

Ashburton District Council

AGENDA

Notice of Meeting:

A meeting of the Ashburton District Council will be held on:

Date: Wednesday 17 February 2021

Time: 1.00pm

Venue: Council Chamber

Membership

Mayor	Neil Brown
Deputy Mayor	Liz McMillan
Members	Leen Braam
	Carolyn Cameron
	John Falloon
	Rodger Letham
	Lynette Lovett
	Angus McKay
	Diane Rawlinson
	Stuart Wilson

Meeting Timetable

Time	Item
1pm	Meeting commences
1.30pm	Ashburton Service Level Alliance and Canterbury Clinical Network update

1 Apologies

2 Extraordinary Business

3 Declarations of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

Minutes

4	Council – 3/02/21	3
5	Methven Community Board – 1/02/21	5
6	Ashburton District Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee – 2/02/21	7
7	Biodiversity Advisory Group – 2/02/21	10

Reports

8	Review of Rates Remission Policy 2021	14
9	Review of Rates Postponement Policy 2018	30
10	Mid Year Performance Report	37
11	Water Services Bill Submission	56
12	Financial Variance Report – December 2020	<i>circulated</i>
13	Road Closure – Ashburton Car Club gravel sprint	66
14	Mayor's Report	70

Business Transacted with the Public Excluded

15	Council – 3/02/21	PE 1
	• Ashburton Library & Civic Centre PCG 19/01/21 Section 7(2)(h)	
16	Sale of Land	PE 2
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
17	Sale of Land	PE 6
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	
18	Freeholding Glasgow Lease	PE 11
	Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities	

11 February 2021

4. Council Minutes – 3 February 2021 (unconfirmed)

Minutes of the Council meeting held on Wednesday 3 February, commencing at 1.00pm, in the Council Chamber, 137 Havelock Street, Ashburton.

Present

His Worship the Mayor, Neil Brown; Councillors Leen Braam, Carolyn Cameron, John Falloon, Rodger Letham, Lynette Lovett, Liz McMillan, Diane Rawlinson and Stuart Wilson.

In attendance

Hamish Riach (Chief Executive), Paul Brake (GM Business Support), Steve Fabish (GM Community Services), Jane Donaldson (GM Strategy & Compliance), Sarah Mosley (Manager People & Capability) and Phillipa Clark (Governance Team Leader).

1 Apologies

Cr Angus McKay

Sustained

2 Extraordinary Business

Nil.

3 Declarations of Interest

Nil.

4 Confirmation of Minutes – 17/12/20

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 17 December 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

McMillan/Lovett

Carried

5 Confirmation of Minutes – 23/12/20

That the minutes of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 23 December 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Rawlinson/Braam

Carried

6 Change in Accounting Policy – property, plant and equipment

That Council amends its accounting policies to no longer require an annual revaluation of property, plant, and equipment.

Falloon/Cameron

Carried

7 Plant Renewal Account – change to a separate reserve

That Council close the plant renewal special fund, and transfer any balance to the plant operating account which will become a separate reserve.

Braam/Letham

Carried

8 Winding up of Experience Mid Canterbury Trust

The Group Manager Business Support reported that there are two sets of accounts outstanding (June 2019 and June 2020) which are both with Audit NZ. The balance of funds will be transferred back to Council and applied to similar purposes (tourism promotion).

EMC's contract with ChChNZ, expiring 30/06/20, will revert to Council. This contract will be reviewed and the subject of a report to Council in March.

The Mayor acknowledged the contribution made by the EMC Board members, past and present.

1. **That** Council acknowledges the winding up of the Experience Mid Canterbury Trust.
2. **That** Council thanks the Board members for their contribution in promoting Tourism promotion.

Wilson/McMillan

Carried

9 Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee – terms of reference

Council heard that vacancies on the Zone Committee will be addressed through the refresh process with applications opening on 1 March. It's anticipated that Council and Environment Canterbury will complete the formal appointments in May-June 2021.

That Council

1. Notes the timeline for confirmation and implementation of changes to the role and function of zone committees.
2. Confirms the Ashburton Water Management Zone Committee's Terms of Reference.
3. Notes the summary of priorities identified by councils in their Letter of Shared Priorities to zone committees.
4. Notes the next steps to communicate outcomes of the review and begin a process to refresh community members.

Lovett/Wilson

Carried

10 Mayor's Report

That the Mayor's report be received.

Mayor/McMillan

Carried

Business transacted with the public excluded – 1.19pm

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely – the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48 (1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Item No	General subject of each matter to be considered:	In accordance with Section 48(1) of the Act, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter:	
11	Council 17/12/20	Sections 7(2)(h) & (a)	Commercial activities & protection of privacy of natural persons
12	Extraordinary Council 23/12/20	Section 7(2)(h)	Commercial activities
13	Library & Civic Centre PCG	Section 7(2)(h)	Commercial activities

Mayor/McMillan

Carried

The meeting concluded at 1.30pm.

Confirmed 17 February 2021

MAYOR

5. Minutes –1 February 2021 *[Unconfirmed]*

Minutes of the Methven Community Board meeting held on Monday 1 February 2021, commencing at 10.30am, in the Mt Hutt Memorial Hall Boardroom, 160 Main Street, Methven.

Present

Dan McLaughlin (Chairman), Kelvin Holmes, Ron Smith, Sonia McAlpine, Richie Owen, Crs Liz McMillan and Rodger Letham.

In attendance

Mayor Neil Brown and Clare Harden (Community Administration Officer).

Presentation: (10.35am-10.45am)

Methven Lions - Mac McElwan & Peter Garde

1 Apologies

Nil

2 Extraordinary Business

Nil

3 Declarations of Interest

Nil

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the minutes of the Methven Community Board meeting held on 09 November 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

Smith/Holmes

Carried

Public Forum

Methven Lions Club (10.30am – 10.45am)

Mac McElwain and Peter Garde presented the Methven Lions Methven Walkway plan.

5 Methven Community Board Standing Orders

That the Methven Community Board adopts the 2020 Standing Orders, as tabled, with the following provisions:

- i) Casting vote for chairpersons
- ii) Option B as the default for speaking and moving motions.

Holmes/Letham

Carried

Activity Reports

That the reports be received

McMillan/McAlpine

Carried

6 Community Services

The Board would like to see the new trees on McMillan Street be maintained as this appears to be lacking.

7 Strategy & Compliance

The Board would like a Workshop with the Strategy and Policy Team on the LTP. This will help the Board with developing a submission for the LTP.

8 Infrastructure Services

The Board would like an update on the Methven Water Project.

Disappointment was expressed at the finish of the Dolma Street re-seal job and a request was made for a member of the Roding team to attend the next meeting.

9 Governance Business Support

An invitation is to be extended to member of the Ashburton Youth Council to attend a Methven Community Board meeting. If this is not possible members of the MCB would be keen to attend an Ashburton Youth Council meeting.

9.4 Discretionary Grant

That the Board approve funding of \$1,378 to clean up the Methven Skills Park area.

Smith/Owen

Carried

That the Board carry over the Methven Children's Christmas Party Funding of \$960 to December 2021

McMillan/ McAlpine

Carried

The meeting concluded at 12pm.

Dated 1 February 2021

_____ **Chairman**

Ashburton District Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee Minutes

6. Minutes - 2 February 2021 (unconfirmed)

Date: 2 February 2021

Venue: Council Chamber, 137 Havelock Street, Ashburton

Time: 9.30am

1 Welcome and Apologies

That apologies for absence be received on behalf of Mayor Neil Brown, Steve Bergerhout (NZ Police – State Highway), David Scarlett (NZTA/ Waka Kotahi), Daniel Naude (South Canterbury Road Safety), Wendy Stuart (ACC), and Bevan Findlay (FENZ)
McMillan/Rawlinson Carried

Present:

Lynette Lovett (Chair)	ADC Councillor	Andrae Gold	ACADS
Liz McMillan	ADC Councillor	Lesley Symington	Safer Mid Canterbury
Diane Rawlinson	ADC Councillor	John Skevington	AA
John Keenan	NZTA/Waka Kotahi	Shane Cochrane	NZ Police – Commercial Vehicle
Sean Nilsson	NZTA/Waka Kotahi		

Also Present: Any additional Councillors

In attendance:

Martin Lo	Graduate Engineer – Roading	Carol McAtamney	Governance Support Officer
Brian Fauth	Contracts Manager		

2 Notification of Extraordinary Business

Nil.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the minutes of the Ashburton District Road Safety Coordinating Committee meeting held on 10 November 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Skevington/Keenan

Carried

4 Reports/Agency Updates

4.1 Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency

John Keenan – report circulated

Safe Networks Programme

Concerns were raised as to what the follow up had been following the submissions on the proposal to install a wire rope median barrier on State Highway One

Mr Keenan responded that feedback from the community and stakeholders was taken into consideration by the project team. Work is continuing on the concept design, taking into consideration submitters suggestions and once finalised will be presented to Council seeking further feedback.

Red Road Signs

The possibility of having red road warning and speed signs to be painted on high risk Ashburton roads and intersections was questioned.

It was advised that they whilst they are an effective way to alert motorists to speed changes/approaching railway crossings etc there were no funds available at this point in time.

Ashburton River Bridge

- Street Lamps

Appreciation was extended to NZTA for arranging the replacement of blown lights on the Ashburton river bridge.

- Safety Walkways

There is a need for safety walkways to be established on the lead up to the Ashburton bridge for the use of pedestrians and cyclists. A formal written request is to be submitted to NZTA.

4.2 Ashburton District Road Safety

Martin Lo – report circulated

Lake Hood Speed Limit Changes

It was noted that the speed limit changes has not yet been implemented at Lake Hood. It was advised that the project of changing speed limits had been separated into two sections and the changes at Lake Hood are scheduled to be implemented in April.

4.3 Safe Crossing Points on SH1

The need for safe crossings at four locations have been identified through the Walking and Cycling strategy consultation:

- West Street (Outside Domain and Museum)
- SH1/Archibald Street, Tinwald
- Methven – skate/bike park
- Rakaia – SH1

A formal request is to be submitted to NZTA requesting consideration for safe crossing installations. Request to include specific location of

- Specific location of crossings in identified areas
- Order of priority

4.4 Safer Mid Canterbury – 2021/22 Safe Communities Projects

A trial social community transport service is now operational. This service operates twice a week commuting passengers from rural areas into the Ashburton townships.

Current projects:

- Promotion on motorcycle safety – possibly in conjunction with national men's health week in June
- NZTA runs a promotional safety programme throughout the year featuring a different topic each month. Would be beneficial to coordinate the motorcycle safety with the NZTA promotion.
- Develop an off road learn to ride/learn the road rules track, also promote use of cycle helmets

4.5 Automobile Association

Continuing to pursue the need for mandatory standardising of 20km per hour signage and flashing lights on the rear of school buses.

4.6 NZ Police – Commercial Vehicle

Currently focusing on slow moving vehicles on country roads (agriculture vehicles, pilot vehicles etc). A number of complaints are being received from motorists who are being held up. The main issue is that due to roads having been scooped out there is limited options for the vehicles to pull over to let traffic passed.

4.7 ACADS

Report circulated.

6 2021 Meeting Dates

The next meeting date is Tuesday 4 May 2021 at 1.30pm (please note change to start time)

Meeting closed at 10.25am

Biodiversity Advisory Group

2 February 2021



7. Minutes - 2 February 2021 (Unconfirmed)

Minutes of the Biodiversity Advisory Group held on Tuesday 2 February, commencing at 1.08pm at the Council Chamber, 137 Havelock Street, Ashburton.

Present: Councillors Diane Rawlinson (Chair), Bert Hofmans (ADC); Steve Fabish (ADC); Val Clemens (Forest & Bird and ACCT), Mike Salvesen (Federated Farmers); Barry Austin (Mt Somers Walkway Soc. & Lake Heron Conservation Soc.); Donna Field (Ecan & Whitcombe Landcare Group); Alice Shanks (QEII Trust); Ian Fraser (DOC); and Brad Edwards (DOC).

