### **Changes made post consultation**

In the following pages you will find details of the decisions Council has made on key issues the community raised during our pre-engagement and consultation processes.

This plan includes several significant policies, planning and infrastructure projects to accommodate growth over the next ten years, while keeping rates increases to less than five percent per annum (including inflation but excluding growth).

### **Key Decisions**

While we always have an eye on the future, we have not lost sight of our day-to-day business. We

are determined to, wherever possible, improve the current lives of our existing residents.

Submissions are one part of the LTP process, and when elected members make decisions, they take into account responses from submitters, staff advice and reports and information gathered outside the submission process, such as conversations with their communities, organisations and key relationships.

The consultation process sought feedback on several key proposals, each with a preferred option. The topics and preferred options included:



### How should Council better manage its recycling collection?

### You said

- 77% of submissions supported a change to introduce recycling crates, saying it would encourage recycling, remove the costs of recycling at transfer stations and reduce landfill.
- 23% opposed saying it should remain as is, staying user pays, to reduce the rates increase, rural residents wouldn't have a kerbside service and that those on reduced incomes would struggle to meet the costs.

### **Council decided**

On balance, elected members considered that recycling and improvement to the service we currently offer is important. Some of the points raised against by submitters had merit and Council decided to defer the implementation of the crate service until Year Two of the LTP (from 01 July 2022). It would still be funded by a targeted rate and give staff a year to plan and inform communities about how the new service would work. Staff were tasked with the investigation of how we balance the needs of rural and urban users to ensure equal levels of service, and how that will impact the proposed targeted rate.



### How should Council charge for drinking water supply to networked houses?

#### You said

- 58% of respondents supported the preferred option to equalise the costs of drinking water.
- 42% didn't support the preferred option, saying every network should be ringfenced and be paid for by
  users. Others stated to do nothing until Government has decided on the scope of Taumata Arowai Three
  Waters, and we should focus more on supplementing rainwater tanks and self-supply.

### **Council decided**

We will go ahead with the proposal to equalise costs, making it more affordable for smaller schemes, especially with upcoming large capital works projects, and ensures a consistent service across all those connected to the Council network. Equalising costs will ensure the benefits are shared while the use of funds can be targeted to those areas that have a backlog in maintenance through subsidies/grants as they become available.

### How should Council charge for wastewater services to networked houses?

### You said

- 55% of submitters agreed with our preferred option, of equalising rates, ensuring an equal service to those connected.
- 45% wanted Option 2, or ringfencing the networks, so those connected pay for the capital expenses. There were concerns about the affordability and significant jump some areas will face in meeting the proposed equalised rate.

### **Council decided**

We will go ahead with the proposal to equalise costs, with a staggered entry for Te Kopuru. This allows for affordability in smaller schemes especially with upcoming large capital works projects and ensures a consistent service across all those connected to the Council network. Equalising costs will ensure the benefits are shared while the use of funds can be targeted to those areas that have a backlog in maintenance through subsidies/grants as they become available.



### Should Council connect to the Tai Tokerau Trust Water Store?

### You said

- 59% of submitters supported the preferred option of connecting to the Tai Tokerau Water Store, recognising the need to secure water for Dargaville township.
- 41% of submitters said Option 2, of not connecting was preferable, stating they were broadly in favour of securing water and an improvement in Council services, but wary of Council's ability to fully utilise the Tai Tokerau Water Store, and the impacts Taumata Arowai Three Waters would have on the work.

### **Council decided**

While elected members believe that securing a water supply is an important step for Dargaville, on hearing feedback and with further investigation into options, they decided we were better placed to reduce the initial spend of \$2m, down to \$100,000 and complete a business case in the forthcoming year. The business case will determine the best option for securing a water supply and for financing it. When we have a clear option, we'll come back to the community.



# How much should Council commit to Climate Change planning and response?

### You said

- 60% of submissions supported Option 1 continuing with the baseline amount of \$1.5m over the next 10 years, with concerns over need to spend money elsewhere, waiting for central government to set a framework, or looking at alternative ways to spend on climate change action.
- 16% of the submissions supported Option 2 increasing investment to \$1.8m over 10 years. Those who wanted more spending, wanted to see increased efforts on climate change, especially increased engagement and education and said that this is an important issue and we should be working on funding it more.
- 24% of the submissions supported Option 3 increasing investment to \$3m over the next 10 years, saying that climate change is the biggest issue we face today, and this issue needs the most investment from Council.

Other comments around climate change included the public health benefits of managed climate change, soil heath and biodiversity being important, that local government should focus on adaptation, and that climate change is a collective action problem, requiring collaborative aligned approaches.

### **Council decided**

They agreed with submitters and would continue with the baseline work as detailed in the Consultation Document.

