
Strategy Committee

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Horowhenua District Council Strategy Committee held in the Council Chambers, 126-148 Oxford St, Levin, on Wednesday 5 July 2017 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT

Chairperson Mrs V M Kaye-Simmons
Councillors Mr W E R Bishop
Mr R J Brannigan
Mr N G Gimblett
Mrs J F G Mason
Mrs C B Mitchell
Ms P Tukapua
Mr B P Wanden

IN ATTENDANCE

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Mr D M Clapperton | (Chief Executive) |
| Mr D Law | (Chief Financial Officer) |
| Mr G Saily | (Group Manager – Infrastructure Services) |
| Mr M Lester | (Projects Coordination Manager) |
| Mr S Grainger | (Economic Development Manager) |
| Mr D McCorkindale | (Senior Manager – Strategic Planning) |
| Mr D Haigh | (Growth Response Project Manager) |
| Mr R Hughes | (Environmental Engineer) |
| Ms T Williams | (Strategic Planner) |
| Mr S Wood | (Legal Counsel) |
| Mrs K J Corkill | (Meeting Secretary) |

MEDIA IN ATTENDANCE

Mr T Frewen (“Otaki Mail”)

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

There were 8 members of the public in attendance at the commencement of the meeting, increasing to 23 toward the end of meeting when the NZTA Submission report was addressed.

1 Apologies

Apologies were recorded for Mayor Feyen and Cr Campbell.

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Bishop, seconded Cr Wanden:

THAT the apologies from Mayor Feyen and Cr Campbell be accepted.

CARRIED

2 Public Participation

6.2 Proposed Plan Change 2 – Review of Residential Development Provisions
Christine Paton

6.3 Solid Waste – Review of the Waste Minimisation and Management Strategy 2012
Malcolm Hadlum

6.8 Submission to NZTA – O2NL Project Engagement
Carol Shore

3 Late Items

There were no late items.

4 Declarations of Interest

None declared.

5 Announcements

There were no announcements.

6 Reports

6.1 Proposed Plan Change 1: Historic Heritage – Update Schedule 2 to include additional buildings, structures and sites

Purpose

To present Proposed Plan Change 1 (including supporting evaluation/technical reports) to the Strategy Committee for its approval and to obtain a recommendation that Council adopts the proposed plan change at its meeting in July and that officers proceed with public notification.

MOVED by Cr Judd, seconded Cr Wanden:

THAT Report 17/266 on Proposed Plan Change 1: Historic Heritage – Update Schedule 2 to include additional buildings, structures and sites be received.

That this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.

CARRIED

Ms Williams and Mr McCorkindale joined the table to speak to this report.

Requesting the report be taken as read, Ms Williams gave a background to the proposed plan change. She clarified that the comment about “owners being generally supportive” included those on the list who had confirmed their support. Those on the list who were not

sure had not been included. In terms of who had nominated the properties for inclusion; of the 78, 60 properties had been nominated by people other than the property owner, with the owners then indicating their support.

Commending Officers on the work done, Cr Judd said the prior briefings and consultation put elected members in a good space to make a decision.

MOVED by Cr Judd, seconded Cr Brannigan:

THAT Proposed Plan Change 1: Historic Heritage – Update Schedule 2 to include additional buildings, structures and sites and the Section 32 Evaluation Report is approved by the Strategy Committee and that the Committee recommends it be adopted by Council for the purpose of public notification in accordance with Clause 5 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

THAT the Strategy Committee recommends to Council that, if necessary, the Senior Manager – Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Hearings Committee be authorised (prior to public notification) to correct any minor errors or omissions in the text and maps of Proposed Plan Change 1 and the Section 32 Evaluation Report.

THAT the Strategy Committee recommends to Council that officers be authorised to proceed with public notification of Proposed Plan Change 1: Historic Heritage – Update Schedule 2 to include additional buildings, structures and sites, in accordance with the statutory requirements set out in the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

CARRIED

6.2 Proposed Plan Change 2: Review of Residential Development Provisions

Purpose

To present Proposed Plan Change 2: Review of Residential Development Provisions (including supporting evaluation/technical reports) to the Strategy Committee for its approval and to obtain a recommendation that Council adopts the proposed plan change at its meeting in July and that officers proceed with public notification.

MOVED by Cr Judd, seconded Cr Mason:

THAT Report 17/267 on Proposed Plan Change 2: Review of Residential Development Provisions be received.

THAT this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.

CARRIED

Commencing by saying that the report provided a lot of information, Mrs Christina Paton queried what process would be used when it went out for public consultation because it had the potential to significantly affect a considerable number of people and it would help if it was broadly communicated. As well as the usual communication channels, Mrs Paton suggested public meetings where people could see and have explained what was proposed.