In attendance: Aisling O'Reilly (Governance Support - minutes); Angela Cushnie (Kānuka Trust and Water Zone Committee), Richie Owen (Mt Hutt Ski Area), Justin Legg (MHV Water)

1 Apologies

Mayor Neil Brown, Cr Lynette Lovett, Jayde Couper, Gen De Spa, Mary Ralston, Marcelo Wibmer and Edith Smith.

Austin/Field

Carried

2 Extraordinary Business

Nil

3 Declarations of Interest

Nil

4 Confirmation of Minutes – 8/12/20

That the minutes of the Biodiversity Advisory Group meeting held on 8 December 2020 be taken as read and confirmed.

Clemens/Austin

Carried

Ian Fraser and Brad Edwards arrived at 1:12pm

Moved to agenda item 7 as Richie Owen was running late.

7 Agency Updates

Department of Conservation (Brad Edwards)

- Over the past 18 months DOC have been working closely with runaka Arowhenua to form a relationship and together are working towards creating a river management plan for the Rangitata (Rakitata). A working group called the Rangitata Restoration Working Group has been formed.
- There will be some workshops with the residents who live along the river to see how they can draw these people into the project.
- This will be an ongoing project. There is no specific timeline.
- The working group have created a vision statement with a set of objectives under this. There are action points cascading out of this. Vision is to restore the mauri of the river. This is the vision for Arowhenua also. This is central to the project. Great opportunity to take the story of the Arowhenua out to the rest of the community.

- Barry Austin advised that Ecan have been awarded a lot of money to restore the flood damage of the river and asked if this will hinder what the group have to do. Brad advised that ECan are on the same page and the flood works restoration is a part of the conversation.

Ian Fraser

- This is now the end of the 6th season in the Rangitata River in terms of predator control work which has been partly funded by ECAN. While things have improved, it is probably not enough. Some LINZ funding will go towards predator control work.
- Recruiting through LINZ funding to hire a 3.5 year position to manage this work. This is all Covid recovery money.

Forest and Bird (Val Clemens)

- Black-Billed Gulls: Edith has been in close contact with the family whose farm has been used as a nesting site. This family has been monitoring the birds and trapping pests. There is also a nesting site at the Arundel Bridge.
- Harris Reserve: the latest planting of Carex secta along the water race went well. Another large area has been sprayed and ripped for future plantings and an enclosure for tiny plants is being constructed. This will house plants such as Craspedia “Wakanui” and the smaller members of the Carmichaelia or native broom family, among others.
- Just before Christmas two members dealt to 40 flowering Russell Lupins and about 250 of their offspring, from near the old rubbish dump in the Hakatere Conservation Park. Some willows, broom and gorse were also treated with herbicide.
- The next Forest and Bird Meeting is Tuesday 16 February at 7.30pm at Sinclair Centre. Ecologist Nick Head will be speaking at this meeting on the topic: “*Battle for the Biome - The Mackenzie Basin - a fraught journey to protection (or not)*”.
With barely a native species to be seen on the road between Christchurch and Timaru, the Canterbury Plains are a stark reminder of the issues confronting nature conservation in low- altitude, low-lying environments of New Zealand. As a result, remaining dryland ecosystems are the least protected and most threatened in the country. This talk provides a recent history of the struggle to protect the internationally significant biome of the Mackenzie Basin.
- Val spoke to the group about the case for a Biodiversity Officer.
The need for this role is obvious when reading the Biodiversity Action Plan which lists 5 objectives and 26 actions needed to support those objectives.
The National Biodiversity Strategy was launched in August 2020 which will begin to increase the work required by ADC. To do this work effectively and efficiently will require considerable expertise.
Selwyn District Council has two Biodiversity Officers, one of whom has a Master’s Degree in Conservation and Ecology. There is a need within council for similarly qualified people.
- Forest & Bird see an opportunity to hold a seminar for people who are looking to do some native planting. Many landowners are very keen to enhance any areas with remaining native plants on their farms, or to plant natives as shelter belts or general enhancement. Natives not only provide resources for beneficial insects (research at Lincoln University has found that ti kouka/cabbage trees support 19 species of beneficial insects and no insect pests), but also food and shelter for birds. They also don’t need trimming every year or two.
- It was suggested that the Biodiversity Advisory Group support the staging of a seminar to provide some of the information people are looking for, ways to find support and fund their projects. Topics that could be covered in the seminar:
Positive reasons for planting natives.
Site selection & assessing environmental conditions at the site.
Site preparation.
Plant selection & where to buy plants.
Best practice planting techniques.
Funding opportunities and accountability.
Record keeping.

Ongoing maintenance, especially weed control.

Support available from milk companies, local councils, etc.

- Volunteers from the Biodiversity Advisory group were sought.
- Alice Shanks mentioned how the planting that is going into the town now is not reflective of the Council's support for biodiversity as there is no native biodiversity being planted. Kowhai is the native plant for this district. Additionally, the trees that were planted in Hinds are the wrong trees for the soil type there.
- Angela Cushnie suggested that this discussion should all be part of the submission to the LTP.

Mt Somers Walkway Society & Lake Heron Conservation (Barry Austin)

- Starting wasp control programme tomorrow. Evidence suggests that the wasps are not as bad as they have been.

Ecan & Whitcombe Landcare Group (Donna Field)

- Ecan have done some water sampling at Lake Clearwater and will now be investigating further. People can now go swimming.
- Have received some funding from Fonterra to do some work on Mt Harding Stream. Looking at doing some restorative work with the mauri of the river here.
- Whitcombe Landcare group have received some extra funding. Wilding pine control is ongoing. Just completed a goose cull which was very successful.
- There was relatively small amounts of vandalism over the summer at Ashton Beach. Some ongoing problems with some people using their bikes.
- Underground beach to bridge run: keep an eye on Facebook for this. Unsure of how to best manage this at this point. Don't want people going down through to the beach and going through the reserve.

General Updates

Lake Clearwater

- Ian Hyde advised that Tangata Whenua, Ecan, FENZ DOC and ADC are very much involved. There are also hut owners involved. There has been a lot of work done by Ecan. It is emerging that there doesn't seem to be an easy solution but there are steps to be taken to improve the situation.

Ashburton District Council (Bert Hofmans)

- Bert updated on the process for the LTP in regards to the creation of a Biodiversity Officer role. Submissions will open in mid-march for about 4 weeks.
- It was discussed that individual submissions from each group should be done and that if the Biodiversity Advisory Group want to make a submission, Crs Rawlinson and Lovett will exclude themselves from the submission as they cannot then be part of the decision-making process if they make a submission.
- Biodiversity Field Trip

Places to add to the itinerary:

Plantation Road	
Harris Reserve	
Swamp Road	Alice Shanks to speak at this area
Ferrimans Road	Edith Smith to speak at this area
Carr's Farm	Glenys Carr to speak at this area
Ashton Beach	Bert Hofmans to speak at this area

It was agreed that a half day would be enough time. A day in March will be suggested. Aisling O'Reilly to come back to the group with this.

Reports and Presentations

Mt Hutt Ski Area

- Richie Owen presented on the trapping programme at Mt Hutt.
- Trapping programme now in its third year. Had seen a decline in Kea numbers which was a concern.
- Formed a sustainability group and got funding to start with 50 traps. Trapping is all done on a volunteer basis.
- Since doing this they have had a sighting of one Kea over a number of weeks.
- Have gone around the schools in Mt Hutt and spoken to them about trapping and why Mt Hutt Ski are doing this.
- Started a replanting programme. Got these trees from DOC in Geraldine. Staff volunteers and planted all of these.
- Angela Cushnie stated that there seems to be a lack of cohesion in terms of doing work with the schools. Would be good to try and get some more connectivity around this and is looking for some leadership. Need a hub for our predator control programmes. Kānuka Trust have put an educator in place. The more of this that can be done, the better but need a collection place of the things all the groups are doing.

Agency Updates (*continued*)

Water Zone Committee & Kānuka Trust (Angela Cushnie)

- Draft work programme has gone in. Working more towards community engagement.
- It is timely to acknowledge Lachie Ashton and the key role he had in getting the Carters Creek project going.
- Kānuka Trust have employed an educator to start their Footprint Project
- Will be working with Ashburton College at a Champions of Change Youth Hui. Hoping to time this in with Youth Council.
- Hinds Reserve Board have started doing some native planting.

Next Meeting

Tuesday 6 April 2021 at 1pm.

The meeting concluded at 2:50pm

8. Review of Rates Remission Policy 2021

Author *Richard Mabon, Senior Policy Advisor*
Activity manager *Rachel Sparks, Finance Manager*
General manager *Paul Brake, General Manager Business Support*

Summary

- This report is to inform Council's decision on content of a draft Rates Remission Policy 2021 for public consultation.
- Officers propose minor changes to wording to improve clarity.
- Officers recommend that:
 - the policy objectives statement be updated to align with current strategies
 - the policy on rates penalty remissions return to the pre-Covid settings as demand for remissions did not increase.
 - Council make information available to all extraordinary (metered) consumers to enable them to monitor and control their water use.
 - Council provide policy definition of one quarter's excess usage due to leaks, for consumers who are billed annually.
- Officers note that this reviewing sheds light on unintended consequences, risks and issues arising from previous decisions that fall outside the scope of this review.
- Officers recommend that Council examine those risks and issues alongside the LTP as they relate to LTP topics such as revenue and financing policy, the rating funding impact statement, the sustainable and efficient operation of drinking water services and universal metering.

Recommendation

1. **That** Council adopt the draft Rates Remission Policy 2021 attached as Appendix One for public consultation.
2. **That** Council provide information to all extraordinary consumers to enable them to monitor their consumption and detect excessive usage due to internal leaks.
3. **That** Council review the consequences, risks and issues arising from decisions on billing and allowances for extraordinary consumers alongside the 2021-31 long-term plan process.

Background

The current situation

1. Council practice is to review the Rates Remission Policy (RRP) every three years alongside the long-term plan.
2. Council also needs to review the RRP in 2021 because:
 - the RRP objectives align poorly with strategies and plans;
 - the RRP contains provisions on rates penalty remissions that expire on 1 July 2021 and guidance for future rates penalty remissions is needed;
 - Officers have highlighted unforeseen consequences from previous decisions on annual billing of residential extraordinary consumers that will disadvantage some extraordinary (metered) consumers and create risks for Council.
3. While reviewing the RRP, officers propose wording changes to improve clarity without changing the substance of the RRP.

Improving clarity and reducing duplication

4. Changes to improve clarity and reduce duplication are highlighted in Appendix One and listed in Appendix 3.

RRP issue one – objectives statement

5. The first RRP issue is that the objectives statement has become out of date.
6. New wording is highlighted in Appendix One that:
 - states the purpose of this RRP under the Local Government Act 2002
 - aligns the RRP with the implementation of revenue and financing policy and other funding policies
 - aligns the RRP with the mandatory national drinking water service delivery measures and local targets.

Drinking water service delivery objectives

7. Our drinking water service delivery objectives include a level of service statement that “we provide efficient and sustainable drinking water services”.
8. This level of service is monitored through two mandatory measures imposed by regulation:
 - Reduction in real water loss from the reticulated systems
 - Reduction in average consumption/resident/day

9. Ashburton is not meeting targets for either measure. In comparison with other Councils our real water loss is high. The RRP objective has been reworded to note the need to promote efficient and sustainable drinking water services.

