



HURUNUI
District Council

Strategy & Policy Committee

AGENDA

FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING TO BE HELD ON:

THURSDAY 11 OCTOBER 2012

COMMENCING AT 9.30AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
66 CARTERS ROAD,
AMBERLEY.

Community partnership in growth and wellbeing.

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

11 OCTOBER 2012

TIMETABLE

Time	Item
9.30am	Meeting commences.
10.30am	Morning tea.
12.30pm	Lunch.
3.00pm	Afternoon tea.

Item	Order of Business	Pages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologies: Cr Gary Cooper – Leave of Absence. • Conflict of Interest Declarations • Recording Device • Urgent Business 	
1	Minutes for confirmation – Ordinary meeting of 13 September 2012.....	1 - 10
2	Action List	11
3	Forward Programme	12 - 13
4	Corporate: 4.1 Financial Report (Report to be circulated.)..... 4.2 Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners & Improved Water Management) Amendment Bill..... 4.3 South Island Strategic Alliance 4.4 Targeted Tourism Rate Consultation – Request from the Hurunui Tourism Board.....	 14 - 23 24 - 29 30 - 32
5	Environmental: 5.1 District Plan Review - Workshop Outcomes and Project Update 5.2 Alcohol Reform Bill.....	 33 - 40 41 - 43
6	Engineering: 6.1 Enlarged Rural Fire District	 44 - 51

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL'S STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY 13 SEPTEMBER 2012 AT 9.30AM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 66 CARTERS ROAD, AMBERLEY.

Contents

1.	MINUTES	2
2.	ACTION LIST	2
3.	FORWARD PROGRAMME	2
4.	ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS	3
4.1	Biodiversity Update.....	3
4.2	New Zealand Productivity Commission Inquiry Into Local Government.....	3
4.3	Coastal Environment Management Plan.....	4
4.4	Gambling Policy Review.....	5
5.	ENGINEERING MATTERS	6
5.1	Roading Report to the End of August 2012.....	6
5.2	Utilities Report to the End of August 2012.....	7
5.3	Stormwater Asset Management Plan 2012.....	7
5.4	Vehicle Replacement.....	8
6.	PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION	9

PRESENT:

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

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PART MEETING:

Brett Beer (Team Leader - Utilities), Rebecca Holden (Senior Policy Planner), Brian McManus (Roading Team Leader) and Neville Parminter (Biodiversity Field Adviser).

APOLOGIES:

Nil.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Nil.

RECORDING DEVICE:

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

URGENT BUSINESS:

- Cr M Black – request from the organiser of the “Counter Fete” to use Rutherford Reserve.
- Cr R Black – matter to be discussed under Public Excluded.

THAT THE COMMITTEE ACCEPTS THE MATTERS OF URGENT BUSINESS AND AGREES TO DEAL WITH THEM AT THIS MEETING.

Harré/Cooper

CARRIED

1. MINUTES**1.1 Ordinary meeting of 16 August 2012**

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 16 AUGUST 2012, AS CIRCULATED, ARE TAKEN AS READ AND NOW CONFIRMED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT:

- Page 5, second-last paragraph – amend the first sentence to reflect that it refers to reprioritising of Canterbury Regional Council work.

Cooper/R Black

CARRIED

Matters Arising

Nil.

2. ACTION LIST

The Action List was received with officers confirming the relevant actions had been completed or were in progress.

Cr M Black reported that the Road Safety Coordinating Committee item would be discussed at the November meeting. She said that the Committee is now focusing more on linking back to the road safety strategy and this is a positive step.

3. FORWARD PROGRAMME

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

Cr Malthus advised that planning for the regular officer updates through 2013 was now included to give the Committee a better sense of its work plan.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

4.1 Biodiversity Update

The Biodiversity Field Adviser provided an outline of his activity in June to August 2012. He advised that with the assistance of a Lincoln University professor he would be conducting a survey regarding biodiversity issues in the district, awareness of the environment, use of local reserves and parks and whether people are interested in working on volunteer projects.

The Biodiversity Field Adviser said he was also working with local schools in terms of helping them to get involved in biodiversity projects and involving the whole community, where possible. He said his overall aim is to work with the community to promote local biodiversity.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Cooper/M Black

CARRIED

4.2 New Zealand Productivity Commission Inquiry Into Local Government

The Manager Environmental Services reported that the New Zealand Productivity Commission is conducting an inquiry into local government regulation. The Commission released an Issues Paper in July 2012 and the Council had until 14 September to lodge a submission. The Council delegated a working group of Councillors Little, Harré and Davison and the Manager Environmental Services to prepare a submission. The draft submission was circulated separately.

The Manager Community and Corporate Services introduced the discussion and said the draft submission was essentially a summary of the notes from the Councillors' working group discussion.

Cr Davison said the submission adequately answered the government-framed questions but nowhere was the concept of subsidiarity raised. He said this was included in the Resource Management Act and it means making decisions at the lowest possible level to avoid the imposition of national and regional standards that may not be applicable locally. Cr Davison said he wanted a separate statement reinforcing the importance of decision making at the local level as the Hurunui was a perfectly capable community that can make its own decisions.

Mayor Dalley noted that the drinking water standards issue was an example of national standards set but with the Council deciding how best to meet them. He said the Canterbury Water Management Strategy was also a good example of how making decisions at the catchment level, with overarching guidance, is an effective approach.

THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVES THE DRAFT SUBMISSION (AS TABLED AT THE MEETING) FOR LODGING WITH THE NEW ZEALAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION, SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- Officers to include an additional statement about subsidiarity, the concept of making decisions at the most appropriate level. It should be noted that the Hurunui District Council is a small local Council working under national guidance making decisions at the local level.
- Officers to include the Council's experience with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy as a good example of how subsidiarity works.
- The reference to the first four questions is to be deleted from the front page.
- The information about the Hurunui district should include specific reference to dairy farming.
- Additional reference to question 21 should be included.

Harré/Davison

CARRIED

4.3 Coastal Environment Management Plan

The Manager Community and Corporate Services reported that at the Council meeting held on 16 August 2012, a report was presented on Coastal Environment and Natural Hazard workshop recommendations. One of the recommendations made and subsequently agreed upon was: *"That Council officers send a strong message to the Regional Council that the Hurunui District Council supports the progression of this project (the Regional Council's 'Defining and Mapping the Canterbury Coastal Environment' project) and that the Hurunui district Council wishes to work in close collaboration with the Regional Council when/if this project recommences."*

The Council had since received two replies from the Canterbury Regional Council and both were appended to the report. The first letter was a direct reply to the letter written by Council officers, and the second was to provide an update on the project. The Council's letter was also appended to the report.

Cr Little commented that the project involved mapping coastal areas and if it had been done in time for the District Plan review it would have been useful, but was not essential. The Senior Policy Planner said the Canterbury Regional Council may not be reactivating the project but some data can still be used. She said this is about management of the coastal environment and protecting natural character, not about hazards.

Cr Daly said the Council needed to remember that this was an important subject for those who have significant money invested. Mayor Dalley noted that the status quo remains until the rules are redefined. He said that development could not go ahead anyway, unless within the existing rules and he noted this was a big issue for the Canterbury Regional Council.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Dalley/McKendry

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned for morning tea at 10.38am and reconvened at 10.57am.

4.4 Gambling Policy Review

The Community Development Adviser reported that the Gambling Act 2003 and the Racing Act 2003 require Territorial Local Authorities (TLAs) to have a Class 4 Gambling Policy (being electronic gaming machines [EGMs] outside of casinos) and a TAB Venue Policy (being premises that are owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board and where the main business carried out at the premises is providing racing betting or sports betting services). These need to be reviewed on a three yearly basis, including being available for public submission. The existing policies were adopted from December 2009 and are now required to be reviewed.

The Community Development Adviser advised that there were no TAB venues in the Hurunui, only TAB kiosks and there needs to be a policy so it is recommended that the Council prohibit TAB venues. Other similar size Councils have made similar decisions. The other issue was whether to limit the number of venues for EGMs and numbers. He advised that most were operating under permitted limits anyway and a sinking lid process could be used.

Cr Daly expressed concern about the amount of money going through the EGMs and the Council needed to put to the community how much was being spent. He said the fact is that hundreds of thousands of dollars were coming out of local communities to get the approximately \$40,000 being donated back into the community. Cr Daly said he would like more information about how much money is going through the EGMs in each town and asked officers to seek more detailed information.

Cr Harré said he did not favour the Council being overly regulatory in this area as people should have the freedom to do what they want, as long as there is a framework to address problem gambling.

Mayor Dalley raised the issue of a sinking lid policy, noting that the existing allocation of EGMs is currently not used by licence holders. It was agreed that the Council could not make a decision about this until it had more detailed information as indicated earlier. It was agreed that option 1 in the report would be approved and consulted on as recommended. The Council would seek further information and consider submissions before deciding on matters like a sinking lid policy.

THAT THE COMMITTEE RESOLVES TO PUBLICLY NOTIFY THE PROPOSED CLASS 4 GAMBLING VENUE POLICY AND THE TAB VENUE POLICY (AS IDENTIFIED IN OPTION 1 OF THE AGENDA REPORT) FOR SUBMISSIONS FOR ONE MONTH UNDER THE SPECIAL CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURE OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002.

THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVES THE TABLED CONSULTATION PLAN AND STATEMENT OF PROPOSAL FOR THE PROPOSED CLASS 4 GAMBLING VENUE POLICY AND THE TAB VENUE POLICY

R Black/Daly

CARRIED

Officers were requested to seek information regarding how much money in the district goes through the electronic gaming machines, by venue and township if possible.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.38pm and reconvened at 1.08pm.

5. ENGINEERING MATTERS

5.1 Roothing Report to the End of August 2012

The Roothing Team Leader provided a report that included an operational and financial review of the road maintenance contracts, works contracts, minor improvement projects and resealing of the district roads contract up to the end of August 2012.

