

AGENDA

REGIONAL COUNCIL

**10.00am
Tuesday
16 DECEMBER 2008**

for further information regarding this agenda, please contact:
Julie Kennedy, 06 952 2800

CONTACT	24hr Freephone 0508 800 800	help@horizons.govt.nz	www.horizons.govt.nz
SERVICE CENTRES	Kairanga Cnr Rongotea & Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Rds Palmerston North Marton Hammond Street Taumarunui 34 Maata Street Woodville Cnr Vogel (SH2) & Tay Sts	REGIONAL HOUSES	DEPOTS
		Palmerston North 11-15 Victoria Avenue Wanganui 181 Guyton Street	Levin 11 Bruce Road Taihape Torere Road Ohotu

POSTAL ADDRESS

Horizons Regional Council, Private Bag 11025, Manawatu Mail Centre, Palmerston North 4442 | F 06 9522 929



Notice is given of a meeting of Horizons Regional Council to be held on Tuesday, 16 December 2008 at 10.00am in the Tararua Room, Horizons Regional Council offices, 11-15 Victoria Avenue, Palmerston North.

ORDER PAPER

Regional Council

Agenda Pages

10.00 am Tuesday, 16 December

1 - 43

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT
COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY COUNCIL**

NEWS EMBARGO

Items in this agenda may be subject to amendment or withdrawal at the meeting. Items are embargoed until two days before the date of the meeting.

Reporters who do not attend the meetings should seek confirmation of the agenda material or proceedings from the Chief Executive prior to any media reports.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Cr GP Murfitt (Chairman)

Cr L Bailey

Cr LR Burnell

Cr VJF Chettleburgh QSM ED

Cr EB Gordon

Cr MC Guy

Cr AK Main

Cr DB Meads

Cr MW Plowman

Cr PW Rieger QSO

Cr RG Walker JP

Cr J White

AGENDA

16 December 2008
10.00am

PART ONE

Pages

PROCEDURAL ITEMS

1. Apologies
2. Public Speaking Rights
Notification to speak is required by 4pm on the working day prior to the meeting. Further information is available on www.horizons.govt.nz or by phoning 0508 800 800
3. Late Items:
To consider, and if thought fit, to pass a resolution to permit the Committee to consider any further items relating to items following below which do not appear on the Order Paper of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded.
Such resolution is required to be made pursuant to Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the Chairperson must advise:
 - (i) The reason why the item was not on the Order Paper, and
 - (ii) The reason why the discussion of this item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.
4. Members' Conflict of Interest
Members are reminded of their obligation to declare any conflicts of interest they might have in respect of the items on this Agenda.
5. Confirmation of Minutes - 25 November 2008 1 - 8
6. Petitions/Deputations
7. Chairman's Report
8. Chief Executive's Report

COMMITTEE REPORTS

9. Endorsement and Adoption of Committee and Advisory Group Resolutions and Recommendations:

Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group	2 December 2008	
Regional Transport Committee	9 December 2008	9 - 12
(to be tabled on the day)		
Strategy & Policy Committee	9 December 2008	
(to be tabled on the day)		
Catchment Operations Committee	10 December 2008	
(to be tabled on the day)		

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------|
| 10. | Ohau-Manakau Scheme
Proposed Scheme Upgrade and Revised Rating System
<i>Report No: 08-231 (Incl. Annex A, B & C)</i>
<i>File No: PRD 5 21</i> | 13 - 24 |
| 11. | Lower Whanganui River Management and Flood Protection Scheme
Capital Works Stages Two and Three
<i>Report No: 08-230</i>
<i>File No: PRD 5 36</i> | 25 - 28 |
| 12. | 2008 Don Linklater Memorial Bursary
<i>Report No: 08-213</i>
<i>File No: RCR 5 01</i> | 29 - 30 |
| 13. | Affixing of the Common Seal
<i>Report No: 08-232</i>
<i>File No: OMS 5 00</i> | 31 - 32 |
| 14. | Members' Questions | |

PART TWO - PUBLIC EXCLUDED SECTION

The public is to be excluded from the remainder of the Council meeting as the general subject 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 is as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution	Grounds under section 48 (1) for passing this resolution
PX1 Confirmation of Minutes of 25 November 2008 <i>Pgs 33 - 36</i>	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.
PX2 Endorsement and Adoption of Audit, Risk & Investment Committee resolutions and recommendations of 28 November 2008 <i>Pgs 37 - 40</i>	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.
PX3 Endorsement and Adoption of Strategy & Policy Committee resolutions and recommendations of 9 December 2008 (to be tabled on the day)	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.
PX4 One Plan Hearing Schedule Update <i>Report No. 08-233</i> <i>Pgs 41 - 43</i>	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.

M J McCartney
CHIEF EXECUTIVE



Minutes of the fourteenth meeting of the seventh triennium of Horizons Regional Council held at 10.30am on Tuesday, 25 November 2008, in the Missoula Room, Palmerston North City Council, 32 The Square, Palmerston North.

PRESENT Crs GP Murfitt (Chair), L Bailey, LR Burnell, VJF Chettleburgh QSM, EB Gordon, MC Guy, AK Main, DB Meads, MW Plowman, PW Rieger QSO, RG Walker JP, and J White.

IN ATTENDANCE Chief Executive Mr M McCartney
 Group Manager Corporate & Governance Mr C Grant (to 12.05pm, from 1.55pm)
 Committee Secretary Ms K Booth

ALSO PRESENT Mr G Carlyon (Group Manager Regional Planning and Regulatory, until 12.05pm), Mr A Cook (Group Manager Operations, from 12.45pm to 2.12pm), Dr Jan Wright (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment) accompanied by Dr Alex Thompson and Mr Shaun Killerby, from 11.13am until 12.05pm), Mr D Ward (Chief Executive, Horowhenua District Council) accompanied by Mr B Austin and a consultant from 11.24am until 12.05pm), Mr C Mitchell (Group Manager Environmental Management, from 11.35am until 12.56pm), Ms C Webb (Media Liaison Advisor), Mr R Munneke (Manager Policy, from 2.15pm), members of the public and a member of the Press.

APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

PUBLIC SPEAKING RIGHTS

No public speaking rights were notified.

LATE ITEMS

There were no Late Items, however documentation to support items in the Agenda, was distributed.

MEMBERS' CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no Conflicts of Interest.

08-283

Moved

Murfitt/Plowman

that the public is to be excluded from this portion of the Council meeting as the general subject matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to the matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for passing of this resolution is as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution	Grounds under section 48 (1) for passing this resolution
PX1 Confirmation of Minutes of 28 October 2008	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the need to protect the privacy of natural persons.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.
PX2 Endorsement and Adoption of Strategy & Policy Committee resolutions and recommendations of 11 November 2008	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the need to protect the privacy of natural persons.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.
PX3 Endorsement and Adoption of Audit, Risk & Investment Committee resolutions and recommendations of 12 November 2008	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.
PX4 Councillor Remuneration <i>Report No. 08-210</i>	As disclosure would not be in the public interest because of the greater need to enable Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations.	That the exclusion of the public from that part of the meeting is necessary to prevent the disclosure of information for which good reasons for withholding exist.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned to the Public Excluded part of the meeting at 10.35am and resumed at 11.13am.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Cr White referred to the first paragraph of page 5 (He Tini Awa Charitable Trust, 3rd line), and requested that the words "...as allowed..." be deleted.

In response to Members' questions on resolution 08-281 and the lack of a report on the Proposed Whanganui River Flood Protection works to the meeting, the Chief Executive explained that a response had not yet been received from Wanganui District Council. He advised the item would be brought to the December Council meeting.

08-284

Moved

Main/Walker

*that the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2008, as circulated and with the deletion of the words "...as allowed..." in the first paragraph, 3rd line of page 5, be **confirmed** as a correct record.*

CARRIED

PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS

There were no Petitions or Deputations.

The Chairman welcomed the Chief Executive and the Engineering Manager from Horowhenua District Council, and the consultant from Montgomery Watson to the meeting.