RRP issue two – rates penalty remissions

10. The second RRP issue is a lack of guidance on future rates penalty remissions.
11. Prior to Covid-19, Councils policy on rates penalty remissions was to allow a remission for one quarterly rates instalment every two years. With the onset of Covid-19, lockdown, and associated economic uncertainty, Council agreed to allow ratepayers to apply for remissions every quarter, starting from Q4 in 2019/20 and extending that until the end of Q4 2020/21. The current RRP setting is time bound and will expire after 30 June 2021.
12. The economic impacts to date have not created increased demand for penalty remissions. It has been more a case of “business as usual”. For this reason, officers see no need to extend the change to penalty remissions and recommend Council revert back to the previous RRP settings.
13. This recommendation is reflected in the edits to paragraph 26 in Appendix One.

RRP issue three – water rates remissions

14. The third RRP issue is unintended consequences arising from allowances for extraordinary consumers and the annual billing of residential extraordinary consumers.

What we do now

15. Council divides its drinking water consumers into three groups, being:
 - Ordinary consumers – households without a swimming pool or spa
 - Extraordinary consumers – all other consumers on a drinking water supply
 - Residential extraordinary consumers – Ashburton extraordinary consumers in Residential D and Rural A zones.
16. Ordinary consumers pay a uniform targeted rate for water (\$415.30 in 2020/21). They are not metered and pay nothing for “excess” water use.
17. Extraordinary consumers are metered and billed quarterly. They have a quarterly allowance of 90 cubic metres and pay for water consumed in excess of that.
18. Residential extraordinary consumers are metered and billed annually. They have an annual allowance of 90 cubic metres and pay for water consumed in excess of that.

Current RRP

19. Council policy is that it “*may agree*” to a remission or part remission of water by meter charges “*where the amount due is clearly the result of a fault (leak) in the internal water reticulation serving the rating unit.*” The RRP also states that “*the ratepayer will remain*

liable for the full charge of their normal water consumption based on past water consumption” and a remission may be made on charges “for one meter reading period only”.

20. The reasoning behind this RRP works adequately¹ when all metered consumers have their meters read and billed quarterly, with extra water over the normal quarterly allowance causing excess charges and a higher bill. This was Council’s practise up until 2020/21. The extraordinary (metered) consumer can see from their bill that more water than expected has passed through their meter. If they find the leak and get it fixed, they can qualify for remission and be no worse off. At the same time, a fixed leak helps to reduce real water losses.

June 2020 changes and unintended consequences

21. Council made two changes in June 2020. Council increased the quarterly allowance for residential extraordinary consumers from 900 to 1200 cubic meters and Council also moved to annual billing.² These decisions were made to improve fairness, as unmetered users pay a fixed sum (\$413.50 in 2020/21) for a theoretically unlimited amount of water.
22. The first unintended consequence is that a residential extraordinary consumer may not know they have a leak until they receive their annual bill. Such a leak may have caused high excess water usage, and under the RRP they can only get a remission for one quarter (because their meter is still read four times a year). Even if they act promptly once they get their bill, they still have to pay for leaks occurring in more than one quarter.
23. Staff are tasked with “alerting” customers if meter readings indicate changing consumption that may be a leak. This is being done as resources and good judgement allow. This too, has some unintended consequences. Namely:
 - The current level of resources is not sufficient to deal with all the affected customers (50 in the July-September 2020 quarter³), because calls typically lead to customers⁴ asking questions and requesting more information to work out whether increased consumption is due to leaks.
 - Meter readings can show changes in consumption but they don’t explain why. We may “alert” people with no leaks, and we may miss some leakage e.g. slow leaks and

¹ Adequately but not brilliantly. Purely domestic (unmetered) consumers don’t get identified at all. Metered consumers with leaks that don’t exceed the overall quarterly allowance don’t get identified either. Residential extraordinary consumers with leaks that don’t exceed the overall annual allowance also don’t get identified. Our RRP settings on metering, billing and remissions hold some people accountable, others unaccountable and do not consistently incentivise consumers to watch their consumption or to fix leaks quickly.

² At the time, Council had not requested advice on the consequences of a move to annual billing, and officers had not explored the implications for consumers and Council.

³ At 22 January 2021 we had contacted about 70% of them.

⁴ Our experience is that they are usually residential customers.

cases where the quarterly or annual allowance “masks” leakage because no excess charges are incurred.

- By taking responsibility for alerting people, we expose Council to blame if someone with excess charges is not alerted and incurs a bill.
- “Alerting” systems require resources. Improving them costs more resources.

Educating is better than alerting

24. It is better and more efficient risk management by Council to inform people how to monitor their own consumption and manage their own risk. This is why energy retailers don’t chase customers who are using excessive power, and they don’t offer rebates for leaving the heater running by mistake.

Defining quarterly excess charges in an annual bill

25. Further, because the current RRP was adopted in a context of quarterly billing, it doesn’t provide guidance on which quarter should be remitted in the context of annual billing. Officers propose to address this in the RRP.

Definition confusion

26. Finally, the definitions of extraordinary consumers and residential extraordinary consumers in the rating funding impact statement and the Water Supply Bylaw 2016 are potentially confusing and should be clarified for the avoidance of doubt.

Non-policy interventions

27. Officers have considered actions, other than RRP changes, which could help metered consumers to track their water consumption.
28. In the short-term, the most efficient response is to advise consumers via the Council website and other channels, about how to read their meter and calculate excess water charges. Officers recommend that this work be done, as it enables metered consumers to monitor and regulate their own consumption, and this is useful and consistent with sustainable and efficient use of drinking water. In the meantime, Council should continue with “alerting” work until 30 June 2021.
29. Over a longer timeframe, there are other systems⁵ that could be put in place enabling metered water consumption information to be directly available to consumers. At this stage, these would require more resources and are unlikely to be in place before 1 July

⁵ Officers have looked at ideas including improving reporting from meter readings to enable Council to identify individual consumers whose consumption increases greatly. Another option is to make that reporting available to Customer Services so that customers can ring in and find that information. Another alternative is to make the information from better reporting available through the website for people to check their own results. All these options are problematic in terms of resourcing and delivery by 30 June 2021. Any of them would require more careful cost:benefit assessment before being put in place.

2021. As previously noted, more effort to help people see their consumption, comes with more cost, and the costs and benefits of extra work need be assessed.

What other Councils do about remission of excess water rates

30. A summary of policies from other Canterbury territorial authorities (TAs) is in Appendix Two. The summary shows that:
- Five⁶ Canterbury TAs offer no remissions for excess water use.
 - One TA⁷ has a RRP which included a general provision to consider any application for remission of any rates, but is silent on excess water charges.
 - Three TAs (including Ashburton) have policies varying from 50% to 100% remission of excess water charges subject to conditions. Those conditions typically limit the amount of the remission in some way and usually require proof that the leak had been repaired and consumption was back to “normal”.
 - TAs typically note that primary responsibility for managing leaks on private property lies with the land owner. TAs vary in how much of that risk they transfer to other water consumers.

Options analysis

Option one – Status quo

31. This option is where we stand today. Regardless of what Council decides to consult upon, the current RRP settings are in place for this year and the billing, excess charges and remissions that occur as a result will be addressed under these settings.
32. Under this Option, every extraordinary consumer faces the risk of a large bill if they get a leak in their internal reticulation and fail to detect and repair it quickly. The risk is greater for residential extraordinary consumers because of the shift to annual billing.
33. With the implementation of more communications about how to monitor their meters, extraordinary consumers will be able to identify leaks more quickly and reduce the likelihood of excess water charges.
34. We are working to alert those we believe may have a leak based on historic trends, as discussed in paragraphs 19 and 20.
35. Officers do not favour this option because:
- the RRP does not define what a quarterly remission is for an annual bill; and
 - the risks and resources tied up in “alerting” customers on annual billing.
36. This option is **NOT RECOMMENDED**.

⁶ The five Councils are Hurunui, Kaikoura, Selwyn, Waimate and Waitaki Districts.

⁷ This is Waimakariri District.

Option two – Amended status quo – Define the extent of remission for consumers on annual billing and move from “alerting” to “educating” customers

37. Under this Option, Council would retain current RRP settings and:

- Provide guidance on what constitutes the quarter to be remitted for excess annual charges. Officers propose a maximum remission of 25% of the annual excess water charges.
- Explore and implement practicable steps to limit its liability for “failure to alert” metered consumers.

38. This option is **RECOMMENDED**.

Option Three - Return all residential extraordinary consumers to quarterly invoicing

39. Under this Option, all residential extraordinary consumers would go back to quarterly billing. This Option would restore settings to the pre-June 2020 situation described in paragraph 16.

40. This Option involves some work to return to previous systems, although this could be implemented within timeframes. Returning to a system in place less than twelve months ago is reasonably straightforward.

41. Previous water metering decisions were made after considerable work and debate arising from the revenue and financing policy discussions. Those decisions have implications (described in paragraphs 17 to 22) that go far wider than rates remissions. Overturning those decisions is outside the scope of reviewing a rates remissions RRP.

42. Many Council policies and strategies are inter-connected. If we do not respect the scope, we could relitigate many policies and decisions many times over. This is not productive. Officers do **NOT RECOMMEND** this option.

43. If one review highlights a potential issue elsewhere, the appropriate Officer action is to signal those issues and invite Councillors to seek more advice. Officers **RECOMMEND** that Council review the consequences, risks and issues arising from decisions on billing and allowances for extraordinary consumers alongside the 2021-31 long-term plan process.

Option Four – Cease remissions of rates for excess water charges for extraordinary (metered) consumers

44. Under this Option, Council would cease offering any remission for excess water charges. This Option places Ashburton extraordinary (metered) consumers in the same situation as their counterparts in five other Canterbury councils. It puts all the responsibility for

water leakage inside private property boundaries (of metered consumers) with the water consumer.

45. This option avoids the inconsistencies and administrative resources tied up in providing metered consumers on annual billing with “progress reports” on their consumption.
46. This option is a substantial change for ratepayers who have previously had a remission available. It worsens perceptions of unfairness in the treatment of metered consumers compared to unmetered consumers if the remission is removed.
47. This option is **NOT RECOMMENDED**.
48. Councillors could give further consideration to this Option under the review proposed in recommendation 3.

Legal/policy implications

49. These implications are addressed throughout the background and options analysis.

Financial implications

Requirement	Explanation
What is the cost?	Council currently budgets \$130,000 annually for rates remissions.
Is there budget available in LTP / AP?	Yes.
Where is the funding coming from?	The work of the Finance Team is funded from overheads allocated across activities which in turn are funded from a mixture of rates, debt, fees, charges and grants as set out in the Revenue & Financing policy.
Are there any future budget implications?	No. The recommendations proposed do not materially affect the overall sum of remissions.
Reviewed by Finance	Review not required

Significance and engagement assessment

Requirement	Explanation
Is the matter considered significant?	No
Level of significance	The matter is assessed as having medium significance.
Level of engagement selected	Consult – formal two-way consultation
Rationale for selecting level of engagement	Changes to the RRP require consultation that complies with section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.
Reviewed by Strategy & Policy	Toni Durham; Strategy & Policy Manager

50. All ratepayers have an interest in the RRP generally and the issue of penalty remissions. All extraordinary (metered) consumers have an interest in the issue of water rates remissions. The RRP attracted no submissions when last consulted on in 2020.
51. Elected members who are also extraordinary consumers may have an interest that could be considered greater than the general public and should consider whether they have a conflict of interest

Next steps

52. This table describes governance actions that include and arise from the recommendations. Communications work to implement recommendation two will occur during the first half of calendar year 2021.