As more information is brought forward around investigations into the impacts of climate change and more direction from central government is announced, our approach to climate change may change.

Should the Council demolish the 1990s leaky annex at 37 Hokianga Road and repair and reinstate the two, separate older buildings (Northern Wairoa War Memorial Hall and Municipal Chambers)?

### You said

- 34% of the submissions support Option 1, to demolish the annex, and repair and reinstate the older buildings. Comments included the unsustainability of leaky buildings and the health risks they pose, and that demolishing is the most economically sensible option. Submitters also mentioned the opportunity to better meet the needs of the community by providing a community centre, library, cultural centre, conference meeting rooms and "pop-up" shops.
- 15% said no. Their feedback primarily related to the loss of the space, the lack of cost/benefit analysis presented in the consultation document and the uncertainty of what will happen to existing services there, such as the Citizens Advice Bureau and the Anzac Theatre (51% of respondents didn't choose an answer).

### **Council decided**

We will demolish the Town Hall annex when it is no longer economical to continue repairing it, this is likely to occur in 2024. We'll then proceed with recladding and reinstating the Municipal Chambers and Northern Wairoa War Memorial Hall. We'll work with those current users of the facilities to see how we can continue to support them through this change.

# Do you support development of a new building adjacent to the War Memorial Hall and Municipal Building to house the Library and a community hub?

### You said

- 36% of the submissions support Option 1 to develop a new building adjacent to the Northern Wairoa War
  Memorial Hall to support the library and community hub. Themes from the feedback were that a library
  is vitally important place for all ages of the community and that there is not enough space or books at the
  current Dargaville Library. The feedback relating to a community hub also expressed the importance of
  community spaces and how this would be a great asset to the community.
- 15% said no, comments from this feedback questioned why Council does not repair and use their current office building to house the new library and included suggestions for Council to consider another vacant premise in Dargaville (49% of respondents didn't choose an answer).

### **Council decided**

We will support the formation of a trust to facilitate the development of a community hub and library next to the Municipal Building and Northern Wairoa War Memorial Hall.

# What should Council do with the current Dargaville Council office building at 42 Hokianga Road?

### You said

- 56% of respondents said to demolish and retain the land. The feedback from these submitters proposed different suggestions for the land after demolition which included building accommodation for emergency housing or kaumatua flats, a community garden, or a public park/green space.
- 44% who said to sell the building highlighted the financial benefits of selling for both Council and ratepayers. Other suggestions included remediating the current office building to house the proposed library and community hub or to sell it to a Non-Government Organisation who will refurbish it to create extra housing.

#### **Council decided**

We will demolish the building, once it is no longer required and find appropriate ways to repurpose the green space.



## Do you support the Council securing a site and building a new library in Mangawhai, and if yes, where?

### You said

- 45% in support of securing the site focused on the inadequate space in the current library and emphasised the need for a new library given Mangawhai's growing population.
- 55% of submitters opposed establishing a new library in Mangawhai. The issues for the opponents were the costs of the project to ratepayers, the need for other services such as a medical centre and the need for more consultation with the community to determine the service of this resource.
- In terms of preferred location 52% selected Mangawhai Village and 48% selected Mangawhai Central.
   Other options submitted included next to Fagan Place behind the shops, and various locations in Mangawhai Community Park.

### **Council decided**

Staff should proceed with work to secure a site for a future library in Mangawhai. This recognised that land will become increasingly scarce, opportunities to incorporate cultural and community functions and that there are opportunities for this to be funded through external funding including development.

Due to no significant support for either preferred location identified that the site will be selected considering relevant technical matters such as suitability, accessibility, and land availability, and will go back to Council for approval of any land purchases, if necessary.



### Should Council become a shareholder in Northland Inc and contribute to the wider investment and Growth Reserve Fund?

### You said

- 47% of submitters agreed with option 1 to become a shareholder in Northland Inc. Those who were supportive, stated that the proposal would be better for the region and district, would help to attract more business and employment into the district.
- 53% of submitters were against the proposal to join the fund, for reasons such as, it will add more bureaucracy, not as sustainable without Whangārei District Council and that the funding could be better used for local projects or Kaipara specific solutions.

### **Council decided**

The Council will become an equal shareholder in Northland Inc (resulting in Northland Inc becoming a Council Controlled Organisation of Kaipara District Council), committing to financial contributions as proposed of \$29,000 in Year 1 transitioning to \$180,000 from Year 6 of the LTP 2021-2031. Also, this decision is contingent on agreement by the Northland Regional Council and Far North District Council.