PRESENTATION FROM DR JAN WRIGHT (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment) on the LEVIN LANDFILL REPORT

The Chairman welcomed Dr Jan Wright, who introduced Dr Alex Thompson and Mr Shaun Killerby to the meeting.

Dr Wright said she was invited to present to Horizons, a summary of the "Levin Landfill : Environmental Management Review" which was published and tabled in Parliament in August 2008. It was a review of environmental management within landfills. She thanked Horizons for its positive response to the recommendations that arose from the report. Dr Wright explained her role was that of an independent officer of Parliament and she outlined what that role involved.

Dr Wright spoke to her presentation, outlined what the investigation did and did not cover, explained the six recommendations for Horowhenua District Council (HDC) and the three recommendations for Horizons Regional Council (HRC), and clarified Members' questions. Mr Ward (Chief Executive of HDC) said he looked forward to working through the issues with Horizons' staff, and commented on progress with some of the breaches of consent conditions that were mentioned in the report. Dr Wright thanked him for his updates.

08-285 Moved Chettleburgh/Bailey

*that the Council **requests** the Chief Executive to report on the recommendations affecting Horizons Regional Council contained in the Environmental Management Review from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment dated August 2008.*

CARRIED

*The meeting adjourned at 12.05pm.
The meeting resumed at 12.45pm.*

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman referred to his report which had been distributed to Members the previous day. He answered questions of clarification from Members in relation to the items in his report.

08-286 Moved Murfitt/Chettleburgh

that the Chairman's Report be received.

CARRIED

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

The Chief Executive referred to his report which had also been distributed to Members the previous day. He went through the report, elaborated on items and provided further information where relevant. He invited Members to provide comments on draft documentation that was distributed to them, such as draft National Policy Statements etc. In response to questions, he advised that copies of Memoranda of Understanding between HRC and iwi would be placed in the Councillors' Lounge, and that he would report back to Members after he had perused the Decision made in respect of Taupo Variation 5.

08-287 **Moved**

Murfitt/Walker

that the Chief Executive's Report be received.

CARRIED

MEMBERS' REPORTS

Cr Bailey advised she observed at the Hokino Scheme meeting, the Foxton Waste Water Hearing, and the Shannon Waste Water Hearing, she attended the usual Council, Committee and Subcommittee meetings, the Zone 3 meeting, a meeting of the Manawatu Estuary Trust as liaison representative, a pre-Hearing site visit to the Ohau-Manakau area and the Ohau-Manakau Scheme Hearing, and the Moutoa Scheme Liaison Committee meeting.

Cr Burnell said he had attended the normal Council and Committee meetings, the Lower Manawatu Scheme (LMS) Hearings, and commented on the assistance he had received from Crs Meads and Guy at the Hokino Hearing. He also attended the Horowhenua District Council meeting.

Cr Chettleburgh attended the Zone 3 meeting at Caccia Birch, meetings and interviews for the Linklater Bursary, Field Day at Massey University, the local funeral for Mike Higgins, chaired the Passenger Transport Subcommittee and mentioned the free weekend bus services in Palmerston North, Feilding, Ashhurst and Wanganui in the leadup to Christmas.

Cr Gordon said he attended the usual Council and Committee meetings, the Scheme meetings for Tutuenui, Porewa and Rangitikei, the LMS Hearings, a local Lions Club meeting where an HRC staff member spoke about compliance, and he had been invited to Rangitikei District Council to talk about the Haunui-Rakautaua Scheme.

Cr Guy attended the usual Council and Committee and Subcommittee meetings and the Council Tour in the Ruapehu area, chaired the Ohau-Manakau Scheme Hearing with Crs Meads and Bailey, chaired the Foxton and Shannon Waste Water Consents Hearings, and attended the Rangitikei Aggregates Hearing.

Cr Main attended the Rangitikei Aggregates Hearing, the Bushy Park Trust meeting and TamaUpoko meeting as an HRC representative. She also attended the Waitangi Tribunal Hearings in Taumarunui, chaired the Whanganui River Working Party meeting, and attended the usual Council, Committee and Subcommittee meetings, and the start of the Biodiversity and Heritage One Plan (OP) Hearings. She advised that Mr Kevin Ross had been appointed as Chief Executive of Wanganui District Council.

Cr Meads advised he attended the usual Council and Committee meetings, the Council Tour of the Ruapehu area, the Ohau-Manakau Scheme Hearing with Crs Guy and Bailey, met with HRC engineers (eastern area) to discuss the Mangatainoka audit, attended the Whanganui River Working Party meeting, Liaison and Drainage Scheme meetings, and the LMS Hearing.

Cr Plowman attended the Council and Committee meetings and workshops, the Council Tour of the Ruapehu area, three days of the Waitangi Tribunal Hearings with a consequent follow up meeting to be held in December.

Cr Rieger attended the meeting with Mayors and members of two Rescue Helicopter Trusts, and also attended the LMS Hearings.

Cr Walker attended a Whanganui River flood protection meeting, Council meetings and workshops, the Council Tour of Ruapehu, and met with constituents about their house flooding problems.

Cr White explained that although she attended the Council meeting at Taumarunui, she was not able to join other Councillors for the tour of the Ruapehu area as she was attending her final

that the Council:

- a. **notes** the contents of report and additions agreed to;
- b. **endorses** the recommendations of the Hearing Committee meeting held on 10 October 2008, to hear submissions on the Proposed Extension and New Rating System for Hokio Drainage Scheme, as set out below and in the Minutes attached at Annex A;

Hokio Stream

- (a) The Scheme undertakes a comprehensive clearance of willows from the stream mouth to the marae; and
- (b) a report be prepared with cost estimates and a programme of works for consultation with landowners and stakeholders;
- (c) a report is prepared to assess the options (including works and related environmental impacts) for the Scheme to maintain the position of the Hokio Stream mouth.

Proposed Drains

- (d) Extend the Scheme drain network to include those mentioned in paragraph 15. G. 1, 3, 4 and 5 (in Report No. 08-175) subject to further consultation with landowners as required; and
- (e) For the roadside drain along Arapaepae Road, (paragraph 15. G. 2 in Report No. 08-175), investigate the feasibility by survey and relay the request to the Horowhenua District Council for action;
- (f) Further investigate the option to re-establish the natural flow to relieve overloading of McLeavey Road, in consultation with landowners.

Rating System

- (g) Amend the IN area as shown on the amended plan;
- (h) Extend the rating system to include a new category (DH) for the drains servicing 11 properties along Hokio Beach Road; the rate to be applied subject to consultation with the landowners affected; and
- (i) Amend the rates calculation to ensure the Hokio Stream costs are funded from the UH, UL and IN categories without affecting the proportion deducted from the drainage benefit categories, maintaining the Indirect/Contributor rate (IN) at 20%, and achieving a rating for UH and UL that would result in the rates for an average property in Hokio Beach being about double that in Levin.

Scheme Liaison and Consultation

- (j) A catchment forum approach, as proposed in the One Plan, to ensure water quality and drainage issues are actioned in a timely and coordinated manner by the appropriate authority.

Scheme Name Change

- (k) The extended Scheme is called Hokio Catchment Drainage Scheme.

- c. **approves** the revisions to the proposed rating system as set out in the revised Rating Report in Annex B, for inclusion in the Draft Long-term Council Community Plan for 2009-19;
- d. **notes** that all submitters will be advised of the outcome of the consultation process.

CARRIED

The Chairman thanked the Hearing Committee and the staff involved in the process.

AFFIXING OF THE COMMON SEAL*Report No. 08-209*

This paper reported on documents to which Horizons Regional Council's Common Seal had been affixed.

