



HURUNUI
District Council

AGENDA

FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE:

Strategy & Policy Committee

TO BE HELD ON:

THURSDAY 16 JUNE 2011

**COMMENCING IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE
EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING.
(APPROXIMATE START TIME 1.00PM)**

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

16 JUNE 2011

TIMETABLE

| Time | Item |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1.00pm (approx.) | Meeting commences. |
| 3.00pm | Afternoon tea. |

| Item | Order of Business | Pages | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--------------|---|--|---|---------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies • Urgent Business • Conflict of Interest Declarations • Recording Device | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Minutes for confirmation – 12 May 2011 | 3 - 19 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Action List | 20 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Forward Programme | 21 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Corporate: | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4.1 Financial Report to 30 April 2011..... | 22 - 57 | | | | | | | | |
| | 4.2 Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations..... | 58 - 75 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Engineering: | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.1 Utilities Report..... | 76 - 90 | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.2 Purchase of Utility Vehicles..... | 91 - 93 | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.3 Grass Mowing Tenders 2011-14 (Report to be circulated)..... | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | <p>PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION</p> <p>THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF THE MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO THE MATTERS AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48 (1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:</p> | | | | | | | | | |
| | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th> <th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th> <th>Grounds under section 48 (1) for the passing of this resolution</th> <th>Pages</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Item 7 Rates Relief for Earthquake Damage</td> <td>Report contains information which if released would affect the privacy of natural persons.</td> <td>Section 48(1)(a)(i) & Section 48(2)(a)(i)</td> <td>95 - 99</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | General subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter | Grounds under section 48 (1) for the passing of this resolution | Pages | Item 7 Rates Relief for Earthquake Damage | Report contains information which if released would affect the privacy of natural persons. | Section 48(1)(a)(i) & Section 48(2)(a)(i) | 95 - 99 | |
| General subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter | Grounds under section 48 (1) for the passing of this resolution | Pages | | | | | | | |
| Item 7 Rates Relief for Earthquake Damage | Report contains information which if released would affect the privacy of natural persons. | Section 48(1)(a)(i) & Section 48(2)(a)(i) | 95 - 99 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

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 12 MAY 2011 AT 9.30AM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 66 CARTERS ROAD, AMBERLEY.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.MINUTES..... | 2 |
| 2.ACTION LIST..... | 2 |
| 2.1 KATE VALLEY LANDFILL | 2 |
| 3.FORWARD PROGRAMME..... | 2 |
| 4.ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS..... | 2 |
| 4.1 DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW STRATEGY..... | 2 |
| 4.2 SUBMISSION ON NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT FOR INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY..... | 4 |
| 4.3 RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW..... | 5 |
| 5.CORPORATE MATTERS..... | 9 |
| 5.1 LONG TERM PLAN STEERING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS | 9 |
| 5.2 QUARTERLY REPORT..... | 11 |
| 5.3 RATE ARREARS..... | 14 |
| 6.ENGINEERING..... | 14 |
| 6.1 GENERAL CONDITION OF PENSIONER UNITS AND RESIDENTIAL HOUSING; PRESENT OCCUPANCY AND FUTURE DEMAND..... | 14 |
| 6.2 GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT ON THE LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME FUNDING..... | 14 |
| 7. DISCUSSION WITH THE HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON THE DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME..... | 15 |
| 8.PRESENTATION ON SMOKEFREE OUTDOOR AREAS..... | 17 |
| 9.URGENT BUSINESS..... | 17 |
| 9.1 WASP CONTROL..... | 17 |

PRESENT:

Cr Michael Malthus (Chairperson), Mayor Winton Dalley, Councillors Marie Black, Gary Cooper, Dick Davison, Ross Little, Jim Harre, Russell Black and Judith McKendry.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Judith Batchelor (Manager Environmental Services), Jason Beck (Manager Financial Services), Audrey van der Monde (Manager Community and Corporate Services), Maree Hare (Council Secretary) and Michelle Thompson (Committee Secretary).

PART MEETING:

Rachael McClung (Senior Policy Planner), Bruce Yates (Manager Amenities and Special Projects), David Edge (Manager Rooding and Utilities), Rebecca Holden (Policy Planner), Andrew Dalziel (Chief Executive Officer), David Edge (Manager Rooding and Utilities) and Sally Cracknell (Solid Waste Manager).

APOLOGIES:

Cr Daly.

THAT THE APOLOGY BE ACCEPTED.

McKendry/Cooper

CARRIED

Cr Malthus noted that Cr Daly had briefed Cr Malthus on his views as they relate to Cheviot and he (Cr Malthus) would contribute these views during the meeting when appropriate.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS:

There were no declarations of Conflict of Interest.

RECORDING DEVICE:

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

URGENT BUSINESS:

- Wasp Control

1. MINUTES

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14 APRIL 2011, AS CIRCULATED, ARE TAKEN AS READ AND WITH THE DELETION OF THE CEO BEING RECORDED AS PRESENT BE CONFIRMED .

M Black/Davison

CARRIED

2. ACTION LIST

The Action Sheet was tabled with officers confirming the relevant actions have been completed.

2.1 Kate Valley Landfill

The Manager Environmental Services noted that the odour had been discussed at a community liaison meeting recently where it was reported that there had been no further complaints. An agreed complaints procedure is now in place.

3. FORWARD PROGRAMME

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

The Manager Environmental Services stated that there would be a review of the Council's Liquor Ban Policy included in the next meeting's agenda.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

4.1 District Plan Review Strategy

The Senior Policy Planner provided a report advising that Council is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 to review its District Plan and this process must commence by 2013.

The Senior Policy Planner noted that the Councillors attended a workshop on 8 April to gain a greater understanding of the District Plan and review process and it was agreed that an in depth consultation process should occur beyond the minimum requirements of the RMA. It was also agreed that the District Plan process should incorporate a high degree of elected member involvement. She noted that the community consultation process would commence mid-2011 and could be quite lengthy.

The Senior Policy Planner stated that the review process will provide an opportunity to include several key issues currently not included in the District Plan including climate change, natural hazards and renewable energy.

The Senior Policy Planner noted that minimum the requirement for consultation excludes non land owners, businesses and organisations that operate in the district however a wider consultation process will include these groups.

The Senior Policy Planner drew the Committee's attention to Appendix B detailing the scoping and the major stages for the District Plan review. The Senior Policy Planner noted that this approach would see the Proposed District Plan adopted by the current Council and notified in October or November 2013, prior to the triennial elections.

Mayor Dalley joined the meeting at 9.43am.

Cr Davison queried if the process would be managed "in-house" and the Policy Planner agreed noting that technical input was required which was not available "in-house" and would be obtained from outside specialists. Mayor Dalley clarified that Council does have resources to manage this project and a budget allowance for specialist input.

THAT AN IN-DEPTH CONSULTATION PROCESS OCCURS BEYOND THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT; NOTING THAT THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH OUTCOME 1 OF THE HURUNUI LONG TERM PLAN: 'A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE, WORK AND PLAY'.

Davison/Harre

CARRIED

THAT ELECTED MEMBERS HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE REVIEW PROCESS TO ENABLE GREATER UNDERSTANDING AND A MORE ROBUST DISTRICT PLAN.

McKendry/Cooper

CARRIED

THAT THE COUNCIL DIRECTS STAFF TO BEGIN UNDERTAKING A FULL REVIEW (OPTION 1) OF THE DISTRICT PLAN, NOTING THAT THE TIMEFRAMES GIVEN IN THE REPORT ARE APPROXIMATE ONLY.

Little/M Black

CARRIED

4.2 Submission on National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

The Senior Policy Planner provided a report seeking endorsement of a submission to the Ministry of the Environment on the proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity noting that the National Policy Statement will not be subject to a board of enquiry and it will not go to a hearing. The Senior Policy Planner added that the final decision will be made by the Minister for the Environment, but the Council does have the opportunity to lodge a submission.

It was noted that the National Policy Statement applies to land owned by any person but does not apply to Department of Conservation land or coastal marine areas. The Senior Policy Planner recommended that a more community collaborative approach be employed suggesting that relationships with landowners be developed within the Hurunui District. The Senior Policy Planner added that the exclusion of Department of Conservation land is a fault of the National Policy Statement and Cr Little pointed out that Department of Conservation land is a matter of national legislation and not a matter for local government. Mayor Dalley noted that the Hurunui has significant DoC land e.g. the St James protected area, which cannot be used as a credit for the district. It was agreed that for Council to effectively manage their habitat the district should be considered as a whole and the Senior Policy Planner confirmed that this point had been made in the submission.

The Senior Policy Planner noted that in the General Comments it is stated that this Council is strongly of the view that the regulatory approach is not acceptable and Cr R Black agreed noting that he objects to the inference that the problem is declining. Cr R Little agreed noting that it is essential that the role the landowner plays is essential.

Mayor Dalley stated that it was undesirable to live in a totally regulated society noting that over the last six years the Council has been successful with a consultative approach.

The Senior Policy Planner noted that she would add the following text as a result of the Committee's comments:

“We are strongly of the view that the regulatory approach posed by the National Policy Statement will not result in the gains sought. The experience of the Hurunui District Council is that the regulatory approach through the District Plan process has resulted in loss of biodiversity”.

Mayor Dalley stated that the good will and the serious biodiversity gains that the Council has gained from a non regulatory approach should be included on the general comments and Cr R Black concurred stating that the non regulatory approach has lead to advances in the protection of biodiversity in the district.

Cr Davison posed the questions of how the Council's response could be co-ordinated with other councils and how that could proceed.

The Policy Planner stated that she is aware of the content of the Waimakariri, Kaikōura, Selwyn, and McKenzie submissions and they are all in a similar vein to the Hurunui's. The Senior Policy Planner added that the New Zealand Planning Institute's submission was also in the same vein.

Cr Malthus asked if there was any way in which a collective approach could be made. Mayor Dalley responded that he thought that there was support for mayors to collectively request a hearing. Mayor Dalley undertook to follow up on this possible collective approach.

THAT THE MAYOR MAKE AN APPROACH TO OTHER MAYORS IN RESPECT OF A COLLECTIVE VIEW POINT BEING EXPRESSED TO THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT ON WHAT IS PROPOSED IN THIS NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT IN REGARDS TO THE PROCESS OF THE NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT.

Malthus/Davison

CARRIED

Cr R Black referred to policy eight and requested that "private landowners" be substituted for "they".

Cr R Black requested that the words "their good will" be inserted in policy eight instead of "empathy".

Cr Malthus also clarified that Cr Little had made the point that there is good work being done by private landowners, and there is never any credit given to this. The Senior Policy Planner stated that she would incorporate these comments.

THAT THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE APPROVES THE COUNCIL SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY, WITH AGREED AMENDMENTS.

Malthus/R Black

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10.34am for morning tea and reconvened at 10.50am.

4.3 Reserve Management Plan Review

The Policy Planner provided a report advising that following a Workshop on 13 April 2011 Councillors provided clear direction in relation to the Districts Reserves and the scope of the Reserve Management Plan Review. This included refining the delegations to the Ward and Reserve Committees, making amendments to the individual Reserve Policies and developing a new formula for distributing Reserve Funding.

The Policy Planner stated that it is proposed that the delegations are presented to each ward committee highlighting the Reserves they are responsible for, and asking for comment on their areas of responsibility.

Cr Little asked if a more co-ordinated view of all the reserves should be considered and Cr Malthus observed that it is up to the communities as whether they wish to combine them or retain them as they are.

Cr Malthus advised on behalf of Cr Daly and the Cheviot Ward Committee that in respect to delegations that it would be preferable that the four domain committees report directly to the Council. The Manager Community and Corporate Services noted that this would come as a recommendation from the Ward Committee. Mayor Dalley agreed noting that the ward committees in consultation with the smaller committees will make the recommendations with regards to which committee the smaller committees are responsible to and reminded Council that there is a Councillor on all ward committees. Mayor Dalley advised that Council are looking for “a steer” from the committees on how they want to continue noting that some will want to amalgamate but he stated that he is opposed to this Council dictating to these communities.

Cr Malthus clarified that it would be the ward committees and the discussions that they have with smaller committees within that ward that make these recommendations to the Council.

The Manager Financial Services drew the attention of the members to the suggested conditions provided at the bottom of each delegation noting that these conditions will apply to reserve committees that operate their own bank accounts. He reported that the only committee who presently has their own bank account is Waiau Reserve and that all other committees have their financial reporting completed through the Council. The Manager Financial Services stated that the first two conditions should be maintained, but the other conditions relating to running the bank accounts are no longer applicable.

Mayor Dalley suggested that the first two conditions be moved into the delegations and the note “does not apply to this committee” be inserted above any unnecessary conditions. The Manager Finance confirmed that an amendment will be made to reflect this discussion. Cr Malthus noted that the delegations will come back to this Committee for final approval and the detail will be finalised at that time.

Mayor Dalley suggested that there is a need to clarify what the governance and/or management delegations mean as there are different levels of engagement for different committees and Council agreed.

The Policy Planner queried if the Strategy and Policy Committee wished to resume management of the plantation reserves and Cr Malthus confirmed that forestry is now under the governance of the Strategy and Policy Committee.

It was noted that the current reserve funding policy divides each of the reserves in the district into three categories and allocates funding accordingly; however under this suggested review the district/amenity reserves would be reclassified into either the district reserve or amenity reserve category.

Mayor Dalley stated that the community was consulted on grading of the three rates and suggested that if one is eliminated it will have an impact on finances. The Manager Financial Services clarified how capital works are funded and maintenance afforded. Cr Davison stated that a flow chart explaining this once everything had been decided on would be useful. Cr Malthus agreed with this idea.

Cr Malthus noted that if a reserve changes from an amenity reserve to a district reserve the management changes and Cr Harre noted that it may be the inclination of each reserve committee to maximise funding from the Council therefore reserve committees may elect to see themselves as district reserves and in doing so move the management to the Council. Mayor Dalley added that the reserve committees do have a choice in this and if they recommend that they become a district reserve they abdicate their right to manage their reserve. The Manager Financial Services stated that if the reserve committee would like their reserve developed and this is not supported by the Council then they should retain management of that reserve and stay as an amenity reserve.

Cr Harre advised that a lot of people have taken ownership of their reserves and will see this as Council taking over. He suggested that this decision is not in the best interest of the community.

The Manager Financial Services provided a financial report in relation to the Hanmer Springs Thermal Reserve noting that after all expenses are paid the balance of surplus available will be \$88,390 and assuming the budgets for the Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa are sound there is potential for a further \$88,000 to be allocated for reserve costs..

THAT THE THERMAL POOLS CONTESTABLE ALLOCATION FOR 2011/12 BE \$100,000.

Cooper/Harre

CARRIED

Mayor Dalley left the meeting at 12.11pm.

There was a discussion on the split of the contestable fund and the Manager Finance noted that the suggested split was based on history and the six rateable amenity areas. Cr Little stressed that he was not comfortable with the split of areas noting that effectively an additional ward had been created. Cr Cooper added that he agreed with the split.

Cr Malthus stated that he was going to suggest that the areas be called communities of interest and reminded the committee that there is a representation review in the 2012 and suggested that the committee continue with these communities of interest until the time of this review. Cr Little stated that he was happy with this.

Cr M Black stated that she supports the split as this would give the smaller communities the opportunity to complete some projects. Cr Harre noted his support for an equal split amongst the communities of interest.

Cr Cooper stated that the whole district has benefited from spending money on Hanmer Springs and argued that the same approach should be taken with Amberley which is the gateway town for the district. Cr Cooper stated that benefits would be felt around the district if some serious projects were completed in Amberley and therefore he did not support splitting the money evenly.

Cr Davison stated that he disagreed with Cr Cooper, adding that the contestable fund allows small communities to complete some local projects. Cr McKendry added that she did not agree with Cr Cooper's view point either.

THAT THE CONTESTABLE FUND OF \$100,000 BE EQUALLY DIVIDED AMONGST THE SIX COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST AS INDICATED HERE.

McKendry/R Black

CARRIED

(Cr Cooper against and Cr Little abstained.)

- A) THAT THE DELEGATIONS OF EACH WARD AND RESERVE COMMITTEE REFLECT THEIR RESPONSIBILITY TO PRIORITISE FUTURE CAPITAL DEVELOPMENTS AS PART OF THE LONG TERM PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS.

McKendry/Davison

CARRIED

- B) THAT THE PROPOSED DELEGATIONS ARE TAKEN TO THE RESPECTIVE WARD AND RESERVE COMMITTEES FOR COMMENT.

M Black/Harre

CARRIED

- C) THAT THE COUNCIL AGREE TO INVITE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEES AND RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATIONS TO BECOME SUB-COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL:

- BALMORAL RECREATION COMMITTEE
- CULVERDEN AREA COMMITTEE
- ROTHERHAM RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION
- MOTUNAU BEACH RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION
- WAIAU HALL COMMITTEE

Harre/Davison

CARRIED

The Chief Executive Officer added that when these committees meet they should understand that they are committees of Council and as such should publically advertise their meetings, the minutes should be taken and these minutes must be made available to the public.

- D) IF THESE COMMITTEES AGREE TO BECOME A SUB-COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL, THAT THEY ARE DELEGATED THE SAME POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AS OTHER RESERVE COMMITTEES IN RESPECT TO THE APPROPRIATE RESERVES THEY CURRENTLY MANAGE.

R Black/McKendry

CARRIED

- E) THAT THE INDIVIDUAL RESERVE MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND COMMITTEE DELEGATIONS REFLECT A TWO-TIER MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE: GOVERNANCE (POLICY) AND MANAGEMENT (MAINTENANCE).

R Black/Harre

CARRIED

- F) THAT THE RESERVE FUNDING POLICY IS AMENDED TO EXCLUDE THE DISTRICT/AMENITY RESERVE CATEGORY AND ACCORDINGLY THAT THE FUNDING CATEGORY CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO EACH RESERVE IS REVIEWED. IT IS REVIEWED BY THE APPROPRIATE WARD AND RESERVE COMMITTEES.

Davison/M Black

CARRIED

- G) THAT THE RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN NO LONGER IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC FUTURE CAPITAL DEVELOPMENTS.

The Policy Planner noted that these capital expenditure projects would now be identified in the Long Term Plan.

Harre/R Black

CARRIED

THAT THE COUNCIL APPROVE THE CONSULTATION PROCEDURE OUTLAINED IN THE WORK PLAN IN APPENDIX B.

McKendry/Little

CARRIED

It was noted that some Reserve Committees do not meet until September and it was agreed that there is a need to accommodate this. Cr Little noted that there is no Ward committee in Glenmark therefore the groups in that area should be notified of the Amberley meeting. Cr R Black agreed to provide a list of the groups to the Policy Planner,

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.37pm and reconvened at 1.04pm.

5. CORPORATE MATTERS

5.1 Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations

The Manager Community and Corporate Services provided a report on the items discussed and conclusions of the first meeting of the Long Term Plan Steering Group.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services reviewed the recommendations of the report directing the members' attention to the five recommended outcomes and definitions and stressing that these had been very well considered.

The Hurunui Waiau Water Zone Committee entered the meeting. Cr Malthus directed the meeting to this section of the agenda. When this presentation concluded the Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations agenda item was continued.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services reported that the group recommended that the name remains the same, the Hurunui Long Term Plan. Cr R Black suggested that this changed to the Hurunui Community Long Term Plan (HCLTP). This was agreed.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services advised that the steering group had decided that a competition would be held amongst all the children of the Hurunui to design the cover and Cr Harre stated that the children represent the future and that he felt this idea is very appropriate.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services advised that it was decided to retain the ward sections in the Plan but due to a change in the Local Government Act there is a requirement to identify groups of activities under infrastructure for example, roading and drainage.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services also noted that the group recommended that the number of appendices be reduced and because this plan will still be current when the next triennial elections are held there would be a reduction in the naming of all positions for example Environment Canterbury Commissioners and the ward chairs. The Manager Community and Corporate Services also noted that many plans, strategies and policies feed into the Long Term Plan but they do not have to be included in this document.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services noted that at the next meeting there will be a review of the significance policy, the road seal extension policy, the groups of council activities and the ward sections.

THAT THE COMMITTEE ADOPTS THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LONG TERM PLAN STEERING GROUP FOR INCLUSION INTO THE DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2012 – 22 AS FOLLOWS:

1. Vision Statement: *Community partnership in growth and wellbeing*
2. Core Principles: *Focus on core services, Financial responsibility and affordability, Continuous improvement in service to everyone in our district & Facilitate appropriate growth in the district*
3. Outcomes: *A desirable and safe place to live, A place where our traditional rural values and heritage make Hurunui unique, A place with a thriving local economy, A place that demonstrates environmental responsibility, & A place with essential infrastructure*
4. The name of the next LTP is the "Hurunui Community Long Term Plan 2012 – 2022".
5. The Council invites local schools in the Hurunui district to design the cover of the LTP through a competition.
6. The Committee endorses the Steering Group's directions regarding sections of the LTP and that the Committee will adopt draft sections of the LTP at a later date as they are been reviewed and revised by the Steering Group.

