



Notice is given that an ordinary meeting of the Full Council will be held on:

Date: Thursday 4 April 2013
Time: 9.30 am
Meeting Room: Tasman Council Chamber
Venue: 189 Queen Street
Richmond

Full Council AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Mayor	Mayor R G Kempthorne	
Deputy Mayor	Cr T B King	
Councillors	Cr M L Bouillir	Cr J L Inglis
	Cr S G Bryant	Cr C M Maling
	Cr B F Dowler	Cr Z S Mirfin
	Cr J L Edgar	Cr T E Norriss
	Cr B W Ensor	Cr P F Sangster
	Cr G A Glover	Cr E J Wilkins

(Quorum 7 members)

Contact Telephone: 03 543 8405
Email: pamela.white@tasman.govt.nz
Website: www.tasman.govt.nz

AGENDA

1 OPENING, WELCOME

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Recommendation

That apologies be accepted.

3 PUBLIC FORUM

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

5 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on Thursday, 14 March 2013, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

6 PRESENTATIONS

Nil

7 REPORTS

7.1	Collaboration for the Management of Land Transport across the Top of the South Island.....	5
7.2	Appointment of Electoral Officer.....	31
7.3	Richmond Town Centre Project Update	37
7.4	Chief Executive's Activity Report.....	43
7.5	Mayor's Report	51
7.6	Full Council Action Items	59

8 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

8.1	Procedural motion to exclude the public.....	63
8.2	Council's Commercial Subcommittee - Recommended External Members	63
8.3	Commercial Subcommittee - Appointment of Elected Member	63

7 REPORTS

7.1 COLLABORATION FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF LAND TRANSPORT ACROSS THE TOP OF THE SOUTH ISLAND

Decision Required

Report To:	Full Council
Meeting Date:	4 April 2013
Report Author:	Peter Thomson, Engineering Manager
Report Number:	RCN13-04-01
File Reference:	

1 Summary

- 1.1 The three Councils of the Top of the South Island – Nelson, Tasman and Marlborough – and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) responsible for State Highways, have been working together to consider opportunities for joint collaboration for the management of land transport across the Top of the South Island that might lead to more efficient and effective services.
- 1.2 These opportunities would add to a suite of many and varied initiatives and collaborations already in place between the Top of the South councils and also with NZTA.
- 1.3 Roothing has been identified as a high budget activity worthy of early consideration as a shared service opportunity.
- 1.4 A governance group of representatives from the three Councils and NZTA has been formed and has met three times since 26 September 2012. A proposed Memorandum of Understanding and Issues and Objectives paper has been developed by the group.
- 1.5 These two documents are being formally considered by the three Councils at their respective meetings in late March and early April. NZTA has already signalled their intention to approve the documents.
- 1.6 The Tasman District Council is requested to endorse the documents for signing.

2 Draft Resolution

That the Full Council

1. receives the Collaboration for the Management of Land Transport across the Top of the South Island report; and
2. notes the work being done to investigate options to improve the efficiency of Top of the South Island roading maintenance and operations as set out in the Issues and Objectives paper (attached to report RCN13-04-01); and
3. endorses the approach and approves the “Memorandum of Understanding in respect of collaboration for the management of land transport across the Top of the South

Island” and the “Issues and Objectives paper” (attached to report RCN13-04-01) to guide ongoing work.

Item 7.1

3 Purpose of the Report

- 3.1 This report summarises the collaborative work being undertaken by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), Tasman District Council, Nelson City Council and Marlborough District Council to investigate options to improve the efficiency of roading maintenance and operations across the Top of the South Island.

4 Background and Discussion

- 4.1 The three councils of Te Tau Ihu (Top of the South Island) have been working together to consider opportunities for shared services and joint collaborations. An overarching Memorandum of Understanding on Shared Services has been signed by each Council, and was presented to the Tasman District Council at its meeting of July 2012.
- 4.2 Roading has been identified as a high budget activity worthy of early consideration as a shared service opportunity.
- 4.3 The Government and NZTA are actively encouraging the investigation of road maintenance and operations efficiencies. A “Road Maintenance Task Force 2012 – Review of Road Maintenance Regime” has led to the establishment of a national cross sectional “Road Maintenance Task Force Implementation Group” with key recommendations including:
- create a national asset management framework
 - establish a national roading classification
 - promote high quality asset management
 - communicate expectations that collaboration and clustering is investigated between road controlling authorities and incentivised to occur
 - pursue improved procurement methods and delivery models where necessary.
- 4.4 A national cross-sectional “Road Efficiency Group” is now overseeing the implementation of these recommendations and the New Zealand Transport Agency’s own maintenance and operations review.
- 4.5 NZTA has offered expertise to support an initiative between the three Top of the South Island councils (Tasman, Nelson and Marlborough) and has commenced work on collaboration and clustering options. Their expertise is in demand nationally as many councils are now considering opportunities. It is opportune to get underway early and utilise this expertise.
- 4.6 A Top of the South Governance Group (Mayors and Infrastructure Chairs, NZTA’s Regional Director and Council Chief Executives) and a Working Group (NZTA’s State Highway Manager and Planning and Investment Manager, relevant Council department managers) have both met several times to prepare:
- a Memorandum of Understanding for collaboration on the roading investigation
 - an Issues and Objectives paper.

These documents lay a framework for how, and why, any proposed joint initiatives might proceed. These documents are attached for your consideration.

- 4.7 The Issues and Objectives paper explains in some detail what the Governance Group agrees are “issues” that need to be addressed in any shared service arrangement for roading. It was decided these “issues” were therefore preconditions to be satisfied.
- 4.8 It is stressed in the paper that all viable options can be explored, including a continuation of the status quo. However it is also recognised that the latter may not be acceptable to either councils or NZTA as future funding constraints take effect.
- 4.9 The “issues” (pre-conditions) of any new shared service arrangement are:
 - a. the overall structure and stakeholder responsibilities are clear and easily understood
 - b. benefits must be achieved for all participants
 - c. savings achieved need to be equitably split between stakeholders
 - d. a “one network” approach to road corridor management will provide a more integrated higher quality user experience and improved planning outcomes
 - e. ultimate ownership, policy, funding and high level strategic control of road networks should stay with current owners
 - f. there should be opportunities for a range of contractors (not just major, national firms) to participate in an efficient, competitive contract market
 - g. there will be clear, short communication and decision making lines
 - h. ratepayers need to understand the link between their rate payments and road network quality
 - i. a “one stop shop” interface with the public has many benefits
 - j. stakeholders must retain “smart buyer” capability and individual stakeholder’s intellectual property needs to be preserved and maintained
 - k. across the Top of the South professional and technical roading expertise should be enhanced and succession for key staff planned
 - l. levels of service targets should be achieved
 - m. gain and retain community acceptance
- 4.10 The paper then identifies and discusses “Key Focus Areas” for the project. Road Maintenance Taskforce key recommendations were considered against each Council’s Regional Transport Strategy Vision and Objectives. There were no inconsistencies.

It was then agreed that four of the Taskforce’s recommendations would be given priority as “Key Focus Areas” for TOTS and NZTA to work on:

Key Focus Areas for the Top of the South Island	Success Measures
Review road maintenance, renewal and operations business models and implement an improved option if a sound business case is developed.	Any new business model is implemented effective 1 July 2014. Meaningful annual network maintenance, operations and renewal efficiency improvements are recorded, reported and achieved.

	A sound business case supporting the new models is developed.
Consider procurement options available which support the business model chosen and implement the improved option as contract expiry dates or negotiations permit.	As for business models.
Jointly review TOTS road network levels of service ongoing against the economic and social benefits provided by that network.	A review is completed by 30 September 2014 to inform the 2015-2018 Land Transport Programme funding decisions.
Review asset management practices and improve as necessary.	Commence under new business model by 1 July 2015. (NB: Ongoing development of Activity Management Plans by individual authorities should continue until then).

- 4.11 The Tasman, Nelson and Marlborough Councils and NZTA have established a sound basis to progress an investigation into roading maintenance and operational efficiencies and the potential for shared services.
- 4.12 Some challenging timelines to progress key focus areas have been set requiring a strong commitment particularly from the Council and NZTA working group members.

5 Options

- 5.1 The Council can note the work to date and endorse the Memorandum of Understanding and “Issues and Objectives paper”. The Nelson and Marlborough Councils will be considering this option also. NZTA have signalled that they are prepared to sign the Memorandum of Understanding. This is the preferred option and will allow continued investigation and scoping work into the Key Focus Areas.
- 5.2 The Council can decline to endorse the attached Memorandum of Understanding and require either the document to be amended; or decide not to endorse this approach at all.

6 Strategic Challenges / Risks

- 6.1 Investigations and scoping work recommended at this stage of the multi-party collaboration are a very low risk to Council. However any proposals coming from this work will need to be considered alongside other opportunities for shared services and the possible effects or impact this collaboration may have on all activities and services that the Council provides to its communities. Any proposals for collaboration in transportation will also need to consider other likely changes that may be imposed by central government, particularly in other areas of infrastructure service delivery.

7 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan

- 7.1 This collaborative approach is not in conflict with current Council policies.

8 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications

- 8.1 The cost of work to date has been conducted within existing budgets, utilising staff time only. The cost of further investigation of the Key Focus Areas, the next step in the process, will also be conducted within existing budgets.
- 8.2 If the project proceeds to a specific proposal and an implementation phase, the Council will receive a further report back, however it is planned to only proceed in areas where collaborative efforts are either cost neutral or create savings.

9 Significance

- 9.1 Investigation of shared service or collaboration options is of low significance in terms of the Council's Significance Policy. The investigations are not significant pursuant to Section 90(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002 because there will be no impact on the delivery or level of service provided by the Council to the community.
- 9.2 Should a shared service be agreed to it may be of high significance as it could change the way Council carries out and delivers its transportation activities across the whole system potentially affecting all service users.

10 Consultation

- 10.1 The framework has been developed in consultation with Marlborough District Council, Nelson City Council and the New Zealand Transport Agency.

11 Conclusion

- 11.1 In order to progress the development of shared services, staff recommend that Council receives and endorses the attached reports, and adopts the Memorandum of Understanding in respect of collaboration for the management of land transport across the Top of the South Island.

12 Next Steps / Timeline

- 12.1 The governance group will report back to the Councils and NZTA once options have been developed and reviewed.

13 Appendices

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Top of the South Island (TOTS) Road Maintenance Efficiencies MOU | 13 |
| 2. | Issues and Objectives Paper | 23 |

Memorandum of Understanding

Between

New Zealand Transport Agency

and

Tasman District Council

And

Marlborough District Council

And

Nelson City Council

**In respect of collaboration for the management of land
transport across the Top of the South Island**

Preamble

The council parties to this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) have committed, in a separate Memorandum of Understanding dated 26 July 2012, to collaborate when procuring goods and by sharing services. That agreement sets out those commitments. It also provides for other parties to join shared services arrangements. The aim is to deliver improved and more resilient services and to provide value for money and savings.