08-291**Moved****Guy/Walker**

*that the Council **acknowledges** the affixing of the Common Seal to the following documents:*

- *Funding Agreement for the Afforestation Grant Scheme*
- *Lease Agreement – Horizons Regional Council and Pirie Valley Farm Limited*

CARRIED**WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE****23 October 2008 – 19 November 2008**

Members noted the workshop attendances.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Cr Bailey asked how the charging regime for resource consents was applied, and whether it would be timely to review the policy to lessen any risk to Horizons. She referred to the possible use of bonds or interim billing. The Chief Executive advised that the consents charging was based on the funding policy that Council had in place, which was currently 80% recovery. There was an opportunity to use interim billing where the costs were likely to be high. Council had the ability to impose bonds, but these tended to be performance bonds based on complying with the condition, rather than addressing costs of the process. Mr Munneke (Policy Manager) then explained the charging regime, and that interim billing was routinely used when the consent application reached another step in the process, or where there was a time lapse in the process. He clarified that applicants were only charged for work that had been done and there were opportunities for the applicants to object to the bill. There was then discussion over the process if interim bills were not paid, or where the invoice was challenged and the applicant was ultimately unable to pay following resolution of the challenge. Mr Munneke said the process was to resolve objections in an expedient manner to minimise the risk of non-payment.

Cr Plowman asked about progress with the review of the Green RIG. The Chief Executive advised that a report would be included in the December agenda for the Strategy and Policy Committee meeting.

The meeting closed at 2.49pm.

Confirmed.

 CHIEF EXECUTIVE

 CHAIRMAN



Report of a meeting of the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group of Horizons Regional Council held in the Missoula Room of Palmerston North City Council, 32 The Square, Palmerston North, at 7.30pm on Tuesday, 2 December 2008.

PRESENT Crs L Burnell (Chairman), L Bailey, Messrs I Taylor (Manawatu Freshwater Anglers' Club), Mr B Culley (Manawatu Marine Boating Club), Mr M Wheatley (Manawatu Four Wheel Drive Club), Mr J Roxburgh (Department of Conservation), Mr R Christmas (Massey Lake Charitable Trust), Mr A Wakeling (Manawatu Marine Boating Club), Mr R Bailey (member of the public).

IN ATTENDANCE	Area Engineer	Mr D McKee
	Harbourmaster	Mr E Lloyd
	Committee Secretary	Mrs J Kennedy

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cr G Murfitt, Cr C Southgate, and Mr AD Cook.

Moved **Culley/Taylor**

that the apologies of Cr Murfitt, Cr Southgate, and Mr Cook be accepted.

CARRIED

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved **Bailey/Culley**

that the minutes of the meeting of the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group held on 3 June 2008, as circulated, be confirmed as a correct record.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING

Mr Culley referred to the 3 June 2008 meeting where he asked for permission to erect a sign at both ends of the sailing racecourse on race day. He further requested that the Harbourmaster authorise that by way of a letter addressed to the Manawatu Marine Boating Club.

Moved **Burnell/Bailey**

*that the Manawatu Marine Boating Club **receives** a letter from the Harbourmaster authorising the erection of a 5 knot speed restriction sign during club race days.*

CARRIED

In regard to a letter tabled at the 3 June 2008 meeting, which outlined the Water and Environmental Care Association's concerns in regard to two consents that had been granted to discharge treated manufacturing wastewater into the Manawatu River, the Harbourmaster advised that a meeting had been held to work through the Association's concerns.

HARBOURMASTER'S REPORT

Report No: 08-214

The purpose of this item was to provide Members of the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group (MRUAG) with an update on matters relating to the Office of the Harbourmaster.

The Harbourmaster introduced the report, and answered questions of clarification. He noted that in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 s158, a review of the Bylaws was due no later than 1 August 2009. It was suggested that the June 2009 meeting be brought forward about six weeks, and that a workshop be held at that meeting in order to discuss the review of the Bylaws.

In regard to the Foxton Beach Erosion Hazards Assessment due for release in July 2008, Cr Bailey updated Members on progress of a decision to erect a low stopbank to safeguard residents from flooding.

Mr Roxburgh, Department of Conservation advised that the Department had sought legal advice on who was responsible for the derelict wharf structure at Foxton Beach, and were currently waiting for an opinion on that legal advice, from Crown Law.

Moved

Bailey/Culley

that the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group

a. **receives** the information contained in Report No. 08-214.

CARRIED

LOWER MANAWATU RIVER MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Report No: 08-217

The purpose of this item was to inform Members of the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group (MRUAG) of Lower Manawatu Scheme (LMS) management issues, that may have some impact on the recreational use of the river during the period December 2008 to June 2009.

Mr Derek McKee, Area Engineer answered Members questions of clarification in regard to Lower Manawatu River Management Issues.

Members commented on the 'global' consent issued to the Operations Group of Horizons Regional Council for the extraction of gravel from the 'aggradation reach' of the river between Karere Road and Riverbank Road over a term of 20 years.

Moved

Burnell/Bailey

that the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group

a. **receives** the information contained in Report No. 08-217.

CARRIED

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Report No: 08-215

The purpose of this report was to present the Manawatu River Calendar of Events to the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group for information.

The Harbourmaster outlined the upcoming events by the Manawatu Marine Boating Club Sailing Section, and the Manawatu Power boat Club Incorporated.

Moved

Bailey/Wakeling

that the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group

- a. **receives** the information contained in Report No. 08-215.

CARRIED

GENERAL BUSINESS

It was noted that the warrant cards for Honorary Enforcement Officers expired on 1 September 2008.

Moved

Bailey/Burnell

that the Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group

- a. **instructs** the Harbourmaster to update the warrant cards for Honorary Enforcement Officers as required.

CARRIED

Mr Cully requested that the Harbourmaster erect permanent 5 knot speed restriction signs on the left bank of the river. The harbourmaster agreed to procure the signs and liaise with MMBC officials and Coastguard regarding location and placement.

In answer to a question as to what determines when the flood gates were opened, Mr McKee outlined the procedure, and advised that the operating range for that was strictly adhered to.

Mr Taylor asked again, if the turbidity chart displayed on the Horizons Regional Council website could be made clearer for the general public to understand. At the December 2007 meeting, Mr Watson (Manager Catchment Information) was to investigate adding an interpretation panel to the website page.

NEXT MEETING

Members would be advised by the Harbourmaster as to when the next Manawatu River Users' Advisory Group meeting would be held.

The Chairman thanked the Group for their attendance, interest and contribution.

The meeting closed at 8.30pm.

Confirmed.

CHAIRPERSON

HARBOURMASTER

A Significant decision? <i>If Yes</i>	No
Do recommendations meet Significance Policy (contained within the LTCCP)	

Item No: 10
Date: 16/12/2008
Report No: 08-231
File No: PRD 5 21

OHAU-MANAKAU SCHEME PROPOSED SCHEME UPGRADE AND REVISED RATING SYSTEM

PURPOSE

1. This report is to inform Members of the outcome of the hearing of submissions relating to flood protection improvement and rating proposals for the Ohau-Manakau Scheme, and to seek Council's adoption of the Hearing Committee's recommendations, for inclusion in the Draft 2009-19 Long-term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).

FINANCIAL IMPACT

2. The adoption of recommendations included in this report will have significant funding implications in terms of both targeted and general rates, over the next 20 years.