Cooper/Harre

CARRIED

5.2 Quarterly Report

The Manager Financial Services presented the quarterly report to 31 March 2011.

It was noted that the overall operating revenue sits at \$27.3 million, which is \$116,161 higher than budget. The key variance is in Utilities where NZTA funding is up on budget due to additional subsidies received for reinstatement work carried out in July and August.

The financial summary for Public Toilets (page 15). The Manager Financial Services reported that the operational costs are in line with budget noting that that there was \$100,000 set aside for the Culverden public toilets from the previous year.

The financial summary for District Parks and Reserves (page 19). The Manager Financial Services noted that the key variance in this activity is in direct expenditure where a budget of approximately \$300,000 has not been used. The financial summary for Environment and Safety (page 22). The Manager Financial Services reported that income has been consistently down on budget noting that the Mount Cass-Mainpower Appeal costs, and costs resulting from the Ashworths fire have resulted in higher than budgeted operating expenditure. The Manager Financial Services noted that the invoices relating to the Ashworths fire were received in March 2011, however a significant amount of this has been claimed back through National Rural Fire Authority and the Council is hopeful of receiving a credit for these expenses. Cr R Black also noted that the income from the sale of the wood has not been received as yet; the Manager Financial Services confirmed that to be correct.

The financial report for Resource Management and Planning (page 26). The Manager Financial Services noted that the income is below budget for consents and sub-division inspection fees and expenses are over budget for costs relating to the Mount Cass-Mainpower Appeal.

The financial summary for Civil Defence (page 28). The Manager Financial Services noted that the budget for the generators and the radio repeater on Mount Lyford is still to be used.

The financial summary for Rural Fire (page 30). The Manager Financial Services noted that a large budget for training has not been utilised, resulting in lower than budgeted employment costs. The Manager Finance stated that expenses of approximately \$260,000 have been incurred due to the Ashworths Fire; however these expenses are expected to be credited through the National Rural Fire Authority.

The financial summary for Building Compliance (page 33). The Manager Financial Services reported that this activity is down on income for the year to date, however March saw increased compliance activity. The Manager Financial Services added employment costs are down as there is one less full time staff member due to the low level of compliance activity.

The financial summary for Growth and Development (page 39). The Manager Financial Services noted that income levels are down because retail income from the Visitor Information Centre is lower than expected.

The financial summary for Tourism (page 41). The Manager Financial Services noted that an extra \$14,000 has been received in rates and extra funding was received for the visitor guide in March. The Manager Financial Services also noted that there has been work done on the visitor information boards and the budget of \$20,000 for this project has been exceeded.

The financial summary for the Visitor Information Centre (page 43). The Manager Financial Services reported that retail income is down on budget which has resulted in a deficit of approximately \$47,000 as opposed to a budgeted deficit of approximately \$600.

The financial summary for Utility Services and Infrastructure (page 46). The Manager Financial Services noted that this activity represented approximately half of the expenditure for the district.

Cr Little stated that the performance indicators show that the Hurunui performs well and there should be recognition given to those that are responsible for this.

Cr Little noted the high number of unsealed roads in the district and the Manager Roding and Utilities concurred with Cr Little comments noting that 53% of the roads are sealed and there is an expectancy that there should be an improvement over and above this level. The Manager Roding and Utilities stated that in terms of budget allocations the Waimakariri District has 900 kilometres of sealed roads and 600 kilometres of unsealed roads compared with the opposite numbers in the Hurunui district however Hurunui District Council has 70% of the Waimakariri District Council budget. The Manager Financial Services drew the Committee's attention to page 56 of the quarterly report and highlighted that income and operating expenses have both exceeded budget. He added that the higher than expected expenses are due in part to emergency repairs and that approximately \$280,000 was spent sealing Woodbank Road. The Manager Roding and Utilities noted that the balance between expenditure on new works as opposed to maintenance was not aligned and signalled that there was no longevity to continuing with expenditure on new works and limited expenditure on maintenance.

The financial summary for Waste Management (page 58). The Solid Waste Manager advised of an in schools programme to educate children on solid waste minimisation and that the response has been pleasing.

The Solid Waste Manager suggested that a waste plan targeted specialist be employed to work on education for two days a week.

Mayor Dalley left the meeting at 3.05pm.

The meeting adjourned at 3.05pm for afternoon tea and reconvened at 3.15pm.

Mr Martin Witt from the New Zealand Cancer Society presented to the Committee after afternoon tea the Quarterly Report review was continued after this presentation.

Quarterly Report Continued

The financial summary for Sewerage (page 64). The Manager Financial Services noted that income was over budget and key expense variances are the result of capital works in Amberley and Hanmer. Drainage issues and costs were discussed and as a result Cr Malthus requested a specific agenda item for the next meeting and a report detailing what the storm water costs are, what has been spent to date, and further details on the outfall drain. Cr Malthus stated that further detail is required so the Committee has an improved understanding of the situation.

The financial summary for Water Supplies (page 78). The Manager Financial Services noted that development contributions are down and employment costs are up a little. The Manager Roding and Utilities referred the committee to the top of page 67 noting that although there is a performance measure requiring major water faults to be rectified within twenty four hours he explained that it can take up to three days to find a fault.

The Manager Roding and Utilities noted that the Council is working on securing an alternative long term water supply for Amberley noting that water security is the biggest issue for Amberley. Manager Roding and Utilities cautioned that a notice has been issued to a land owner on Amberley Beach Road requesting that that landowner remove trees on the advice of an arborist. The Manager Roding and Utilities added that the landowner has provided a counter arborist report which makes the claim that the trees are safe and has indicated that he will not remove the trees. The Manager Roding and Utilities advised that this situation may result in court action which will incur costs.

The financial summary for the Hamner Springs Thermal Reserve Pools and Spa (page 79). The Manager Finance noted that profit for March was \$91,000 up on budget, which will assist with offsetting the deficit prior to Christmas.

The financial summary for Governance (page 84). The Manager Finance reported that this account is owed \$28, 000 from Environment Canterbury to cover costs associated with the Hurunui Waiau Water Zone Committee.

The financial summary of Commercial Activities (page 85). The Manager Finance noted that two commercial activities are forestry and treasury. The Manager Finance stated trees had been milled in the burnt areas and approximately \$150,000 in income had been received. The Manager Finance noted that there is a meeting planned with Mayor Dalley, Cr R Black a forestry expert and himself to assess the situation.

THAT THE QUARTERLY REPORT FOR THE NINE MONTHS TO MARCH 2011 BE RECEIVED.

McKendry/Cooper

CARRIED

5.3 Rate Arrears Report – 30 April 2011

The Manager Financial Services provided the Rate Arrears Report for the Hurunui District Council as at 30 April 2011. The Manager Finance noted that in summary the outstanding rates are approximately \$3.8 million. The Manager Finance added that of this total amount approximately \$3.6 million of this is current and not due for payment until 20 May 2011.

THAT THE REPORT BE RECEIVED.

Harre/M Black

CARRIED

6. ENGINEERING

6.1 General Condition Of Pensioner Units And Residential Housing; Present Occupancy And Future Demand

The Manager Amenities & Special Projects advised that the waiting list for Council owned accommodation had grown considerably since the Canterbury Earthquakes.

The Manger Amenities and Special Projects advised that the budget for double glazing in the pensioner units was \$51,000, however the lowest tender was returned at \$127,000 and therefore he recommends that this project be rolled over to next year when a more competitive price may be negotiated.

Cr R Black stated that he was satisfied with the quality and management of the accommodation units. Cr Harre added that the detail in the report was very good.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

M Black/Harre

CARRIED

6.2 Government Policy Statement on the Land Transport Programme Funding

The Manager Roding and Utilities presented this report and explained that the Ministry of Transport has requested feedback on the direction of the Government Policy Statement (GPS) on the Land Transport Programme Funding 2012/13 – 2021/22. The Manager Roding and Utilities explained the Ministry had issued an “Engagement Document” that indicted the direction of the GPS. Manager Roding and Utilities added that feedback on the Engagement Document was due 27 May 2011.

The Manager Roding and Utilities tabled the submission to the Ministry of Transport from Local Government New Zealand. The Manager Roding and Utilities stated that he would review this submission with the committee by highlighting the points of importance. The submission was then reviewed.

The Manager Roding and Utilities highlighted paragraph nine stating that Local Government New Zealand is not opposed to the three priority themes of the GPS 2012, but is opposed to the implementation path. He also noted that Local Government New Zealand was opposed to the proposed funding allocations.

Cr R Black noted the comment that if the economic significance of roading be the main criteria for funding then the rural roads should be considered a priority alongside the stated state highways. He argued that the rural roads are economically significant in transporting produce to the cities and for export. The Manager Roading and Utilities agreed stating that the criteria were too limited and loaded specifically and intentionally.

The Manager Roading and Utilities pointed out in paragraph 35 that the Ministry of Transport argue that by undertaking work on state highways more employment will be created however he suggested that it does not matter where you build the roads employment will still be generated. Cr R Black agreed.

The Manager Roading and Utilities highlighted paragraph 47 that stated that the current backlog of state highway improvements would take ten to fifteen years to complete stating that this point was hugely significant because not only would this Council receive insufficient funds for three years but for the next ten to fifteen years.

The Manager Roading and Utilities highlighted paragraph 71 as very important and quoted,

“As the local road network is substantially longer than the state highway network the current level of subsidy sees State highways receive \$142,509 per / km compared to the \$7573 per / km for local roads.”

The Manager Roading and Utilities stated that this is eighteen times the investment into state highways compared to local roads.

Cr Malthus asked if Mayor Dalley and the Manager Roading and Utilities had contributed to writing this submission. The Manager Roading and Utilities concurred that they had stressing that the funding and prioritisation is focused on the state highway network to the detriment of local roads. There was a general agreement that Councillors were satisfied with this submission.

Cr Malthus thanked the Manager Roading and Utilities for his report. The committee agreed to support the submission from New Zealand Local Government.

THAT WE STRONGLY SUPPORT THE SUBMISSION BY NEW ZEALAND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN TERMS OF THE ROADING POLICY STATEMENT.

Harre/Cooper

CARRIED

7. DISCUSSION WITH THE HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON THE DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME

David Eder, the chair of the Hurunui Waiau Water Zone Committee, and other committee members were introduced by Mayor Dalley.

D Eder reported that the Hurunui Waiau Water Zone Committee has met approximately 40 times in the last eighteen months since the launch in July 2010. He reported that there has been a huge work load for the committee who have listened to many diverse views. D Eder reported that the draft Zone Implementation Programme (ZIP) has now been completed and that there would be a series of community meetings held over the next three weeks. It is hoped that the ZIP will be finalised at the 27 June 2011 meeting. He reported that the committee would then make recommendations to the Hurunui District Council and Environment Canterbury.

D Eder stated that the two main challenges are water quality and water storage adding that he is also aware that there is \$400,000 to be made available from the biodiversity project over the next four years.

D Eder noted that water quality is important and added that the highest nutrient rate comes from intensive land use and in particular dairying and land users need to be on board in order to reduce this.

Cr Davison stated that there is approximately \$400 million allowed for by the government and there is an interpretation through the media by the community that this is free money. Cr Davison asked for comment on this. D Eder responded stating that there had been more seed money made available which will be useful when assessing the two Waitohi options. D Eder was of the opinion that the developers would not be able to support a feasibility study by themselves, and noted that such a study would take two to three years to complete at a cost of approximately ten million dollars. In order to complete the project a public/ private partnership may have to be made if there is a funding shortfall. D Eder stated that the Hurunui Waiau Water Zone project should stand on its own feet without the need for public money noting that it is also the committee's wish that the result is not environmentally challenging.

The Waitohi and Isolation Hill projects were discussed. D Eder stated that there were no environmental concerns with the Waitohi option and this would assist at the consenting stage however five farms would be lost. D Eder noted that there was also a Hurunui Water Programme which has been largely discounted until recently because it floods homes and this is counter to what the Zone committee had set out to achieve. D Eder reported that the three projects would all cost approximately the same amount of money.

Cr Malthus asked how the committee knows that it has all the information to make a decision and D Eder responded stating a consultant will make that decision not the Zone Committee. D Eder noted that once a consensus is agreed upon on one proposal then a feasibility study can commence.

Mayor Dalley noted that the final draft will then be presented to the Hurunui District Council for support and that when Council adds its support it would need to be convinced that the plan would carry the district into the future. Mayor Dalley stated that it was important to reflect on the fact that the Council has a huge input into this and ultimately the Council and or Environment Canterbury can reject the plan.

Cr Davison thanked the Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee for their work. Cr Malthus thanked the Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee for coming in and speaking to the committee.

The Hurunui Waiau Water Zone Committee representatives left at 2.03pm.

8. PRESENTATION ON SMOKEFREE OUTDOOR AREAS

Presentation by Martin Witt the Health Promotion Manager from the Cancer Society of New Zealand and Gail McLaughlin team leader for Community Public Health.

Mr Witt reported that the Maori Select Committee held an enquiry into tobacco in 2010 which led to an endorsement by the Government in 2011 for a 2025 Smokefree New Zealand. Mr Witt stated that this does not mean a ban or prohibition, but implementing measures to reduce the uptake of smoking, assist those that wish to quit and create an environment where smoking is less and less visible.

Mr Witt stated that Smokefree parks and playgrounds are about role modelling, and smoking becoming less and less visible. He advised that evidence confirmed that reduced visibility does result in lower numbers of children taking up smoking and that approximately fifty percent of councils around New Zealand have adopted a Smokefree policy of which Christchurch is the largest.

Mr Witt addressed the question of how a Smokefree policy may be adopted throughout the Hurunui stating that is not about signage but about acceptance and promoting the policy within the community however he added that the Council may wish to consider the major areas that signage may be appropriate.

Mr Witt advised that the Cancer Society is very keen to support the Hurunui District Council implement a Smokefree policy and would be happy to assist with this process with support and three thousand dollars from the District Health Board.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services noted that the Hurunui playgrounds are not Smokefree and Cr M Black added her support to a Smokefree Hurunui and thought that Smokefree signage had merit. Cr Harre suggested that opinions of the two council officers that smoke be sought.

Cr Malthus suggested that the staff bring back some suggestions based on the presentation from the Cancer Society and Mr Witt stated that he would be happy to talk to the staff and come back with some suggestions. Cr Malthus thanked Mr Witt for the presentation.

9. URGENT BUSINESS

9.1 Wasp Control

The Manager Community and Corporate Services reminded the meeting that that the question had been raised as to whether there was funding available through Environment Canterbury for wasp control and advised that there is funding for areas of high ecological value and this district does not meet this criteria.

The meeting closed at 4.51pm.

Confirmed: _____ Date: _____

MEETING

HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL

16 June 2011

Strategy and Policy Committee Action Sheet

| No. | Date | Matters to be actioned | Item No. Recorded in Minutes | Action By | Action |
|-----|-----------|---|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 17-Mar-11 | Manager Roding & Utilities to investigate Cr Daly's concern about KiwiRail not spraying weeds on railway corridors. Letter to be sent to regulatory authority on behalf of the Strategy & Policy Committee. | Urgent Business | MRU | Letter sent and copy provided to Councillors. Response received and circulated. |

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

| Meeting Date | Report/Other | Responsibility |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | |
| 14 July | Financial Report | MFS |
| | Roading Update | MRU |
| | Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations | MCCS |
| | Youth Programme Update | MCCS |
| | Resident Satisfaction Survey Results | |
| | | |
| 11 August | Quarterly Report | MFS/MCCS |
| | Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations | MCCS |
| | Queen Mary Hospital Historic Reserve – Approval to Prepare a Plan Change | MES |
| | Community Development Update | MCCS |
| | Liquor Ban Review | MES |
| | | |
| 15 September | Financial Report | MFS |
| | Utilities Update | MRU |
| | Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations | MCCS |
| | | |
| 13 October | Financial Report | MFS |
| | Roading Update | MRU |
| | Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations | MCCS |
| | | |
| 10 November | Quarterly Report | MFS/MCCS |
| | Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations | MCCS |
| | | |
| 1 December | Financial Report | MFS |
| | Roading & Utilities Update | MRU |
| | Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations | MCCS |
| | Youth Programme Update | MES |

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 Rooding & Utilities

CS – Council Secretary

SWM – Solid Waste Manager



HURUNUI

District Council

Meeting Date:

16 June 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy & Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Financial Report to 30 April 2011

REPORT BY: Manager Financial Services

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Beck', is positioned above the printed name.

Signature: Author
Jason Beck

Summary Report

Attached is the Financial Report for the Hurunui District Council for the ten months ended 30 April 2011.

The report is split into the key activities and then further broken down to the sub-activities.

| |
|--|
| Report |
| Overall Financial Report |
| Activity Summary – Community Services & Facilities |
| • Library |
| • Township Facilities (including Medical Centres) |
| • Property |
| • Public Toilets |
| • Cemeteries |
| • District Reserves |
| • Grants and Services Awards. |
| Activity Summary – Growth & Development |
| • Tourism |
| • Visitor Information Centre |
| • Economic Development |
| Activity Summary – Environment & Safety |
| • Resource Management & Planning |
| • Civil Defence |
| • Rural Fire |
| • Building Compliance |

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Health & Liquor Licensing |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal Control |
| Activity Summary - Utility Services & Infrastructure: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roothing |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste Minimisation |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater/Drainage/Land Protection |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Supplies |
| Activity Summary - Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanmer Springs Thermal Reserve |
| Activity Summary - Governance |
| Activity Summary - Commercial Activities |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treasury |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry |
| Activity Summary - Corporate Services |

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 | | April 2011 | April 2011 | April 2011 | April 2011 | Year to Date | Year to Date | Year to Date | Full Year |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| April 2011 | | Actual | Budget | Variance | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget | Budget |
| Hurunui District Council (Overall) | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 1,032,137 | 1,019,397 | 12,740 | 10,307,309 | 10,193,970 | 113,339 | 12,232,684 | 12,232,684 | |
| Other Income | 1,609,757 | 1,282,688 | 327,069 | 12,964,555 | 12,331,395 | 633,160 | 14,592,012 | 14,592,012 | |
| Internal Interest Received | 202,552 | 213,883 | (11,331) | 1,977,905 | 2,138,830 | (160,925) | 2,566,575 | 2,566,575 | |
| Development Contributions | 2,948 | 66,899 | (63,951) | 464,144 | 668,990 | (204,846) | 1,404,727 | 1,404,727 | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 376,531 | 378,533 | (2) | 3,785,288 | 3,785,330 | (42) | 4,542,390 | 4,542,390 | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 3,225,925 | 2,961,400 | 264,525 | 29,499,201 | 29,118,515 | 380,686 | 35,338,388 | 35,338,388 | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 667,549 | 668,564 | (1,015) | 6,541,006 | 6,481,843 | 59,163 | 7,926,656 | 7,926,656 | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 1,334,029 | 1,092,084 | 241,945 | 12,185,397 | 11,554,141 | 631,256 | 13,774,419 | 13,774,419 | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 198,557 | 215,461 | (16,904) | 1,973,907 | 2,136,571 | (162,664) | 2,562,974 | 2,562,974 | |
| Council Overheads (Expense) | 378,433 | 377,531 | 902 | 3,785,204 | 3,785,332 | (128) | 4,542,396 | 4,542,396 | |
| Depreciation | 475,643 | 488,079 | (12,436) | 4,594,111 | 4,697,950 | (103,439) | 5,677,287 | 5,677,287 | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 3,054,211 | 2,841,719 | 212,492 | 29,079,625 | 28,655,437 | 424,188 | 34,483,732 | 34,483,732 | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 171,714 | 119,681 | 52,033 | \$419,576 | \$463,078 | (\$43,502) | \$854,656 | \$854,656 | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | |
| Community Services & Facilities | 245,410 | 212,464 | 32,946 | 4,114,129 | 4,194,853 | (80,724) | 4,335,719 | 4,335,719 | |
| Growth & Development | 0 | 1,667 | (1,667) | 44,224 | 16,670 | 27,554 | 35,405 | 35,405 | |
| Environment & Safety | 0 | 1,455 | (1,455) | 48,873 | 137,925 | (89,052) | 140,834 | 140,834 | |
| Utility Services & Infrastructure | 202,806 | 419,430 | (216,624) | 4,768,011 | 6,899,721 | (2,131,710) | 10,213,277 | 10,213,277 | |
| Hammer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa | 27,940 | 292,167 | (264,227) | 6,519,935 | 5,436,937 | 1,082,998 | 6,021,271 | 6,021,271 | |
| Governance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,168 | 0 | 28,168 | 0 | 0 | |
| Commercial Activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Corporate Services | 5,351 | 2,568 | 2,783 | 343,155 | 393,593 | (50,438) | 407,515 | 407,515 | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 481,507 | 929,751 | (448,244) | \$15,866,495 | \$17,095,104 | (\$1,228,609) | \$21,154,021 | \$21,154,021 | |