Land transport (roading) has been identified as a candidate for assessment as a shared service. This MOU sets out the process by which the parties will evaluate and if agreed, implement changes to the management of land transport in the Top of the South so that the network of roads is safer to use, contributes materially to the prosperity of the wider region, meets the needs of communities and is cheaper to build, operate and maintain.

1.0 Parties

- 1.1 Tasman District Council (TDC), Marlborough District Council (MDC) and Nelson City Council (NCC) - unitary authorities constituted under the Local Government Act.
- 1.2 New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), an authority constituted under the Land Transport Management Act.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The parties have objectives, which encourage closer working relationships with other agencies to enhance business results.
- 2.2 The parties have discussed ways to formalise a working relationship and have decided to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding.

3.0 Intent

- 3.1 The intent of this MOU is to:
 - formalise a working relationship between the parties;
 - state the protocols for collaborative actions, including monitoring the health of the relationship
- 3.2 The parties do not intend that this MOU creates a legally enforceable agreement.

4.0 **Scope**

- 4.1 Any land transport management activities plus any activity where the relationship will advance the interests of all parties and those they represent.

5.0 **Goals**

- 5.1 The parties acknowledge they may have separate objectives and statutory responsibilities some of which may not be congruent.
- 5.2 It is important to list the respective goals of the organisations to set up a platform from which collaborative efforts can be pursued.
- 5.3 TDC's statutory vision and objectives:
- To have a land transport system that will support a sustainable and prosperous economy, that is accessible by and services the whole community, contributing to the better health, safety and wellbeing of those living within and visiting Tasman.
 - A transport system that contributes to economic growth and prosperity.
 - A transport system that is safe to use across all transport modes.
 - An efficient transport system that is integrated with land-use planning, optimising access and mobility for all.
 - A transport system that encourages active modes of travel.
 - A transport system that optimises energy efficiency and ensures the sustainability of the natural and built environment.
 - A transport system that is affordable and provides value for money.
- 5.4 NCC's statutory vision and corporate objectives:
- The vision for the Nelson land transport network is: 'a sustainable transport future for Nelson'. This vision is embodied in the following high level objectives:
 - Environmental Sustainability: a transport system that supports international, national and regional strategies for energy efficiency and climate change, and protects natural systems and community values
 - Assist Economic Development: a transport system that supports national and regional development

- Safety & Personal Security: a transport system that reduces road trauma and contributes to a sense of individual and community safety and security
 - Access & Mobility: a transport system that is effective, integrated and physically and financially accessible by all users
 - Public Health: a transport system that contributes to improved health and well-being
 - Affordability: a regional transport programme that is affordable for the Nelson community and users
- The vision and objectives of this strategy can only be achieved by moving away from providing for travel demand by building roads and infrastructure to reducing vehicle use by encouraging transport behavioural change, providing improved modal choice and reducing the demand for travel. The available means of achieving this vision are complex and inter-related. It is clear that no single measure in isolation will be successful in meeting the high level objectives and an integrated package of measures is required.
- 5.5 MDC's statutory vision and corporate objectives:
- To plan a safe and responsive land transport system that facilitates Marlborough community wellbeing.
 - Provide a land transport system which is suitable for existing use.
 - Recognise strategic significance of the land transport hierarchy.
 - Manage development to ensure the network has capacity to operate at the appropriate level of service.
 - Provide a safe land transport system for all users.
 - Maximise return on investment in the land transport network.
 - Consider future proofing the land transport network.
 - Provide for the co-ordination of effective multimodal transport.
 - Maintain amenity values to a level at least consistent as exists at present.
- 5.6 NZTA's purpose and corporate objectives:
- Purpose – Creating transport solutions for a thriving New Zealand.
- Desired long-term outcomes are:
- better use of existing transport capacity

- more efficient freight supply chains
- a resilient and secure transport network
- easing of severe urban congestion
- more efficient vehicle fleets
- reductions in deaths and serious injuries from road crashes
- more transport mode choices
- a reduction in adverse environmental effects from land transport

Priorities:

- improving customer service and reducing compliance costs – focusing our efforts on providing high levels of customer service while being smart about reducing costs.
- embedding the Safe System approach – into everything we do to create a forgiving road system increasingly free of death and serious injury.
- improving freight movement efficiency– contributing to a significant improvement in safe and efficient access of freight to markets.
- improving public transport effectiveness – lifting the effectiveness of public transport services to better use existing transport capacity and ease congestion in our big cities.

6.0 Agreements

6.1 The parties agree to:

- work with each other with the aim of exploring more efficient and effective methods of operating the roads and state highways within the TOTS region;
- work collaboratively and co-operatively on identified issues;
- monitor the effectiveness of the relationship;
- refrain from making any adverse comment about the other party, without first giving that party reasonable advance notice.

6.2 Accordingly, the parties agree to establish Governance and Working groups to develop this MOU and associated studies as the first steps to investigating shared services for roads and state highways in the TOTS region;

- The Working Group will meet at a frequency determined by the Governance Group to:

- Discuss issues which will establish efficiency improvement options for the parties in delivering their goals;
- Document and develop issues in priority order which the parties have agreed to co-operate on for the improvement of business models and practices.

7.0 Principles

7.1 The principles that underpin this Memorandum of Understanding are as follows:

- That the parties agree to meet on a regular basis to ensure that all are informed of issues and that relevant information is shared between them.
- Each party commits to consider, investigate and resolve issues as they arise in a manner that maintains the integrity, professionalism and statutory accountabilities of each party.
- Each party will endeavour to keep their organisation, and the members of the other parties advised of issues that may affect one party as a result of the activities by the other.
- The Parties agree that they will act in good faith in meeting their responsibilities under this agreement and in resolving differences in opinion.

8.0 Term

8.1 The term of this MOU is indefinite. It can only be terminated at the instigation of any party.

9.0 Amendment

9.1 This MOU can be amended at any time but only by written agreement of the parties.

10.0 Publicity/Communications

10.1 Notwithstanding the right for the media to report on any public meeting, all parties, prior to release, will agree to any communications plan or media release on this initiative.

11.0 Costs

11.1 Unless otherwise agreed costs will be where they fall.

12.0 Limitations

12.1 The parties recognise that the Land Transport Management Act and the Local Government Act and other constraints may constrain their capacity to enter into a shared services arrangement and agree to explore other options if necessary so as to give effect to their objectives.

13.0 Conflict

13.1 Where a conflict arises between the parties which is impacting on the collaboration effort then:

- The conflict will be elevated immediately to the respective Chief Executive Officers; and
- If the CEO's are unable to resolve the conflict an independent mediator, agreeable to both parties, shall be appointed to help resolve the issue.

14.0 Implementation

14.1 The parties agree to work collaboratively and co-operatively towards a target date of 1 July 2014 for the implementation of an agreed business improvement delivery model that will deliver their goals.

15.0 Governance Arrangements

15.1 The following persons are authorised to represent their organisations

Position	Organisation	Delegations
Mayor	Tasman District Council	Governance Group
Mayor	Nelson City Council	Governance Group
Mayor	Marlborough District Council	Governance Group
Regional Director Central,	NZTA	Governance Group
Chairman Engineering Services	Tasman District Council	Governance Group

Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure (shared role)	Nelson City Council	Governance Group
Chairman Assets & Services	Marlborough District Council	Governance Group
CEO	Tasman District Council	Governance Group
CEO	Nelson City Council	Governance Group
CEO	Marlborough District Council	Governance Group
Planning and Investment Manager Central Region	NZTA	Working Group Member
Assets & Services Manager	Marlborough District Council	Working Group member
Executive Manager Strategy and Planning	Nelson City Council	Working Group member
State Highway Manager Wellington	NZTA	Working Group member
Engineering Services Manager	Tasman District Council	Working Group member

16.0 Changes

16.1 The following register shall record all changes made to the MOU:

Reference	Description of Change	Documentation

SIGNED BY:
Tasman District Council
Under delegated authority to

SIGNED BY:
Nelson City Council
Under delegated authority to

SIGNED BY:
Marlborough District Council
Under delegated authority to

SIGNED BY:
New Zealand Transport Agency
Under delegated authority to

Item 7.1

Annexure 1: Special Agreement(s)

The following register shall record all Special Agreement(s) entered into by the parties:

Reference	Description of Special Agreement	Documentation

Attachment 1

File ref: R855-06
Record No: 1333855

Top of the South Road Maintenance Efficiency

Issues and Objectives

Date: 1 February 2013

Prepared by: TOTS Road Efficiency Working Group:
Rod James (NZTA)
Michael Schruer (Nelson)
Peter Thomson (Tasman)
Mark Wheeler (Marlborough)

For: TOTS Road Efficiency Governance Group

Purpose:

1. This paper proposes some key focus areas for a joint approach by the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and Top of the South (TOTS) councils (Tasman District, Nelson City and Marlborough District Councils) to achieve road maintenance efficiencies. Issues to be considered and outcomes to be achieved in establishing and evaluating efficiency improvement options are also discussed.

Background:

2. TOTS have been discussing opportunities for shared services for several years. A report was prepared by Leigh Auton (March 2011) which recommended shared services projects for initial consideration. "Top of the South Roads" was one of those recommended.
3. Discussions have continued between the three Councils. A Memorandum of Understanding has been approved by each Council (attached Appendix 1) with the following objectives:

"The Council's aim is to use shared services to deliver, in each Council area:

- Improved and more resilient services; or
- Value for money and savings; or
- Good quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions".

Roading has been confirmed as worthy of early investigation.

4. At the same time as TOTS have been discussing shared services opportunities, the Government has completed a report into the effectiveness of road maintenance titled "Road Maintenance Task Force 2012 – Review of Road Maintenance Regime". Four general improvement areas have been identified:
 - Adapting the business models used to deliver maintenance, renewals and operations.
 - Improved procurement practices, also in support of new business models.
 - Improved prioritisation and optimisation through level of service implementation.
 - Consistent introduction of enhanced asset management practices.

Key recommendations include:

- Establish a cross-sectional Road Maintenance Task Force Implementation Group to champion the changes.
- Create a national asset management framework.
- Establish a national roading classification.
- Promote high quality asset management.
- Communicate expectations that collaboration and clustering is investigated between road controlling authorities and incentivised to occur.
- Pursue improved procurement methods and delivery models where necessary.

5. The New Zealand Transport Agency have also just completed a review of state highway maintenance and network operations (the “MNO” review) focusing on opportunities for more cost effective maintenance.

Consultation meetings including road controlling authorities, consultants and road contractors have been held to discuss the following key areas of opportunity for NZTA:

- Longer term contracts.
- New MNO contract form.
- Contract aggregation.
- Fence to fence approach to term contracts.
- Contract incentives.

6. A National Cross-Sectional Governance Group (the “Road Efficiency Group” or REG) has now been formed to oversee national implementation of the Road Maintenance Task Force and NZTA MNO reviews. “Attachment 2” summarises the work streams underway.
7. NZTA is leading the development of national freight plans to better understand economics and issues with freight movements. North and South Island connectivity is part of that.
8. A meeting of TOTS senior elected members, executives and NZTA officers was held on 26 September to further consider road maintenance improvement opportunities. Minutes of that meeting are attached (Attachment 3).