In response to questions from councillors, the Roothing Team Leader explained the best practice club as pre-empting government direction about neighbouring local authorities working together. The Manager Roothing and Utilities said all local authorities were facing reduced funding and need to learn from each other and get efficiencies from working together. The Roothing Team Leader said this drills down to nut and bolts work on the ground, looking for efficiencies in all aspects of the work and he commented that this was formalising something that happens already at an informal level.

The Roothing Team Leader reported that Calcon, the Council's bridge renewal contractor has been put forward for the contractor of year award in Canterbury. He noted that the bridge contract came in under price, in good time and with excellent work done, which was a great result for the Council.

In response to a question from Cr Little, the Roothing Team Leader said seal edge breaks are an ongoing problem despite looking trying to stabilise certain problem areas they tend to still get transition areas, which are susceptible to breaks. He said he was hoping that road patrols will stay on top of this problem and identify problem areas before they get too bad.

Mayor Dalley said he noticed the occasional school warning signs not operating when they should or working when schools were not open. The Manager Roothing and Utilities said the system required schools to take responsibility for turning them on and off and he would contact them all to remind them about the requirements for operation.

Road Maintenance Contractor Discussion

Ross Anthony, Downers, was in attendance to discuss rooding issues with the Committee. He said Downers have a good database building up which is making monitoring of local rooding issues more effective.

Cr Daly commented that it was good to be getting the grader cycle information by email so councillors know when graders are operating in their wards and can keep their constituents informed.

Cr M Black commented on the area-wide treatment down Waikari Valley Road and said that seal edge breaks are already being repaired. She commented that this work may not last well, particularly given that trucks frequently use the road. She also expressed concern that a realigned corner might not be safe being a 100km/h bend. Ross Anthony said the seal should not be breaking already and he would look into it and report back to Cr M Black.

Mayor Dalley asked if the methodology for area-wide treatments, where there is less than a metre from the seal to drains is appropriate given the wide vehicles that need to pass on district roads, thereby creating seal breaks. The Roothing Team Leader said he would report back on this issue in his next update report to the Committee.

Cr Harré raised a concern about whether the amount of gravel being put on metal roads was sufficient and he asked officers to monitor this.

Cr Daly said he was getting good feedback from his community about the great shape to roads and the good crowns evident following road maintenance work in the area.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Cooper/Harré

CARRIED

5.2 Utilities Report to the End of August 2012

The Utilities Team Leader provided a report that included a comprehensive review of the utilities maintenance and operations, as well as all capital works through internal and external contracts, as at the end of August 2012.

The Manager Roothing and Utilities explained the process of projectising of works, where projects are all broken down and given to Chairpersons of committees responsible for the infrastructure. It was then worked through to identify maintenance and renewals programmes and the intention is to complete all projects on time in future and not need many carryovers.

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED.

Cooper/McKendry

CARRIED

5.3 Stormwater Asset Management Plan 2012

The Manager Roothing and Utilities advised that the first Hurunui District Council Stormwater Asset Management Plan (AMP) had been produced. This had been prepared as a "core" AMP in line with the decision Council made in 2007 as to the appropriate asset management practice for its activities. The new plan is consistent with best practice espoused by Audit NZ and the National Asset Management steering group, and will be fed into the Council's next Long Term Plan for financial forecasting. The AMP was circulated separately.

The Manager Roothing and Utilities explained that the AMP was a living document and would be subject to constant improvement, as it does not yet include information from the Proposed Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP). He said officers were considering what the implications of the LWRP were for the Council and there were a range of issues to address before moving forward on this. He said that officers had good relationships with Canterbury Regional Council officers and would apply due diligence through this process.

The Manager Roothing and Utilities said that having the AMP would help to move through consent processes easier, which was a benefit to the community without compromising environmental standards.

In response to a question from Cr Malthus, the Manager Rooding and Utilities said the AMP was an internal document and would not be consulted on publicly. Cr Little said he was happy to adopt the AMP as it provides a good overall plan and approach. Cr Davison agreed and congratulated officers for producing a good and comprehensive document.

Cr Harré sought reassurance from officers that once plans are adopted they are used effectively by officers as intended, rather than sitting on shelves. The Manager Rooding and Utilities said that the Council has other AMPs that are used for their intended purpose and all AMPs will be incorporated into work practices.

THAT THE COMMITTEE ADOPTS AND ENDORSES THE STORMWATER ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2012, AS CIRCULATED, SUBJECT TO MINOR CORRECTIONS TO BE FED THROUGH FROM COUNCILLORS DIRECTLY TO OFFICERS FOR INCLUSION.

Little/Davison

CARRIED

5.4 Vehicle Replacement

The Manager Amenities and Special Projects provided a report recommending the replacement of a vehicle for the Council's Emergency Management Officer. He also sought the Committee's permission to discuss the purchase of another replacement vehicle, that for the Water and Wastewater Supervisor. He noted that the price details for this vehicle replacement only came through recently.

The Manager Amenities and Special Projects reported that he sought advice in response to comments at the last meeting about timing chain issues with Nissan Navarras and was advised that the issue had been corrected in later models. He said that Navarras are performing well so one was purchased for the Technical Leader Building Control.

The Manager Amenities and Special Projects reported that for the proposed purchases the comparative analysis determined there was not much between the vehicles considered and prices were all similar, so the recommendation came down to personal preference for the operator, which is a factor to consider as it is their work environment.

THAT A HOLDEN COLORADO LT 4X4, DOUBLE CAB UTILITY BE PURCHASED FROM ARTHUR BURKE LTD AT A COST OF \$43,664 (INCLUDING GST).

THAT A MAZDA BT50 GLX 4X4 DOUBLE CAB UTILITY BE PURCHASED FROM ARTHUR BURKE LTD AT A PRICE NO GREATER THAN \$36,488 (EXCLUDING GST).

M Black/McKendry

CARRIED

THAT THE COMMITTEE AGREES THAT OFFICERS BE PERMITTED AT THEIR DISCRETION TO VARY THE POLICY REGARDING VEHICLE COLOUR IN RESPECT OF THE VEHICLE FOR THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT OFFICER.

Dalley/Cooper

CARRIED

Urgent Business

Cr M Black said she was recently asked by Pamela Burrows, organiser of the "Counter Fete" in Culverden to raise with the Council its stance on stallholders using Rutherford Reserve, Culverden, on the day of the Culverden Christmas Country Fete. Cr M Black said that Ms Burrows had heard there might be a rule change coming that would allow stallholders on the reserve and sought clarification of the matter.

Cr Daly said this was a long-standing issue and the Council made a policy decision some time ago that went against a recommendation from the ward committee.

The Manager Amenities and Special Projects advised that there is a rule in place prohibiting private stalls on the reserve but officers had growing concerns about the proliferation of stalls around the township, that potentially created safety risks to the public. He said the Committee may want to revisit the matter and consider if it was prudent and safer to have the stalls all in one place, like Rutherford Reserve.

Cr Davison said private property can be used for stalls without Council permission needed but there have been issues in past years with stalls spilling over onto public land. He said the issue is contentious in the local community and there may not be a simple solution that is acceptable to everyone.

Mayor Dalley provided background to the Council decision made last time this was discussed and said any change now would need the support of the local community therefore the Committee would need to ask the ward committee to revisit this and provide a recommendation.

THAT THE AMURI COMMUNITY COMMITTEE BE REQUESTED TO CONSIDER WHETHER RUTHERFORD RESERVE CAN BE USED FOR STALLS ON THE DAY OF THE CULVERDEN CHRISTMAS COUNTRY FETE AND PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL AT ITS MEETING ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2012.

M Black/Daly

CARRIED

It was agreed that given the agenda for the Amuri Community Committee had been distributed, the matter would be raised by the local councillors under Urgent Business.

6. PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

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:

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48 (1) (a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public.

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Grounds for the passing of this resolution
Item 7 Public Excluded Minutes of the 16 August 2012 Meeting	The minutes contain information withheld to enable the local authority to protect the privacy of natural persons <u>and</u> information withheld to maintain legal professional privilege.	Section 48(1)(a)(i) & Section 7(2)(a) and Section 7(2)(g)
Item 8 Targeted Tourism Rate Remission Request – Follow up	The report contains information withheld to enable the local authority to protect the privacy of natural persons.	Section 48(1)(a)(i) & Section 7(2)(a)

R Black/Little

CARRIED

THAT THE MEETING RESUME IN OPEN SESSION.

Cooper/M Black

CARRIED

The meeting ended at 3.13pm.

Confirmed: _____ Date: _____

Chairperson

Strategy & Policy Committee Action Sheet - 11 October 2012					
No.	Date	Matters to be actioned	Item No. Recorded in Minutes	Manager Responsible	Action
1	17-May-12	The Committee requested that officers review the role and structure of the Road Safety Coordinating Committee.	Minutes - Matters Arising	MRU	Crs M Black & Cooper and Manager Roading & Utilities to discuss possible terms of reference. To be raised at the November Road Safety Committee meeting.

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

Meeting Date	Report/Other	Responsibility
15 November	Quarterly Report	MFS
	Amenities & Special Projects Update	MASP
	Emergency Management Update	MASP
	Environmental Services Update	MES
	Community Development Update	MCCS
	Hurunui Water Project Presentation	CS
	Presentation from HSTP&S Management Committee	MFS
	Roading Reseal Programme	MRU
	Discussion with Canterbury Regional Council Commissioners Regarding the Collaborative Process.	MES
13 December	Financial Report	MFS
	Hurunui Youth Programme Update	MCCS
	Roading & Utilities Update	MRU
	Solid Waste Update	MASP
	Charging Policy for Council Planners	MES
	Waipara River Draft Strategy	MES
	Canterbury Regional Council Commissioner Update	CS
	School Achiever Award Ceremony	MCCS

Proposed 2013 Schedule (Dates to be confirmed.)