### Do you support Council collecting a CCTV charge on behalf of the Dargaville Community Development Board?

### You said

- 52% of respondents agreed with option 1, and that we should collect the charge on behalf of the Dargaville Community Development Board (DCDB). Those who supported said it will encourage a safer community, which is a benefit for everyone.
- 47% preferred option 2 on not collecting the rate saying business and retailers should pay for this as it largely benefits them.

### **Council decided**

The Council agreed to implement a targeted rate of \$9.00 (GST exclusive) per rating unit, collected for the DCDB to fund CCTV operations in the Dargaville and Ruawai townships as proposed in the Consultation Document of the LTP 2021-2031. The targeted rate will apply to rating units from the Dargaville and West Coast/Central wards, and those rating units from the Otamatea ward that currently pay a targeted rate for the Ruawai Tokatoka War Memorial Hall.

### |Changes made from Submissions

As part of the submissions we received, here are some of the new community projects we've included in the LTP.

Project details	Council decision
Te Kopuru Pump Track Surrounds	Council approved the allocation of \$20,000 to complement the Community funded Pump Track development in Year 1 of the LTP.  The funding is for the Pump Track Surrounds and includes practical elements such as seating, lighting, drainage and parking. This does not cover all costs related to the development of the park and Te Kōpuru will need to raise further funds to complete the track.
Lincoln Downs Mountain Bike Park	Council will contribute up to \$375,000 toward the Mountain Bike Park (in a 50% matched funding model), predominantly focused on the access road and car park which is likely to be vested in Council. No design work has been done however the funding would allow for the investigations to be progressed.
McClean Park, Kaiwaka	Council will contribute \$100,000 to bring the previously neglected McClean Park in Kaiwaka up to a standard that is acceptable to the public and easier to maintain, in the first year of the LTP. Council investment will used to provide drainage and improving the hard surfaces.
Ripiro Beach - Beach Management Business Case Development	Council included \$50,000 in Year 1 and \$50,000 in Year 2 of the LTP to progress the Ripiro Beach management project.  The funding will be used to understand what is needed for better beach management and include a beach management plan. Engagement, education, and regulation could be a component of this work.
Baylys Beach - Parking and Connectivity Improvements	Council agreed to include \$100,000 in Year 1 to develop a business case (investigation and design) and \$300,000 in Year 2 for construction, of the parking and connectivity improvements project at Baylys Beach as recommended by the Northland Transportation Alliance.  We will apply to the 2022 Tourism Innovation Fund (TIF) and have assumed an 80% subsidy for the purpose of the LTP. We'll improve existing footpaths as part of the annual footpath renewal programme.
Civil Defence Emergency Management – tsunami sirens upgrade	We're bringing forward \$20,000, set aside in every year of the LTP to invest \$100,000 in Year 2, and an additional \$100,000 in Year 3 to upgrade the tsunami sirens. The Tsunami Siren Upgrade Project is led by Northland Regional Council and will occur over Years 2 and 3 of the LTP.  The network in Mangawhai is not meeting the required standard and must be replaced. A further 10 new sirens will be included in the project.  This is a significant upgrade to the current system as it will cover a larger geographic area and new sirens can be remotely activated and convey messages.



### **Additional** information

As part of the process, and the time involved in creating this LTP we've found some projects where timelines changed, that were omitted but now should be included, or need to be better aligned to ensure streamlined service delivery. These projects fall into those categories, they are also below our

thresholds for consultation from our Significance and Engagement Policy or come about because of other Council's LTPs. These projects were presented to Council as part of their deliberations, and the below details the additional projects and their funding sources.

### **Project details**

#### Kaihu Water Treatment and Truck filler

A water treatment plant will be constructed to supply water to the Waikaraka Marae, a truck filler for the Kaihu community and water carriers outside the Marae grounds. This project seeks to address the water shortages that occur during drought for the non-reticulated community of Kaihu. Dargaville water is restricted during these times and water carriers go further to fetch water to supply households, usually at much higher prices than they pay under normal conditions.

Elected members approved \$500,000 for capital expenditure for the construction of the Kaihu Water Treatment Plant and Truck Filler into the 2021-2022 financial year (which is funded by subsidy from the Northland Regional Council, making the investment cost neutral).

They approved \$65,000 per year in the LTP for operational expenditure recoverable through water charges of \$65,000 per year over the LTP.

#### **Mangawhai Water Security**

There is an opportunity to extend the Whangārei district water supply system to Mangawhai. This could be to connect to create tank filling stations.

Council approved \$100,000 for investigation into a possible water security option, however it's limited to considering the connection to the Whangārei network as a potential tank filler site.

### **Wood Street Mangawhai**

There are two related activities/projects being further developed in the Wood Street area. Both projects were included in the LTP 2018-2028.