There was strong support for further work to be done. A working group was subsequently appointed. The group’s first tasks were the development of a Memorandum of Understanding and an Issues and Options paper for presentation to this TOTS Road Efficiency Governance Group meeting.

9. Following that meeting NZTA has confirmed its support for and willingness to assist with investigation into efficiency opportunities and in particular collaboration/clustering across TOTS. Marlborough’s existing model is an example of collaboration/clustering on a smaller scale.
10. NZTA is also undertaking a Financial Assistance Rate Review. Marlborough’s Chief Executive Andrew Besley is on the reference group. There has been speculation that the FAR’s could be used to incentivise road efficiency improvement projects. The RMTF also recommended incentivising collaboration and clustering.
11. Initially NZTA is working on reform of contract models and structures.

Marlborough Roads (NZTA) is already working with Marlborough District Council, its maintenance contractor and consultants towards replacing the current two hybrid maintenance contracts with one

new form contract incorporating more engineering design and management by the contractor and the principal thus reducing direct consultancy involvement.

This may be an example on which to base the new contract form.

If cost savings are negotiated between the parties and risks are deemed manageable the new model could be operative from 1 July 2013.

12. In summary the key point of the current political and economic environment is that there is significant alignment of NZTA and TOTS maintenance efficiency goals at present, providing an opportunity to achieve positive change. There may be incentives further out (FAR review) to obtaining those efficiency improvements particularly around collaboration and clustering. There is certainly an opportunity to enjoy NZTA's support and expertise at an early stage of the National reforms before their resource gets pulled elsewhere. Prompt action is recommended.

Discussion – Issues (and Pre-Conditions)

13. TOTs roading budgets are very large expense areas for each Council. NZTA approved maintenance, operations and renewal programmes 2012 to 2015 total \$175 million for the three Council regions.
14. The Working Group is only too aware of the public interest in road safety, condition and congestion. Any significant changes perceived as potentially affecting these attributes will therefore be keenly debated and outcomes critically assessed. Public scrutiny is a given. Consultation on any proposed changes is essential. "Road shows" across the three Council areas will be vital to allay concerns and explain accurately any proposals.
15. During recent discussions across TOTS various concerns/issues/pre-condition requirements were expressed by participants. These need to be further considered and the most significant agreed by the Governance Group. Interestingly most were also concerns 12 years ago in Marlborough prior to adopting the Marlborough Roads model.
16. The Working Group considers these issues we began to consider them not so much as problems but really pre-conditions to either introducing or measuring the success of any new models. The Governance Group decided these issues should be framed as outcome statements or success measures. KPIs could be developed from them.
17. A summary of these outcome statements is:
- (a) The overall structure and stakeholder responsibilities are clear and easily understood.

Comment:

Stakeholders are the TOTS Councils and NZTA.

This will require the development of well defined, consulted, documented and communicated changes. Consultation and communication is expected to include road owners, contractors, consultants, industry and interest groups, emergency services and the wider road user and ratepayer community.

- (b) Benefits must be achieved for all participants.

Comment:

Benefits could be quantitative and/or qualitative ie; cost savings might be made and/or improvements in road quality, decision making or design achieved.

Participants are the road owners, funders, ratepayers and users.

- (c) Savings achieved need to be equitably and transparently split between stakeholders.
- (d) A "one network" approach to road corridor management will provide a more integrated higher quality user experience and improved planning outcomes.

Comments:

The road user generally travels on both local roads and State Highways. That user wants a safe, smooth and economic trip regardless of road ownership (Local Roads or State Highway). To optimise that experience an integrated approach to planning is necessary so that design standards, capacities, levels of service etc are well understood and as seamless as feasible. That does not require single, whole of road network ownership but integrated planning and management.

- (e) Ultimate ownership, policy, funding and high level strategic control of road networks should stay with current owners.

Comment:

It is not proposed or legally feasible for these ownership and governance responsibilities to be amended. Any new structures and systems must ensure those fundamental responsibilities are retained and able to be exercised effectively.

This limits changes to those involving planning, maintenance and operation of the networks – subject to controls by the governance entities ie; TOTS Councils and NZTA.

Councils' fundamental governance roles are not diminished.

- (f) There should be opportunities for a range of contractors (not just major, national firms) to participate in an efficient, competitive contract market.

Comment:

Any change in the size, term or conditions of roading contracts will inevitably raise objections from those enjoying the benefits to them of current arrangements. The fact is stakeholders must consider the greater good of their wider community of funders and road users.

It is however important that there are opportunities for smaller, generally locally based contractors outside the major national firms, to obtain some roading work which may be as a sub-contractor. Their involvement will help preserve a degree of competition, local skills and employment.

Short term savings from larger contracts should not compromise the longer term competitive market.

- (g) There will be clear, short communication and decision making lines.

Comment:

Any new structures or systems developed should enable interested parties with questions or concerns to contact informed people who can provide prompt and accurate assistance or responses. Decision making delegations need to be clearly defined, understood and supported at all levels of the road governance and management structure.

- (h) Ratepayers need to understand the link between their rate payments and road network quality.

Comment:

In other words road ratepayers need to understand what their roading rate is being spent on and how the management and operation structure works.

- (i) A “one stop shop” interface with the public has many benefits.

Comment:

This is a different outcome to the “network” approach of (d) above. A “one-stop-shop” is a customer (road user) service. Users with queries or issues about any regional roads (State Highway or Local Road) will benefit from being able to visit one place in each Council area to get answers and actions necessary. This includes developers and contractors. Many road users are unsure (and don't care) if they are on a State Highway or Local road. It is very simple

for them to contact or visit one place to get answers (or in Marlborough Roads case – pay parking fines!).

- (j) Stakeholders must retain “smart buyer” capability and individual stakeholder’s intellectual property needs to be preserved and maintained.

Comment:

TOTS Councils and NZTA need to understand their service provider’s performance and critically assess and propose changes if necessary. This requires “in-house” expertise or alternative controls such as the ability to request audits, get regular verifiable reporting etc. It is also important to ensure the retention of intellectual property by stakeholders in order to deal with possible future changes in structures or systems for service delivery eg; road asset management data, details of renewals programmes etc. This can be achieved with good asset management and reporting systems.

- (k) Across TOTS professional and technical roading expertise should be enhanced and succession for key staff planned.

Comment:

Some form of centralisation could enable more specialist skills to be shared across all three authorities due to economies of scale eg; transportation planning which includes network planning and strategic developments. Better planning creates future efficiencies. It is challenging in our areas to recruit and retain professionally qualified staff. A larger roading management operation might be a more attractive prospect.

- (l) Levels of service targets should be achieved.

Comment:

This requires clear definition and measurement of levels of service for each stakeholder’s roads. It is not necessarily intended that levels of service for local roads are standardised across TOTS given each local authority retains individual governance and funding responsibility. However a key area for improvement identified by the Road Maintenance Task Force was “Improved prioritisation and optimisation through level of service differentiation”.

Some standardisation across TOTS might result from such work.

- (m) Gain and retain community acceptance.

Comment:

Stakeholder, interest group and community engagement and consultation as well as future efficient and effective delivery of agreed levels of service will be required to gain and retain community acceptance.

Discussion – Key Focus Areas

18. In considering objectives for a TOTS roading efficiency project the Government Policy Statement and each Council’s Regional Land Transport Strategy are starting points. The RLTS documents incorporate both state highway and local road networks and have a whole of network approach. A wide range of stakeholders have of course been involved in the development of the RLTS documents including NZTA and the TOTS.
19. It is a statutory requirement that the RLTS’s are not inconsistent with the GPS so it can be assumed the TOTS RLTS’s are compliant with Government direction.
20. Attachment 4 includes the visions/missions/objectives of the Strategies. Aspirations are expressed in different ways – particularly in Marlborough – but in general the TOTS councils are working to achieve similar ends.
21. When these aspirations are compared to the Road Maintenance Task Force (RMTF) key recommendations there are no inconsistencies.

RMTF	Tasman Objectives	Nelson Objectives	Marlborough Objectives
Improvement Areas	Which objectives are consistent with RMTF		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adapting business models used to deliver maintenance, renewals and operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 and 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 and 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3, 5 and 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement, procurement practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 and 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 and 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3, 5 and 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved prioritisation and optimisation through level of service and implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1, 3 and 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1, 3 and 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent introduction of enhanced asset management practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All

22. The RMTF key areas for improvement are proposed as a fundamental starting point in establishing key focus areas for TOTS road efficiency improvements. Success measures should also be considered. The focus should be high level and applicable to each organisation involved. The focus areas pertain to road efficiency improvements rather than individual organisations wider objectives (eg; amenity). However any new business models will need to enable those wider objectives to be achieved. It is not proposed that levels of service need necessarily be standardised across TOTS but any new structure should be able to deliver those levels more efficiently and effectively.

23. Proposed Key Focus Areas and Success Measures for Road Efficiency Improvements:

RMTF Key Area for Improvement	Key Focus Areas for TOTS	Success Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adapting the business models used to deliver maintenance, renewals and operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review road maintenance, renewal and operations business models and implement an improved option if a sound business case is developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any new business model is implemented effective 1 July 2014. Meaningful annual network maintenance, operations and renewal efficiency improvements are recorded, reported and achieved. A sound business case supporting the new models is developed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved procurement practices, also in support of new business models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider procurement options available which support the business model chosen and implement the improved option as contract expiry dates or negotiations permit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for business models.

RMTF Key Area for Improvement	Key Focus Areas for TOTS	Success Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved prioritisation and optimisation through level of service differentiation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jointly review TOTS road network levels of service ongoing against the economic and social benefits provided by that network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review is completed by 30 September 2014 to inform the 2015-2018 Land Transport Programme funding decisions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent introduction of enhanced asset management practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review asset management practices and improve as necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commence under new business model by 1 July 2015. (NB: Ongoing development of Activity Management Plans by individual authorities should continue until then).

24. The priorities are to improve business models and procurement practices which the RMTF and NZTA believe can achieve the biggest savings in relatively short timeframes. The status quo remains an option but is considered unlikely given national review findings and Central Government's intent to make improvements.
25. There will be recommendations and lower level objectives each stakeholder will have which require further discussion and agreement.
26. Baseline measures of current performance will be agreed so that future gains can be measured quantitatively and qualitatively.

Next Steps

27. The report is presented for the Governance Group's approval. Assuming that approval is given the Working Group will develop a timetabled work programme, including the resourcing of that.
28. The highest priority objectives are for the development of improved business models and procurement practices by 1 July 2014. This requires a well coordinated and concerted effort if timeframes are to be met.
29. NZTA is providing resource to the project. Initially they are preparing an overview of possible collaboration, clustering and procurement models for the Working Group. A second working group meeting in February is being planned to discuss these possibilities. The status quo is an option but the Working Group considers that an unlikely outcome given the findings of the national reviews and Central Government's strong intent to make improvements.