Speaking to the report, Ms Williams summarised the information provided saying it was to provide for growth in the existing urban areas. Responding to the matter raised by Mrs Paton, there would be full public notification including a public notice and newspaper articles. Directly affected people, approximately 2,000, would also be notified. That would involve a letter and a pamphlet which provided a summary of the proposed changes.

Mr McCorkindale confirmed that Council had tried to take a proactive approach with a carefully worded media release to ensure it attracted attention. Although a property owner might not have any development aspirations their neighbours may. Other channels, such

as social media, would be used to raise as much awareness as possible.

Responding to a query about whether people in Foxton, Foxton Beach and Shannon would be notified as well, Ms Williams said they had not anticipated doing that at this stage as it would involve a significant number of property owners; however she would be happy to take direction on that.

Mr Clapperton undertook to ensure that communication occurred as widely as possible, including public meetings.

MOVED by Cr Mitchell, seconded Cr Mason:

THAT Proposed Plan Change 2: Review of Residential Development Provisions and the Section 32 Evaluation Report is approved by the Strategy Committee and that the Committee recommends it be adopted by Council for the purpose of public notification in accordance with Clause 5 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

THAT the Strategy Committee recommends to Council that, if necessary, the Senior Manager – Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Hearings Committee be authorised (prior to public notification) to correct any minor errors or omissions in the text and maps of Proposed Plan Change 2 and the Section 32 Evaluation Report.

THAT the Strategy Committee recommends to Council that officers be authorised to proceed with public notification of Proposed Plan Change 2: Review of Residential Development Provisions, in accordance with the statutory requirements set out in the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

CARRIED

6.3 Solid Waste - Review of the Waste Minimisation and Management Strategy 2012

Purpose

To inform the Committee of the process and steps that will be taken to review the Waste Minimisation and Management Plan 2012 which is due for review in 2018. This review forms part of the Long Term Plan and will include reviewing of the entire Solid Waste Activity.

MOVED by Cr Bishop, seconded Cr Judd:

THAT Report 17/323, Solid Waste - Review of the Waste Minimisation and Management Strategy 2012 be received.

THAT this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.

CARRIED

Mr Malcolm Hadlum commenced his comments by saying the district's biggest asset by a country mile was its environment, summarising the benefits that a clean environment could bring. Around New Zealand the most successful towns and cities all were based on enhancing their natural assets.

Commenting on the history of the landfill and its inappropriate location for that type of activity, Mr Hadlum suggested Councillors should look into that and the latest non-compliance report. If the landfill was closed, Council could finally comply with the Waste Minimisation Act. At the moment it was very hard to minimise waste when a landfill depended on a certain tonnage to help reduce landfill debt.

Noting that this review was for the whole strategy and having researched this whole matter, Cr Judd raised the fact that closing the landfill would potentially put the district's waste into someone else's backyard.

Mr Hadlum said he supported that as Bonny Glen was large enough to take all the region's waste, it was in a more suitable environment and it was efficient: a state of the art facility. The cost of sending Kapiti Coast's waste to Bonny Glen would be no dearer than sending it here.

Cr Judd raised the potential impact in terms of cost of closing the landfill which may lead to a rise in the solid waste rate.

Mr Hadlum's response was in terms of the difficulty of putting a figure on having a clean environment and he suggested that in New Zealand the cost per capita would be small and well worth ensuring the activity was done correctly. Also, when the landfill did close, and it would have to close at some stage, there would be on-going costs.

Acknowledging Mr Hadlum's comments, Cr Kaye-Simmons said that going forward it was not just about the landfill but a more holistic approach being taken and being more environmentally friendly overall. She assured Mr Hadlum that elected members would be looking at this very seriously.

Mr Saily introduced Ryan Hughes, Council's Environmental Engineer, who looked after the landfill and Council's solid waste activity. He then made a PowerPoint presentation on the Review to be undertaken, Council's legislative responsibilities, and the key considerations that would be taken into account during the review. The intention of bringing this to the Strategy Committee was to signal to Council that this was coming to the table and to give everyone the opportunity to have a say and understand both sides of the story so Council could make an informed decision around the solid waste activity.

Mr Saily sought questions from Councillors that could be responded to during the review process.

Information requested by Councillors:

- comfort was sought on the integrity of the liner and that there was no leachate going into nearby streams. The understanding was that there was a substantial liner that collected leachate, which was then pumped back to the wastewater treatment plant and then the treated effluent went out to the Pot;
- With the changing face of waste, what would the long term effects and impacts that this community would be facing;
- with the growth projects, was the extra waste that would be generated being taken into account;
- the expiry of the current contract (with 2021 mentioned) and whether the significant amount of tonnage controlled by operators outside this district aligned with that;
- in the analysis could an option be brought back in terms of closing the landfill now – what that would look like, including the carbon cost raised by Mr Hadlum; and future care and other costs;
- information on the subsidies around carbon credits;
- pros and cons of using a regional rather than a local landfill;
- with the current recycling that was occurring, what percentage of that was genuine recycling and how much ended up in the landfill.
- with e-waste being a national issue, what was being done with regard to disposal?

