



HURUNUI
District Council

STRATEGY & POLICY

AGENDA

FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE:

Strategy & Policy Committee

TO BE HELD ON:

THURSDAY 17 MARCH 2011

COMMENCING AT 9.30AM.

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
66 CARTERS ROAD,
AMBERLEY

In Hurunui we live the lives the rest of the world would love to live.

For the meeting timetable and order of business please refer to the back page fold-out.

Committee Membership

Cr Michael Malthus (Chair)
(Hanmer Springs Ward)
Winton Dalley (Mayor)
Cr Gary Cooper (Amberley Ward)
Cr Ross Little (Amberley Ward)
Cr Jude McKendry (Amberley Ward)
Cr Marie Black (Amuri/Hurunui Ward)
Cr Dick Davison (Amuri/Hurunui Ward)
Cr Jim Harré (Amuri/Hurunui Ward)
Cr Vincent Daly (Cheviot Ward)
Cr Russell Black (Glenmark Ward)

Quorum Number – Is no less than five (5) members.

STRATEGY & POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

17 MARCH 2011

TIMETABLE

Time	Item
9.30am	Meeting commences.
10.30am	Morning tea.
10.45am	Biodiversity Update: Presentation from Biodiversity Ambassador.
12.30pm	Lunch.

ITEM	ORDER OF BUSINESS	Pages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies • Urgent Business • Conflict of Interest Declarations • Recording Device 	
1	Minutes for confirmation – 10 February 2011	3 - 18
2	Forward Programme	19
3	Corporate: 3.1 Financial Report 20 - 55 3.2 Community Development Programme 56 - 68	
4	Environmental: 4.1 Environmental Services Team Work Plan..... 69 - 72 4.2 Biodiversity Programme..... 73 - 75	
5	Engineering: 5.1 Drinking Water Standards..... 76 - 112 5.2 The Role of Elected Members During a Civil Defence Emergency – Presentation from the Hurunui District Council's Emergency Management Officer..... No report attached.	

Guidelines from Hurunui District Council's Significance Policy:

The Committee, in considering each matter, must be:

- a. Satisfied that it has sufficient information about the practicable options and their benefits, costs and impacts, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions.
- b. Satisfied that it knows enough about and will give adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decisions to be made.

Questions

- a. Does the Committee have sufficient information about the issue, proposal, decisions or other matter?
- b. Does the issue, proposal, decisions or other matter:
 - affect all or a large portion of the community in a far-reaching way?
 - have a potential impact or consequence on the affected persons (being a number of persons) that is substantial?
 - have financial implications on the Council's resources that would be substantial?
 - generate (or would be expected to generate) a high degree of controversy?
 - fail to flow logically or consequentially from a decision in the Hurunui Community Plan?

Evaluation

Council officers preparing these reports will have regard to Council's policy on significance. Committee members will make the final assessment on whether the subject under consideration is to be regarded as being significant or not. Unless a Committee explicitly determines that the subject under consideration is to be deemed significant then the subject will be deemed as not being significant.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL'S STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2011 AT 10.07AM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 66 CARTERS ROAD, AMBERLEY.

CONTENTS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS:	2
1. FORWARD PROGRAMME	2
2. CORPORATE MATTERS	2
2.1 Consultation for the Draft Annual Plan 2011/12	2
2.2 Long Term Plan 2012 - 2022 Project Update	4
2.3 Quarterly Report - July to December 2010	4
2.4 Peaks Recreation Ground Trustees – Water Rates Remission	6
3. ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS	7
3.1 Environmental Services Team Work Plan	7
3.2 Draft Canterbury Regional Policy Statement - meeting with Commissioner Skelton	7
3.3 Update on Hanmer Recreational Track Network Group	12
3.4 Private Functions on Queen Mary Hospital Historic Reserve	12
3.5 Accreditation Programme for Commissioners	13
3.6 New Zealand Planning Institute Conference Councillor Attendance	14
4. ENGINEERING MATTERS	15
4.1 Update on the Provision of Waste and Recycling Services in the Hurunui District and Waste Reduction Proposals	15
4.2 Supply of New Excavator	16
4.3 Supply of New Utility Vehicle	16

PRESENT:

Cr Malthus (Chairperson), Councillors Marie Black, Russell Black, Gary Cooper, Vince Daly, Dick Davison, Jim Harré, Ross Little (until 3.16pm) and Judith McKendry.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrew Dalziel (Chief Executive Officer), Judith Batchelor (Manager Environmental Services), Jason Beck (Manager Financial Services), David Edge (Manager Roding and Utilities Services), Audrey van der Monde (Manager Community and Corporate Services), Bruce Yates (Manager Amenities and Special Projects) and Graham Sutherland (Council Secretary).

PART MEETING:

Jason Fletcher (Hanmer Springs Community Board Chairperson), Rebecca Holden (Policy Planner), Rachel McClung (Senior Policy Planner), Brian McManus (Roding Engineer Contracts), Bob Nye (Operations Engineer Utilities) and Jan Weaver (Policy Planner).

APOLOGIES:

Mayor Dalley. Cr Little for early departure.

Davison/Little

CARRIED

Cr Malthus welcomed attendees to the first meeting of the committee and said he looked forward to the Committee getting underway and working on the significant issues facing the district.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS:

- Cr Malthus noted that he had a potential conflict of interest with respect to agenda item 3.5 and would ask Cr Little to take the chair for this item. (Cr Davison took the Chair as Cr Little was not in attendance for the item.)

RECORDING DEVICE:

The Committee was advised that a recording device was in use for the purpose of accurately recording the minutes.

URGENT BUSINESS:

The following items were raised as urgent business:

- Cr R Black said he had a question from a constituent regarding smells at the Kate Valley landfill and he would raise this during the discussion with Martin Pinkham, Transwaste.
- Cr R Black also referred to a recent Sunday Star Times article that reported a low level of community respect for local body councillors at 34.4% and said this was a reminder to all councillors to improve performance.

1. FORWARD PROGRAMME

A program of known reports and events was provided for the Committee's information and taken as read.

Cr Malthus said that the Committee has broad delegations and would have a large workload. He said that as the Committee progresses there may be a need to ask individual councillors to take on a spokesperson role on particular issues, to work with officers and report back to the Committee on those issues.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Daly/Davison

CARRIED

2. CORPORATE MATTERS**2.1 Consultation for the Draft Annual Plan 2011/12**

The Manager Financial Services and Manager Community and Corporate Services reported that the Council is required in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) to prepare and adopt an Annual Plan for each financial year. An important aspect of this is the requirement for Council to consult with the public on the draft Annual Plan and seek their feedback before the Plan. This is called the 'special consultative procedure' on which the LGA is very specific. A common problem for councils is getting the public to engage with plans for the future over 'business as usual' matters. When there are big issues, particularly controversial matters, people are more likely to engage with the Council and let their views be known.

Understanding what is important to the District's residents and ratepayers provides the Council with confidence that the final Annual Plan reflects those views. The purpose of this report is to provide a communication and consultation plan for consideration and inclusion into the draft Plan before the Council adopts it on 24 February 2011.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that it is critical that all councillors are in attendance for hearing oral submissions and deliberating on the written submissions if they want to take part in the decision making, as they cannot be part of decision making if they have not heard all discussions.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services noted that after hearing submissions officers would amend any budgets or details as required by Council and bring them back to the May Council meeting for consideration and the final Annual Plan would be endorsed in June.

Cr Davison said that he wanted to see the role of the website maximised to provide easy access to the draft Annual Plan and the ability to make submissions through the website. The Manager Community and Corporate Services confirmed this was achievable.

The Chief Executive Officer spoke about the effectiveness of public meetings and the low numbers of public that traditionally attend these. He said the Council was considering other ways in which to best engage the community.

Cr Daly commented on the successful Cheviot model where all local organisations are invited to an annual public meeting to report to the ward committee and Council.

Cr Malthus said he supported a flexible approach at this point and said that if councillors needed something specific in their wards they could contact the Manager Community and Corporate Services to discuss arrangements.

THAT THE COMMITTEE ADOPT THE RECOMMENDED COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION PLAN FOR THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2011/12.

THAT THE COMMITTEE NOTE THE OTHER COMMUNICATION OPTIONS SUGGESTED FOR INCLUSION INTO THE COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION PLAN.

Malthus/R Black

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10.30am for morning tea and reconvened at 10.45am.

2.2 Long Term Plan 2012 - 2022 Project Update

The Manager Community and Corporate Services advised that every three years, the Local Government Act 2002 requires all local authorities to review its long term plan. The next three year cycle starts from the 2012/13 year and the Council's long term plan will have to be revised for the period from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2022. The Council's current long term plan is known as the 'Hurunui Long Term Community Plan 2009 – 2019'. Due to the significance and importance of the long term plan, work on the revision of the plan has commenced. The purpose of the report was to provide an overview of the process.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services said that the value of the steering group was to work through planning for the LTP and provide recommendations back to the Strategy and Policy Committee for decisions to be made.

Cr Malthus supported the approach and said the steering group would not be setting policies, just developing drafts and recommendations for consideration.

Cr M Black commented that the process seemed clear and sensible and Cr Malthus said the last Council took a similar approach and it had worked well.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

THAT THE COMMITTEE ENDORSE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A STEERING GROUP TO STEER AND OVERSEE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LONG TERM PLAN 2012-22, AND THAT THE ELECTED MEMBERS TO THE STEERING GROUP ARE: MAYOR DALLEY, DEPUTY MAYOR MALTHUS, COUNCILLORS DICK DAVISON AND ROSS LITTLE.

R Black/M Black

CARRIED

2.3 Quarterly Report - July to December 2010

The Manager Financial Services reported on the Council's performance for the first six months of the current financial year, being from 1 July to 31 December 2010. The performance measures in this document were those developed for the Hurunui Long Term Community Plan 2009 – 2010 for the 2010/2011 year (also shown in the current Annual Plan).

The Manager Financial Services and Manager Community and Corporate Services explained the process and format of the report, noting that it took a great deal of work to get all the information together and there would be more information in future. Officers were keen to hear feedback from councillors about the format and it was hoped this would be good for developing a new performance framework.

The Manager Financial Services noted variances in the capital expenditure budget due mostly to the Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa project and he said that development contributions were down on budget. He said the level of development in the district is lower so this has impacts everywhere.

Cr R Black asked if officers had considered charging for toilets and the Chief Executive Officer advised that the Southland District Council did so and it might be worth looking at its policy.

Cr Malthus said that if councillors want breakdowns on particular matters, for example the Mt Cass wind farm costs, then the Manager Financial Services can provide that. The Chief Executive Officer advised that funds would be needed for upcoming planning work and consent hearings and those costs were hard to budget for but councillors need to be aware of the process.

Cr Davison said he wanted it clearly identified what it costs the Council to handle consent applications. The Chief Executive Officer said this was difficult as many consent processes are ongoing and span a long period.

Cr Harré commented that it should be the Hurunui Tourism Board that focuses on increasing visitors to Hurunui, not the Manager Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa, who is currently managing the Hanmer Springs Visitor Information Centre. He also addressed the high level of the tourism rate and asked how those paying the rate know they are getting value for money.

The Roothing Engineer Contracts provided an oral update on roading matters and highlighted key areas, noting in particular that bridging works have commenced and Opus is reporting good results from the contractor Calcon.

Cr Little expressed concern about the low performance score with respect to unsealed roads and the Chief Executive Officer said this was usually the Council's worst performing measure and the councillors would have to agree to provide more resources to achieve higher satisfaction results. In response to a further question the Chief Executive Officer said that officers are benchmarking against other councils and most are around the 50-60% mark, so given the huge number of unsealed roads it has, the Hurunui District Council's performance is roughly comparable. He said that NZTA also does a quality audit which was regularly reported to the previous Works and Services Committee and Cr Davison suggested this should now come to Council given the significant budget involved.

Cr Harré asked for a breakdown of the costs of school active warning signs as the Waiau Citizens Association was concerned at the reported costs. The Manager Roothing and Utilities Services advised that it involved not just a static sign but a flashing sign linked to the school who operates it as appropriate for their own timings and they are powered by solar panels.

The Manager Financial Services noted with respect to the capital expenditure for Amberley and Hanmer Springs sewerage works, carryforwards had not been done and the budgets needed to be amended. He noted that there was some concern expressed by the Amberley Ward Committee at the level of rating for the Amberley sewer and there may be a desire to take a longer term approach to this.

With respect to the variance identified for Hanmer Springs stormwater, Cr Malthus asked the Manager Financial Services to clarify this as some expenditure may be allocated to stormwater. The Manager Financial Services agreed to follow up on this.

The meeting adjourned for afternoon tea 3.16pm and resumed at 3.28pm. (Note this item was taken later in the meeting.) Cr Little left at afternoon tea.

The Manager Financial Services noted that the Hanmer Springs thermal pools were behind budget for December 2010 but noted the impacts of the recent redevelopment and said the figures needed to be tempered by January being a record month. Cr Malthus commented that the next few months would be critical regarding how sustainable the increases are.

The Manager Financial Services reminded the Committee about the Council's joint venture forest trees near Cheviot that had been felled without permission. He said an offer had been made but nothing had been agreed at this stage. He said the offer is being peer reviewed and that once agreement had been reached it would represent another source of income.

In concluding the discussion, Cr Malthus thanked the officers for a good quarterly report format and asked councillors if they had any feedback on the new approach and layout. There was general agreement to combining the performance measures and financials and it was noted that more refinement would be made as the Committee progresses. The Manager Financial Services said that he would still provide a monthly financial update to the Strategy and Policy Committee, in between quarterly reports.

THAT THE QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE SIX MONTHS TO DECEMBER 2010 BE RECEIVED.

R Black/Malthus

CARRIED

2.4 Peaks Recreation Ground Trustees – Water Rates Remission

The Manager Financial Services outlined a request for remission of water rates for the Peaks Recreation Ground. The request had been approved by the Hurunui Water Committee and required Council consent for the remission to be actioned.

Cr Little asked if there was any concern about setting a precedent and the Manager Financial Services said generally halls and recreation reserves are not charged other rates and requests for waiver are considered on a case by case basis and each in isolation. Cr M Black said that in this case, the community owns the hall but it is not on reserve land and they have to fund raise to maintain the hall.

THAT THE COUNCIL PROVIDE THE PEAKS RECREATION GROUND TRUSTEES A WAIVE OF WATER RATES PROVIDING THAT THE USE OF THE HALL REMAINS THE SAME.

Daly/Cooper

CARRIED

3. ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

3.1 Environmental Services Team Work Plan

The Manager Environmental Services provided a work plan with upcoming work for the Environmental Policy team mostly and noting the timing that officers are working towards.

Cr Harré asked about the speed limits bylaw and the Manager Environmental Services said that it covers the whole district and is reviewed every five years. She said that officers are working with NZTA regarding its concerns and are hoping to work through these to allow the Council to resolve to notify the bylaw soon.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

McKendry/Little

CARRIED

3.2 Draft Canterbury Regional Policy Statement - meeting with Commissioner Skelton

The Senior Policy Planner reported that the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement was released in September 2010 and feedback closed on 3 December. The Hurunui District Council was a signatory to a group territorial authorities submission, as well as lodging a separate submission to address specific Hurunui District Council concerns. A meeting was arranged for all territorial authorities to have a discussion with Commissioner Skelton on 2 February. The meeting was to provide territorial authorities with the opportunity to discuss three to four key concerns in relation to the group feedback provided on the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The Senior Policy Planner was involved as the Council representative.

The Senior Policy Planner provided an oral update from the meeting between 15 regional territorial planners, Canterbury Regional Council Commissioner Skelton and four Canterbury Regional Council planners. Key issues covered were:

- Territorial authorities did not want the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to be a best practice guide as territorial authorities should be left to find the best path for their communities.
- Landuse and infrastructure matters created potential conflict with Hurunui District Council Plan Change 23.
- Ecosystems and biodiversity – territorial authorities argued that non-statutory approaches can get better outcomes and blanket rules are not favoured. Commissioner Skelton disagreed and said he believed that territorial authorities must regulate to protect biodiversity.

Cr R Black said this last point was very serious as this Council did not want to go back to the divisive Significant Natural Area (SNA) issue and said it had the opposite effect of what it sought to achieve. He said that the Council needs to fight hard on this issue. Cr Little agreed and sought further clarification on what is meant by 'regulation'.

The Chief Executive Officer said that he had discussed this with Mayor Dalley who had also spoken to Commissioner Skelton to explain the district's experience with SNAs. The Chief Executive Officer said that this is an area of concern and he signalled that it may be something that requires significant officer workload.

With respect to Freshwater matters and specifically the target of no dams on mainstems of major rivers, the Senior Policy Planner noted that there was discussion about moving the balance back towards economic imperatives as opposed to mostly environmental drivers in this chapter.

Cr Malthus asked what the next steps were on this matter and was advised that Commissioner Skelton would be meeting again with the territorial authorities' planners to discuss issues highlighted. This would happen before public consultation. It was noted that the Hurunui District Council would be formally submitting again on the matter, in due course.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Harré/Cooper

CARRIED

Discussion with the Hurunui-Waiiau Zone Committee members.

David Eder, John Faulkner, Michele Hawke, Mike Hodgen, Ken Hughey, Te Marino Lenihan and Ian Whitehouse were in attendance. Apologies were received from David Bedford, Winton Dalley, Andrew Harris, Tony Hawker, Makarini Rupene and Raewyn Solomon.

Cr Malthus welcomed the Zone Committee members and said this was a good opportunity for the Council to meet with the members, discuss the progress of the Committee and for members to understand how the local councillors are feeling about water issues and to provide information about where to from here. Cr Malthus commented that he was aware of a groundswell of interest in the committee's work and he encouraged ongoing openness and interaction with the public.

David Eder, Committee Chairperson, said the Committee has a huge task, much bigger than what each member anticipated, noting that there had been 20 meetings organised in the last six weeks alone. He said from January onwards the Committee had been meeting with a wide range of interest groups and stakeholders. He said the Committee has made good progress on developing its values and principles around water management and providing more water and has narrowed down potential storage options from 25 to about 10. He said the Committee is now awaiting economic comparative data and information on environmental impacts and mitigation.

Ian Whitehouse, Zone Committee Facilitator, gave an update on the timetable of the Committee and the sense of urgency and focus driven by moratoria on the Hurunui and Waiiau rivers coming off in October. By 30 September, the Canterbury Regional Council needs to notify a water plan for those catchments and the final scope of the plan needs to be developed by July. The Zone Committee needs to develop its recommendations to the Hurunui District Council and Canterbury Regional Council first and it intends to discuss its draft plan at its April meeting. Ian Whitehouse also said the Committee is considering its recommendations for more water and the options on the Committee's shortlist are being assessed as mentioned.

Cr Davison commented on the economic analysis sought and said he doubted that sufficient information could be obtained in such a short time to allow a full assessment of options. Ian Whitehouse said the objective was to get comparative costs on capital and operating expenditure based on the same modelling assumptions. He said it was accepted the information would not be complete and totally accurate but the Committee needed a starting point.

John Faulkner said they were also seeking economic data of the costs of irrigating against not irrigating and the potential costs to the community of doing nothing.

Te Marino Lenihan said that an important part of considerations is the environmental and cultural costs of storage options and part of the costs of a potential scheme will need to be concerned with how to address these impacts.

Cr Daly expressed concern about the Waiau River flows and local Cheviot water supply. He said that the community is aware of the delicate state of its water supply and how this is linked to the flow and water quality of the Waiau River. He said that the Committee must ensure it has this at the forefront of its thinking.

Ian Whitehouse said that drinking water is a very clear target in the Hurunui-Waiiau zone and the Committee has discussed it many times, considering it an essential achievement.

Cr Malthus said it was also a question about capacity, that is what is left at the end of the Waiau River as it approaches the sea. He said the Cheviot community has to live with the effects so the Committee should take on the strong message from councillors that Waiau River flows should leave enough in the river for community supplies and the health of the river at the mouth.

Ian Whitehouse said that the Committee has discussed that storage options need to improve drinking water and the capital cost of storage has to also consider costs of water supplies and water treatment. He said it is a collaborative process trying to find ways to make this work.

Michele Hawke reassured the councillors that the health of rivers was paramount and the key is working collaboratively with all interested parties to find the right balance.

Cr Davison asked if there was a feeling amongst the Committee members that water storage would happen and David Eder said he was more confident now that storage would happen and there are serious options on the table for consideration. He said that the Committee is recognising that storage is an important part of achieving all the targets.

Ken Hughey commented that most people are talking realistically about off-river storage and the key is how to come to a community view about achieving this.

Mike Hodgen said that the only people paying for storage development at this stage is the landowners so it will be important that the Committee finds storage options that are affordable and economic for landowners. He said the local economy would continue to deteriorate without it.

Cr Malthus commented on affordability and asked what would happen if the preferred options were not affordable. Ian Whitehouse said that the Committee was tasked with agreeing to a water plan not a storage development plan that dictates where a dam would necessarily be. He said the plan would try to smooth the path for storage options with particular locations under certain conditions and would likely make it hard for storage in other locations, but it cannot dictate specific storage development.

Cr Harré discussed the economic value of water to tourism and mentioned specifically the importance of Hanmer Springs to the wealth of the district. He said the visual impact of the river to visitors is significant and he wanted the Committee to bear this in mind when considering its recommendations. Ian Whitehouse said that the Committee was given a similar message in one of its earlier meetings with a local tourism operator and said perhaps this could be captured by saying that an important focus for the Committee should be that water management solutions must not compromise landscape values in Hanmer Springs.

Cr Harré sought clarification of the Waiau River flow regime process currently underway with the Canterbury Regional Council and what role the Zone Committee played in this. Ian Whitehouse said that these river flow regime plans would be written in September and the plans would relate closely to the work of the Zone Committee. Canterbury Regional Council officers would be working closely with the Zone Committee to ensure compatible outcomes.

Te Marino Lenihan said that with respect to who pays for storage, the benefits will be across a wide range of values and the costs should therefore be shared by all those benefiting. This means that for environmental, social and cultural benefits there may need to be contributions from the community, the Government or possible public-private partnerships.