We look forward to discussion.

Yours sincerely

MARK WHEELER (MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL)
on behalf of the TOTS ROAD EFFICIENCY WORKING GROUP

c.c. P Thomson (Tasman)
M Schruer (Nelson)
R James (NZTA)

7.2 APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORAL OFFICER**Decision Required**

Report To: Full Council
Meeting Date: 4 April 2013
Report Author: Lindsay McKenzie, Chief Executive
Report Number: RCN13-04-02
File Reference:

Item 7.2**1 Summary**

- 1.1 Council must at all times have an Electoral Officer.
- 1.2 Lloyd Kennedy has stepped down from this position; and Council must therefore appoint new Electoral Officer, as required under Section 12 of the Local Electoral Act 2001.
- 1.3 I recommend appointing Sandra Hartley as Electoral Officer. Sandra has been Deputy Electoral Officer for some time, and has largely run the last by-election and poll. She has a good understanding of the Local Electoral Act and other relevant legislation.

2 Draft Resolution**That the Full Council:**

1. receives the report **Appointment of Electoral Officer RCN13-04-02**; and
2. **Acknowledges the work undertaken by Lloyd Kennedy as Electoral Officer for the Tasman District Council since its formation in 1989; and**
3. **appoints Sandra Hartley as the Electoral Officer for the Tasman District Council as required by Section 12 of the Local Electoral Act 2001.**

3 Purpose of the Report

- 3.1 To appoint a new Electoral Officer for the Tasman District Council for the 2013 Local Authority Elections

4 Background and Discussion

- 4.1 Lloyd Kennedy has stepped down from his position as the Electoral Officer for the Tasman District Council. Mr Kennedy has served as the Electoral Officer for Tasman District Council for triennial elections and polls since the Council's inception in 1989, and prior to that for the former Waimea County Council.
- 4.2 Council must therefore appoint a new Electoral Officer. This is a requirement set out in Section 12 of the Local Electoral Act 2001 (LEA).
- 4.3 The Electoral Officer is responsible for the organisation and administration of all elections and polls pertaining to Tasman District Council and its Community Boards. The specific duties are outlined in Section 15 of the LEA as follows:
- The compilation and certification of electoral rolls
 - The publication of any public notice in relation to elections and polls
 - Receiving nominations, candidate profile statements and deposits required to be paid
 - Issuing and receiving ordinary and special votes and other official documents
 - The processing and counting of votes
 - The declaration of results
 - Receiving returns of electoral expenses
 - Investigating and reporting offences
- 4.4 The Deputy Electoral Officer, Sandra Hartley, is currently acting in the Electoral Officer role for Tasman District Council. Section 13(2) requires the Deputy Electoral Officer to act as the Electoral Officer if that person resigns, and continues to act in that capacity until such time as a new Electoral Officer has been appointed.
- 4.5 Sandra Hartley has considerable knowledge and experience in running elections, having assisted in the organisation and conduct of elections, by-elections and polls for the District since 2004. I am satisfied Sandra would be an appropriate person to appoint to this role.
- 4.6 Should Council agree to the appointment of Sandra Hartley to the role of Electoral Officer, Sandra intends to appoint Mark Tregurtha as Deputy Electoral Officer. Mark has electoral officer experience from a previous position, and would be a suitable support person for Sandra.
- 4.7 Alternatively Council could contract out the Electoral Officer role to an external service provider and retain Sandra Hartley in the Deputy role.

5 Options

- 5.1 There are two options which Council could consider.
- 5.2 Option 1 – Appoint Sandra Hartley as Electoral Officer. Sandra has relevant experience and has largely run the last by-election and poll on her own in Lloyd's absence. She has a good understanding of the Local Electoral Act and Regulations, and a good understanding of the electoral process. It is more cost effective to do the work in-house rather than outsourcing the complete process. For example, the recent amalgamation poll cost over \$100,000. My recommendation is that the electoral process be run in-house.
- 5.3 Option 2 – Enter into a contract with Council's electoral services provider, electionz.com, for the appointment of one of its staff, Warwick Lampp, as the Electoral Officer. While contracting the role out does ensure independence, it will reduce the ability for the public to have direct contact with electoral staff locally to deal with enquiries and questions. It will also cost more.

6 Strategic Challenges / Risks

- 6.1 It is a legal requirement to appoint an Electoral Officer. Council must, therefore, appoint someone to the role. By appointing someone with the appropriate experience to undertake the work, it reduces the risk to Council of the electoral processes not being carried out judiciously and with integrity.

7 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan

- 7.1 The Chief Executive of a local authority must not be appointed as an electoral officer unless the local authority is satisfied that no other action is reasonably practicable in the circumstances.
- 7.2 The Electoral Officer is independent of the local authority and as such is not subject to the direction of the local authority or community board in undertaking his/hr role, other than an instruction to conduct an election or referendum in terms of Sections 8(1) or 9(1) of the LEA.

8 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications

- 8.1 The costs of engaging an Electoral Officer and Deputy Electoral Officer in-house to manage the election process and the covering of their normal Council roles as required is being budgeted for as part of the overall cost of the 2013 elections.

9 Significance

- 9.1 This report deals with what is largely an internal matter which is likely to be of limited public interest and does not have major budgetary implications if undertaken in-house. I consider that the matter is of relatively low significance, given these factors.

10 Consultation

10.1 Consultation with the public is not required on this matter.

11 Conclusion

11.1 My conclusion is that the Electoral Officer role is best undertaken in-house. I consider that Sandra Hartley has the appropriate skills, knowledge and experience to undertake the roll and recommend that she be appointed to the Electoral Officer role.

12 Next Steps / Timeline

12.1 Refer to attached timeline.

13 Appendices

1. Triennial Elections Timetable 2013

35

LOCAL GOVERNMENT 2013 TRIENNIAL ELECTIONS TIMETABLE* POLLING DAY 12 OCTOBER 2013	
November 2012	EO training workshop (SOLGM)
On/after Fri 1 February 2013	Declaration of electoral officer (<i>sec 14, LEA</i>)
February 2013	EO forum (SOLGM)
Sat 2 March 2013 – Tues 30 April 2013	Ratepayer roll enrolment confirmation forms sent (<i>reg 16, LER</i>)
Sat 2 March 2013 – Sat 6 July 2013	Preparation of ratepayer roll (<i>reg 10 LER</i>)
Fri 8 March 2013	EEC questionnaire sent to EOs
Wed 10 April 2013	Final representation review decisions from LGC
Fri 12 April 2013	EEC questionnaire due
May 2013	SOLGM national ratepayer roll qualifications and procedures campaign (<i>sec 39 LEA</i>)
Wed 15 May 2013	EEC test data sent to EOs
By Fri 28 June 2013	Optional early processing resolution (<i>sec 79 LEA</i>). Optional order of candidate names resolution (<i>reg 31 LER</i>)
Sun 7 July 2013	Check It electoral roll closes (<i>reg 10 LER</i>)
Mon 8 July 2013	EEC enrolment update campaign commences
Fri 12 July 2013	Receive residential roll data from EEC
Fri 12 July 2013 - Wed 24 July 2013	Compile preliminary electoral roll (<i>sec 38 LEA</i>)
Say, Wed 24 July 2013 (no later than Fri 26 July 2013)	Public notice of election, calling for nominations, roll open for inspection (<i>sec 42, 52, 53 LEA</i>)
Fri 26 July 2013	Nominations open/roll open for inspection (<i>sec 42 LEA</i>)
By Wed 31 July 2013	Appointment of Justice(s) of the Peace
Fri 23 August 2013	Nominations close (12 noon)/ roll closes (<i>sec 5, 42, 55, LEA, reg 21 LER</i>)
Say, Wed 28 August 2013 (or as soon as practicable)	Public notice of day of election, candidates' names (<i>sec 65, LEA</i>)

continues next page

* Based on legislation and regulations as at December 2012. If the Local Electoral Amendment Bill (No 2) currently before Parliament is enacted as introduced, a number of the dates in this timetable will change. Accordingly a revised timetable will be published in May 2013.

LEA = Local Electoral Act 2001 LER = Local Electoral Regulations 2001

By Fri 30 August 2013	Receive final data from EEC
By Sat 31 August 2013	Ratepayer roll insert with rates notice (<i>sec 39 LEA</i>)
By Mon 16 September 2013	Electoral officer certifies final electoral roll (<i>sec 51 LEA, reg 22 LER</i>)
Fri 20 September 2013	EEC letter sent to unpublished roll electors
Fri 20 September 2013 – Wed 25 September 2013	Delivery of voting documents (<i>reg 51 LER</i>)
Fri 20 September 2013 – Sat 12 October 2013	Progressive roll scrutiny (<i>sec 83 LEA</i>) Special voting period (<i>sec 5 LEA, reg 35 LER</i>) Early processing period (<i>secs 79, 80 LEA</i>)
By 12 noon, Fri 11 October 2013	Appointment of scrutineers (<i>sec 68 LEA</i>)
Sat 12 October 2013	Election day (<i>sec 10, LEA</i>) Voting closes 12 noon – counting commences (<i>sec 84, LEA</i>), progress/preliminary results available as soon as practicable after close of voting (<i>sec 85, LEA, reg 80A, 125A, LER</i>)
PM Sat 12 October 2013 – Thur 17 October 2013	Official count (<i>sec 84 LEA</i>)
Thur 17 October 2013 – Wed 23 October 2013 (or as soon as practicable)	Declaration of result/public notice of results (<i>sec 86, LEA</i>)
December 2013	EO forum (SOLGM)
Mid December 2013 (depends on date results published)	Return of election expenses forms (<i>sec 109, LEA</i>)

*LEA = Local Electoral Act 2001 LER = Local Electoral Regulations 2001
Prepared by Dale Ofsoske, SOLGM Electoral Working Party, Dec 2010*

7.3 RICHMOND TOWN CENTRE PROJECT UPDATE

Information Only - No Decision Required

Report To:	Full Council
Meeting Date:	4 April 2013
Report Author:	Sarah Downs, Transportation Planning Officer
Report Number:	RCN13-04-03
File Reference:	

Item 7.3

1 Summary

- 1.1 The Richmond Town Centre project is included in the Council's Long Term Plan 2012-2022. There is over \$10 million budgeted for either Utilities or Transportation capital works on Queen Street, with new infrastructure planned for 2015 – 2016. The budgets allocated to this project make it highly significant.
- 1.2 A workshop was held on 24 January 2013, briefing Councillors on the project and allowing comment on the information presented. The workshop provided a variety of material with expert presentations. Staff indicated a need for an Action Plan. This was viewed as a priority by the Council.
- 1.3 Consideration has been given to Policy and Tasman Resource Management Plan changes that may be required to make the town centre a vibrant place to visit and businesses to operate.
- 1.4 The project team have developed a draft Action Plan to progress the project until the point where the capital works have been completed. This draft Action Plan outlines the various work streams that will need to be completed for a positive and enduring outcome.
- 1.5 Both formal and informal consultation and engagement with the community and other stakeholders, is required for the Richmond Town Centre project to be successful. The community have a high level of interest in this project. The priority with respect to consultation is engaging with the business community as discussions with them regarding funding some parts of the project will be highly relevant to them.