Meeting Date	Report/Other	Responsibility
February	Quarterly Report	MFS
	Libraries Update	MCCS
	Biodiversity Update	MES
	Amenities & Special Projects Update	MASP
March	Financial Report	MFS
	Environmental Services Update	MES
	Roading Update	MRU
	Canterbury Regional Council Commissioner Update	CS
April	Financial Report	MFS
	Community Development Update	MCCS
	Biodiversity Update	MES
	Utilities Update	MRU
May	Quarterly Report	MFS
	Emergency Management Update	MASP
	Amenities & Special Projects Update	MASP
	Solid Waste Update	MASP
	Presentation from HSTP&S Management Committee	MFS

June	Financial Report	MFS
	Environmental Services Update	MES
	Roading Update	MRU
	Hurunui Youth Programme Update	MCCS
	Canterbury Regional Council Commissioner Update	CS
July	Financial Report	MFS
	Utilities Update	MRU
	Biodiversity Update	MES
August	Quarterly Report	MFS
	Libraries Update	MRU
	Amenities & Special Projects Update	MASP
September	Financial Report	MFS
	Roading Update	MCCS
	Environmental Services Update	MES
	Canterbury Regional Council Commissioner Update	CS
October	Financial Report	MFS
	Utilities Update	MASP
	Community Development Update	MCCS
November	Quarterly Report	MFS
	Amenities & Special Projects Update	MASP
	Solid Waste Update	MASP
December	Financial Report	MFS
	Environmental Services Update	MES
	Roading & Utilities Update	MRU
	Hurunui Youth Programme Update	MCCS

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:

11 October 2012

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners & Improved Water Management) Amendment Bill

REPORT BY: Manager Community and Corporate Services

Signature: Author
Audrey van der Monde

Summary Report

The Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Amendment Bill implements the Government's decisions to extend the Canterbury Regional Council's governance arrangement and special water management decision-making powers in the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Act 2010 (the Act).

The Bill will continue to empower Government-appointed commissioners to provide the governance and leadership necessary to continue to address long-standing, systemic, institutional, and governance issues with the Canterbury Regional Council. It will also continue to provide the commissioners with powers necessary to enable them to complete and implement the Canterbury region's resource management framework.

Recommendation:

THAT THE COMMITTEE DECIDES WHETHER IT WILL SUBMIT TO THE ENVIRONMENT CANTEBURY (TEMPORARY COMMISSIONERS AND IMPROVED WATER MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL.

BACKGROUND

Submissions to the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Amendment Bill close on 23 October 2012. The Bill will continue to empower Government-appointed commissioners to provide the governance and leadership necessary to continue to address long-standing issues with the Canterbury Regional Council. The Bill will also continue to provide the commissioners with powers necessary to enable them to complete and implement the Canterbury region's resource management framework.

The introduction to the Bill reads:

After the expiry of governance by commissioners in the Act, circumstances and governance challenges will continue to exist in Canterbury that require the continuation of an innovative approach to regional governance. The Canterbury earthquakes, Canterbury's vast and valuable water resources, its significant capacity to support efficient and highly productive agriculture, its size, and its history of competing interests for resources continue to set the challenges of its regional governance apart from those of other regions.

National initiatives in water and land reform require an effective, efficient, and stable governance arrangement to achieve the projected outcomes of economic and environmental return. Governance continuity of the Canterbury Regional Council is also essential to support the earthquake recovery process. The commissioners will be expected to continue to provide leadership and direction for the Canterbury region on resource management matters, with a particular emphasis on their important freshwater management responsibilities. As the governing body of the Canterbury Regional Council, the commissioners will continue to have the same statutory duties and powers as those of a regional council under the Local Government Act 2002, the Resource Management Act 1991, and other statutes that give regional councils responsibilities. The public consultation and participation requirements of those statutes will remain in place.

In order to enable the commissioners to adopt a second-generation Land and Water Plan and other plans and to fully implement the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, the commissioners will continue to be provided with additional resource management powers. Appeals to the Environment Court on the merit of the commissioners' decisions on the Canterbury resource management planning and policy framework will continue to be disallowed under the Bill. However, the Bill will continue to preserve the right of participants to appeal against commissioners' decisions to the High Court on points of law. Appeals to the superior courts on the decisions of the High Court will follow the normal judicial processes.

When making decisions on regional plans and policy statements in Canterbury, including any variations or changes subsequently promoted by the commissioners, the commissioners will be required to have particular regard to the vision and principles of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

The Bill will continue to require the Minister for the Environment to direct applications for new water conservation orders in Canterbury, and applications to vary or revoke existing water conservation orders in Canterbury, to the commissioners rather than to a special tribunal.

The commissioners' recommendations on water conservation orders will be appealable to the High Court on points of law only. The Bill will continue to provide commissioners with the power to impose targeted moratoria, subject to the approval of the Minister for the Environment, to prevent the granting of further resource consents for water takes in groundwater zones and other freshwater resources in Canterbury that are nearing or beyond full allocation. It will continue to provide both the commissioners and the Minister for the Environment with the power to revoke a moratorium at any time.

The Bill will require the Minister of Local Government to commence a review of the Canterbury Regional Council's governance arrangement on 1 March 2014. The review must cover the governance structure of the Canterbury Regional Council, its membership, and its powers and functions in relation to resource management issues.

The Bill repeals the provisions relating to the Hurunui WCO application. The application has been withdrawn, making those provisions unnecessary.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Do Nothing

The Council is not required to submit on the Amendment Bill.

1st Option - Make a Submission to the Amendment Bill

There is the opportunity for the Council to submit on the Bill to either support the intentions of the Bill or to oppose parts of the proposal.

POLICY AND PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

The Committee's decision on this matter does not impact on the Council's plans or policies.

SIGNIFICANCE

The recommendation is not deemed significant.

MĀORI IMPLICATIONS

No issues for Māori have been identified.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are no financial issues relating to this report.

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 for the Committee to decide whether or not to submit to the Bill.

COMMUNITY OUTCOME(S)

A place that demonstrates environmental responsibility

APPENDIX

Copy of the Bill.

**Environment Canterbury
(Temporary Commissioners
and Improved Water Management)
Amendment Bill**

Government Bill

Explanatory note

General policy statement

The Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Amendment Bill implements the Government's decisions to extend the Canterbury Regional Council's governance arrangement and special water management decision-making powers in the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Act 2010 (the **Act**).

The Bill will continue to empower Government-appointed commissioners to provide the governance and leadership necessary to continue to address long-standing, systemic, institutional, and governance issues with the Canterbury Regional Council (**ECan**). It will also continue to provide the commissioners with powers necessary to enable them to complete and implement the Canterbury region's resource management framework.

After the expiry of governance by commissioners in the Act, circumstances and governance challenges will continue to exist in Canterbury that require the continuation of an innovative approach to re-

gional governance. The Canterbury earthquakes, Canterbury's vast and valuable water resources, its significant capacity to support efficient and highly productive agriculture, its size, and its history of competing interests for resources continue to set the challenges of its regional governance apart from those of other regions.

National initiatives in water and land reform require an effective, efficient, and stable governance arrangement to achieve the projected outcomes of economic and environmental return. Governance continuity of ECan is also essential to support the earthquake recovery process. The commissioners will be expected to continue to provide leadership and direction for the Canterbury region on resource management matters, with a particular emphasis on their important freshwater management responsibilities.

As the governing body of ECan, the commissioners will continue to have the same statutory duties and powers as those of a regional council under the Local Government Act 2002, the Resource Management Act 1991, and other statutes that give regional councils responsibilities. The public consultation and participation requirements of those statutes will remain in place.

In order to enable the commissioners to adopt a second-generation Land and Water Plan and other plans and to fully implement the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, the commissioners will continue to be provided with additional resource management powers. Appeals to the Environment Court on the merit of the commissioners' decisions on the Canterbury resource management planning and policy framework will continue to be disallowed under the Bill. However, the Bill will continue to preserve the right of participants to appeal against commissioners' decisions to the High Court on points of law. Appeals to the superior courts on the decisions of the High Court will follow the normal judicial processes.

When making decisions on regional plans and policy statements in Canterbury, including any variations or changes subsequently promoted by the commissioners, the commissioners will be required to have particular regard to the vision and principles of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

The Bill will continue to require the Minister for the Environment to direct applications for new water conservation orders in Canterbury, and applications to vary or revoke existing water conservation orders in Canterbury, to the commissioners rather than to a special tribunal.

The commissioners' recommendations on water conservation orders will be appealable to the High Court on points of law only.

The Bill will continue to provide commissioners with the power to impose targeted moratoria, subject to the approval of the Minister for the Environment, to prevent the granting of further resource consents for water takes in groundwater zones and other freshwater resources in Canterbury that are nearing or beyond full allocation. It will continue to provide both the commissioners and the Minister for the Environment with the power to revoke a moratorium at any time.

The Bill will require the Minister of Local Government to commence a review of ECan's governance arrangement on 1 March 2014. The review must cover the governance structure of ECan, its membership, and its powers and functions in relation to resource management issues.

The Bill repeals the provisions relating to the Hurunui WCO application. The application has been withdrawn, making those provisions unnecessary.

Regulatory impact statement

The Department of Internal Affairs produced a regulatory impact statement on 31 July 2012 to help inform the main policy decisions taken by the Government relating to the contents of this Bill.

A copy of this regulatory impact statement can be found at—

- http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Resource-material-Regulatory-Impact-Statements-Index?OpenDocument
- <http://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/informationreleases/ris>

Clause by clause analysis

Clause 1 is the Title clause.

Clause 2 is the commencement clause. The Bill is to come into force on the day after the date on which it receives the Royal assent.

Clause 3 provides that the Bill amends the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Act 2010 (the **Act**).

Part 1

Amendments to preliminary provision

Clause 4 amends section 4, which contains definitions of terms used in the Act. The amendments—

- replace the definition of 2013 election with a definition of 2016 election:
- repeal the definition of Hurunui WCO application:
- amend the definition of next election to replace the reference to the 2013 election with a reference to the 2016 election.