6.4 Community Forums - Expressions of Interest

Purpose

To present to the Strategy Committee the expressions of Interest received for the Environment and Economic Community Forums.

MOVED by Cr Mason, seconded Cr Bishop:

THAT Report 17/289 on Community Forums - Expressions of Interest be received.

That this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

CARRIED

A name correction was noted, with it being Pauline Masters, not Masten.

MOVED by Cr Mason, seconded Cr Bishop:

THAT the Strategy Committee endorses those people proposed by the Community Forums' Working Party for submission to Council for appointment to the relevant Forum.

CARRIED

6.5 Funding Infrastructure to Support Growth

Purpose

To consider funding mechanisms for infrastructure in relation to future infrastructural requirements and growth, in the context of development of the 2018/38 LTP development.

MOVED by Cr Gimblett, seconded Cr Wanden:

THAT Report 17/319 on Funding Infrastructure to Support Growth be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

CARRIED

Mr Law and Mr Clapperton both added commentary to the report which was a scene setter for Council to consider funding options for future growth as part of the LTP process.

6.6 Socio-economic Projections for Horowhenua

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Strategy Committee regarding the review of Horowhenua's socio-economic forecasts.

MOVED by Cr Bishop, seconded Cr Wanden:

THAT Report 17/317 on Socio-economic Projections for Horowhenua be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

CARRIED

Council's Economic Development Manager, Shanon Grainger, spoke to this report which he said provided an update to give visibility to work being undertaken. The district had changed quite considerably since NZIER undertook research eighteen months ago and Council was operating in a dynamic space. The draft report had been taken down to Wellington for consideration by a steering group of experts, which had been very beneficial. The Strategy Committee's endorsement of the approach being taken was now sought.

Responding to a query from Cr Wanden as to whether Council was drilling down on how the current growth being experienced was made up, and how that could be tracked, Mr Grainger noted that there had been a shift in LIM reports. Historically the district had seen 60% of its LIM enquiries happening from the local population and 40% for out of town; it was now going the opposite way with 60% being from out of town and 40% local. There was a strong flow from the south, but also from others areas such as Manawatu and Palmerston North.

With the Horowhenua being promoted as the best rural lifestyle district in New Zealand, Cr Gimblett queried if there was a vision as to what the community should look like in the future.

Mr Clapperton said that was part of the discussion that needed to occur as part of the LTP. Also to be brought to Council was a piece of work being undertaken called H2030 looking at what Horowhenua may look at that point in time. That discussion needed to be undertaken with the wider community and he would be facilitating a discussion with the Waitare community around the long term vision for that area and where they wanted to be in 20 years' time.

Mr Grainger noted that there was a view that fundamentally growth was not a good thing. However Horowhenua had a very strong community outcomes framework and it was a matter of thinking about growth as positive rather than negative: not growth just for the sake of it.

Cr Brannigan raised the importance of bringing Government agencies, particularly around such things as education, into the discussion. He noted the two schools at Foxton Beach were bulging and the seams and he requested some information be brought to the Strategy Committee around Government agency engagement.

Commenting on the recent steering group meeting, Mr Grainger said of interest was the approach used which nationally was a top down model, rather than a bottom up approach and understanding the implications of that. He acknowledged it would be an ongoing conversation.

Deputy Mayor Bishop said it was great to see this report with its socio-economic projects because for too long too many negative indicators had prevailed for the district. Now it was not just talking about possibilities; growth was actually occurring and it was putting the district on the radar with Government agencies.

In terms of where Council sat with regard to conversations with Government Agencies, Mr Grainger said Council had a few forums in place such as the Community Wellbeing Committee and Education Horowhenua, and those existing frameworks would be used for engagement.

Mr Clapperton said there needed to be a realisation that the growth that was forecast was quite unique. The only other examples on a similar scale was the growth that occurred in Kapiti 15-20 years ago where the population increased quite significantly.

With the number of the reports in the Agenda being closely related and with the LTP looming, Cr Judd queried how confident Council was with how it was tracking in terms of progress against activities such as funding of infrastructure, and would those specific projects be able to be delivered against the demand that was going to come.