David Eder said that the Committee is aware that if the environmental cost potentially undermines an otherwise good project then he hopes a good solution can be found through public contribution.

Ian Whitehouse commented on the Immediate Steps Biodiversity funding the Committee has already approved for the first year and said the Committee hopes that major environmental biodiversity improvements will occur alongside water storage. Michele Hawke said that storage can add value as river flows could be managed better and it allows more flexibility to manage braided river habitats. Ken Hughey said that natural flow patterns were currently the most effective way to protect bird habitat and control predators. Ken Hughey said that off-mainstem river storage was from an environmental perspective seen as preferable and he said that if these options are more expensive then that additional cost could be borne by the broader community.

Cr Malthus said the Council is aware of recommendations coming from the Committee and that given the Council will be in a year of long-term planning it would need to take these matters into account as water is likely to be a major factor in planning for the next three years. He thanked the Hurunui-Waiiau Zone Committee members for attending and engaging in frank discussions with the councillors. He wished them well with their upcoming challenges.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.30pm and resumed at 1.03pm.

Presentation from Martin Pinkham, Transwaste, regarding the Emissions Trading Scheme and Landfills.

Martin Pinkham, Transwaste, spoke about the key costs that the Kate Valley landfill needs to keep in mind, those being fuel costs, interest rates, the waste levy and the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS). He said this was an opportune time to brief the Council on the ETS implications as it takes effect from 2013 onwards. He said that waste operators have to measure their waste streams in 2013 and will have associated liabilities in the following year. Martin Pinkham said that waste operators will have to purchase credits on the open market, with early indications suggesting this would be roughly \$20-25 per tonne, which has significant cost implications. Martin Pinkham said he was mindful of the Council's three-year Long Term Plan process and Transwaste will provide guidance to all its councils regarding budget impacts. He said currently it is taking a watching brief regarding allocation of credits as Transwaste owns 400 hectares of forests which it can claim against.

In response to a question from Cr Davison, Martin Pinkham said that for simplicity the calculations for waste tonnages are based on assumptions made about how long a tonne of waste takes to decay and produce methane, that being approximately 30-40 years. He said it was still quite a theoretical approach and closed landfills are exempt despite still emitting. He said that a code of practice has been suggested as a way forward for managing the issue.

Martin Pinkham said that Canterbury organic waste levels have been lower over the last few years due to Canterbury's very mature recycling programme and significant diversion of waste. He said that councils would need to analyse waste streams and develop a unique emissions factor for future calculations. He said the measuring equipment is complicated and there might be an opportunity to use some new measuring process. Operators can also consider a gas capturing process which reduces liability. Martin Pinkham said the initial liability costs are likely to be about \$6-10 per tonne, with poor performing landfills paying a higher maximum rate. In response to a question from Cr R Black, he said there may be opportunities for hedging and to do long-term deals with forestry owners.

In conclusion, Martin Pinkham said that the regulations were not finalised and there was a submissions process to go through so Transwaste would be submitting on concerns about singling out landfills, clarifying the auditing process, metering system details and a code of practice.

Martin Pinkham said he also wanted to discuss briefly the waste levy. He said currently the waste levy is \$10 per tonne, set by the Ministry for the Environment. He said \$5 goes back to territorial authorities for initiatives and \$4.50 into a contestable fund for new initiatives, with the remainder in administration. He said there was strict criteria and not a lot of uptake from the contestable fund. He said a review was coming up and there was concern about a possible increase in the levy. He said this was an issue for Kate Valley as one of the larger landfills and he was raising this as a matter the Council should be aware of.

Cr R Black asked Martin Pinkham about a reported odour problem coming from the Kate Valley landfill recently. Martin Pinkham said that this was due to the landfill replacing a cover and cap on top of an area and it has now been addressed.

Cr Malthus thanked Martin Pinkham for the presentation.

3.3 Update on Hanmer Recreational Track Network Group

The Manager Environmental Services provided a report to inform the Council of progress made over the last year towards the development of a coordinated recreational track network in the Hanmer Forest, and future intentions. The Policy Planner advised that signs had been commissioned and there was remaining budget for current year.

Cr Malthus said that the project of upgrading the track network was to bring the standards up to that associated with the high quality experience at the Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa. He said that the Group would be seeking funds externally and the Hanmer Springs Community Board was managing that process.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Daly/Cooper

CARRIED

3.4 Private Functions on Queen Mary Hospital Historic Reserve

The Manager Environmental Services reported that the Council received a request for permission to allow a wedding to occur in the Queen Mary Hospital grounds. The exact details are unknown, however it is likely that the Council will receive similar requests for functions in the grounds of Queen Mary Hospital. The Committee was asked to determine whether it is appropriate to allow functions within the grounds of the Queen Mary Hospital site before the Historic Reserve Management Plan has been consulted on and adopted.

The Manager Environmental Services noted the request received for a wedding and said that the Committee should decide this matter until a management plan was in place. The Manager Environmental Services recommended option three in the report, as this was less onerous and an efficient initial response.

The Chief Executive Officer noted that there was an issue regarding alcohol as the Police were keen on a ban for the whole Hanmer Basin and the Hanmer Springs Community Board has indicated its support for this. He said that officers favoured option three, as it did not place additional pressure on Council officers to administer the process. The Chief Executive Officer said the Council was likely to get more requests so it was advisable to establish a policy approach.

Cr Harré advised that the Ngāi Tahu representative on the historic reserve management group believed no alcohol should be consumed on the grounds and that the long term plan might reflect this position.

Cr Daly commented that the reserve was given to the public and it was good to see it being used. He said he was wary of rules being too restrictive and the Council needs to make it easier for the public to use the reserve.

Cr Cooper felt there needed to be some way of controlling use to reflect and respect the status of the reserve however, it should not be too onerous.

THAT WITH RESPECT TO REQUESTS FOR FUNCTIONS IN THE QUEEN MARY HOSPITAL SITE THE COUNCIL REQUIRE WRITTEN APPLICATION FOR EACH OCCASION TO BE CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL OFFICERS TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE LOCATION OF THE ACTIVITY ON THE SITE, TYPE OF FUNCTION AND NUMBER OF GUESTS AND USING THE POLICY APPROACH IDENTIFIED IN OPTION 3 IN THE REPORT AS A GUIDELINE, THAT BEING:

- THAT WEDDING CEREMONIES, MARKETS, FETES, AND FESTIVALS OF UP TO 100 PEOPLE BE ALLOWED WITHIN THE GROUNDS TO THE NORTH OF THE CHISHOLM WARD AND PROHIBITING THE CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL.

THAT COUNCIL OFFICERS ADVISE THE COUNCIL AND DISCUSS EACH APPLICATION RECEIVED WITH THE LOCAL WARD COUNCILLOR.

Harré/Davison

CARRIED

3.5 Accreditation Programme for Commissioners

The Manager Environmental Services advised that the Making Good Decisions Programme is designed to equip councillors with the skills to make decisions under the Resource Management Act 1991(RMA). Certification under the programme is the means by which decision makers meet the accreditation requirements of the RMA. The current provisions of the Act require that the chairperson is accredited or for a group of persons whether or not the group has a chairperson, half the group must be accredited. Currently only Councillor's Little and Malthus are accredited. The Aquaculture Amendment Bill (No 3) proposes an amendment to the RMA to require all persons on a hearing panel to be accredited.

Cr Malthus declared a potential conflict of interest for this matter, vacated the chair and took no part in the decision. Cr Davison assumed the chair for this item.

The Manager Environmental Services advised that currently the Council only has Councillors Malthus and Little accredited and Cr Malthus' accreditation expires in July 2011. She said that Cr Malthus would therefore need to attend a refresher course and the recommendation was that one more councillor attend the new course in March to provide better coverage for the Council.

With respect to the intention of the Aquaculture Amendment Bill, Cr Daly said it needs to be challenged as it would restrict the democratic decision making process and undermine the role of councillors to make decisions as representatives of their communities. He said that councillors reflect the local knowledge of their areas, which is important in rural matters.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that the majority of councils are supporting the Bill and Local Government New Zealand is staying neutral. He said the Hurunui District Council practice is to have all councillors on hearings panels, whereas other councils do not. He said that officers would frame a submission to reflect the position of the Council on this matter.

Cr Davison said he supported the Council maintaining good coverage of accredited members as good practice.

THAT THE COMMITTEE AGREE THAT COUNCILLOR GARY COOPER ATTEND THE MAKING GOOD DECISIONS PROGRAMME IN CHRISTCHURCH IN MARCH 2011.

M Black/Harré

CARRIED

THAT THE COMMITTEE AGREE THAT COUNCILLOR MICHAEL MALTHUS ATTEND THE REFRESHER COURSE FOR THE MAKING GOOD DECISIONS PROGRAMME IN APRIL 2011.

McKendry/M Black

CARRIED

THAT THE COUNCIL LODGE A SUBMISSION TO THE AQUACULTURE AMENDMENT BILL (NO.3) EXPRESSING CONCERN AT THE COST TO SMALLER RURAL COUNCILS OF GAINING ACCREDITATION FOR COUNCILLORS WITHIN TWO YEARS OF THE ROYAL ASSENT OF THE BILL AND THE POTENTIAL EROSION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ROLE OF COUNCILLORS.

McKendry/Daly

CARRIED

Cr Malthus resumed the chair.

3.6 New Zealand Planning Institute Conference Councillor Attendance

The Manager Environmental Services reported that the New Zealand Planning Conference is to be held at Wellington from 29 March to 1 April 2011. The theme of the conference is "Winds of Change", an opportunity to explore the changing nature of the planning environment. The conference will explore the changing natural environment and how climate change may result in further changes. The programme includes looking at changing governance in relation to local government changes.

Cr Malthus advised that he and the Manager Environmental Services had attended before. The Chief Executive Officer commented that it has been the practice in the past to send one councillor and he noted it was a worthwhile conference, particularly given the significant planning matters facing the Council.

Cr R Black agreed that it was important for a councillor to attend and to maximise the benefit to the Council, given the many planning issues facing the Council.

THAT THE COMMITTEE AGREE TO CR MICHAEL MALTHUS ATTENDING THE NEW ZEALAND PLANNING INSTITUTE CONFERENCE IN WELLINGTON IN MARCH/APRIL 2011.

Harré/Cooper

CARRIED

4. ENGINEERING MATTERS

4.1 Update on the Provision of Waste and Recycling Services in the Hurunui District and Waste Reduction Proposals

The Manager Amenities and Special Projects provided information on how householders, businesses and visitors to the Hurunui can recycle and dispose of their waste. The report included details regarding the kerbside collection services Council provides, the recycling and waste facilities available at the transfer stations, green waste recycling and the additional recycling/waste reduction schemes which Hurunui District Council runs. Also provided was an update on the recycling bins being designed and built for Hanmer Springs, the feasibility of encouraging the use of bokashi to reduce the quantities of organic waste derived from households and suggestions to reduce the use of plastic carrier bags in the district.

Cr Harré commented that he uses a bokashi bucket for managing household organic waste and is very impressed with the results and ease of use. He suggested that if using these are encouraged widely in the district then it could cut waste significantly and the Council could play a role in encouraging this.

The Chief Executive Officer advised that money could be available from the waste levy for the purposes of education and new waste initiatives.

Cr M Black supported this and suggested that local schools be used as a promotional avenue and that the Council could consider subsidising the cost of bokashi buckets for the community.

Cr Harré also asked if the Council had a position on the use of plastic supermarket bags and was advised that council's cannot enforce bans on bag use. Cr Harré said that there was a good opportunity for the Waste Manager to talk to local supermarkets to get them onside and to try to phase out plastic bags. Cr McKendry supported this and said the Council could consider using its waste levy to subsidise reusable bags to get them into the community.

THAT THE SOLID WASTE MANAGER BE REQUESTED TO PURCHASE HOME COMPOSTING UNITS, WITH A BUDGET OF UP TO \$5,000 FROM THE WASTE LEVY AND EDUCATION FUND, WITH A VIEW TO EDUCATING SCHOOL CHILDREN INITIALLY AND THEN EXTENDING THEIR USE MORE WIDELY INTO THE HURUNUI COMMUNITY.

THAT THE SOLID WASTE MANAGER BE REQUESTED TO APPROACH SUPERMARKETS IN THE DISTRICT TO CONVEY THAT THE COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO ENCOURAGE CUSTOMERS TO NOT USE NON-RECYCLABLE BAGS AND ASK FOR SUGGESTIONS ON POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO ACHIEVE THIS.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED BY THE COMMITTEE.

Harré/Cooper

CARRIED

4.2 Supply of New Excavator

The Operations Engineer Utilities recommended the purchase of a replacement excavator for the existing machine that is considered uneconomical to repair. He said that the recommendation represented the best balance of price, performance and back-up service.

THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF A BOBCAT 324 FOR THE PRICE OF \$31,000.

Davison/R Black

CARRIED

4.3 Supply of New Utility Vehicle

The Operations Engineer Utilities recommended the purchase of a replacement vehicle for an existing vehicle that has exceeded the distance and age guidelines as set out in Council's Plant and Light Vehicles Policy.

In response to a question from Cr R Black about resale value of the existing vehicle, officers advised that the sale proceeds would be returned to the budget as an offset.

THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF A HOLDEN COLORADO SPACE CAB 4WD AT A COST OF \$29,102.61.

Davison/M Black

CARRIED

The meeting closed at 4.42pm.

Confirmed: _____ Date: _____

**KNOWN STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME
(EXCLUDING PUBLIC EXCLUDED)**

Meeting Date	Report/Other	Responsibility
14 April	Queen Mary Hospital Reserve – Approval to Prepare a Plan Change	MES
	Public Places Bylaw – Approval for Review	MES
	Parking review – Approval to prepare a plan change	MES
	Review of Earthquake Prone Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy	MES
12 May		
16 June		

Acronym Key:

CEO – Chief Executive Officer
 MASP – Manager Amenities & Special Projects
 MCCS – Manager Community & Corporate Services
 MES – Manager Environmental Services
 MFS – Manager Financial Services
 MRU – Manager Roading & Utilities
 CS – Council Secretary



HURUNUI

District Council

Meeting Date:

17 March 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy & Policy Committee

Subject: Financial Report to 31 January 2011

Report by: Manager Financial Services

Signature: Author
Jason Beck

Summary Report

Attached is the Financial Report for the Hurunui District Council for the seven months ended 31 January 2011.

The report is split into the key activities and then further broken down to the sub-activities. *(Please note the page numbers in the index below refer to the smaller page numbers in the Financial Report and not the Committee Agenda page numbers at the top of the page.)*

Report	Page #
Overall Financial Report	1
Activity Summary – Community Services & Facilities	2
• Library	3
• Township Facilities (including Medical Centres)	4
• Property	5
• Public Toilets	6
• Cemeteries	7
• District Reserves	8
• Grants and Services Awards.	9
Activity Summary – Growth & Development	10
• Tourism	11
• Visitor Information Centre	12
• Economic Development	13
Activity Summary – Environment & Safety	14
• Resource Management & Planning	15
• Civil Defence	16

• Rural Fire	17
• Building Compliance	18
• Public Health & Liquor Licensing	19
• Animal Control	20
Activity Summary - Utility Services & Infrastructure:	21
• Roding	22
• Waste Minimisation	23
• Sewerage	24
• Stormwater/Drainage/Land Protection	25
• Water Supplies	26
Activity Summary - Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa	27
• Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa	28
• Hanmer Springs Thermal Reserve	29
Activity Summary - Governance	30
Activity Summary - Commercial Activities	31
• Treasury	32
• Forestry	33
Activity Summary - Corporate Services	34

Variance Analysis

Where a significant variance from budget has been identified, I have attempted to provide some explanation for this.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Hurunui District Council (Overall)										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	1,031,773	1,019,417	12,356			7,217,676	7,135,779	81,897		12,232,684
Other Income	1,477,835	1,896,053	(418,218)			8,466,263	8,416,172	50,091		14,591,191
Internal Interest Received	201,679	213,414	(11,735)			1,377,109	1,496,712	(119,603)		2,567,396
Development Contributions	54,330	66,899	(12,569)			358,682	468,293	(109,611)		1,404,727
Council Overheads (Income)	378,588	378,533	55			2,649,761	2,649,731	30		4,542,390
Total Operating Revenue	3,144,205	3,574,316	(430,111)			20,069,491	20,166,687	(97,196)		35,338,388
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	734,925	692,660	42,265			4,514,133	4,487,497	26,636		7,894,447
Other Direct Expenditure	954,643	1,042,275	(87,632)			8,592,144	8,179,603	412,541		13,793,037
Internal Interest Paid	200,239	212,880	(12,641)			1,376,555	1,493,946	(117,391)		2,564,376
Council Overheads (Expense)	390,083	390,077	6			2,649,703	2,649,718	(15)		4,542,396
Depreciation	488,265	497,135	(8,870)			3,170,298	3,229,810	(59,512)		5,675,230
Total Operating Expenditure	2,768,155	2,835,027	(66,872)			20,302,833	20,040,574	262,259		34,469,486
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	376,050	739,289	(363,239)			(\$233,342)	\$126,113	(\$359,455)		\$669,902
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
Community Services & Facilities	389,273	238,271	151,002			3,050,973	3,419,734	(368,761)		4,335,719
Growth & Development	5,521	1,667	3,854			31,446	27,074	4,372		35,405
Environment & Safety	0	1,455	(1,455)			48,873	78,130	(29,257)		115,139
Utility Services & Infrastructure	183,078	1,446,015	(1,262,937)			3,036,138	4,600,289	(1,564,151)		10,217,333
Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa	598,174	188,167	410,007			5,856,559	3,870,980	1,985,579		5,329,816
Governance	28,168	0	28,168			0	0	28,168		0
Commercial Activities	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Corporate Services	73,336	11,568	61,768			237,475	351,569	(114,094)		413,719
Total Capital Expenditure	1,277,550	1,887,143	(609,593)			\$12,289,632	\$12,347,776	(\$58,144)		\$20,447,131

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes		Full Year	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Budget	
Community Services & Facilities (Summary)															
Operating Statement															
OPERATING REVENUE															
Rates															
Other Income		131,244	128,947	2,297		919,592	902,489	17,103						1,547,085	
Internal Interest Received		267,573	222,104	45,469	1	1,560,887	1,465,797	95,090	7					2,485,780	
Development Contributions		3,460	7,250	(3,790)		56,509	53,564	2,945						92,620	
Council Overheads (Income)		0	26,089	(26,089)	2	104,084	182,623	(78,539)	8					313,064	
		4,377	4,328	49		30,296	30,296	0						51,938	
Total Operating Revenue		406,654	388,718	17,936		2,671,368	2,634,769	36,599						4,490,497	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE															
Employment Costs		53,045	58,805	(5,760)		325,977	370,225	(44,248)	9					643,625	
Other Direct Expenditure		129,142	127,559	1,583		1,033,354	1,247,488	(214,134)	10					1,974,937	
Internal Interest Paid		9,305	21,727	(12,422)	3	59,203	152,089	(92,886)	11					262,977	
Council Overheads		78,279	81,276	(2,997)		467,044	467,037	7						800,639	
Depreciation		38,169	34,873	3,296		210,502	194,326	16,176						334,470	
Total Operating Expenditure		307,940	324,240	(16,300)		2,096,080	2,431,165	(335,085)						4,016,648	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)		98,714	64,478	34,236		\$575,288	\$203,604	\$371,684						\$473,849	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE															
Library		3,757	5,092	(1,335)		40,918	40,766	152						66,229	
Township Facilities		385,516	203,179	182,337	4	2,556,473	2,910,574	(354,101)	12					3,586,423	
Property		0	0	0		0	0	0						51,350	
Public Toilets		0	30,000	(30,000)	5	32,800	30,000	2,800						100,000	
Cemeteries		0	0	0		4,712	0	4,712						5,136	
District Reserves		0	0	0		416,070	438,394	(22,324)	13					546,582	
Grants & Service Awards		0	0	0		0	0	0						0	
Total Capital Expenditure		389,273	238,271	151,002		\$3,050,973	\$3,419,734	(\$368,761)						\$4,335,719	

Notes - January 2011:

- Rental for the Car Park in Hammer Springs was received in January.
- No development contributions for the range of Amberley and Hammer Springs projects were received in January.
- The level of interest charged on Amenities and the Amuri Medical Centre is lower than budgeted for due to the timing of the key capital work.
- Costs towards the Hammer Springs Town Centre Upgrade were incurred in January, whereas it was budgeted for prior to Christmas.
- The work on the Culverden Toilets that was budgeted for in January was carried out prior to Christmas.

Notes - Year to Date:

- The key variance is the \$44,000 received for the sale of a section in Hammer Springs and rental received for the Car Park in Hammer Springs.
- Development Contributions, particularly in Amberley, are lower than was scheduled in the Annual Plan.
- Wages costs are lower than budgeted due to the staff costs being allocated elsewhere throughout the organisation.
- General Amenities and Township Operating Expenditure is lower than was budgeted for the first three months. In addition, the amount carried forward from the 2009/10 year for the Contestable Funds have yet to be spent.
- Internal interest paid is lower than budgeted as the cost of the key Capital Work in the Townships has yet to be recognised.
- The level of expenditure for both Amberley and Hammer Springs Townships did not progress as budgeted, but will flow through in the coming months.
- The level of capital work for the Queen Mary Buildings was lower than budgeted for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Full Year	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Budget
Library													
Operating Statement													
OPERATING REVENUE													
Rates	2,945	2,501	444		20,440	17,367	3,073			29,775	29,775		
Other Income	71,339	66,772	4,567		472,794	467,403	5,391			801,249	801,249		
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0		
Development Contributions	0	3,615	(3,615)		15,075	25,305	(10,230)	1		43,374	43,374		
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0		
Total Operating Revenue	74,284	72,888	1,396		508,309	510,075	(1,766)			874,398	874,398		
OPERATING EXPENDITURE													
Employment Costs	24,942	25,974	(1,032)		184,190	181,818	2,372			324,520	324,520		
Other Direct Expenditure	8,350	8,992	(642)		67,763	81,225	(13,462)	2		140,543	140,543		
Internal Interest Paid	1,621	1,795	(174)		11,822	12,565	(743)			21,537	21,537		
Council Overheads	22,436	22,436	0		157,054	157,052	2			269,233	269,233		
Depreciation	8,547	8,889	(342)		59,834	62,223	(2,389)			106,665	106,665		
Total Operating Expenditure	65,896	68,086	(2,190)		480,663	494,883	(14,220)			862,498	862,498		
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	8,388	4,802	3,586		\$27,646	\$15,192	\$12,454			\$11,900	\$11,900		
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE													
Library	3,757	5,092	(1,335)		40,918	40,766	152			66,229	66,229		
Total Capital Expenditure	3,757	5,092	(1,335)		\$40,918	\$40,766	\$152			\$66,229	\$66,229		

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The level of Development Contributions received is lower than was budgeted for.