Part 2

Amendments to other provisions

Clause 5 inserts *new section 17A*, which requires the responsible Ministers to begin a review of ECan on 1 March 2014. The review must cover—

- the governance structure of ECan; and
- the membership of ECan; and
- ECan's powers and functions under Part 3.

Clause 6 makes a drafting amendment to the cross-heading above section 22.

Clause 7 amends section 22, which provides that the triennial general election of members of ECan for 2010 is not to be held. The amendments extend the provision to apply to the 2013 triennial general election.

Clause 8 repeals section 60(2), which applies Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the Hurunui WCO application.

Clause 9 repeals Part 2 of Schedule 2.

Hon David Carter

**Environment Canterbury
(Temporary Commissioners
and Improved Water Management)
Amendment Bill**

Government Bill

Contents

		Page
1	Title	2
2	Commencement	2
3	Principal Act	2
Part 1		
Amendments to preliminary provision		
4	Section 4 amended (Interpretation)	2
Part 2		
Amendments to other provisions		
5	New section 17A inserted (Review)	2
	17A Review	2
6	Cross-heading above section 22 amended	3
7	Section 22 amended (2010 election for members of ECan must not be held)	3
8	Section 60 amended (Transitional provisions)	3
9	Schedule 2 amended	3

The Parliament of New Zealand enacts as follows:

- 1 Title**
This Act is the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Amendment Act **2012.** 5
- 2 Commencement**
This Act comes into force on the day after the date on which it receives the Royal assent.
- 3 Principal Act**
This Act amends the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Act 2010 (the **principal Act**). 10

Part 1

Amendments to preliminary provision

- 4 Section 4 amended (Interpretation)** 15
- (1) In section 4(1), replace the definition of **2013 election** with:
“**2016 election** means the triennial general election of members of ECan that (subject to section 11 of the Local Electoral Act 2001) must be held on the second Saturday in October 2016”. 20
- (2) In section 4(1), repeal the definition of **Hurunui WCO application**.
- (3) In section 4(1), definition of **next election**, replace “2013” with “2016”.

Part 2

25

Amendments to other provisions

- 5 New section 17A inserted (Review)**
- After section 17, insert:
- “**17A Review**
- “(1) The responsible Ministers must begin a review of ECan on 1 March 2014. 30
- “(2) The review must cover—

**Environment Canterbury (Temporary
Commissioners and Improved Water
Management) Amendment Bill**

Part 2 cl 9

- “(a) the governance structure of ECan; and
- “(b) the membership of ECan; and
- “(c) ECan’s powers and functions under Part 3.”

- 6 Cross-heading above section 22 amended** 5
In the cross-heading above section 22, replace “*2010 election*” with “*2010 and 2013 elections*”.
- 7 Section 22 amended (2010 election for members of ECan must not be held)**
- (1) In the heading to section 22, replace “**2010 election**” with “**2010 and 2013 elections**”. 10
- (2) In section 22(1),—
- (a) replace “general election” with “general elections”; and
 - (b) after “(the **2010 election**)”, insert “and in October 2013”.
- 8 Section 60 amended (Transitional provisions)** 15
Repeal section 60(2).
- 9 Schedule 2 amended**
In Schedule 2, repeal Part 2.
-



Meeting Date:

11 October 2012

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: South Island Strategic Alliance

REPORT BY: Manager Community and Corporate Services

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Aud Monde'.

Signature: Author
Audrey van der Monde

Summary Report

Councils have been discussing the need for the South Island to work more collaboratively through their Zone meetings. The outcome of these discussions has been a decision to form a South Island Strategic Alliance (SISA). This grouping will be a coalition of the willing, rather than any structured governance or management structure. In order to proceed, the attached Terms of Reference now needs to be adopted by the constituent Councils.

Recommendation

THAT THE COMMITTEE ADOPTS THE TERMS OF REFERENCE TO FORMALISE A SOUTH ISLAND STRATEGIC ALLIANCE.

BACKGROUND

Since mid-2011 the Zone members of the South Island Councils have been discussing the need for the South Island to work more collaboratively:

- on joint projects and procurement where efficiencies or cost savings may be achieved; and
- a need for a combined South Island approach with central government and with other stakeholders.

The outcome of these discussions between Mayors, Chairs and CEOs of the South Island Councils has been a decision to form a South Island Strategic Alliance (SISA). This grouping will be a coalition of the willing, rather than any structured governance or management structure.

The Alliance will include the membership of the combined LGNZ Zone 5 & 6 groups (i.e. Mayors, Chairs, CEOs or their delegates). While SISA is to operate separate to LGNZ there is no intention to operate contrary to LGNZ. It is simply an opportunity to advocate for all councils in the South Island on key issues, as the case arises.

Strategic guidance was needed for SISA and a Terms of Reference has been crafted to provide a guiding document for that strategic direction.

At its meeting of 20 June 2012, the Combined LGNZ Zone 5 & 6 members resolved to:

1. Endorse in principal the proposed Terms of Reference for a South Island Strategic Alliance; and
2. Recommend to the constituent councils that the Terms of Reference be adopted; and
3. Recommend the respective Mayors and Chairs be authorised to become signatories; and
4. Advise LGNZ of the intended course of action

In order to proceed, the attached Terms of Reference now needs to be adopted by the constituent Councils.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1st Option – Do nothing

The Council has the option to do nothing, however this would be counter to the general agreement of Mayors and CEO's in the South Island to form a closer working relationship.

2nd Option – Confirm the recommendations made during the workshop

This is the recommended option and consistent with the Zone meeting agreement.

POLICY AND PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

The matters and recommendations raised in this report do not impact on Council's plans and policies.

SIGNIFICANCE

This matter is not considered to be significant.

MĀORI IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for Māori.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are no financial considerations.

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 adopt the terms of reference to form a South Island Strategic Alliance.

COMMUNITY OUTCOME(S)

A desirable and safe place to live

APPENDICES

Terms of Reference



SOUTH ISLAND STRATEGIC ALLIANCE (SISA)

Following are Terms of Reference for a South Island Strategic Alliance consisting of a membership of the Mayors/Chairs, supported by the CEO's, of the combined LGNZ Zone 5 and 6 groups.

Purpose

The purpose of the SISA is to provide for collaboration at a senior level between the LGNZ Zone 5 & 6 groups for responding to and managing a range of common and mutual interests to South Island local authority issues. SISA will facilitate;

- The ability for these parties to cooperate in areas of mutual benefit
- A combined South Island approach with central government and LGNZ
- The ability to work collaboratively with other Zones to develop local government positions on issues.
- Collaboration which will lead to the identification of strategic opportunities and may lead to sharing of services or shared procurement activity between alliance members.

SISA will be a collaborative body that may make recommendations to constituent councils and central government but holds no decision making authority.

Objectives

The overall objective is to maximise sustainable development opportunities for all of the South Island and its contribution to New Zealand.

- a) Identify strategic opportunities, and to collaborate on joint initiatives, which will support social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing across the South Island;
- b) Recognise and utilise the strengths of each region for the greater good of the South Island and New Zealand as a whole;
- c) Help coordinate and encourage beneficial interrelationships and connections between economic activities/services across the alliance;

- d) Share information, expertise, databases and research where there is a mutual interest and benefit;
- e) Encourage integration and consistency of planning across the South Island;
- f) Develop agreed positions as appropriate on matters of national importance and major government initiatives, and to communicate these positions to central government and relevant national organisations;
- g) Investigate opportunities for achieving cost efficiencies by sharing responsibilities and services, such as through one-stop shops and centres of excellence.

Benefits

- A means to better meet our statutory obligation to evaluate, plan for and manage inter authority issues as they affect our functions and responsibilities.
- Provide a means for efficient administration of Local Government legislation to support South Island economic development in a sustainable manner and meet the requirements of the local authorities and regional councils as outlined in the LGA and RMA Acts.
- A stronger and more unified voice into central government initiatives.
- Access to sharing specialist/professional services strengthening the autonomous role of individual members within the alliance.
- The opportunity to decrease costs in the provision of ratepayer services.

How this will work

- SISA will meet twice a year.
- The meeting will be attended by where possible the Chairperson/Mayor and Chief Executive of each alliance partner or his/her nominee.
- Each partner will fund their own participation
- Chief Executive's will identify officer resource to support SISA projects.
- SISA compliments LGNZ processes or structures.
- SISA will support the continued growth and development of shared services and shared procurement initiatives.

Principles

- The parties will work in good faith in a pragmatic, workable, collaborative relationship at the governance and management levels
- The primary strategic and major issues are at the inter-authority level.
- The parties recognise each council's right to make decisions for their region, city or district, and that these decisions may not always be in the interests of neighbouring councils
- Each party will seek to communicate on matters of mutual interest in an open, honest, respectful and proactive way.
- Where a party to this agreement has a significant disagreement with the position of another, each party will seek to accommodate, acknowledge or at least fairly represent the dissenting view of the other.
- Nothing in this agreement alters any statutory rights or obligations under any Act.
- This agreement neither precludes nor constitutes a joint venture, pooling arrangement, partnership or formal business organisation of any kind, nor an obligation to perform a contract with any other party.
- SISA administration and projects will be funded by agreement with participating councils.



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

11 October 2012

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Targeted Tourism Rate Consultation – Request from the Hurunui Tourism Board

REPORT BY: Manager Community and Corporate Services

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

Signature: Author
Audrey van der Monde

Summary Report

The Hurunui Tourism Board met on Tuesday, 2 October 2012 and considered a report outlining the Council's decision on a proposed new Targeted Tourism Rate. The Board are keen for those affected by the proposal to be individually notified by way of letter so they can see what band they are in now, and what band they will be if the proposal is confirmed.

Recommendation

THE HURUNUI TOURISM BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT THE COUNCIL WRITES TO EACH AFFECTED BUSINESS OR PROPERTY REGARDING THE PROPOSED NEW TARGETED TOURISM RATE OUTLINING THE WHAT THEIR NEW RATE WILL BE AGAINST THE CURRENT RATE.