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Notes | | Full Year | |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|--|--------------------|--------|
| | | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | | | Budget | Budget |
| Community Services & Facilities (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 131,574 | 128,927 | 2,647 | | | 1,313,289 | 1,289,270 | 24,019 | 6 | | | 1,547,095 | |
| Other Income | 227,574 | 205,327 | 22,247 | 1 | | 2,204,810 | 2,084,204 | 120,606 | 7 | | | 2,485,780 | |
| Internal Interest Received | (814) | 7,719 | (8,533) | | | 53,140 | 77,190 | (24,050) | 8 | | | 92,620 | |
| Development Contributions | 2,948 | 26,089 | (23,141) | 2 | | 149,998 | 260,890 | (110,892) | 9 | | | 313,064 | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 4,320 | 4,328 | (8) | (8) | | 43,198 | 43,280 | (82) | | | | 51,938 | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 365,602 | 372,390 | (6,788) | | | 3,764,435 | 3,754,834 | 9,601 | | | | 4,490,497 | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 41,825 | 51,660 | (9,835) | | | 498,682 | 538,235 | (39,553) | 10 | | | 658,513 | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 201,167 | 140,045 | 61,122 | 3 | | 1,548,369 | 1,670,671 | (122,302) | 11 | | | 1,963,001 | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 9,745 | 22,727 | (12,982) | 4 | | 88,701 | 217,270 | (128,569) | 8 | | | 260,700 | |
| Council Overheads | 66,720 | 65,717 | 1,003 | | | 667,208 | 667,200 | 8 | | | | 800,639 | |
| Depreciation | 27,131 | 24,978 | 2,153 | | | 298,872 | 275,340 | 23,532 | | | | 333,795 | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 346,588 | 305,127 | 41,461 | | | 3,101,832 | 3,368,716 | (266,884) | | | | 4,016,648 | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 19,014 | 67,263 | (48,249) | | | \$662,603 | \$386,118 | \$276,485 | | | | \$473,849 | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library | 5,564 | 5,092 | 472 | | | 51,913 | 56,042 | (4,129) | | | | 66,229 | |
| Township Facilities | 241,733 | 207,372 | 34,361 | 5 | | 3,433,718 | 3,543,932 | (110,214) | 12 | | | 3,566,423 | |
| Property | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 51,350 | (51,350) | 13 | | | 51,350 | |
| Public Toilets | (9,666) | 0 | (9,666) | | | 108,710 | 100,000 | 8,710 | 14 | | | 100,000 | |
| Cemeteries | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4,712 | 5,135 | (423) | | | | 5,135 | |
| District Reserves | 7,779 | 0 | 7,779 | | | 515,076 | 438,394 | 76,682 | 15 | | | 546,582 | |
| Grants & Service Awards | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 245,410 | 212,464 | 32,946 | | | \$4,114,129 | \$4,194,853 | (\$80,724) | | | | \$4,335,719 | |

Notes - April 2011:

- Other income is up on budget due to the receipt of donations from the Kate Valley Trust for the Glenmark Ward.
- A very low amount of Development Contributions were received in April.
- Some work funded from the Contestable Funds were paid for in April, whereas the budget predicted the expenditure to be earlier in the year.
- Interest Paid for Amenities and the Annun Medical Centre differs from budget due to the timing of the Capital Works.
- Capital Expenditure, particularly for Culverden and Hamner Springs Township, did not progress in April as budgeted. This is offset by the progress payments paid in April for the Rotherham Medical Centre.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Overall, the rates for Community Services are greater than was budgeted for. This is due to the fact that Targeted Rates (which meet the costs of Amenities and Medical Centres) were not growth adjusted when they were set in July.
- The key variance is the \$44,000 received for the sale of a section in Hamner Springs and rental received for the Car Park in Hamner Springs.
- Internal interest received and paid differs from budget due to the timing of the key capital work.
- 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 ten months. In addition, the amount carried forward from the 2009/10 year for the Contestable Funds have yet to be spent.
- Capital Expenditure on Townships and Amenity Reserves are down on budget for the first ten months of the year.
- The budgeted installation of Double Glazing on some Pensioner Housing Units did not occur in February
- The costs to complete the work on the Culverden Toilets were higher than budgeted for.
- The level of capital work for the Queen Mary Buildings is up on budget for the year to date due to bringing forward the replacement of the Nurses Hostel roof.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 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 | 2,966 | 2,481 | 485 | | 29,273 | 24,810 | 4,463 | | 29,775 | 29,775 | | |
| Other Income | 69,777 | 72,771 | (2,994) | | 673,926 | 667,707 | 6,219 | | 801,249 | 801,249 | | |
| Internal Interest Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | |
| Development Contributions | 991 | 3,615 | (2,624) | | 22,344 | 36,150 | (13,806) | 1 | 43,374 | 43,374 | | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 73,734 | 78,867 | (5,133) | | 725,543 | 728,667 | (3,124) | | 874,398 | 874,398 | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 26,328 | 25,974 | 354 | | 267,491 | 259,740 | 7,751 | | 324,520 | 324,520 | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 11,161 | 8,992 | 2,169 | | 88,372 | 108,201 | (19,829) | 2 | 140,543 | 140,543 | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 1,556 | 2,795 | (1,239) | | 16,578 | 17,950 | (1,372) | | 21,537 | 21,537 | | |
| Council Overheads | 22,437 | 22,436 | 1 | | 224,363 | 224,360 | 3 | | 289,233 | 289,233 | | |
| Depreciation | 8,549 | 8,889 | (340) | | 85,478 | 88,890 | (3,412) | | 106,665 | 106,665 | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 70,031 | 69,086 | 945 | | 682,282 | 695,141 | (16,859) | | 862,498 | 862,498 | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 3,703 | 9,781 | (6,078) | | \$43,261 | \$29,526 | \$13,735 | | \$11,900 | \$11,900 | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library | 5,564 | 5,092 | 472 | | 51,913 | 56,042 | (4,129) | | 66,229 | 66,229 | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 5,564 | 5,092 | 472 | | \$51,913 | \$56,042 | (4,129) | | \$66,229 | \$66,229 | | |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- The level of Development Contributions received is lower than was budgeted for.
- Direct expenditure is lower than budget for the year to date due to the level of telecommunications being lower than budget. The savings will be used to assist in funding the new software system in the 2011/2012 year.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Township Facilities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 116,687 | 116,418 | 2,269 | | | 1,183,299 | 1,164,180 | 19,119 | 7 | 1,397,003 |
| Other Income | 34,826 | 12,465 | 22,361 | | 1 | 242,293 | 186,130 | 56,163 | 8 | 211,023 |
| Internal Interest Received | (9,672) | 2,622 | (12,294) | | 2 | (18,084) | 26,220 | (44,304) | 9 | 31,459 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 15,343 | (15,343) | | 3 | 90,510 | 153,430 | (62,920) | 10 | 184,115 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 143,841 | 146,848 | (3,007) | | | 1,498,018 | 1,529,960 | (31,942) | | 1,823,600 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 10,111 | 15,622 | (5,511) | | | 159,314 | 177,855 | (18,541) | 11 | 208,195 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 71,736 | 60,009 | 11,727 | | | 732,143 | 704,288 | 27,855 | 12 | 813,585 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 8,189 | 19,932 | (11,743) | | 4 | 72,123 | 199,320 | (127,197) | 13 | 239,163 |
| Council Overheads | 10,835 | 10,831 | 4 | | | 108,353 | 108,340 | 13 | | 130,008 |
| Depreciation | 11,478 | 9,312 | 2,166 | | | 114,422 | 94,920 | 19,502 | 14 | 114,117 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 112,349 | 115,706 | (3,357) | | | 1,186,355 | 1,284,723 | (98,368) | | 1,505,068 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 31,492 | 31,142 | 350 | | | \$311,663 | \$245,237 | \$66,426 | | \$318,532 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Amenities | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Townships | 6,998 | 41,192 | (34,194) | | 5 | 2,260,928 | 2,413,310 | (152,382) | 15 | 2,435,457 |
| Local Reserves | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Swimming Pools | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Halls | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 117,947 | 98,637 | 19,310 | 16 | 98,637 |
| Amenity Reserves | 465 | 6,180 | (5,715) | | | 40,238 | 75,472 | (35,234) | 17 | 75,816 |
| Medical Centres | 234,270 | 160,000 | 74,270 | | 6 | 1,014,605 | 956,513 | 58,092 | 18 | 956,513 |
| Township Related Special Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 241,733 | 207,372 | 34,361 | | | \$3,433,718 | \$3,543,932 | (\$110,214) | | \$3,566,423 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 Other income is up on budget due to the receipt of donations from the Kate Valley Trust for the Glenmark Ward.
- 2 Interest Received for Amenities differs from budget due to the timing of the Capital Works.
- 3 No Development Contributions were received for Community Facilities in April.
- 4 Interest Paid for Amenities and the Amuri Medical Centre differs from budget due to the timing of the Capital Works.
- 5 Capital Expenditure, particularly in Culverden and Hamner Springs, did not progress in April as budgeted.
- 6 Progress payments were paid in April for the Rotherham Medical Centre.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 7 Amenities Rates are higher than budget due to a greater number of properties being rated for than was anticipated when the budgets were set.
- 8 Income is up on budget for the Scargill-Motunau Recreation Reserve and also donations received for the Glenmark, both for the Waipara Sculpture and from the Kate Valley Trust.
- 9 Interest Received for Amenities differs from budget due to the timing of the Capital Works.
- 10 Development Contributions, particularly in Amberley, are lower than was budgeted for.
- 11 Total wages allocated to Township Facilities are lower than was budgeted for.
- 12 Direct Expenditure includes the \$91,000 transferred to NZTA from the Waiatu Ferry Bridge Fund in March. This is offset by expenses being lower than budgeted in numerous other areas.
- 13 Interest Paid for Amenities and the Amuri Medical Centre differs from budget due to the timing of the Capital Works.
- 14 The level of depreciation expense is higher than was budgeted for, however as the depreciation is non funded by rates, it has not effect on cashflow.
- 15 Capital Expenditure for townships, especially the Amuri Townships and Cheviot, has not been incurred to date.
- 16 Some Strengthening work was required on the Amberley Domain Pavilion which was not budgeted for.
- 17 Capital Expenditure budgeted in February and March Hamner Reserves did not occur.
- 18 The total cost of the Medical Centre in Rotherham is up on the annual budget due to the decision of Council to allow the sales proceeds from the existing medical centre to be used for capital.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|--------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Budget | Variance | Budget | Budget |
| Property | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 1,092 | 1,119 | (27) | | 11,284 | 11,190 | 94 | | 13,423 | | 13,423 | |
| Other Income | 24,888 | 22,943 | 1,945 | | 307,832 | 229,430 | 78,402 | 2 | 275,319 | | 275,319 | |
| Internal Interest Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 4,320 | 4,328 | (8) | | 43,198 | 43,280 | (82) | | 51,938 | | 51,938 | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 30,300 | 28,390 | 1,910 | | 362,314 | 283,900 | 78,414 | | 340,680 | | 340,680 | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 3,103 | 1,396 | 1,707 | | 24,131 | 13,960 | 10,171 | | 17,449 | | 17,449 | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 26,494 | 15,254 | 11,240 | 1 | 162,331 | 173,731 | (11,400) | | 183,391 | | 183,391 | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Council Overheads | 4,538 | 3,539 | 999 | | 45,385 | 45,390 | (5) | | 54,464 | | 54,464 | |
| Depreciation | 4,556 | 4,475 | 81 | | 73,715 | 68,510 | 5,205 | | 85,388 | | 85,388 | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 38,691 | 24,664 | 14,027 | | 305,562 | 301,591 | 3,971 | | 340,692 | | 340,692 | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (8,391) | 3,726 | (12,117) | | \$56,752 | (\$17,691) | \$74,443 | | \$51,350 | | (\$12) | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pensioner Housing | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 51,350 | (51,350) | 3 | 51,350 | | 51,350 | |
| Residential Housing | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Other Property | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Depots | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | | \$0 | \$51,350 | (\$51,350) | | \$51,350 | | \$51,350 | |

Notes - April 2011:
 1 Some Contracting work was completed on the Pensioner Housing in April.

Notes - Year to Date:
 2 Rental for the Car Park in Hammer Springs was received in January.
 3 The budgeted Installation of Double Glazing on some Pensioner Housing Units has not occurred due to only one quote received for the work. The project will be carried forward into the 2011/2012 year.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|------------|-------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Public Toilets | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Income | 26,986 | 25,986 | 1,000 | | | 269,860 | 268,860 | 1,000 | | 323,831 | 323,831 | 0 | 323,831 |
| 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 | 26,986 | 25,986 | 1,000 | | | 269,860 | 268,860 | 1,000 | | 323,831 | 323,831 | 0 | 323,831 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 300 | 0 | 300 | | | 3,328 | 0 | 3,328 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 24,324 | 20,072 | 4,252 | | | 217,174 | 212,017 | 5,157 | | 252,159 | 252,159 | 0 | 252,159 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 3,687 | 3,687 | 0 | | | 36,875 | 36,870 | 5 | | 44,248 | 44,248 | 0 | 44,248 |
| Depreciation | 2,534 | 2,285 | 249 | | | 25,118 | 22,850 | 2,268 | | 27,425 | 27,425 | 0 | 27,425 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 30,845 | 26,044 | 4,801 | | | 282,495 | 271,737 | 10,758 | | 323,832 | 323,832 | 0 | 323,832 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (3,859) | (58) | (3,801) | | | (\$12,635) | (\$2,877) | (\$9,758) | | (\$1) | (\$1) | 0 | (\$1) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Toilets | (9,666) | 0 | (9,666) | | | 108,710 | 100,000 | 8,710 | 2 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | (9,666) | 0 | (9,666) | | | \$108,710 | \$100,000 | \$8,710 | | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | 0 | \$100,000 |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget in April.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 The costs to complete the work on the Culverden Toilets were higher than budgeted for.

| Financial Report | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cemeteries | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Income | 13,002 | 14,604 | (1,602) | 136,864 | 146,040 | (9,176) | 136,864 | 146,040 | (9,176) | 175,236 | 175,236 | 0 | 0 |
| Internal Interest Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 13,002 | 14,604 | (1,602) | 136,864 | 146,040 | (9,176) | 136,864 | 146,040 | (9,176) | 175,236 | 175,236 | 0 | 0 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 1,370 | 2,649 | (1,279) | 13,957 | 26,490 | (12,533) | 13,957 | 26,490 | (12,533) | 33,112 | 33,112 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 10,736 | 6,420 | 4,316 | 63,969 | 71,800 | (7,831) | 63,969 | 71,800 | (7,831) | 84,625 | 84,625 | 0 | 0 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 4,775 | 4,775 | 0 | 47,750 | 47,750 | 0 | 47,750 | 47,750 | 0 | 57,302 | 57,302 | 0 | 0 |
| Depreciation | 14 | 17 | (3) | 139 | 170 | (31) | 139 | 170 | (31) | 200 | 200 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 16,895 | 13,861 | 3,034 | 125,815 | 146,210 | (20,395) | 125,815 | 146,210 | (20,395) | 175,239 | 175,239 | 0 | 0 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (3,893) | 743 | (4,636) | \$11,049 | (\$170) | \$11,219 | \$11,049 | (\$170) | \$11,219 | (\$3) | (\$3) | 0 | 0 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cemeteries | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,712 | 5,135 | (423) | 4,712 | 5,135 | (423) | 5,135 | 5,135 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$4,712 | \$5,135 | (\$423) | \$4,712 | \$5,135 | (\$423) | \$5,135 | \$5,135 | 0 | 0 |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

1 Total wages allocated to Cemeteries are lower than was budgeted for.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| District Parks & Reserves | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Other Income | 58,095 | 56,558 | 1,537 | 553,254 | | 565,496 | 565,496 | (12,242) | 2 | 678,581 |
| Internal Interest Received | 8,858 | 5,097 | 3,761 | 71,224 | | 50,970 | 50,970 | 20,254 | 3 | 61,161 |
| Development Contributions | 1,957 | 7,131 | (5,174) | 37,144 | | 71,310 | 71,310 | (34,166) | 4 | 85,575 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 68,910 | 68,786 | 124 | 661,622 | | 687,776 | 687,776 | (26,154) | | 825,317 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 613 | 5,718 | (5,105) | 30,362 | | 57,180 | 57,180 | (26,818) | 5 | 71,475 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 40,312 | 11,418 | 28,894 | 198,387 | 1 | 305,800 | 305,800 | (107,413) | 6 | 378,624 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 19,040 | 19,040 | 0 | 190,399 | | 190,400 | 190,400 | (1) | | 228,482 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 59,965 | 36,176 | 23,789 | 419,148 | | 553,380 | 553,380 | (134,232) | | 678,581 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 8,945 | 32,610 | (23,665) | 242,474 | | 134,396 | 134,396 | 108,078 | | 146,736 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Reserves | 7,779 | 0 | 7,779 | 515,076 | | 438,394 | 438,394 | 76,682 | 7 | 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 | 7,779 | 0 | 7,779 | 515,076 | | 438,394 | 438,394 | 76,682 | | 546,582 |

Notes - April 2011:

1 Some work funded from the Contestable Funds were paid for in April, whereas the budget predicted the expenditure to be earlier in the year.

Notes - Year to Date:

- The budgeted amount for Rental Income has not been received.
- 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.
- Development Contributions for the upgrade of Queen Mary are down on budget for the year to date.
- Wages costs are lower than budgeted due to the staff costs being allocated elsewhere throughout the organisation.
- 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.
- The level of capital work for the Queen Mary Buildings is up on budget for the year to date due to bringing forward the replacement of the Nurses Hostel roof.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Grants & Services Awards | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 8,829 | 8,909 | (80) | | | 89,433 | 89,090 | 343 | | 106,894 |
| Other Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 20,781 | 20,541 | 240 | | 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 | 8,829 | 8,909 | (80) | | | 110,214 | 109,631 | 583 | | 127,435 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 0 | 301 | (301) | | | 99 | 3,010 | (2,911) | | 3,762 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 16,404 | 17,880 | (1,476) | | | 85,993 | 94,834 | (8,841) | | 110,074 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 1,408 | 1,409 | (1) | | | 14,083 | 14,090 | (7) | | 16,902 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 17,812 | 19,590 | (1,778) | | | 100,175 | 111,934 | (11,759) | | 130,738 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (8,983) | (10,681) | 1,698 | | | 10,039 | (2,303) | \$12,342 | | (3,303) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grants & Service Awards | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Hilary 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 - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for March.

Notes - Year to Date:

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

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|---|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Growth and Development (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 26,541 | 27,094 | (553) | | 285,263 | 270,940 | 14,323 | 2 | 325,127 | 900,805 | | |
| Internal Interest Received | 77,675 | 74,640 | 3,035 | | 594,769 | 746,400 | (151,631) | 3 | 900,805 | | | |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 104,216 | 101,734 | 2,482 | | 880,032 | 1,017,340 | (137,308) | | | 1,225,932 | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 29,866 | 24,193 | 5,673 | | 264,616 | 241,930 | 22,686 | | 291,765 | | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 37,845 | 62,770 | (24,925) | 1 | 557,302 | 696,151 | (138,849) | 4 | 837,094 | | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Council Overheads | 4,530 | 4,529 | 1 | | 45,296 | 45,290 | 6 | | 54,355 | | | |
| Depreciation | 803 | 3,559 | (2,756) | | 8,012 | 35,590 | (27,578) | | 42,717 | | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 73,044 | 95,051 | (22,007) | | 875,226 | 1,018,961 | (143,735) | | | 1,225,931 | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 31,172 | 6,683 | 24,489 | | \$4,806 | (\$1,627) | \$6,427 | | | | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tourism | 0 | 1,667 | (1,667) | | 44,224 | 16,670 | 27,554 | 5 | 20,000 | | | |
| Visitor Information Centre | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Economic Development | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 1,667 | (1,667) | | \$44,224 | \$16,670 | \$27,554 | | | 15,405 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | \$35,405 |

Notes - April 2011:

1 Retail at the Visitor Centre is still well down on budget and the level of purchases in April reflect that.

Notes - Year to Date:

2 The level of Targeted Rate for Tourism is ahead of what was budgeted for.

3 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 and funding for the Visitor Guide.