Date	Action / milestone	Comments
17 February 2021	Council adopts draft RRP 2021 for consultation.	Decisions made by Council
19 March 2021	Draft RRP 2021 publicly notified for consultation.	First day for public submissions
19 April 2021	Period for making submissions ends	Last day for public submissions
11-12 May 2021	Submission hearings	Submissions considered by Council
18-20 May 2021	Deliberations and decisions on policy	Decisions made by Council
30 June 2021	Adoption of RRP	Decisions made by Council

Policy (Draft 3)

RATES REMISSION

TEAM:	Finance
RESPONSIBILITY:	Finance Manager
ADOPTED:	30 June 2021
REVIEW:	Every three years
CONSULTATION:	Consultation under section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002
RELATED DOCUMENTS:	Local Government Act 2002 Local Government (Rating) Act 2002

Policy Objective

1. This policy aims to:

- define the objectives sought to be achieved by the remission of rates;
- set out the conditions and criteria to be met in order for rates to be remitted;
- support the overall objectives of prudent financial management and Council's finance, funding and rating policies
- promote the economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the Ashburton district by:
 - facilitating the provision of community services and recreational opportunities, including community and memorial halls;
 - encouraging the protection of land for natural, historic or cultural purposes;
 - providing an equitable rate impost on separately inhabited dwellings;
 - responding appropriately through the rating system to internal reticulation leaks affecting properties on water by meter charges; and
 - aligning where practicable, with other Council strategies, plans and policies.

Definitions

Council means Ashburton District Council.

Community facility is a facility which is open to and provided for the benefit of the public

Policy Statement

Community Facilities

2. Council provides for the remission of rates payable by qualifying community organisations if the property is used exclusively to provide community services, facilities and recreational opportunities for the residents of the Ashburton District.
3. To qualify for the remission of rates the property must be owned by one of the following:
 - Ashburton District Council
 - A registered charitable trust or incorporated society.
4. A remission of rates will not be granted to organisations operated for private pecuniary profit.
5. The maximum rate remission for qualifying community facilities will be 50% of total rates (including targeted rates such as water and sewerage, but excluding water by meter charges and stockwater rates).
- ~~6. Applications received during a rating year will apply to the following rating year. Applications will not be backdated.~~
- ~~7. Council will grant a maximum of one rates remission for any one rating unit, in any one financial year, unless there has been a Council error.~~

Separately Inhabited Dwellings

8. Council provides for the remission of rates payable on residential rating units which include a separately inhabited part that is occupied by a dependent family member **of the owner of the rating unit.**
9. The owner of the rating unit must complete and provide to Council a statutory declaration outlining the conditions above, and this declaration will be effective for three years or until the conditions cease, whichever is earlier. The owner must provide a fresh declaration after each three year period.
10. The remission will be for a maximum of the additional inhabited unit (the minor flat or other residential accommodation unit) and includes targeted rates such as water and sewerage.

Memorial and Community Halls

11. Memorial and community halls are considered non-rateable land by the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, provided they fall within the categories of non-rateable land listed in Schedule 1 to the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
12. Some memorial and community halls do not fall within those definitions. Council wishes to treat them on the same basis as other memorial and community halls.
13. Council will provide 100% remission of rates for all memorial and community halls including 100% remission of service rates (targeted rates such as water and sewerage but excluding water by meter charges and stockwater rates).

~~14. Applications received during a rating year will apply to the following rating year. Applications will not be backdated.~~

~~15. Council will grant a maximum of one rates remission for any one rating unit, in any one financial year, unless there has been a Council error.~~

Properties Protected for Natural, Historic or Cultural Conservation Purposes

16. Council provides for the remission of rates on land or buildings with cultural, natural or historic heritage that is recognised in the Ashburton District Plan or legally protected by:
 - A heritage covenant under the Historic Places Act 1993
 - A heritage order under the Resource Management Act 1991
 - An open space covenant under the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977
 - A protected private land agreement or conservation covenant under the Reserves Act 1977
 - Any other covenant or agreement entered into by the owner of the land with a public body for the preservation of existing features of land, or of buildings, where the conditions of the covenant or agreement are registered against the title to the land and are binding on subsequent owners of the land.
17. The maximum rate remission for qualifying properties will be 50% of the rates payable on the protected portion of the land only (including targeted rates such as water and sewerage, but excluding water by meter charges and stockwater rates).
- ~~18. Applications received during a rating year will apply to the following rating year. Applications will not be backdated.~~
- ~~19. Council will grant a maximum of one rates remission for any one rating unit, in any one financial year, unless there has been a Council error.~~

Remission and Postponement of Rates on Māori Freehold Land

20. Council does not provide for the remission or postponement of rates on Māori freehold land, unless the application qualifies under another remission provision detailed in this policy.

~~Remission on Water Rates~~

- ~~21. Council may agree to a remission or part remission of water by meter charges in situations where the amount due is clearly the result of a fault (leak) in the internal water reticulation serving the rating unit.~~
- ~~22. The ratepayer will remain liable for the full charge of their normal water consumption based on past water consumption.~~
- ~~23. A remission may be made on charges for one meter reading period only.~~

Remission of Rates Penalties

24. Council may agree to the remission of rates penalties (excluding annual penalties) where payment has been late due to significant family disruption, death, illness, accident or genuine mistake.
25. Rates penalties on single rates instalments (excluding annual penalties) may also be remitted as part of an agreed repayment plan for ratepayers with significant arrears as a result of financial hardship or difficulties.
- ~~26. Council will only consider one remission of rates penalties per applicant within a 24 month period, applicable to a single rates instalment (three-monthly). This restriction will be waived for penalty write-offs for instalments 1-4 of the 2020-21 rating year with write-offs meeting Council's criteria being available for all instalments.~~
27. Penalties resulting from Council error will be remitted.

Application and Consideration

28. Applications received during a rating year will apply to the following rating year. Applications will not be backdated.
29. Council will grant a maximum of one rates remission for any one rating unit, in any one financial year, unless there has been a Council error. This does not apply to remission of rates penalties.
30. Applications for the remission of rates must be made either in writing, via an online form, or over the phone. Evidence or additional documents may be required. Applications may require a statutory declaration.
31. Decisions on the remission of rates will be made by officers with the appropriate delegations. Applicants will be notified of any decision in writing within 30 days of application.

32. In granting remissions under this policy, Council may specify certain conditions before a remission will be granted. Applicants ~~will be required to~~ **must** pay any remitted rates if the applicable conditions are not ~~adhered to~~ **met**.

Monitoring and Review

33. Remissions granted under this policy will be reviewed at least **once** every three years as part of the Councils Long Term Plan.
34. Ratepayers receiving rates remission under this policy ~~are required to~~ **must** notify Council of any changes in their situation that may alter their eligibility for ongoing remission.
35. Council ~~may~~ **will** cancel a remission granted under this policy if it is found a property no longer qualifies for rates remission.

Appendix Two – Summary of rates remission policies in other Canterbury Councils

Council	Approach
Christchurch City	Council may consider remitting up to 100% of excess water rates when the ratepayer could not reasonably have been expected to know that a leak within their boundary has resulted in unusually high water consumption.
Hurunui, Kaikoura, Selwyn, Waimate and Waitaki Districts	Policy is silent on remissions for water rates. No remissions granted for these rates.
Mackenzie District	<p>Council may remit a maximum of 50% of the difference between the normal consumption and the actual water consumed within the period subject to the application where both of the following criteria are met:</p> <p>A written application for the remission of water charges, signed by the owner of the rating unit, is made to Council and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report from a registered plumber confirming that the property has experienced a water loss as a result of a leak; or • Two subsequent meter readings demonstrating that the leak has been repaired. • The applicant has not been granted a remission of excess water charges within the previous three years. • Note: normal consumption will be calculated from the average consumption for the previous three annual meter readings for the rating unit concerned.
Timaru District	<p>The Council will provide rates remissions to ratepayers who meet the objectives, conditions and criteria of this policy.</p> <p>Objective</p> <p>To standardise procedures to assist ratepayers who have excessive water rates due to a fault (leak) in the internal reticulation serving their rating unit, having acted promptly in remedying the fault.</p> <p>Conditions and Criteria</p> <p>The Council may remit all or part of the excess water rates where the application meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy will apply to applications from ratepayers who have excess water rates due to a fault(s) in the internal reticulation; • That all applicants are requested to submit their application in writing; • That proof of the repairs to the internal reticulation be submitted for verification (i.e. plumbers repair account); • That proof be submitted for verification of the repairs being carried out promptly once the existence of a fault has been identified; • That the ratepayer be charged the full amount for normal consumption; • That part or all of the excess amount be remitted.

Council	Approach
Waimakariri District	Policy is silent on remissions for water rates. There is a general provision in the policy that enables Council to consider remissions for any reason on their merits.

Appendix Three – Changes proposed to improve clarity and reduce duplication

The following changes are made in Appendix One to improve how the RRP is drafted:

- Paragraphs 6, 7, 14, 15, 18 & 19 are deleted and inserted as paragraphs 28 & 29 to reduce repetition
- Paragraph 8 – words added to clarify meaning
- Paragraph 24 – words added to mirror the wording used in paragraph 25 to clarify meaning
- Paragraph 32 – simpler words substituted for plain English
- Paragraph 33 – word added to correct grammar
- Paragraph 34 - simpler words substituted for plain English
- Paragraph 35 – word substituted to clarify meaning

9. Review of Rates Postponement Policy 2018

Author	<i>Richard Mabon, Senior Policy Advisor</i>
Activity manager	<i>Rachel Sparks, Finance Manager</i>
General manager	<i>Paul Brake, General Manager Business Support</i>

Summary

- This report is to inform Council's decision on a review of the Rates Postponement Policy 2018 (RPP).
- Council is required to review the Policy, using a Section 82 consultation process, once every six years. This last occurred in 2018.
- Council practise is to review this policy alongside the long-term plan every three years.
- Officers have reviewed the RPP and
 - find no good reason to amend or revoke the RPP; and
 - propose no changes to the RPP.
- Officers **RECOMMEND** that:
 - Council undertake no consultation on this Policy in 2021; and
 - Review the Policy again in 2024;

As this is the most efficient approach to achieve the objectives of this decision.

Recommendation

1. **That** Council make no changes to the Rates Postponement Policy 2018.
2. **That** Council undertake no consultation on the Rates Postponement Policy 2018
3. **That** Council review the Rates Postponement Policy 2018 in 2024.

Background

The current situation

1. Council practice is to review the Rates Postponement Policy (RRP) every three years alongside the long-term plan. The current RPP is attached as Appendix One.
2. Officers have reviewed the text of RPP in 2021 and have found no good reason to amend or revoke the RPP.

What we do now

3. The RPP is a discretionary policy under the Local Government Act 2002. It sets out the circumstances in which Council will consider a postponement of rates.
4. The policy is seldom used, but remains a useful option to provide relief for ratepayers who experience financial hardship and for superannuitants who may be asset-rich but cash-poor.

What other Councils do about postponement of rates

5. Officers have researched the RPPs from other Canterbury local authorities (TAs) in Appendix Two. The summary shows that:
 - One TA⁸ has a RRP which includes a general provision to consider any application for postponement of rates.
 - One TA⁹ has no policy on postponement of rates.
 - Eight¹⁰ Canterbury TAs have policies allowing for the postponement of rates for extreme financial hardship.
 - In broad terms, the eight policies across Canterbury are very similar.

Options analysis

6. Officers note that Council has four reasonable and practicable Options:
 - Option One – Make no changes and review with consultation in 2024
 - Option Two – Make no changes and consult in 2021
 - Option Three – Amend the policy and consult in 2021
 - Option Four – Revoke the policy and consult in 2021
7. As noted under background, the policy remains fit for purpose. Officers see no good reason to amend or revoke the RPP 2018. For this reason, Officers do **NOT RECOMMEND** Option Three or Option Four.

⁸ This is Selwyn District Council.

⁹ This is Waimate District Council

¹⁰ The eight Councils are Christchurch City, Environment Canterbury, Ashburton, Hurunui, Kaikoura, Timaru, Waimate and Waitaki Districts.