BACKGROUND

The Council confirmed that it would undertake public consultation on the proposed targeted tourism rate (TTR) bands when it met last on 27 September 2012. A report was presented to the Hurunui Tourism Board when it met on 2 October 2012 to advise the members of the Council's new proposal.

The Board has recommended that the Council increases its consultation effort to personally advise every affected business or property owner of the proposed change. This would be by way of letter to tell them of what band they now fall into and the new band if the proposal is confirmed. Business or property owners that are currently not paying the TTR would also receive a letter explaining that in future they would be charged the TTR and the band they fall into.

The proposal impacts on 925 business or properties, and all of these would receive letters and be told of the opportunity to send in a submission or to find out more.

The Council's consultation plan which it adopted on 27 September did not include every business or property owner. The consultation plan was to send information about the proposal to:

Tourism businesses as listed on Hurunui Tourism's database

- Hanmer Springs Business Association
- Local promotional groups based in the following areas Hurunui/Hawarden area, Cheviot, Waiau/Mt Lyford, Waipara Valley and Amberley
- Waipara Valley Winegrowers
- Members of the public who have previously submitted to the LTP about tourism and/or the targeted tourism rate
- Members of the Hurunui public who have requested a targeted tourism rates remission
- Holiday home owners in the Hanmer Springs ward

In addition to the above, the consultation process will also include:

- Public notices in newspapers:
- *The Northern Outlook*, 13 October, 31 October editions
- *Hurunui News*, 11 October, 25 October editions
- Copies of the Statement of Proposal (including submission forms and summaries) available at libraries and service centres throughout the district
- Promotion on Council website
- 'Special edition' newsletters via the Hurunui Tourism database encouraging stakeholders to submit

The consultation timeframe is:

- 10 October to 11 November 2012: open for and receiving public submissions
- 21 November 2012: extraordinary Council meeting to review submissions including those who wish to speak to their submissions
- 29 November 2012: targeted tourism rate ratified by Council

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1st Option – Do nothing

The status quo is an option and the Committee is not required to change the targeted tourism rate.

2nd Option – Agree to the Tourism Board's Recommendation

Additional resourcing would be required to manually assist with the preparation and sending of 925 letters given the tight timeframe. The letters would need to be received within the consultation period so that people have an optimum opportunity to submit on the proposal.

POLICY AND PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

The matters and recommendations raised in this report do not impact on Council's plans and policies.

SIGNIFICANCE

The matter raised in this report is not significant. The Council has already decided that the proposed change to the TTR is a significant matter and already agreed on a consultation plan that exceeds the requirements of legislation. However, the Council is free to go to any lengths to ensure that people have the opportunity to know about decisions that may affect them.

MĀORI IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for Māori.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The financial impact is minor.

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 for the Committee to decide on the recommendation made by the Hurunui Tourism Board.

COMMUNITY OUTCOME(S)

- A place with a thriving local economy



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

11 October 2012

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: District Plan Review - Workshop outcomes and project update

REPORT BY: Project Leader District Plan Review

Signature: Author
Rebecca Holden

Manager
Judith Batchelor

Summary Report

The Council held three internal workshops on 26 September 2012 to identify and address issues relating to 'Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity', 'Landscape' and 'Heritage' work streams, with a view of providing staff with direction on the next steps required for progressing the District Plan review in these areas.

This report includes a summary of those steps and seeks the formalisation of these through this Committee. It also includes a brief update on other topic streams which form part of the District Plan review.

Recommendation:

THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THE WORKSHOP HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2012 AND APPENDED TO THIS REPORT ARE CONFIRMED BY THE COMMITTEE.

BACKGROUND

A strategy for the District Plan review was adopted by the Strategy and Policy Committee at its meeting held on 12 May 2011. The topic streams for stage 2 of the review were adopted on 15 March 2012. DPR2005 – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, DPR2012 – Landscape, and DPR2013 – Heritage are three of these topic streams.

The Council held an internal workshop on 26 September 2012, to address issues relating to each of these topic streams of the District Plan review. The primary purpose of each workshop was to:

- Understand the existing provisions within the District Plan.
- Identify issues that need to be addressed as part of the District Plan review and understand why it is necessary to address these.
- Discuss possible methods to address these issues.
- Provide direction to staff on preferred methods for detailed investigation and consultation.

This report summarises the outcomes of the workshop and seeks the formalisation of these outcomes through this Committee.

DPR2005 – Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity

There is a statutory requirement for local authorities to maintain indigenous biodiversity under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Section 6 sets out the matters of national importance, and these include the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (s6 (c)). The Council is required to recognise and provide for matters of national importance in exercising their functions and powers.

Section 31 of the RMA sets out specifically the functions of territorial authorities under the Act, and this includes the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity.

In addition, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) requires that indigenous biodiversity is protected within the coastal environment, that natural character is preserved, and that restoration and rehabilitation of natural character is promoted. Chapter 9 of the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) also sets out Territorial Authority obligations for the identification and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The District Plan must give effect to these two documents.

At the workshop, Stephanie Styles, a consultant planner from Boffa Miskell who has been engaged by the Council to lead this topic stream of the review, facilitated the workshop. Key points of the discussion at the workshop included:

- A 'package' of options for protecting indigenous biodiversity is ideal including identifying techniques such as biodiversity offsets, transferable development rights, general rules, identified SNA's, rates remissions and farm management plans (the more tools in the toolbox the better).
- Embedding the philosophy of 'net gain' of biodiversity within the District Plan provisions.

- Promotion of voluntary protection as opposed to regulation with decision making occurring at the lowest level possible. A belief was expressed that with voluntary protection comes community ownership.
- There is uncertainty for landowners in managing land identified as an SNA due to District Plan rules changing at least every 10 years.
- Any rules relating to SNAs should also have a permissive element e.g. allow vegetation clearance for track development or stock water.
- The use of 'trigger' rules to initiate conversation.

In terms of the work around reviewing the existing SNA's, Councillors were presented with a continuum outlining various options for the progression of this work. Through the discussion, it was identified that a combination of all options should be presented to landowners, including:

- A 'do nothing' option – the SNA boundary will remain in the District Plan as it currently appears.
- Review the current boundary to reflect the actual situation and request further information or a site visit to discuss the changes.
- Nominate a new area to be assessed and potentially identified as an SNA.
- Remove any area covered by QEII covenant or DoC owned areas
- Give landowners an 'opt-out' possibility (in which case indigenous biodiversity will still be protected by general vegetation clearance rules and therefore still give effect to the RPS).

However, it was felt that before consultation with landowners was carried out, there needed to be more work done on the potential implications of each option. Therefore, as outlined in the recommendations appended to this report, direction was given to draft a package of provisions (the 'toolbox'), which will then be brought back to the Councillors for discussion prior to consultation.

In the meantime, the Biodiversity Field Advisor will continue contacting existing landowners with SNA's on their property and offer a review of the SNA boundary. Landowners will then be provided with a pack of information which will include the options for reviewing their SNA's, a fact sheet on what this means for them, and information about the District Plan review. Landowners will also be informed of the submission process and the on-going opportunities for them to be involved in the rule development. This will allow landowners to be better informed about the implications of identifying SNAs on their land and allow them to make an informed decision.

DPR2012 – Landscape

As mentioned above, section 6 of the RMA outlines the matters of national importance which includes the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.

In addition to the RMA, the key relevant documents that influence the provisions to be included in the District Plan, and the decisions to be made regarding its review, are the NZCPS and the RPS. There are also some relevant Environment Court principles from recent cases including the Mt Cass wind farm, and the interim decision on the Mackenzie District Council Plan Change 13. These documents and decisions give rise to the need to make some specific changes to the District Plan, including (but not limited to) identifying areas of outstanding natural character within the coastal environment, and identifying cultural and historic heritage landscapes.

At the workshop, Councillors were informed that in terms of the existing outstanding natural landscapes (ONL's) identified in the District Plan, these generally align well with the Canterbury Regional Landscape Study with the exception of a couple of localised areas (near Boyle village and in the St James area). It was suggested that a review of these specific areas be carried out to better align with the regional study.

Discussion turned to other landscapes in the district where it was pointed out that the District Plan has existing provisions to help maintain amenity values such as restricting building on ridgelines, height restrictions, setback rules etc. It was decided that these rules were sufficient to protect other areas with landscape values, and are being reviewed as part of another topic stream. However, these provisions will still be considered as part of the Landscape topic stream to integrate with other parts of the review.

In terms of giving effect to the NZCPS, Councillors were reminded of the discussion at the workshop held on the 25 July 2012 relating to the coastal environment topic stream. Hurunui's coastal environment has been identified and delineated in the planning maps as the Coastal Environment Management Area. The Council wishes to review this area, however, in light of the Canterbury Regional Council's decision to pause work on defining and mapping the coastal environment at a regional level, this work has been delayed. A clear message was sent to the Regional Council of the Hurunui's desire to progress this work in close collaboration with them, and its implications for the District Plan review.

However, at the workshop on the 26 September 2012, there was some agreement amongst the workshop attendees that in light of having been provided the base data for the work which has already been carried out by Boffa Miskell on behalf of the Regional Council, the review of Hurunui's coastal environment should be progressed and should also include the identification of areas of at least high natural character value and areas of outstanding natural character value. A process regarding sharing this information and building upon the work already undertaken needs to be worked out between the Regional Council and Hurunui.

Cultural and heritage landscapes were also discussed at the workshop. Raewyn Solomon from Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura informed that these landscapes have been mapped as part of Ngāi Tahu's draft Iwi Management Plan, which is due for notification at the end of the year. The data contained within this Plan can be provided to the Council. There was some uncertainty over the definition of what a 'cultural' or 'historic' landscape is with Raewyn indicating that the definition of a cultural landscape could be found within Ngāi Tahu's submission to the proposed RPS. In terms of any rules within the plan relating to cultural or historic landscapes, there was a strong indication that they should be rules which 'trigger' consultation with iwi or other appropriate agencies. Some more work around identifying 'historic landscapes' (including European history) needs to be carried out.