BACKGROUND

3. The Ohau-Manakau Scheme, originally established in 1979, provides flood control, erosion control and drainage services in the catchments of the Ohau River and the Manakau and Waikawa Streams.
4. The Scheme was last reviewed in 1996. A new rating system was developed at that time under the provisions of the Rating Powers Act, 1988 and was adopted by Council in 1997.
5. A study undertaken in 2006 and updated following the flood in the Ohau River in 2008, identified a range of measures that could be implemented to mitigate the present serious flooding risk on the lower Ohau River flood plain.
6. At a meeting held in June 2008, Council approved a flood protection upgrade proposal for the purpose of stakeholder consultation. Five upgrade options were presented. At a subsequent informal meeting, those ratepayers particularly affected by the flooding problem gave conditional support for a \$2.7 million upgrade programme undertaken over 20 years, to be funded partly by rates and partly by loans repaid over 20 years. That proposal would have provided a uniform standard of flood protection close to 2% annual exceedance probability (50-year). While ratepayers were given an indication of rating impacts arising from the upgrade proposal, their support was conditional on the affordability of the proposal, to be assessed on the basis of the final details contained in a new rating system to be developed.
7. A draft new rating system was subsequently developed and was endorsed by Council on 9 September 2008, for the purpose of ratepayer consultation.
8. The main changes to the rating areas benefiting from the existing and proposed flood protection works on the Ohau River are:

- a. two previous flood control benefit rating differentials on the left bank of the river have been reduced to one, recognising that these two areas are in fact interconnected and that the benefits are best reflected in one rating differential;
 - b. the extension of the existing flood control benefit area to include additional low-lying areas that have been identified with the recently obtained LIDAR survey data; and
 - c. the establishment of an additional flood control differential to recognise that there are properties whose access would be cut off from time to time if it were not for the protection afforded to Muhunoa West Road and Kuku Beach Road by either the existing or upgraded flood protection works.
9. The newly identified benefit area referred to in c. above will be rated under two separate categories. The first category will relate to the flood control maintenance works on the Ohau River and the other will relate to capital upgrade works on the Ohau River.
 10. In addition to these changes, a review of the existing rating system was undertaken to assess the degree of alignment of actual works expenditure in the various Scheme compartments over the past 10 years, with the assumptions made in setting the original differentials.
 11. This analysis has shown that the existing levels of rating do not fairly reflect the actual expenditure on Scheme works, and accordingly a series of new differentials is proposed that will ensure future rating will be more equitable.
 12. A new rating category has also been included to reflect the benefits derived from a proposed major upgrade at the Whakahoro Road culvert on the Manakau Stream.
 13. Two minor rating categories are proposed to be deleted as they are no longer required because of legislation changes.

CONSULTATION

14. A comprehensive newsletter was sent to all ratepayers on or about 22 September 2008, explaining the flood protection upgrade proposals and revised rating system.
15. Indicative rate assessments were sent to all ratepayers affected by the changes to the flood benefit rating categories.
16. Two ratepayer meetings were held where staff made presentations on the flood protection upgrade and associated rating proposals. Those directly affected ratepayers and Scheme Liaison Committee members were invited to the first meeting held on 24 September 2008, while the second meeting on 30 September 2008 was publicly advertised.
17. Submissions were sought through the newsletter and at the meetings, in relation to both the flood protection upgrade proposal and the revised rating proposal.

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AND SUBMISSIONS HEARING

18. Nine written submissions were received. All submitters were provided with a copy of submissions received, together with a copy of the Officers' Report on those submissions, in advance of the hearing date.
19. Eight of the submitters did not support the proposed upgrade works or the proposed changes to the rating system.

20. A Special Hearing Committee comprising Councillors Guy (Chair), Meads and Bailey, sat on 30 October 2008 to hear five submitters and to consider written submissions.
21. Minutes of the Hearing are attached at Annex A

DELIBERATIONS

22. The Committee deliberated on the various submissions received and formulated recommendations in relation to the following general issues:
 - a. **The proposed flood protection upgrade option** – The committee recognised the strong opposition to upgrade works progressing on the basis of the proposed option (Option E). The opposition was largely related to cost and affordability.

Committee recommendation A. That due to strong opposition to the proposed flood protection upgrade option, this proposal should be rejected.
 - b. **A modified flood protection upgrade option** – The Committee noted that a number of submitters clearly had an expectation for some improvement in the present standard of flood protection. The Committee considered a ‘modified’ upgrade option presented by Officers at the hearing.
23. That option would comprise works designed to increase the flood-carrying capacity in the most restricted sections of the river. The works would involve a combination of berm lowering/clearing; raising the most capacity deficient sections of stopbank, and lowering sections of flood berm that are elevating the flood profile. There would also be an emphasis on works that would improve egress of floodwaters that at present become trapped behind the stopbanks at the downstream end of the flood protection.
24. The work would commence in the current financial year with the construction of flood water egress structures (\$100,000 provision in current Scheme budget) and would progress with stopbank improvements and associated berm lowering/clearing work estimated to cost \$200,000 per year for the following three years. Clearing of vegetation from strategic locations within the river channel would proceed concurrently with the capital work, with funding from the Scheme maintenance budget.
25. The ‘modified’ option would not provide a clearly defined and consistent standard of flood protection throughout the identified flood risk area; however it would provide significant improvement to the present very unsatisfactory situation and in particular would address the major problem that results from flood water becoming trapped behind stopbanks in over-design flows.
26. The Committee also considered a possible enhancement to that option that would involve more extensive stopbank raising, to provide an increased standard of protection, at an additional capital cost of \$300,000.
27. The modified options were discussed in general terms with those submitters at the hearing who were directly affected by the flooding and most indicated their support for implementation of the \$700,000 option.

Committee recommendation B. That the ‘modified’ proposal, to be referred to as the Berm Lowering, Bank Equalising and Flood Egress (\$700,000) Option, be further investigated to confirm the extent of the stopbank upgrade that it would allow, and the resulting protection level that it would provide.
28. Subsequent to the hearing, staff have further considered the above matters. With the amount of survey information presently available, it can now be confidently determined

that the extent of upgrade work that could be achieved under the \$700,000 option is as follows:

- Stopbank raising right bank (three identified low sections) - 1.5 km.
 - Stopbank raising left bank (two identified low sections) - 1.1 km.
 - Berm lowering at Catley/Burnell bends – 1 km, mainly on the right bank (all material to be used for either stopbank raising or widening).
 - Floodwater egress structures, including three new drop gates (two in the Haines property and one in the Parkin property) and two new gravity outlets (Parkin and Shailer properties).
29. It is proposed that any section of stopbank upgraded would be designed with a wide crest, such that if a decision were made in future to further raise the protection standard, then that could be readily achieved without the need for complete stopbank reconstruction.
30. The 'modified' option would provide a minimum protection standard of between 10 and 20-year protection (10% to 5% AEP). However the standard would not be consistent. In some areas there would be no freeboard in the 10 to 20-year flood, in others the standard would be significantly higher than the 10 to 20-year minimum.
- c. Possible change to the FI and CI direct benefit rating categories** – The Committee considered the introduction of a Uniform Annual Charge in respect of the area that receives benefit, in the form of improved access to properties beyond the directly floodable area. The change would shift a greater proportion of the total rate for those categories to the smaller lifestyle properties.
- d. Committee recommendation C.** That Officers investigate apportioning 50% of the 'Muhunua West' rate as a uniform property charge and 50% as an area-based rate.
31. Subsequent to the hearing, officers have modelled the suggested change and have discussed the outcome with members of the Hearing Committee. Members have elected to adhere to the initial proposal to apportion the rate in the FL and CL categories entirely on an area basis.
32. Attached at Annex B is a copy of the revised rating calculations including the allowances for the proposed upgrade works. The calculations are based on the 'modified' Berm Lowering, Bank Equalising and Flood Egress (\$700,000) Option. The table at Annex C sets out the present Scheme rates, the rates that were proposed to fund the initial upgrade proposal (\$2.7 million capex) and the rates now proposed to fund the 'modified' upgrade option.
- e. Administrative issues** – The Committee discussed a process that would lead to presentation of firm recommendations to Council in respect of the upgrade and rating proposals. It was decided that the recommendation would be for the \$700,000 'modified' option and for the rating system as proposed, amended only to reflect the substantial decrease in capital expenditure. However a survey of direct benefit category ratepayers would be conducted to confirm the majority support for that option as expressed at the hearing, and the results would assist Council in reaching its ultimate decision.
- Committee recommendation D.** That the direct benefit category ratepayers be sent an indicative rates assessment based on the 'modified' proposal.

Committee recommendation E. That a questionnaire be sent to direct benefit category ratepayers seeking their support or otherwise for the 'modified' proposal.