2 Draft Resolution

That the Full Council receives the Richmond Town Centre Project Update RCN13-04-03

3 Purpose of the Report

- 3.1 The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Council on a draft Action Plan to progress the Richmond Town Centre project.

4 Background and Discussion

- 4.1 The Richmond Town Centre project was included in the last two of the Council's Long Term Plans. The project drivers were a need to upgrade the utilities' underground infrastructure in Richmond Town Centre, specifically in Queen Street; and recognition that Queen Street is looking a little tired.
- 4.2 Following on from this utilities upgrade, it is logical to make improvements to the layout and infrastructure associated with the above ground assets. These assets include footpaths, parking, trees and lighting. Any work needs to take into consideration the soft engineering components which will improve the existing amenities.
- 4.3 A cross departmental project team was established in 2010. This team worked extensively in the first year to establish the core purpose of the project, to engage with the community and to audit the existing infrastructure in the Richmond Town Centre.
- 4.4 The main conclusion was that the Richmond Town Centre was tired and that some form of revitalisation was required. The team also established the many positives of the town centre and how these could be further developed. Consultation included a stall in the Richmond Mall for public to provide comment. This was well attended and provided material for the development of the framework/structure plan.
- 4.5 In 2011, the project team was involved in a workshop to develop Revitalisation Opportunities in Richmond. Work streams from this workshop were developed.
- 4.6 A workshop with staff, consultants, Councillors and a stakeholder reference group was then held in February 2012. The output from this workshop was a draft framework/structure plan based around the original eight revitalisation opportunities. Input also included an economic retail assessment of Richmond by Tim Heath from Property Economics.
- 4.7 During 2012, further work was carried out through the Engineering and Policy Planning departments to develop a framework/structure plan for the Richmond Town Centre. This work was facilitated by Graeme McIndoe and included input from Isthmus Consultants.
- 4.8 Tim Heath was contracted to develop his initial economic assessment to carry out a combined study of Nelson and Richmond and their future growth. This study related to the growth of the economic centres and their need for resilience in dealing with that growth.
- 4.9 A number of elements that will contribute to the framework that has been developed, and the economic assessment, were presented to Council in a workshop held on 24 January 2013.
- 4.10 The reports and framework showed that there is potential for growth in Richmond Town Centre, which will also to provide choice for the needs of the community and visitors to the region.
- 4.11 Budgets are included in the Long Term Plan 2012-2022 for both the Utilities upgrade and the Richmond Town Centre project. Capital works on these projects will commence during 2014-2016. Investigations for the stormwater upgrade on Queen Street have commenced.

4.12 The draft project Action Plan outlines how the project will progress from this point.

5 Considerations

- 5.1 The draft Action Plan shows several work streams that are required to reach a point where the Utilities and Transportation work programmes can commence. These work streams can be seen as projects in their own right and will require input across the various Council departments.
- 5.2 There will be the need for several amendments to the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP). The aim is to progress these changes early so that a more useful urban design approach is supported by the TRMP. However, there is a need to complete an urgent Plan change to enable some controls over new buildings in the Town Centre to ensure no legacy issues arise from poorly considered development.
- 5.3 There is funding available in the Long Term Plan for the planned capital works. Most of this funding in the first few years will be allocated for the investigation and design work.
- 5.4 Some funding in the budgets is to carry out some minor improvements to the roading configurations and footpaths in Richmond Town Centre.
- 5.5 One of the challenges for this project is the timeline. The project has appeared in two Long Term Plans, and since staff first engaged with the community there is little visible progress in terms of public perception. To date there have been improvements to the lighting and to Cambridge Street, plus new street furniture and more trees planted.
- 5.6 Consultation with various groups is now vital in order to gain acceptance and commitment to the framework/structure plan and improvements in the future. Engagement with the community is crucial to gain feedback and direction.
- 5.7 The consultation process is described in greater detail later in the report.

6 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan

- 6.1 As indicated in paragraph 5.2, there will be at least four issues to be addressed by one or more changes to the TRMP, so that the initiatives and good urban design can be better implemented.
- 6.2 With any new developments that have occurred in recent years, for example the property at 184 Queens Street, members of staff across Council have worked with the developers and the Urban Design Panel to reach good outcomes for both those who locate there and the Richmond Town Centre.
- 6.3 Policies will need to be developed for parking, and in particular, the 'cash in lieu' system.
- 6.4 The Council will need bylaw changes with regard to parking as well as sandwich boards and other advertising techniques employed by businesses.

7 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications

- 7.1 Funding for this project is in the Long Term Plan 2012 – 2022.

- 7.2 The bulk of the expenditure is focused between 2014 and 2016. There is \$2.8 million budgeted for the stormwater upgrades, \$2.2 million for the water main replacements and \$5.2 million for the roading and footpath improvements.
- 7.3 The Council will need to engage with those affected by the improvements as to how these improvements are funded.
- 7.4 Further work will also be required to ascertain what aspects of the work will require direct contributions from the businesses located in the Richmond Town Centre.

8 Significance

- 8.1 This project has a high significance for Tasman District Council and its community with all the projects added together totalling over \$10 million. Additionally, the scope of the work to be done affects the wider district in terms of their social and economic interactions with the Town Centre area.

9 Consultation

- 9.1 To date, consultation has involved engaging with the community through public displays in Richmond Mall and the library. Feedback was also requested through Newline. The high numbers participating in this engagement process demonstrated that there was considerable public interest in this project.
- 9.2 A stakeholder reference group was put together to be involved in early discussions on the project. They have been involved in various workshops during the process to date. The membership of the stakeholder group will need to be revised as some people have moved away or are no longer involved in the business community. This is a priority.
- 9.3 The project team will first need to engage with the businesses and property owners based in Richmond. Their commitment to the framework/structure plan is essential to its success. Funding discussions are necessary to begin with this group.
- 9.4 The draft framework/structure plan will need to go out for public consultation, including public displays. This will provide an opportunity for the community feedback as part of a more formal consultation process.
- 9.5 The various Plan changes, Bylaws and Policies will require a more formal consultation process as set by the Council's Community Engagement Strategy. It would be beneficial to have one consultation process for these work streams rather than several.

10 Conclusion

- 10.1 The draft Action Plan will inform the Council of the plan to progress the Richmond Town Centre project.
- 10.2 Councillors should note that the Action Plan is a draft document and that feedback is welcome from both Council and the wider community. The documents produced to date on the Action Plan and framework/structure plan are dynamic, so will continue to evolve as consultation takes place.

11 Next Steps / Timeline

- 11.1 Priorities have been established in terms of consultation and funding discussions. These will be addressed within the next two months.
- 11.2 A first priority change to the TRMP on building form, retail frontages, landscaping and parking is proposed for 2013.
- 11.3 The Utilities and Transportation teams within Engineering will be focusing on the investigation and design work required prior to the capital works taking place during 2015/2016.
- 11.4 Consultation with the wider community will be programmed for later in 2013.

12 Appendices

Nil

7.4 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S ACTIVITY REPORT**Decision Required**

Report To: Full Council
Meeting Date: 4 April 2013
Report Author: Lindsay McKenzie, Chief Executive
Report Number: RCN13-04-04
File Reference:

Item 7.4**1 Summary**

- 1.1 This report summarises my activities for the period from the 21 February Council meeting until around 21 March 2013 when I went on leave. The period was an exceptionally busy one for staff. Recruiting for Engineering Services staff is well underway and the Annual Plan and budget has been adopted for consultation.
- 1.2 A key meeting with **marine and dairying farming** interests took place on 25 February 2013. You may recall concerns about microbial contamination in Golden Bay frequently closing the marine farms during 2102. Good progress has been made with on-farm inspections and the required follow up work as well as on better understanding the salinity/microbial contamination relationship.
- 1.3 The **Council's finances** for the period ending January 2013 are reported on. The surplus of \$3.78 million is ahead of budget year-to-date. There are timing differences to consider. Vested assets income has increased but is still behind budget. The report under the heading "Managing People" includes a response to a request made at the Corporate Services Committee for information on sick leave balances and usage over the past year.
- 1.4 Work on the **Port Tarakohe finances** has been finished. Meetings of the working party and with the marine farmers have taken place. As a next step a proposal for reviewed line levies and other bases for changing will be prepared for the marine farmers and other users. That work is to be completed by the end of April and will be reported to Council soon after.
- 1.5 Now that Murray Staite has resigned another second Acting Chief Executive needs to be appointed to support Dennis Bush-King. Dennis had previously been appointed as an 'alternate' Acting Chief Executive if Murray was not available. Susan Edwards is recommended.

2 Draft Resolution**THAT the Full Council**

- 1) **receives the Chief Executive's Activity Report RCN13-04-04; and**
- 2) **appoints Dennis Bush-King, Environment and Planning Manager as Acting Chief Executive until 30 June 2013; and**
- 3) **appoints Susan Edwards, Strategic Development Manager as an 'alternate' Acting Chief Executive to serve for the same period should Dennis not be available.**

3 Purpose

- 3.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Council about my operational activities for the period since Council's 21 February 2013 meeting. The report is for noting. Council is also requested to adopt a recommendation on changes to the Acting Chief Executives.

4 Strategy and Planning – *vision, direction, plans and policies, Long Term Plan, implementing*

- 4.1 Council's Long Term Plan 2012-2022 and Draft Annual Plan 2013/14 propose a strategic review of the **Tasman Bays Heritage Trust** operating facilities including storage facilities. This proposal was included in the Plans in response to a request from the Trust for funds to rebuild storage and research facilities at Isel Park. The review was to be joint project between the Tasman and Nelson Councils and the Trust. Funds are available for the work. Terms of the Reference for the review are to be discussed with the Trust and Nelson City Council over the next few months.
- 4.2 In the interim the Trust's Isel Park facilities have been assessed as earthquake prone. Staff and the public have been excluded from parts of the main building. Professional advice has been sought and an affordable solution has been found which will lead to the building reopening before the end of May. The engineer's report on Isel Park has made the Trust more aware of the shortcomings and vulnerabilities of the Isel Park facilities. As a result the Trust is focusing on the long term strategic issues that surround the Trust's buildings and locations. This is great news and is aligned with Council's thinking. The Trust has been offered funding assistance with the review. It is likely that the Joint Shareholders Committee will be briefed on the proposals and the Trust's draft Statement of Intent may be reviewed to take the proposal into account.