Transport - Iterative improvements within the Wood Street retail area were trialled during the LTP 2018-2028 period as part of the Waka Kotahi NZTA Innovating Streets programme. Using a tactical urbanism approach the Council has been collaborating with the Mangawhai Business Association, Wood Street businesses and community, testing layout and design to create a more people-friendly area. The interim designs included a one-way road system, extra off-street parking and a new access route through the old fire station, and the introduction of various streetscape improvements. A permanent upgrade is now required to realise the benefits.

Stormwater – The Wood Street area experiences flooding which is both a barrier to growth and a safety risk. A business case has been developed which confirms the most effective response and involves draining water to the west (via the golf course).

We propose to complete the roading and waters investigations in Year 1 and then move into the construction phase in Years 2 and 3 of the LTP (subject to Waka Kotahi NZTA subsidy).

By bringing the funding forward the transportation and stormwater team can collaborate to deliver the programme, which will reduce the disruption to community and businesses.

Council agreed to align stormwater and transport projects in Wood Street in Years 1 to 3 of the LTP, to bring forward \$4m from Year 5 and 6 of the LTP to Years 1 to 3 in the Transport Activity and agreed to bring forward \$800,000 from Year 4 of the LTP for Wood Street area stormwater improvements.

#### **MCWWS Balance Tank**

In September 2020 Council approved a budget of \$2.1m for the construction of a balance tank (which improves the performance of the wastewater system in peak flows), \$1.45m of this was not included in the capital works budget but has now been budgeted for.

Council approved the changes, and the new budget, set at \$3.1m. This allows components of projects that were already planned from 2024/2025 to move to 2022/2023. It includes additional scope such as a larger inlet screen and odour controls that will increase the capacity of the plant.

Further investigation has resulted in some extra works to improve the safety and stability of the system, including earthworks and the movement of some existing infrastructure.

### **Dargaville Transfer Station Weigh bridge**

\$65,000 was included to install a weigh bridge at the Dargaville Transfer Station to more accurately measure the waste that is taken to the Dargaville Transfer Station. This will provide good information for planning future transfer station activities and data for reporting refuse going to landfill.

24

### Project details continued

#### **Paparoa Wastewater**

Kaipara has several coastal communities who have failing septic systems. The regulatory team is aware of specific issues in Paparoa, which predominantly effects the commercial area.

The proposal includes a consultant's assessment of the proposal which will provide the community and Council with a report. The report will cover -

Risk assessment – construction and operations

Assessment of environmental effects

Performance review - i.e., will it work?

Recommendations.

Approved the allocation of \$60,000 for investigations to support a community wastewater scheme in Paparoa. Once we know more, we'll come back to the community to figure out how they fund the implementation of the best solution.

#### **SCADA System**

Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) is a critical system for managing our water and wastewater network. The draft LTP included \$250,000 however there has been an increasing number of failures which increases Council's risk exposure in terms of our response time to events and ability to rectify. This increases the risk of environmental impact, consent breach as well as health and safety. The proposal is to increase the resilience of the system by moving to a secure data centre. The impact of this is a slight increase in capital costs and the introduction of an annual operating cost both funded through the water and wastewater targeted rates.

Council approved that the SCADA system replacement programme be brought forward from Year 4 of the LTP to Year 1 and the capital cost be increased by \$100,000 over the 10 years of the plan to \$350,000 (all to be funded from depreciation reserves); and approved the additional SCADA operational costs of \$900,000 over the 10 years of the LTP.

### **Spring Street and Wastewater Reticulation**

The Spring Street Project provides an efficient solution for a community which has developed on land which is not suitable for septic systems. Consultation with the community has occurred since the LTP was developed and this has highlighted a risk for Council in terms of its ability to force landowners to connect to the system given the approvals that have been provided historically. The additional funds will allow the connections to be made whilst the main works are being undertaken.

Council approved an additional \$175,000 in the LTP (funded through the Wastewater Targeted Rate) for the 'Spring Street Wastewater Project' which allows for connections to be made to the Dargaville wastewater system.

These ratepayers connecting will pay the appropriate building consent, development contribution and connection fee, as a portion of the investment.

### **Dargaville Stormwater stopbanks and floodgates**

As a first step in understanding the current assets, the risks faced from flooding and the options available \$200,000 was approved in the first three years (\$50,000 each Year 1 -3 for stopbanks and floodgates).

The scope and cost of required future projects can be understood in time for other funding opportunities if investigations are started now.

With this work we'll a comprehensive understanding of the boundary between river and land in the Dargaville urban area with special consideration for protection of life, property, and business from flooding and an options assessment that gives a starting point for discussions with the public and possible funding agencies, with special consideration to what level of service can be delivered and what the costs would be.