33. A letter, together with an indicative rates assessment, was sent to all direct benefit ratepayers on 3 December, seeking confirmation of support for the 'modified' flood protection upgrade option. Feedback in response to that letter will be tabled at the Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

34. It is recommended that the Council:
- a. **adopts**, subject to survey results to be tabled at the meeting, the Draft Ohau-Manakau Scheme flood protection upgrade and rating proposals, based on the 'modified' Berm Lowering, Bank Equalising and Flood Egress (\$700,000) Option;
 - b. **requests** that the Chief Executive makes appropriate funding provision, to facilitate implementation of the modified upgrade proposals, in the Draft 2009-19 LTCCP;
 - c. **requests** the Chief Executive to include the new rating system proposal in the Annual Funding Impact Statement within the Draft 2009-19 LTCCP; and
 - d. **instructs** the Chief Executive to advise all submitters of the outcome of the submissions hearing process.

A D Cook

GROUP MANAGER OPERATIONS

ANNEX

- A Minutes of the Submissions Hearing Committee Meeting for the Ohau-Manakau Rivers Scheme Proposed Flood Protection Upgrade and New Rating System.
- B Revised rates calculations based on the 'modified' Berm Lowering, Bank Equalising and Flood Egress (\$700,000) Option.
- C Table showing impact of rating changes.

Minutes of the Submissions Hearing Committee Meeting for the Ohau-Manakau River Scheme Proposed Flood Protection Upgrade and New Rating System held at Horowhenua District Council in Levin on Thursday 30 October 2008 10.00 am.

PRESENT: Cr M Guy (Chair), Cr L Bailey, Cr D Meads

IN ATTENDANCE: John Philpott, Consultant
John Foxall, Area Engineer
Paul Arcus, Engineering Officer
Kelly Standish, Secretary

PRESENT: Submitters – Brian Thomas (Scheme Liaison Committee), John Haines, F R and F A Catley, John Catley, John and Dorothy Burnell,

APOLOGIES: Dennis Craddock

The Chair welcomed submitters to the meeting and introduced the Panel members, staff and consultants present at the meeting. The Chair advised that each submitter had 10 minutes for their presentation with a further 10 minutes allowed for questions from the Committee. The Chair also suggested once submitters had been heard other options for the Scheme could be discussed.

MR BRIAN THOMAS

Mr Thomas gave a brief outline of his written submission. Mr Thomas explained that he believed that there were two parts to the problem, the first being the south bank which would often overtop during small and medium floods, and secondly the north bank which in larger flood events appeared to cause total bank failure, big floods were a real concern.

Mr Thomas also advised that he believed that during metal extraction less flooding occurred based on historical floods which have occurred during metal extraction. Mr Thomas believes if there is metal available for extraction that it should be extracted. Sediment deposits in the worst affected areas can be removed cost-effectively, and that material could then be used to raise stopbanks.

Mr Thomas acknowledged the huge amount of time and resources put in to the proposed Flood Upgrade Proposal by Horizons. However he believes the cost of the upgrade is more than ratepayers are prepared to pay and/or are able to commit to, and believes those paying for the upgrade should have the say on whether it is approved, and if not, what other options could be considered.

The Committee asked questions for clarification. Cr D Meads gave Mr Thomas assurance that the Committee would weight their decision on the feeling and opinion of the directly affected parties.

Committee members thanked Mr Thomas for his time and for the matters brought forward.

MR JOHN HAINES

Mr Haines advised his property is significantly affected by flooding and wanted to know that if this proposal was accepted, how soon rates would be reduced back to a normal rate as the extra cost will be substantial. Mr Haines also asked if work would still be done in the problem area near his property if the proposed Scheme did not go ahead.

Mr Haines advised he believes the problem is due to a build-up of the bed, congestion in the channel, and berm problems in the area with the build-up of vegetation. Flooding comes across from another property and water is left sitting on his property for a long period of time.

Mr Haines advised he would like Horizons to install additional drop gates so that when flood waters go down water will be able to escape. Prior to stopbanking Mr Haines never had problems with flooding and believes floods seem to be occurring more frequently.

Cr Guy advised the period of rates increase is 20 years, as indicated in the proposal.

Mr Philpott advised why the 20-year period would be necessary.

Committee members thanked Mr Haines for his time and for the matters brought forward.

MR FRANCIS CATLEY

Mr Catley thanked the Committee for the opportunity to relay his experiences.

Mr Catley relayed his experience when Colliers came in to extract gravel in 1960; he advised that this gave relief to farms in the area which were affected by flooding. Mr Catley stated that he has been advised by others and observed himself that gravel is now back up to levels it was at before 1960.

Mr Catley believes nothing is being done about the amount of gravel coming down the river and that the Regional Council has been reluctant to address the gravel problem. Mr Catley also believes the whole situation could be resolved by removal of the gravel.

Mr Catley relayed how he had spoken to Mr Foxall about the bottleneck at Catley's Bend and the possibility of getting it cleared out. Mr Foxall agreed with Mr Catley's concerns and had willows, gravel etc cleared from the channel. Mr Catley advised the water had flowed very well through the channel ever since.

Mr Catley expressed his appreciation for Mr Foxall's efforts and believes Mr Foxall has done his best in the circumstances. Mr Catley stated that he would be happy if the stopbanks were not raised at all, provided the gravel was removed from the river bed.

Committee members thanked Mr Catley for his time and for the matters brought forward.

MR JOHN CATLEY

Mr Catley expressed his disappointment that the ratepayers haven't received a copy of Gary Williams' review since it has been completed. Mr Foxall advised it would have been circulated at the time of completion; however Mr Catley possibly wasn't a member of the Liaison Committee at that time.

Mr Catley outlined a number of issues he has with the proposed Scheme as follows:

- in the past the Scheme has been restricted using gravel extraction and cross-blading;
- protection works done in the past have been washed away very quickly along with the money spent;
- gravel is clearly building up in the river as the piles under the rail bridge are now completely covered;
- stopbanks are not dealing with the problem so Mr Catley cannot see benefit in increasing their height;

- concerned that material available is not suitable for constructing stopbanks;
- does not believe that lowering the berms will solve the problem as they build up again very quickly during floods;
- believes only a fraction of the last rates increase was spent on the Ohau-Manakau Scheme;
- believes rationale of rates increase is biased;
- the financial weight of the rates is too high with not enough benefit, and believes the financial climate around the world at the moment needs to be taken into consideration;
- that consents are causing part of the problem as they are making it difficult for Higgins to extract more gravel;
- scientists etc do not know what has been going on on-site; and
- removing gravel will cost a lot less and will help to reverse what has been happening in the river.

Mr Catley also advised that he would like to see a plan which showed exactly how the money is being spent, and also commented that he realises the Council is looking at other options for the Scheme and is pleased. Mr Catley also advised he thought an independent person would have been on the Hearing Committee.

Mr Philpott answered some of the questions raised by Mr Catley at Cr Guy's request.

Cr Guy advised that there is a plan in place for how the money would be spent and asked Mr Foxall to comment. Mr Foxall advised there are spots identified which will be upgraded initially, and where the work is likely to be done first. Cr Meads advised that when a Scheme upgrade is proposed it is a little broad at first; however when prepared the detailed plans will be available to ratepayers.

Cr Bailey asked for clarification regarding who Mr Catley thought the independent person on the Committee should be. Cr Bailey explained that she is an independent person of sorts as she does not sit on the Catchment Operations Committee. Cr Meads reassured Mr Catley that the Committee is there to provide the community with the solution they want, and also that stopbanks are never made from unsuitable material and that any unsuitable material would be removed from the site.

Cr Bailey asked why the rationale for rates increase is biased. Mr Catley replied that because he is the beneficiary and he doesn't believe he gets any benefit and does not agree with the rating system. Mr Catley also advised he believes Councillors are there because they want to do what they have put forward.

Committee members thanked Mr Catley for his time and for the matters brought forward.

MR JOHN BURNELL

Mr Burnell advised the water on his property is getting out via a small culvert and is taking four to five days to escape. Mr Burnell advised the stopbanks have only been put back to the same standard following flooding, and he cannot understand why the stopbank is not upgraded whilst works are being done to repair the bank.