8. Also noted under background, Council must review the Policy every six years with a section 82 consultation process, even if it is making no change. As only three years have passed since the previous consultation, this is not required in 2021. Officers do not support expending Council resources on a consultation that is neither required for operational improvement or to meet a legal duty.
9. For this reason, Officers do not support Option Two. Officers **RECOMMEND** Option One.

Legal/policy implications

10. These implications are addressed throughout the background and options analysis.

Financial implications

Requirement	Explanation
What is the cost?	Council does not budget for rates postponements as these rates are eventually recovered and the number of postponements is very low.
Is there budget available in LTP / AP?	No.
Where is the funding coming from?	There is no budget to fund.
Are there any future budget implications?	No. The recommendations proposed do not materially affect the number of postponements.
Reviewed by Finance	Rachel – please review

Significance and engagement assessment

Requirement	Explanation
Is the matter considered significant?	No
Level of significance	The matter is assessed as having low significance.
Level of engagement selected	1. Inform . This is achieved through this report appearing on a public meeting agenda.
Rationale for selecting level of engagement	There is no need to consult until 2024 and no change proposed in the meantime. The RPP is not controversial.
Reviewed by Strategy & Policy	Toni Durham; Strategy & Policy Manager

Next steps

12. This table describes governance actions that include and arise from the recommendations. This matter will not return to the Council table until 2024, or if there is some unforeseen material change that leads to a need for earlier review.

Date	Action / milestone	Comments
17 February 2021	Council approves recommendation in the report	Decision made by Council

Policy

RATES POSTPONEMENT POLICY

TEAM:	Finance
RESPONSIBILITY:	Finance Manager
ADOPTED:	28 June 2018
REVIEW:	Every three years
CONSULTATION:	Consulted on through the Long Term Plan 2018-28
RELATED DOCUMENTS:	Sections 109 and 110 Local Government Act 2002

1. Policy Objective

The objective of this policy is to provide qualifying ratepayers with the option of postponing payment of rates, subject to the full cost of postponement being met by the ratepayer and a minimal risk of loss to Council.

2. Definitions

Council means Ashburton District Council.

3. Policy Statement

1. Criteria

Council will postpone rates for ratepayers who intend to use equity in their home to pay postponed rates at a later date.

In order to qualify for rates postponement:

- The applicant must be aged 65 years or over
- The applicant(s) must own the rating unit

- Rating units must be classified as residential and used as the principal place of residence by the applicant
- The rating unit must be insured to its full value at all times.

Applications from ratepayers aged under 65 will be considered on a case by case basis.

Applications for postponement of rates due to extreme financial hardship will be considered on a case by case basis.

2. Scheme Requirements

All financial and administration costs will be added to postponed rates. These costs will be added annually. The financial cost will be the interest Council will incur at the rate of Council's cost of borrowing for funding postponed rates, plus a margin to cover other costs.

Interest and fees payable will be added to the amount of postponed rates annually and be paid at the same time postponed rates are paid.

Water by meter charges cannot be postponed.

Council will assess applications for home equity rates postponement on a risk model to predict likely future equity. Applications with less than 20% forecast future equity will not be successful.

Rates under this provision will be postponed until:

- The death of the ratepayer(s) (rates fall due within three months after grant of probate or letters of administration); or
- The ratepayer(s) ceases to be the owner of the rating unit; or
- The rating unit ceases to be the principal place of residence of the ratepayer(s); or
- The minimum equity threshold is reached; or
- An alternative date as agreed with Council.

An applicant must obtain independent advice from an appropriately qualified and trained person, as determined by Council. Confirmation that this advice has been sought will be required before postponement can be granted.

If there is a mortgage owing on the rating unit, the mortgagor must confirm their agreement in writing before rates postponement will be granted.

Council reserves the right to specify additional conditions before postponement will be granted.

Postponed rates, or any part thereof, may be paid at any time. The applicant may elect to postpone a lesser sum than that which they would be entitled to under this policy.

Postponed rates will be registered as a statutory land charge on the rating unit title. This means that Council will have first call on the proceeds of any revenue from the sale or lease of the rating unit.

3. Application

Applications for postponement of rates must be made on the appropriate form, prior to the commencement of the rating year. Evidence or additional documents may be required. All applications include a statutory declaration.

Applications received during a rating year will apply to the following rating year. Applications will not be backdated.

4. Decisions

Decisions on the postponement of rates will be made by an officer with the appropriate delegation. Applicants will be notified in writing within 30 days of application.

10. Mid-year performance report

Author	<i>Emily Watson; Corporate Planner</i>
Activity manager	<i>Toni Durham; Strategy & Policy Manager</i>
Group manager	<i>Jane Donaldson; Group Manager: Strategy & Compliance</i>

Summary

- The purpose of this report is provide the mid-year non-financial reporting against the performance measures set in Year 3 of the Long-Term Plan 2018-28.
- These results are for the first half of the 2020/21 financial year, from 1 July 2020 – 30 December 2020.

Recommendation

- 1. That** Council receives the mid-year non-financial performance report.

Appendix 1 – Mid-year performance report

Background

The current situation

1. Council monitors its progress towards achieving the non-financial performance measures. These are reported to Council mid-way through the financial year and at the end of the financial year.
2. As part of the Long-Term Plan process, Council sets levels of service for each activity. Accompanying these levels of services are performance measures and targets.
3. Performance measures enable Council and the community to assess whether the levels of service are being delivered to the community. Targets for each performance measure show the level of achievement Council is aiming for each year.
4. The end of year results are also included in Council's Annual Report.

Legal/policy implications

Legislation

5. Council is required (Local Government Act 2002) to report against the performance targets set for each activity in the Annual Report.
6. While Council isn't required by legislation to provide progress reports, to do so informs both Council and the community with how well Council is tracking on a timely basis.

Financial implications

Requirement	Explanation
What is the cost?	Monitoring Council's performance is met from within existing budgets.
Is there budget available in LTP / AP?	Yes
Where is the funding coming from?	284 Community Planning
Are there any future budget implications?	No
Reviewed by Finance	Not required

Significance and engagement assessment

7. The progress reporting of Council's achievement towards its non-financial performance measures is not considered significant and is of low significance to the community.

Requirement	Explanation
Is the matter considered significant?	No
Level of significance	Low; Not Significant
Level of engagement selected	1 – Inform the community
Rationale for selecting level of engagement	The community will be informed of Council's progress in achieving the non-financial performance measures through relevant media channels.
Reviewed by Strategy & Policy	Toni Durham; Strategy & Policy Manager

Appendix 1

Mid-year performance report

Local Infrastructure

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – DRINKING WATER

What we're aiming for: To promote the health and safety of the community through the provision of an efficient, safe and reliable water supply.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)		2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide quality drinking water to connected properties	All Council drinking water schemes achieve bacteria compliance		11/12	100%	12/12	
	All Council drinking water schemes achieve protozoal compliance		2/12	100%	2/12	Only 2 schemes (Rakaia and Fairton) are protozoa compliant. All other Council supplies require upgrading. These upgrades are a key feature of the 2021-31 LTP.
Council contractors respond to drinking water failures and requests with median response times	Median response time (in hours) to urgent and non-urgent callouts	Urgent call-out attendance	0.33 hours (20 minutes)	1 hour	-	Unable to be determined – There were 4 urgent callouts attended, but no job timestamp data available.
		Urgent call-out resolution	2.4 hours	4 hours	-	Unable to be determined – There were 4 urgent callouts resolved, but no job timestamp data available.
		Non-urgent call-out attendance	0.26 days (6.19 hours)	1 day	0.95 days (22.94 hours)	352 Completed Non-urgent call-outs with a median response time of 22 hours 56 minutes.
		Non-urgent call-out resolution	0.96 days (23.02 hours)	5 days	1.11 days (26.77 hours)	352 Completed Non-urgent call-outs with a median resolution time of 26 hours 46 minutes.
We provide efficient and sustainable drinking water services	Reduction in real water loss from the reticulated systems		56%	34%	47%	Not all properties on Council supplies are metered and so the approved water loss calculation yields a coarse figure and

						includes losses on private reticulation.
Reduction in average consumption (per resident per day)		714 L	≤706 L	761L		3,490,186 m ³ across 184 days and an estimated population 24,925
The majority of residents are satisfied with our drinking water services	Customer satisfaction with drinking water services	a)Clarity b)Taste c)Odour d)Pressure or flow e)Continuity of supply f) Council's response to any of these issues	7.85 complaints / 1,000 connections	≤ 10 complaints / 1,000 connections	2.34 complaints / 1,000 connections	25 complaints received (10,703 connections)
		Residents are satisfied with Council's drinking water supplies	83%	80%	81%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey (September and December). The next data collections occur in March and June 2021.

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – WASTEWATER

What we're aiming for: To help protect community health and safety, and the environment, through the provision of reliable and efficient wastewater schemes.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)		2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide an efficient and sustainable wastewater service	Dry weather overflow incidents		0.31 / 1000 connections	≤1.0/1000 connections	0.20	2 dry weather sewerage overflows caused by blocked sewer mains (9,780 connections)
	Compliance with resource consents	Abatement notices	0	0	0	No abatement notices received.
		Infringement notices	0	0	0	No infringement notices received
		Enforcement orders	0	0	0	No enforcement orders received
		Convictions	0	0	0	No convictions received
Council contractors respond to wastewater failures and requests with median response times	Median response time (in hours) to callouts	Call-out attendance time	0.5 hours (30 minutes)	1 hour	0.26 hours (15 minutes)	2 overflow call-outs with a median response time of 15 minutes.
		Call-out resolution	3.0 hours	4 hours	2.38 hours	2 overflow call-outs with a median resolution time of 2 hours 23 minutes.
The majority of residents are satisfied with our wastewater services	Customer satisfaction with wastewater services	a) Sewage odour b) Sewerage system faults c) Sewerage system blockages d) Council's response to issues with our sewerage system	5.70 complaints/1,000 connections	≤10 complaints/1,000 connections	2.15 complaints/1,000 connections	21 complaints received (9,780 connections)

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – STORMWATER

What we're aiming for: To help protect community health and safety, and the environment, through the provision of reliable and efficient wastewater schemes.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide protection from flooding for private properties	Flooding events from stormwater overflows *	0	0	0	No flooding events where stormwater flooded a habitable floor of a property
	Number of habitable floors affected for each flooding event *	0	0	0	No habitable floors affected by stormwater.
	Median response time (in hours) to callouts *	N/A	1 hour	N/A	Not applicable as there were no flooding events during this period.
We provide efficient and sustainable stormwater services	Compliance with resource consents *	0	0	0	No abatement notices received
		0	0	0	No infringement notices received
		0	0	0	No enforcement orders received
		0	0	0	No convictions received
The majority of residents are satisfied with our stormwater services	Customer satisfaction with stormwater services (complaints / 1,000 connections) *	1.94	≤5	0.10	1 stormwater system performance complaint received (9,780 connections)

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – STOCKWATER

What we're aiming for: To promote the productivity of rural land through the efficient provision of clean, reliable stockwater.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS		2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
(Levels of service)	Performance measures)					
We provide efficient and sustainable stockwater services	Compliance with resource consents	Abatement notices	0	0	0	No abatement notices received
		Infringement notices	0	0	0	No infringement notices received
		Enforcement orders	0	0	0	No enforcement orders received
		Convictions	0	0	0	No convictions received