4 Costs for Tourism includes of the contribution to CCT for International Marketing was made early in the financial year. In addition there costs of the Spring/Summer Planner and the Visitor Guide that were not budgeted for but funded by third parties. This is offset by the retail purchases for the Visitor Centre being lower than budget.

5 The actual cost for information signs was spent is expected to be higher than what was budgeted for.

6 The budget for signage is still to be spent.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Tourism | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 21,644 | 22,083 | (439) | | 234,725 | 220,830 | 13,895 | 2 | | | | 265,000 |
| Internal Interest Received | 35,315 | 3,605 | 31,710 | 1 | 132,897 | 36,050 | 96,847 | 3 | | | | 43,260 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 56,959 | 25,688 | 31,271 | | 367,622 | 256,880 | 110,742 | | | | | 308,260 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 4,317 | 2,880 | 1,437 | | 36,147 | 28,800 | 7,347 | | | | | 36,000 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 15,668 | 21,522 | (5,854) | | 261,615 | 215,220 | 46,395 | 4 | | | | 258,260 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 833 | 833 | 0 | | 8,333 | 8,330 | 3 | | | | | 10,000 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 333 | (333) | | 0 | 3,330 | (3,330) | | | | | 4,000 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 20,818 | 25,568 | (4,750) | | 306,095 | 255,680 | 50,415 | | | | | 308,260 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 36,141 | 120 | 36,021 | | 61,527 | 1,200 | 60,327 | | | | | 0 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tourism | 0 | 1,667 | (1,667) | | 44,224 | 16,670 | 27,554 | 5 | | | | 20,000 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 1,667 | (1,667) | | 44,224 | 16,670 | 27,554 | | | | | 20,000 |

Notes - April 2011:

1 The contribution to the Visitor Guide from the Hammer Springs Business Association was received in April.

Notes - Year to Date:

2 The level of Targeted Rate for Tourism is ahead of what was budgeted for.

3 Income from the Visitor Guide was received in March and April as well as third party funding towards the Hammer Springs and Hurunui Planner. These income flows were no budgeted for.

4 Expenditure for the Visitor Guide was incurred in March.

5 Costs relating to the Visitor Information Board has exceeded budget.

| Financial Report | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|------------|--|----------------|-------|----------------|--|-----------|--|-------|--|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | |
| Visitor Information Centre | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | (2,648) | (2,709) | 61 | (28,713) | 1 | (27,330) | (248,560) | 3 | | (27,090) | (240) | (32,512) | | | | | |
| Internal Interest Received | 42,322 | 71,035 | | | | 461,790 | | | | 710,350 | | 852,410 | | | | | |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 39,674 | 68,326 | (28,652) | | | 434,460 | (248,800) | | | 683,260 | | 819,898 | | | | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 25,549 | 21,313 | 4,236 | (18,357) | 2 | 228,469 | 15,339 | | | 213,130 | | 255,765 | | | | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 21,971 | 40,328 | | | | 223,597 | (182,421) | 3 | | 406,018 | | 486,676 | | | | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Council Overheads | 3,485 | 3,485 | | | | 34,850 | | | | 34,850 | | 41,820 | | | | | |
| Depreciation | 731 | 2,969 | (2,238) | | | 7,321 | (22,369) | 4 | | 29,690 | | 35,636 | | | | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 51,736 | 68,095 | (16,359) | | | 494,237 | (189,451) | | | 683,688 | | 819,897 | | | | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (12,062) | 231 | (12,293) | | | (\$59,777) | (\$59,349) | | | (\$428) | | \$1 | | | | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Information Centre | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | \$0 | \$0 | | | \$0 | | \$0 | | | | | |

Notes - April 2011:

- Income from Retail sales are down on budget for April.
- Retail is still well down on budget and the level of purchases in April reflect that.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Retail Income and the purchases are down on budget for the year to date.
- The level of Depreciation budgeted for is too high compared to the actual.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|--|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| <u>Economic Development</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Operating Statement</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | 7,720 | (175) | | 77,868 | 77,200 | 668 | | 92,639 | | | |
| Other Income | | 38 | 0 | 38 | | 82 | 0 | 82 | | 5,135 | | | |
| 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 | | 7,583 | 7,720 | (137) | | 77,950 | 77,200 | 750 | | 97,774 | | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | | 206 | 920 | (714) | | 72,090 | 74,913 | (2,823) | | 92,158 | | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Council Overheads | | 212 | 211 | 1 | | 2,113 | 2,110 | 3 | | 2,535 | | | |
| Depreciation | | 72 | 257 | (185) | | 691 | 2,570 | (1,879) | | 3,081 | | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | | 490 | 1,388 | (898) | | 74,894 | 79,593 | (4,699) | | 97,774 | | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | | \$7,093 | \$6,332 | \$761 | | \$3,056 | (\$2,393) | \$5,449 | | \$0 | | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economic Development | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 15,405 | | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$15,405 | | | |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

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

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|---|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Environment and Safety (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 99,612 | 99,704 | (92) | | | 1,005,089 | 997,040 | 8,049 | | 1,196,448 |
| Internal Interest Received | 51,192 | 75,376 | (24,184) | 1 | 791,286 | 930,486 | (139,200) | 3 | | 1,097,250 |
| Development Contributions | (1,281) | 159 | (1,440) | | 3,181 | 1,590 | 1,591 | | | 1,906 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 149,523 | 175,239 | (25,716) | | 1,799,556 | 1,929,116 | (129,560) | | | 2,295,604 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 84,722 | 85,311 | (589) | | 826,097 | 886,287 | (60,190) | 4 | | 1,087,059 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 140,551 | 48,478 | 92,073 | 2 | 1,027,518 | 537,328 | 490,190 | 5 | | 642,076 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 511 | (511) | | | 875 |
| Council Overheads | 48,792 | 48,794 | (2) | | 487,921 | 487,940 | (19) | | | 585,526 |
| Depreciation | 8,769 | 6,885 | 1,884 | | 61,149 | 68,850 | (7,701) | | | 82,610 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 282,834 | 189,468 | 93,366 | | 2,402,685 | 1,980,916 | 421,769 | | | 2,398,146 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (133,311) | (14,229) | (119,082) | | (\$603,129) | (\$51,800) | (\$551,329) | | | (\$102,542) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resource Management & Planning | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 25,695 | (25,695) | 6 | | 25,695 |
| Civil Defence | 0 | 1,455 | (1,455) | | 0 | 44,285 | (44,285) | 7 | | 47,194 |
| Rural Fire | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 16,108 | 35,945 | (19,837) | 8 | | 35,945 |
| 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 | \$137,925 | (\$89,052) | | | \$140,834 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 Income from Consent Fees & Subdivision Inspections are still down on budget for April.
- 2 Expenditure is up on budget due to \$25,625 of further Mainpower Appeal costs incurred in April and a further \$69,837 in costs relating to the Ashworths Fire. These costs are expected to be reimbursed by the Rural Fire Fighting Fund.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 3 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.
- 4 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.
- 5 Direct Expenditure is over budget for the period due to costs for the Mt Cass-Mainpower Appeal. In addition, a total of \$333,607 has been spent to date on the Ashworths Fire.
- 6 A budget was provided for the replacement of the vehicle for the Consents Engineer has been deferred to the next financial year.
- 7 The Capital Expenditure budget for Civil Defence has yet to be utilised.

| Financial Report | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Notes | | Full Year | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|-----------------|--|------------------|--|--|
| | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Budget | | |
| Resource Management & Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 52,924 | 52,886 | 38 | 530,066 | 528,860 | 1,206 | 634,625 | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 10,449 | 29,662 | (19,213) | 224,850 | 312,620 | (87,770) | 387,956 | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 63,373 | 82,548 | (19,175) | 754,916 | 841,480 | (86,564) | 1,022,581 | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 37,283 | 39,883 | (2,600) | 409,250 | 398,830 | 10,420 | 498,124 | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 49,269 | 19,055 | 30,214 | 394,606 | 204,675 | 189,931 | 242,758 | | | | | | | | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Council Overheads | 22,590 | 22,589 | 1 | 225,891 | 225,890 | 1 | 271,073 | | | | | | | | | |
| Depreciation | 3,955 | 886 | 3,069 | 12,539 | 8,860 | 3,679 | 10,630 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 113,097 | 82,413 | 30,684 | 1,042,286 | 838,255 | 204,031 | 1,022,585 | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (\$49,724) | \$135 | (\$49,859) | (\$287,370) | \$3,225 | (\$290,595) | (\$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 - April 2011:

- 1 Income from Consent Fees & Subdivision Inspections are still down on budget for April.
- 2 A further \$25,625 was paid in Legal and Consultants Fees for the Mainpower Appeal in April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 4 Income from Consent Fees and Subdivision Inspections significantly lower than budget for the year to date.
- 5 Direct Expenditure is over budget for the period due to the costs attributable to the Mainpower Appeal and Plan Change 18.
- 6 A budget was provided for the replacement of the vehicle for the Consents Engineer has been deferred to the next financial year.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Civil Defence | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 12,406 | 12,693 | (287) | | | 128,039 | 126,930 | 1,109 | | 152,315 |
| Other Income | 0 | 197 | (197) | | | 0 | 1,970 | (1,970) | | 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 | 12,406 | 12,890 | (484) | | | 128,039 | 128,900 | (861) | | 154,677 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 4,370 | 8,543 | (4,173) | | | 52,379 | 56,784 | (4,405) | | 67,060 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 853 | 3,606 | (2,753) | | | 21,566 | 40,682 | (19,116) | 1 | 47,875 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 3,262 | 3,263 | (1) | | | 32,625 | 32,630 | (5) | | 39,157 |
| Depreciation | 1,180 | 1,241 | (61) | | | 11,802 | 12,410 | (608) | | 14,881 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 9,665 | 16,653 | (6,988) | | | 118,372 | 142,506 | (24,134) | | 168,973 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 2,741 | (3,763) | 6,504 | | | \$9,667 | (\$13,606) | \$23,273 | | (\$14,296) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Civil Defence | 0 | 1,455 | (1,455) | | | 0 | 44,285 | (44,285) | 2 | 47,194 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 1,455 | (1,455) | | | \$0 | \$44,285 | (\$44,285) | | \$47,194 |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- Expenditure on the EOC Information Management System, Stationery and Sundry purchases are all running lower than budget for the year.
- The Capital Expenditure budget has yet to be utilised.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|--------|-----------|-------------------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Rural Fire | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 18,060 | 17,752 | 308 | | 179,869 | 177,520 | 2,349 | | | | | 213,027 |
| Other Income | 0 | 3,704 | (3,704) | | 3,420 | 37,040 | (33,620) | 2 | | | | 44,446 |
| Internal Interest Received | (1,701) | 0 | (1,701) | | (1,991) | 0 | (1,991) | | | | | 0 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 16,359 | 21,456 | (5,097) | | 181,298 | 214,560 | (33,262) | | | | | 257,473 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 5,370 | 4,417 | 953 | | 32,522 | 88,093 | (55,571) | 3 | | | | 98,573 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 74,140 | 9,962 | 64,178 | 1 | 431,421 | 99,109 | 332,312 | 4 | | | | 118,676 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 511 | (511) | | | | | 875 |
| Council Overheads | 3,999 | 3,998 | 1 | | 39,980 | 39,980 | 0 | | | | | 47,975 |
| Depreciation | 2,748 | 2,942 | (194) | | 27,474 | 29,420 | (1,946) | | | | | 35,302 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 86,257 | 21,319 | 64,938 | | 531,397 | 257,113 | 274,284 | | | | | 301,401 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (69,898) | 137 | (70,035) | | (\$350,099) | (\$42,553) | (\$307,546) | | | | | (\$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 - April 2011:

1 A further \$69,837 was paid in April towards the costs of the Ashworths Fire.

Notes - Year to Date:

- The budgeted level of subsidies have not been received for the period.
- The costs relating to Training have not progressed as was budgeted for.
- Costs of \$333,607 have been incurred on the Ashworths Fire. A claim has been made to the National Rural Fire Authority to cover the majority of the costs.
- The purchase of a fire tanker from Waimakariri District Council was at a cost lower than the budget for the year.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|---|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Public Health & Liquor Licensing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 8,218 | 8,408 | (190) | | 84,815 | 84,080 | 735 | | | | | 100,895 |
| Internal Interest Received | 4,670 | 5,477 | (807) | | 87,885 | 88,148 | (263) | | | | | 99,106 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 12,888 | 13,885 | (997) | | 172,700 | 172,228 | 472 | | | | | 200,001 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 10,091 | 9,444 | 647 | | 93,770 | 94,340 | (570) | | | | | 117,794 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 1,708 | 2,712 | (1,004) | | 23,717 | 28,042 | (4,325) | | | | | 33,471 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 3,599 | 3,599 | 0 | | 35,990 | 35,990 | 0 | | | | | 43,192 |
| Depreciation | 343 | 462 | (119) | | 3,432 | 4,620 | (1,188) | | | | | 5,546 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 15,741 | 16,217 | (476) | | 156,909 | 162,992 | (6,083) | | | | | 200,003 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (2,853) | (2,332) | (521) | | \$15,791 | \$9,236 | \$6,555 | | | | | (\$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 - April 2011:
There are no significant variances from budget for April.

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

| Financial Report | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|------------------|--|---------------|--|-------------------|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Budget | | |
| Animal Control | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 2,883 | 2,850 | (67) | | 29,759 | 29,500 | 259 | | | | | | | | | | | 35,401 |
| Internal Interest Received | 75 | 111 | (36) | | 147,050 | 128,458 | 18,592 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 128,683 |
| Development Contributions | 420 | 159 | 261 | | 5,172 | 1,590 | 3,582 | | | | | | | | | | | 1,906 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 3,378 | 3,220 | 158 | | 181,981 | 159,548 | 22,433 | | | | | | | | | | | 165,990 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 1,382 | 1,550 | (168) | | 22,201 | 15,500 | 6,701 | | | | | | | | | | | 19,375 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 8,003 | 9,768 | (1,765) | | 80,422 | 98,502 | (18,080) | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 118,055 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 3,572 | 3,573 | (1) | | 35,725 | 35,730 | (5) | | | | | | | | | | | 42,872 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 12,957 | 14,891 | (1,934) | | 138,348 | 149,732 | (11,384) | | | | | | | | | | | 180,302 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (9,579) | (11,671) | 2,092 | | \$43,633 | \$9,816 | \$33,817 | | | | | | | | | | | (\$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 - April 2011:
There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 The amount of income derived from Dog Licenses is well up on the level budgeted for.
- 2 Contractors costs are running lower than budget for the year to date.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Utility Services and Infrastructure (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 738,437 | 728,507 | 9,930 | | 7,352,077 | 7,285,070 | 67,007 | 8 | 8,742,039 | 8,742,039 | | |
| Internal Interest Received | 470,380 | 237,889 | 232,491 | 1 | 3,946,270 | 3,233,778 | 712,492 | 9 | 4,001,381 | 4,001,381 | | |
| Development Contributions | 60,141 | 59,918 | 223 | | 604,880 | 599,180 | 5,700 | | 719,014 | 719,014 | | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 40,810 | (40,810) | 2 | 314,146 | 408,100 | (93,954) | 10 | 1,091,663 | 1,091,663 | | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 1,320,948 | 1,119,112 | 201,836 | | 12,737,271 | 12,046,008 | 691,263 | | 15,177,948 | 15,177,948 | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 82,630 | 81,446 | 1,184 | | 850,942 | 801,410 | 49,532 | 11 | 1,013,332 | 1,013,332 | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 621,044 | 496,906 | 124,138 | 3 | 5,853,290 | 5,043,141 | 810,149 | 12 | 6,021,011 | 6,021,011 | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 54,007 | 58,785 | (4,778) | | 514,994 | 579,300 | (64,306) | 13 | 694,016 | 694,016 | | |
| Council Overheads | 160,544 | 160,550 | (6) | (6) | 1,605,457 | 1,605,462 | (5) | (5) | 1,926,960 | 1,926,960 | | |
| Depreciation | 358,894 | 361,178 | (2,284) | | 3,587,980 | 3,611,780 | (23,800) | 14 | 4,334,128 | 4,334,128 | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 1,277,119 | 1,158,865 | 118,254 | | 12,412,663 | 11,641,093 | 771,570 | | 13,989,047 | 13,989,047 | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 43,829 | (39,753) | 83,582 | | \$324,608 | \$404,915 | (80,307) | | \$1,188,901 | \$1,188,901 | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roading Network | 213,617 | 153,465 | 60,152 | 4 | 2,764,853 | 3,562,228 | (797,375) | 15 | 4,393,584 | 4,393,584 | | |
| Solid Waste | 787 | 0 | 787 | | 176,097 | 130,000 | 46,097 | | 1,707,830 | 1,707,830 | | |
| Sewerage | 57,224 | 7,119 | 50,105 | 5 | 818,824 | 254,049 | 564,775 | 16 | 365,650 | 365,650 | | |
| Stormwater/Drainage/Land Protection | 231 | 0 | 231 | | 236,408 | 781,757 | (545,349) | 17 | 781,757 | 781,757 | | |
| Water Supplies | (69,053) | 258,846 | (327,899) | 6 | 771,829 | 2,171,687 | (1,399,858) | 18 | 2,964,456 | 2,964,456 | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 202,806 | 419,430 | (216,624) | | \$4,768,011 | \$6,899,721 | (\$2,131,710) | | \$10,213,271 | \$10,213,271 | | |

Notes - April 2011:

- Income from NZTA subsidies are higher than budget for April due to the increased level of Capital expenditure.
- No Development Contributions for Water, Sewer or Stormwater were received in April.
- Adjustments were made in April to re-classify some renewal work as operating expenditure rather than capital for the Ashley, Cheviot and Hurunui Rural Water Supplies.
- The level of roading renewal work carried out in April was higher than budgeted for.
- Further cost were incurred on the Amberley Sewer Ponds and the Hammer Springs Sewer Ponds in April
- Overall, Capital Expenditure for Water is lower than was budgeted for April.
- Overall, Capital Expenditure for Water is higher than was budgeted for March, but still well down on the year to date.