2 Direct expenditure is lower than budget for the year to date due to the level of telecommunications being lower than budget.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes		Full Year		
		Actual	Budget	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Budget	Variance		Budget		
Township Facilities																
Operating Statement																
OPERATING REVENUE																
Rates	118,219	116,418	1,801				828,497	814,926	13,571					1,397,003		
Other Income	34,832	34,256	576				156,538	135,674	20,864	6				211,023		
Internal Interest Received	(4,030)	2,622	(6,652)				5,096	18,354	(13,258)	7				31,459		
Development Contributions	0	15,343	(15,343)			1	65,561	107,401	(41,840)	8				184,115		
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0				0	0	0					0		
Total Operating Revenue	149,021	168,639	(19,618)				1,055,692	1,076,355	(20,663)					1,823,600		
OPERATING EXPENDITURE																
Employment Costs	22,976	22,767	209				107,822	117,959	(10,137)					193,307		
Other Direct Expenditure	81,025	89,408	(8,383)				458,832	508,574	(49,742)	9				825,521		
Internal Interest Paid	7,684	19,932	(12,248)			2	47,381	139,524	(92,143)	7				241,440		
Council Overheads	11,332	14,329	(2,997)				75,845	75,835	10					130,008		
Depreciation	11,580	9,712	1,868				79,894	66,184	13,710					114,792		
Total Operating Expenditure	134,597	156,148	(21,551)				769,774	908,076	(138,302)					1,505,068		
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	14,424	12,491	1,933				\$285,918	\$168,279	\$117,639					\$318,532		
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE																
Amenities	0	0	0				0	0	0					0		
Townships	335,508	4,023	331,485			3	2,104,259	2,292,744	(188,485)	10				2,435,457		
Local Reserves	0	0	0				0	0	0					0		
Swimming Pools	0	0	0				0	0	0					0		
Halls	48,682	38,637	10,045			4	117,947	98,637	19,310	11				98,637		
Amenity Reserves	1,326	10,519	(9,193)				35,998	22,680	13,318	12				75,816		
Medical Centres	0	150,000	(150,000)			5	298,269	496,513	(198,244)	13				956,513		
Township Related Special Funds	0	0	0				0	0	0					0		
Total Capital Expenditure	385,516	203,179	182,337				\$2,556,473	\$2,910,574	(\$354,101)					\$3,566,423		

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 No development contributions for the range of Amberley and Hammer Springs projects were received in January.
- 2 Interest Costs for Amenities and the Amuri Medical Centre are lower than budget due to the timing of the Capital Works.
- 3 Capital Costs for the Hammer Springs Town Centre Upgrade was incurred in January whereas it was budgeted to be done earlier in the financial year.
- 4 Some Straining work was required on the Amberley Domain Pavilion which was not budgeted for.
- 5 The timing of work on the Medical Centre in Rotherham was slightly behind budget for the quarter.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 6 Income from the Self Funded Reserves are up on budget and also the rental from the Hammer Golf Club was received ahead of when it was budgeted for.
- 7 Internal interest received and paid differs from budget due to the timing of capital work.
- 8 Development Contributions, particularly from Amberley, is down on budget.
- 9 General Amenities and Township Operating Expenditure is lower than was budgeted for the first seven months.
- 10 The level of expenditure for both Amberley and the Amuri Townships did not progress as budgeted.
- 11 Some Straining work was required on the Amberley Domain Pavilion which was not budgeted for.
- 12 Further unbudgeted costs have been spent on the Glenmark Pavilion, which is funded by a special fund.
- 13 The timing of work on the Medical Centre in Rotherham was slightly behind budget for the quarter.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Notes	Year to Date		Notes	Full Year	
	Actual	Budget	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget		Variance	Budget		Budget	
Property												
Operating Statement												
OPERATING REVENUE												
Rates												
Other Income	1,133	1,119		14	7,929	7,833		96			13,423	
Internal Interest Received	64,737	22,943		41,794	245,367	160,601		84,766	1		275,319	
Development Contributions	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	
	4,377	4,328		49	30,296	30,296		0			51,938	
Total Operating Revenue	70,247	28,390		41,857	283,592	198,730		84,862			340,680	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE												
Employment Costs	1,761	1,396		365	14,181	9,772		4,409			17,449	
Other Direct Expenditure	12,257	4,669		7,588	121,400	121,153		247			183,391	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	
Council Overheads	4,539	4,539		0	31,770	31,773		(3)			54,464	
Depreciation	7,949	7,115		834	53,160	49,805		3,355			85,388	
Total Operating Expenditure	26,506	17,719		8,787	220,511	212,503		8,008			340,692	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	43,741	10,671		33,070	\$63,081	(\$13,773)		\$76,854			(\$12)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE												
Pensioner Housing	0	0		0	0	0		0			51,350	
Residential Housing	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	
Other Property	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	
Depots	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0		0	\$0	\$0		\$0			\$51,350	

Notes - January 2011:
 1 Rental for the Car Park in Hamner Springs was received in January.

Notes - Year to Date:
 1 Rental for the Car Park in Hamner Springs was received in January.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Public Toilets										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Other Income	26,986	26,986	0	0		188,902	188,902	0		323,831
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Development Contributions	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Total Operating Revenue	26,986	26,986	0	0		188,902	188,902	0		323,831
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	600	0	600	0		2,428	0	2,428		0
Other Direct Expenditure	8,281	2,156	6,125	6,125		156,954	151,801	5,153		252,159
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Council Overheads	14,750	14,748	2	2		25,813	25,809	4		44,248
Depreciation	10,080	9,140	940	940		17,517	15,995	1,522		27,425
Total Operating Expenditure	33,711	26,044	7,667	7,667		202,712	193,605	9,107		323,832
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(6,725)	942	(7,667)	(7,667)		(\$13,810)	(\$4,703)	(\$9,107)		(\$1)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
Public Toilets	0	30,000	(30,000)	1		32,800	30,000	2,800		100,000
Total Capital Expenditure	0	30,000	(30,000)	(30,000)		\$32,800	\$30,000	\$2,800		\$100,000

Notes - January 2011:

1 The work on the Culverden Toilets that was budgeted for in January was carried out prior to Christmas.

Notes - Year to Date:

There are no significant variances from budget for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes
Cemeteries									
Operating Statement									
OPERATING REVENUE									
Rates	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	
Other Income	14,985	14,604	381			96,666	102,228	(5,562)	
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Development Contributions	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Total Operating Revenue	14,985	14,604	381			96,666	102,228	(5,562)	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE									
Employment Costs	1,093	2,649	(1,556)			9,386	18,543	(9,157)	
Other Direct Expenditure	4,747	6,420	(1,673)			36,682	49,378	(12,696)	1
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Council Overheads	4,775	4,775	0			33,425	33,425	0	
Depreciation	13	17	(4)			97	119	(22)	
Total Operating Expenditure	10,628	13,861	(3,233)			79,590	101,465	(21,875)	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	4,357	743	3,614			\$17,076	\$763	\$16,313	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE									
Cemeteries	0	0	0			4,712	0	4,712	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0			\$4,712	\$0	\$4,712	
Notes - January 2011:									
There are no significant variances from budget for January									
Notes - Year to Date:									
1 The cost of Contractors, Grass Mowing and Grave Digging are all tracking lower than budget for the year to date.									

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The cost of Contractors, Grass Mowing and Grave Digging are all tracking lower than budget for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			
District Parks & Reserves											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Other Income	54,760	56,543	(1,783)		385,543	395,840	(10,297)		678,581	678,581	
Internal Interest Received	7,490	4,628	2,862		51,413	35,210	16,203	1	61,161	61,161	
Development Contributions	0	7,131	(7,131)		23,448	49,917	(26,469)	2	85,575	85,575	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Total Operating Revenue	62,250	68,302	(6,052)		460,404	480,967	(20,563)		825,317	825,317	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	1,673	5,718	(4,045)		7,871	40,026	(32,155)	3	71,475	71,475	
Other Direct Expenditure	14,454	15,418	(964)		127,430	267,287	(139,857)	4	378,624	378,624	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Council Overheads	19,039	19,040	(1)		133,279	133,280	(1)		228,482	228,482	
Depreciation	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Total Operating Expenditure	35,166	40,176	(5,010)		268,580	440,593	(172,013)		678,581	678,581	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	27,084	28,126	(1,042)		191,824	40,374	151,450		146,736	146,736	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
District Reserves	0	0	0		416,070	438,394	(22,324)	5	546,582	546,582	
Overhead Allocation for Reserves	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Queen Mary Development Fund	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Nurses Block Fund	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0		416,070	438,394	(22,324)		546,582	546,582	

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 Due to the timing of the capital work, the interest received on the QM Development Contributions Fund and the Nurses Block Fund is higher than budgeted for.
- 2 Development Contributions for the upgrade of Queen Mary are down on budget for the year to date.
- 3 Wages costs are lower than budgeted due to the staff costs being allocated elsewhere throughout the organisation.
- 4 Reserve Costs, particularly the amount that was carried forward from the Contestable Funds and the Woodland and Waitohi Reserves, have yet to be spent as budgeted.
- 5 The level of capital work for the Queen Mary Buildings was lower than budgeted for the year to date..

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			
Grants & Services Awards											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	8,947	8,909	38		62,726	62,363	363		106,894		
Other Income	(66)	0	(66)		15,077	15,149	(72)		20,541		
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Total Operating Revenue	8,881	8,909	(28)		77,803	77,512	291		127,435		
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	0	301	(301)		99	2,107	(2,008)		3,762		
Other Direct Expenditure	28	496	(468)		64,293	68,070	(3,777)		110,074		
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Council Overheads	1,408	1,409	(1)		9,858	9,863	(5)		16,902		
Depreciation	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Total Operating Expenditure	1,436	2,206	(770)		74,250	80,040	(5,790)		130,738		
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	7,445	6,703	742		3,553	(2,528)	\$6,081		(3,303)		
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Grants & Service Awards	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Hillary Commission	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Creative NZ	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
SPARC	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		

Notes - January 2011:
There are no significant variances from budget for January

Notes - Year to Date:
There are no significant variances from the budget for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			
Growth and Development (Summary)											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	28,460	27,094	1,366		201,805	189,658	12,147	3	325,127		
Other Income	36,766	74,640	(37,874)	1	350,164	522,480	(172,316)	4	900,805		
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Total Operating Revenue	65,226	101,734	(36,508)		551,969	712,138	(160,169)		1,225,932		
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	32,979	24,197	8,782		184,805	169,351	15,454		291,765		
Other Direct Expenditure	33,523	62,768	(29,245)	2	412,497	507,841	(95,344)	5	837,094		
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Council Overheads	4,529	4,527	2		31,707	31,703	4		54,355		
Depreciation	843	3,559	(2,716)		5,599	24,913	(19,314)	4	42,717		
Total Operating Expenditure	71,874	95,051	(23,177)		634,608	733,808	(99,200)		1,225,931		
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(6,648)	(6,683)	(13,331)		(82,639)	(21,670)	(60,969)		\$1		
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Tourism	5,521	1,667	3,854		31,446	11,669	19,777	6	20,000		
Visitor Information Centre	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Economic Development	0	0	0		0	15,405	(15,405)	7	15,405		
Total Capital Expenditure	5,521	1,667	3,854		\$31,446	\$27,074	\$4,372		\$35,405		

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 Income at the Visitor Centre is down on budget due to very slow retail sales.
- 2 Retail purchases are also lower due to the level of sales.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 3 The level of Targeted Rate for Tourism is ahead of what was budgeted for.
- 4 Retail Income for the Visitor Centre is down on budget for the year to date. This is offset by income received for the Spring/Summer Planner.
- 5 Costs for Tourism includes of the contribution to CCT for International Marketing was made early in the financial year and the costs of the Spring/Summer Planner. This is offset by the retail purchases for the Visitor Centre being lower than budget.
- 6 The full year's budget for information signs was spent in the December quarter, rather than being spread throughout the year as budgeted.
- 7 The budget for signage is still to be spent.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Budget	
Tourism										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	23,392	22,083	1,309		166,298	154,581	11,717	1	265,000	
Other Income	3,605	3,605	0		55,786	25,235	30,551	2	43,260	
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	
Total Operating Revenue	26,997	25,688	1,309		222,084	179,816	42,268		308,260	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	3,886	2,880	1,006		25,012	20,160	4,852		36,000	
Other Direct Expenditure	12,476	21,524	(9,048)		184,681	150,654	34,027	3	258,260	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	
Council Overheads	833	831	2		5,833	5,831	2		10,000	
Depreciation	0	333	(333)		0	2,331	(2,331)		4,000	
Total Operating Expenditure	17,195	25,568	(8,373)		215,526	178,976	36,550		308,260	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	9,802	120	9,682		6,558	840	5,718		0	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
Tourism	5,521	1,667	3,854		31,446	11,669	19,777	4	20,000	
Total Capital Expenditure	5,521	1,667	3,854		31,446	11,669	19,777		20,000	

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 The level of Targeted Rate for Tourism is ahead of what was budgeted for.
- 2 Joint from the Spring/Summer Planner which was not budgeted for, but used to offset costs relating to its production.
- 3 Costs for Tourism are ahead of budget because of the contribution to CCT for International Marketing was made early in the financial year.
- 4 The full year's budget for information signs was spent in the December quarter, rather than being spread throughout the year as budgeted.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			Full Year Budget	
Visitor Information Centre													
Operating Statement													
OPERATING REVENUE													
Rates			(2,709)	(33)		(19,201)	(18,963)						
Other Income	33,161	71,035	(37,874)	1		294,334	497,245	(202,911)	2			(32,512)	
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0	0		0	0	0				852,410	
Development Contributions	0	0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Total Operating Revenue	30,419	68,326	(37,907)			275,133	478,282	(203,149)				819,898	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE													
Employment Costs	29,093	21,317	7,776			159,793	149,191	10,602				255,765	
Other Direct Expenditure	21,047	40,324	(19,277)	1		164,964	285,034	(120,070)	2			486,676	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Council Overheads	3,485	3,485	0	0		24,395	24,395	0				41,820	
Depreciation	734	2,969	(2,235)			5,126	20,783	(15,657)				35,636	
Total Operating Expenditure	54,359	68,095	(13,736)			354,278	479,403	(125,125)				819,897	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(23,940)	231	(24,171)			(\$79,145)	(\$1,121)	(\$78,024)				\$1	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE													
Visitor Information Centre	0	0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0			\$0	\$0	\$0				\$0	

Notes - January 2011:

1 Retail Income and the purchases are down on budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 Retail Income and the purchases are down on budget for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes
<u>Economic Development</u>									
<u>Operating Statement</u>									
OPERATING REVENUE									
Rates	7,810	7,720	90			54,708	54,040	668	
Other Income	0	0	0			44	0	44	
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Development Contributions	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Total Operating Revenue	7,810	7,720	90			54,752	54,040	712	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE									
Employment Costs	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Other Direct Expenditure	0	920	(920)			62,852	72,153	(9,301)	1
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0			0	0	0	
Council Overheads	211	211	0			1,479	1,477	2	
Depreciation	109	257	(148)			473	1,799	(1,326)	
Total Operating Expenditure	320	1,388	(1,068)			64,804	75,429	(10,625)	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	\$7,490	\$6,332	\$1,158			(\$10,052)	(\$21,389)	\$11,337	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE									
Economic Development	0	0	0			0	15,405	(15,405)	2
Total Capital Expenditure	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$15,405	(15,405)	
Notes - January 2011:									
There are no significant variances from budget for January									
Notes - Year to Date:									
1 The School Achiever Awards will be recognised when they are paid in February and March.									
2 The budget for signage for the year has not been spent.									

There are no significant variances from budget for January

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The School Achiever Awards will be recognised when they are paid in February and March.

2 The budget for signage for the year has not been spent.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Budget	Variance		
Environment and Safety (Summary)											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates			863		704,334	697,928	6,406				
Other Income	100,567	99,704	(55,767)	1	626,996	704,358	(77,360)			1,196,448	
Internal Interest Received	19,609	75,376	368		4,045	1,113	2,932			1,096,429	3
Development Contributions	527	159	(396)		0	0	0			2,727	
Council Overheads (Income)	(396)	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Total Operating Revenue	120,307	175,239	(54,932)		1,335,377	1,403,399	(68,022)			2,295,604	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	73,624	99,472	(25,848)	2	571,152	595,972	(24,820)			1,087,059	4
Other Direct Expenditure	56,176	46,956	9,220		485,957	373,163	112,794			633,426	5
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Council Overheads	48,793	48,784	9	9	341,546	341,548	(2)			585,526	
Depreciation	5,768	6,885	(1,117)		40,846	48,195	(7,349)			83,945	
Total Operating Expenditure	184,361	202,097	(17,736)		1,439,501	1,358,878	80,623			2,389,956	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(64,054)	(26,858)	(37,196)		(\$104,124)	\$44,521	(\$148,645)			(\$94,352)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Resource Management & Planning	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Civil Defence	0	1,455	(1,455)		0	10,185	(10,185)			47,194	6
Rural Fire	0	0	0		16,108	35,945	(19,837)			35,945	7
Building Compliance	0	0	0		32,765	32,000	765			32,000	
Public Health & Liquor Licensing	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Animal Control	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	1,455	(1,455)		\$48,873	\$78,130	(\$29,257)			\$115,139	

Notes - January 2011:

- Income from Resource Management Consent Fees, Subdivision Inspections and Building Inspection significantly lower than budgeted for January.
- Wage Costs are down on budget due the level of Rural Fire Training not being spent as budgeted. Also the wage costs for the Building Dept is down on budget due to the lower than budgeted level of staffing.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Income from Subdivision Inspections are down on budget for the year to date and the level of Rural Fire subsidies are lower than was budgeted for.
- Wage Costs are down on budget due the level of Rural Fire Training not being spent as budgeted. Also the wage costs for the Building Dept is down on budget due to the lower than budgeted level of staffing.
- Direct Expenditure is over budget for the period due to cost totalling \$44,099 attributable to the Mt Cass-Mainpower Appeal. In addition, costs have been incurred in relation to the Brackenfields Development, the Hurunui Windfarm, the Frydenlund (Mt Lyford) and Plan Change 18. Rural Fire Vehicle Costs have also been greater than budgeted.
- The budget for a new Civil Defence Generator has not been spent.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes		
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	
Resource Management & Planning														
Operating Statement														
OPERATING REVENUE														
Rates														
Other Income	52,882	52,886	96		371,148	370,202	946							634,625
Internal Interest Received	4,659	29,662	(25,003)	1	192,719	223,634	(30,915)							387,956
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Total Operating Revenue	57,641	82,548	(24,907)		563,867	593,836	(29,969)							1,022,581
OPERATING EXPENDITURE														
Employment Costs	38,878	39,883	(1,005)		298,805	279,181	19,624	3						498,124
Other Direct Expenditure	24,449	19,055	5,394		248,963	142,288	106,675	4						241,423
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Council Overheads	22,588	22,589	(1)		158,123	158,123	0							271,073
Depreciation	953	886	67		6,677	6,202	475							11,965
Total Operating Expenditure	86,868	82,413	4,455		712,568	585,794	126,774							1,022,585
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(\$29,227)	\$135	(\$29,362)		(\$148,701)	\$8,042	(\$156,743)							(\$4)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE														
RMA Implementation	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
RMA Admin/Compliance	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Subdivision Inspections	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
RMA Policy Development	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Total Capital Expenditure	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0							\$0

Notes - January 2011:

1 Income from Consent Fees & Subdivision Inspections significantly lower than budgeted for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

2 Income from Subdivision Inspections significantly lower than budget for the year to date.

3 The wage cost is over budget due to the staff costs for the period being allocated to the Resource Management cost centres rather than being spread to other areas of the organisation. This will be reviewed to ensure that the correct allocation of staff costs have been made.