Mr Burnell also believes rates will continue to go up, so with the extra cost of the Scheme upgrade it will cost a lot. Cr Meads commented that the point was well made and he could understand the concern and Councillors were listening. Mr Burnell also advised he felt that too much money was being spent on consultation.

Mr Foxall advised that no decision had been reached regarding the level of flood protection in the area, and therefore the stopbank damaged in the flood was restored to the same level.

Cr Meads advised that money is spent on consultants as we do not have the capacity within Horizons to provide all the technical knowledge. This kind of expenditure is paid for out of the Council's General Rate which is being paid by the whole Region, and not the specific Scheme rate.

Cr Guy asked what Mr Burnell would be prepared to do as a landowner to maintain the berm. Mr Burnell advised he would be prepared to maintain the berm.

Committee members thanked Mr Burnell for his time and for the matters brought forward.

MR JOHN PHILPOTT

Mr Philpott gave a brief overview of why gravel extraction alone would not solve the problem. Mr Philpott also gave an explanation of the new rating system and how the rates had been apportioned around the catchment area.

MR JOHN FOXALL

Mr Foxall discussed the various options the Scheme could use instead of the proposal being heard. They were:

- \$700,000 worth of work.
- Rates would still increase from \$114 (fl) and \$78 (fm) up to \$113 per hectare.
- The work would involve spending \$100,000 in getting the water off the Haines, Burnell, Parkin and Shailer properties more quickly by upgrading the three culverts plus putting in two droppate structures.
- The remaining \$600,000 would be used to bring the stopbanks up to a uniform level, lower the berms and clear vegetation that was restricting flood flows.

Mr Foxall advised that this would probably have to be revisited after around 10 years.

Mr Foxall advised the other option was the expenditure of \$1,000,000 which would allow the stopbank to be brought up to a higher standard. This would require the rates to be increased from \$114 (fl) and \$78 (fm) up to \$142 per hectare.

Mr Foxall also explained where the flood was likely to come over the stopbanks in the event of a 20-year flood.

Cr Meads noted that the standard of protection provided by the \$0.7 m or the \$1.0 m upgrade is a very low level of flood protection. Twenty-year flood protection was preferred but would require an expenditure of \$2.7 m.

Discussion took place between all parties regarding the two revised options as outlined by Mr Foxall.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.21 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 1.07 pm to discuss Written Submissions.

The Committee noted D R Craddocks submission. taken into consideration.

The Committee noted M K and W E Bryants submission, taken into consideration.

The Committee noted Pauline and Bryan May's submission, taken into consideration.

The Committee noted Ron Parkin's submission and will take it into consideration.

DELIBERATIONS

Discussion took place around the two revised options outlined by Mr Foxall at the Hearing. The Committee discussed whether there was substantial benefit in the \$1,000,000 option over the \$700,000 option. It was agreed that general indication from people present at the Hearing was that the \$700,000 option would be preferred. Mr Foxall advised that a full survey needed to be undertaken to assess where and how substantial the amount of work required was.

Discussion took place regarding the technical aspects of the two proposals and which one had the greater benefit. The Councillors agreed that the stopbank should be widened to future-proof the stopbank to enable future works to be done with as much ease as possible.

Cr Bailey suggested the \$700,000 option should be revisited in 10-15 years and that clear parameters should be set surrounding the new proposal. The Councillors agreed only one option should be put forward as a clear alternative to the \$2.7 million option. It was also noted that Horizons could compile the required information and make a recommendation in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) before the end of the year.

The suggested name for the modified upgrade proposal was “Berm Lowering, Bank Equalising and Flood Egress (\$700,000)”.

Discussions also took place regarding the Flood Control Low Benefit Category in regard to the impact on the larger properties. It was felt that spreading half the income required from these beneficiaries as a UAC and the other half on a per hectare basis could be more equitable.

Mr Philpott was requested to analyse the impact of this change and report back to the committee.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES

- a. that due to strong opposition to the proposed flood protection upgrade option, this proposal should be rejected;
- b. that the Modified proposal: Berm Lowering, Bank Equalising and Flood Egress (\$700,000) option should be further investigated to confirm the extent of the stopbank upgrade that it would allow and the resulting protection level that it would provide;
- c. that Officers investigate apportioning 50% of the ‘Muhunoa West Area’ rate as a uniform property charge and 50% as an area-based rate;
- d. that the direct benefit category ratepayers be sent an indicative rates assessment based on the modified proposal; and
- e. that a questionnaire be sent out to direct benefit category ratepayers seeking their support or otherwise for the modified proposal; and
- f. the letter explaining these changes be sent to Councillors Guy, Meads and Bailey to review before being sent to ratepayers with the revised indicative rates.

Meeting closed at 2.27 pm

Annex B. Ohau-Manakau Scheme - Rates Calculation For 2009-10 ('Modified' \$700,000 Upgrade Option)

Location	Category	Area (ha)	Scheme Budget Works Cost + Management	Works Proportions	Proportion	Effective Area	Annual Maintenance	Less Indirect Benefit	Less General Rate Contribution	Total Rate Required 2009-10	Rates per hectare (\$)	Rates per hectare (\$) GST INCL
OHAU RIVER			131,113									
OHAU LOWER EROSION	OL	33.330		1.25%	100%	33.330	1,637	1,146	917	\$ 904.48	\$ 27.14	\$ 30.53
OHAU MIDDLE EROSION	OM	74.989		8.46%	100%	74.989	11,093	7,765	6,212	\$ 6,130.38	\$ 81.75	\$ 91.97
OHAU UPPER MIDDLE ERO	OU	50.022		10.06%	100%	50.022	13,184	9,229	7,383	\$ 7,286.10	\$ 145.66	\$ 163.87
OHAU UPPER EROSION	OT	117.637		48.54%	100%	117.637	63,647	44,553	35,642	\$ 35,174.29	\$ 299.01	\$ 336.38
FLOOD CONTROL MTCE HIGH	FM	393.927		31.69%	100%	504.077	41,553	29,087	23,269	\$ 17,945.79	\$ 45.56	\$ 51.25
FLOOD CONTROL MTCE LOW	FI	1,468.662			7.5%					\$ 5,017.99	\$ 3.42	\$ 3.84
OHAU CAPITAL WORKS												
FLOOD CONTROL CAPITAL	CO	393.927	152,583	100.00%	100%	504.077	152,583	36,808	29,447	\$ 23,012.09	\$ 58.42	\$ 65.72
FLOOD INDIRECT ONLY	CI	1,468.662			7.5%					\$ 6,434.63	\$ 4.38	\$ 4.93
WAIKAWA & MANAKAU STREAM			32,187									
MANAKAU STREAM	ML	40.779		10.27%	100%	40.779	3,306	2,314	1,851	\$ 1,826.84	\$ 44.80	\$ 50.40
MANAKAU STREAM	MU	57.720		34.25%	100%	57.720	11,024	7,717	6,174	\$ 6,092.44	\$ 105.55	\$ 118.74
WAIKAWA STREAM	WL	89.977		16.80%	100%	89.977	5,407	3,785	3,028	\$ 2,988.41	\$ 33.21	\$ 37.36
WAIKAWA STREAM	WU	79.895		38.68%	100%	79.895	12,450	8,715	6,972	\$ 6,880.45	\$ 86.12	\$ 96.88
WAIKAWA & MANAKAU CAPITAL WORKS												
TAKAPAU MANAKAU CULVERT	MC	398.887	10,397	100.00%	100%	398.887	10,396.70	7,278	5,822	\$ 5,822.15	\$ 14.60	\$ 16.42
DRAINAGE			26,368									
MAIWIRI DRAINAGE	WD	278.751		15.29%	100%	278.751	4032	2,822	2,258	\$ 2,228.09	\$ 7.99	\$ 8.99
LAKE WAITAHA DRAIN	LD	59.568		11.46%	100%	71.2088	3022	2,115	1,416	\$ 1,396.98	\$ 23.45	\$ 26.38
	L2	23.281			50%				277	\$ 272.99	\$ 11.73	\$ 13.19
PARKIN WEST BURNELL DR	PD	69.177		5.69%	100%	69.177	1500	1,050	840	\$ 829.16	\$ 11.99	\$ 13.48
KUKU STR HAINES CATLEY	HD	422.272		19.25%	100%	422.272	5076	3,553	2,842	\$ 2,805.15	\$ 6.64	\$ 7.47
KUKU TRIB DR	KD	188.867		18.19%	100%	188.867	4796	3,357	2,686	\$ 2,650.68	\$ 14.03	\$ 15.79
TAKAPAU MANAKAU DR	TD	134.081		16.64%	100%	134.081	4388	3,071	2,457	\$ 2,424.82	\$ 18.08	\$ 20.35
ADINS DRAIN	AD	136.606		11.71%	100%	136.606	3088	2,161	1,729	\$ 1,706.41	\$ 12.49	\$ 14.05
SWEETMAN	SD	53.210		1.48%	100%	53.210	390	273	219	\$ 215.67	\$ 4.05	\$ 4.56
CAMPBELL	CD	5.130		0.29%	100%	5.130	76	54	43	\$ 42.26	\$ 8.24	\$ 9.27
INDIRECT	IB	12,481.869			100%	16,699		56,901	45,521	\$ 44,922.59	\$ 3.60	\$ 4.04
URBAN OHAU - INDIRECT	UO	863			100%	these are equiv hectare		18,894	15,115	\$ 15,115.23	\$ 3,102.76	\$ 3,490.61
URBAN MANAKAU - INDIRECT	UM	653			100%	refer to sheet urban					\$ 2,347.75	\$ 2,641.21
URBAN WAIKAWA - INDIRECT	UW	2,701			100%	fo details					\$ 9,710.97	\$ 10,924.84
TOTALS			352,649				352,649	252,649	202,119	\$ 200,126		