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 ten months of the year.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------------------|
| | | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Roading Network | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 218,929 | 217,782 | 1,147 | | | 2,184,915 | 2,177,820 | 7,095 | | | | | 2,613,374 |
| Other Income | 435,621 | 217,076 | 218,545 | 1 | | 3,637,824 | 3,025,648 | 612,176 | 4 | | | | 3,645,588 |
| Internal Interest Received | 59,025 | 59,025 | 0 | | | 590,250 | 590,250 | 0 | | | | | 708,305 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 495,886 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 51,990 | 51,988 | 2 | 2 | | 519,898 | 519,880 | 18 | | | | | 623,851 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 765,565 | 545,871 | 219,694 | | | 6,932,887 | 6,313,598 | 619,289 | | | | | 8,087,004 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 29,689 | 28,519 | 1,170 | | | 300,491 | 285,190 | 15,301 | | | | | 355,999 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 240,746 | 227,276 | 13,470 | 2 | | 2,839,280 | 2,154,182 | 685,098 | 4 | | | | 2,604,544 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 74,080 | 74,093 | (13) | | | 740,890 | 740,892 | (2) | | | | | 889,062 |
| Depreciation | 251,866 | 252,488 | (622) | | | 2,518,583 | 2,524,880 | (6,297) | | | | | 3,029,845 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 596,391 | 582,376 | 14,015 | | | 6,399,244 | 5,705,144 | 694,100 | | | | | 6,879,450 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 169,174 | (36,505) | 205,679 | | | \$533,643 | \$608,454 | (\$74,811) | | | | | \$1,207,554 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subsidised Roading | 213,617 | 151,599 | 62,018 | 3 | | 2,572,639 | 3,216,532 | (643,893) | 5 | | | | 4,042,361 |
| Special Purpose Roading | 0 | 548 | (548) | | | 189,818 | 5,480 | 184,338 | 5 | | | | 6,573 |
| Unsubsidised Roading | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 305,675 | (305,675) | 6 | | | | 305,675 |
| Road Safety Programme | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Technical Services Business Unit | 0 | 1,318 | (1,318) | | | 2,396 | 34,541 | (32,145) | 7 | | | | 38,975 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 213,617 | 153,465 | 60,152 | | | \$2,764,853 | \$3,562,228 | (\$797,375) | | | | | \$4,393,584 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 Income from NZTA subsidies are higher than budget for April due to the increased level of Capital expenditure.
- 2 The level of operational work carried out in April was higher than budgeted for.
- 3 The level of renewal work carried out in April was higher than budgeted for.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 4 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% (10% higher than the normal subsidy rate).
- 5 Timing of Renewal work carried out was different to the calendarised budget.
- 6 The work budgeted for the next stage of the Woodbank Road Sealing has not progressed.
- 7 Budget for replacement of vehicle has not been utilised.

| Financial Report April 2011 | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------|
| | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | Budget |
| Solid Waste | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 140,212 | 140,944 | (732) | | 1,406,137 | 1,409,440 | (3,303) | | 1,691,322 | 1,691,322 | | |
| Other Income | 20,828 | 14,459 | 6,369 | | 162,680 | 144,590 | 18,090 | 1 | 173,500 | 173,500 | | |
| 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 | 161,040 | 155,403 | 5,637 | | 1,568,817 | 1,554,030 | 14,787 | | 1,864,822 | 1,864,822 | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 6,732 | 5,900 | 832 | | 65,713 | 59,000 | 6,713 | | 73,751 | 73,751 | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 137,036 | 136,795 | 241 | | 1,247,013 | 1,383,330 | (136,317) | 2 | 1,656,907 | 1,656,907 | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 683 | 631 | 52 | | 7,719 | 6,310 | 1,409 | | 7,572 | 7,572 | | |
| Council Overheads | 10,468 | 10,468 | 0 | | 104,678 | 104,680 | (2) | | 125,615 | 125,615 | | |
| Depreciation | 1,686 | 2,083 | (397) | | 15,983 | 20,830 | (4,847) | | 25,000 | 25,000 | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 156,605 | 155,877 | 728 | | 1,441,106 | 1,574,150 | (133,044) | | 1,888,845 | 1,888,845 | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | \$4,435 | (\$474) | 4,909 | | \$127,711 | (\$20,120) | \$147,831 | | (\$24,023) | (\$24,023) | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transfer Stations | 787 | 0 | 787 | | 176,097 | 130,000 | 46,097 | 3 | 1,707,830 | 1,707,830 | | |
| Liter Bin Collection | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | |
| Refuse Collection | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | \$787 | \$0 | 787 | | \$176,097 | \$130,000 | \$46,097 | | \$1,707,830 | \$1,707,830 | | |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 Income from Gate Charges are higher than budgeted for the year to date.
- 2 The level of costs budgeted for Becon, 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 April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Sewerage | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 46,374 | 45,386 | 988 | | | 460,968 | 453,860 | 7,108 | | 544,635 |
| Other Income | 222 | 26 | 196 | | | 6,945 | 260 | 6,685 | | 308 |
| Internal Interest Received | 431 | 240 | 191 | | | 3,511 | 2,400 | 1,111 | | 2,884 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 7,303 | (7,303) | | | 75,226 | 73,030 | 2,196 | | 193,694 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 47,027 | 52,955 | (5,928) | | | 546,650 | 529,550 | 17,100 | | 741,521 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 4,488 | 3,813 | 675 | | | 52,364 | 36,600 | 15,764 | 4 | 45,670 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 22,236 | 11,217 | 11,019 | 1 | | 167,499 | 160,667 | 6,832 | | 183,703 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 22,354 | 15,669 | 6,685 | | | 206,552 | 156,690 | 49,862 | 5 | 188,016 |
| Council Overheads | 9,507 | 9,507 | 0 | | | 95,084 | 95,070 | 14 | | 114,111 |
| Depreciation | 29,681 | 29,675 | 6 | 6 | | 296,803 | 296,750 | 53 | | 356,103 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 88,266 | 69,881 | 18,385 | | | 818,302 | 745,777 | 72,525 | | 887,603 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (\$41,239) | (\$16,926) | (24,313) | | | (\$271,652) | (\$216,227) | (\$55,425) | | (\$146,082) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Wide Sewerage | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 106,054 |
| Amberley | 38,266 | 1,937 | 36,329 | 2 | | 634,225 | 219,370 | 414,855 | 6 | 223,247 |
| Culverden | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Cheviot | 15 | 0 | 15 | | | 1,581 | 0 | 1,581 | | 0 |
| Greta Valley | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Motunau Beach | 0 | 4,349 | (4,349) | | | 0 | 9,349 | (9,349) | | 9,349 |
| Waipara | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Hammer Springs | 18,943 | 833 | 18,110 | 3 | | 166,765 | 20,330 | 146,435 | 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 | \$57,224 | \$7,119 | 50,105 | | | \$818,824 | \$254,049 | \$564,775 | | \$365,650 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 Contractors Costs in Amberley and Electricity Costs in Hammer Springs were higher than budget for April.
- 2 Further cost were incurred on the Amberley Ponds in April.
- 3 Capital Costs relating to Resource Consent conditions for the Upgrade of the Hammer Springs Ponds were incurred in April but not budgeted for.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 4 Wages costs are higher than budgeted for the year to date particularly for Amberley and Hammer Springs.
- 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 and the additional capital costs as a result of the Resource Consent conditions.

| Financial Report | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|-----------|--|-------|--|--------|--|--|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Budget | | |
| Stormwater, Drainage & Land Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 21,392 | 17,952 | 3,440 | 0 | 212,070 | 179,520 | 32,550 | 1 | | 215,418 | 215,418 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | (281) | 0 | (558) | 0 | 954 | 0 | 954 | | | 0 | 0 | (977) | | | | | | | | |
| Internal Interest Received | 0 | 277 | (3,637) | 0 | 1,793 | 2,770 | (977) | | | 3,315 | 3,315 | (977) | | | | | | | | |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 3,637 | (3,637) | 0 | 30,414 | 36,370 | (5,956) | | | 43,634 | 43,634 | (5,956) | | | | | | | | |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Total Operating Revenue | 21,111 | 21,866 | (755) | 0 | 245,231 | 218,660 | 26,571 | | | 262,367 | 262,367 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 31 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 122 | | | 0 | 0 | 122 | | | | | | | | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 8,378 | 1,533 | 6,845 | 0 | 249,491 | 15,883 | 233,608 | 2 | | 18,963 | 18,963 | 233,608 | | | | | | | | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 6,995 | 12,022 | (5,027) | 0 | 63,803 | 120,220 | (56,417) | 3 | | 144,266 | 144,266 | (56,417) | | | | | | | | |
| Council Overheads | 952 | 953 | (1) | 0 | 9,519 | 9,530 | (11) | | | 11,416 | 11,416 | (11) | | | | | | | | |
| Depreciation | 0 | 1,437 | (1,437) | 0 | 0 | 14,370 | (14,370) | 4 | | 17,241 | 17,241 | (14,370) | | | | | | | | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 16,356 | 15,945 | 411 | 0 | 322,935 | 160,003 | 162,932 | | | 191,886 | 191,886 | 162,932 | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 4,755 | 5,921 | (1,166) | 0 | (77,704) | 58,657 | (136,361) | | | 70,481 | 70,481 | (136,361) | | | | | | | | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Wide Stormwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Dock Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Amberley Beach Foreshore Protection | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Leithfield Outfall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44,898 | 0 | 44,898 | 5 | | 0 | 0 | 44,898 | | | | | | | | |
| Ashworths | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Newcombes Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Amberley | 231 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 58,144 | 535,140 | (476,996) | 6 | | 535,140 | 535,140 | (476,996) | | | | | | | | |
| Jed River | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Hammer Springs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133,366 | 246,617 | (113,251) | 7 | | 246,617 | 246,617 | (113,251) | | | | | | | | |
| Hammer Springs DC Fund | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | \$231 | \$0 | 231 | 0 | \$236,408 | \$781,757 | (545,349) | | | \$781,757 | \$781,757 | (545,349) | | | | | | | | |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- The amount of rates collected for Amberley Stormwater is higher than budgeted for.
- 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.
- 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.
- This represents the 5th progress payment on the Leithfield Outfall project paid in July.
- The full amount of physical works for Amberley is still to be incurred.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | 311,530 | 306,443 | 5,087 | | | 3,087,987 | 3,064,430 | 23,557 | 4 | 3,677,290 |
| Internal Interest Received | 13,709 | 6,328 | 7,381 | | | 137,867 | 63,280 | 74,587 | 5 | 181,985 |
| Development Contributions | 966 | 376 | 590 | | | 9,326 | 3,760 | 5,566 | | 4,510 |
| | 0 | 29,870 | (29,870) | 1 | | 208,506 | 298,700 | (90,194) | 6 | 358,449 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 326,205 | 343,017 | (16,812) | | | 3,443,686 | 3,430,170 | 13,516 | | 4,222,234 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 41,690 | 43,214 | (1,524) | | | 432,252 | 420,620 | 11,632 | 7 | 537,912 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 212,648 | 120,085 | 92,563 | 2 | | 1,350,007 | 1,329,079 | 20,928 | 8 | 1,556,894 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 23,975 | 30,463 | (6,488) | | | 236,920 | 296,080 | (59,160) | 9 | 354,162 |
| Council Overheads | 65,527 | 65,529 | (2) | | | 655,286 | 655,290 | (4) | | 786,356 |
| Depreciation | 75,661 | 75,495 | 166 | | | 756,611 | 754,950 | 1,661 | | 905,939 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 419,501 | 334,786 | 84,715 | | | 3,431,076 | 3,456,019 | (24,943) | | 4,141,263 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (93,296) | 8,231 | (101,527) | | | 12,610 | (25,849) | \$38,459 | | 80,971 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Wide | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 106,054 |
| Amberley | 1,231 | 206,103 | (204,872) | 3 | | 139,695 | 1,177,969 | (1,038,274) | | 1,177,969 |
| Leithfield Beach | 0 | 8,541 | (8,541) | | | 0 | 93,303 | (93,303) | | 112,393 |
| Ashley Rural | (36,562) | 13,718 | (50,280) | 2 | | 181,750 | 167,430 | 14,320 | | 194,865 |
| Culverden | 1,311 | 427 | 884 | | | 2,058 | 7,270 | (5,212) | | 8,125 |
| Waiau Town | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 3,167 | 27,625 | (24,458) | | 27,625 |
| Amuri Plains | 4,535 | 0 | 4,535 | | | 12,582 | 17,000 | (4,418) | | 17,000 |
| Balmoral | 220 | 343 | (123) | | | 1,783 | 10,430 | (8,647) | | 11,115 |
| Waiau Rural | 19,168 | 0 | 19,168 | | | 51,939 | 82,500 | (30,561) | | 82,500 |
| Cheviot | (18,904) | 2,692 | (21,596) | 2 | | 83,659 | 81,420 | 2,239 | | 674,375 |
| Waipara | 702 | 0 | 702 | | | 8,433 | 36,050 | (27,617) | | 36,050 |
| Hammer Springs | 8,040 | 20,585 | (12,545) | | | 41,076 | 210,850 | (169,774) | | 247,515 |
| Hawarden - Waikari | 74 | 2,337 | (2,263) | | | 4,880 | 15,090 | (10,210) | | 15,920 |
| Hurunui Rural | (48,868) | 4,100 | (52,968) | 2 | | 240,807 | 244,750 | (3,943) | | 252,950 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | (\$69,053) | \$258,846 | (\$327,899) | | | \$771,829 | \$2,171,687 | (\$1,399,858) | 10 | \$2,964,456 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 No Development Contributions for Water Supplies were received in April.
- 2 Adjustments were made in April to re-classify some renewal work as operating expenditure rather than capital for the Ashley, Cheviot and Hurunui Rural Water Supplies.
- 3 Only a small amount of capital work was for Amberley was carried out in April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 4 Water Rates are higher than budget due to a greater number of properties being rated for than was anticipated when the budgets were set.
- 5 Other Income has been boosted by the level of connection fees recognised for the Ashley and the Hurunui Rural Supplies.
- 6 The level of development contributions for Amberley and Ashley Water Supplies are down on budget for the period.
- 7 Wage costs allocated to Water were higher than budgeted for the year to date.
- 8 Maintenance costs for Ashley, Cheviot and Hurunui Rural are all down on budget for the period.
- 9 Interest Costs are lower than budget, particularly for Amberley and Waiau Rural, because the debt level is currently lower than was budgeted for.
- 10 Overall, Capital Expenditure to date is lower than was budgeted for the first ten months of the year.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|---|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Other Income | 720,202 | 684,979 | 35,223 | 0 | | 5,075,977 | 5,139,031 | (63,054) | | 5,801,154 |
| 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 | 720,202 | 684,979 | 35,223 | 0 | | 5,075,977 | 5,139,031 | (63,054) | | 5,801,154 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 243,813 | 242,571 | 1,242 | 2,302,230 | | 2,302,230 | 2,198,023 | 104,207 | | 2,617,818 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 100,132 | 153,846 | (53,714) | 1,802,634 | | 1,802,634 | 1,939,329 | (136,695) | | 2,312,929 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 60,251 | 60,251 | 0 | 602,511 | | 602,511 | 602,510 | 1 | | 723,013 |
| Council Overheads | 5,983 | 5,983 | 0 | 59,829 | | 59,829 | 59,830 | (1) | | 71,796 |
| Depreciation | 65,115 | 75,119 | (10,004) | 493,211 | | 493,211 | 561,190 | (67,979) | | 711,428 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 475,294 | 537,770 | (62,476) | 5,260,415 | | 5,260,415 | 5,360,882 | (100,467) | | 6,436,984 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | \$244,908 | \$147,209 | \$97,699 | (\$184,438) | 1 | (\$184,438) | (\$221,851) | \$37,413 | 1 | (\$635,830) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa | 27,940 | 292,167 | (264,227) | 6,519,935 | 2 | 6,519,935 | 5,436,937 | 1,082,998 | 2 | 6,021,271 |
| HSTR - Internal Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | \$27,940 | \$292,167 | (\$264,227) | \$6,519,935 | | \$6,519,935 | \$5,436,937 | \$1,082,998 | | \$6,021,271 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 Profit from the pools operation for April was \$97,554 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 ten months is now \$57,269 greater than was budgeted for.
- 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 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|----------|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | |
| Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Income | 877,908 | 842,685 | 842,685 | 35,223 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,653,038 | 6,716,091 | 6,716,091 | 63,053 | 0 | 7,683,627 | 7,683,627 | 0 |
| Internal Interest Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 877,908 | 842,685 | 842,685 | 35,223 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,653,038 | 6,716,091 | 6,716,091 | (63,053) | 0 | 7,683,627 | 7,683,627 | 0 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 242,832 | 241,445 | 241,445 | 1,387 | 2,291,753 | 2,186,763 | 1,04,990 | 0 | 0 | 2,291,753 | 2,186,763 | 2,186,763 | 104,990 | 0 | 2,604,307 | 2,604,307 | 0 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 100,132 | 153,846 | 153,846 | (53,714) | 1,781,996 | 1,939,329 | (157,333) | 0 | 0 | 1,781,996 | 1,939,329 | 1,939,329 | (157,333) | 0 | 2,312,929 | 2,312,929 | 0 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Depreciation | 65,115 | 75,119 | 75,119 | (10,004) | 493,211 | 561,190 | (67,979) | 0 | 0 | 493,211 | 561,190 | 561,190 | (67,979) | 0 | 711,428 | 711,428 | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 408,079 | 470,410 | 470,410 | (62,331) | 4,566,960 | 4,687,282 | (120,322) | 0 | 0 | 4,566,960 | 4,687,282 | 4,687,282 | (120,322) | 0 | 5,628,664 | 5,628,664 | 0 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | \$469,829 | \$372,275 | \$372,275 | \$97,554 | \$2,086,078 | \$2,028,809 | \$57,269 | 1 | 1 | \$2,086,078 | \$2,028,809 | \$2,028,809 | \$57,269 | 1 | \$2,064,963 | \$2,064,963 | 0 |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa | 27,940 | 292,167 | 292,167 | (264,227) | 6,519,935 | 5,436,937 | 1,082,998 | 2 | 2 | 6,519,935 | 5,436,937 | 5,436,937 | 1,082,998 | 2 | 6,021,271 | 6,021,271 | 0 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | \$27,940 | \$292,167 | \$292,167 | (\$264,227) | \$6,519,935 | \$5,436,937 | \$1,082,998 | 2 | 2 | \$6,519,935 | \$5,436,937 | \$5,436,937 | \$1,082,998 | 2 | \$6,021,271 | \$6,021,271 | 0 |

Notes - April 2011:

- 1 Profit from the pools operation for April was \$97,554 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 ten months is now \$57,269 greater than was budgeted for.
- 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 April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Hammer Springs Thermal Reserve - Internal Costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Other Income | (157,706) | (157,706) | (157,706) | 0 | | (1,577,061) | (1,577,060) | (1) | 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 | (157,706) | (157,706) | (157,706) | 0 | | (1,577,061) | (1,577,060) | (1) | | (1,892,473) |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 981 | 1,126 | 1,126 | (145) | | 10,477 | 11,260 | (783) | | 13,511 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 20,638 | 0 | 20,638 | 2 | 0 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 60,251 | 60,251 | 60,251 | 0 | | 602,511 | 602,510 | 1 | | 723,013 |
| Council Overheads | 5,983 | 5,983 | 5,983 | 0 | | 59,829 | 59,830 | (1) | | 71,796 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 67,215 | 67,360 | 67,360 | (145) | | 693,455 | 673,600 | 19,855 | | 808,320 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (\$224,921) | (\$225,066) | (\$225,066) | \$145 | | (\$2,270,516) | (\$2,250,660) | (\$19,856) | | (\$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 - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from the budget for April.

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 April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 2011 Variance | Notes | Year to Date Actual | Year to Date Budget | Year to Date Variance | Notes | Full Year Budget |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Governance (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 56,712 | 56,383 | 329 | | | 565,632 | 563,830 | 1,802 | | 676,595 |
| Other Income | 3,000 | 2,333 | 667 | | | 3,000 | 23,330 | (20,330) | 1 | 28,000 |
| Internal Interest Received | 5,903 | 5,903 | 0 | | | 59,030 | 59,030 | 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 | 65,615 | 64,619 | 996 | | | 627,662 | 646,190 | (18,528) | | 775,426 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 23,963 | 23,495 | 468 | | | 251,019 | 234,950 | 16,069 | 2 | 285,058 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 37,292 | 47,062 | (9,770) | | | 183,363 | 231,791 | (48,428) | 3 | 251,688 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 20,005 | 20,005 | 0 | | | 200,050 | 200,050 | 0 | | 240,061 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 81,260 | 90,562 | (9,302) | | | 634,432 | 666,791 | (32,359) | | 776,807 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (15,645) | (25,943) | 10,298 | | | (6,770) | (20,601) | 13,831 | | (1,381) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Governance | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 28,168 | 0 | 28,168 | 4 | 0 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 28,168 | 0 | 28,168 | | 0 |

Notes - April 2011:

There are no significant variances from budget for April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 1 Funding from Ecan towards the Hurunui-Waiapu Water Zone Committee is still to be invoiced.
- 2 Costs are up on budget due to the Honorarium Paid to the Zone Committee members being budgets as Other Direct Expenditure.
- 3 The share of Election Costs from the Canterbury DHB was recognised in March, which offsets some of the costs associated with the election.
- 4 No budget was provided for the purchase of the Mayor's car.

| Financial Report April 2011 | | April 2011 Actual | April 2011 Budget | April 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Income | (20,739) | (21,218) | 479 | | | (214,041) | (212,180) | (1,861) | | (254,620) |
| Internal Interest Received | 58,162 | 870 | 57,292 | 1 | | 167,903 | 67,495 | 100,408 | 3 | 99,786 |
| Development Contributions | 138,603 | 140,184 | (1,581) | | | 1,257,674 | 1,401,840 | (144,166) | 4 | 1,682,204 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 176,026 | 119,836 | 56,190 | | | 1,211,536 | 1,257,155 | (45,619) | | 1,527,370 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 1,558 | 614 | 944 | | | 5,857 | 6,140 | (283) | | 7,675 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 84,603 | 54,225 | 30,378 | 2 | | 299,295 | 548,796 | (249,501) | 5 | 657,249 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 74,554 | 73,698 | 856 | | | 767,701 | 736,980 | 30,721 | 4 | 884,370 |
| Council Overheads | 746 | 747 | (1) | | | 7,465 | 7,470 | (5) | | 8,960 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 161,461 | 129,284 | 32,177 | | | 1,080,318 | 1,299,386 | (219,068) | | 1,558,254 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 14,565 | (9,448) | 24,013 | | | \$131,218 | (\$42,231) | \$173,449 | | (\$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 - April 2011:

- 1 This represents the first payment for the trees milled after the fire at Ashworths.
- 2 An adjustment has been made to recognise interest charged for March and April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 3 Timber sales were not budgeted for but necessary due to the fire at Ashworths. 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 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|---|-------------------|--|------------------|---|------------------|--|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | |
| | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | |
| Treasury | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | (20,739) | | (21,218) | | 479 | (214,041) | | (212,180) | | (1,861) | | (254,620) | |
| Other Income | 3,924 | | 870 | | 3,054 | 113,665 | | 67,495 | | 46,170 | 2 | 99,786 | |
| Internal Interest Received | 138,603 | | 140,184 | | (1,581) | 1,257,674 | | 1,401,840 | | (144,166) | 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 | 121,788 | | 119,836 | | 1,952 | 1,157,298 | | 1,257,155 | | (99,857) | | 1,527,370 | |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 81,191 | | 53,583 | | 27,608 | 265,341 | 1 | 535,830 | | (270,489) | 4 | 643,000 | |
| Internal Interest Paid | 74,554 | | 73,698 | | 856 | 767,701 | | 736,980 | | 30,721 | 3 | 884,370 | |
| Council Overheads | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Depreciation | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 155,745 | | 127,281 | | 28,464 | 1,033,042 | | 1,272,810 | | (239,768) | | 1,527,370 | |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (33,957) | | (7,445) | | (26,512) | \$124,256 | | (\$15,655) | | \$139,911 | | \$0 | |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Treasury | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | |

Notes - April 2011:

1 An adjustment has been made to recognise interest charged for March and April.

Notes - Year to Date:

- 2 Rate penalties charged in the first ten months was \$14,252 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.
3 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.
4 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 | | April 2011 | April 2011 | April 2011 | April 2011 | Year to Date | Year to Date | Year to Date | Notes | Full Year |
|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------|------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|
| April 2011 | | Actual | Budget | Variance | Notes | Actual | Budget | Variance | | Budget |
| Forestry | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Other Income | 54,238 | 0 | 54,238 | 1 | | 54,238 | 0 | 54,238 | 2 | 0 |
| 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 | 54,238 | 0 | 54,238 | | | 54,238 | 0 | 54,238 | | 0 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 1,558 | 614 | 944 | | | 5,857 | 6,140 | (283) | | 7,675 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 3,412 | 642 | 2,770 | | | 33,954 | 12,966 | 20,988 | 3 | 14,249 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 746 | 747 | (1) | | | 7,465 | 7,470 | (5) | | 8,960 |
| Depreciation | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 5,716 | 2,003 | 3,713 | | | 47,276 | 26,576 | 20,700 | | 30,884 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | 48,522 | (2,003) | 50,525 | | | \$6,962 | (\$26,576) | \$33,538 | | (\$30,884) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Forestry | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 |

Notes - April 2011:

1 This represents the first payment for the trees milled after the fire at Ashworths.

Notes - Year to Date:

2 Harvesting of trees at Ashworths was necessary after the fire prior to Christmas.

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

| Financial Report | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | April 2011 | | Year to Date | | Year to Date | | Full Year | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|----|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| April 2011 | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Notes | | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | | Budget | |
| Corporate Services (Summary) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPERATING REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Income | 1,572 | 1,274 | 1,274 | 298 | 0 | 180,540 | 106,671 | 73,869 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 177,856 | 0 | 177,856 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Internal Interest Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Development Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads (Income) | 322,221 | 322,217 | 322,217 | 4 | 322,217 | 3,222,192 | 3,222,170 | 22 | 22 | 3,222,192 | 3,222,170 | 3,866,601 | 3,866,601 | 3,866,601 | 3,866,601 | 3,866,601 | 3,866,601 |
| Total Operating Revenue | 323,793 | 323,491 | 323,491 | 302 | 323,491 | 3,402,732 | 3,328,841 | 73,891 | | 3,402,732 | 3,328,841 | 4,044,457 | 4,044,457 | 4,044,457 | 4,044,457 | 4,044,457 | 4,044,457 |
| OPERATING EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Costs | 159,172 | 159,274 | 159,274 | (102) | 159,274 | 1,541,563 | 1,574,868 | (33,305) | 3 | 1,541,563 | 1,574,868 | 1,965,436 | 1,965,436 | 1,965,436 | 1,965,436 | 1,965,436 | 1,965,436 |
| Other Direct Expenditure | 111,395 | 88,752 | 88,752 | 22,643 | 88,752 | 913,626 | 886,934 | 26,692 | 4 | 913,626 | 886,934 | 1,089,371 | 1,089,371 | 1,089,371 | 1,089,371 | 1,089,371 | 1,089,371 |
| Internal Interest Paid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Council Overheads | 71,113 | 71,206 | 71,206 | (93) | 71,206 | 711,978 | 712,090 | (112) | | 711,978 | 712,090 | 854,499 | 854,499 | 854,499 | 854,499 | 854,499 | 854,499 |
| Depreciation | 14,931 | 16,360 | 16,360 | (1,429) | 16,360 | 144,887 | 144,800 | 87 | | 144,887 | 144,800 | 172,609 | 172,609 | 172,609 | 172,609 | 172,609 | 172,609 |
| Total Operating Expenditure | 356,611 | 335,592 | 335,592 | 21,019 | 335,592 | 3,312,054 | 3,318,692 | (6,638) | | 3,312,054 | 3,318,692 | 4,081,915 | 4,081,915 | 4,081,915 | 4,081,915 | 4,081,915 | 4,081,915 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) | (32,818) | (12,101) | (12,101) | (20,717) | (12,101) | 90,678 | 10,149 | \$80,529 | | 90,678 | 10,149 | (37,458) | (37,458) | (37,458) | (37,458) | (37,458) | (37,458) |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offices | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40,278 | 50,000 | (9,722) | | 40,278 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Information Technology | 4,569 | 2,568 | 2,568 | 2,001 | 2,568 | 169,570 | 149,733 | 19,837 | 5 | 169,570 | 149,733 | 154,863 | 154,863 | 154,863 | 154,863 | 154,863 | 154,863 |
| Support & Services Centres | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Human Resources & Policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chief Executive Officer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22,709 | 20,540 | 2,169 | | 22,709 | 20,540 | 20,540 | 20,540 | 20,540 | 20,540 | 20,540 | 20,540 |
| Township & Amenities Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Works & Services Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water & Sewer Administration | 782 | 0 | 0 | 782 | 0 | 82,097 | 173,320 | (91,223) | 6 | 82,097 | 173,320 | 182,112 | 182,112 | 182,112 | 182,112 | 182,112 | 182,112 |
| Environmental Services Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 0 | 7 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 28,501 | 28,501 |
| Total Capital Expenditure | 5,351 | 2,568 | 2,568 | 2,783 | 2,568 | 343,155 | 393,593 | (50,438) | | 343,155 | 393,593 | 407,515 | 407,515 | 407,515 | 407,515 | 407,515 | 407,515 |

Notes - April 2011:

1 Audit Fees relating to the interim audit were charged ahead of when they were budgeted for.

Notes - Year to Date:

- The profit generated by the sale of vehicles compared to their book value has been recognised. In addition, the second instalment of Grant money for the Community Development Programme was received ahead of budget.
- 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.
- Audit Fees relating to the interim audit were charged ahead of when they were budgeted for.
- The computer replacements for the 2011/2012 year were carried out four months earlier than budget to provide computer equipment for Ecan.
- The replacement of the Utilities vehicles is still to occur.
- The Manager Environmental Services car was purchased in January.



HURUNUI Meeting Date:
District Council 16 June 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Long Term Plan Steering Group Recommendations
REPORT BY: Manager Community and Corporate Services

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Audrey van der Monde".

Signature: Author Manager
Audrey van der Monde

Summary Report

The Long Term Plan Steering Group last met on Wednesday 18 May 2011. The topics covered at this meeting included: LTP work plan; council activity groupings; ward/township beautification and plans; review of the Significance Policy and the Road Seal Extension Policy.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION IS RECEIVED.

THAT THE COMMITTEE ACCEPTS THE STEERING GROUP'S RECOMMENDATIONS TO:

1. MAKE NO CHANGE TO THE SIGNIFICANCE POLICY.
2. AMEND THE ROAD EXTENSION SEAL POLICY.

BACKGROUND

The Long Term Plan (LTP) Steering Group met on Wednesday 18 May. Apologies were noted from Councillor Dick Davison and Judith Batchelor. The agenda items included:

1. A detailed work plan and timeframes for completion of the LTP.
2. Establish the groupings of Council Activities to be included into the LTP.
3. Review the Significance Policy and the Road Seal Extension Policy
4. Discuss the concept of village beautification and township plans
5. Review the process for updating the Ward Profiles in the LTP
6. Key projects for consideration of the LTP draft budget

Work Plan

The work plan was noted and agreed on up until the end of September 2011. Some rearranging of dates was done as a result. The work plan is appended to this report to provide an overview of the range of tasks to be auctioned over the coming months.

1. Steering Group's Recommendation to the Committee:

For the Committee's information.

Groupings of Council Activities

The way in which the Council's activities are arranged in the LTP will influence the way in which financial reporting occurs, as financial reports will line up with the Council activities. The Council has no option but to change from its present groupings (of six activity groups) due to a change in the Local Government Act which requires a core set of grouped Council activities. Formerly, these activities were grouped under a 'utility services / infrastructure' heading. Now the Council must have as separate groupings: Water Supply, Sewerage, Stormwater/Drainage, and Roads/Footpaths. These have been included in the one activity up until now, but from 2012, these activities alone will represent four separate groupings.

There are many other Council activities to also group, hence the need to look carefully at how these are grouped. It will be impractical and resource intensive to have too many activity groupings. Therefore, the Steering Group agreed that the remainder of the activities could be grouped within another four to five activity groups. These groups are likely to be: Community Services and Facilities, Environment / Safety, Growth / Development, and Governance / Corporate. The Steering Group agreed for staff to come up with the groupings to meet the needs of the Council, the LTP reader and Audit. The groupings will go back to the next LTP Steering Group for confirmation.

2. Steering Group's Recommendation to the Committee:

For the Committee's information.

Policy Review

A number of policies are to be included in the LTP and any changes to them must be through the LTP review process. The Steering Group will systematically review those policies before referring through to the Strategy and Policy Committee for a decision. The Steering Group reviewed two policies as noted below and appended to this report:

- Significance Policy – it was agreed that this policy served its purpose well as it is currently written and that no change is required. The policy has not caused any issues in the years that it has been in place and seemed sufficient for Council's use.
- Road Seal Extension Policy – one minor change was suggested as an improvement to this policy. It was agreed that the Policy on the whole was adequate but some additional words were recommended to the section on determining priorities for seal extensions for clarification and to reduce any ambiguity.

3. Steering Group's Recommendation to the Committee:

That the Committee makes no change to the Significance Policy.

That the Committee agrees to the revised Road Seal Extension Policy.

Village Beautification / Ward Plans

A discussion was held over what was needed to capture the various plans that the Towns in the Hurunui had regarding township upgrades, beautification and general enhancements. With that in mind, it was agreed that a stock take of the formal township plans and concept plans be undertaken, and put to the Ward Committees for consideration as to their next steps and planning for the next 10 years. Any gaps identified would also be apparent.

This discussion led to the way forward to update the Ward Profile sections in the LTP. These are to be reviewed by staff and then forwarded to the Councillors for the respective Wards to review and add suggestions. The completed and revised Ward Profile sections will be forwarded to the Strategy and Policy Committee once the Steering Group has approved them.

4. Steering Group's Recommendation to the Committee:

For the Committee's information.

Key Projects and Issues

Enclosed for the Committee's information is a list of projects, issues and items to be considered for the LTP draft budget. These items will not necessarily all be included, but the purpose is to capture all suggestions for the LTP for Council to make its decision later in the year. Many of these items came through the Council's strategic planning day. Others have come through the LTP Steering Group or individual Councillors, or from the various committee meetings. This list is appended to each Steering Group meeting agenda and updated as new items arise.

5. Steering Group's Recommendation to the Committee:

For the Committee's information.

Next Steering Group Meeting

The Steering Group is scheduled to meet again on 15 June. The agenda for this meeting will include the review of the groupings of Council Activities, the review of more policies and several other items listed on the work plan.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Do Nothing

The Committee is not required to consider or make any decisions on this report. Alternatively, the Committee could make its decision on the completed draft LTP prior to consultation. This is not a recommended option. The advantage of considering the work of the Steering Group is that the Committee keeps up to date with where the draft LTP is at, and the Council has the ability to influence and direct the Steering Group to ensure the draft LTP is reflective of its direction.

1st Option – Endorse the Steering Groups Recommendations

This option is recommended to keep the draft LTP on track and in line with the Council's direction.

POLICY AND PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

The Council is required to review its LTP every three years and therefore, this report is consistent with the Council's policy and plans.

SIGNIFICANCE

The recommendations are not deemed significant. The final draft LTP is a significant matter and the Council is required to undertake the special consultative procedure prior to finalising the LTP.

MĀORI IMPLICATIONS

No implications for Māori have been identified.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The matter is provided for in the approved annual plan and is within budget.

CONCLUSION

After considering all issues, options and the known views of those affected, as well as giving consideration to the level of significance and the legal and financial implications, the conclusion of this report is that the Council endorses the recommendations of the Steering Group.

COMMUNITY OUTCOME(S)

A desirable place to live, work and play

WELLNESS OUTCOMES

Social wellbeing – a healthy, safe place to live, with strong community spirit, involvement and opportunity for all.

APPENDICES

1. LTP Work Plan
2. Significance Policy
3. Road Seal Extension Policy

Appendix 1 LTP Work Plan

| Topic | Action | Due | Who | Complete |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------|------------------|----------|
| February to September 2011 | | | | |
| Steering Group | Appointment of the project team & steering group | February | Audrey | ✓ |
| Scope | Confirmation of the scope of the project | February | Audrey | ✓ |
| Council vision | Confirm vision for LTP | May | Audrey | ✓ |
| Council principles | Confirm underlying principles for LTP | May | Audrey | ✓ |
| Community Outcomes | Review/confirm community outcomes | May | Audrey | ✓ |
| Village Plans | Encourage Ward Committees/Community Board to develop forward and proactive plans for each village. Need to do a stock take on what concept plans have been done already and to what extent. Also include in the discussion, the concept of village beautification plans - a 'community pride' campaign. | May/June | Audrey Judith | |
| Policies for review | Road Seal Extension Policy | May | Jason | ✓ |
| | Significance Policy | May | Audrey | ✓ |
| | Public Private Partnership Policy | May/June | Jason | |
| | Rates Remission on Maori Freehold Land | May/June | Jason | |
| | Rates Remission on Non Contiguous Agricultural Land | May/June | Jason | |
| | Rates Remission on Biodiversity | May/June | Jason | |
| Ward Profiles | Review these for the LTP | May/June | Audrey | |
| Tourism Targeted Rate | Review Council's policy on this. Report to go to the Strategy & Policy Committee to scope the size of the review. | May/June | Jason Audrey | |
| Audit NZ LTP Questionnaire | Extensive self assessment to be completed by 20 June | June | MT | |
| Promotion of Amberley & the District | Report for Council on options for district promotion, including whether or not the Tourism Board/ENC has a role to play in this. Explore the concept of a separate body covering the lot to be formed. | June | Audrey Andrew | |
| Heritage Forest Park | Look at securing long term access to Ngai Tahu tracks in Hanmer Springs. Outline process and plan for the future. | June | Judith | |
| Retaining older people in the | Develop an action plan of things Council can do. | June | Audrey | |

| Topic | Action | Due | Who | Complete |
|-----------------------------|---|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| district | | | | |
| Amberley Development | Look at future projects and items within the plans for the Amberley development and cost them | June | Bruce Judith | |
| One Accountant & TAFM costs | Report for Council outlining a proposal for additional budget to cover increased costs due to TAFM. Will be considered in the HSTP&S strategy session on 13 May first. | June | Jason Andrew | |
| Scoping projects | Report for Council outlining what a scoping budget would be used for and suggested costs. | June | Andrew | |
| Digital Archives | Report to go to the Strategy & Policy Committee to look at options and costs for a digital archiving system. | June | Audrey | |
| AMPs | Completion of infrastructure AMPs | June | Bruce | |
| Levels of Service | Review/confirm levels of service | June | MT | |
| Policies for review | Revenue and Financing Policy | June/July | Jason | |
| | Statement concerning balancing of the budget | June/July | Jason | |
| | Rates Postponement Policy | June/July | Jason | |
| | Rates Penalties Policy | June/July | Jason | |
| | Reapportionment of Developer Outlays Policy | June/July | Jason | |
| | Reserves Funding Policy | June/July | Jason | |
| Waste & Recycling | Model to be reviewed (and Waste Management Strategy), starting with a presentation to the Strategy & Policy Committee on the present arrangement and possible options for the future. | July | Bruce | |
| Development Contributions | Review the Development Contributions Policy (through contracted service) | July | Jason | |
| Policies for review | Investment Policy – also look at the Forestry component – separate out to its own policy? | September | Jason Judith | |
| | External Liability Management Policy | September | Jason | |
| | Treasury Risk Management Policy | September | Jason | |
| | Internal Financing Policy | September | Jason | |
| Key Assumptions | Revise assumptions (financial and non financial) that the LTP is based on | September | Jason | |

| October to December 2011 | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------|--------|--|
| Financial Policies | Review other Financial Policies: | October | Jason | |
| Fees & Charges | Review Fees and Charges | October | MT | |
| Performance Measures | Review performance management framework | October | MT | |
| District Cycleways | Include other cycleways in the LTP in addition to the St James Cycleway – Hurunui Trials (Waipara to Waikari etc). | October | Bruce | |
| Stormwater | LTP budget case for essential programme over the 10 year period. | October | Dave | |
| Council Communications | LTP budget case for investing into more technology to enable faster and better public communication. | October | Audrey | |
| Budget | LTP draft budget prepared with input from Council's committees and boards | November | Jason | |
| Key Consultation Issues | Draft these for inclusion into the LTP | November | Audrey | |
| Introduction to LTP | Draft out the introduction from the Mayor and CEO | November | Audrey | |
| Financial Overview | Spreadsheet updates and Rating Statements updates (Breakdown of Rates, funding Impact Statement, Rating for next 3 years) | November | Jason | |

| January to June 2012 | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------|-----------------|--|
| Summary | Development of the summary of the LTP | January | Audrey | |
| Audit | Audit opinion on the draft LTP | January | Jason Audrey | |
| Submissions | Decisions on submissions to the draft LTP made | May | Jason Audrey | |
| Audit | Final audit opinion | June | Jason Audrey | |
| Final LTP | Final LTP adopted | June | Jason Audrey | |
| Submissions | Responses to submitters | July | Audrey | |

Appendix 2 Significance Policy

Introduction

The purpose of this policy is to outline the general approach of the Hurunui District Council to determining the significance of proposals and decisions in relation to issues, assets or other matters. The policy includes determinants (any thresholds, criteria or procedures) used to assist in assessing the extent to which issues, proposals, decisions or other matters are significant. It also includes procedural guidelines designed to ensure that a proper process is followed and that all compliance requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 in relation to decision making will be met by Council.

This policy is made up of the following parts:

Legislative Framework

- Legislative requirements
- Definitions

Application of the Policy on Significance

- Determining significance
- Criteria for determining significance
- Significant issues, proposals, decisions and other matters
- Consultation

Strategic Assets

- Introduction
- Schedule of Strategic Assets

Appendices

- Relevant Extracts from the Local Government Act 2002
- Significance Consideration for Inclusion in Council Agendas

Legislative Framework

Every local authority is required to have a policy on significance pursuant to section 90 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). Adoption and the amendment of this policy must use the special consultative procedure. A summary of the policy must be included in the Long Term Plan (the Hurunui Long Term Community Plan).

Definitions

Section 5 of the LGA defines significance, significant and strategic asset as follows:

Significance, in relation to any issue, proposal, decision, or other matter that concerns or is before a local authority, means the degree of importance of the issue, proposal, decision, or matter, as assessed by the local authority, in terms of its likely impact on, and likely consequences for:

- (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental or cultural wellbeing of the District or region;

- (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in the issue, proposal, decision or matter;
- (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Significant, in relation to any issue, proposal, decision, or any other matter means that the issue, proposal, decision, or other matter has a high degree of significance.

Strategic Asset, in relation to the assets held by a local authority means an asset or group of assets that the local authority needs to retain if the local authority is to maintain the local authority's capacity to achieve or promote any outcome that the local authority determines to be important to the current and future well being of the community and includes:

- (a) any asset or group of assets listed in accordance with section 90(2) by the local authority; and
- (b) any land or building owned by the local authority and required to maintain the local authority's capacity to provide affordable housing as part of its social policy; and
- (c) any equity securities held by the local authority in:
 - (i) a port company within the meaning of the Port Companies Act 1988
 - (ii) an airport company within the meaning of the Airport Authorities Act 1966.

Application of the Policy on Significance

Determining Significance

Each issue, proposal, decision or other matter is considered by Council on a case by case basis to determine:

- whether it is significant, and, if so,
- the degree of significance. The higher the impact or consequences, costs or implications, the higher the degree of significance.