4 Direct Expenditure is over budget for the period due to cost totalling \$71,403 attributable to the Mt Cass-Mainpower Appeal. In addition, costs have been incurred in relation to the Brackenfields Development, the Hurunui Windfarm, the Frydenlund (Mt Lyford) Plan and appeals costs for Plan Change 18

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget	Variance	Budget	Variance		
Civil Defence											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	12,846	12,693		153	89,957	88,851	1,106			152,315	
Other Income	0	197		(197)	0	1,379	(1,379)			2,362	
Internal Interest Received	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Development Contributions	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Total Operating Revenue	12,846	12,890		(44)	89,957	90,230	(273)			154,677	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	4,803	4,249		554	32,135	29,743	2,392			67,060	
Other Direct Expenditure	752	3,606		(2,854)	15,765	29,864	(14,099)		1	47,875	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0		0	0	0	0			0	
Council Overheads	3,263	3,263		0	22,838	22,841	(3)			39,157	
Depreciation	1,181	1,241		(60)	8,262	8,687	(425)			14,881	
Total Operating Expenditure	9,999	12,359		(2,360)	79,000	91,135	(12,135)			168,973	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	2,847	531		2,316	\$10,957	(\$905)	\$11,862			(\$14,296)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Civil Defence	0	1,455		(1,455)	0	10,185	(10,185)			47,194	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	1,455		(1,455)	\$0	\$10,185	(\$10,185)			\$47,194	

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 Expenditure on the EOC Information Management System, Stationery and Sundry purchases are all running lower than budget for the year.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			
Rural Fire											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	17,971	17,752	219		125,854	124,264	1,590		213,027		
Other Income	0	3,704	(3,704)		0	25,928	(25,928)	2	44,446		
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0		245	0	245		0		
Development Contributions	(396)	0	(396)		0	0	0		0		
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Total Operating Revenue	17,575	21,456	(3,881)		126,099	150,192	(24,093)		257,473		
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	2,401	18,340	(15,939)	1	20,698	44,842	(24,144)	3	98,573		
Other Direct Expenditure	16,877	9,962	6,915		86,939	69,734	17,205	4	119,551		
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0		0		
Council Overheads	3,998	3,998	0		27,986	27,986	0		47,975		
Depreciation	2,748	2,942	(194)		19,232	20,594	(1,362)		35,302		
Total Operating Expenditure	26,024	35,242	(9,218)		154,855	163,156	(8,301)		301,401		
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(8,449)	(13,786)	5,337		(\$28,756)	(\$12,964)	(\$15,792)		(\$43,928)		
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Rural Fire	0	0	0		16,108	35,945	(19,837)	5	35,945		
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0		\$16,108	\$35,945	(\$19,837)		\$35,945		

Notes - January 2011:

1 Costs on Training did not occur in January as budgeted.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 2 The budgeted level of subsidies have not been received for the period.
- 3 The costs relating to Training have not progressed as was budgeted for.
- 4 Maintenance work on Rural Fire vehicles has been higher than budgeted for the period.
- 5 The purchase of a fire tanker from Waimakariri District Council was at a cost lower than the budget for the year.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes		
Building Compliance											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates											
Other Income	5,273	5,015	258			36,878	35,105	1,773			60,185
Internal Interest Received	11,219	36,225	(25,006)	1		216,365	253,575	(37,210)	2		434,697
Development Contributions	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0
Total Operating Revenue	16,492	41,240	(24,748)			253,243	288,680	(35,437)			494,882
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	17,203	24,474	(7,271)			141,468	165,318	(23,850)	3		286,133
Other Direct Expenditure	4,555	3,375	1,180			56,498	42,193	14,305	3		73,051
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0			0	0	0			0
Council Overheads	11,772	11,772	0			82,398	82,404	(6)			141,257
Depreciation	543	1,354	(811)			4,273	9,478	(5,205)			16,251
Total Operating Expenditure	34,073	40,975	(6,902)			284,637	299,393	(14,756)			516,692
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(\$17,581)	\$265	(\$17,846)			(\$31,394)	(\$10,713)	(\$20,681)			(\$21,810)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Building Services Consents	0	0	0			32,765	32,000	765			32,000
Building Services Admin	0	0	0			0	0	0			0
Total Capital Expenditure	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$32,765	\$32,000	\$765			\$32,000

Notes - January 2011:

1 Income in January is lower than budgeted.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The level of activity for the year is still lower than was budgeted for.

2 There has been an increased use of Consultants (particularly Selwyn District Council) to cover for the lower than budgeted level of staffing.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Notes		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget	Variance	Budget
Public Health & Liquor Licensing											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates											
Other Income		8,509	8,408	101	59,589	58,856	733				100,895
Internal Interest Received		3,316	5,477	(2,161)	72,394	71,717	677				99,106
Development Contributions		0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Council Overheads (Income)		0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Total Operating Revenue		11,825	13,885	(2,060)	131,983	130,573	1,410				200,001
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs		8,807	10,976	(2,169)	61,628	66,038	(4,410)				117,794
Other Direct Expenditure		1,788	1,180	608	19,857	19,876	(19)				33,471
Internal Interest Paid		0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Council Overheads		3,599	3,599	0	25,193	25,193	0				43,192
Depreciation		343	462	(119)	2,402	3,234	(832)				5,546
Total Operating Expenditure		14,537	16,217	(1,680)	109,080	114,341	(5,261)				200,003
Operating Surplus (Deficit)		(2,712)	(2,332)	(380)	\$22,903	\$16,232	\$6,671				(\$2)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Health Inspection		0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Liquor Licensing		0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Total Capital Expenditure		0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0				\$0

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

There are no significant variances from the budget for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes
Animal Control													
Operating Statement													
OPERATING REVENUE													
Rates													
Other Income	2,986	2,950	36			20,908	20,650	258				35,401	
Internal Interest Received	415	111	304			145,520	128,125	17,395	1			127,862	
Development Contributions	527	159	368			3,800	1,113	2,687				2,727	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0				0	
	0	0	0			0	0	0				0	
Total Operating Revenue	3,928	3,220	708			170,228	149,888	20,340				165,990	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE													
Employment Costs	1,532	1,550	(18)			16,418	10,850	5,568				19,375	
Other Direct Expenditure	7,755	9,778	(2,023)			57,935	69,208	(11,273)	2			118,055	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0			0	0	0				0	
Council Overheads	3,573	3,563	10			25,008	25,001	7				42,872	
Depreciation	0	0	0			0	0	0				0	
Total Operating Expenditure	12,860	14,891	(2,031)			99,361	105,059	(5,698)				180,302	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(8,932)	(11,671)	2,739			\$70,867	\$44,829	\$26,038				(\$14,312)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE													
Ranging & Impounding	0	0	0			0	0	0				0	
Animal Control	0	0	0			0	0	0				0	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0			\$0	\$0	\$0				\$0	

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The amount of income derived from Dog Licences is well up on the level budgeted for.

2 Contractors costs are running lower than budget for the year to date.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Full Year	
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Budget	Variance	Budget	
Utility Services and Infrastructure (Summary)												
Operating Statement												
OPERATING REVENUE												
Rates	736,493	728,507	7,986		5,146,318	5,099,549	46,769	9	8,742,039			
Other Income	86,696	559,382	(472,686)	1	2,477,103	2,133,415	343,688	10	4,001,381			
Internal Interest Received	60,711	59,918	793		424,193	419,426	4,767		719,014			
Development Contributions	54,726	40,810	13,916	2	254,598	285,670	(31,072)	11	1,091,663			
Council Overheads (Income)	51,990		2		363,928	363,916	12		623,851			
Total Operating Revenue	990,616	1,440,605	(449,989)		8,666,140	8,301,976	364,164		15,177,948			
OPERATING EXPENDITURE												
Employment Costs	96,919	80,184	16,735	3	606,231	561,288	44,943	12	996,011			
Other Direct Expenditure	446,618	507,599	(60,981)	4	4,397,514	3,541,952	855,562	13	6,032,276			
Internal Interest Paid	53,110	57,204	(4,094)		353,164	404,214	(51,050)	14	694,016			
Council Overheads	160,538	157,546	2,992		1,123,812	1,123,822	(10)		1,926,560			
Depreciation	358,860	361,178	(2,318)		2,511,299	2,528,246	(16,947)	15	4,334,128			
Total Operating Expenditure	1,116,045	1,163,711	(47,666)		8,992,020	8,159,522	832,498		13,982,991			
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(125,429)	276,894	(402,323)		(325,880)	\$142,454	(468,334)		\$1,194,957			
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE												
Roading Network	32,728	883,003	(850,275)	5	1,346,884	2,129,271	(782,387)	16	4,393,584			
Solid Waste		0	2,618		152,951	130,000	22,951		1,707,830			
Sewerage	(87,197)	2,770	(89,967)	6	683,300	236,390	446,910	17	365,650			
Stormwater/Drainage/Land Protection	133,366	207,253	(73,887)	7	217,703	449,459	(231,756)	18	781,757			
Water Supplies	101,563	352,989	(251,426)	8	635,300	1,655,169	(1,019,869)	19	2,968,512			
Total Capital Expenditure	183,078	1,446,015	(1,262,937)		\$3,036,138	\$4,600,289	(1,564,151)		\$10,217,333			

Notes - January 2011:

- Income from NZTA subsidies are lower than budget for the Quarter due to the decreased level of both Operational and Capital expenditure.
- A significant level of Development contributions were recognised in both the Ashley and Hurunui Rural Water Supplies in January.
- Wages costs are ahead of budget due to a greater level of costs being assigned particularly to Cheviot and Hurunui Rural Water.
- Operational expenditure for roading is down on budget for January but offset by the Regional Council Costs for Amberley Stormwater paid for in January.
- Renewal work for Roading is lower than the level budgeted for January.
- An adjustment was carried out on Hammer Springs Sewer to correct the portion of costs relating to Hammer Stormwater as part of the Town Centre Upgrade.
- The Stormwater Costs were incurred as part of the Hammer Springs Town Centre Upgrade.
- Overall, Capital Expenditure for Water is lower than was budgeted for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Overall, the rates for Utilities are greater than was budgeted for. This is due to the fact that Targeted Rates (which meet the costs of Water, Sewer, Stormwater and Refuse Collection) were not growth adjusted when they were set in July.
- Other income is up on budget due to the NZTA subsidies received as a result of the Reinstatement work carried out after the Rain Events of July and August.
- The level of development contributions for Amberley and Ashley Water Supplies are down on budget for the period.
- Wages costs are ahead of budget due to a greater level of costs being assigned particularly to Cheviot and Hurunui Rural Water.
- Significant Rain events in July and August had necessitated Emergency Reinstatement work to be carried out throughout the district.
- The level of interest is lower than budgeted due to the full amount of Capital Work yet to be completed.
- Depreciation has not been recognised on Stormwater as the full physical works are still to be completed.
- Timing of Roading Renewal work carried out was different to the calendarised budget.
- Purchase of the land for the Amberley ponds was made in the December quarter, which has not been sufficiently budgeted for and additional work was undertaken in Hammer Springs in conjunction with the Town Centre Upgrade
- The full physical works are still to be carried out on the Amberley Stormwater System.
- Overall, Capital Expenditure for Water Supplies to date is lower than was budgeted for the first seven months of the year.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	Full Year		
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget		Variance	Notes	Budget
Roading Network														
Operating Statement														
OPERATING REVENUE														
Rates														
Other Income	218,298	217,782	516		1,529,279	1,524,474	4,805							2,613,374
Internal Interest Received	31,958	538,569	(506,611)	1	2,277,679	1,987,724	289,955	4						3,645,588
Development Contributions	59,025	59,025	0		413,175	413,175	0							708,305
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0							495,886
	51,990	51,988	2		363,928	363,916	12							623,851
Total Operating Revenue	361,271	867,364	(506,093)		4,584,061	4,289,289	294,772							8,087,004
OPERATING EXPENDITURE														
Employment Costs	33,532	28,519	5,013		211,615	199,633	11,982							351,716
Other Direct Expenditure	140,802	220,677	(79,875)	2	2,330,849	1,471,726	859,123	4						2,608,827
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Council Overheads	74,089	71,089	3,000		518,620	518,623	(3)							889,062
Depreciation	252,866	252,488	(378)		1,762,986	1,767,416	(4,430)							3,029,845
Total Operating Expenditure	500,289	572,773	(72,484)		4,824,070	3,957,398	866,672							6,879,450
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(139,018)	294,591	(433,609)		(\$240,009)	\$331,891	(\$571,900)							\$1,207,554
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE														
Subsidised Roding	32,728	788,352	(755,624)	3	1,329,656	2,003,860	(674,204)	5						4,042,361
Special Purpose Roding	0	0	0		14,832	3,288	11,544	5						6,573
Unsubsidised Roding	0	93,333	(93,333)		0	93,333	(93,333)	6						305,675
Road Safety Programme	0	0	0		0	0	0							0
Technical Services Business Unit	0	1,318	(1,318)		2,396	28,790	(26,394)							38,975
Total Capital Expenditure	32,728	883,003	(850,275)		\$1,346,884	\$2,129,271	(\$782,387)							\$4,393,584

Notes - January 2011:

- Income from NZTA subsidies are lower than budget for the Quarter due to the decreased level of both Operational and Capital expenditure.
- The level of operational work carried out in January was lower than budgeted for.
- The level of renewal work carried out in January was lower than budgeted for.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Significant Rain events in July and August had necessitated Emergency Reinstatement work to be carried out throughout the district. This cost was offset by a NZTA subsidy set at 60% higher than the normal subsidy rate).
- Timing of Renewal work carried out was different to the calendarised budget.
- The work budgeted for the next stage of the Woodbank Road Sealing has not progressed.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance		
Solid Waste									
Operating Statement									
OPERATING REVENUE									
Rates									
Other Income	140,443	140,944	(501)		985,447	986,608	(1,161)	1,691,322	
Internal Interest Received	23,279	14,459	8,820		114,318	101,213	13,105	173,500	1
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	
Total Operating Revenue	163,722	155,403	8,319		1,099,765	1,087,821	11,944	1,864,822	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE									
Employment Costs	7,441	5,900	1,541		45,298	41,300	3,998	73,751	
Other Direct Expenditure	142,874	138,394	4,480		878,039	973,576	(95,537)	1,656,907	2
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		4,885	3,786	1,099	7,572	
Council Overheads	10,467	10,468	(1)		73,274	73,276	(2)	125,615	
Depreciation	1,653	2,083	(430)		10,924	14,581	(3,657)	25,000	
Total Operating Expenditure	162,435	156,845	5,590		1,012,420	1,106,519	(94,099)	1,888,845	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	\$1,287	(\$1,442)	2,729		\$87,345	(\$18,698)	\$106,043	(\$24,023)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE									
Transfer Stations	2,618	0	2,618		152,951	130,000	22,951	1,707,830	3
Litter Bin Collection	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	
Refuse Collection	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	
Total Capital Expenditure	\$2,618	\$0	2,618		\$152,951	\$130,000	\$22,951	\$1,707,830	

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 Income is up on budget for the year to date.
- 2 The level of costs budgeted for Beacon Canterbury Gate fees are well down on budget as is the costs associated with the Operation of the Transfer Station at Hammer Springs.
- 3 Planning Costs relating to the Amberley Transfer Station were made ahead of budget and the loader at Hammer Springs was not budgeted for.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Full Year	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Budget	Budget
Sewerage											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	46,068	45,386	682		322,517	317,702	4,815			544,635	
Other Income	133	26	107		6,723	182	6,541			308	
Internal Interest Received	342	240	102		2,286	1,680	606			2,884	
Development Contributions	0	7,303	(7,303)		48,391	51,121	(2,730)			193,694	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Total Operating Revenue	46,543	52,955	(6,412)		379,917	370,685	9,232			741,521	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	2,280	3,660	(1,380)		37,566	25,620	11,946	3		44,438	
Other Direct Expenditure	19,925	15,670	4,255		113,106	126,214	(13,108)	4		184,935	
Internal Interest Paid	22,337	15,669	6,668		140,050	109,683	30,367	5		188,016	
Council Overheads	9,508	9,507	1		66,559	66,549	10			114,111	
Depreciation	29,680	29,675	5		207,762	207,725	37			356,103	
Total Operating Expenditure	83,730	74,181	9,549		565,043	535,791	29,252			887,603	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(\$37,187)	(\$21,226)	(15,961)		(\$185,126)	(\$165,106)	(\$20,020)			(\$146,082)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
District Wide Sewerage	0	0	0		0	0	0			106,054	
Amberley	28,984	1,937	27,047	1	560,440	213,559	346,881	6		223,247	
Culverden	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Cheviot	0	0	0		1,270	0	1,270			0	
Greta Valley	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Motunau Beach	0	0	0		0	0	0			9,349	
Waipara	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Hammer Springs	(116,181)	833	(117,014)	2	105,337	17,831	87,506	7		22,000	
Hawarden	0	0	0		13,254	0	13,254	8		0	
Waikari	0	0	0		2,999	5,000	(2,001)			5,000	
Total Capital Expenditure	(\$87,197)	\$2,770	(89,967)		\$683,300	\$236,390	\$446,910			\$365,650	

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 Further cost were incurred on the Amberley Ponds
- 2 An adjustment was carried out to correct the portion of costs relating to Hammer Stromwater as part of the Town Centre Upgrade.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 3 Wages costs are higher than budgeted for the year to date particularly for Amberley and Hammer Springs.
- 4 Video inspection of the schemes that was budgeted for in the December quarter was not spent.
- 5 Interest Costs, particularly for Amberley and Hammer Springs have increased from budget due to additional capital work being undertaken.
- 6 Purchase of the land for the Amberley ponds was made in the December quarter, which has not been sufficiently budgeted for.
- 7 Additional work was undertaken in Hammer Springs in conjunction with the Town Centre Upgrade

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Stormwater, Drainage & Land Protection										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	21,362	17,952	3,410			148,132	125,664	22,468	4	215,418
Other Income	0	0	0			954	0	954		0
Internal Interest Received	386	277	109			2,312	1,939	373		3,315
Development Contributions	0	3,637	(3,637)			21,805	25,459	(3,654)		43,634
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Total Operating Revenue	21,748	21,866	(118)			173,203	153,062	20,141		262,367
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Other Direct Expenditure	21,137	10,789	10,348	1		207,877	10,759	197,118	5	18,963
Internal Interest Paid	6,822	12,022	(5,200)			42,928	84,154	(41,226)	6	144,266
Council Overheads	950	953	(3)			6,662	6,671	(9)		11,416
Depreciation	0	1,437	(1,437)			0	10,059	(10,059)	7	17,241
Total Operating Expenditure	28,909	25,201	3,708			257,467	111,643	145,824		191,886
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(7,161)	(3,335)	(3,826)			(84,264)	41,419	(\$125,683)		70,481
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
District Wide Stormwater	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Dock Creek	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Amberley Beach Foreshore Protection	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Leithfield Outfall	0	0	0			44,898	0	44,898	8	0
Ashworths	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Newcombes Road	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Amberley	0	125,047	(125,047)	2		39,439	285,047	(245,608)	9	535,140
Jed River	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Hammer Springs	133,366	82,206	51,160	3		133,366	164,412	(31,046)	10	246,617
Hammer Springs DC Fund	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Total Capital Expenditure	\$133,366	\$207,253	(73,887)			\$217,703	\$449,459	(231,756)		\$781,757

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 Costs from the Regional Council relating to the Consent Application were incurred in January.
- 2 The actual capital spend in the December quarter for Amberley was lower than planned.
- 3 Capital Costs for Hammer Springs relates to the work on the Town Centre Upgrade.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 4 The amount of rates collected for Amberley Stormwater is higher than budgeted for.
- 5 Contractors Costs for Amberley are ahead of budget and in addition, Consultants Costs relating to the Global Consent are also up on budget, but a portion of these costs will be capitalised.
- 6 The level of interest is lower than budgeted due to the full amount of Capital Work yet to be completed.
- 7 Depreciation has not been recognised on Stormwater as the full physical works are still to be completed.
- 8 This represents the 5th progress payment on the Leithfield Outfall project paid in July.
- 9 The full amount of physical works for Amberley is still to be incurred.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Water Supplies										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates		310,322	306,443	3,879		2,160,943	2,145,101	15,842		3,677,290
Other Income		31,326	6,328	24,998	1	77,429	44,296	33,133	4	181,985
Internal Interest Received		958	376	582		6,420	6,420	3,788		4,510
Development Contributions		54,726	29,870	24,856	1	184,402	209,090	(24,688)	5	358,449
Total Operating Revenue		397,332	343,017	54,315		2,429,194	2,401,119	28,075		4,222,234
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs		53,666	42,105	11,561	2	311,752	294,735	17,017	6	526,106
Other Direct Expenditure		121,880	122,069	(189)		867,643	959,677	(92,034)		1,562,644
Internal Interest Paid		23,951	29,513	(5,562)		185,301	206,591	(41,290)	8	354,162
Council Overheads		65,524	65,529	(5)		458,697	458,703	(6)		786,356
Depreciation		75,661	75,495	166		529,627	528,465	1,162		905,939
Total Operating Expenditure		340,682	334,711	5,971		2,333,020	2,448,171	(115,151)		4,135,207
Operating Surplus (Deficit)		56,650	8,306	48,344		96,174	(47,052)	\$143,226		87,027
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
District Wide		0	0	0		0	0	0		106,054
Amberley		5,968	254,366	(248,398)		33,505	817,465	(783,960)		1,177,969
Leithfield Beach		0	8,541	(8,541)		0	67,680	(67,680)		110,393
Ashley Rural		28,494	13,718	14,776		186,842	126,276	60,566		194,865
Culverden		0	427	(427)		747	5,989	(5,242)		8,125
Waiau Town		0	12,000	(12,000)		3,167	26,000	(22,833)		27,625
Amuri Plains		3,566	0	3,566		3,768	17,000	(13,232)		17,000
Balmoral		1,453	343	1,110		1,563	9,401	(7,838)		11,115
Waiau Rural		7,521	0	7,521		19,944	82,500	(62,556)		82,500
Cheviot		20,560	5,492	15,068		86,239	73,344	12,895		675,931
Waipara		0	12,000	(12,000)		5,150	36,050	(30,900)		36,050
Hamner Springs		39	20,585	(20,546)		31,477	149,095	(117,618)		252,015
Hawarden - Waikari		0	1,417	(1,417)		4,699	11,919	(7,220)		15,920
Hurunui Rural		33,962	24,100	9,862		258,199	232,450	25,749	9	252,950
Total Capital Expenditure		\$101,563	\$352,989	(\$251,426)	3	\$635,300	\$1,655,169	(\$1,019,869)		\$2,968,512

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 A significant level of Connection Fees and Development contributions were recognised in both the Ashley and Hurunui Rural Supplies in January.
- 2 Wage costs, particularly for Cheviot and Hurunui Rural Supplies, were higher than budgeted for in January.
- 3 Overall, Capital Expenditure to date is lower than was budgeted for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 4 Other Income has been boosted by the level of connection fees recognised for the Ashley and the Hurunui Rural Supplies.
- 5 The level of development contributions for Amberley and Ashley Water Supplies are down on budget for the period.
- 6 Wage costs, particularly for Cheviot and Hurunui Rural Supplies, were higher than budget for the year to date.
- 5 Maintenance costs for Ashley, Cheviot and Hurunui Rural are all down on budget for the period.
- 6 Interest Costs are lower than budget, particularly for Amberley and Waiau Rural, because the debt level is currently lower than was budgeted for.
- 7 Overall, Capital Expenditure to date is lower than was budgeted for the first seven months of the year.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			Full Year	Budget
Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa (Summary)													
Operating Statement													
OPERATING REVENUE													
Rates	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Other Income	1,046,108	960,074	86,034			3,243,369	3,432,489	(189,120)		5,801,154	5,801,154	0	0
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0			0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Development Contributions	0	0	0			0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Operating Revenue	1,046,108	960,074	86,034			3,243,369	3,432,489	(189,120)		5,801,154	5,801,154	0	0
OPERATING EXPENDITURE													
Employment Costs	285,440	251,036	34,404			1,577,008	1,522,366	54,642		2,617,818	2,617,818	0	0
Other Direct Expenditure	163,627	137,375	26,252			1,366,896	1,361,668	5,228		2,312,929	2,312,929	0	0
Internal Interest Paid	60,251	60,251	0			421,757	421,757	0		723,013	723,013	0	0
Council Overheads	70,000	75,119	(5,119)			41,880	41,881	(1)		71,796	71,796	0	0
Depreciation	0	0	0			301,035	335,833	(34,798)		711,428	711,428	0	0
Total Operating Expenditure	585,300	529,764	55,536			3,708,576	3,683,505	25,071		6,436,984	6,436,984	0	0
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	\$460,808	\$430,310	\$30,498		1	(\$465,207)	(\$251,016)	25,071		(\$635,830)	(\$635,830)	0	0
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE													
Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa	598,174	188,167	410,007		2	5,866,559	3,870,980	1,985,579		5,329,816	5,329,816	0	0
HSTR - Internal Costs	0	0	0			0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Total Capital Expenditure	\$598,174	\$188,167	\$410,007			\$5,866,559	\$3,870,980	\$1,985,579		\$5,329,816	\$5,329,816	0	0

Notes - January 2011:

1 Profit from the pools operation for January was \$30,644 up on budget.

2 Costs of the expansion will be ahead of budget because the bulk of the work was completed prior to Christmas, rather than spread throughout the year.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The profit for the first seven months is \$196,363 lower than was budgeted for due the lower patronage. The downturn in the economy, the effects of the construction and the September Earthquake has had an effect on customer numbers.