Annex C. Ohau-Manakau Scheme - Changes To Rating Levels Arising From Flood Protection Upgrade Proposal and Revised Rating Classification

Rating Category		2008-09 Rates (Existing Rating System) (\$ per ha.) (GST incl)	Proposed Rates for 2009-10 (Updated Rating System) Assuming Option E = \$2.7 m Upgrade Proposal (\$ per ha.) (GST incl)	Proposed Rates for 2009-10 (Updated Rating System) Assuming 'modified' = \$700,000 Upgrade Proposal (\$ per ha.) (GST incl)	Comment
Ohau Lower Erosion	OL	105.89	30.53	30.53	
Ohau Middle Erosion	OM	112.06	91.97	91.97	
Ohau Middle Upper Erosion	OU	78.27	163.87	163.87	
Ohau Upper Erosion	OT	307.71	336.38	336.38	
Flood Control Maintenance	FL/FM	114.33			
		78.84			
Flood Control Maintenance Indirect	FI	-	51.25	51.25	Now only one rating category
Flood Control Capital	CO	-	3.84	3.84	New category
Flood Control Capital Indirect	CI	-	184.13	65.72	New category
Manakau Stream Lower	ML	24.41	13.81	4.93	New category
Manakau Stream Upper	MU	54.36	50.4	50.40	
Waikawa Stream Lower	WL	23.57	118.75	118.74	
Waikawa Stream Upper	WU	60.55	37.36	37.36	
Waiwiri Drain	WD	19.98	96.88	96.88	
Lake Waitaha Drain	LD	57.87	8.99	8.99	
Lake Waitaha Drain 2	L2	28.94	26.38	26.38	
Parkin West Burrell Drain	PD	29.48	13.19	13.19	
Kuku, Haynes Catley Drains	HD	16.82	13.48	13.48	
Kuku Tributary Drain	KD	35.21	7.47	7.47	
Takapu Manakau Drain	TD	44.73	15.79	15.79	
Adins Drain	AD	30.44	20.35	20.35	
Sweetman Drain	SD	10.21	14.05	14.05	
Campbell Drain	CD	19.12	4.56	4.56	
Takapu Manakau Adins Culvert	TC	-	9.27	9.27	
Indirect Benefit	IB	3.35	16.42	16.42	New category
Urban Ohau Indirect	UO	2,174	5.58	4.04	
Urban Manakau Indirect	UM	1,638	4,277	3,490.61	
Urban Waikawa Indirect	UW	8,966	3,237	2,641.21	
			13,389	10,924.84	

A Significant decision? If Yes	No
Do recommendations meet Significance Policy (contained within the LTCCP)	

Item No: 11
Date: 16/12/2008
Report No: 08-230
File No: PRD 5 36

LOWER WHANGANUI RIVER MANAGEMENT AND FLOOD PROTECTION SCHEME – CAPITAL WORKS STAGES TWO AND THREE

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this item is to seek Council's agreement to a delay in consultation in respect of Stages Two and Three of a proposed flood protection capital works programme for the Lower Whanganui River Management and Flood Protection Scheme.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

2. Adoption of the recommendations in this item would result in a deferral of substantial capital expenditure proposed for 2010-11 and 2011-12, and accordingly there would be favourable general and Scheme rate impacts in each of those years.

BACKGROUND

3. In adopting the 2008-09 Annual Plan on 25 June 2008, Council committed to:
 - The establishment of a new Lower Whanganui River Management and Flood Protection Scheme from 1 July 2008.
 - Execution of Stage One capital flood protection works at Balgownie during 2008-09 and 2009-10.
 - Ongoing edge vegetation management and channel maintenance.
 - Sufficient investigation and design work to facilitate further stakeholder consultation in relation to impacts and order of construction of proposed flood protection works at Putiki and Anzac Parade (Stage Two).
4. In adopting the 2008-09 Annual Plan, Council also undertook to further consult with the community in respect of the Putiki and Anzac Parade proposals. It was intended that the consultation commence in the last quarter of 2008, leading into the 2009-19 Long-term Council Community Plan (LTCCP). Had a decision been made to proceed with that Stage Two work, a Statement of Proposal, including appropriate funding provision, would need to have been included in the Draft LTCCP.
5. It was further agreed through adoption of the Annual Plan that consultation in respect of the Moutoa Frontage proposals (Stage Three) would take place three years later through the 2012-22 LTCCP process.
6. Work is progressing satisfactorily with the Stage One capital works programme. Submissions have closed in respect of an application for resource consents and a tentative hearing date has been set for 29-30 January 2009. Land owner discussions and detailed design work are well advanced and subject to the outcome of the consent application, physical works are scheduled to commence in March 2009.
7. A vegetation management programme has been finalised and works are progressing.
8. In preparation for the intended consultation programme for Stage Two works at Anzac Parade and Putiki, discussions have been held with Wanganui District Council officers, particularly with regard to the interrelationship of flood protection works and planned

development at Kowhai Park. In addition, visual presentation/display material has been prepared.

9. However, at the 14 October 2008 Strategy and Policy Committee meeting, Councillors discussed the possibility of delaying the consultation around Stages Two and Three, in recognition of the economic plight of some groups of ratepayers. Council discussed and recognised the need to balance affordability of the works for ratepayers against its flood management responsibilities.
10. The Committee recommended that Council should seek a formal position from Wanganui District Council (WDC), together with an indication from officers of the implications of a delay, before making a final decision on the matter.
11. On 21 October 2008, staff and Councillors attended a meeting of the WDC Finance and Infrastructure Committee to present an update on progress with the Stage One consent application and project works; to advise of the consideration being given to the delay of Stages Two and Three; and to seek advice of WDC's position in that regard.
12. That Committee's recommendation to the District Council was that Horizons Regional Council be requested to delay consultation for Stages Two and Three of the Lower Whanganui River Flood Protection Scheme. The District Council approved the recommendation at its meeting on 3 November 2008.
13. The likelihood of a delay was also discussed at a meeting of the Lower Whanganui River Scheme Working Party held on 14 November 2008. The Working Party generally supported a delay.

