

Minutes of an ordinary meeting of the Gore District Council, held in the Council Chambers, James Cumming Wing, 10C Ardwick Street, Gore on Tuesday 8 September 2020, at 4.05pm

Present His Worship the Mayor, Mr Tracy Hicks JP, Crs Bolger, Davis, Dickson, Gardyne, D Grant JP, N Grant, Highsted, MacDonell, McPhail, Phillips and Reid.

In attendance The Chief Executive (Mr Stephen Parry), General Manager Infrastructure (Mr Ramesh Sharma), Chief Financial Officer (Ms Lornae Straith), HR/Administration Manager (Susan Jones), Communications-Marketing Manager (Sonia Gerken), 3 Waters Asset Manager (Mr Matt Bayliss), Roading Asset Manager (Mr Peter Standring), Planning Consultant (Mr Keith Hovell), Project Manager Infrastructure (Mr Hashem Ramezan-zadeh), Accountant (Mrs Donna McKewen), Graduate Planner (Leigh Clutterbuck Young) and one member of the public in the gallery.

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

His Worship referred to the confirmation of the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 August, and more specifically, the confirmation of the report of the Community Strategy Committee from its meeting held on 5 August. There had been discussion about clause 1 of that report that related to the library upgrade project and reference to a \$5.5 million rough order of cost provided by a Quantity Surveyor. The cost had originally been part of the recommendation from the Community Strategy Committee meeting and there had been discussion at the Council meeting that it had been incorrectly recorded and should not have formed part of the recommendation.

His Worship said he had viewed and listened to the recording of the Council meeting and confirmed that reference to the \$5.5 million rough order of cost that had been included in the recommendation was in fact correct. To have the \$5.5 million figure totally withdrawn from the recommendation was not correct. He did not think it was major as the Council had continued and made decisions around what it wanted to do with the library project. However, he urged the Council to be very careful when it was considering the record of a meeting to ensure that it was correct. The Council had suggested the record was not correct yet the video and audio record confirmed it was. It was an unusual situation and he invited the Chief Executive to provide advice. The Chief Executive said he had not been invited to make a comment or offer an opinion

at the previous meeting. The key point was to ensure that the record of the meeting was accurate and correct but that did not inhibit the Council changing a Committee recommendation at a Council meeting. In this case, the Council was ensuring the report of the Committee meeting was correct and any recommendation from the meeting could be subsequently amended by the Council.

Cr Bolger referred to the minutes that noted the \$5.5m rough order of cost would be removed and he thought that was indicative of the Council's intention. His Worship said the Council had a discussion on the premise that the recommendation from the Community Strategy Committee meeting had been incorrect, where in fact the audio and video record disputed that. The Council needed to record that was the case.

His Worship moved THAT the Council record that the subject had been raised and confirm the record of the Community Strategy Committee meeting held on 5 August 2020 as verified by the audio and video recording was correct,

AND THAT the report of the Community Strategy Committee meeting held on 5 August 2020, as it appeared on the agenda at the Council meeting of 11 August 2020, be accepted as a true and complete record.

The motion was seconded by Cr Bolger, was put and carried.

2020/101

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Dickson, THAT the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Gore District Council, held on Tuesday 11 August 2020, as presented, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor as a true and complete record.

2. DOG CONTROL POLICY AND PRACTICES (SC2498)

A copy of the annual report on the Council's dog control policy and practices for the year ended 30 June 2020 had been circulated with the agenda. The report was an annual obligation required by the Dog Control Act 1996.

In response to Cr Gardyne asking how the current registration numbers were compared to last year, the Chief Executive did not have the information to hand but would come back to him.

Cr Dickson asked where the cost lay with microchipping dogs that were impounded and rehomed. The Chief Executive understood it was met by the new owner but would confirm.

Cr McPhail asked if there was a breakdown of urban and rural dog numbers. The Chief Executive advised there was and added there had been little issue with the change made the previous year in fees for non-working dogs living on rural properties.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Gardyne, seconded by Cr Reid, THAT pursuant to Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996, the Gore District Council report on Dog Control Policy and Practices for 2019/2020 be adopted.

2020/102

The senior Rooding Operations Officer attended the meeting from 4.17pm

3. REPORT FROM RURAL HALLS AND DOMAINS SUB-COMMITTEE (SC2802)

A memo had been received from the Chief Executive together with a copy of the report from the Rural Halls and Domain's Sub-Committee meeting held on Tuesday 18 August 2020.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Gardyne, seconded by Cr MacDonell, THAT the report be received,

AND THAT the recommendations contained within the report be ratified.

2020/103

4. DUST SUPPRESSION POLICY (SC0110)

A memo had been received from the senior Rooding Operations Officer seeking approval for a policy defining the dust suppression options available on sections of unsealed roads within the Gore District. Historically, dust suppression on unsealed roads had been undertaken by the owners of properties with homes in close proximity to the road. Until 2018, property owners applied waste oil onto the road surface and that practice had been permitted by Environment Southland. However, the proposed Southland Water and Land Plan effectively stopped the use of waste oil for dust suppression throughout the region. Environment would now only allow dust suppressants approved under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996 to be used without a permit.