Again, as for the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity topic stream, before going out to landowners, the implications for them should be identified so as they can be better informed.

DPR2013 – Heritage

Section 6 of the RMA identifies the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance.

The RMA defines historic heritage as meaning the natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of NZ's history and culture and includes:

- historic sites, structures, places and areas
- archaeological sites
- sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu
- associated surroundings

The Regional Policy Statement also give direction to TAs in terms of protecting historic heritage. The existing provisions of the District Plan generally give effect to the RPS except for New Policy 13.3.4 which requires that territorial authorities **will** - *set out objectives and policies, and may include methods that enable appropriate repair, rebuilding, upgrading, seismic strengthening and adaptive re-use of historic buildings in a manner that is sensitive to their historic values.*

Other minor changes proposed include updating the schedules of heritage, archaeological and geological features, and notable trees against agency registers.

Discussion about how to raise awareness and consult on the existing list led to the suggestion that the existing schedules be taken to the district's historical societies and ward committees for local knowledge input, rather than seeking nominations from the public to volunteer new listings at this stage.

UPDATE ON OTHER DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW TOPIC STREAMS

Below is an update on other topic streams that have been initiated as part of the District Plan review.

DPR2003 – Energy

A workshop was held with Councillors on Thursday May 10 2012 in order to gain an understanding as to why the Council must address Energy issues in the District Plan review. Based on the discussions and direction provided in the workshop, this topic was further researched, with the finding being presented to the Strategy and Policy Committee at their meeting held on 16 August 2012.

As directed, initial consultation with statutory and interested parties has begun. A report summarising the outcomes of this initial consultation is due to be finalised the week ending 5 October. Once this has been received, the drafting of plan provisions for the energy topic stream will commence and be returned to the committee for further input with recommendations for consultation.

DPR2009 Natural hazards

At the workshop held on 25 July 2012, it was noted that the existing provisions contained in the District Plan relating to flooding were based on a 1990 Civil Defence analysis and referenced in a 1992 report by Kent Wilson on the natural hazard risks in the district. This information was considered out of date due to a variety of factors such as the natural courses of rivers changing, and flood mitigation measures being implemented.

In addition, it was noted that much of the hazard data that the Council receives is provided by the Regional Council. However, they have informed the Council that there is no flood modelling planned for catchments in the Hurunui District.

Accordingly, the Council directed staff to carry out a desk top study to identify reports or updated information on flooding in the district, and to seek local knowledge of the issue from local ward committees. To date, all ward committees have been approached and asked to look at the current district planning maps showing the flood hazard areas. They were asked to assess the accuracy of this flood risk, and in particular, to identify areas which may not be marked but are subject to flooding or ponding, or those areas which are identified which may no longer pose a risk.

This information is currently being collated and will be taken to the Flood Hazard Analysts at the Regional Council for comment. This committee will receive a further update once this has occurred.

DPR2011 The Coastal Environment

As discussed above (DPR2012 – Landscapes), work on reviewing the Coastal Environment Management Area has been paused pending the outcome of the Regional Council's work on 'Defining and Mapping the Canterbury Coastal Environment'. In a letter dated 7 August 2012, Council officers sent a strong message to the Regional Council that the Hurunui District Council supports the progression of this project and that the Hurunui District Council wishes to work in close collaboration with the Regional Council when/if this project recommences. As outlined at this committee's meeting held on 13 September, the response from the Regional Council was presented.

As discussed above, it is the recommendation of this report that the review and redefinition of Hurunui's coastal environment recommence using the information collected as part of the Regional Council's defining and mapping project as a base.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Do Nothing

This is not recommended. It is a statutory requirement for the Council to review the District Plan every 10 years.

1st Option - Adopt the recommendations of this report

This approach meets the statutory obligation and will provide a robust basis for further comprehensive consultation during and after drafting of provisions.

POLICY AND PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

The District Plan must be reviewed every 10 years. Both National and Regional policy are directing the District Plan to address the above matters. These high level policy documents include the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The District Plan is required to Give Effect to National Policy Statements and Regional Policy Statements.

SIGNIFICANCE

The recommendation is not deemed significant. Councillors will have further opportunity for input and debate once provisions are drafted. Councillors will also be required to adopt the provisions before public notification.

MĀORI IMPLICATIONS

Reference has been made to Te Poha o Tohu Raumati (Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura's Environmental Management Plan) on this issue, and no implications for Māori have been identified in relation to the recommendations. It is noted that the representatives from Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are keen to work closely with the Council and be kept informed throughout the District Plan review process.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is a legal requirement on Section 79 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to undertake a review of the District Plan by the time that it has been operative for 10 years. The legal requirements for undertaking a review and proposing a new District Plan are set out in the RMA and will be followed.

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 THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THE WORKSHOP HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2012 AND APPENDED TO THIS REPORT ARE CONFIRMED BY THE COMMITTEE.

COMMUNITY OUTCOME(S)

A desirable and safe place to live

A place where our traditional rural values and heritage make Hurunui unique

A place that demonstrates environmental responsibility

APPENDIX 1:**Recommendations arising from the workshops held on 26 September 2012**Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity:

- A) That a package of draft provisions be prepared and that a Councillor workshop be arranged to discuss these draft provisions.
- B) That once confirmed by this committee, the draft provisions be incorporated into an information package so that landowners understand the implications of their options under recommendation C).
- C) That all existing SNA's are reviewed and the landowners are provided with options including:
 - A 'do nothing' option – the SNA boundary will remain in the District Plan as it currently appears.
 - Review the current boundary to reflect the actual situation and request further information or a site visit to discuss the changes.
 - Nominate a new area to be assessed and potentially identified as an SNA.
 - Remove any area covered by QEII covenant or DoC owned areas.
 - Give landowners an 'opt-out' possibility (in which case indigenous biodiversity will still be protected by general vegetation clearance rules and therefore still give effect to the RPS).

Landscape:

- D) That the existing Outstanding Natural Landscapes are reviewed to better align with the Canterbury Regional Landscape Study in relation to the identified gaps.
- E) That the review of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes also include assessing Mt Cass and Claremont Farms for inclusion, along with any other identified ONFs.
- F) That a review and redefinition of Hurunui's Coastal Environment Management Area be undertaken building on the work previously undertaken by Boffa Miskell on behalf of the Canterbury Regional Council.
- G) That within the coastal environment, areas of at least High Natural Character value and areas of Outstanding Natural Character value be identified.
- H) That the Council consults with Ngāi Tahu to help identify cultural and historic landscapes.

Heritage:

- I) That the district's historical societies and ward committees be approached to gain local insight into any known heritage resources that could be added to the heritage schedules as part of the District Plan review.



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

11 October 2012

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Alcohol Reform Bill

REPORT BY: Team Leader Regulatory

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sue Courtney', with a large loop at the end.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J - Batchelor', with a long horizontal stroke.

Signature: Author
Sue Courtney

Manager
Judith Batchelor

Summary Report

One of the key changes in the Alcohol Reform Bill, compared to the 1989 Sale of Liquor Act, is that the Bill specifically provides for effective Local Alcohol Policies (LAPs) with a statutory mandate; currently local alcohol policies are limited in their ability to influence outcomes because they are 'non-statutory'. The Council will need to decide whether to have a 'Local Alcohol Policy' which is more prescriptive than our current Liquor Licensing Policy.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION IS RECEIVED.

One of the key changes in the Alcohol Reform Bill, compared to the 1989 Sale of Liquor Act, is that the Bill specifically provides for effective Local Alcohol Policies (LAPs) with a statutory mandate; currently local alcohol policies are limited in their ability to influence outcomes because they are 'non-statutory'. In terms of the current Bill's provisions a LAP is optional; if a local authority decides to have a LAP, it must consult the community including using the special consultative procedure of the Local Government Act 2002 and there is a right of appeal for submitters. The Council will need to decide whether to have a 'Local Alcohol Policy' which is more prescriptive than our current Liquor Licensing Policy.

In a LAP there is the provision to provide differently for different parts of the district or to provide for only one part of the district. A LAP may also apply differently to different kinds of premises.

Two or more territorial authorities may adopt a single LAP for their districts and in that case the Act applies as if they were a single territorial authority with a single district.

In terms of the current Bill provisions, a LAP relates to licensing matters only (although there is a Supplementary Order Paper proposing a widening of this scope), and can include polices on any or all of the following:

- Location of licensed premises by reference to broad areas or to proximity to premises or facilities of a particular kind
- Whether further licences of a particular kind should be issued for premises in the district concerned, or any stated part of the district
- Maximum trading hours
- The issue of licences, or licences of a particular kind or kinds, subject to discretionary conditions.
- One-way door restrictions

A territorial authority that wishes to have a LAP must first produce a draft policy which must have regard to the following matters:

- the objectives and policies of its district plan; (A local alcohol policy may be more restrictive than the district plan) and
- the number of licences of each kind held for premises in its district, and the location and opening hours of each of the premises; and
- any areas in which bylaws prohibiting alcohol in public places are in force; and
- the demography of the district's residents; (a districts residents include people who have holiday homes there) and
- the demography of people who visit the district as tourists or holidaymakers; and
- the overall health indicators of the districts residents; and
- the nature and severity of the alcohol-related problems arising in the district

The authority must not produce a draft policy without having consulted the Police, inspectors, and the Medical Officers of Health.

After producing a draft policy the territorial authority must consult with the community by using the special consultative procedure and then produce a provisional policy. Public notice must then be given and any person or agency that made a submission as part of the special consultative procedure may within 30 days appeal to the

licensing authority against any element of the resulting provisional policy. Anyone who did not make a submission cannot appeal.

If no appeal is made the policy is adopted 30 days after its public notification. If the policy includes a change in maximum trading hours for licensed premises then the day in which it is brought into force must be no sooner than 3 months after public notice.