COMMENT

14. The advantages of delaying Stages Two and Three can be summarised as follows:
 - Confirmation of Stage One final costs and rating impacts. The community is likely to be more receptive to proceeding with Stage Two and to be more comfortable with overall project estimates, once the final costs and therefore the rating impacts of Stage One are known.
 - Increased acceptance of flood protection Scheme over time and especially once visual impacts of Stage One works are apparent.
 - Additional time to engage with community and to ensure compatibility of proposals with other recreational and amenity enhancement projects being considered by the District Council.
 - Affordability. Flood protection should not necessarily be regarded as a discretionary item. A significant risk has been identified and the most cost effective means of mitigating that risk have been identified. Delaying Stages Two and Three will not make the project more affordable, only a permanent 'delay' will achieve that objective. In fact, a delay in commencement will most likely result in increased overall project costs. The rating impact on the present generation can be reduced by varying the funding model, for example by extending the loan term, however that is a matter that can be addressed through consultation and does not require a delay of further stages of capital works.
15. The disadvantages of delaying Stages Two and Three are twofold:
 - Maintained elevated level of risk. The investigations undertaken in 2007 identified a relatively high risk of flooding in four separate compartments within the 'City' area. Flooding of houses and other buildings in Anzac Parade will commence in a one in 20-year flood. There is a 1% probability that houses will flood to depths of up to 1.5 m around Ikatara Road and to depths between 0.2 m and 0.7 m further upstream, in any one year. If physical works in that area were delayed until say

2012-13, then there is a 4% probability that houses will flood to those depths within that period of time. The estimated damage cost that would be incurred in that event is \$416.6 million in the Anzac Parade flooding compartment alone.

- Loss of project impetus. Since assuming responsibility in 2006 for flood risk management in Whanganui, and completing initial investigations that identified a significant risk, Council has assigned a high priority together with the necessary funding to progress the development of a Scheme and the construction of flood protection. There is a risk that staff and financial resources may be committed elsewhere and not readily available to re-establish the project following any lengthy delay.
16. It is considered on a purely objective basis that the disadvantages, that is the risks, outweigh the advantages of delaying the flood protection works. Nevertheless the strength of opposition to progressing with Stages Two and Three in the current economic conditions is such that Council may still wish to delay for at least a short period of time. The following modified project timeframe is advanced for Council's consideration:

Year	Activity
2008-09	Establish new Scheme, obtain consents for Stage One (Balgownie) works, commence flood protection works.
2009-10	Complete Stage One (Balgownie) works.
2010-11	Scheme maintenance activities only.
2011-12	Undertake consultation for Stage Two (Anzac Parade and Putiki) works and adopt proposal through 2012-13 LTCCP.
2012-13	Commence Stage Two works (subject to LTCCP adoption).
2013-14	Continue with Stage Two works.
2014-15	Complete Stage Two works. Undertake consultation for Stage Three (Moutoa Frontage) works and adopt proposal through 2015-16 LTCCP.
2015-16 (LTCCP)	Commence Stage Three works (subject to LTCCP adoption).
2016-17	Complete Stage Three works.

17. The effect of the above would be a two-year delay in the programme adopted through the 2008-09 Annual Plan process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

18. It is recommended that the Council:
- a. **receives and acknowledges** the information contained in this report;
 - b. **acknowledges** the risk involved in delaying consultation with respect to Stages Two and Three of proposed flood mitigation works in the Lower Whanganui Scheme;
 - c. **agrees** to delay consultation for Stage Two for two years, and to develop a statement of proposal for inclusion in the draft 2012-13 LTCCP; and
 - d. **requests** the Chief Executive to make an appropriate press release.

A Significant decision? If Yes	N
?Do recommendations meet Significance Policy and LGA requirements?	

Item No: 12
Date: 16/12/2008
Report No: 08-213
File No: RCR 5 01

2008 DON LINKLATER MEMORIAL BURSARY

PURPOSE

1. This report is to inform Members of the 2009 Linklater Memorial Bursary recipients as decided by the Linklater Memorial Bursary Selection Panel on Monday 17 November 2008.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

2. The Don Linklater Memorial Bursary is allocated at \$11,868 per financial year in the Annual Plan.

BACKGROUND

3. This is the eighth year that the Linklater Memorial Bursary has been offered. The Bursary is worth \$4,000 per year (for a maximum of three years undergraduate study) and was offered for the first time in 2002, in memory of the late Mr Don Linklater.
4. One of the most recent Bursary recipients, Kristina Mead, has been working part-time for the Consents Team.
5. The 2008 Bursary recipient, Lucy Forgie, is returning to Dunedin University for her final year of study, and Kristina Mead has completed her final year at Massey University.

2009 Bursary Allocation

6. Nominations for the eighth Linklater Memorial Bursary were sought from September to November 2008. Twenty two applications were received from around the region, the majority of a high standard.
7. As one recipient from last year, Lucy Forgie, remains eligible for the bursary, two new bursaries were being awarded.
8. The Selection Panel consisting of Councillors Chettleburgh, Meads and White, and Lee Cowan, Communications Team Leader, considered the applications using the following criteria:
 - Course relevance to the work of Horizons Regional Council
 - Academic achievement
 - Community contribution
 - General quality (including content and ideas)

COMMENT

9. Two bursaries have been awarded by the Selection Panel. It will mean three payments of \$4000 being made in 2009 as budgeted.

10. There will be a full review of the Linklater Bursary process carried out by the Communications Team. The review will include reassessing the primary purpose, criteria for selection, and the interview questions. This will be brought to Council in mid-2009.

11. The successful recipients are:

Alana Standish – Alana will be in her second year at Massey University studying a Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning with a special interest in Maori and the environment. Alana returned to the Manawatu to raise her young daughter here.

Phillip Goulter – Phillip will be in his final year at Victoria University studying a Bachelor of Science, Majoring in Geography. Phillip has been working as a student hydrologist in Horizons' Hydrology Team between university semesters since February 2007.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12. It is recommended that Council:

- a. **confirms** that providing her academic results for 2008 are satisfactory, Lucy Forgie will continue to receive support in 2009;
- b. **confirms** that Alana Standish is the successful recipient of a Linklater Memorial Bursary for 2009; and
- c. **confirms** that Phillip Goulter is the successful recipient of a Linklater Memorial Bursary for 2009.

A J Harper
COMMUNICATIONS SPECIAL PROJECT ADVISOR

A Significant decision? If Yes	No
Do recommendations meet Significance Policy and LGA requirements?	

Item No: 13
Date: 16/12/2008
Report No: 08-232
File No: OMS 5 00

AFFIXING OF THE COMMON SEAL

PURPOSE

1. This paper reports on documents to which Horizons Regional Council's Common Seal has been affixed.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

2. There is no additional financial impact.

COMMENT

3. The Common Seal has been affixed to the following documents:
 - a. **Under Chief Executive's Delegated Authority:**
 - Warrant Honorary Enforcement Officer:
Ben Tacon, Allan Wakeling, Bruce Culley, Keith Eveleigh, Ian Taylor, Roger O'Sullivan, Mike King, Maurice Reid.
 - Forestry Rights Registration:
Richard Steele and R Steele and Jeremy Stubbs Trustees Limited and Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council.
 - Term Loan Agreement between:
Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council and Richard Steele, Rachel Steele and Jeremy Stubbs Trustees Limited.
 - Warrant Card - Pita Kinaston
 - Warrant Card - Carol Nicholson
 - b. **Under Urgency:**
Nil
 - c. **To be Approved:**
Nil

RECOMMENDATION

4. It is recommended that the Council:
 - a. **acknowledges** the affixing of the Common Seal to the abovementioned documents.



11-15 Victoria Avenue
Private Bag 11 025
Manawatu Mail Centre
Palmerston North 4442

T 0508 800 800
F 06 952 2929
help@horizons.govt.nz
www.horizons.govt.nz