The starting point for determining the degree of significance is to consider:

- the likely impact on or consequences for the wellness of the community, taking account in relation to current and future needs (i.e. sustainability) the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of the District, along with the District's landscape & outlook, individual and community lifestyle, education and skills development, heritage & tradition, and infrastructure.
- the likely impact on or consequences for those affected or interested.
- the capacity of the Council (including financial capacity) to implement the decision and carry out its normal role.

It is Council's decision as to what "a high degree of significance" means in each instance.

Criteria for Determining Significance

The significance of a decision will help determine the appropriate nature, extent and degree of compliance required with the decision-making process set out in Part 6 of the LGA. For significant decisions, the Council will ensure appropriate compliance.

The questions set out below should be used by Council to assist in determining the degree of significance of any issue, proposal, decision or other matter. These questions will also help with the required level of compliance with sections 77, 78, 80, 81 and 82 of the LGA. (Refer to the appendices.)

Firstly: Does Council have sufficient information about the issue, proposal, decisions or other matter?

If not, then no decision as to the significance of the issue can be made.

Secondly: If the answer is yes to any of the following questions then the issue, proposal, decisions or other matter has significance. The greater the number of 'yes' answers, the greater the degree of significance.

In the opinion of the Council, does the issue, proposal, decision 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 Long Term Community Plan (including the ideal of District and community wellness)?

Significant Issues, Proposals, Decisions and Other Matters

Significant issues, proposals, decisions or other matters will be included in the Hurunui Long Term Community Plan wherever possible. Where this is not practical they will be included wherever possible in the Annual Plan produced in the years between the Hurunui Long Term Community Plan or where required by the Act in an amendment to the Hurunui Long Term Community Plan.

Significant decisions will only be made outside of the above processes where there are compelling reasons for it not being practical for them to be included in the Hurunui Long Term Community Plan or Annual Plan.

The Council will not proceed with a decision that is determined to be significant without consideration of a detailed statement evidencing compliance with sections 77, 78, 80,81 and 82 of the LGA.

Other implications of significance under the LGA are:

- The Council must use the special consultative procedure (SCP) when considering a proposal to alter the mode (as set out in LGA section 88(1-2)) by which a significant activity is undertaken.
- If an option identified in the decision-making process involves a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, the local authority must take into account the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land, water, etc.
- The Council must not lose control of, sell or dispose of 'significant infrastructure' necessary for providing water services.

Consultation

The significance of a matter will guide the Council's decisions concerning the extent and nature of the consultation to be undertaken with the persons likely to be affected or interested in the decision or matter as set out in section 82 of the LGA.

In determining what is appropriate, the Council must have regard to various matters including its likely impact from the perspective of the persons who will or may be affected by the decision. The degree of significance will help decide whether a special round of consultation is necessary, or whether it is sufficient to rely on information already gathered and held by the Council. The degree of compliance

and associated cost involved when making a judgment about significance of a particular decision also needs to be considered.

Procedures

Every agenda will include a statement of "Significance Consideration" which will include the questions which determine the level of significance. (Refer to the appendices.)

Every report to the Council must include a statement indicating that the issue of significance has been considered, and including a recommendation where necessary.

When the Council is considering the significance of an issue, proposal, decision or other matter, in the event one or more elected members consider it to be significant, but are in the minority, the Council will:

- a. Reconsider the significance questions, and/or;
- b. Consider whether a view should be sought from the relevant Ward if appropriate to do so.

If a decision to be made is considered to be significant, the report will also include a statement addressing what has been done to ensure compliance with sections 77, 78, 80, 81 and 82 of the LGA as applicable.

Strategic Assets

Introduction

The Council is required pursuant to section 90(2) of the LGA, to list all strategic assets as defined in section 5 of the LGA and set out under the 'Legislative Framework' of this policy. The schedule of the strategic assets set out on the opposite page is not exhaustive but includes those which are considered significant in ensuring the Council's capacity to achieve or promote important outcomes.

It is important to note that the Council manages a number of strategic assets as a whole. This is because these asset classes as a whole deliver the service. Strategic decisions in these areas, therefore only concern the whole asset class and not individual components, unless those components substantially affect the ability of the Council to deliver the service. It is the principle of the provision of the services that makes these asset groups strategic, not the individual roads, individual toilet blocks, individual halls, etc.

Appendix 1: Relevant Extracts from the Local Government Act 2002

S 77 Requirements in relation to decisions:

- (1) A local authority must, in the course of the decision-making process:
 - (a) seek to identify all reasonably practicable options for the achievement of the objective of a decision; and
 - (b) assess those options by considering:
 - (i) the benefits and costs of each option in terms of the present and future social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of the district or region; and
 - (ii) the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted or achieved in an integrated and efficient manner by each option; and
 - (iii) the impact of each option on the local authority's capacity to meet present and future needs in relation to any statutory responsibility of the local authority; and
 - (iv) any other matters that, in the opinion of the local authority, are relevant; and

- (c) if any of the options identified under paragraph (a) involves a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, take into account the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land, water, sites, waahi tapu, valued flora and fauna, and other taonga.

(2) This section is subject to section 79.

S 78 Community views in relation to decisions:

- (1) A local authority must, in the course of its decision-making process in relation to a matter, give consideration to the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter.
- (2) That consideration must be given at:
 - (a) the stage at which the problems and objectives related to the matter is defined;
 - (b) the stage at which the options that may be reasonably practicable options of achieving an objective are identified;
 - (c) the stage at which reasonably practicable options are assessed and proposals developed;

Schedule of Strategic Assets (*inserted here*)

- (d) the stage at which proposals of the kind described in paragraph (c) are adopted;
- (3) A local authority is not required by this section alone to undertake any consultation process or procedure.
- (4) This section is subject to section 79.

S 80. Identification of inconsistent decisions:

- (1) If a decision of a local authority is significantly inconsistent with, or is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with, any policy adopted by the local authority or any plan required by this Act or any other enactment, the local authority must, when making the decision, clearly identify—
 - (a) the inconsistency; and
 - (b) the reasons for the inconsistency; and
 - (c) any intention of the local authority to amend the policy or plan to accommodate the decision.
- (2) Subsection (1) does not derogate from any other provision of this Act or of any other enactment.

S 81. Contributions to decision-making processes by Māori:

- (1) A local authority must—
 - (a) establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and
 - (b) consider ways in which it may foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and
 - (c) provide relevant information to Māori for the purposes of paragraphs (a) and (b).
- (2) A local authority, in exercising its responsibility to make judgments about the manner in which subsection (1) is to be complied with, must have regard to—

- (a) the role of the local authority, as set out in section 11; and
- (b) such other matters as the local authority considers on reasonable grounds to be relevant to those judgments.

S 82 Principles of consultation:

- (1) Consultation that a local authority undertakes in relation to any decision or other matter must be undertaken, subject to subsections (3) to (5), in accordance with the following principles:
 - (a) that persons who will or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision or matter should be provided by the local authority with reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format that is appropriate to the preferences and needs of those persons
 - (b) that persons who will or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision or matter should be encouraged by the local authority to present their views to the local authority
 - (c) that persons who are invited or encouraged to present their views to the local authority should be given clear information by the local authority concerning the purpose of the consultation and the scope of the decisions to be taken following the consideration of views presented
 - (d) that persons who wish to have their views on the decision or matter considered by the local authority should be provided by the local authority with a reasonable opportunity to present those views to the local authority in a manner and format that is appropriate to the preferences and needs of those persons
 - (e) that the views presented to the local authority should be received by the local authority with an open mind and should be given by the local authority, in making a decision, due consideration
 - (f) that persons who present views to the local authority should be provided by the local authority with information concerning both the relevant decisions and the reasons for those decisions.
- (2) A local authority must ensure that it has in place processes for consulting with Māori in accordance with subsection (1).
- (3) The principles set out in subsection (1) are, subject to subsections (4) and (5), to be observed by a local authority in such manner as the local authority considers, in its discretion, to be appropriate in any particular instance.
- (4) A local authority must, in exercising its discretion under subsection (3), have regard to:
 - (a) the requirements of section 78; and
 - (b) the extent to which the current views and preferences of persons who will or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision or matter are known to the local authority; and
 - (c) the nature and significance of the decision or matter, including its likely impact from the perspective of the persons who will or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision or matter; and
 - (d) the provisions of Part I of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (which Part, among other things, sets out the circumstances in which there is good reason for withholding local authority information); and
 - (e) the costs and benefits of any consultation process or procedure.

- (5) Where a local authority is authorised or required by this Act or any other enactment to undertake consultation in relation to any decision or matter and the procedure in respect of that consultation is prescribed by this Act or any other enactment, such of the provisions of the principles set out in subsection (1) as are inconsistent with specific requirements of the procedure so prescribed are not to be observed by the local authority in respect of that consultation.

S 88 (1-2) Use of special consultative procedure in relation to change of mode of delivery of significant activity:

- (1) A local authority must use the special consultative procedure in relation to any proposal for an alteration (of the kind described in subsection (2)) in the mode by which a significant activity is undertaken by or on behalf of the local authority.
- (2) The kind of alteration to which subsection (1) refers is an alteration that involves—
- (a) a change from delivery of the activity by the local authority itself to delivery of the activity by a council controlled organisation in which the local authority is a shareholder; or
 - (b) a change from delivery of the activity by the local authority itself to delivery of the activity by another organisation or person; or
 - (c) a change from delivery of the activity by a council controlled organisation in which the local authority is a shareholder to delivery of the activity by another organisation or person.

Appendix 2: Significance Consideration for inclusion in all Council Agendas

The [name of the council 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 Council have sufficient information about the issue, proposal, decisions or other matter?
- b. Does the issue, proposal, decision 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 Long Term Community Plan (including the ideal of District and community wellness)?

Evaluation

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

Appendix 3 Road Seal Extensions Policy

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Introduction

To promote the community outcome / dimension of wellness of “Essential Infrastructure”, the Hurunui District Council wishes to increase the length of sealed roads in the District in order to prevent accidents and link people, places and businesses, while representing best value for money. Subject to Council approval, funds will be allocated for this purpose in the Council’s Long Term Community Plan. The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines to assist the Council to prioritise the expenditure of such funds so as to best promote the outcome as described. “Seal”, in this context, includes any equivalent surface treatment that may be determined to be the best option in any particular case. In accordance with current practice, it is considered that this will best be achieved by drawing at least 50% of funding for road seal extensions from sources external to the Council. This will at least double the total length of road that the Council would otherwise be able to seal. Sources of external funding include, but need not be limited to, contributions by residents, development contributions, and New Zealand Transport Agency subsidies.

Deleted: -

Deleted: -

Determining Priorities for Seal Extensions

1. The first priority for sealing will be roads that qualify according to New Zealand Transport Agency formulae for a subsidy from that agency. The Council will monitor roads that are potential candidates for such funding, and, within the constraints of the budget allocated for that purpose, and subject to Council approval, will construct and seal such roads when, and if, they qualify for New Zealand Transport Agency subsidies.
2. Any person or group of persons (“the applicant”) may apply in writing to the Council to have the seal extended by a minimum length of 200 metres on any section of unsealed road in the District. Reduced minimum lengths may be considered and approved by Council debate, dependant upon justified special circumstances prevailing on the proposed seal section. Such applications will be processed in the order in which they are received. Upon the receipt of such an application, the Council will assess the section of road in question in relation to a schedule of roads that are determined to be priorities for seal extensions. This schedule will be based upon engineering data and formulae that evaluate, for each road, the average daily traffic volume, the number of heavy goods vehicles, the importance of the route, estimated maintenance costs, the adjacent resident density, resident dust effects, agricultural dust effects, and the number of unsealed intersection legs. The schedule will also be subject to Council debate, taking into consideration factors such as road safety, school bus routes, wear-and-tear on vehicles, and other issues that may come to the attention of the Council.

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

If the section of road in question falls within the range of roads identified by the Council from its schedule as being within its allocated budget to construct and seal, an offer will be made, subject to Council approval, to the applicant and all persons who own properties that fall within what the Council determines to be the area of benefit for the sealing of that section of road (the “property owners”) for them to meet 50% of the cost of sealing as calculated by the Council. Subject to the Council determining that the owners of at least 80% of the titles in the areas of benefit are willing to contribute

their share of 50% of the cost of sealing, the Council will [construct and seal](#) that section of road. The Council will contact all property owners in order to determine whether the 80% threshold has been met.

In order to facilitate the necessary level of agreement, the applicant and/or property owners may agree in writing at the time of application to make lump-sum payments [towards the 50% share of the cost of sealing, over and above](#) their individual shares of the costs. The Council will take the amount of such payments into account in making its calculations for the offer that it makes to all property owners.

Deleted: -

The Council will contribute 50% of the total cost of sealing from the funds allocated for that purpose. The balance (i.e. taking into account any lump sum payments made), will be loan-funded by the Council and the total amount of the loan (including interest) will be recovered from all property owners on a basis that is determined by the Council to be equitable, via scheduled loan repayments or targeted rates over a 10 year period. In order to avoid interest payments, property owners may opt to make a lump-sum payment, within 3 months of receiving notice of the success of the application, for the full amount of their individual share.

In accepting any application, the Council will consider if the sealing proposal can be linked to growth and whether it is appropriate to fund a proportion of that proposal via development contributions imposed under the Local Government Act 2002.

3. If there are no successful applications within the timeframe for which funds have been allocated, the Council may make an offer in terms identical to the above to applicants and property owners of sections of road that are not sufficiently highly placed in the schedule to merit [construction and sealing](#) on engineering grounds. Alternatively, the Council may choose to fund the sealing of 100% of the cost of sections of road at the top of its schedule of priorities, or may choose to defer the spending of the funds allocated for seal extensions until such a time as external sources of funding become available.



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

16 June 2011

REPORT TO: Strategy & Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Utilities Report

REPORT BY: Manager Roothing And Utilities

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Edge', written over a large, loopy scribble.

Signature:

Author
David Edge

Manager

Summary Report

This report includes for a comprehensive review of the utilities maintenance works, new utility works through contracts, investigation projects and asset management, as at the end of April 2011.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

BACKGROUND

WATER

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).

Water Supplies – Operations and maintenance

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Operations engineer: | Bob Nye |
| Contractor: | In-house works |
| Start date: | 01 July 2010 |
| Completion date: | 30 June 2011 |
| HDC budget (direct expenditure): | \$1,556,894 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$1,350,007 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 86.7% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Hurunui District Council intends to continue to own, control, manage and operate all of the public water systems (see appendix 1). The day to day maintenance of the Council water systems is carried out by the Hurunui District operational staff.

Council is required to provide water services in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002. Council is responsible for the ongoing maintenance of public infrastructure assets, improving public water supply schemes, and providing water treatment and distribution services. Our water supply is categorised as follows:-

On-demand water supply; this covers the abstraction, treatment and reticulation of potable water (drinking water) to urban communities in the Hurunui District, where water is delivered to consumer's taps under pressure.

Restricted water supply; this covers the abstraction, treatment and reticulation of stock and domestic water to rural properties in our district, where water is delivered to consumer's tanks at a set rate of flow on a continual basis, as 'units' of water.

Officer's comments: - *All schemes are performing well with few complaints of no water. Salaries and electricity are the main cause in variations to budget. Some missing coding; this is still to be rectified.*

Water Supplies - Capital

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Operations engineer: | Bob Nye |
| Contractor: | In-house works |
| Start date: | 01 July 2010 |
| Completion date: | 30 June 2011 |
| HDC budget: | \$2,858,402 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$771,829 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 27.0% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

There are currently 13 Council owned water schemes in the District, extracting water from 23 different sources (eight of which are on permanent boil water notices). The schemes are overseen by Water Committees with delegated responsibilities for planning and development of their schemes.

Officer's comments: - *The low capital expenditure of only 27% to budget is distorted by the allowance of \$580,000 for a treatment option for Cheviot, \$406,000 for assets with zero life in Amberley and similarly \$217,000 for assets in Hanmer Springs with zero life. Some other projects such as the Amberley reservoir (\$171,828) and new well for Leithfield Beach (\$105,000) have yet to be scoped.*

Amberley Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$1,117,969 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$139,695 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 12.5% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Virtually all the expenditure related to the new deep bores at Amberley Domain and SH1 Leithfield. The budget allows \$243,950 for replacing water mains with a theoretical remaining life of zero years. Similarly \$162,155 has been allowed for new and replacement connections/tobys with a zero life. \$171,828 has also been allowed for new or upgraded reservoirs.

[Includes: c/f. capital 2009/2010; \$600,036 / new asset reservoirs; \$78,828 / reservoir upgrade; \$93,000]

Leithfield Beach Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$112,393 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$0 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 0% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

\$102,500 has been allowed for a new well to replace the existing which is showing signs of serious deterioration of the casing.

[Includes: c/f. reticulation 2009/2010; \$2,000]

Ashley Rural Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$194,865 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$181,750 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 93.3% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Higher than expected expenditure on pump sheds, but compensated by reducing expenditure on pipes and re-jetting.

Culverden Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$8,125 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$2,058 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 25.3% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Some pipe laying along St Leonards Road still to be installed.

[Includes: c/f. telemetry 2009/2010; \$3,000]

Waiau Town Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$27,625 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$3,167 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 11.5% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

A new hydrant in Lyndon Street by the netball courts still to be installed. Proposed work at the reservoir on hold pending the outcome of an application for funding assistance.

Amuri Plains Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$17,000 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$12,582 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 74% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Balmoral Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$11,115 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$1,783 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 16% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

[Includes: c/f. reservoirs 2009/2010; \$4,000 / c/f. electrical & communications 2009/2010; \$3,000]

Waiau Rural Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$82,500 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$51,939 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 63% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

New shed constructed, but changeover including pipework and electrical still to be done.

[Includes: c/f. new shed 2009/2010; \$50,000 / c/f. pipework 2009/2010; \$7,000]

Cheviot Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$674,375 * |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$83,659 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 12.4% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

[Includes: c/f. generators 2009/2010; \$11,700 / c/f. datran 2009/2010; \$10,000 / water purification DWS; \$580,000]

* includes for future \$585,000 sewer purification upgrade works to meet DWS (hence 93.6% expenditure for this item)

Waipara Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$36,050 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$8,433 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 23.4% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Most of reservoir expense incurred last financial year. Pipe renewal is still to take place. Pricing from contractors is up to 200% of budget.

[Includes: c/f. pipe renewal 2009/2010; \$19,000 / c/f. reservoir 2009/2010; \$15,000]

Hanmer Springs Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$247,515 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$41,076 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 16.3% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Most of the budget (\$217,300) for new or replacement pipe

Hawarden-Waikari Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$15,920 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$4,880 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 30.6% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

[Includes: c/f. telemetry 2009/2010; \$3,000]

Hurunui Rural Scheme

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$252,950 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$240,807 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 95.2% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

[Includes: c/f. pipe renewal 2009/2010; \$70,000]

SEWER

To provide proficient, cost-effective sewage disposal schemes to the needs of the community.

Sewerage – Operations and maintenance

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Operations engineer: | Bob Nye |
| Contractor: | In-house works |
| Start date: | 01 July 2010 |
| Completion date: | 30 June 2011 |
| HDC budget (direct expenditure): | \$183,703 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$167,499 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 91.2% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Council is required to provide wastewater services in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002. This activity covers the safe collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater from urban areas of the Hurunui District in seven separate schemes:-

- Amberley
- Cheviot
- Great Valley
- Motunau Beach
- Hanmer Springs
- Hawarden
- Waikari

These serve all but four urban localities. All use oxidation ponds for treatment of sewage and 14 pump stations are operated within the pipeline infrastructure.

Council provides this service to support the development of the district and to protect the physical environment and the health of the community through good sanitary practices.

Officer's comments: - *All schemes are performing well, but wet weather infiltration an on-going problem.*

Sewerage - Capital

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Operations engineer: | Bob Nye |
| Contractor: | In-house works |
| Start date: | 01 July 2010 |
| Completion date: | 30 June 2011 |
| HDC budget: | \$259,596 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$818,824 * |
| Percentage expenditure: | 315.4% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

* see Amberley Sewer and Hanmer Springs Sewer below for explanation

Significant Council capital expenditure should be loan funded for the life of the investment. If loans are not raised, then it will be from annual rates. The Council may loan fund sewerage main extensions with the loan repayments met by those properties directly benefitting where the majority of the property owners agree to the extension.

If any of the Capital expenditure caters for future growth of the scheme, then that portion of the expenditure that relates to growth will be funded from future users via Development Contributions. Landowners with the new connections will pay the cost of connecting to the nearest main, plus any new sub-dividers putting in the sub-main.

Property owners wanting new connections will pay those costs necessary for the connection and any levies as specified in the Development Contributions policy. The Council should pay any costs of scheme requirements that are over and above those necessary for the connection and the direct costs.