Mr Clapperton responded that from a strategic perspective at the moment it was about how that growth should occur. It was not possible to put the handbrake on completely if that was what the community desired. Whilst it was not going to happen in 12 months or 2 years, it

was going to happen over time. The good thing was the work completed to date around infrastructure development – water and wastewater treatment facilities – had put Council in a good place to manage growth. If that investment, and using debt to fund it, had not been made there would be problems how and Council would have to move quickly to increase capacity to get those plants upgraded in short order. In hindsight, the decisions made by previous Councils were some of the best decisions made as Council was now at a point where it could consider how growth should be managed rather than bringing core infrastructure up to speed. Council was probably 80% along the way and how to manage the further 20% would be discussed as part of the LTP.

MOVED by Cr Brannigan, seconded Cr Wanden:

THAT the Strategy Committee endorses the review of Horowhenua's socio-economic projections with a view to updating those currently being utilised for current and future policy development and integrated planning purposes.

CARRIED

6.7 Economic Development in Horowhenua - Discussion Paper

Purpose

To provide the Strategy Committee with a discussion paper regarding the future of Economic Development in the Horowhenua.

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Bishop, seconded Cr Judd:

THAT Report 17/318 on Economic Development in Horowhenua - Discussion Paper be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

CARRIED

Mr Grainger gave a PowerPoint presentation focusing elected members attention to the Discussion Paper on Economic Development in the Horowhenua. He stressed the timeliness of the discussion with Council having introduced an Economic Development Strategy four years ago. Shortly thereafter the first private/public partnership was established in the formation of an Economic Advisory Board which morphed into the Economic Development Board, with the vision and goal being the economic prosperity of the Horowhenua.

Mr Grainger said he was seeking feedback and support for some of the principles outlined in the paper so further information could be brought back to the next Strategy Committee meeting to identify a way forward.

MOVED by Cr Mason, seconded Cr Judd:

THAT Officers bring a report and roadmap to the next Strategy Committee Meeting that applies the principles set out above and provides direction for future actions.

CARRIED

6.8 Submission to NZTA - O2NL Project Engagement

Purpose

To present to Council the proposed submission to the NZ Transport Agency on the Otaki to North of Levin (O2NL) Roads of National Significance project.

MOVED by Cr Mitchell, seconded Cr Brannigan:

THAT Report 17/325 on Submission to NZTA - O2NL Project Engagement be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

CARRIED

Mrs Carol Shore acknowledged the people in the gallery on whose behalf she was also speaking.

Mrs Shore introduced herself saying as a resident of Queen Street East she had an undeniable interest in the conversations that were being held around this submission and she was appealing directly on the matter – though what she had to say applied to many more in the Horowhenua than just herself.

Mrs Shore expressed a concern that Council had been liaising with various parties with regard to the development on the east side of Levin (east of Arapaepae Road) without any consultation with residents. If that had occurred she requested that any information be shared openly and honestly.

In her comments and speaking strongly against a possible expressway through the eastern greenbelt which would sever Levin from the Tararuas, she said she felt that Council's current submission was giving NZTA the greenlight to go ahead with whatever they wanted, wherever they wanted and as quickly as they wanted. However, she requested that Council engage with the whole community to find out what was best for the district.

Mrs Shore also read out an email from Murray Petherick, a Kimberley Road resident, in which he raised historical concerns that neither NZTA nor HDC had been more proactive on the whole issue. Had appropriate provision been made in past decades for a corridor for a future northern arterial route there would not be the complicated situation that now existed where the approach seemed to be reactive rather than proactive.

Mr Petherick emphasised that whichever route was decided upon there would be significant impact on the affected parties. As a retired engineer, he also made some suggestions from a technical perspective with regard to future route options.

To provide some context and clarify Council's position, Mr Haigh, Growth Response Project Manager, joined the table to speak to the report and respond to questions. He noted that this was a NZTA project with Council being a key stakeholder. Currently there was no expressway alignment on the table and Council had no stance as yet as it did not have enough knowledge. What was set out in the submission was high level principles which had been developed following a number of workshops with elected members. As part of the process, Council did want to be supportive of community views. Mr Haigh said he had been fielding enquiries from a number of people and groups, had attended NZTA meetings and had been getting out and about to understand the messaging.

In terms of time frames, Mr Haigh said the best indication was that by October there should be more information on a particular route.

Mr Clapperton gave an overview of NZTA decision changes since 2015 with regard to this

project, with Councillors also adding comment..

With the high level of interest, and with it noted that there was going to be a decision that not everyone was happy with due to the differing opinions and views, it was AGREED that a community driven Working Group be established to ensure that everyone with an interest should be involved in the discussions taking place.

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Bishop, seconded Cr Tukapua:

THAT the Committee recommends to Council that it approves the submission to the NZ Transport Agency on the Otaki to North of Levin (O2NL) Roads of National Significance Project

CARRIED

6.10 pm

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD
AT A MEETING OF THE STRATEGY COMMITTEE
HELD ON

DATE:.....

CHAIRPERSON:.....