Details of how other Councils in the south dealt with dust suppression issues were provided in the report. Nearly half of the Councils listed contributed to the construction of dust seals for their rural householders. Funding assistance from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) applied to dust seal construction. The Council was likely to receive NZTA funding assistance at the current normal Funding Assistance Rate (FAR) through the NZTA Low-Cost Low-Risk work category. Funding from that source would require little or no rates input. The local share would be contributed by the householder/applicant.

Three options had been proposed with option 3 – shared cost dust seal construction - being preferred. That option involved the construction of a 100m dust seal on the section of unsealed road adjacent to the residential house. The Council would contribute 50% of the cost of the seal construction and would maintain the seal, including cyclic resealing. The approximate cost to the Council for each section of dust seal would be \$6,000. It was expected that option 1 (retention of the status quo

permitting householders to apply a dust suppressant agent approved by Environment Southland) would apply to sites that were awaiting Council funding of dust seal construction in future years.

Prioritisation of applications for dust seal construction would be based on the following criteria:

- Traffic volume of the road as recorded in RAMM;
- Traffic operating speed;
- Temporary treatment permit history;
- Evidence of related ill-health;
- Water supply contamination;
- Proximity to the unsealed road;
- Prevailing wind direction; and
- Other relevant factors

In response to Cr Gardyne, the Officer said the estimated total cost for a 100m seal was \$12,000 however that depended on the topography of the area to be sealed etc. His Worship thought the solution was a good one. Cr Gardyne agreed and said the vegetable oil application would be a good interim measure for those who may be waiting for dust seal construction.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Bolger, seconded by Cr D Grant, THAT the report be received,

THAT the Council approve option 3 - shared cost dust seal construction,

THAT this option be adopted as the Council's Dust Suppression Policy,

AND THAT an amount of \$30,000 be provided in the Council's annual roading budget as its contribution to the cost of constructing dust seals within the district.

2020/104

5. ALLOCATION OF 3 WATERS STIMULUS FUNDING (SC2957)

A report had been received from the 3 Waters Asset Manager together with recommendations about how the stimulus funding the Council was expecting to receive from the Government following the signing of the 3 Waters reform MoU, should be allocated. The Gore District would receive a direct allocation of \$1.1 million, excluding GST with an allocation of \$11.15 million, excluding GST, to the Southland region. The purpose of the Government's regional allocation was to establish collective participation by Councils in the reform programme. Each regional group had until 30 September to agree on how best to apportion the regional funds to the individual territorial authorities in the region.

At the August meeting, the Council delegated decisions about the allocation of regional funding to the Chief Executive. As a result, the Chief Executive had achieved

an agreement in principle with the Chief Executives of the Invercargill City and Southland District Councils that the Council would receive \$1,603,851 of the Southland regional funding.

In addition to signing the MoU to access the stimulus funding, the Council also had to complete a delivery plan showing that the funding allocation was to be applied to operational and/or capital expenditure relating to 3 Waters infrastructure and service delivery.

When considering the various projects that the stimulus funding could be expended on, ensuring the work could be delivered sustainably and efficiently in the required timeframes was a key concern. The recommended funding allocation was as follows:

1. Development of a robust wastewater renewals strategy - \$600,000
2. Renewal of Wigan Street wastewater main - \$1.925 million
3. Recruitment of additional resources - \$150,000
4. Otago and Southland water collaboration - \$57,702

A copy of the draft delivery plan based on the recommended funding allocation had been circulated with the agenda. Over the previous 12-18 months, the ten Otago and Southland local authorities had been working together to explore collaboration opportunities in the 3 Waters area. It was believed a collaborative working relationship would provide the best opportunity to ensure local input into the Government's proposed reform. A copy of a Mayoral Forum briefing paper to establish a lower South Island Water Secretariat had also been circulated with the agenda. It was proposed that a shared budget of \$1 million would be set for the proposed office with each local authority's allocation being proportional to population size. The Gore share would be \$57,702 and it was suggested it be funded by the stimulus allocation.

As a result of the Council signing the 3 Waters reform MoU, and following negotiations with the other Southland local authorities, the Council was expected to receive \$2,707,702 of stimulus funding.

Cr Gardyne thought as much renewal of the main water main as possible should be undertaken and get it across the state highway. He wondered if it should be extended from Wigan Street and use a lining technique to try and keep the pipe right for the next 50 years. He asked if it should be put into the budget and cut back on inspection costs. It was one of the major mains that also went under the railway line. The Manager agreed it was a critical piece of pipe and could potentially be very expensive to replace. It may lend itself to pipe lining, although a lot of the cost was the set up. It would certainly feature in the Council's thinking. Following attendance at a webinar the previous week where further details about what needed to be included in the delivery plan, he added there would be some changes required to the delivery plan circulated to meet the updated requirements.