5 Advice and Reporting – *Long Term Plan, annual report, current issues, governance support*

- 5.1 The Council and Community Board members of the **Tarakohe Working Party** met on 14 March 2013 to consider a detailed analysis of the port's finances. Finance staff have analysed each of the major activities at the port and have assigned operating costs and calculated income derived from each of them. The port is running at a loss when interest costs and depreciation is taken into account. Activity at the wharf is running at a significant loss. The operating deficit is expected to be around \$185,000 for the year or \$75000 when the general rates contribution is taken into account.
- 5.2 The Working Party was concerned to find that billing for the use of the port by contractors to the Tasman Bay mussel farms had not occurred as a dispute over the charging regime had not been resolved. Some members of the Working Party met mussel industry representatives on 19 March 2013 to sort out the issues. A new charging regime is being prepared and will be provided to industry representatives with a view to having an agreement by the end of April. The port is required to break even in the year ended 30 June 2014. The Harbour Manager's contract ends on 30 June 2013 and work is underway to advertise a Request for Tender for the contract.

- 5.3 Two interviews for one **vacancy on the Tasman Bays Heritage Trust** have been carried out. Aaron Brown is the new trustee. Aaron's significant knowledge of museums, art, heritage and culture should be a very valuable asset to the Tasman Bays Heritage Trust Board. While he has this rich sector background he is commercially astute and has developed his own successful business consultancy in recent years. Over the last two years, Aaron has integrated governance training into his on-going professional development.
- 5.4 In November last year Mayor Richard Kempthorne convened a meeting of **marine and dairy farmer interests in the Golden Bay Aorere catchment** to try and resolve concerns about the effect of E. Coli on the marine farms. The occurrence of unexplained 'spikes' was a particular concern. As a follow up to that meeting I convened a Working Group of marine farming/dairy tasked with identifying the source of the spikes and finding a solution to remove or predict them. The Working Group met on Monday 25 February 2013.
- 5.5 The hydrology of the Aorere catchment and the behaviour of the river and its tributaries changed significantly after the December 2011 storm event. Most commentators observe that it will be some generations before stability returns to the main stem river and to many of its tributaries. The wet period that followed the December 2011 storm created pressure on farmers and necessitated work by the Council in the river. All of this combined to create a most challenging environment for both the dairy industry and the marine farming industry to operate within.
- 5.6 Spikes or unexplained episodes of high E.Coli levels in the marine environment occurred. There was particular concern about an event in May 2012 which occurred around the time when river works were being carried out but the flow in the Aorere was not particular high.
- 5.7 Since that time intensive on-farm work by the Council is producing detailed information about on-farm practices throughout the catchment. The quality of this work is unprecedented and has resulted in confidence building about the Council's commitment to its role. The work is due to be reported to Council's Environment and Planning Committee in May. When combined with the Fonterra Sustainable Water Accord work, there is a high level of comfort that on-farm best management practices are being promoted and are in place.
- 5.8 For the marine industry's part, further work on the relationship between salinity and E. Coli has been carried out. A better understanding of the model has resulted. Rather than spikes in E. Coli numbers being attributed to a point-source discharge (as in the May event) it is acknowledged now that the spike could have been caused by the behaviour of fresh water in Golden Bay not accounted for in the model. The sustained period of good weather and low flows has given both industries and the Council comfort that the risk of contamination at low flows is slight. The quality work that has been done since November, together with the opening of relationships, has given all of the parties confidence that they can work in and manage their industries in a sustainable way.
- 5.9 As a series of next steps, it was agreed that:
- the Council officers will report on the on-farm work in May
 - the marine farming industry will continue to use the monitoring data they are obtaining, together with real-time flow data from the Council to refine their modelling
 - the Group proposed to meet again in June to take stock of the situation as it then exists and to identify the risks and how to manage them leading into the high-risk spring period.

- 5.10 Councillor King and I interviewed 5 candidates for the three non elected member positions on the **Commercial Subcommittee**. There is a separate report on that process on the public excluded agenda.
- 5.11 A staff group has begun **planning for the 2013 elections** and change of Council. There is a separate report on this agenda recommending that Sandra Hartley be appointed to the role of Electoral Officer replacing Lloyd Kennedy. Sandra will be backed up by Mark Tregurtha who has undertaken the role for Nelson City in the past. We propose that the Council holds a workshop prior to the elections to review the current governance arrangements and the servicing of Council and committees. It would be useful to discuss committee structure and membership, quorum (which staff recommend be increased for committees), meeting frequency, minutes style, the new powers of the Mayor and so on. Pamela White will schedule a time to suit you.
- 5.12 This is the first year that **a pre-election report is to be produced**. The requirement came out of a former Minister of Local Government's (Rodney Hide) 'TAFM' reforms. The legal requirements for a pre-election report for the most part, replicate information in the annual plan and report. The chief executive is obligated to prepare the report (as compared with other documents such as the long-term plan and annual report where the obligation is placed on "the local authority"). The report must not have any statements by, or photographs of any elected member. It must be completed and published no less than two weeks before nomination day – 9 August 2013.
- 5.13 The report is substantially financial. Unaudited estimates will need to be used in place of actuals for the financial year preceding the election. A statement that reports on compliance with the financial strategy in each of the three financial years preceding the election is to be included with performance reported against any self-set limits on rates, rates increases and debt, as well as actual returns on investments with the targets specified in the strategy. The major projects planned for the three years following the date of the election are to be described. Russell Holden is leading this work.
- 5.14 The Justice and Electoral Select Committee has reported back on the **Local Electoral Amendment Bill (No 2)**, recommending that it be passed with a number of amendments. The Bill is, at least in part, a way of preventing a repeat of the Banks/Dotcom electoral donations drama. The Bill provides some relief for strict compliance with the so call plus or minus 10% rule applied in representation reviews.
- 5.15 The Government's proposals for reforming the nation's approach to freshwater management "*Freshwater reform 2013 and beyond*," was launched on Saturday 9 March at the BlueGreen conference by the Minister for the Environment, Hon Amy Adams. The response time for comment is tight (8 April 2013) with limited opportunity for consideration and feedback by stakeholders, including the public. Our input is via LGNZ. On one level the reforms are underwhelming. The actions are grouped under the headings –
- planning as a community
 - a national; objectives framework
 - managing within quantified limits.
- 5.16 When taken together with the RMA 2 reforms and the earlier National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management the measures are significant. I don't think that the significance is appreciated by many in the community. Some people at the Waimea River plan change proposal meetings have questioned the Council's right to reduce the water available for

abstraction in a manner which could limit use of land or force land uses to change. The real issue is not so much do with the Council's 'rights' but rather the 'obligations' Council has as a result of these laws and policies to address over allocation and to manage the river within quality and quantity limits.

6 Management of Council Resources – *finance, operations, systems and processes*

- 6.1 Financial information for the seven months to the end of January has recently become available. Income and expenditure are slightly up on budget at 60%. The surplus is also ahead of expectations at \$3.78 million or 70% of the annual budget. A small number of significant variances to budget have led to this result.
- 6.2 Vested Assets income has improved considerably from previous months but is still well behind budget expectations at 31%. This equates to a shortfall of around \$1.4 million. Legal Fee expenditure continues to track above budgets. This item is now at 128% of the annual budget and continues to climb. The account is dominated by the Industrial Water Users case costs which are contained within the Water Supply Closed Account. The increased water charges to the industrial users also sits in that account. Expenditure on consultants is now 66% of budget.
- 6.3 Early harvesting of the forest at Rabbit Island has resulted in higher income (76%) than budgeted year to date. Logging costs are now in line with budget projections. The net result is a surplus of \$307K against the year to date budget of \$76K. This variance may decrease if harvesting slows and programmed expenditure continues over the remainder of the year.
- 6.4 Photocopying expenses are significantly under budget. As reported previously, this position is not expected to change for the remainder of the year given we are now taking full advantage of the new lower contract rates. Printing and Stationery costs are also down due to the All of Government pricing opportunities.
- 6.5 Revenue in the Solid Waste account is being closely monitored. The arrival of warmer months has seen an increase in activity, leading to a closing of the gap between actual and budgeted income, to the extent that there currently is no gap. The activity has a net surplus better than budget.
- 6.6 Fees and Recoveries Income is well ahead of budget due to contributions from Trustpower, Network Tasman, the Department of Conservation, and the back charge to the Industrial Water Users. Capital Expenditure, which includes carry forward projects, is sitting at 57%. Working Capital at \$2.89 million is significantly improved on the year end projection.
- Councillors will be aware of the problems that arose when work began on **Turner's Bluff (Pukekoikoi)** on the Riwaka/Kaiteriteri Road. Both parties (the Turners and Council staff) are frustrated at the time it has taken to agree on the price for the land needed for the new road alignment. The Turners have been in the office to make their case. In addition to dealing with the issue at hand a review of our land acquisition practises is underway to ensure that we are using a proper process ahead of the possible purchase of land for the Lee Valley dam especially.
- 6.7 Work on **shared services** initiatives is ongoing. The proposed Top of the South joint land transport initiative is covered separately in this agenda. The three chief executives are considering a proposal for a single building consents authority, among other models.

7 Managing People – good employer, performance, health and safety, policies
--

- 7.1 Following two complaints about our health and safety policies and practices not being followed when engaging contractors there has been a step up in our efforts to ensure compliance. It is important that we meet our obligations for the health and safety of contractors and others who enter a Council work site. Our tertiary accreditation under the ACC Workplace Safety Management Programme relies on us getting these things right. Our tertiary accreditation audit is coming up.
- 7.2 I took a short period of annual leave prior to Easter. Dennis Bush-King was Acting Chief Executive. Now that Murray Staite has resigned I need to recommend another **second tier manager to be appointed as Acting Chief Executive** in my absence. Council's approach has been to appoint two people to be Acting Chief Executive. The decision to ask one or other of them to step in depending on the needs and circumstances has been delegated to me.
- 7.3 Council has previously been advised that the Employment Relations Authority has been asked to resolve a disagreement with the PSA Union over how to interpret a clause in the Collective Employment Agreement about market pay. The Authority has set out a timeframe of 17 May for both parties to submit further information and for us to respond to the PSA's evidence submissions. The Authority has indicated that it is prepared to consider the issue 'on the papers' towards the middle of the year.
- 7.4 I would like to brief Council in confidence on two employment relationship matters that have arisen over the past two weeks. It will be necessary to exclude the public to protect the privacy of individuals.
- 7.5 Over the past six weeks we have appointed staff to fill several vacancies:
- Casual Customer Services Officer at Motueka (Anne Maclaine commenced on 12 February to additional on-call cover)
 - Compliance Officer (Fixed Term 5 months) to provide additional resourcing for the water metering season
 - Property Services Officer – 0.6 FTE (Rhonda Muir commenced on 25 March)
 - Assistant Librarian – Collections (Aimee Lowe commenced on 25 March)
 - Compliance & Investigations Officer (Neil Green commenced on 25 March)
 - Administration Officer – Human Resources (Fixed Term 12 Months) to provide extended maternity leave cover
 - Management Accountant (Fixed Term – 8 Months) as part of the Engineering Services reorganisation
- 7.6 We are interviewing during April for a:
- Library Assistant (18 hrs) in Motueka – interviews completed and awaiting an acceptance
 - Environmental Monitoring Officer – to replace Tom Kennedy who retired on 6 March
 - Policy Planner – Natural Resources – to replace Neil Jackson who retired on 15 March

- Information Services Developer – a new position due to reducing external consultancy project work and bringing it in-house
 - Information Services Service Desk Operator a new position as a result of the Engineering Services reorganisation
 - Building Consent Officer – to replace David Curl
- 7.7 Work on the **Engineering Services reorganisation recruitment** is progressing well. All existing staff have been given new job descriptions and offers of employment to accept. Recruitment for other positions is underway with four offers of employment having been accepted. We are waiting on responses to a further four offers of employment. Interviews for the Programme Delivery Manager have been completed. Interviews for the Activity Planning Manager and six positions recently advertised internally are arranged from mid April onwards.
- 7.8 In response to a request made at the Corporate Services Committee meeting on 7 March for information about **Council staff's sick leave balances and usage** I can report that the balance of outstanding sick leave at the end of February 2013 is 10,200 days. The annual sick leave entitlement is currently 2,154 days per annum. Total number of sick days taken by Council staff during the 12 months to 28 February 2013 was 1,700 days. This figure is bolstered by two staff on relatively long term sick leave. Sixty five staff have a balance of 50 days or more and nearly all staff who leave our employment do so with a sick leave balance that disappears.
- 7.9 We are offering a series of half day **training sessions during March and April** on 'working with change' and these form part of our overall improvement projects and strategies that have been developed. Some of the projects within these strategies have already commenced while others will begin over the next two or three months.