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – TRANSPORTATION

What we're aiming for: To enable efficient travel throughout the district to support economic and social interaction.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide quality transportation services for the district	The footpath network is well maintained *	94%	85%	94%	Jul to Dec 2020
	The sealed local road network is smooth *	96%	90%	96%	Jul to Dec 2020
	The sealed local road network is well maintained *	5.6%	4%	2.5%	Jul to Dec 2020
	Volume of metal replaced on unsealed roads *	48,926m ³	48,000m ³	39,058 m ³	Jul to Dec 2020
	Reduction in fatalities on local roads * <i>The change in the number from the previous financial year.</i>	0 (2 fatalities)	≤2	1 (1 fatality in period)	Jul to Dec 2020
	Reduction in serious injury crashes on local roads * <i>The change in the number from the previous financial year.</i>	-1 (7SCI)	≤2	2 (5SCI in period)	Jul to Dec 2020
Council contractors respond to transportation network failures and requests within required response times	Roading service requests are responded to on-time *	56%	75%	59%	Jul to Dec 2020
	Footpath service requests are responded to on-time *	61%	70%	69%	Jul to Dec 2020
The majority of residents are satisfied with Council's transportation services	Residents are satisfied with Council's unsealed roads	51%	80%	56%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
	Residents are satisfied with Council's sealed roads	34%	80%	38%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – WASTE REDUCTION & RECOVERY

What we're aiming for: To develop a cost-effective range of waste management services to ensure sustainable management, conservation of resources, and protection of the environment and public health.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide kerbside collection services to the majority of residents in the district	Increase the volume of recyclable material from kerbside collection services	-11%	+1%	-39.6%	This result reflects the changes made to recycling that were actioned from the 1 st August 2020 This also reflects lower contamination levels of heavy putrescible wastes
	Kerbside collection service complaints are responded to within 24 hours (response time – contract KPI)	95%	95%	100%	
We provide waste reduction and recovery facilities throughout the district	Increase the volume of recyclable/recoverable material recovered from the waste stream	-5%	+1%	-12.3%	This result reflects the changes made to recycling that were actioned from the 1 st August 2020

Public Services

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE - DEMOCRACY

What we're aiming for: To engage in meaningful conversations and lead the community with clear and rational decision-making that is based on robust monitoring, research and analysis.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
The community to be informed of, and involved in, local decision making	Residents are satisfied that the Council provides opportunities to have their say	86%	80%	90%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey (September and December).
	Residents are satisfied with the quality of information about Council activities and events	92%	80%	93%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
The community's views are taken fully into account for effective governance by elected members	Residents are satisfied with the performance of the Mayor and councillors	78%	80%	89%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – COMMUNITY GRANTS & FUNDING

What we're aiming for: To support other organisations in the community in areas that are far better serviced by these groups than what we could do.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
Community-led projects are well supported to enhance community development and wellbeing	Residents are satisfied that the Council provides opportunities for grants and funding to support community-led projects	95%	80%	96%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

What we're aiming for: To support the local economy by assisting tourism, employment and business development initiatives.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
Commercial property assets that are financially sustainable	Occupancy of all commercial tenancies at or above 95% at all times	98%	≥95%	98%	
Council will provide, through Experience Mid Canterbury and Methven i-SITE, a tourism promotion service that meets the needs of the tourism industry and visitors	The EMC business membership will show an increase each year	13%	≥ 2%	N/A	Unable to be measured
	Total visitor guest nights in the Ashburton District will show an increase each year	Unable to be measured	≥ 2%	N/A	Unable to be measured

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – COMMUNITY SERVICES

What we're aiming for: To provide community services that meet resident's needs

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
The majority of residents are satisfied with Council-provided public conveniences	Residents are satisfied with Council-provided public conveniences	94%	80%	90%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
Ashburton District is a safe community	Residents are satisfied with Council's provision of CCTV and security patrols within the district	91%	80%	92%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
Council will provide rental accommodation that meets the specific needs of eligible elderly members of the community	Occupancy rates of Elderly Persons Housing	97%	95%	98%	Two vacant units. One in Methven which has now been refurbished for a new tenant but previously no interest from the waiting list for tenants to move to Methven. The other one is in Kitchener Street due to not meeting Tenancy Services standards. 98% based on 104 units

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

What we're aiming for: To provide the district with a network of open green spaces that contribute towards the beauty and enjoyment of the area for residents and visitors alike.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide residents with accessible, fit for purpose Parks & Open Spaces	Urban residents live within 400 metres of a park or open space.	95%	100%	95%	
	Urban residents have access to open spaces (per 1,000 residents).	8,715 m ²	≥4,000m ²	8,715m ²	
	Residents throughout the district have access to sports parks (per 1,000 residents).	3.5 ha	≥3.5 ha	3.5ha	
Council responds to Parks & Open Spaces failures and requests within median response times	Complaints are responded to within ten working days.	58%	100%	56%	
The majority of residents are satisfied with our Parks & Open Spaces	Residents are satisfied with Council-provided Parks & Open Spaces	92%	80%	96%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
Council responds to cemetery failures and requests within acceptable response times.	Complaints are responded to within ten working days.	100%	100%	100%	
The majority of residents are satisfied with our cemeteries.	Residents are satisfied with Council-provided cemeteries.	97%	80%	96%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.

HALF-WAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE – RECREATION FACILITIES

What we're aiming for: To provide recreation services that are well utilised and meet the needs of the community.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YTD RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide all residents and visitors with accessible library resources for recreation and discovery	The Ashburton Public Library is well utilised	90,931	130,000 visitors	40,115	
	Most households in the district utilise the library	9, 122	10,100	Not available	Available end June
We will have a library that is a welcoming and community-centred destination	Users are satisfied with Council's library services	97%	80%	98%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
	Free public internet sessions (Aotearoa People's Network Kaharoa) are well utilised and increasing each year	36,486	47,200	15,998	3 weeks of data not received for December.
We provide a modern museum for the community that aligns with NZ Museum Standards	Museum programmes and services are well utilised and increasing	20,567	16,700	10,500	
	Ashburton Museum meets New Zealand Museum Standards	75%	100%	80%	
The majority of users are satisfied with the Museum	Users are satisfied with Council-provided Museum services and programmes	94%	80%	91%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
We provide quality gym, pool, and stadium facilities	EA Networks Centre is well utilised	359,739	>480,000	196,597	Covid-19 impact in July/August meant numbers from sports events were lower than usual
	Swim School is well utilised	3,523	>4,500	1,716	Slow rebuild from Covid-19 , some members of the community are still tentative about using facilities
	The gym is well utilised	956	>1,100	884	Covid-19 + commercial

					pressure, some members of the community are still tentative about using facilities
The majority of users are satisfied with EA Networks Centre	Users are satisfied with EA Networks Centre services and programmes.	88%	80%	90%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.

Regulatory Services

BUILDING REGULATION

What we're aiming for: To implement the requirements of the Building Act 2004 fairly and impartially so the public has confidence that buildings in the district are constructed in accordance with the building code.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide quality building regulation services	Building consents are processed and decisions made within 20 working days	99.1%	100%	96.9%	9 consents out of 209 consents went over time
	Code of Compliance Certificates are processed and decisions made within 20 working days	99.4%	100%	99.8%	1 certificate out of 409 certificates went over time
	Buildings with compliance schedules are audited each year	10.3%	10%	2.7%	14 out of the 52 required audits have been carried out so far
	Swimming pool fences are inspected every year	35.5%	33%	15.2%	89 out of the 195 required inspections have been carried out so far
Council responds to concerns with building regulation services within required response times	Building service complaints are responded to within two working days	100%	100%	N/A	No complaints have been received so far

DISTRICT PLANNING

What we're aiming for: To achieve a fit for purpose function which meets statutory obligations and customer expectations, while anticipating and reacting to the changing needs of the district.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide quality district planning services	Resource consent applications and exemptions are determined within statutory timeframes	99.5%	100%	100%	All consents processed within statutory timeframes
	Subdivision plan approval certificates (RMA s.223) are determined within ten working days	98%	100%	98%	1 out of 35 applications for signoff exceeded 10 working days
Council responds to concerns with district planning services within required response times	District planning service complaints are responded to within five working days	100%	100%	100%	All complaints responded to within timeframes
The majority of residents are satisfied with the standard of our district planning services	Residents are satisfied with the standard of Council's planning services	82%	80%	86%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey (September and December). The next data collections occur in March and June 2021.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

What we're aiming for: To support the community's ability to respond to and recover from emergency events.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
We support emergency preparedness through community-based emergency management	A community response plan is developed or renewed annually	1	1	3	Two new community response plans developed for communities at South Rakaia Huts & Lake Clearwater Huts. South Rakaia Huts is still in development. Completed review of Methven CRP as part of Covid-19 debrief.
The majority of residents are satisfied with the standard of our civil defence services	Residents are satisfied with the civil defence services provided by Council	96%	80%	96%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.

LAND INFORMATION

What we're aiming for: To provide an efficient production of Land Information Memoranda (LIMS's) within statutory timeframes and with a high degree of accuracy.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide quality land information services efficiently	LIM applications are processed within ten working days	100%	100%	100%	All LIMs processed within statutory timeframes

REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

What we're aiming for: To improve, promote, and protect public health within the district by the promotion of sustainable environmental practices and the monitoring and enforcement of associated legislation and bylaws.

WHAT WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS (Levels of service)	HOW WE'LL MEASURE PROGRESS (Performance measures)	2019/20 RESULTS	2020/21 TARGET	2020/21 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS	COMMENTS
We provide quality alcohol licensing services	Licensed premises are monitored each year	100%	100%	76%	83 of 109 licensed premises monitored to date
	Stakeholder meetings are held each year	26	10	5	5 meetings held to date
The majority of residents are satisfied with Council's role in alcohol licensing	Residents are satisfied with how Council undertakes its role in alcohol licensing	90%	80%	92%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
We provide quality animal control services	Known dogs are registered	96%	95%	93%	6414 of 6909 known dogs registered to date
Council contractors respond to animal control incidents within contractual response times	Urgent incidents are responded to within one hour	100%	100%	100%	11 urgent call outs received and all responded to within one hour
	Found, wandering or barking dog incidents are responded to within five working days	100%	100%	100%	276 non urgent call outs received and all responded to within 5 working days
The majority of residents are satisfied with our animal control services	Residents are satisfied with Council's animal control services	86%	80%	87%	This data is from the first and second data collections (417 responses) of the Annual Residents' Survey.
We provide quality environmental health services	Registered food premises are risk assessed each year	81%	80%	30%	62 out of 209 premises risk assessed to date
Council contractors respond to environmental health issues within contractual response times	Noise complaints are responded to within two hours	100%	100%	100%	237 complaints received and all responded to within two hours.

11. Water Services Bill Submission

Author	<i>Rachel Thomas; Policy Advisor</i>
Manager	<i>Toni Durham; Strategy & Policy Manager</i>
GM Responsible	<i>Jane Donaldson; GM Strategy & Policy</i>

Summary

- The purpose of this report is for Council to consider a submission to the Health Committee (central Government) on the Water Services Bill (the Bill).
- The Bill is the second bill under the three waters reform package, with the first being Taumata Arowai Water Services Regulator Bill¹¹.
- The draft submission has been developed following discussion with Council officers (Assets and Strategy & Policy) and consideration of other Canterbury councils' submissions (Christchurch City and Selwyn District).
- Officers have focused the submission on the following issues:
 - **Requirement for small suppliers to comply** – any property which services more than one dwelling is considered a water supplier and subject to the requirements of the Bill (i.e. on a farm one well may service several dwellings).
 - **Defining key terms** – 'drinking water supplier' and 'point of supply'
 - **Requirement for residual disinfection** – i.e. 'chlorination'.
 - **Duty to provide sufficient quantity of drinking water**
 - **New requirements for territorial authorities** – such as assessing all drinking water supplies in their district.
 - **Well-being** - the impact on Ashburton District's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.
- The submission is due Tuesday 2 March 2021.

Recommendation

1. That Council:
 - 1.1 **Receives** the report
 - 1.2 **Approves** the submission to the Health Committee about the Water Services Bill attached as Appendix One.

Appendix One – Ashburton District Council draft submission

¹¹ This Bill received Royal Assent on the 6 August 2020.