2 Costs of the expansion will be ahead of budget because the bulk of the work was completed prior to Christmas, rather than spread throughout the year.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Other Income	1,203,815	1,117,781	86,034			4,347,312	4,536,432	(189,120)		7,693,627
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Development Contributions	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Total Operating Revenue	1,203,815	1,117,781	86,034			4,347,312	4,536,432	(189,120)		7,693,627
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	284,458	249,910	34,548			1,569,474	1,514,484	54,990		2,604,307
Other Direct Expenditure	163,336	137,375	25,961			1,348,719	1,361,668	(12,949)		2,312,929
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Council Overheads	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Depreciation	70,000	75,119	(5,119)			301,035	335,833	(34,798)		711,428
Total Operating Expenditure	517,794	462,404	55,390			3,219,228	3,211,985	7,243		5,628,664
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	\$686,021	\$655,377	\$30,644		1	\$1,128,084	\$1,324,447	(\$196,363)	1	\$2,064,963
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa	598,174	188,167	410,007		2	5,856,559	3,870,980	1,985,579		5,329,816
Total Capital Expenditure	\$598,174	\$188,167	\$410,007		2	\$5,856,559	\$3,870,980	\$1,985,579		\$5,329,816

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 Profit from the pools operation for January was \$30,644 up on budget.
- 2 Costs of the expansion will be ahead of budget because the bulk of the work was completed prior to Christmas, rather than spread throughout the year.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 The profit for the first seven months is \$196,363 lower than was budgeted for due the lower patronage. The downturn in the economy, the effects of the construction and the September Earthquake has had an effect on customer numbers.
- 2 Costs of the expansion will be ahead of budget because the bulk of the work was completed prior to Christmas, rather than spread throughout the year.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Hanmer Springs Thermal Reserve - Internal Costs										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Other Income	(157,707)	(157,707)	(157,707)	(0)		(1,103,943)	(1,103,943)	(0)	1	(1,892,473)
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Development Contributions	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Total Operating Revenue	(157,707)	(157,707)	(157,707)	(0)		(1,103,943)	(1,103,943)	(0)		(1,892,473)
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	982	1,126	1,126	(144)		7,534	7,882	(348)		13,511
Other Direct Expenditure	291	0	0	291		18,177	0	18,177	2	0
Internal Interest Paid	60,251	60,251	60,251	0		421,757	421,757	0		723,013
Council Overheads	5,982	5,983	5,983	(1)		41,880	41,881	(1)		71,796
Depreciation	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Total Operating Expenditure	67,506	67,360	67,360	146		489,348	471,520	17,828		808,320
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(\$225,213)	(\$225,067)	(\$225,067)	(\$146)		(\$1,593,291)	(\$1,575,463)	(\$17,828)		(\$2,700,793)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
HSTR - Internal Costs	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Total Capital Expenditure	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0

Notes - January 2011:

There are no significant variances from the budget for January.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 Other Income is negative in the cost centre as it provides for the allocation of the HSTP&S Surplus to the various reserve costs, as follows:

Libraries	750,719
District Amenities	95,805
Amberley Amenities (to Fund Kowai Track Maintenance)	3,000
Cemeteries	123,886
Tourism	43,260
Public Toilets	323,832
District Reserves	551,971
	1,892,473

The negative allocation nets off against the positive allocations in each of the other cost centres.

2 Some Insurance Costs for the Expansion was paid for directly by Council.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	Full Year	
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Budget	Budget			
Governance (Summary)													
Operating Statement													
OPERATING REVENUE													
Rates	56,483	56,383	100		396,007	394,681	1,326						676,595
Other Income	0	2,333	(2,333)		0	16,331	(16,331)						28,000
Internal Interest Received	5,903	5,903	0		41,321	41,321	0						70,831
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0						0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0						0
Total Operating Revenue	62,386	64,619	(2,233)		437,328	452,333	(15,005)						775,426
OPERATING EXPENDITURE													
Employment Costs	17,483	23,495	(6,012)		155,342	164,465	(9,123)						285,058
Other Direct Expenditure	29,992	34,002	(4,010)		157,515	155,033	2,482						251,688
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0						0
Council Overheads	20,005	20,005	0		140,035	140,035	0						240,061
Depreciation	0	0	0		0	0	0						0
Total Operating Expenditure	67,480	77,502	(10,022)		452,892	459,533	(6,641)						776,807
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(5,094)	(12,883)	7,789		(15,564)	(7,200)	(8,364)						(1,381)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE													
Governance	28,168	0	28,168	1	28,168	0	28,168						0
Total Capital Expenditure	28,168	0	28,168		28,168	0	28,168						0

Notes - January 2011:

1 The purchase of the Mayor's Car was recognised in January.

Notes - Year to Date:

2 Funding from Ecan towards the Hurunui-Waiapu Water Zone Committee is still to be received.

3 No budget was provided for the purchase of the Mayor's car.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Commercial Activities (Summary)										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	(21,474)	(21,218)	(256)			(150,380)	(148,526)	(1,854)		(254,620)
Other Income	5,438	870	4,568			86,911	50,764	36,147	3	99,786
Internal Interest Received	131,078	140,184	(9,106)	1		851,041	981,288	(130,247)	4	1,682,204
Development Contributions	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Total Operating Revenue	115,042	119,836	(4,794)			787,572	883,526	(95,954)		1,527,370
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	558	614	(56)			4,183	4,298	(115)		7,675
Other Direct Expenditure	12,817	54,225	(41,408)	2		96,829	386,121	(289,292)	5	657,249
Internal Interest Paid	77,573	73,698	3,875			542,431	515,886	26,545	4	884,370
Council Overheads	747	747	0			5,226	5,229	(3)		8,960
Depreciation	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Total Operating Expenditure	91,695	129,284	(37,589)			648,669	911,534	(262,865)		1,558,254
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	23,347	(9,448)	32,795			\$138,903	(\$28,008)	\$166,911		(\$30,884)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
Treasury	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Forestry	0	0	0			0	0	0		0
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0			\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0

Notes - January 2011:

- The level of internal interest received is lower than budgeted for as communities have not gone into debt to the levels budgeted for as yet due to the key Capital Projects yet to be fully expended.
- The level of external interest paid was lower than budget as Council had yet to pull down the full amount in its loan facility.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Rate penalties charged in the first six months was \$12,991 greater than was budgeted for. The level of external interest was also up on budget as Council had retained cash in interest bearing deposits form a period.
- The level of internal interest received is lower than budgeted for as communities have not gone into debt to the levels budgeted for as yet due to the key Capital Projects yet to be fully expended.
- The level of external interest paid was lower than budget as Council had yet to pull down the full amount in its loan facility.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes	
		Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes			Full Year Budget	
Treasury													
Operating Statement													
OPERATING REVENUE													
Rates			(21,218)	(256)		(150,380)	(148,526)	(1,854)				(254,620)	
Other Income		5,438	870	4,568		86,911	50,764	36,147	2			99,786	
Internal Interest Received		131,078	140,184	(9,106)		851,041	981,288	(130,247)	3			1,682,204	
Development Contributions		0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Council Overheads (Income)		0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Total Operating Revenue		115,042	119,836	(4,794)		787,572	883,526	(95,954)				1,527,370	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE													
Employment Costs		0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Other Direct Expenditure		2,516	53,583	(51,067)	1	71,971	375,081	(303,110)	4			643,000	
Internal Interest Paid		77,573	73,698	3,875		542,431	515,886	26,545	3			884,370	
Council Overheads		0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Depreciation		0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Total Operating Expenditure		80,089	127,281	(47,192)		614,402	890,967	(276,565)				1,527,370	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)		34,953	(7,445)	42,398		\$173,170	(\$7,441)	\$180,611				\$0	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE													
Treasury		0	0	0		0	0	0				0	
Total Capital Expenditure		0	0	0		\$0	\$0	\$0				\$0	

Notes - January 2011:

1 The level of external interest paid was lower than budget as Council had yet to pull down the full amount in its loan facility.

Notes - Year to Date:

3 Rate penalties charged in the first seven months was \$15,298 greater than was budgeted for. The level of external interest was also up on budget as Council had retained cash in interest bearing deposits form a period.

4 The level of internal interest received is lower than budgeted for as communities have not gone into debt to the levels budgeted for as yet due to the key Capital Projects yet to be fully expended.

5 The level of external interest paid was lower than budget as Council had yet to pull down the full amount in its loan facility.

Financial Report January 2011	January 2011		January 2011		January 2011		Year to Date		Year to Date		Notes
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Actual	Budget	Variance	Notes	Budget	Variance	
Forestry											
Operating Statement											
OPERATING REVENUE											
Rates	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Other Income	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Development Contributions	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Council Overheads (Income)	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Total Operating Revenue	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
OPERATING EXPENDITURE											
Employment Costs	558	614	(56)		4,183	4,298	(115)			7,675	
Other Direct Expenditure	10,301	642	9,659	1	24,858	11,040	13,818			14,249	
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Council Overheads	747	747	0		5,226	5,229	(3)			8,960	
Depreciation	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	
Total Operating Expenditure	11,606	2,003	9,603		34,267	20,567	13,700			30,884	
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(11,606)	(2,003)	(9,603)		(\$34,267)	(\$20,567)	(\$13,700)			(\$30,884)	
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE											
Forestry	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Total Capital Expenditure	0	0	0		\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	

Notes - January 2011:

1 Some fencing work was required on the Ashworths Block as a result of the fire prior to Christmas.

Notes - Year to Date:

2 Some fencing work was required on the Ashworths Block as a result of the fire prior to Christmas.

Financial Report January 2011		January 2011 Actual	January 2011 Budget	January 2011 Variance	Notes	Year to Date Actual	Year to Date Budget	Year to Date Variance	Notes	Full Year Budget
Corporate Services (Summary)										
Operating Statement										
OPERATING REVENUE										
Rates	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Other Income	15,645	1,274	14,371	1		120,831	90,538	30,293	5	177,856
Internal Interest Received	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Development Contributions	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Council Overheads (Income)	322,221	322,217	322,217	4		2,255,537	2,255,519	18		3,866,601
Total Operating Revenue	337,866	323,491	323,491	14,375		2,376,368	2,346,057	30,311		4,044,457
OPERATING EXPENDITURE										
Employment Costs	174,877	154,857	20,020	2		1,089,435	1,099,532	(10,097)	6	1,965,436
Other Direct Expenditure	82,748	71,791	10,957	3		641,582	606,337	35,245	7	1,093,438
Internal Interest Paid	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Council Overheads	71,210	71,209	1	1		498,453	498,463	(10)		854,499
Depreciation	14,625	15,521	(896)			101,017	98,297	2,720		168,542
Total Operating Expenditure	343,460	313,378	30,082			2,330,487	2,302,629	27,858		4,081,915
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(5,594)	10,113	(15,707)			45,881	43,428	\$2,453		(37,458)
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE										
Offices	0	0	0	0		40,278	50,000	(9,722)		50,000
Information Technology	11,385	2,568	8,817			127,842	142,029	(14,187)	8	154,863
Support & Services Centres	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Human Resources & Policy	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		23,996
Financial Services	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Chief Executive Officer	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Township & Amenities Administration	0	0	0	0		22,709	20,540	2,169		20,540
Works & Services Administration	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0
Water & Sewer Administration	33,450	9,000	24,450	4		18,145	139,000	(120,855)	9	164,320
Environmental Services Administration	28,501	0	28,501	4		28,501	0	28,501	10	0
Total Capital Expenditure	73,336	11,568	61,768			237,475	351,569	(\$114,094)		413,719

Notes - January 2011:

- 1 A grant from the Ministry of Youth Development was received for the youth programme in January.
- 2 Wages are up on budget due to more of the Water & Sewer staff charging time (particularly holidays) to the Administration Cost Centre.
- 3 Some redecoration work, which was budgeted for earlier in the year was completed in January.
- 4 Replacement vehicles for the Utilities Engineer and Manager Environmental Services were recognised in January.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 5 The profit generated by the sale of vehicles compared to their book value has been recognised.
- 6 Wage costs are down on budget due to timing of leave and also the Community Development Programme did not start until late in the December quarter.
- 7 Direct Expenditure is up on budget due to the timing of Software licence payments, payment of a \$25,663 call to RiskPool and the recruitment costs of the Manager - Environmental Services position.
- 8 Capital purchases for Information Technology is behind budget for the year to date.
- 9 The replacement of the Utilities vehicles is still to occur.
- 10 The Manager Environmental Services car was purchased in January.



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

17 March 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Community Development Programme

REPORT BY: Community Development Advisor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bronwen Byers', written in a cursive style.

Signature: Bronwen Byers
Author

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Audrey van der Monde', written in a cursive style.

Audrey van der Monde
Manager

Summary Report

The Community Development Programme commenced in mid November 2010 with the appointment of our Community Development Advisor, Bronwen Byers. Funding for the programme was approved by the Department of Internal Affairs following the Council's application for a Community Development Scheme grant. The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an update on the programme's activities and to show progress to date.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

BACKGROUND

The initial proposal for the Council to be involved in a community development programme came through a former group known as the 'Hurunui Network' which comprised mainly of social services providers for North Canterbury. Subsequently, the Council was successful in its application for funding for a three year programme. The funding was approved as per the outcomes identified through the application process. These outcomes, including initiatives to support the outcomes, are appended to this report.

It had been intended to commence the programme from August as it had been envisaged that a community development advisor would have been appointed by then. Unfortunately, no suitable applicant was identified through the first round of recruitment and a second recruitment process was undertaken. The successful applicant was Bronwen Byers who commenced in mid November 2010. Therefore, the programme was delayed by three months.

The role of the Community Development Advisor is to undertake initiatives through planned activities and events to encourage, facilitate, support, enable and strengthen strong connections across age, gender, socio-economic, and different ethnic groups, within the communities that make up the Hurunui district. Our agreement with the Department of Internal Affairs includes a range of short term outcomes to be achieved each year which contribute to the overall long term vision. This long term vision is:

To enable people living and working in Hurunui to live a "whole life" in the district; to strengthen the wellbeing of families and promote a strong sense of community belonging, encouraging people to be involved in local activities and support volunteer services.

Included in the agreement, are a series of long term outcomes with a subset of short term outcomes to be achieved within one year. These are:

Long Term Outcomes	Short term outcomes (to support the long term outcomes)
1. People have a strong sense of community and belonging in the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are aware of the support services available to them • Cultural diversity is embraced • Volunteering is encouraged
2. The hau-ora (wellbeing) of families living in the district is strengthened and developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migrant families are welcomed into the district • Parents are supported and their skills developed • School truancy is reduced
3. Elderly people are supported to remain living in their community of choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elderly people in the district feel respected and valued by their communities, and are able to remain in their community of choice
4. The ability and capacity of communities to seek solutions to their problems is improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is well established, supported and connected with each of the communities in the Hurunui district

A number of initiatives were proposed in the application for funding (see attached appendix). In addition to these, as work is undertaken in the community by the Community Development Advisor, other opportunities have presented which also lead to the original long term and short term outcomes, but may in some part, overtake some of the original initiatives proposed. This will depend on community needs, as the intent of the programme is to strengthen our communities' ability to support themselves and have tools in place to continue when the programme ceases.

The work of the Community Development Advisor has been well received across the District and by individuals and groups. A number of initiatives are underway and reported on throughout the remainder of this paper. They have been set out to show which long term outcome each initiative is contributing to.

1. Long Term Outcome: *People have a strong sense of community and belonging in the community*

Initiative: Re-establish the Hurunui Social Services Network with a focus on the Hurunui District

- *Map the current levels of social services to support local communities*
- *Work with government agencies and service providers to identify how to improve the level of services available*

Activity

Interest is currently being sought to re-establishing this Network. It plays an important role in developing a collaborative approach by those services across the district to help grow and maintain a healthy community. There has been considerable support for this initiative and a number of referrals have been made to other members of organisations who want to be involved.

Outcome

So far twenty organisations or individuals have replied showing interest to join to work together via the network. A date had been set for a meeting but due to the earthquake this is on hold until we can organise another day, as most of the organisations are now involved in earthquake recovery or response in some way.

Initiative: Oral History – District Wide

Within a community there are a myriad of life stories, covering such diverse areas as war, immigration, acts of bravery, lifestyles to name a very small number. In order to capture these from our residents to have these historical accounts, an oral history project was established. This also enables a feeling of belonging to a community as the stories are retold and celebrated. The project is in collaboration with our local high schools. Using senior student volunteers to record these stories ensures that we adopt an intergenerational focus, an aspect sought in the project vision, bringing together members of the community who do not necessarily interact with each other.

Activity

The criterion for the project is that the respondents must reside in the Hurunui District. The students may or may not; however it is desirable they do live in the district. However under certain circumstances this can be waived, as in the case of two very keen senior students who wish to participate in order to expand their knowledge of the Hurunui as they have family in the area. We are actively seeking suggestions for names of other possible participants.

The five senior schools in the district **Hurunui College, Rangiora College, Cheviot, Amuri, Hanmer** schools have been approached to participate. So far we have two

students from Rangiora College, and two other local students from Amberley. Contact with other areas is in the process of being conducted to finalise the interested students.

The Hurunui News will publish these stories and has offered the editorial over a few months. The libraries (ours, Waimakariri's and school libraries of those participating) will display the stories, and the effort of the students is to be celebrated and given exposure.

The interview process:

Respondent approval research ethics agreement forms are to be signed by the respondent prior to any interviews taking place, and prior to any being published in the paper. Confidentiality is paramount if the respondent wishes in certain portions of their oral history. It is intended to have six editorials published over the next few months. One aspect of this is that the students will learn more about interviewing and the preparation of scripts to be published, and how to approach the taking of oral histories and interview methodology and analysis of interview data, and area where my academic expertise will benefit the students.

Outcome

Value older people's lives by acknowledging their contributions to our community and bring together people working in collaboration to foster and celebrate the past. We will have a record of not only the significant histories but also the individual and day to day experiences of the community. Enabling intergenerational development, and providing an understanding for the youth working alongside the elderly to appreciate their life way histories. This project it is hoped will be ongoing something that the schools will pick up and continue with, with the encouragement of the Community Development Advisor.

Initiative: Establishing a Trust for the Hurunui District with representatives from each area

- *Research models of good practice and investigate effective community trusts*
- *Liaise and build relationships with existing local trusts*
- *Investigate setting up a best proactive model for a community trust to serve the district*

Activity

At present there are trusts operating within the Hurunui District, however these are area and interest specific. For example, the Cheviot Community Trust operates as a medical and a community oriented trust. An example of a district wide trust is the Waimakariri Community Development Trust, now known as Wellbeing North Canterbury.

The initial drivers for this proposal are:

- If a trust is established and operational, it will provide a legal entity through which funding opportunities can be maximized within the district. It has to be acknowledged, that various proposed projects have missed out of funding often due to lack of experience in presenting funding applications. This is likely to be an ongoing issue unless it is addressed. An operational trust is more likely to build expertise to understand funding organisations required criteria, and to present a funding application at a high enough standard to impress the particular funders.

- An established trust is a 'body' with a legal, social, community and an economic mandate for the groups it represents. Therefore by its very unique structure has a collective/collaborative strength, rather than the alternative, being, disparate groups, which can be disadvantaged, due to their perceived size and or possible invisibility, making early attempts to initiate projects at a community interest level, that much harder to accomplish.
- Some existing larger community trusts started with modest beginnings, but with the right individuals involved, and their passion and drive they have grown their trusts into influential entities, such as the Waimakariri Community Development Trust now renamed Wellbeing North Canterbury.
- This trust is involved and divided into significant areas with projects and services from counselling to truancy, drug and alcohol services, childcare centres and which frequently undertakes individual projects, such as school bullying, family violence and strengthening of families.

Although the concept of developing a community trust for the whole of the Hurunui District is still in an early stage, it is thought that a trust similar to the Waimakariri model would benefit the District and its communities. The next steps include gauging interest from key stakeholders and identifying the names of those in the district who would be prepared to contribute as trustees for the fledging trust.

Outcome

Discussions have taken place with several people and groups who have operational trusts to gain more information about them. At this early stage, there appears to be interest but this needs to be built on.