8 Relationship Management – <i>Iwi, customers/ratepayers, media, other councils, CCOs</i>
--

- 8.1 On 21 February 2013 I attended an **Abel Tasman National Park** user's forum hosted by the Department of Conservation at Motueka. The meeting was asked how the changes to the Abel Tasman Foreshore Scenic Reserve Management Plan had affected them since the plan came in to effect in November 2012. The reaction was mixed, with most operators expressing concern about the limits on pick up and drop off arrangements at Torrent Bay. Improvements to the facilities in the northern end of the Park such as an all tide crossing of Richardson Stream (Onetahuti) and a possible track to Shag Harbour are expected to take the pressure off Torrent Bay and offer alternative walks for the operators to market.
- 8.2 The Board of **Network Tasman** invited Clare Hadley and I to attend their February board meeting. This was a great opportunity to learn more about Network Tasman's operations, issues and relationship with Council.
- 8.3 Meetings of the Regional Chief Executives (RCEOs), the Chief Executives Environment Forum (CEEF) and the Regional Sector Group (RSG) were combined in Wellington over 3 days in late February. The issues covered at the three meetings included updates and briefings on –
- the possibility that the Land Use Recovery Plan used to speed up the Christchurch rebuild could provide a tool for more central direction over city planning in the future

- the Ministry for the Environment’s plans to join the regional councils’ water quality website – Land and Water NZ (LAWNZ)
- an approach to Maritime NZ to revisit the role of regional councils in navigation safety especially relating to large ships
- amalgamation proposals including a concern that the lack of provision for local boards in communities with less than 400,000 people will result in some amalgamation proposals failing
- RMA 2 reforms especially concerns about the problem definition (lack of predictability of outcome, time and cost) and the solutions (national consistency and guidance; fewer plans; effective and efficient consenting system; aggregation of plans on a district basis; future templates for plans and the option of combined plans)
- housing affordability and the causes that the Government is working on – supply and demand; development contributions; building consent processes; material and costs; construction method; market characteristics.
- Water reforms and the follow up to the LAWF work notably the recent release of “Freshwater Reform 2013 and Beyond”
- the Productivity Commission’s Better Local Regulation work especially the concerns in their second report about inadequate problem definition in law making; the lack of thought about implementation when bashing through regulations; monitoring and enforcement not resourced; poor regulatory impact statement quality and so on
- the Office of the Auditor General’s views on the meaning of financial prudence and what influence the Office may have on financial benchmarks. They suggest measures such as Stability (budgets), Resilience (shocks) and Sustainability (balance sheet).

8.4 Other meetings and contacts included –

- Clare Hadley Nelson City CEO for a monthly catch up
- Waimea water management Plan change meetings
- Staff meetings at Takaka and Motueka
- February Community Board meetings
- Bede Kearney - Council’s new auditor
- Poutama Drain issues
- A&P Society about cycle trail access and Queens Street land purchase

9 Appendices

Nil

7.5 MAYOR'S REPORT

Information Only - No Decision Required

Report To: Full Council
Meeting Date: 4 April 2013
Report Author: Richard Kempthorne, Mayor
Report Number: RCN13-04-05
File Reference:

Item 7.5

1. Summary

- 1.1 The attached report is a commentary of the Mayor's activities for the months of February/March 2013 for Councillors' information.

2. Draft Resolution

That the Tasman District Council receives the Mayor's Report RCN13-04-05.

3. Activities

19 February

Together with Crs Glover, Edgar and Mirfin I met with Graham Walker and Murray Kerr about Murray's ongoing complaint in regard to the location of the old building on the Hope Reserve. We discussed the Ombudsman's opinion, which resulted from a complaint to the Ombudsman about the process that Council followed leading up to the building being moved from its former site. Councillors discussed and resolved this matter at our meeting of 14 March.

22 February

I was pleased to attend the Top of the South Trades Academy powhiri at NMIT.

24 February

I presented medals at the ASB Aquatic Centre for the regional Special Olympics competitions.

25 February

I had my regular meeting with MP Hon Damien O'Connor. Councillors will be aware that Damien presented the Tasman Rates Validation Bill to Parliament on our behalf. I am grateful for the support that Damien, and other members, such as Green MP Eugene Sage, have offered Tasman District Council on this Bill in Parliament.

I also had my regular catch up meeting with MP Maryan Street.

27 February

I attended an NZAET Management Committee meeting in Wellington

28 February

At a meeting of the Regional Sector Group in Wellington, I attended a speech given by Minister Hon Amy Adams in her role as Minister for the Environment on 'round two' of the RMA reforms.

1 March

With CEO Lindsay McKenzie, I attended the Regional Sector Group meeting in Wellington.

4 March

I met with Mayors Miccio and Sowman in regard to the proposal to move the cross-Cook Strait ferry from Picton to Clifford Bay. We agreed to support the Marlborough District Council's request for an economic and social impact report, before any decision by government to support moving the ferry terminal to Clifford Bay. Our letter to Minister Gerry Brownlee was co-signed by the Nelson Tasman EDA, Tourism Nelson Tasman and the Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce.

5 March

I attended the SportNZ roadshow at Sport Tasman.

6 March

I joined the National CoastCare conference field trip at Kaiteriteri – it was a great day out and a good chance to chat with the conference attendees.

7 – 8 March

In Dunedin for a South Island Strategic Alliance (SISA) meeting and then a combined Zone 5 & 6 meeting the following day. All SISA members are working together with NZTA on **transport issues** common to us all, and we discussed ongoing work on identifying **efficiencies** with **shared services** and **road classifications**. The **FAR review** was explained and all councils were encouraged to look at this 'first principles' approach to the review. We also tabled the letter from the Hon Jo Goodhew, Minister of Health, regarding acknowledging affordability when meeting Government's Drinking Water Standards.

I have covered the Combined Zone meeting in more detail below.

13 March

Jane and I attended, and I spoke briefly, at the opening of the French Film Festival at the Suter theatre.

14 March

A meeting of the Port Tarkohe Working Party. There needs to be more clarity around the systems and charging regime used at the Port, and we need to find a way to ensure that the Port breaks even. The CEO, staff and I met with representatives of the Marine farmers and discussed a new charging regime in order to achieve break even. We are working towards a next meeting with Marine farmers to progress this.

Lindsay and I met with Terry Horne and Phil Thomason, Trustees of the Tasman Bays Heritage Trust (TBHT) about the future of the Museum's research and storage facility at Isel Park. The Trust is engaging very constructively on reviewing options for location of respective TBHT facilities.

17 March

With Mayor Miccio, I spoke at the Race Unity Day at Victory Square – this is always a very worthwhile event which I enjoy attending.

4. Other**Combined Zone 5 & 6 Meeting 8 March**

- 4.1 From the combined Zone meeting, it is clear there is a lot of current activity in Government that will affect local government. Clearly the Government is focussed on housing affordability and in particular Auckland. I believe that Nelson (and I presume Tasman) is highlighted, however I think all Councillors are aware that the part of this that involves our Council is ensuring that development contributions have been appropriately calculated (already done) and having an efficient and constructive building consent process, which in my opinion is working well with the Tasman building consent team.
- 4.2 Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) has established a new vision, *Local democracy powering community and national success*, which I believe captures what we aim for very succinctly.
- 4.3 Local Government Australia Queensland (LGAQ) has discussed a shared service with LGNZ and this is going to be trialled.

4.4 Councillors will also be aware of the Resource Management Act II review and development contributions review, both with LGNZ input and significant work to try and ensure constructive outcomes rather than reforms with unintended and unwanted consequences.

4.5 The Zone meeting was addressed by both Ministers Hon Chris Tremain and Hon Bill English. Minister Tremain, the Minister for Local Government said there are four key objectives of Cabinet;

- the Christchurch rebuild
- to have finances in order by 2014/15
- roading
- delivering better services for the community

Some key projects are

- Financial contributions (one of about 17 workstreams in housing affordability).
- Two-tier governance models (involving local boards etc)
- the Local infrastructure review being led by Fran Wilde

4.6 Some Deputy Prime Minister Hon Bill English spoke in his role as Minister of Finance.

The outlook for economy for next few years is consistent moderate growth. The Christchurch re rebuild and manufacturing sector are continuing to grow, as is the primary sector. We are hooked to the China/Australia chain. China is the fastest growing economy in the world, so this is good.

Housing affordability – the Minister stated that local government politicians have a good grasp on the complex issues. It seems to be the larger metro councils that are feeling the pressure the most. We (the south island) councils are probably best at managing housing affordability.

The Minister said the government has gone as far as it wants to go in terms of restructures and is not a big fan of “bigger is better”.

Responding to a question on **seismic strengthening**, The Minister replied that the Royal Commission view was more pragmatic than expected. There is a need to pass the risk back to the people using buildings i.e. ‘this building is at 10% of code, enter at your own risk’, rather than forced closures.

4.7 Dave Hawkey from Christchurch International Airport was present to speak about the **SOUTH** Initiative which was instigated and funded by Christchurch International Airport. SOUTH aims to market tourism in the South Island as a whole. A PowerPoint presentation is available is Councillors would like to view it. Dave recommended that South Island councils should ensure they are ‘market ready’ for increasing numbers of Chinese visitors by making themselves “China friendly” in terms of visitor signage etc.

4.8 It was agreed that I would write to the Minister of Social Development regarding the **Settling In programme** aimed at supporting new immigrants to our districts, asking for continued government support for this initiative. I have written on behalf of councils in Zone 5 and 6 and the letter is attached.

