facebook and other social media, Public forum, and the Annual Residents Survey. Council's customer services team often receive feedback and/or questions which are then forwarded on to the relevant teams for follow up when required. Community input via co-design of service offerings is a useful source of fresh ideas and officers note that the example given highlights the potential benefits of engagement in co-design. This is not equally appropriate for all services and projects, but there are certainly projects where this approach will add value.