2. Long Term Outcome: *The hau-ora (wellbeing) of families living in the district is strengthened and developed*

Initiative: Information pack for new migrants into the Hurunui

- *Migrant families are welcomed into the district and establish community-based processes to welcome new migrants*

Activity

An Amuri resident, Sharon Davie-Martin has created a Welcome Pack for new migrants in her area but has been doing this largely unsupported. To develop this initiative further so that it is able to be more widely utilised and be sustained, Enterprise North Canterbury and the Community Development Advisor will work with Sharon to progress this. Advice has been sought from the Christchurch Multicultural Council and they may also assist.

Outcome

To establish a formal welcome pack, that incorporates both dairy and winery migrant workers in the district.

Initiative: Community Web page**Activity**

A new Community Development section is being developed for inclusion into the Council website and due to be completed shortly. This will be updated on a regular basis to be a good source of information for our communities.

Outcome

To give up to date information on community projects and provide an area where they may comment or leave suggestions that can be investigated or assisted with.

Initiative: Social Services Directory**Activity**

This is in the process of being investigated. Once the Social Services Network Group is up and running, it will be more apparent as to what services are currently available in the Hurunui and where the gaps are, if any. It will also enable an approach to any organisations that are missing but considered essential to have a presence in the Hurunui District.

Outcome

The Citizens Advice Bureau is willing to assist and compile a social services directory for the Hurunui District. They have done a similar thing for the Waimakariri District Council at a virtually nil cost, which has been a valuable resource. There is no such information available for the Hurunui District at this stage, but it has been identified as a tool that should be available for those living in our District.

Initiative: Accessing funding for community projects**Activity**

The Community Development Advisor has been involved in a number of funding applications to varying degrees. This has been identified as a real gap in the District – both in terms of skills and/or an official body to make applications. Applications for funding in this calendar year alone have included the following:

On behalf of Art in a Garden - Creative NZ, PGG Wrightsons, CRT Realty , Amberley Residents Association, Bashers Ltd

The Council's Bio Diversity programme - Canterbury Community Trust

Hurunui Youth Programme continuation - Ministry of Youth Development

Age Concern Confidence Driving for Mature Drivers – Lions, Rural Canterbury Public Health Organisation (RCPHO)

Hurunui Recycling Facilitator/Educator – Canterbury Regional Council

Yet to be initiated – source of funding for the Amberley Pavilion stage

Outcome

To assist community groups to apply for funding, to have an overview of what is required and assist with the preparation of the funding application.

3. Long Term Outcome: *Elderly people are supported to remain living in their community of choice*

Initiative: Confidence Driving Course for Mature Drivers

This initiative was instigated to enable mature residents to remain in their area of choice. Early discussions focussed on how to achieve this came up with assessing the needs of elderly drivers and put in place a programme that would increase their confidence. Firstly it assists mature drivers to remain in the community of choice being able to access social and medical amenities. Secondly it will give mature drivers the ability to feel less isolated in their homes, knowing they are able to drive themselves, or to be the driver for friends, no longer driving.

Activity

The courses are planned for **Amberley, Hanmer, Cheviot, Amuri and Waikari** from 11 April 2011. Each local venue is booked along with the provided lunch. Funding has been sought and gratefully received from RCPHO and Lions. A letter has been to the patients of the District's Health Clinics over the age of seventy five years. The course can accommodate 20-25 people. All elderly participants have been offered the course free of charge to ease any financial stress that may hinder potential participants from responding to taking advantage of the course.

The Driving Course is held by Age Concern Canterbury. Their representatives are pleased to 'be invited to bring their courses to Hurunui'.

Outcome

Several groups have connected up to work with the elderly on this project including Age Concern, New Zealand Police, RCPHO, Lions and the five medical clinics under the guidance of the Practice Managers. With all these groups working together it will assist in building confidence across the specific driving age group and encourage collaboration with groups that don't necessarily work alongside each other, enhancing the affect of community understanding of those issues experienced by mature drivers. It is envisaged to have these courses annually or more frequent depending on funding available.

Initiative: Safety Course for Elderly – Amberley, Hanmer, Cheviot, Amuri and Waikari

In order to enable mature residents to remain in the area of choice, another way is to provide for their safety needs is by putting in place programmes that will increase their confidence to live in their homes for as long as possible and to feel secure. The intent is to make people more aware of the home safety products they are able to access and also the emergency services they are entitled to use and refer to when required and most importantly ways to minimise accidents around the home.

Activity

It is intended to organise and run a day course with Age Concern on safety within the home in September 2011. These courses will be conducted again in **Amberley, Hanmer, Cheviot, Amuri and Waikari**. The content of these courses covers safety in the home, with the Fire Service, New Zealand Police, Neighbour Hood Watch, information regarding family trusts and protection from family pressure regarding inheritance. Physical safety within the home and property, and other health issues such as protecting against accidents will be addressed.

Outcome

Similar to the former initiative, this contributes assisting the elderly remain in the community of their choice. It is envisaged to hold these course bi-annually depending on the interest and success of the first course.

Initiative: Sunflower Day (St John) Amberley and RotherhamActivity

The St John Ambulance Service has organised again this annual Trade Show in the Hurunui consisting of a number of home safety providers and suppliers. It is hoped that the New Zealand Police and Fire Service also take part. The Community Development Advisor will make a short five minute presentation on her role within the district and how this relates to the community both on a practical basis and also efforts to develop a stronger community spirit. My role will be to assist and support this programme where possible and to help promote it.

Outcome

To enable the elderly to have a wide ranging understanding of what is available to assist them keep safe in their homes.

Initiative: Age Concern Volunteer Award – District Wide

To celebrate the role of elderly volunteers within the community, who often work tirelessly over a long time, and more often than not expecting little praise or recognition for their selfless efforts. Age Concern therefore, as it begins to operate in the Hurunui with the Driving and Safety Courses have asked they be permitted to award one of our most elderly volunteers with their Volunteer Award. Mayor Dalley suggested recipients that he thought were very deserving of the Award.

Activity

An award ceremony will be held with family and guests and representatives from Age Concern who have organised this award.

Outcome

This recognises volunteers in their own community. Volunteers both male and female make up the army of unpaid helpers that are so necessary in order to carry out many community initiatives. From this beginning it is hoped to develop a training and support programme for volunteers, and talks have begun with Volunteer Canterbury to hold a function in the Council chambers with Mayor Dalley in attendance, to again celebrate the community's unsung heroes. This initiative will strengthen the connection between Council and the volunteers and hopefully we can provide through ongoing training and support a very competent group of people able and willing to participate in community events, growing the considerable group that already works in many areas of the community at the moment.

Initiative: Bus for Elderly in district to attend social functions – Amuri, Waikari

Due to the earthquake this has been postponed, however it is something that would assist the elderly to visit other social groups within the district, for instance there was a request by the Waikari Medical Clinic to have this facility for Waikari residents to come through to Amberley and join in with the Welcome Club which is held once a month.

Initiative: Day Clubs – A social day for the elderly held once a month

Scope the viability of setting up Day Clubs in the Hurunui. Selwyn District Council has a very good programme running which could be used as a model.

Activity

The concept of the Day Clubs includes having entertainment, lunch and a guest speaker.

Outcome

Plan to initiate this activity later this year.

4. Long Term Outcome: *The ability and capacity of communities to seek solutions to their problems is improved*

The Community Development Advisor has been approached to visit, observe or address various community groups and inform them of her role and how it could assist their groups or organisations, or how they can work more closely with the Council. Excellent feedback and interest has been received following an article featuring the Community Development Advisor in the Hurunui News. Through the various discussions and calls that have resulted, a better understanding has been gained about how to assist with community projects and find solutions to problems. Enterprise North Canterbury has requested a profile for the next issue of the Amuri Dairy Employers Group newsletter which all helps in giving the role exposure within the district.

Projects being scoped and viability being assessed over the next months

- Parenting programmes planned and organised by the schools – primarily Amuri
- Ethnic food festival through an approach made by Linda Constable who expressed an interest in planning one later in the year
- Volunteer Training and Support projects – discussion has been had with Volunteering Canterbury and they are going to assist to plan a training course
- School Holiday Programmes and Fun Events throughout the year. To scope the possibility of commencing these over the next months. For instance a Bike ride, or a Fun Run, a community contest for children. There are many events that could be organised, and further investigations are being made.

APPENDIX

Outcomes for the Community Development Programme

PROJECT VISION	To enable people living and working in Hurunui to live a “whole life” in the district; to strengthen the wellbeing of families and promote a strong sense of community belonging, encouraging people to be involved in local activities and support volunteer services.		
LONG-TERM OUTCOME ONE	People have a strong sense of community and belonging in the community		
SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES	INITIATIVES TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES	PLANNED ACTIVITIES/MILESTONES FOR EACH INITIATIVE	REPORTING FOR ACTIVITIES
People are aware of the support services available to them	Set up a community groups contact database for the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source appropriate database software • Connect with groups for input into database, ensuring all community groups and agencies are listed • Encourage groups to update their own information • Organise open days to showcase support services 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved and reported at six months and by the end of the year
Cultural diversity is embraced	Establish a community trust for the delivery of support services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research models of good practice and investigate effective community trusts • Liaise and build relationships with existing local trusts • Investigate setting up a best practice model for a community trust to serve the district 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved and reported at six months and by the end of the year
Volunteering is encouraged	Improve community connections and understanding of cultural diversity locally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate and promote community-based cultural diversity events • Facilitate and promote marae-based programmes • Plan and coordinate a community event celebrating cultural diversity in the Hurunui district 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved and reported at six months and by the end of the year
	Increase the profile of volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriately recognise and celebrate the contribution of volunteers • Facilitate and promote strategies to promote volunteering and to link volunteers to appropriate organisations and to volunteering opportunities 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved and reported at six months and by the end of the year

LONG-TERM OUTCOME TWO	The hau-ora (wellbeing) of families living in the district is strengthened and developed		
SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES	INITIATIVES TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES	PLANNED ACTIVITIES/MILESTONES FOR EACH INITIATIVE	REPORTING FOR ACTIVITIES
Migrant families are welcomed into the district	Establish community-based processes to welcome new migrants into the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and develop an information pack for new migrants to the Hurunui communities, including identifying translation services and strategies that may be required • Establish a process for identifying and welcoming new migrants • Identify a lead agency or person to connect with and engage new residents 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
Parents are supported and their skills developed	Encourage parents to participate in community activities with their children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate the delivery of parenting classes in local communities • Facilitate or coordinate events within communities that encourage whole family participation 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
School truancy is reduced	Promote initiatives to support local youth to stay in learning situations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate the setting up of a sustainable, dedicated youth worker role in the district • Facilitate dialogue between local school principals, boards of trustees, training providers and industry representatives to identify local issues, needs and development potential • Work with schools, learning institutions and interested parties to identify solutions to truancy and those leaving school without qualifications • Investigate what other learning options may be available for local young people and promote alternative learning options for youth 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year

LONG-TERM OUTCOME THREE		Elderly people are supported to remain living in their community of choice	
SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES	INITIATIVES TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES	PLANNED ACTIVITIES/MILESTONES FOR EACH INITIATIVE	REPORTING FOR ACTIVITIES
Elderly people in the district feel respected and valued by their communities, and are able to remain in their community of choice	Promote participation by older people in community life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involve local organisations in recognising and valuing older people, and the roles they can play in the community Identify the needs of older people Promote and support new initiatives for older people in the main towns 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
	Record the stories of older people and their communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set up facilities and processes for recording and digitising the stories of older people, including promoting skills development to enable local people to participate in these initiatives Identify key people to record stories and promote the participation of older people through the sharing of their stories and photographs Coordinate skills development and community learning in oral history and publishing 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
	Raise awareness of the support services available to older people in the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a 'trade show' approach to promote a friendly environment and opportunities for sector representatives to share information about their services with older people Develop a plan for the sustainable coordination of events of this type in the community 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
Identify appropriate services to support older people's living choices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map the current levels and accessibility of services available to support older people living in local communities Set up focus groups and undertake community consultation to identify what is working and what services are required to support older people's living choices Work with government agencies and service providers to identify how to improve the levels of services available 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year	

LONG-TERM OUTCOME FOUR	The ability and capacity of communities to seek solutions to their problems is improved		
SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES	INITIATIVES TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES	PLANNED ACTIVITIES/MILESTONES FOR EACH INITIATIVE	REPORTING/COMPLETION DATES FOR ACTIVITIES
The project is well established, supported and connected with each of the communities in the Hurunui district	Establish a community-based project steering group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a project steering group of key stakeholders and community representatives to provide direction and support Develop terms of reference for the project steering group Identify how the project will work with the Hurunui communities to identify development priorities , issues and initiatives for the future Develop the outcomes- based project plan for the second year of the project, based on the research, consultation and experiences from the first year 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
	Employ a community development project worker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify key attributes of an effective community development worker in consultation with experienced people Establish a recruitment panel Advertise for, and recruit an appropriately skilled project worker for the role 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year
	Advertise and promote the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact key stakeholder throughout the community Arrange at least two meetings in the main townships to promote the project Ensure regular progress updates are published and profile key events 	Progress, impacts, issues and outcomes achieved reported at six months and by the end of the year



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

17 March 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Environmental Services Team Work Plan

REPORT BY: Manager Environmental Services

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J - Batchelor".

Signature:

Author
Judith Batchelor

Manager

Summary Report

Attached for the Committee's information is the current work plan for the Environmental Services team with the timing of individual projects.

The report has been updated following the February 22 earthquake to highlight potential impacts on ongoing projects.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

**Environmental Services Project Planning
Updated March 2011**

Project	Timing	Lead Officers
RMA Advocacy		
Canterbury Regional Policy Statement	HDC have submitted on draft	Rachel McClung
NRRP – files notice to become a party to appeals	Current	Judith Batchelor
NES plantation forestry Council submission		Jan Weaver
NPS biodiversity		Rachel/Judith
General Policy Work		
Amberley East Side Reserve/Landor Proposal	Current	Rachel McClung Jason Beck
Waipara River Strategy	Current – next meeting postponed earthquake	Helga Rigg
Local Biodiversity Strategy Implementation programme Partner project Greening Waipara	Current	Dale McEntee
Queen Mary Site Historic Reserve Management Plan	Awaiting Iwi input and completion of Conservation Management Plans	Jan Weaver
Conservation Management Plans for Chisholm, Soldiers and Nurses Block.	Update Strategy and Policy 14/04/11	Judith Batchelor
HSTR Reserves Management Plan for new area to vest as recreation reserve.	Consultation with HSTR	Jan Weaver
Queen Mary reporting to the Crown		Bruce Yates Jan Weaver
District Reserve Management Plan Review	April workshop	Rebecca Holden
Speed Limits Bylaw – approval to notify	Council meeting 30/03/11	Jan Weaver
Earthquake Building Policy adopted 2006	Council meeting 30/03/11	Rebecca Holden/Kerry Walsh

Project	Timing	Lead Officers
Hurunui Lakes access	ongoing	Jan Weaver
District Plan review	Workshop April	
Review Public Places bylaw	Consult HSCB 21/03/11 approval to review Strategy and Policy 14/04/11	Liz White
Event management policy options	HSCB 21/03/11	Jan
Freedom Camping bylaw	Submissions close 4/03/11 Consult HSCB 21/03/11 Hearing submissions Strategy and Policy 14/04/11	Jan
Review statutory delegations		Rebecca
Amuri Arts Council – market location	HSCB 21/03/11	Judith
Plan Changes		
PC18 Frost fans – Environment Court hearing	Interim decision released	Judith Batchelor
PC21 Waipara Oaks hearing panel appointed	Hearing adjourned	Helga Rigg
PC23 Urban subdivision hearing	Hearing Panel adjourned McKendry/Davidson and Bob Batty	Rachel McClung
PC24 St James Estate – hearing held recommendation of Commissioner's to be adopted	Decision notified appeal period	Helga Rigg
PC26 Conway Hills adoption	Decision notified appeal period	Jan Weaver
PC27 Minor dwelling units	Notified for further submissions hearing panel Malthus/Little/M Black	Rebecca S42A
PC28 Apartment living	Consult HSCB 12/05/11 approval to notify	Rachel McClung Rebecca S42A

Project	Timing	Lead Officers
	Regulatory Committee 2/06/11	
PC29 Mendip Hills approval to notify	Regulatory Committee 2/06/11	Jan Weaver
PC30 Queen Mary Hospital Reserve	approval to prepare a plan change Strategy and Policy 14/04/11 Consult HSCB 16/05/11 Approval to notify Regulatory Committee 2/06/11	Liz White
PC31 Carparking standards	HSCB 21/03/11 approval to prepare a plan change Strategy and Policy 14/04/11 Approval to notify Regulatory Committee 2/06/11	Liz White
PC32 Rural subdivision	Consult HSCB 21/03/11 Update Strategy and Policy 14/04/11 approval to notify Regulatory Committee 2/06/11	Emma
Resource consents		
Mt Cass Windfarm - Mainpower	Environment Court Hearing 20/06/11	Helga Rigg
Hurunui Wind - Meridian	Lodged and on hold because of earthquake	Helga



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

17 March 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Biodiversity Programme

REPORT BY: Manager Community and Corporate Services

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Audrey van der Monde". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Signature: Audrey van der Monde
Author

Summary Report

An application for a grant to fund the Council's Biodiversity Programme was made to the Department of Conservation in October 2010. We have recently learned that this funding application has been successful. The Department of Conservation has agreed to fund the Biodiversity Ambassador Role for one year, with a further two years if the first year is successfully achieved as per the application for funds. The Council needs to decide whether or not it wants to continue to run the programme in the way it has been operating up until now, before the conditions of the funding are accepted.

Recommendation

THAT THE COMMITTEE AGREES TO CONTINUE THE CURRENT BIODIVERSITY PROGRAMME THROUGH AN APPOINTED BIODIVERSITY AMBASSADOR.

BACKGROUND

The Department of Conservation (DOC) has approved our application for a Biodiversity Ambassador to run a biodiversity programme along the lines as to how it is currently run.

The application for the funds, was made in early September 2010, and before there had been any opportunity to brief the new Council on the programme and what it set out to achieve. The application was therefore, based on what is currently in place as we had to provide specific objectives and an explanation as to how the programme was going to operate in the Hurunui district. DOC has agreed to fund the Biodiversity Ambassador for the first year, with the funding of years 2 and 3 being conditional on a successful review of the role and it's achievements after completion of the first year.

Before the funds are transferred to the Council, the Council (officer level) needs to formally accept the grant and the conditions of that acceptance.

This brief paper is to provide the Committee the opportunity to decide on whether or not the current biodiversity strategy is the direction it wishes to take. In order to accept the funding, we have no option but to continue the programme in a similar manner to how it has been operating. If the Council decides to take a different approach, it is likely that the funding will not be available.

Judith Batchelor, Manager Environmental Services, will lead the discussion at the meeting to enable other options to be considered. This paper does not consider any further detail due to the timing of the agenda being printed and the gathering of the information necessary.

BIODIVERSITY PROGRAMME:

The funding approval is based on the application's stated intentions as shown below:

Project Objective:

Increase the capacity of the landowners and community of Hurunui to conserve its precious biodiversity. This meets the objectives of the Hurunui Biodiversity Strategy for non-regulatory action and is consistent with actions promoted by the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy.

Co-ordination, co-operation & collaboration with other stakeholders:

1. Joint partnership agreement with the community based project Greening Waipara
2. Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Advisory Group
3. Partnership with Mainpower for the Hurunui Natural Environment Fund
4. Jointly working with Environment Canterbury Resource care on the Jed River project
5. Working alongside DOC Mahaanui and community in the Motunau Beach coastal area
6. Engaging with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy and the Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee re biodiversity

Working with Target Audience and Providing Advice:

The Ambassador will continue to raise awareness of the role and disseminate relevant information. Plan to continue to build on what has been established over the next three years as follows:

- Display materials (in 11 sites)
- Monthly articles in local newspaper

- Email through Google groups
- Industry and community meetings
- Participating in initiatives
- Communication with individuals
- Council webpage and the Canterbury Biodiversity webpage



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

17 March 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy & Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Drinking-water standards

REPORT BY: Manager Roding And Utilities

Signature:

Author
David Edge

Manager

Summary Report

Territorial local authorities provide drinking-water as part of their obligations under the Local Government Act 2002. The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 was designed to introduce a drinking-water section to the Health Act 1956; “to protect the health and safety of people and communities by promoting adequate supplies of safe and wholesome drinking-water from all drinking-water supplies”. The change was driven by a desire to produce safe drinking-water for all New Zealanders. In May 2005, the Government announced it would make financial subsidies available from 2006 to 2016, to help small communities improve their drinking-water systems (these subsidies are administered by the Minister of Health). Technical assistance is available to all water suppliers through their local District Health Board (DHB) public health unit. This assistance aims to help water suppliers determine how best to operate a small drinking-water supply and how to manage the risks associated with providing drinking-water to a community.

In September 2009, the Minister of Health put the drinking-water subsidies programme on hold in order to conduct a review of the eligibility criteria, to ensure that those communities in need of the subsidies were not missing out on this “affordable” opportunity. The review was completed, and in December 2010 the subsidy programme was reopened with revised qualifying criteria to upgrade the drinking-water supplies (providing for human drinking only). All applications for subsidy, under the revised criteria (see Appendix A), must be submitted to the DHB prior to 31 March 2011, to be judiciously considered for this year.

Council’s aim is ‘to provide a sustainable supply of water that meets the needs of present and future domestic and agricultural/horticultural consumers, and complies with the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards 2005 (revised 2008)’.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

BACKGROUND

Central Government has approved a national environmental standard for sources of drinking-water under the Resources Management Act 1991 (RMA). This aims to reduce risks to all water bodies used for drinking-water supplies.

Hurunui District Council operates 13 water schemes, extracting water from 23 different water intakes (8 on boil water notices), providing drinking-water to between 50 and 1500 people per scheme. The majority of these water intakes are shallow bore or river gallery intakes, thus considered at-risk supplies. The table below indicates the intake locations, their respective depths and the number of end-users.