Background

1. The Water Services Bill (the Bill) creates significant requirements around the provision of drinking water for communities across New Zealand. Taumata Arowai has been established as the new water services regulator.
2. The Bill can be found here: https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/bills-and-laws/bills-proposed-laws/document/BILL_99655/tab/submissionsandadvice

The current situation

3. The Taumata Arowai-Water Services Regulator Act 2020 created a new regulator for water services. The regulator will not become fully operational until the enactment of the Water Services Bill, which is expected to be in the second half of 2021.
4. The Bill was introduced in Parliament on 27 July 2020 and had its first reading on 8 December 2020.
5. The Bill has been brought about by the recommendations and findings of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry which found that there are six fundamental principles of drinking water safety:
 - A high standard of care must be embraced in relation to drinking water
 - Protection of source water is of paramount importance
 - Multiple barriers against the contamination of drinking water must be maintained
 - Change precedes contamination of drinking water, and must never be ignored
 - Suppliers must own the safety of drinking water
 - A preventive risk management approach must be applied in relation to drinking water.
6. The Bill:
 - (a) outlines functions and powers of Taumata Arowai, and
 - (b) sets forth the duties, obligations and functions of drinking water suppliers and local government.
7. The Bill would repeal Part 2A of the Heath Act 1956, which regulates drinking water, and replaces it with a stand-alone Act to regulate drinking water. The Bill would amend the Local Government Act 2002, by replacing Subpart 1 of Part 7, which pertains to obligations to assess water and sanitary services.
8. The majority of the Bill concerns drinking water supplies, with some general provisions regarding wastewater and stormwater.
9. The Bill does not concern itself with the aggregation or rationalisation of drinking water supplies or the formation of drinking water entities.
10. Notable features of the Bill are:

- The Bill broadens the definition of ‘drinking water supply’ and ‘drinking water supplier’. This means a greater number of properties are now subject to the requirements of the Bill in being a drinking water supplier (if supplying more than one dwelling).
- This is a significant change from the current framework under the Health Act 1956, which regulates drinking water supplies that serve at least 25 people at least 60 days a year.
- In the Ashburton District, there are many properties where a single supply would service multiple dwellings (i.e. a farm with multiple dwellings). Officers estimate there are more than 500 properties with multiple dwellings. If each property was supplying those dwellings from a single source, they would be subject to the requirements of a drinking water supplier as per the Bill.
- The Bill also notes the definition of drinking water supplier includes a person “...who ought reasonably to know that the water they are supplying is used as drinking water;...”. This may impact on piped schemes that are relying on a T&C statement that water is to be used for stockwater only.

11. The Bill would place additional responsibilities on territorial authorities, including:

- Conducting assessments of all drinking water supplies, other than self-supplies, both public and private. Assessments of wastewater services and ‘other sanitary services’ within their districts are also required, without appearing to limit these responsibilities to their own water services but include private water services as well.
- Requiring territorial authorities to work with Taumata Arowai, consumers of a drinking water supply and the drinking water supplier in circumstances where the drinking water supplier is, or potentially will be, failing to meet its obligations. This may result in territorial authorities being obliged to ensure that consumers of the affected supply have access to drinking water. As stated above, there may be hundreds of private drinking water supplies in the district, under the new definition.

Previous Council decisions

12. Council submitted on the Essential Freshwater proposals in 2019 (31 October). This submission has been prepared with consideration of the points raised in that submission.

Māori and tangata whenua participation

13. Officers have not discussed this matter with Aoraki Environmental Consultancy (the commercial part of Te Rūnanga o Arowhenua). However, their advice was sought when preparing the Council submission on the Freshwater Proposal which addressed similar matters.

What others have done

14. Given the breadth of the proposed changes, the desire to provide feedback on these proposals has been extensive, not only from a community perspective but also from within the local government sector.

15. Council's submission has been prepared with consideration of the submissions of Christchurch City and Selwyn District councils.
16. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum have prepared a submission on behalf of the region. Officers have not been involved in the drafting of this. Council's submission indicates support for the Mayoral Forum submission.

Options analysis

Option 1 – Do nothing

17. This is not the recommended option. Council may decide to stay silent and not make a submission on the Water Services Bill. This could result in Council missing an opportunity to advocate on behalf of the district on what is a very topical issue.

Option 2 – Approve the submission as attached in Appendix One (recommended option)

18. This option would see Council officers lodge the appended submission to the Health Committee.
19. The Water Services Bill is a significant piece of legislation covering not only the roles and responsibilities of Taumata Arowai (the new water services regulator) but also the roles and responsibilities of drinking water suppliers and local government. It also contains some provisions for wastewater and stormwater. As such officers consider that the Council should submit on the Bill.

Legal/policy implications

20. The lodging of a submission does not breach or trigger any statutory or legal duty of the Council.

Financial implications

21. There are no financial implications in making this submission.

Requirement	Explanation
What is the cost?	Officer resource in preparing the submission. This has been met from within existing operating budgets.
Is there budget available in LTP / AP?	Yes
Where is the funding coming from?	Community Planning
Are there any future budget implications?	No
Finance review required?	No

Significance and engagement assessment

22. The overall significance level in regards to the preparation of this submission is considered low.
23. However, the potential impacts of the Water Services Bill on Council's drinking water services, as well as the Council's other water services, is considered to be of at least medium significance. Once there is greater clarity regarding the Government's Water Reform proposal for water service entities there may be a need to engagement with communities to seek their views.

Requirement	Explanation
Is the matter considered significant?	No
Level of significance	Low, not significant
Level of engagement selected	2. Comment – informal 2-way communication
Rationale for selecting level of engagement	The rationale for selecting the 'comment' level of engagement is because the draft submission was prepared following discussion with Council officers and peers throughout Canterbury.
Reviewed by Strategy & Policy	Toni Durham; Strategy & Policy Manager

Next steps

24. The Water Services Bill is currently at the Select Committee stage of Parliament. Submitters will be heard in person, prior to the second reading of the Bill.

Submission

Water Services Bill (Select Committee stage)

PREPARED BY: Ashburton District Council
PO Box 94
ASHBURTON 7774

SUBMITTED TO: Hon Nanaia Mahuta
Health Committee
Central Government
WELLINGTON

Toni Durham
Strategy & Policy Manager
toni.durham@adc.govt.nz

Introduction

1. Ashburton District Council (the Council) welcomes the opportunity to submit on the *Water Services Bill*, currently at the Select Committee stage of the Health Committee (the Committee).
2. Located an hour's drive south of Christchurch, more than 35,300¹² residents live in the district, with the main town of Ashburton accounting for over 50% of residents. The rest of our residents live rurally or in smaller towns or villages.
3. Ashburton district (the District) has experienced moderate and sustained population increase since the mid-1990s, increasing by 23% between 2006 and 2013 (a 3.3% increase per year). This growth, however, is now slowing, with an average growth of 1.3% per year since 2013. The expansion of irrigation and agricultural diversification on the Canterbury Plains have been major factors in this growth.
4. The Council supports the Government's intent to provide for a more robust and comprehensive three waters management regime that began with the enactment of the Taumata Arowai Water Regulator Act 2020 and continues with the Water Services Bill.
5. Council is governed by the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002). Under this, our purpose¹³ requires us to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of our communities in the present and for the future. Our purpose, along with technical input, has formed the basis of our submission.
6. This submission addresses Council's concerns on the areas of:
 - (1) the requirements for small suppliers to comply;
 - (2) key terms 'drinking water supplier' and 'point of supply'
 - (3) the requirement for residual disinfection;
 - (4) the duty to provide a sufficient quantity of water;

¹² Source: Statistics New Zealand Population Estimates 30 June 2020

¹³ Source: Section 10; Local Government Act, 2002

- (5) the consequences for territorial authorities; and
 - (6) the impact on well-being for Ashburton District.
7. This submission generally aligns in principle with the submissions of Christchurch City, Waimakariri District and Selwyn District councils and the Canterbury Mayoral Forum, as such, we support the general direction of their submissions.

Requirement for small suppliers to comply

8. The Bill lacks clarity on the requirements of small drinking water suppliers which were not previously covered under the Health Act 1956 (but will now be covered under the Act due to the proposed amendment to the Health Act¹⁴).
9. We are aware that in the Ashburton District there are many properties that contain multiple dwellings (i.e. an agricultural property with multiple dwellings which may be for workers). We estimate there may be over 500 properties of this nature. If each of those properties is supplied by a single well, they will be considered water supplies, and subject to the requirements of the legislation.
10. We note that the exposure draft of the proposed new drinking water standards and rules have not yet identified requirements for very small drinking water suppliers (those supplying between 2 and 50 people).
11. It may be unreasonable to expect all small suppliers to develop Water Safety Plans and fully comply with the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards. To do so would impose a time and resource burden on these properties. While we acknowledge the importance of imposing duties on all suppliers to ensure safety of drinking water, we believe the Bill requires more detail regarding these requirements for small suppliers and the exemptions available.
12. The Bill is unclear on whether the intention is that these properties are included. We request the wording be revised to address this.
- a. If it is not the intention to include these properties, the Council suggest the Bill is amended to provide clarity on the requirements of small suppliers.
 - b. If it is the intention to include these properties we support Christchurch City Council's recommendation that the Bill is amended to provide for a transition period for small suppliers to meet drinking water standards (i.e. 5 years). We request clarification on what the role of territorial authorities would be in this process.

Key Terms – drinking water supplier

13. The meaning of 'drinking water supplier' has been expanded through Clause 8(b) to include "...a person who ought reasonably to know that the water they are supplying is used as drinking water;...". Clause 9(2) also states that the regulator can declare a water supply.

¹⁴ Under the Health Act currently only drinking water supplies that service at least 25 people at least 60 days a year are subject to the Act's drinking water provisions. The amendment to Part 2A of the Health Act would significantly increase the range of suppliers covered.

14. Council is concerned how this may impact on private reticulated stockwater schemes. Such schemes were incepted to supply water for stock.
15. However in practice once a supply enters a property, it is impossible for those operators to regulate what use is made of the water supplied. A property may use the water for their household and in so doing potentially change the entire status of the supply.
16. Council recommends that
 - a. Clarification is provided on how an operator of a reticulated stockwater scheme can satisfactorily demonstrate to the regulator that they are not considered a drinking water supplier.

Key Terms – point of supply

17. Clause 13(c) indicates that if a supply has end-point treatment devices, these devices are considered to be the point of supply. In practice, because end-point treatment devices are typically located on the dwelling, this may move the current point of supply (typically at the property boundary) some distance inside the property.
18. In such cases the water supplier would have to assume maintenance responsibility for significant lengths of additional pipework on private property in order to ensure the integrity of the supply through to the point of supply.

Requirement for residual disinfection

19. Clause 31 (1) (j) of the Bill requires that drinking water safety plans provide for residual disinfection where the drinking water supply includes reticulation unless an exemption is obtained. Although there is no definition of ‘residual disinfection’ in the Bill it presumably refers to chlorination or similar chemical treatment.
20. In general, the Council supports the overall intent to require residual disinfection under the Bill as we are committed to providing a multi-barrier approach. The Council operates twelve schemes of which all are now operating with residual disinfection.
21. However, in the District there are number of private schemes which are not routinely chlorinated, and many properties in the rural area considered ‘small suppliers’. They would be required to chlorinate or apply for an exemption (Clause 31 (1) (j)). In its current drafting, there appears to be significant uncertainty as to the requirements. On behalf of these suppliers, we seek clarification as to whether an exemption can be progressed in the absence of first providing a residual disinfection.
22. The Council recommends that
 - a. Greater detail is provided on the residual disinfection requirements that may apply to small supplies including any timeframes around transitional compliance.