Officer's comments: - *All but \$36,349 of the total capital budget is allocated to Amberley and Hanmer Springs, as does the reflected corresponding expenditure. Both of these projects are detailed and reported on below, under Major Capital works.*

Amberley Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$223,247 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$634,225 * |
| Percentage expenditure: | 284% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

* resource consents and land purchases not budgeted for in 2010/2011

Culverden Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$0 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$0 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 0% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Cheviot Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$0 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$1,581 |
| Percentage expenditure: | #% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Greta Valley Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$0 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$0 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 0% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Motunau Beach Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$9,349 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$0 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 0% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Waipara Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$0 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$0 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 0% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Hanmer Springs Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$22,000 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$166,765 * |
| Percentage expenditure: | 758% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

* capital costs relating to resource consent conditions for the upgrade of Hanmer Springs ponds not budgeted for in 2010/2011

Hawarden Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$0 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$13,254 |
| Percentage expenditure: | #% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

Waikari Sewer

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| HDC capital budget: | \$5,000 |
| Expenditure to end April 2011: | \$2,999 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 60% |
| Percentage time: | 83.3% |

WATER AND WASTEWATER MAJOR CAPITAL WORKS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Amberley Wastewater Treatment Plant Extensions

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Project engineer: | Peter Farrant |
| Contractor: | Southern Contracting/Viking |
| Start date: | 2007 |
| Completion date: | July 2011 |
| HDC budget: | \$223,247 + \$291,323 (land) |
| Expenditure to end May 2011: | \$577,716 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 112% |
| Percentage time: | 100% |

Work initially to create new aerated pond and small extensions in border dyke irrigation area. Consent process taken to full hearing and additional lining work and site protections required. Extra land purchased after this to extend irrigation area. Liner had to be vented as gas bubbles appeared under it compromising its integrity.

Officer's comments: - *Main pond work completed and land purchased for additional disposal area. Pond gas and venting work completed (not planned) and final wiring work being completed. Delays in commissioning are due to wrong parts and missing items from aerator, being addressed by staff and suppliers. Total budget for completed project will be closer to \$2M compared to an adjusted budget (2010 at \$1.7M)*

Amberley Domain Water Exploratory Deep Bore

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Project engineer: | Peter Farrant |
| Contractor: | Clemence Drilling |
| Start date: | January 2008 |
| Completion date: | March 2011 |
| HDC budget: | \$1,177,969 |
| Expenditure to end May 2011: | \$421,000 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 44% |
| Percentage time: | Completed |

Scope of Works: Drill replacement bore south of SH1 bore at Leithfield, provide pump, headworks and connect to network. Drill a new bore at Amberley domain site as a new supply for Amberley.

Officer's comments: - *Drilled to over 200m with good water found around 120m but the aquifer sealed up while awaiting consent to be processed and the bore was irrecoverable. Cost \$251,000. Attempts will be made to slot further up the casing to see if some water can be drawn but work has not yet started. Leithfield SH1 has been drilled and is ready for use. Cost \$170,000 to date.*

Hanmer Springs Wastewater Treatment Plant Extensions

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Project engineer: | Peter Farrant |
| Contractor: | Southern Contracting |
| Start date: | March 2011 |
| Completion date: | July 2011 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| HDC budget: | \$182,000 |
| Expenditure to end May 2011: | \$98,700 |
| Percentage expenditure: | 54% |
| Percentage time: | 50% |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. | Works Gabion basket flood protection and flood path earthworks | Contract value \$59,076 | Materials \$33,000 | Sub-total's: \$92,076 |
| 2. | Draining of spring above buffer pond | Contract value \$22,135 | Materials \$7,000 | Sub-total's \$29,135 |
| 3. | Pump, sump and piped final discharge | Contract value \$14,829 | Materials \$17,000 | Sub-total's: \$31,829 |
| 4. | Fabrication and fitting flow control weirs to ponds | Contract value \$11,000 | Materials \$9,000 | Sub-total's: \$20,000 |
| 5. | Installing two new monitoring bores | Contract value \$7,043 | Materials \$2,000 | Sub-total's: \$9,043 |
| | | | | Totals: \$182,083 |

Officer's comments: - *work is about 50% complete, as at budget update. Most of the materials have been purchased. Contractor has been paid 51% of tendered price. Work progressing well, but has been delayed with rain. Three variations have been added to date being: (1) creating new track and culvert to the outlet/southern monitoring bore at \$1,635; (2) additional power cable to discharge pump (still to come); and (3) replacing the outlet flow meter (still to come).*

Amberley Water Supply Options Investigation and Report

Project engineer: Peter Farrant

Securing a second reliable and safe water source remains a priority for Amberley. The Domain gallery is effectively non-operational. The Domain deep bore was not successful, even with water located in three zones. The upper of these (100m) was poorer quality and a limited lens of water was found lower down (204m). A good flow zone with excellent water quality was located at 118–122m, but it sealed up when we stopped pumping, awaiting transfer of consent.

The consequence is Amberley has only one dedicated and reliable water source to draw from (SH1 deep bore). There are back-up options available with water from adjacent Ashley Rural water bores, but these should not be considered long term solutions apart from coupling the Kowai River bore into the Amberley network on a lease basis, provided the Amberley community is willing to tolerate the harder water.

A report on water options was presented to the Amberley Town Planning workshop in November 2007, looking at a wide range of water source options. Only two of these look to be economically viable, being deep bores either north (Option 1 - Glasnevin) or south (Option 2 - Ashworths Plantation site).

The capital cost for option 1 (Glasnevin) is \$803,000 or \$269,000 pa to operate. Option 2 (Ashworths) has a capital cost of \$863,000 or \$282,000 pa to operate. The current network operating costs are lower than the above estimates, at \$222,000 pa.

Any new bores will be subject to the Environment Canterbury (Ecan) moratorium on new water takes, but if these are viewed as transfers of the Domain bore consent, they may well be viable.

Drinking Water Standard Compliance for Cheviot – Treatment and Options Report

Project engineer:

Peter Farrant

The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act [2007] aims to have all water supplies compliant with the 2008 New Zealand Drinking Water Guidelines, which for Cheviot would require either a new water source, full treatment or a combination of both.

Compliance is through having an approved Public Health Risk Management Plan (PHRMP) which must be in place by a set date, depending on population. If the whole Cheviot Main network was to be compliant, this date would be 1 July 2014.

Full treatment would cost \$1.1M, adding \$338 + GST to the water rate on a per dwelling basis. This is a fairer method of allocation costs where treatment is for potable purposes only, so the rate per unit of water supplied will remain as it is now with the additional charge being per dwelling. If we can find secure groundwater, capital cost would be around \$240,000 (160m bore) with a water rate increase of \$109 + GST per unit of water (or alternatively, \$ 218 + GST per dwelling).

Council carried out water turbidity trials over the 2010/11 summer using private bores that are further away from the Waiau River. A 28m deep bore (1100m distant to the river) showed little water quality variation with changing river conditions as well as low turbidity. The capital cost for harnessing and treating mid-depth water (25 – 40m) is around \$366,000 which means an annual water rate increase around \$153 + GST per unit of water (or alternatively, \$305 + GST per dwelling).

The community should be consulted with for their views on this matter before we start the 2013/23 Council Long Term Plan process, so that meaningful budget figures and a possible work programme can be included in the LTP as well as the PHRMP.

Culverden Water Supply - Alternative Water Source Options Report

Project engineer:

Peter Farrant

A back-up water source for the Culverden urban water network is being investigated in response to a request from the Culverden Water Committee. The Committee was advised by Council staff that security of supply could be enhanced by connecting up to the Amuri Plains water network and drawing water from their shallow bores.

Culverden presently has a back-up water source, being the older shallow bore at the main intake. Both the deep and shallow bores are clear of known flood risk and the probability of both being knocked out during an earthquake is assessed as being low.

The cost of linking into the Amuri Plains water network, as a back-up is high and would require placing a new reservoir and boost pump in Culverden. The lowest cost of providing back-up from Amuri Plains at a minimal demand of 300m³/day would be \$397,000 which will impose a 55% increase in water rates (to \$512/annum) or a 62% increase if peak demand flows were to be accommodated (to \$536/annum).

The Culverden community would be better to invest in either another deep bore closer to town, replacing the old AC delivery main or relocating the reservoirs and boost pump from the bore to the Domain in preference to linking into the Amuri network. Water rate increases for Culverden would be between 23% and 34% for these options, increasing the water rate to \$407 and \$445/annum respectively.

Culverden Urban Area – Wastewater network Investigation Report

Project engineer: Peter Farrant

This report introduces a suitable public sewer network design and layout for Culverden, inclusive of collection, treatment & disposal - including land. A cost estimate is attached as well as a predicted rating impact for the community (including loan repayments) based on anticipated property numbers.

This report is in response to the Annual Plan request for an investigation into the above with cost estimates that can be considered by Council and the community to see if the matter should progress further. It also provides up-to-date information to use in response to Regional Council expectations that communities consider investing in reticulated wastewater networks.

Culverden is a small rural service town with all wastewater being disposed through on-site systems, mostly soak-pits. The area has a seasonally high water table and has been the focus of a number of investigations post 1984 into groundwater contamination issues and how best to address these.

There are 184 developed titles in Culverden and another 128 undeveloped lots. Some of these are outside the urban area but are likely to be connected to a sewer network because of proximity. The report works on an anticipated rating base of 200 developed properties plus another 100 undeveloped titles.

Rating estimates use the same method applied to other public wastewater networks in the Hurunui District, with developed properties paying full rate charge and undeveloped lots paying a half charge. Larger users like the school, motels and tavern will have multiple pan charges applied.

The most common method of collecting wastewater is conventional gravity sewer. Individual property pump discharges (pressure), vacuum lines and shallow sewer with multiple pump stations are alternative methods but each has benefits and limitations. Conventional gravity sewers sit well for the Culverden case and are simple and low cost to operate.

Treatment options will fall into either mechanical tank or passive pond systems. Both could be used to good effect in this application, but pond systems offer construction cost benefits, simplicity and good flow/load buffering so have been used for costing purposes. The ponds would be aerated and segmented to provide for optimum performance.

By releasing these works through a three year contract (targeted economy of scale), we received an improved interest from the contractor market (10 tenders at the box) with prices varying from \$595,000 to \$1,055,141. This focused tactic provided a 38.6% saving on our budget engineer's estimate, allowing HDC to secure another two bridges to be considered for renewal; thus doing "more for less".

Officer's comments: - *"Currently works have been completed for Woodbank Bridge; Culvert 2354.00; MacMillan Bridge; Willaims Bridge; and Forresters Bridge. Works are currently underway on Manuka Creek Bridge. All costs are tracking to tender price received, with no projected over-expenditures expected to date. No public complaints have been generated to date for these ongoing works. Opus are currently assessing our bridges asset stock for two more timber bridges to have bridge deck replacements, with works to be carried out by Calcon Ltd. at their current agreed rates"*.

Water Treatment Site - Land Purchase Offer Report

Project engineer:

Peter Farrant

An offer to sell up to 2000m² of land adjacent to the water treatment shed in Hanmer Springs has been made by the owners. There has been no valuation established as yet, given the offer being made on the basis of whether or not we would like to pursue this opportunity further.

The offer has been made by G Lunn and is part of a family land title. Council purchased part of this title in early 2000 to allow for the construction of a storage shed and area. This area has now been consumed by the recent water treatment upgrading and there is no longer any capacity to store pipe, equipment nor to allow for future water supply needs and to provide for growth in this activity.

The only other storage area we have access to is the wastewater pond site, but this is behind a locked gate and located out of the town area. It is also more difficult to access and is not ideal for water related material storage or activities.

This offer is worthy of consideration and staff welcome the opportunity to follow it up and establish a valuation, should a decision to make an offer arise. Using a nominal valuation of \$130,000 for up to 2000m² (as Open Recreational zoning in the District Plan) the rating impact of this would be around \$9.60 + GST/annum per connection.

Hurunui District Water Schemes

| Committee | Scheme | Supply | System | Treatment | Risk | Town supply | Ward | PHRMP | PHRMP due date |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 Culverden Township Water Committee (CTWC) | 1 Culverden Township Water Scheme (CTWS) | 1 Culverden On-demand Water | 1 Deep bore intake | No treatment | | Culverden | Hurunui-Amuri | Age test water | 1-Jul-15 |
| | | | 2 Shallow bore SH7 | Chlorine | | Culverden | Hurunui-Amuri | | 1-Jul-15 |
| 2 Balmoral Water Committee (BWC) | 2 Balmoral Water Scheme (BWS) | 2 Balmoral Restricted Water | 3 River weir gallery | Chlorine treatment | | | Hurunui-Amuri | | Indefinite |
| 3 Ashley Rural Water Committee (ARWC) | 3 Ashley Rural Water Scheme (ARWS) | 3 Ashley Restricted Water | 4 Main intake shallow bore | uV (NC) | | Ashley; Sefton; Leithfield | Waimakariri District Council | Yes (2008) - to be updated | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | 5 Smiths Road deep bore | Greensand filter | | Leithfield | Amberley | Age test water | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | 6 Kowai River Road deep bore | IE and sand filter | | Amberley (emergency); Amberley Beach (emergency) | Amberley | Age test water | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | 7 Racecourse Road deep bore | No treatment | | Amberley (emergency); Amberley Beach | Amberley | Age test water | 1-Jul-14 |
| 4 Hurunui Rural Water Committee (HRWC) | 4 Hurunui Rural Water Scheme (HRWS) | 4 Hurunui #1 Restricted Water | 8 Hurunui Main river gallery | No treatment | 1 PBWN | Greta Valley; Motunau Beach | Hurunui-Amuri | Required | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | 5 Lower Waitohi Restricted Water | 9 Shallow bore | No treatment | 2 PBWN | | Hurunui-Amuri | | Indefinite |
| | | 6 Peaks Restricted Water | 10 Shallow bore | No treatment | 3 PBWN | | Hurunui-Amuri | | Indefinite |
| | | 7 Upper Waitaho Restricted Water | 11 River gallery | Chlorine | | | Hurunui-Amuri | | Indefinite |
| | 8 Waipara Town Water Scheme (WPTWS) | 8 Waipara On-demand Water | 12 Mid-depth bore | No treatment | | Waipara | Greta Valley | Yes (2008) - to be updated | 1-Jul-15 |
| 5 Amuri Plains Rural Water Committee (APRWC) | 6 Amuri Plains Water Scheme (APWS) | 9 Amuri Plains Restricted Water | 13 Shallow bore | uV (NC) | | Rotherham | Hurunui-Amuri | Required | 1-Jul-15 |
| 6 Waiau Rural Water Committee (WRWC) | 7 Waiau Rural Water Scheme (WRWS) | 10 Waiau Rural Restricted Water | 14 Shallow bore | No treatment | 4 PBWN | | Hurunui-Amuri | | Indefinite |
| 7 Waiau Township Water Committee (WTWC) | 8 Waiau Township Water Scheme (WTWS) | 11 Waiau Township On-demand Water | 15 Shallow bore | uV (NC) + chlorine | | Waiau | Hurunui-Amuri | Yes (2011) | 1-Jul-15 |
| 8 Amberley Ward Committee (AWC) | 9 Amberley Water Scheme (AWS) | 12 Amberley On-demand Water | 16 Leithfield deep bore | No treatment | | Amberley | Amberley | Age test water | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | 17 Leithfield SH1 deep bore | No treatment | | Amberley | Amberley | Yes (2011) | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | 18 Domain Kowai shallow bore river gallery | uV (NC) | | | Amberley | Yes (2011) | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | Amberley Domain deep bore | Abandoned | | | Amberley | | |
| | 10 Leithfield Beach Water Scheme (LBWS) | 13 Leithfield Beach On-demand Water | 19 Leithfield Beach deep bore | No treatment | | Leithfield Beach | Amberley | Age test water | 1-Jul-15 |
| 9 Cheviot Ward Committee (CWC) | 11 Cheviot Water Scheme (CWS) | 14 Cheviot Restricted Water | 20 Cheviot Main mid-depth bore | MIOX (part treatment) | 5 PBWN * | Cheviot; Gore Bay | Cheviot | Yes (2008) - to be updated | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | 15 Blythe Restricted Water | 21 Shallow bore | No treatment | 6 PBWN | | Cheviot | | Indefinite |
| | | 16 Kaiwara Restricted Water | 22 Shallow bore | No treatment | 7 PBWN | | Cheviot | | Indefinite |
| | | 17 Parnassus Restricted Water | 23 Shallow bore | No treatment | 8 PBWN | Parnassus | Cheviot | Required | Indefinite |
| 10 Hurunui Community Committee (HCC) | 12 Hawarden-Waikari Water Scheme (HWWS) | 18 Hawarden-Waikari On-demand Water | 24 Bishells Road mid-depth bore | uV (NC) + chlorine | | Waikari; Hawarden | Hurunui-Amuri | Drafted - to be submitted to DHB | 1-Jul-14 |
| | | | 25 Bakers Ford river gallery | Mothballed | | Waikari; Hawarden | Hurunui-Amuri | Drafted - to be submitted to DHB | 1-Jul-14 |
| 11 Hanmer Springs Community Board (HSCB) | 13 Hanmer Springs Water Scheme (HSWS) | 19 Hanmer Springs On-demand Water | 26 River weir | uV + filtration | | Hanmer Springs | Hanmer | Yes (2008) - to be updated | 1-Jul-14 |

| Committee | Scheme | Supply | System | Treatment | Risk | Town supply | Ward | PHRMP | PHRMP due date |
|--|--------|--------|--------|-----------|------|-------------|------|-------|----------------|
| Legend:- | | | | | | | | | |
| PBWN - Permanent Boil Water Notice (* implies 'in part' - Miox plant for town water supply in Cheviot) | | | | | | | | | |
| PHRMP - Public Health Risk Management Plan | | | | | | | | | |
| IE - ionic exchange process | | | | | | | | | |
| NC - non-compliant | | | | | | | | | |
| PHRMP 01 July 2014 - small supply | | | | | | | | | |
| PHRMP 01 July 2015 minor scheme | | | | | | | | | |
| PHRMP indefinite - rural water supply | | | | | | | | | |



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

16 June 2010

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Supply of New Utility Vehicles

REPORT BY: Operations Engineer Utilities

Signature: Author
R Nye

Manager

Summary Report

This report recommends the purchase of replacement vehicles that have exceeded the distance and age guidelines as set out in Council's Plant and Light Vehicles Policy, for Water & Waste Water Officers.

Recommendation

THAT TWO HOLDEN COLORADO SPACE CAB 4WDS BE PURCHASED FOR THE COST OF \$29,021.74 EACH.

Background

The existing vehicles are almost 8½ years old and have exceeded the distance and age guidelines as set out in Council's Plant and Light Vehicles Policy.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Do Nothing

The existing vehicles are likely to incur increasing maintenance costs.

1st Option - Purchase of Holden Colorado LX Space Cab 4WD.

This option provides the most economical solution and is available from a local dealer. The same models purchased last year have proved to be very suitable for the purpose.

Capital Cost \$29,021.74 each

2nd Option - Purchase of Mazda BT50 Cab Plus 4WD

This vehicle is also available from a local dealer.

Capital Cost \$29,148.70 each

3rd Option - Purchase of Mitsubishi Triton Club Cab 4WD

Capital Cost \$29,454.00 each

POLICY AND PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

The LTCCP identifies the need to provide safe and appropriate vehicles for maintenance of water schemes.

SIGNIFICANCE

The recommendation is not considered significant.

MĀORI IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for Maori that have been identified.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The existing budget is adequate for the recommended purchase.

CONCLUSION

After considering all issues, options and the known views of those affected, as well as giving consideration to the level of significance and the legal and financial implications, the conclusion / recommendation of this report is THAT TWO HOLDEN COLORADO LX SPACE CAB 4WDS BE PURCHASED FOR THE SUM OF \$29,021.74 EACH.

COMMUNITY OUTCOME(S)

A healthy, safe place to live

HSPL

Enhance our essential infrastructure

ESIN

APPENDICES

Comparison of Cab Plus vehicles

Comparison of Utility Vehicles

| | Excl GST | cc | Kw | Torque | towing | lock | fuel | |
|--------------|-------------|------|-----|--------|--------|------|------|-----------|
| Colorado | \$29,021.74 | 3000 | 120 | 360 | 3000 | | | lsd |
| Mazda BT50 | \$29,148.70 | 3000 | 115 | 380 | 3000 | 12 | 9.5 | lsd |
| Triton GL | \$29,454.00 | 2500 | 133 | 407 | 2700 | 11.8 | 8 | diff lock |
| Ford Courier | \$31,106.00 | 3000 | 115 | 380 | 3000 | 12 | 9.5 | lsd |
| Hilux | \$34,111.30 | 3000 | 126 | 343 | 2500 | 12.4 | 8.3 | |
| Navara ST | \$35,886.52 | 2500 | 145 | 405 | 2800 | | 9.2 | |