It is planned that once the new legislation is enacted a working group made up of representatives of TA's in the region, the police and Medical Officers of Health, with support from the Local Government Alcohol Reference group, will work together to form a template for local alcohol policies that can then be modified to suit each district.

Another of the key changes in the Alcohol Reform Bill is that the District Licensing Agency (DLA) will become the District Licensing Committee (DLC). Each territorial authority must appoint a licensing committee whose functions will be to consider and determine applications for:

- licences and managers certificates; and
- renewals of licences and managers certificates; and
- temporary authorities; and
- variation, suspension, or cancellation of special licences.

Each DLC is to consist of 3 members appointed by the territorial authority. A member of the territorial authority (an elected member) must be appointed as the chairperson unless the territorial authority recommends that the chief executive appoint a commissioner as the chairperson of the committee.

A territorial authority must not approve a person to be included on the committee unless that person has experience relevant to alcohol licensing matters and cannot be a constable, a Medical Officer of Health, an inspector, or an employee of the territorial authority.

In deciding whether to issue a licence the DLA will have a much larger criteria to consider, such as, the design and layout of the premises and whether the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced by more than a minor extent.

The following are to be taken in to account when considering effects of amenity and good order of locality.

- Current and possible future noise levels
- Current and possible future levels of nuisance and vandalism
- The number of premises for which licenses of the kind concerned are already held
- The purposes for which land near the premises concerned is used
- The purposes for which those premises will be used if the licence is issued

This means that territorial authorities can place certain conditions on licenses which would work towards the object of the Act and mitigate harm. They can also restrict trading hours to shorter than the maximum trading hours stated in the Act.



HURUNUI
District Council

Meeting Date:

11 October 2012

REPORT TO: Strategy and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Enlarged Rural Fire District

REPORT BY: Manager Amenities and Special Projects

Signature:

Bruce Yates

Manager

Summary Report

The eight Rural Fire Districts in Canterbury have been working together as a steering committee to consider the implications of creating a larger rural fire district, under the direction of the Fire Service Commission. Three options are being considered, because the Commission has made it very clear that the status quo is not an option.

The committee has not yet been able to reach an agreement on a recommendation to bring back and discuss with individual Councils, but the attached communique is a report on progress to date for councillors' information.

The important issue of costs has not yet been determined but we are working to a December deadline to fit in with the Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan and the other Councils' annual plans. As soon as possible after that date, a full report will be presented to the Council on the steering committee's preferred option.

Recommendation

THAT THE INFORMATION BE RECEIVED

Progress made towards
Evaluation of Options for an
Enlarged Rural Fire District for the
Canterbury Region

Report to Territorial Local Authorities on progress made towards evaluating options for an
Enlarged Rural Fire District for the Canterbury Region

Date Created: 25 September 2012
Prepared By: Dennys Guild, Project Manager

Introduction

Rural fire control in New Zealand is administered by the National Rural Fire Authority (NRFA) under the legislative framework provided by the Fire Service Act of 1975, and the Forest and Rural Fires Act (1977), their amendments and their regulations. Current directions from central government and strategies of the NRFA have increased the focus on the performance of Rural Fire Authorities set up to deliver rural fire control service to territorial New Zealand.

There are currently 80 Rural Fire Authorities in New Zealand. This can lead to duplication of resources in some places and stretched resources in others.

The Enlarged Rural Fire Districts Strategy¹ outlines the government and NRFA expectations of the forest and rural fire sector to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of forest and rural fire management through the voluntary amalgamations of smaller rural Fire Authorities to form enlarged Rural Fire Districts.

The National Rural Fire Officer (NRFO), Murray Dudfield, has pledged the support of the NRFA to the initiative to review forest and rural fire management in the Canterbury region.

With significant progress towards the evaluation of options for an enlarged rural fire district (ERFD) for the Canterbury region having been made over the last 2 years, the Steering Committee guiding this process deemed that it is now appropriate to report on progress to the contributing Territorial Local Authorities.

Current Rural Fire Management in Canterbury

Rural Fire Authorities in Canterbury, being aware of this strategic push by the NRFA, began discussing how this strategy could affect them. The Southern Region of Canterbury consisting of Timaru District Council, the Mackenzie District Council and the Waimate District Council in cooperation with Forest Owners, Department of Conservation and the New Zealand Fire Service had already formed an ERFD, called the South Canterbury Rural Fire District, which has been operating successfully for some years.

This left the Fire Authorities in the North/Central Region being Ashburton, Selwyn, Christchurch City, Waimakariri, Hurunui, Ashley, Department of Conservation and forestry companies to reflect on their position.

The Canterbury region's Rural Fire Authorities have actively worked together over many years through the Canterbury West Coast Regional Rural Fire Committee (CWCRRFC) which has formal representation from all the above Rural Fire Authorities and includes representation from New Zealand Forest Owners, Federated Farmers, SCRFD, WCRFD, NZFS, Environment Canterbury and recently, the new Marborough/Kaikoura ERFD.

¹ NRFA Enlarged Rural Fire Districts booklet, 2009.

The CWCRRFC has operated to some degree as a quasi ERFD, yet with each Rural Fire Authority retaining all its legislated responsibilities. Co-operative agreement of the Rural Fire Authorities administered through the CWCRRFC committee has seen the Canterbury region effectively meet NRFA requirements.

Scoping Study

With this background in mind it appeared logical for the North/Central Rural Fire Authorities in Canterbury to consider (what could be termed the next step) of combining 7 existing Fire Authorities into one ERFD for the north/central sector of Canterbury.

The Canterbury Rural Fire Authorities jointly appointed Kerry Ellem as project manager in 2009 to undertake a Scoping Study on the consideration of an ERFD for North/Central Canterbury. Unfortunately, Mr Ellem had to relinquish this task before it was completed in order to take up a permanent position in Central North Island. However, he did manage to undertake a significant amount of investigation, so that when the current project manager took over the task in April 2011, he was able to complete the task in relatively short time.

The Scoping Study was used by the NRFA to call a meeting of stakeholder representatives in the wider Canterbury Region in July 2011 to define a way forward.

Steering Committee

The meeting of stakeholder representatives in July 2011 led to the formation of a Steering Committee to oversee the investigation of options for the establishment of an ERFD for Canterbury. The study region was expanded to include all of the Canterbury Region (including the South Canterbury ERFD) at the request of the latter to be involved. A Steering Committee was set up to include a representative from each of the financially contributing authorities, including NRFA, DOC, South Canterbury RFD, Ashburton DC, Selwyn DC, Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri DC, Hurunui DC and Ashley RFD.

A Steering Committee was appointed and a Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Options and an Assessment Criteria document were developed and both were approved by the Steering Committee on 7th November 2011. The Terms of Reference have the following objective:

“The objective of this project is to examine and present the options to establish the most effective means of managing the forest and rural fire function in the Canterbury region, namely;

- To identify the most effective and efficient regional governance and management structure for forest and rural fire management.
- To scope the creation of a Rural Fire District that works collaboratively and effectively to reduce the incidence and impact of rural wildfires on the forest and rural lands of the stakeholders and to effectively manage land use fires in the open air.
- To create an environment which provides for agreed forest and rural fire management policies across the different hazardscapes and allows key stakeholders to agree a common platform for performance and opportunities for improvement.
- To create an environment which provides for good governance across the forest and rural fire stakeholder groups in the region.
- To create a forest and rural fire management programme that is sustainable within an equitable funding regime.
- To create a structure that delivers improved benefits and is cost effective.
- To create a structure that, as far as practical, ensures lands within any proposed ERFD boundaries are contiguous i.e. no other RFA district permissible within the boundaries of the ERFD(s).

whilst taking into account wider Territorial Authority responsibilities such as Civil Defence.”

Options for an Enlarged Rural Fire District in Canterbury

A number of options were developed in skeletal form in order to assist the process of evaluation. These were as follows:

1. An enlarged RFD which includes all current rural fire authorities from Hurunui in the north to (and including) South Canterbury ERFD in the south, and that part of the DOC RFD that falls within that area
2. An enlarged RFD which includes all current rural fire authorities from Hurunui in the north to Ashburton in the south, and that part of the DOC RFD that falls within that area. i.e South Canterbury remains as a separate RFA.
3. An enlarged RFD which includes all current rural fire authorities from Hurunui in the north to Selwyn in the south, and that part of the DOC RFD that falls within that area. Ashburton could opt to be absorbed into the South Canterbury ERFD under this option.

After some trial runs that failed to meet the acceptance of all members of the Steering Committee, a scoring system that examined 22 criteria developed from a SWOT analysis carried out by the Steering Committee was accepted and adopted. The scoring system (called the Jensen model) enabled a survey of officers of each RFA to be carried out to

evaluate their preference of option as well as their preference for degree of centralization or decentralization for each criteria examined.

Although the NZ Fire Commission has made it clear that the status quo is not an option, the scoring system allowed each of the options to be compared with the status quo in order to determine the level of support for each of the options against the status quo. Whilst reducing the number of RFA's is Commission policy, it is not enshrined in legislation and is still optional.

Results from the Survey

The results from the survey are appended. Conclusions can be drawn from the survey as follows:

- that Option 3 is the most preferred option both in terms of total number of points scored and in terms of there being only one respondent that scored this option lower than 3. This option excludes Ashburton RFA and South Canterbury RFA from the new ERFD.
- that volunteer recruitment and management, and effective linkages with the community need to be maintained by decentralizing the DPRFOs.
- that the largest gains from centralization can be made in the Planning, Auditing and Administration functions

These results will enable an organization framework to be developed that takes the conclusions into account.

Where to from here

The next stage of the project is to put some flesh on the framework which will provide a tangible entity that can be evaluated for operational, financial and governance efficacy. Upon acceptance of the final model by the Steering Committee, the individual councils within the Canterbury region will be requested for their support before implementing the changes via a transitional plan. It is hoped that the Steering Committee will be able to sign off the on the most preferred option by the end of December 2012.