Tasman Bays Heritage Trust

- 4.9 During late February/early March the Appointments Committee for Tasman Bays Heritage Trust met the shortlisted candidates for the vacant Trustees' positions on Trust. This shortlist had been prepared by an external consultant after a recruitment process was undertaken. From Tasman District Council, the Appointments Committee members are myself and Lindsay McKenzie.
- 4.10 The Appointments Committee has made a decision on who will be appointed to the Trust and I have written a letter to the preferred candidate.
- 4.11 I am excited by the calibre of the candidates we met, and confident that the preferred candidates will add to the good governance and skills set of the existing Trust members.

Commercial Subcommittee

- 4.12 During March the recruitment process for external, non-elected members of the Council's new Commercial Subcommittee was concluded. This is the subject of a separate report to this Council meeting.
- 4.13 I am now required to make my appointment of another elected Council member to join Corporate Services Chair Tim King on the Subcommittee and this is covered by my separate report.

Draft Annual Plan

- 4.14 As I write, we have held the Motueka Draft Annual Plan presentation. The meeting was attended by a relatively small number of people but asking many insightful questions.

2013 Local Body Elections

- 4.15 Council staff are well underway preparing the necessary processes for the 2013 local body elections. The appointment of the Electoral Officer is the subject of a separate report to this meeting. One item I have been asked to raise at our Council meeting is around pre-election workshops and information for prospective candidates. As elected members, you will know what information was, or could have been, most useful to you when you were considering standing for Council. I may be approaching some of you in the future to ask if you could join me, the CE and senior managers to assist with this.

Waimea Plan Change proposal for Lee Valley Dam

- 4.16 I attended two of the three public meetings that were held to consult on the objectives for the proposed change to the Tasman Resource Management Plan to incorporate the Lee Valley Dam.
- 4.17 It became clear that the Proposed Plan change, which will go out for formal consultation in April, is about understanding the management of water with or without the Lee Valley dam.
- 4.18 The results of either decision are very clear. With a dam there is adequate water to be managed for the future benefit of the region. If the dam is not built, the need for a consistent minimum environmental flow to protect the river and prevent saltwater intrusion means

current allocations will need to be significantly reduced and there will be greater restrictions in dryer months, significantly impacting crops that require irrigation water.

4.19 This is not intended as a threat, but rather highlighting the reality we are facing

4.20 We will be discussing proposed costs of the dam once they are reviewed and we have looked further at the possible funding options. Right now we are welcoming comments on the proposed Plan change.

Appendices

1. Settling In - Letter of Support

57

Ref: C785

26 March 2013

Hon. Paula Bennett
Minister for Social Development
Parliament Office
Private Bag 18888
Parliament Buildings
Wellington 6160

Dear Minister

Government budget cuts to “Settling In” programme

I am writing on behalf of the members of Zone 5 and Zone 6 of Local Government New Zealand (which is made up of primarily the Mayors, Chairs and Chief Executives of all the councils in the South Island). The members are concerned to hear that the Government is currently considering making funding cuts to the “Settling In” migrant settlement support programme. As a result of this, the Settling In programme may lose over 60% (\$1 million) of its current budget at the end of June 2013.

The Zone members have asked me to write to you on behalf of all the Zone 5 and Zone 6 local authorities advising you that they consider that Settling In undertakes valuable work in the communities and that this social service should continue to be paid for by the Government. Zone members consider that the existing funding for the Settling In team’s work should be continued on an ongoing basis, plus an allowance for inflation.

The Settling In team works across the country to improve the settlement experiences of migrants and refugees. The team’s particular focus is on ensuring that the social needs of the migrant and refugee communities are understood and met to maximise settlement outcomes, promote social cohesion and support their contribution to their local communities and to New Zealand’s society and economy.

The key functions of Settling In are to:

- Raise the profile of migrants and refugees locally.
- Work collaboratively with other central government agencies, local government and community groups to enable a collective focus on migrant and refugee issues.
- Develop reports for local communities that bring together information about migrants and refugees in that location and form a strategic plan for further work. These reports include:

- local data (population, school, health services etc)
 - information from other relevant reports and sources
 - a wide range of qualitative data including findings from focus groups with significant numbers of refugees and migrants in a community to ensure a strong migrant voice is included
 - social services needs that have been identified
 - actions to improve settlement.
- Focus on practical, achievable, value for money solutions that involve:
 - pooling resources and expertise in communities; and
 - building the strengths (capacity and capability) of communities.
 - Connect refugees and migrants to mainstream agencies and other services that they need.
 - Educate host communities (mainstream agencies, local government and others) about the particular needs of, and issues for, refugees and migrants.
 - Support host communities to welcome and involve migrants and refugees.
 - Advocate for isolated communities and those migrant and refugee communities without a voice.
 - Address social issues early and effectively to ensure that they do not escalate unnecessarily.
 - Create meaningful links between migrant and refugee communities and government at both the local and national levels.

On behalf of the members of Zone 5 and Zone 6 I ask that you support continued Government funding for the Settling In programme through the Budget process.

Yours sincerely

Richard Kempthorne
Chair LGNZ Zone 5
On behalf of LGNZ Combined Zones 5 & 6

cc: Rt Hon. John Key, Prime Minister
Hon. Bill English, Minister of Finance
Hon. Chris Tremain, Minister of Local Government
Hon. Jo Goodhew, Minister for the Community and Voluntary Sector

Page 2 of 2

7.6 FULL COUNCIL ACTION ITEMS

Information Only - No Decision Required

Report To: Full Council
Meeting Date: 4 April 2013
Report Author: Pamela White, Executive Assistant to CEO/Mayor
Report Number: RCN12-04-08
File Reference:

Item 7.6

1 Summary

1.1 The outstanding action Items from previous Full Council meetings are attached, with progress or completion of those action items noted.

2 Draft Resolution

That the Full Council receives the Full Council Action Items RCN12-04-08

3 Appendices

1. Action Items - Full Council

61

Action Items - Full Council Meetings

Report Number	Item	Minute / Action	Accountable Officer	Status
Meeting Date: 26 July 2012				
	Commercial Subcommittee	Advertise for non-elected independent members of Commercial Subcommittee	M Staite	Recommendation coming to 4 April Council Meeting. Mayor's recommendation for Elected Member will come to same meeting.
Meeting Date: 6 September 2012				
RCN12-09-01con	Pukekoiko Road Realignment	Commence work programme on Riwaka Kaiteriteri Road	G Clark	Negotiation with land owner still ongoing
		Acquire land on which archaeological site is located	G Clark	Negotiation with land owner still ongoing
Meeting Date: 29 November 2012				
RCN12-11-05	Murchison Sport, Recreation and Cultural Centre / Contract	Develop a contract with MSRCC to provide community recreation programmes and events from 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2014, then annually reviewed	M Tasman-Jones	Contact has been signed by both parties
RCN12-11-06	Motueka Aerodrome Management and Development Plans	Advise Motueka Aerodrome Management Committee, tenants and other stakeholders of final Management and Development Plans, after making amendments agreed at the meeting.	J Frater	Submitters and tenants advised, Posting plans on website February 2013
		advise E & P Committee of appropriate Plan change to more efficiently enable development of the Aerodrome	J Frater	J Frater requested Policy department to add this to their work programme 29-01-2013
RCN12-11-12	Proposed Lee Valley Dam - an update	Scope out project management role	L McKenzie/ M Staite	Underway.
		commence land acquisition process	L McKenzie	Land owners have been written to requesting initial meeting.
		progress draft Plan change as a priority	D Bush-King	Discussion paper will go to Environment and Planning meeting 28-02-13. Draft Plan change expected to go to Environment and Planning Committee in April.
RCN12-11-16	Confidential: Building Purchase Mapua Wharf Precinct	Negotiate building purchase as per resolution specifications	J Frater	Under action
		Negotiate and complete lease agreements with current occupiers	J Frater	Complete
RCN12-11-07(b)	143 Salisbury/Motueka Cinema/Queen Street property	Report back on the income received (and outstanding loan) on the cinema lease - next Corporate Services Committee meeting	J Frater	Complete
Meeting Date: 21 February 2013				
RCN13-02-01	Murchison RSA Hall	Commence Hall sale	R Cant	
RCN13-02-02	DC Policy	Advise any submitters on the draft DC Policy	A Humphries	Submitters have been informed of the results
		Implement revised DC policy conditions as from 25 February 2013	D Bush-King	
RCN13-02-03	Rates Policies on rezoned land	Amend Rates Remission and Rates Postponement Policies as per Council direction	L McKenzie	Policies have been amended.
		Change Statement of Proposals to reflect Policy changes	L McKenzie	Statements of proposal have been amended.
		Advertise draft policies and invite submissions through Draft Annual Plan consultation process	M Tregurtha	The two draft policies and consultation process have been included in the Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-04	Rates Remission on LAND	Advise applicants of decision on their application	M Staite	Staff have completed this
		Remit rates where required	M Staite	Completed
RCN13-02-05	Motueka Library Redevelopment	Include changes to proposal in Draft Annual Plan	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
		Include \$25,000 in Draft Annual Plan for further investigations, to be funded from Motueka Reserve Financial Contributions.	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-06	Community Board Targeted Rates	Include rates agreed in Draft Annual Plan	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-07	UAGC	Include UAGC in Draft Annual Plan at the amount set (\$290.00 incl GST per property)	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-08	Utilities Budgets	Include Utilities budgets, as detailed in resolution, in Draft Annual Plan	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-09	Lee Valley Community Dam	Transfer \$150,000 from Urban Water Account to Waimea Water Augmentation account	M Staite	
		Include funding for the Waimea Water Augmentation project in Draft Annual Plan as detailed in resolution		Included in Draft Annual Plan
		Include funding for the Waimea Water Augmentation project of \$190,000 in Draft Annual Plan 2014-15	M Tregurtha	Will include when 2014/15 Draft Annual Plan is prepared
		Prepare a Request for Proposal for a Project Manager for the next stage of the Lee Valley Dam project	L McKenzie	No progress
RCN13-02-10	Schedule of Charges	Include Schedule of Charges, as per Appendix 1 of report, in Draft Annual Plan	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-11	Overview report	Include budgets, as detailed in resolution, to Draft Annual Plan	M Tregurtha	Included in Draft Annual Plan
RCN13-02-13	Forest Stewardship Application	Apply for Forest Stewardship Certification	J Frater	
		Provide an amended forestry budget to Full Council to show that the general rate subsidy remains unaffected	J Frater	
RCN12-11-17	Chief Executive's Report	Write brief submission to Fire Service Review	L McKenzie	Submission sent 07-03-13

Y:\Attachments\2554\3551\Action List from Full Council Meetings - for meeting of 13-04-04.xlsx

8 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

8.1 Procedural motion to exclude the public

The following motion is submitted for consideration:

THAT the public be excluded from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting. The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution 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 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

8.2 Council's Commercial Subcommittee - Recommended External Members

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person.	s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.

8.3 Commercial Subcommittee - Appointment of Elected Member

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person.	s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.