PLACE	INTAKE	PEOPLE	PLACE	INTAKE	PEOPLE
<i>Hurunui River</i>			<i>Waiau River & tributaries</i>		
Peaks	6m well	100	Hanmer Springs	Gallery	1500
Bishells Road	25m well	750	Amuri Plains	7m well	400
Kaiwara	Gallery	85	Waiau Rural	10m well	300
Hurunui No1	Gallery	600	Waiau Town	10m well	400
Blythe	6m well	50	Cheviot	17.4m well	1000
<i>Waitohi River</i>			Parnassus	12m well	100
Upper Waitohi	Gallery	400	<i>Kowai River & tributaries</i>		
Bakers Ford	Gallery	750*	Racecourse Road	120m well	400
Lower Waitohi	8m well	300	Mays	86m well	500
<i>Pahau River</i>			Kowai	129m well	630
Balmoral	Gallery	200	Leithfield Beach	119m well	150
Culverden	71m well	475	Amberley (Domain)	Gallery	1200
<i>Waipara River</i> Waipara Town	30m well	220	Amberley SH1	123m well	1200

As can be seen, 6 of the 23 intakes are deep bore (>70m depth well bore). Deep bore wells are considered low-risk for contaminated drinking-water supply. However, the remaining 17 intakes are considered at-risk for micro-organisms.

Micro-organisms found in water fall into five categories: bacteria, protozoa, viruses, helminths and cyanobacteria.

Bacteria includes for verotoxic e-coli, salmonellosis, typhoid fever, paratyphoid fever, shigellosis, campylobacter, cholera and legionellosis (typically causing cramping, abdominal pain, vomiting, diarrhoea, fever, chills and nausea).

Protozoa includes for amoebiasis, cryptosporidiosis and giardiasis (typically causing the same symptoms as for bacteria contamination, as listed above).

Viruses include for viral gastroenteritis, infectious hepatitis A, polio and flu virus (typically causing the same symptoms as for bacteria contamination, but with other further serious complications that could lead to neural damage or death, if left untreated).

Helminths include for thread worms, tape worms and nematodes (causing intestinal worms and other worm-like parasites).

Cyanobacteria includes for cylindrospermopsin (causing clogging and blockages in filtration systems, bad water taste and in some cases, releases toxins into the water).

The populations most susceptible to waterborne illness are the very young, older people and the sick (especially those with compromised immune systems such as HIV and cancer victims, who have undergone radiation treatment or chemotherapy).

Shallow bore and river gallery intakes are most susceptible to contamination through groundwater contamination (leaking septic tanks, untreated sewage into river systems, agricultural and feral animal faecal waste to underground or surface water, intake backflow and resultant cross-contamination).

Under the Drinking-Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2008), supplies are required to provide a certain level of protozoa treatment according to their raw water source type and the level of contamination in that water source. For example, a source supplying water from a bore in which bacteria are rarely found needs to provide a lower level of treatment than a surface water supply with regular bacterial contamination (e.g. e-coli).

Bacteria water quality tests and readings for 2009/2010 are as per the table below:

	INTAKE	E-COLI COUNT		INTAKE	E-COLI COUNT
<i>Hurunui River</i>	Peaks	0/12	<i>Waiau River</i>	Hanmer Springs	1/54
	Kaiwara	5/12		Amuri Plains	0/15
	Bishells Road	0/51		Waiau Rural	0/8
	Hurunui Nu1	4/51		Waiau Town	4/59
	Blythe	3/13 (PBWN)		Cheviot	0/45
<i>Waitohi River</i>	Upper Waitohi	0/11		Parnassuss	1/12
	Bakers Ford	0/51	<i>Kowai River and tributaries</i>	Racecourse Road	0/52
	Lower Waitohi	0/12 (PBWN)		Mays	5/18
<i>Pahau River</i>	Balmoral	3/19		Kowai	0/7
	Culverden	1/102		Leithfield	11/28
<i>Waipara River</i>	Waipara Town	0/12		Amberley domain Amberley SH1	1/28 0/47

The deep bore intakes at Culverden, Racecourse Road, Mays Kowai, Leithfield Beach and Amberley SH1 should all reflect zero readings for e-coli count testing (secure bore water), but as can be seen from the table above, this is not the case for the Culverden (1 failure out of 102 tests – less than 1%) or Mays (5 failures from 18 tests – 28%) intake. These e-coli readings are under investigation for potential cross-contamination from other sources (other than the actual deep-bore water intake source).

The level of treatment required is given in a water supply catchment risk assessment and is called the 'log credit requirement'.

Log credit requirement	Raw water source
None	Secure bore water
2	Non-secure bore water source from deeper than 30m
3	Water with low risk, such as shallow groundwater and surface waters with a forested catchment
4	Water with moderate risk, such as surface water with a low-intensity agricultural catchment
5	Water with high risk, such as surface water with a high-intensity agricultural catchment or a wastewater discharge upstream

Once the supplies have determined their log credit requirement and had it signed off by their drinking-water assessor, they will need to install treatment processes that have a total number of log credits equal to their log credit requirement. UV treatment has a total log credit of up to 3, and cartridge filtration has a log credit of 2. Thus, if a

supply has a cartridge filtration and UV disinfection, they would have a total of up to 5 log credits.

UV (ultraviolet light) inactivates protozoa, bacteria and to a lesser extent viruses. This renders the organism harmless, because it cannot replicate itself to the large numbers needed to make people sick. Unlike chlorine, UV does not have ongoing disinfection effects to prevent re-contamination in the distribution system. Because of the shielding effects that water can have, the effectiveness of UV disinfection is highly dependant on the quality (low turbidity – ‘cloudiness’) of the water entering the reactor, as well as mitigated fouling of the lamp sleeves caused by water hardness and high concentrates of suspended iron and manganese (resulting in ‘depositing’).

Making sure people have clean water to drink is an important step towards public health. In the past, public health management of supplies relied largely on monitoring the quality of the water produced by individual water suppliers to check that it complied with Drinking-Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ). While monitoring (largely reactive rather than proactive) is always important, public health risk management plans (PHRMP) for drinking-water supplies provide the additional benefit of reducing the likelihood of contaminants entering the supplies in the first place. PHRMP’s encourage the use of risk-management principles during treatment and distribution, so that monitoring is not the only water quality management technique used and thus reducing the risk of contaminated water supplies.

Of the 23 HDC water intakes;

SIX (6) are “MINOR” schemes (Amberley (x2), Hanmer Springs, Waiau Rural, Cheviot and Hawarden/Waikari) and MUST comply with the legislation for an approved PHRMP by July **2014**;

NINE (9) are “SMALL” schemes (Amuri Plains, Mays, Racecourse Rd, Kowai, Balmoral, Culverden, Waiau Town, Leithfield Beach, and Waipara) and MUST comply with the legislation for an approved PHRMP by July **2015**;

THREE (3) are “Neighbourhood” schemes (Blythe, Parnassus, and Peaks) and MUST comply with the legislation for an approved PHRMP by July **2016**;

FIVE (5) are “Rural Agriculture” schemes (Kaiwara, Hurunui No 1, Upper Waitohi, Lower Waitohi, and Waiau Rural) and the legislation is **STILL TO BE DETERMINED** as to the date for their PHRMP compliance.

We currently have four approved PHRMP’s (2008). These are:-

Ashley – main
 Waipara – mid depth bore
 Hanmer Springs – river weir
 Cheviot – main

We also have six drafted PHRMP’s (still to be approved by the local drinking-water assessor), these being:-

Amberley SH1 - deep bore
 Amberley – gallery
 Amberley – domain
 Hawarden/Waikari – Bakers Ford
 Hawarden/Waikari – Bishells Road
 Waiau Town – shallow bore

The proposed course of action is to have all at-risk water intake schemes ready with approved PHRMP's, attached Optimisation and Sustainability Plans, attached Project plans and budget costs, clearly defined community support through early consultation and demonstrated public health need.

Under the revised criteria for the drinking-water financial subsidies (set nationally at \$10,000,000 for this funding year, with all applications to be nationally prioritised and ranked for feasible subsidy allocation), new pre-qualification parameters have been set for initial consideration of financial subsidy scheme eligibility. These are as listed below:-

1. The supply must serve a maximum of 5000 people and a minimum of 25 people for 60 day of the year.
2. Only those communities with a deprivation index (DI) of 7 or more (up to 10), based on geographical meshblock areas, can be applied for.
3. Must have an approved PHRMP by the local drinking-water assessor.
4. Must demonstrate that their drinking-water supply has been optimised (submit an optimisation plan).
5. Must have a prepared sustainability plan that demonstrates the ongoing sustainability of the water supply.
6. Must demonstrate that there is a community support for the supply plan.
7. Must demonstrate that there is a clear public health need.
8. Have a full project plan and budget (for any scheme greater than \$10,000 in cost).

Under item 2 above, there are only two communities that qualify for a 7 or greater DI, these being Amberley Beach and Waiau Town. Amberley Beach is served from a secure deep-well bore water intake source, not requiring any log credits, thus not requiring any upgrade works to be DWS compliant.

The Waiau urban water supply is an on-demand supply, serving 400 or so residents of the town. It draws water from a shallow bore on the edge of the Waiau River and delivers it to consumers either from the pumping pressure or back-feed from a reservoir on the terrace above the town.

The water is prone to contamination from the bore (4 failures out of 59 tests in 2009/2010 – 7%) when the river is in flood and from wind-blown detritus, vermin and birds at the reservoir site.

This water network meets eligibility criteria for the Ministry of Health drinking water funding assistance. One of the areas (Phase I) where improvements to the network can be made is upgrading both the size of the town reservoir and providing proper security against re-contamination of water.

Council will need to show how we plan to comply with drinking water standards, which is when a community the size of Waiau (small scheme) is expected to have an approved PHRMP by July 2015 under the new legislation. Any improvements to treatment or water source will need to be considered, but irrespective of this, the poor condition of the main reservoir will also need to be addressed.

Attending to the reservoir will mean a significant capital cost, but will impose no on-going operating expenses. If an application for funding assistance was successful at the maximum of 85% level, the community share will be less than the current budget of \$25,400 for reservoir improvements, provided for in the current 2010/11 Annual Plan.

There are two options available for upgrading the storage, these being either a single storage reservoir or a cluster of smaller tanks.

The most cost effective single storage construction method would be a timber tank (a 500m³ reservoir), would cost approximately \$163,000. A cluster of smaller polyethylene tanks would cost around \$148,000 for a total storage capacity of 720m³. The cost per cubic meter of water stored under the multiple tank option is about 63% of that for a single reservoir.

The cluster tank option is perhaps easier to screen visually and could be plumbed to prevent wholesale loss of water should any part of the tank cluster fail (natural hazard).

The multiple plastic tank option is the recommended storage option for the community to consider as part of any network improvement or application for funding assistance.

This will form the basis of the application to the DHB prior to the 31st of March 2011, subject to the established support from the community (public meeting on the 14th March 2011), acceptable land ownership principle through an MOU or the like, accepted project plan (including for all proposed project management details and budget), and the DHB's approval of the submitted draft PHRMP.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Revised Criteria for Drinking-Water Subsidies

Revised Criteria for Drinking-water Subsidies

Citation: Ministry of Health. 2010. *Revised Criteria for Drinking-water Subsidies*.
Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Published in December 2010 by the
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013, Wellington 6145, New Zealand

ISBN 078-0-478-37420-9 (Online)
HP 5281

This document is available on the Ministry of Health's website:
<http://www.moh.govt.nz>



MANATŪ HAORA

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Technical assistance	2
1.2	Drinking-water subsidies	2
2	Who is Eligible for Drinking-water Subsidies?	4
2.1	Eligible communities	4
2.2	Supplies that are not eligible	5
3	What will be Subsidised?	6
3.1	Staged applications	7
4	How much Subsidy is Available?	8
5	The Application Process	10
5.1	Prerequisites for applications	10
5.2	Making an application	11
5.3	Assessing applications	13
6	Payment of Drinking-water Subsidies	15
Appendices		
	Appendix 1: Contact Details for Public Health Units	16
	Appendix 2: Example Application Form	18
List of Tables		
Table 1:	Maximum percentage of costs of capital works that drinking-water subsidies will fund	8
Table 2:	Calculation of marks for risks to health	13

1 Introduction

In May 2005, the Government announced it would make subsidies available from 2006 to 2016, to help small communities improve their drinking-water systems. These subsidies are administered by the Ministry of Health. This document sets out the criteria and processes that will be used to determine eligibility for drinking-water subsidies.

1.1 Technical assistance

Technical assistance is available to water suppliers through their local District Health Board (DHB) public health unit (for contact details, see Appendix 1). This assistance aims to help water suppliers determine how best to operate a small drinking-water supply and how to manage the risks associated with providing drinking-water to a community. It will also provide information on options for upgrading or improving supplies. It will help small drinking-water suppliers to optimise their operations and make the most effective use of existing equipment.

Seeking technical assistance from the public health unit is a prerequisite for any application for a drinking-water subsidy. Public health staff will also assist eligible water suppliers to apply for drinking-water subsidies.

Technical assistance will focus on developing public health risk management plans (or water safety plans) for drinking-water supplies. These plans will help to identify any improvements that need to be made to ensure that the water from the supply is safe to drink and can be managed in a sustainable manner.

1.2 Drinking-water subsidies

The subsidies aim to:

- assist small water suppliers in disadvantaged communities to provide safe drinking-water
- make funding available to community water supplies that have demonstrated a need for funding and have obtained technical advice from their local DHB public health unit
- help communities establish a reticulated drinking-water supply.

In September 2009, the Minister of Health put the drinking-water subsidies programme on hold in order to conduct a review of the eligibility criteria. The Minister wanted to confirm that the drinking-water subsidies were operating under the best possible process to ensure that the communities with the greatest need were accessing the available Government funding. The Minister was concerned that the first-come, first-served format of the previous programme structure meant that most funding was only available in the initial stages of the programme and some communities in need of subsidies might be missing out.

The review of the criteria has been completed, and the revised criteria discussed in this document reflect the advice received from local government, health officials and other interested parties.

2 Who is Eligible for Drinking-water Subsidies?

Drinking-water subsidies will be available to water suppliers that meet the criteria outlined in this document. Further information and technical advice is available from the DHB public health units (see Appendix 1 for contact details).

Not all drinking-water suppliers or communities are eligible to apply for drinking-water subsidies, but all may obtain technical advice from their local DHB public health unit.

Disadvantaged communities or drinking-water supplies that are owned and operated by a local authority or community for the benefit of the community as a whole may apply for drinking-water subsidies.

For the purposes of these criteria, a local authority drinking-water supply is a supply owned by a district council or regional or unitary authority. It excludes city councils and water supplies within city boundaries.

2.1 Eligible communities

Drinking-water suppliers applying for drinking-water subsidies must operate supplies for the benefit of the community as a whole. The supply must serve a maximum of 5000 people and a minimum of 25 people for 60 days of the year or 1500 person days per year. Eligible community water supplies are not operated for profit and are not able to charge fees. This excludes sports clubs, ski fields, camping grounds and other similar situations.

Eligibility will be restricted to those communities with a deprivation index or score (DI) of 7 and above (based on geographical meshblock areas).

Eligible water suppliers must also:

- be listed in the Ministry of Health Register of Community Drinking-water Supplies in New Zealand if they are an existing supply or agree to become registered if they are proposing a new supply
- be able to demonstrate that they have received technical advice from their local DHB public health unit (see Appendix 1 for contact details)
- have a public health risk management plan approved by a drinking-water assessor
- demonstrate that their drinking-water supply has been optimised (see 5.1.1 to follow)
- have prepared a sustainability plan that demonstrates the ongoing sustainability of the water supply (see 5.1.2 to follow).

Communities that currently do not have a reticulated drinking-water supply will be eligible to apply for drinking-water subsidies to establish a supply if it can be demonstrated that there is community support for the supply plan and there is a clear public health need.

Water supplies for communities that have a **fluctuating population** could still be eligible to apply for drinking-water subsidies to meet the needs of all of the community (ie, the maximum population size). However, where a community includes 'second homes' (such as holiday houses), these homes are assigned a DI of 3. This means, for example, that if 30 percent of a community's residential properties were owned as second homes, then these would be given a DI of 3, and the remaining 70 percent of homes would be given the DI from the census meshblocks. The overall DI will be calculated accordingly.

Where an **industry**, for example, a freezing works, places significant demand on the community's drinking-water supply, the percentage of subsidy funding for improving the drinking-water supply would be the percentage of the drinking-water used by the community rather than the industry. Because the water supply must be designed for the peak flow, the component assigned to industry is the demand when the industry is operating (ie, for seasonal industries). The industry would be expected to provide the balance of funding for improving the drinking-water supply.

In other words, the drinking-water subsidies are available to upgrade the water provided for human drinking only. They are not available for water supplies for which the primary use is industrial (including farming, irrigation and/or stock water) unless the industry funds the proportion of the supply used to meet its needs.

2.2 Supplies that are not eligible

If a supply does not comply with the criteria listed above, it is not eligible. The following list gives some examples for clarity but is not exhaustive.

Drinking-water subsidies will not be available for:

- government departments and Crown entities, including (but not limited to) the Ministry of Education, the Department of Conservation and the Department of Corrections
- city councils or within city council boundaries
- water supplies serving communities over 5000 people
- individual domestic dwellings and premises
- commercial organisations, such as home stays, restaurants and hotels
- not-for-profit organisations that charge fees, such as sports clubs
- replacing existing assets or purchasing land
- retrospective applications (ie, for capital works started before the introduction of subsidies scheme).

3 What will be Subsidised?

Water suppliers can apply for drinking-water subsidies in relation to two areas: construction and the purchase of equipment that is considered necessary in order to manage risks identified in the public health risk management plan.

As an example, subsidies may be provided for:

- increasing the quantity to normal design flows and/or improving the quality of the water supplied
- conducting raw water source works in order to extract either ground or surface water
- transferring water from the point of extraction to a treatment plant
- developing a treatment plant and reservoirs
- developing pre-treatment settling or raw water storage capabilities
- installing new distribution reticulation systems (to the property's boundaries)
- amalgamating two or more water supply infrastructures
- purchasing remote monitoring or alarm equipment or other necessary drinking-water supply equipment
- paying the fees of professional advisors for their technical or design assistance (under specific circumstances, for example, where the applicant can demonstrate that they have insufficient engineering capacity).

The subsidy for any single eligible proposal will be capped at \$1,000 per eligible person. The subsidy will only exceed this amount where an engineering review confirms that the application only includes what is required to provide safe drinking-water and represents value for money.

Subsidies will not be available for any other forms of works or activities. The following list gives some examples of exclusions for clarity, but it is not the definitive list:

- asset replacement costs
- land purchase
- training to enable operation of the plant (this can be supported through the technical advice available from the public health unit)
- sampling or analysis of raw or treated water to establish the nature of any treatment required to make the water safe for drinking (this is part of demonstrating optimisation)
- operational maintenance expenditure
- any infrastructure within a residential property boundary.

3.1 Staged applications

In rare cases, applicants will need to make a staged application. A staged application involves two stages:

- Stage 1: investigations and design (eg, test bores)
- Stage 2: capital works, including reticulation.

For example, a groundwater source might need to be investigated before a decision can be made about the optimal water supply if a surface water source were also available.

Approval of stage 1 for any staged application will not guarantee funding for stage 2. Further funding will depend, in part, on the application submitted for stage 2. If the combined value of stages 1 and 2 exceeds the \$1,000 per eligible community member cap, an engineering review would be required.

However, because of the investment in stage 1, applications for stage 2 of a staged application would be ranked and considered for subsidy ahead of any new applications.

4 How much Subsidy is Available?

The total amount of subsidy available in any funding year is \$10 million. All applications will be prioritised and ranked. The funding will be allocated to the applications from the highest scoring to the lowest until all of the funding available for that year has been allocated.

The percentage of the total capital amount that the drinking-water subsidies will fund will be determined by the size of the community and the disadvantage of the community. Smaller, more disadvantaged communities will receive a greater percentage of their required total capital costs than larger, less disadvantaged communities (see Table 1).

Some communities (eg, fewer than 200 people) may not be accurately represented on the DI. Where this occurs, the water supplier or community can outline the circumstances of their community in writing to their DHB public health unit (see Appendix 1 for contact details). The public health unit will assess the community's deprivation and allocate a new DI, which they will provide in a written notification to the applicant. This new DI can then be included in the application. The population considered is the normally resident population. As noted in section 2.1 above, where a community includes second homes (such as holiday houses), these homes are assigned a DI of 3, and the community's total DI is adjusted to reflect this.

Table 1 below lists the maximum percentage of the total cost of capital works that the drinking-water subsidies will fund. This percentage can be determined by reading down the table to the required row of a population band, and across the columns to the appropriate DI.

Table 1: Maximum percentage of costs of capital works that drinking-water subsidies will fund

Community size	Percentage of costs funded per deprivation index (DI)			
	7	8	9	10
4501–5000	50%	60%	65%	75%
4001–4500	55%	60%	70%	75%
3501–4000	55%	65%	70%	80%
3001–3500	60%	70%	75%	80%
2501–3000	65%	75%	75%	80%
2001–2500	65%	75%	80%	80%
1501–2000	70%	80%	80%	85%
1001–1500	75%	80%	85%	85%
501–1000	80%	85%	85%	85%
<500	85%	85%	85%	85%

Water suppliers and communities are encouraged to undertake some of the works themselves, wherever possible, as a 'contribution in kind'. For example they may dig trenches for pipes or install and connect storage tanks. However, activities such as project management cannot be considered as 'contribution in kind' activities. In recognition of this, such work may reduce the financial contribution that a community is required to make.

5 The Application Process

Drinking-water subsidy applications will be considered once a year and applications must be submitted by 28 February each year.

5.1 Prerequisites for applications

Before applying for a drinking-water subsidy, a water supplier or community must show that they:

- are a legal entity and will own the water supply
- have the appropriate DI to be eligible for a drinking-water subsidy
- have an approved public health risk management plan
- have optimised their water supply (see 5.1.1 below)
- have developed a sustainability plan (see 5.1.2 below)
- have received technical advice from their DHB public health unit
- have included a report on their application from their DHB public health unit.

Applicants for drinking-water subsidies will need to demonstrate they have received technical advice on their drinking-water supply from their District Health Board public health unit, and that the operation of the supply has been 'optimised' and is sustainable. Contact details for local public health units are shown in Appendix 1.