In response to Cr McPhail, the Manager said there had been a criticality assessment undertaken for pipe assessments and that would factor into which areas of the

network were assessed as part of the review. Cr D Grant asked if it would be better to allocate more than \$600,000 to allow for more than 30-40% of the network to be covered. The Manager said it would cost about \$1.8 million to assess the entire network. Cr D Grant asked if it would fit the criteria of the money being allocated to assess the whole network. The Manager said it was something to be considered in the future but 30% would be a good start. If in 12 months time, there was still some uncertainty it could be undertaken then. He did not think it could be attainable within the timeframe that the funding needed to be expended. He felt the best approach was to do the 30-40% and then reassess it thereafter. He said the Wigan Street wastewater main renewal was also crucial work that needed to be undertaken.

Cr Phillips asked if the assessment was district wide. The Manager confirmed it was.

Cr N Grant said rehabilitating an existing main with a liner scared him. Fifty years was not a long time. He had heard stories about liners where the outside of the pipe had collapsed. He would not recommend it. He would prefer to extend it to 100 years. He questioned whether a company would still be around after 50 years to validate a warranty. The Manager said lining was a relatively new technology and there had been situations where it had not gone to plan. However, it was improving.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr N Grant, seconded by Cr McPhail, THAT the report be received,

AND THAT the Council approve the attached delivery plan which outlined how stage 1 of the 3 Waters reform stimulus funding will be allocated and implemented.

2020/105

6. COVID-19 RATES DEFERMENT UPDATE (SC2450)

A memo had been received from the Rating Officer confirming that since the last report in July, no further applications for rates deferment had been received.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Reid, seconded by Cr Highsted, THAT the information be received.

2020/106

7. FLOOD EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FUNDING UPDATE (SC2823)

A memo had been received from the Accountant advising that discussions had resumed with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) on 30 July in regard to recovering costs arising from the February flood event. A summary table outlining the breakdown of costs, including initial high level estimated costs and the portion claimable from NEMA had been circulated with the agenda. Costs agreed in principle with NEMA totalled \$615,368 and according to the criteria for a claim from NEMA, the Council was able to secure \$231,247.

In response to Cr D Grant, the General Manager Infrastructure advised the high level estimates had been provided by Harrison Grierson, consultants.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Dickson, seconded by Cr Gardyne, THAT the information be received.

2020/107

The Accountant departed the meeting at 4.45pm

8. DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW UPDATE (SC0487)

A report had been received from the Planning Consultant updating the Council on the progress of the District Plan review. The Review Committee had met on the first Friday of each month since June. Details of the issues that had been focused on since then had been provided. The National Planning Standards would result in the number of chapters in the district plan review being increased from the current 11 to between 50 and 56 and the number of zones and overlays from six to between 17 and 20. He added the review was running about six weeks behind.

Cr Bolger commented the Committee was to grips with the complexity of the review.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Bolger, seconded by Cr MacDonell, THAT the Council note the progress being made on the District Plan review.

2020/108

9. NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY – FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE RATE (FAR) REVIEW (SC2773)

A memo had been received from the Chief Executive advising that earlier this month, then Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) had reviewed and set the Funding Assistance Rates (FAR) for the 2021-24 National Land Transport programme. Following the review process, the Council's FAR rate had been lifted from 55% to 59%. The increase would come into effect on 1 July 2021. The Council was one of 22 Councils that had received an increase.

Cr Highsted asked in the years that the FAR had dropped what impact had there been on the level of service. The Chief Executive said it was very much dependent on the fiscal outlook of the Council at the time. On occasions it had been a drop in service. The rate had been stable at 55% for about six years. He added there was no guarantee the rate would remain at 59% past 2024.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr D Grant, seconded by Cr Reid, THAT the report be received,

THAT the decision of NZTA to increase the Gore District's FAR from 55% to 59% with effect from 1 July 2021 for a three-year period, be noted,

THAT the Council approve the retention of the budgeted local ratepayer share, noting that the scheduled amount for the 2021/22 financial year is \$2,312,594,

AND THAT the Council note that a further report will be prepared profiling options for service enhancements on the roading network to take cognisance of the increased funding coming on-stream from NZTA with effect from the 2021/22 financial year.

2020/109

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY REPORT (SC2752)

A report had been received from the Human Resources Manager and was considered by the Council. The report covered staff training, Covid-19 Alert Level 2 and a summary of 31 incidents recorded for the period 20 May to 10 August 2020.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Highsted, seconded by Cr Dickson, THAT the report be received.

2020/110

11. CREATIVE COMMUNITIES SCHEME

A copy of the report from the Creative Communities Sub-Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2 September 2020 had been circulated with the agenda and was perused by the Council.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Reid, THAT the information be received.

2020/111

The meeting concluded at 4.55pm