Duty to provide sufficient quantity of drinking water

23. Clause 25 describes the duty to provide sufficient quantity of drinking water. The section also makes provisions for suppliers to impose restrictions, however the reasons do not include managing peak demands arising from residential hosing/irrigation.
24. Council is concerned that if suppliers do not retain the ability to manage peak demands in this way, it may impose a requirement for significant additional infrastructure upgrades on suppliers.
25. Building infrastructure to manage what are otherwise short term peak demands is considered to be inefficient and wasteful.

26. The Council recommends that
- a. clause 25(3)(c) is strengthened to allow “efficient management of network capacity” (or similar text) as a justification to impose restrictions.

Consequences for territorial authorities

27. The Bill amends the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) to place new requirements on territorial authorities. These amendments would mean territorial authorities must assess all drinking water supplies other than self-supplies in their districts; and work with suppliers, consumers and Taumata Arowai to find solutions if a drinking water service is (or appearing to be) failing.
28. This extension of responsibility is far greater than the current responsibility under the LGA 2002. It is likely Council would require additional staff to meet this requirement. In line with charging for other similar regulatory functions, we would rate to recover the cost of regulation.
29. Council therefore considers it unreasonable to be responsible for not only our own, but also all applicable private drinking water supplies in the district. Private water supply has a clear private benefit.
30. The amendments to LGA 2002 would also require territorial authorities to assess wastewater services and “other sanitary services” within their districts, without appearing to limit these responsibilities to their own water services but include private water services as well.
31. We note that the Bill does not appear to anticipate future delivery service models for three waters services in which territorial authorities may no longer be responsible for supply in a future service delivery scheme. As such the appropriate and relevant body to work with drinking water suppliers who fail to provide drinking water services may be the primary drinking water entity for the region, rather than the territorial authority.
32. The Council recommends that
- a. Where a territorial authority manages its own public drinking water supplies, wastewater services and other sanitary services it should be responsible only for assessing its own water services, so that the territorial authority is able to focus on meeting new requirements on their drinking water, wastewater and stormwater networks.
 - b. Where a primary drinking water entity is responsible for one or more drinking water supplies it should be responsible for assessing those supplies under its management.
 - c. Taumata Arowai should bear the responsibility for assessing water services that are not managed by a territorial authority or a primary drinking water entity.

Impact on well-being

Social well-being

33. Council acknowledges the importance of the Bill in providing assurance of the safety and reliability of drinking water.
34. However, our agricultural community (who are the majority of ‘small suppliers’ in the District) are facing many pressures to comply with new regulations. Under the Bill, this

community faces pressure to comply as a small supplier where farms consist of multiple residential dwellings serviced by a central point. We request the Committee consider the transition period for small suppliers in light of other compliance pressures placed on the agricultural community by central Government.

Economic well-being

35. From the perspective of the activities and services we provide as a Council to our community, we consider that the Bill will have a significant impact on local authorities throughout New Zealand to upgrade infrastructure for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater. Rate increases may be inevitable to carry out these upgrades, impacting on our economic well-being.

Environmental well-being

36. Council supports measures to lift the standards of drinking water as there are clear environmental benefits.
37. Under the Bill, Taumata Arowai is empowered to set environmental performance measures which require annual reporting for wastewater and stormwater. While not a legislative issue, we note there is no detail on what these measures entail. We suggest the Committee consider the level of regulation versus the risk of poor performance in setting these measures.

Cultural well-being

38. Council agrees with the concept of Te Mana o te Wai (the mana of water) as a guiding principle and notes that this parallels requirements imposed on local authorities under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. However, the implications of the concept in terms of the provision of drinking water are unclear and may result in significantly more expensive approaches for drinking water supplies.
39. Council knows that water is of great significance to Ngāi Tahu. As kaitiaki (guardians), Ngāi Tahu and the Papatipu Rūnanga are required to exercise kaitiakitanga (guardianship) over the surface water resources of the district.
40. Through our Surface Water Strategy, Council has recognised that our surface water resources are a taonga (treasure) which provides and sustains life. It is akin to the lifeblood of the earth. The health of the water reflects the health of the environment and the people. The surface water bodies of Ashburton District support many places of spiritual and cultural importance to Ngāi Tahu and provide important mahinga kai resources. The importance of this relationship is reflected in law, with the Resource Management Act 1999 identifying the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water bodies, wahi tapu (sacred sites) and other taonga as a matter of national importance.
41. Council thanks the Health Committee for the opportunity to make a submission on the Water Services Bill.

Chief Executive

Hamish Riach

13. Ashburton Car Club – gravel sprint event

Author	<i>Rhys Roberts; Technical Support Officer-Roading</i>
Activity Manager	<i>Brian Fauth; Roading Manager</i>
GM Responsible	<i>Neil McCann; Group Manager – Infrastructure Services</i>

Summary

- This report considers an application from the Ashburton Car Club for temporary road closure of sections of Lower Downs Road on 06 March 2021 to hold the Gravel Sprint event.
- This report outlines the benefits and risks to be taken into consideration on whether to approve or decline the road closure.
- The Ashburton Car Club has run car racing events safely and successfully for over 17 years. Their events are well organised and every precaution is taken by the organisers to ensure that the highest levels of safety are maintained. Their events are highly supported by the local community and are a valued attraction to the District.
- Council is not obliged to approve any road closures. Our practice has been to approve such requests, subject to being confident that the event organisers can manage the event safely, and that the road will be restored to pre-race condition.
- Officers are satisfied that the Ashburton Car Club can meet these expectations, as they have repeatedly done so for many years. This event requires no detours and the roads concerned do not experience high traffic volumes. For these reasons, Officers recommend the request be approved.
- Objections close on 05 February 2021 and Council will be updated of any submitted objections. The recommendation is made on the premise that no objections are received on 05 February 2021.

Recommendation

That Council permits the following roads to be closed from 8.00am Saturday 06 March 2021 until 6.00pm the same day to allow the Gravel Sprint event to be held:-

Lower Downs Road, from Quarry Road to approximately #518 Upper Downs Road.

Background

1. The Ashburton Car Club has applied to Council for temporary road closure to allow them to hold the Gravel Sprint event.
2. This event has been advertised with a period of time for objections to be submitted. No objections have been currently been received with the objections period closing on 05 February 2021.
3. The required insurances and traffic management plan has been received.
4. This application must be considered by Council under Paragraph 11(e) of the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974, because New Zealand Motorsport, of which the Ashburton Car Club is a member, requires roads to be closed for motor sport events under the Local Government Act, as event participants may be under 16 years of age.

Options analysis

Option 1 – Approve Road Closure (Recommended)

5. Our practice has been to approve such requests, subject to being confident that the event organisers can manage the event safely, and that the road will be restored to pre-race condition.
6. Ashburton Car Club has a strong record of safe and successful management of these events in the district for over 17 years.
7. The responsibility for risk free operation lie with the organisers and all contingencies are covered in the conditions of closure.
8. The road condition will be inspected by Roading staff before and after the event. Staff are confident that the asset will be returned to its pre—existing condition after the event.
9. For these reasons, Officers **recommend** Option 1.

Option 2 – Decline Road Closure

10. This is not preferred.
11. As mentioned in Option 1 these events have been held for a number of years without incident and are well supported by the local community. Many people look forward to these types of events and they provide a positive attraction to the District.

Legal/policy implications

12. Clause 11 of the Tenth Schedule of the Local Government Act 1974 provides –

“That Council may, subject to such conditions as it thinks fit... close any road or part of a road to all traffic (e)... for any exhibition, fair, market, concert, film making, race or other sporting event or public function.”

13. As noted previously, our practice is to enable these events to proceed subject to ensuring the safety of road users, residents and spectators.

Financial implications

14. There are no financial implications.

Requirement	Explanation
What is the cost?	No costs incurred to Council
Is there budget available in LTP / AP?	N/A
Where is the funding coming from?	All costs associated with this event are being paid by the organisers (Ashburton Car Club)
Are there any future budget implications?	No
Finance review required?	No – there are no financial implications for Council.

Requirement	Explanation
Is the matter considered significant?	No
Level of significance	Medium
Level of engagement selected	Level 3 – Consult. Council must advertise the closure and consider objections, if any are received.
Rationale for selecting level of engagement	This level of engagement is required to meet statutory requirements.
Reviewed by Strategy & Policy	Richard Mabon, Senior Policy Advisor

Significance and engagement assessment

15. Property owners in the affected areas have been approached and letters dropped off so they are aware of the road closures and the event.

16. The event has also been publicly notified.

17. Other local organisations are actively involved with marshalling, security etc.
18. Emergency services are provided with copy of road closure information after approval has been given.
19. There will also be publicity around this road closure due to the normal media coverage of public meeting agenda items.
20. The advance communications and notifications are consistent with the overall significance of this decision and the legal requirements.

Next steps

Date	Action / milestone	Comments
17 February 2021	Council make a decision to approve or decline road closure	If approved and there are no objections the event will proceed as planned.

14. Mayor's Report

1. Regional Transport Committee

The RTLP has been adopted and is now out for consultation. I would recommend that Council put forward a submission on the following points:

- ensuring that the 2nd Ashburton urban bridge project remains in the plan on the same timetable as it currently is
- request that safe walkways be established on the existing bridge cycle/pedestrian lanes
- safety improvements being proposed from Rolleston to Ashburton be in the form of a four lane highway

2. Back to Business Seminar

I, along with CE Hamish Riach, attended a Back to Business seminar hosted by CECC on Thursday 4 February.

This seminar set the scene for 2021, providing a snapshot of the current economic environment, including what can be expected from local and central government, key regulatory changes that need to be prepared for and opportunities for the year ahead.

A great networking event with guest speakers being Kirk Hope – Chief Executive Business NZ, Sam Broughton – Mayor of Selwyn District and Canterbury Mayoral Forum Chair and Joanna Norris – Chief Executive Christchurch NZ.

3. Canterbury Mayoral Forum Papatipu Rūnanga

A good first meeting with Canterbury Rūnanga where both parties learnt about each other and the issues that need to be solved. The next meeting will further expand on how we can undertake this task collaboratively.

4. No. 24 Ashburton Squadron, Air Training Corps

Members of the No. 24 Ashburton squadron, Air Training Corps will join the meeting to be presented with the District of Ashburton Charter. The Charter, while mostly symbolic give the squadron the right to parade the streets on occasions such as Anzac Day and Armistice Day.

5. Meetings

- **Mayoral calendar**

Below is the Mayoral Calendar, since the last Mayor's report:

February 2021

- 3 February: Richard Lemon – Ashburton A&P Association with CE Hamish Riach
- 4 February: Regional Transport Committee
- 4 February: CECC Back to Business Seminar
- 5 February: Canterbury Mayoral Forum and Chairs Papatipu Runanga joint meeting
- 6 February: Multi Cultural Bite
- 6 February: Hakatere Marae Waitangi Day Celebrations
- 6 February: Ashburton Aviation Museum – Great Plains Fly In
- 9 February: Speight's Ale House Heritage Plaque Unveiling
- 9 February: Ashburton Trust/Lion Foundation
- 10 February: Council Activity Briefings
- 10 February: Audit & Risk Committee
- 10 February: Climate Change Workshop – Crs Cameron and McMillan deputised
- 11 February: Long Term Plan workshop
- 12 February: Hokonui Radio Interview
- 12 February: Hekeoa/Hinds Water Enhancement Trust
- 14 February: Ashburton's Festival of Pipe Bank Music
- 15 February: Essential Freshwater meeting with Ministers, Wellington
- 16 February: Library and Civic Centre meeting
- 16 February: AFIC Board meeting
- 16 February: Ashburton Aquatic Park Charitable Trust Appointment Committee
- 17 February: Mace Grey – Tuia Representative with Deputy Mayor Liz McMillan
- 17 February: Council meeting
- 17 February: Ashburton Aquatic Park Trust AGM

Recommendation

That Council receives the Mayor's report.
--

Neil Brown

Mayor