5.1.1 Optimisation plan

Optimisation of a supply involves making sure that the management, operation and any equipment used in the supply is functioning as well as it can. The optimisation plan will ensure that the most economic systems and processes changes are in place to address as many as possible of the quality and risk issues identified in the small water supplier's public health risk management plan. Once this is done, the public health risk management plan and the optimisation plan will identify any capital works that might be needed to address the remaining risks. At this point, the Ministry of Health might consider an application for a drinking-water subsidy.

5.1.2 Sustainability plan

The **sustainability plan** will identify all issues relating to the future viability and sustainability of the water supply. This will include details of the ownership and legal structure of the water supply and the ongoing operational and maintenance costs and how these will be funded. It is about how the small water supply maintains its newly optimised supply into the future and, more importantly, how it sustains its supply once the public money has been spent to upgrade it. The sustainability plan must demonstrate how the Government's investment will be protected.

The sustainability plan must consider:

- financial sustainability
- operational sustainability
- governance and management sustainability.

Financial sustainability will require the water supplier to produce a financial plan, showing how income will be generated from the supply users, for example, applying a fixed charge, a variable charge, a mixture of the two or other sources of funding. The financial plan also needs to show the maintenance costs, including all recurring expenditure and large but infrequent expenditure.

The plan needs to demonstrate that enough money will be available to keep the supply going and to maintain the infrastructure funded from subsidies. It needs to demonstrate that facilities and infrastructure purchased with drinking-water subsidy funding will be properly maintained and will continue to be used to benefit the community for a minimum of 10 years.

The plan must also demonstrate operational sustainability. For example, if volunteers are to be used, the plan must identify a reliable volunteer group that is prepared to run the system and outline training arrangements. Adequate, simple, operational and quality manuals must be available for all volunteers to reference. Manufacturer's manuals, where applicable, also need to be available.

Operational and governance, and management sustainability go hand in hand. A good governance and management programme will ensure the ongoing viability of the drinking-water supply. Community-owned supplies will need to demonstrate that they have sound governance and management arrangements. For example, one possible arrangement is for the water supply to be run as an incorporated society, with appropriate termination procedures specified in the society's rules. Governance and management plans must identify staff, secretarial support, and so forth.

The governance arrangements must also detail who will maintain the water supply systems and how those individuals will be trained and supported to ensure the operational requirements are met.

5.2 Making an application

Public health unit staff may assist drinking-water suppliers in preparing their applications for subsidies. All applications need to be reviewed by the public health unit before being sent to the Ministry of Health and must include a copy of the public health unit's report. Application forms are available from the respective DHB public health unit (see the example application form provided as Appendix 2). The Ministry of Health will acknowledge receipt of any application.

Applications can be made under the following categories (see section 3.1 for further information about staged applications):

- investigations
- capital works and/or equipment.

All applications must include the following information:

- the applicant's contact details
- WINZ codes for an existing supply (showing that it is registered) or an undertaking to register for a new supply
- background information about the supply, including history and details of the water source
- demographics, size and the DI for the supply's community
- details of the ownership and governance for the supply
- details of the management and responsibility for the operation of the supply (including qualifications and training of staff, time spent on water supply work, etc)
- details of any community consultation
- details of any existing treatment equipment
- sampling/monitoring results
- the public health risk management plan
- the optimisation plan
- the sustainability plan
- a description of how the subsidy funding would be spent, including estimates or quotes from product and service suppliers
- a preliminary design report, including plans and estimates
- information on the options considered for the capital works or equipment, the reasons the preferred option was selected and why it is considered best value for money
- details of how the water supplier will meet their share of the costs
- the public health unit's report on the supply and the application
- any further information requested by the public health unit or the Ministry of Health.

The public health unit's report on the supply and application will outline how the supply meets the eligibility criteria and prerequisites. The report will discuss the outcome of the technical advice provided to the applicant and will comment on the applicant's optimisation plan, public health risk management plan and sustainability plan. The report will also outline how the proposed application, if successful, would contribute to the provision of a safe drinking-water supply for the community.

5.3 Assessing applications

After the close of applications on 28 February, there will be up to two months period when Ministry of Health officials will review all applications and, during this stage, further clarifying information may be sought from the applicant.

The Ministry of Health will rank all applications so that the most deserving are funded first. The ranking score will be calculated by giving each application a mark relating to the community's ability to contribute financially towards the supply and the public health risks of the supply. The marks from these two categories will be added together to provide a total ranking score.

The ability to contribute financially relates to the DI of the community seeking the subsidy. For example, a community that has a DI of 7 will score 7 marks towards their ranking score total; a community with a DI of 10 will score 10 marks towards their ranking score.

The public health risks of the supply will be calculated from Table 2 below.

Table 2: Calculation of marks for risks to health

Risks to health present in supply	Marks
Source water (contaminant source):	
• Secure groundwater	+0
• Groundwater that is more than 10 m deep	+5
• Rainwater	+10
• Lake/large open reservoir	+15
• Shallow groundwater/spring that is less than 10 m deep	+15
• Stream/river through bushed catchment	+15
• Stream/river/open reservoir through or in an agricultural catchment	+20
Preventive/mitigating measures (contaminant removal) already in place	
• Protozoal and bacterial removal/inactivation to the drinking-water standards	-20
• Bacterial removal/inactivation to the drinking-water standards	-10
• Pre-treatment storage/selective abstraction	-5
• Source protection measures	-5
• Monitoring programme (eg, instrumentation, lab testing) to meet the standards	-3

Risk to health score = source water risk – sum of preventive measures.

Note: Any risk less than 0 will be recorded as 0.

The ranking score is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Deprivation Index} + \text{Risks to Health Score} = \text{Ranking Score}$$

The Ministry of Health will give a 'best-fit' match to any water supplies that do not fit exactly into the categories.

Applicants will be advised in writing of the ranking score calculated for their application once the Ministry of Health has completed the calculation.

All applications will be ranked from the highest scoring to the lowest. The \$10 million available each year will be allocated to the applications from the highest scoring to the lowest until all of the funding available for that application period is allocated.

The Ministry of Health will make recommendations on the applications for the Sanitary Works Technical Advisory Committee to consider. The committee will then advise the Minister of Health on the recommended applications for drinking-water subsidies.

Applicants will be advised in writing of the Minister of Health's decision on their application.

Water suppliers may make more than one application for drinking-water subsidies regardless of the outcome of any previous application.

Any applications that do not receive funding in any year will not automatically be considered for funding in the next year, unless the applicant indicates that they wish their application to be reconsidered and have no changes to make to that application.

6 Payment of Drinking-water Subsidies

Once an application for a drinking-water subsidy is approved, the Ministry of Health will enter into an agreement with the applicant to enable payment to be made as the works are completed.

While the agreement is between the Ministry and the water supplier, the public health unit will be the key contact point, facilitator for accessing technical assistance and other information, and to answer questions about reporting and invoicing. The public Health Unit will hold a copy of the agreement to ensure that they are aware of when works are scheduled to be completed, when they will need to provide reports, and to maintain an awareness of the projects in their area so they can provide informed support. However, it is the applicant's responsibility to meet the requirements of the agreement.

All water suppliers receiving a drinking-water subsidy will need to demonstrate that the facilities or infrastructure purchased with the assistance of the drinking-water subsidy will be properly maintained and will continue to be used to benefit the community. This will be demonstrated through the public health risk management plan and sustainability plan.

Successful applicants will have agreed funding reserved for up to two years, during which time, the applicants must secure any required resource consents. If resource consents cannot be obtained or the works cannot be completed in this time, the applicant must apply in writing to the Ministry of Health for an extension to the reserve period. Any extension would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The agreement between the Ministry of Health and the applicant will identify what payments will be made for the specific activities outlined in the application and the timeframe for work. The applicant will organise for the works or activities to be undertaken and properly supervised. The applicant will report progress to their public health unit at agreed times and provide the public health unit with a report on the works and their commissioning upon their completion.

Before any invoices are sent to the Ministry of Health, the applicant will need to get a report from the public health unit confirming that the work has been completed to an appropriate standard. The public health unit will report on progress against the contract milestones, and the applicant must provide these reports to the Ministry of Health with all invoices, along with any GST receipts for work undertaken by contractors and equipment suppliers (where applicable).

Appendix 1: Contact Details for Public Health Units

When seeking information, please contact your local District Health Board public health unit and ask to speak to someone about drinking-water subsidies.

Area	Public health unit	Address	Phone
Northland	Child, Youth, Maternal, Public Health & Dental Services Northland District Health Board	Dairy House Porowini Avenue Private Bag 9742 Whangarei 0148	Whangarei (09) 430 4100 Kerikeri (09) 537 4342 Kaitaia (09) 408 0010
Auckland	Auckland Regional Public Health Service	Cornwall Complex Building 15, 40 Claude Road Greenlane Private Bag 92 605 Symonds Street Auckland 1035	(09) 623 4600
Waikato Northern Ruapehu	Population Health Services Waikato District Health Board	Level 4, Hugh Monckton Trust Building Cnr Rostrevor and Harwood Streets PO Box 505 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240	(07) 838 2569
Eastern Bay of Plenty	Toi Te Ora – Public Health Service Bay of Plenty District Health Board	Stewart Street PO Box 241 Whakatane 3158	(07) 306 0847
Tauranga	Toi Te Ora – Public Health Service Bay of Plenty District Health Board	Level 4, Westpac Building 2 Devonport Road PO Box 2121 Tauranga 3140	(07) 577 3774
Rotorua Taupo	Toi Te Ora – Public Health Service Bay of Plenty District Health Board	1166 Amohau Street PO Box 12060 Rotorua 3010	(07) 349 3520
Gisborne Tairāwhiti	Healthy Environments Planning, Funding & Population Health Te Puna Waiora Tairāwhiti District Health Board	3rd Floor Morris Adair Building Gisborne Hospital 421 Ormond Road Private Bag 7001 Gisborne 4040	(06) 869 0570
Taranaki	Public Health Unit Taranaki District Health Board	Barrett Building Tukapa Street Private Bag 2016 New Plymouth 4342	(06) 753 7799
Hawke's Bay Chatham Islands	Public Health Unit Hawke's Bay District Health Board	Napier Health Centre 76 Wellesley Road PO Box 447 Napier 4140	(06) 834 1815

Area	Public health unit	Address	Phone
Manawatu	Public Health Unit MidCentral District Health Board	Community Health Village Palmerston North Hospital PO Box 11036 Palmerston North 4440	(06) 350 9110
Whanganui Southern Ruapehu	Public Health Centre MidCentral District Health Board	Lambie Hostel Wanganui Hospital Private Bag 3003 Whanganui 4540	(06) 348 1775
Wairarapa Wellington Lower Hutt Kapiti Coast	Regional Public Health Hutt Valley District Health Board	Level 1 Community Health Building Hutt Hospital Private Bag 31 907 Lower Hutt 5040	(04) 570 9002
Nelson Tasman	Nelson Marlborough Public Health Service Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	Nelson Office 36 Franklyn Street PO Box 647 Nelson 7040	(03) 546 1537
Marlborough	Nelson Marlborough Public Health Service Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	Blenheim Office Wairau Hospital Hospital Road PO Box 46 Blenheim 7240	(03) 520 9914
Canterbury	Community and Public Health Canterbury District Health Board	Datacom House 76 Chester Street East PO Box 1475 Christchurch Mail Centre Christchurch 8140	(03) 364 1777
South Canterbury	Community and Public Health	18 Woollcombe Street PO Box 510 Timaru 7940	(03) 687 2600
West Coast	Community and Public Health	3 Tarapuhi Street PO Box 443 Greymouth 7840	(03) 768 1160
Otago	Public Health South Southern District Health Board	Main Block Level 2 Wakari Hospital Taieri Rd PO Box 5144 Moray Place Dunedin 9058	(03) 476 9800
Southland	Public Health South Southern District Health Board	92 Spey Street PO Box 1601 Invercargill 9840	(03) 211 0900
Central Otago Queenstown Lakes	Public Health South Southern District Health Board	Building 7, Level 3, Suite 2 Remarkables Park Town Centre Hawthorne Drive PO Box 2180 Frankton Queenstown 9349	(03) 450 9156

Appendix 2: Example Application Form

Drinking-water Subsidy Application



This application is for:

- an existing supply OR
 a new supply.

This application is for:

- Stage 1
 Stage 2

of a two-stage application.

An application for funding does not necessarily mean the funding will be approved. Applications will not be considered unless supported by a report from your local District Health Board (DHB) public health unit.

If you need help filling in this form, please contact your local DHB public health unit.

What do I need to do?

- Ensure that you have read and understand the *Revised Criteria for Drinking-water Subsidies*. This document is available online at <http://www.moh.govt.nz>
- Contact your local DHB public health unit to seek technical advice and confirm your deprivation index (or score) (DI).
- Review the checklist below to ensure that you are able to provide all the required documentation to support your application.
- Ensure that you have clarified the legal status of the entity applying for funding. For example are you a territorial authority, regional council, limited liability company, incorporated society, community group, iwi authority, partnership or trust?
- Fill in parts A, B and C of this form.
- Read and sign Part D of this form.
- Send your completed application to:

Drinking-water Assistance Programme
 Ministry of Health
 PO Box 5013
 Wellington 6145

by **28 February**.

Checklist

Information that needs to be provided as part of the application process. (If you provide additional information, please state the question number to which that additional information applies.)

Please include supporting copies of information as attachments at the end of this application form.

- Certified copies indicating your organisation's legal status: eg, local authority, limited liability company, incorporated society, trust, community group, iwi authority or partnership (see question 8)
- Full project plan and budget (for applications greater than \$10,000.00) (see questions 12–14, 18, 22)
- An approved public health risk management plan
- Other supporting information (plans, schematics, maps, consent approvals, etc) (see questions 9, 12, 16, 19, 22)
- Optimisation plan
- Sustainability plan (see questions 17, 19–20)
- Land ownership details (see question 11)
- Supplier quotes (see questions 13 and 14)
- Public Health Unit Report
- GST number (see question 5)

The Ministry of Health must received applications for drinking-water subsidies **no later than 28 February**. Applicants will be informed of the funding decision approximately three months after that date.

NO electronic applications will be accepted. Please provide two signed copies of all application material (photocopies acceptable).

The Ministry of Health will send all applicants a letter confirming receipt of their application.

If your application is accepted, the information you provide in this form will be the basis for your formal funding agreement and will be used to monitor your progress. Please ensure that all information provided is as accurate as possible.

Funding applications are assessed by the Ministry of Health and by the Sanitary Works Technical Advisory Committee (SAWTAC), which makes recommendations to the Minister of Health on whether to accept all or part of an application.

Part A: Water supply details

1. Name of water supply
(existing water supplies must be included on the Ministry of Health's Register of Community Drinking-water Supplies in New Zealand)

2. Community code
(sourced from the Register of Community Drinking-water Supplies in New Zealand)

3. Name of legal owner of water supply

- 3a. Population/size of community served by water supply
(this information should be cross-referenced to census figures)

Normal permanent residential population	
Maximum population	

- 3b. Street address

4. Postal address

5. GST number

6. Name of key contact person

7. Contact details for key contact person

Work phone	
Fax phone	
DDI phone	
Mobile phone	
Email address	

8. Your organisation's legal status
(attach certified copies of documents at the end of this application form)

<input type="checkbox"/>	A local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Limited liability company
<input type="checkbox"/>	A registered charitable trust	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other legal entity (eg, Māori trust/ authority, incorporated society or partnership) (list below)
<input type="text"/>			
9.	Are the water supply assets currently insured?		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes (list what is insured) <input type="text"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	No		
<input type="text"/>			
10.	The community's deprivation index or score (DI) (see your local DHB public health unit for assistance)		
<input type="text"/>			
11.	Who owns the land that the following water supply components are located on? (Attach certified copies of certificates of title, other ownership papers, easements, any lease or land use agreements, Crown gazette notices, or Māori land order)		
11a	Source (bore, well or stream abstraction point)	<input type="text"/>	
11b	Treatment plant	<input type="text"/>	
11c	Distribution system (include relevant maps and clearly show ownership details of the land used in the distribution system)	<input type="text"/>	
12.	Provide information here about any resource or building consents required for your drinking-water supply.		
12a	Provide details on any resource consents currently held (or being sought) that relate to the drinking-water supply (eg, type of consent, what it is for, expiry date, etc)	<input type="text"/>	
12b	Provide details of any resource or building consents that will be required if drinking-water subsidy funding is provided for this project (eg, the type of consent required, what it is for and the name of the consent authority)	<input type="text"/>	

Part B: Project costs

Provide details of the costs of undertaking the project. Provide supporting evidence for your costs, for example, written quotes or estimates.

13. What is the total forecasted cost of the project and what amount of this total is being requested from the subsidy fund?

Total forecasted project cost \$ (excluding GST)	Amount requested from subsidy fund \$ (excluding GST)	Community contribution (including in-kind contributions) \$ (excluding GST)

14. Enter the projected breakdown and costs for your project in the table below. We need to know how any funding granted will be spent. The item headings are an indication only; however, they should be linked to the risks highlighted in the public health risk management plan. Add any other project costs under 'Other' as appropriate.

Project cost items	Brief description	Costs \$ (excluding GST)	Requested subsidy contribution total cost \$ (excluding GST)	Community contribution (including in-kind) \$ (excluding GST)
Raw water source works				
Conveyance from source to treatment plant				
Pre-treatment settling or raw water storage				
Treatment plant				
Reservoirs				
Instrumentation				
Remote monitoring or alarm equipment				
Distribution system installation/upgrade				
Other water supply equipment identified as necessary in the public health risk management plan				
Other (specify)				
TOTAL				

15. Provide a breakdown of your organisation’s contribution as above (question 14) to indicate whether this is cash or in-kind contribution and what period of the project this contribution covers.

Your organisation needs to contribute to the cost of the project. Cash contributions could be made from cash reserves. In-kind contributions could include volunteers’ time or support (donation or supplies) from local businesses. For the purposes of this question, organisational contribution does not include project management. Use the item headings from the above table as appropriate. Provide a dollar value for the in-kind contribution.

Contribution item	In-kind contribution \$ (excluding GST)	Cash contribution \$ (excluding GST)
TOTAL		

16. Provide a breakdown of any other funding related to this project that you have applied for. Failure to disclose may result in your application being disqualified. All cash costs listed should exclude GST.

Funding agency	Contribution value \$ (excluding GST)	Is the funding confirmed?

17. How will your organisation fund the ongoing operational costs once the project has been completed?

Assessment of eligibility for funding will take into account the ongoing sustainability of the water supply and its independence from government funding.


Part C: Project details

If you have any additional information that does not fit in this template, you can include it as an attachment at the end of this application.

18. Supply detailed summary information on the project that your organisation wants to undertake. The project summary should link back to the risks identified in the public health risk management plan and include a preliminary design report that covers plans and estimates.



19. Briefly describe how the project will be managed. Include a detailed work or action plan for the project that clearly shows the project stages, together with the project start and completion dates, and provides details of management and responsibilities for the various stages, listing staff involved, along with their relevant qualifications, etc.



20. Briefly describe the history of the water supply.



21. Briefly describe the current drinking-water supply set up.
Include details of existing treatment equipment and sampling/monitoring results.

22. Briefly describe the proposed project and the improvements to the supply that will be made if your application is successful.
Include reasons for why the preferred options were selected and why these options are considered the best value for money.

23. How will you monitor the progress of the project? Indicate target dates by which specific outcomes/goals will be achieved.
State how the project will be evaluated in terms of achieving its outcomes/goals and providing value for money.

24. Who has been consulted in the planning of the project, for example, the local community and/or council?



25. What concerns, if any, were raised in the consultation? How were these concerns addressed?



26. How will you keep the people you consulted involved as the project progresses?



Part D: Declaration of understanding

The decision to apply for funding as well as the contents of this application has been approved by the organisation applying for funding.

This application is true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge, and our organisation:

- has read and understood the *Revised Criteria for Drinking-water Subsidies*
- is eligible to apply for a subsidy
- agree to become registered in the Ministry of Health Register of Community Drinking-water Supplies in New Zealand if proposing a new supply
- has attached to this application all relevant supporting documents as outlined in the checklist on page 1
- has the skills and experience or necessary support to manage this project
- has no outstanding financial issues that may affect the assessment of this application (ie, it is credit worthy)
- is not insolvent and is not operated by a statutory manager
- is not receiving funding for this or similar projects from other government or non-governmental agencies other than those specified in this application
- has no outstanding issues or disputes with other parties that would impede the progress of this application
- is the legal owner of the supply

I/We understand and agree that, before granting any funds, the Ministry of Health may undertake further checks in relation to project management experience, credit worthiness, referees, funding with other schemes and/or any possible issues. Should referee checks be considered necessary, I/we will be advised in advance of these checks being undertaken.

I/We understand that the information is collected to help the Ministry of Health to assess my/our application for drinking-water subsidy funding. The information I/we give in this application is collected, and will be held, by the Ministry of Health.

I/We understand that I am not/we are not required to give the Ministry of Health any information; but if I/we do not give the Ministry of Health all the information asked for to assess the application, the application may be declined.

Under the Privacy Act 1993, I/we have the right to ask to see all information that the Ministry of Health holds about me/us and to ask the Ministry of Health to correct that information where appropriate.

The Ministry of Health may disclose information about me/us to its agents, contractors or other parties for the purpose of assessing the appropriateness of my/our application. The Ministry of Health may also disclose information about me/us to credit reference agencies for the purpose of obtaining a credit report on me/us.

The Ministry of Health may obtain information and make such enquiries about me/us as it considers warranted from any source, including its agents, contractors and credit reference agencies for the purpose of assessing the appropriateness of my/our application.

Official Information Act 1982

Written funding applications or comments provided to the Ministry of Health will be subject to the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). The OIA requires the information to be made available unless there is good reason, pursuant to the OIA, to withhold the information, and that good reason outweighs the public interest in making the information available.

Authorised signatory or signatories

The person(s) completing this application form has/have the authority to act on behalf of the applicant and is/are authorised to sign this application. (a maximum of two signatories can be nominated)

Name (use block capitals)	
Title or designation	
Date	
Signature	

Name (use block capitals)	
Title or designation	
Date	
Signature	