Progress made towards Evaluation of Options for an Enlarged Rural Fire District for the Canterbury Region

	Preferred degree of centralisation or decentralisation	Total Score from all 8 Respondents	
Scoring	1 = Stongly decentralised; 2 = Decentralised; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Centralised; 5 = Strongly centralised		
Minimise duplication of Resources			Average (divided by 8 respondents)
Plant and machinery	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to locate Plant and machinery where it is most appropriate relative to the wildfire threat	24	3.0
Equipment	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to locate equipment where it is most appropriate relative to the wildfire threat	25	3.1
Staff and PRFOs	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the location of Staff and the number of PRFOs	25	3.1
Administration	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the administration associated with wildfire management	31	3.9
Technical support and services – eg GIS	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the securing of technical support and services necessary to ensure efficient and effective wildfire management	23	2.9
Buildings	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the location of buildings to house plant and machinery, equipment and staff	23	2.9
Training providers	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to secure appropriately skilled Training providers	31	3.9
Finance	This option will provide the opportunity to improve cost efficiency and effectiveness over the Status Quo	28	3.5
Minimise duplication of compliance issues			
Meeting national standards	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to meet national standards	30	3.8
Fire permitting	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to carry out fire permitting in an efficient manner	25	3.1
Fire plans and Health and Safety plans	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in time and effort in preparing and implementing Fire plans and Health and Safety plans	37	4.6
Regulatory requirements, especially financial reporting to NRFA	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce the duplication of fulfilling regulatory requirements, especially financial reporting to NRFA	29	3.6
Auditing	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce the duplication of auditing of compliance with national standards	34	4.3
Volunteer personnel management – eg recruitment and induction procedures	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in Volunteer personnel management – eg recruitment and induction procedures	20	2.5
Other reporting to NRFA	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in other (non-regulatory) reporting to NRFA	31	3.9
Training, induction, recruitment and retention for staff and volunteers	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in training, induction, recruitment and retention for staff and volunteers	27	3.4
Minimise duplication of governance			
Move away from multiple agencies focused on their own goals and move towards a regional focus	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to move away from multiple agencies focused on their own goals and move towards a regional focus	31	3.9
Prioritise appropriate resourcing into areas of the region that currently do not have appropriate resourcing, using the Wildfire Threat Analysis as a guide	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to prioritise appropriate resourcing into areas of the region that currently do not have appropriate resourcing, using the Wildfire Threat Analysis as a guide	26	3.3
Encourage dedicated career development in core roles	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to encourage dedicated career development in core roles	29	3.6
Public education and dissemination of information	This option will provide greater opportunity than the Status Quo to convey messages to the public and speak as a single entity for the region	28	3.5
Rationalisation of imposing fire restrictions across the region	This option will provide greater opportunity than the Status Quo to co-ordinate the application of fire restrictions for the region	23	2.9
Meeting the needs and expectations of the community	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to provide effective linkages with the community and the ability to respond to its needs	22	2.8
	Total	602	75.3
	Average (divided by 22 questions)	27.4	3.4

Progress made towards Evaluation of Options for an Enlarged Rural Fire District for the Canterbury Region

		Option 1 - A single ERFD for the whole of Canterbury, being H-SC (Hurunui to South Canterbury)	Option 2 - Two ERFDs for Canterbury, being H-A (Hurunui to Ashburton) and SC (South Canterbury)	Option 3 - Two ERFs for Canterbury, being H-S (Hurunui to Selwyn) and A-SC (Ashburton to South Canterbury)
Choice of Option				
Scoring	1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree			
Minimise duplication of Resources				
Plant and machinery	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to locate Plant and machinery where it is most appropriate relative to the wildfire threat	27	28	28
Equipment	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to locate equipment where it is most appropriate relative to the wildfire threat	26	28	28
Staff and PRFOs	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the location of Staff and the number of PRFOs	24	25	23
Administration	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the administration associated with wildfire management	29	29	28
Technical support and services – eg GIS	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the securing of technical support and services necessary to ensure efficient and effective wildfire management	24	26	26
Buildings	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to rationalise the location of buildings to house plant and machinery, equipment and staff	20	22	22
Training providers	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to secure appropriately skilled Training providers	30	29	31
Finance	This option will provide the opportunity to improve cost efficiency and effectiveness over the Status Quo	26	29	29
Minimise duplication of compliance issues				
Meeting national standards	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to meet national standards	27	29	29
Fire permitting	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to carry out fire permitting in an efficient manner	22	24	24
Fire plans and Health and Safety plans	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in time and effort in preparing and implementing Fire plans and Health and Safety plans	34	32	34
Regulatory requirements, especially financial reporting to NRFA	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce the duplication of fulfilling regulatory requirements, especially financial reporting to NRFA	29	26	28
Auditing	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce the duplication of auditing of compliance with national standards	31	27	29
Volunteer personnel management – eg recruitment and induction procedures	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in Volunteer personnel management – eg recruitment and induction procedures	24	24	24
Other reporting to NRFA	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in other (non-regulatory) reporting to NRFA	28	25	27
Training, induction, recruitment and retention for staff and volunteers	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to reduce duplication in training, induction, recruitment and retention for staff and volunteers	29	30	31
Minimise duplication of governance				
Move away from multiple agencies focused on their own goals and move towards a regional focus	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to move away from multiple agencies focused on their own goals and move towards a regional focus	26	27	26
Prioritise appropriate resourcing into areas of the region that currently do not have appropriate resourcing, using the Wildfire Threat Analysis as a guide	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to prioritise appropriate resourcing into areas of the region that currently do not have appropriate resourcing, using the Wildfire Threat Analysis as a guide	27	28	27
Encourage dedicated career development in core roles	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to encourage dedicated career development in core roles	30	26	27
Public education and dissemination of information	This option will provide greater opportunity than the Status Quo to convey messages to the public and speak as a single entity for the region	31	25	28
Rationalisation of imposing fire restrictions across the region	This option will provide greater opportunity than the Status Quo to co-ordinate the application of fire restrictions for the region	26	25	26
Meeting the needs and expectations of the community	This option will provide better opportunity than the Status Quo to provide effective linkages with the community and the ability to respond to its needs	21	22	23
	Total	591	586	598
	Average (divided by 22 questions)	26.9	26.6	27.2
	Average (divided by 8 respondents)	3.4	3.3	3.4

Strategy and Policy Committee - Delegations

Authority to decide on all matters apart from those listed under "Limits to Delegations", and to make recommendations to Council on any matters before Council for which Council retains the power to act.

Advise on strategy and approve the policies which fall out of strategy.

Able to delegate to an ad-hoc committee the power to conduct hearings on its behalf and report back any recommendations.

Approval of submissions to relevant bills, discussion and policy documents relating to the responsibilities of the committee.

Amendments to the Council's budgets dependent on specific requirements, provided the total cost to Council does not change.

Pursuant to section 4 of the Public Bodies Contracts Act 1959 approval of tenders for contracts within budget (which exceed the officer authorisation) up to \$500,000.

Waivers of fees and charges in accordance with Council policy.

Authority to act as outlined above, in the following areas:

- Amenities:
 - township maintenance
 - halls
 - local reserves in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977
 - swimming pools
- Cemeteries
- Council owned property
- District reserves operation and maintenance
- Public toilets
- Roading
- Sewage disposal systems
- Solid waste management
- Water supply
- Drainage and stormwater
- Vehicle and plant purchases
- Civil defence in accordance with the Civil Defence Act 1983
- Fire control in accordance with Part 8, Section 183, Local Government Act 2002 and Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977
- Community Services including:
 - Libraries
 - Youth
 - Community development
 - Arts and Culture
 - Issues impacting on the social and cultural aspects of communities

Policy, planning and strategic direction with regard to:

- Dog and Stock Control
- Health
- Sale of Liquor
- Swimming Pools
- Building
- Litter
- Resource Management advocacy (external to the organisation) **Continued next page...**

Strategy and Policy Committee - Delegations (continued)

Financial Management:

- Review monthly and quarterly financial reports and analysis with Council management
- Implement ongoing benchmarking analysis to review all aspects of Council financial performance against best practice standards, wherever possible
- Undertake a rolling program of financial reviews of significant Council activities and expenditure, and recommend to the Council any proposed or recommended changes to services, levels of service, methods of funding or significant changes, and methods of delivery, where such changes would improve the overall financial performance of Council
- Review and monitor the Council's investments, assess returns and review possible acquisition and disposal options that could be to the Council's benefit
- Monitor in detail the performance of the Council's wholly owned Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa operation, and provide feedback as appropriate to both the Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa Management Committee and to the Council.
- Oversee and input into the development of the financial planning of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes.
- Oversee all Council revenue and expenditure.
- Oversee and monitor the activities of Council's forestry assets.
- Consider and decide requests for rates remission or postponement made under sections 177 and 178 of the Rating Powers Act 1988.

Matters that must be processed by way of recommendations to the Council include:

- Special Consultative Procedures, part 6, Section 83, Local Government Act 2002
- Bylaws, part 12, Section 293 Local Government Act 2002
- Road legalisation under the Public Works Act 1981
- Amendment to fees and charges relating to all activities
- Sale of Council property
- Road closures (permanent) in accordance with the relevant sections of part XI and the tenth schedule of the Local Government Act 1974, the Transport (Vehicular Traffic Road Closure) Regulations 1965 and the Public Works Act 1981
- Acceptance of contract tenders outside the parameters delegated under the Public Bodies Contracts Act 1959 above
- Areas delegated to other committees and boards, such as the:
 - Hanmer Springs Community Board
 - Regulatory Committee
 - Code of Conduct Committee
 - CEO Performance Review Committee
 - Audit and Risk Committee
 - Hurunui Tourism Board
 - Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa Management Committee
 - Ward and Community Committees
 - Water and Reserve Committees
 - Joint Committees
 - Advisory Committees

Any other committees or boards that Council may establish.