Questions

1. P 5 of report/p 40 of agenda: Top paragraph on Rate: Middle sentence is incomplete. Response:

The two sentences ought to have been combined, this will be corrected in the updated version of the document.

2. P 10/p 45 of agenda: Community Grants

Pirongia Ratepayers Association should be Pirongia Community Association Response:

The wording will be updated for the next version of the document.

3. P 14/ p 49: Community Facilities and Services

Key Projects

No mention of the Pirongia Skate Park Project. What is happening there in the coming year?

Response:

The project team has only just identified a viable site for the skate park. Engagement with the community, stakeholders and the design phase need to kick off. The stakeholder group needs to raise approximately \$500k for construction. The design, concepting, Geotech, survey, etc costs will be carried forward to the 2023/24 financial year.

- 4. P 16/ p 51 Capital Expenditure
 - a. Corrections needed for Lake Te Koo Utu and Te Awamutu War Memorial Park titles

Response:

The wording will be updated for the next version of the document.

- 5. P 26/p 61 Waste Water Revenue
 - a. With the growth in our district it seems counterintuitive that our Trade Waste revenue should be reducing. Is this correct?

Response:

Trade waste revenue is generated through commercial growth. Growth is anticipated to slow down and therefore our revenue projections have taken this into account.

- 6. P 117 Libraries no longer charging fines for overdue books
 - a. What is the offsetting mechanism referred to so that there isn't a budgetary impact?

Response:

Libraries found operating savings to cover the decrease in revenue, hence no budget impact. These are a series of small savings across library budgets such as not mailing out notices, re-use of purchases, reduced processing of collections.

- 7. P 3 of report/ P 29 of agenda
 - a. Cash surplus what activities or sources have contributed to the cash surplus? Response:

The cash surplus is generated through all activities within Council, with the exception of grants, roading, water, wastewater and stormwater.

8. P 4/ p30 Funding Request: Cambridge Town Hall

a. Please could we be provided with the full funding being provided to the Cambridge Town Hall in addition to this funding request? Is there already funding for staffing operations? How does this compare to the budget before the Trust was set up? How can we have assurance that our community is receiving good value from this funding?

Response:

The base funding originally included in the Draft Annual Plan for the operational funding for the Cambridge Town Hall Community Trust to run the Town Hall was around \$290,000. This level of funding was determined in the current 2021-31 LTP which was devised prior to the Trust's establishment. The Trust has now developed up a draft budget seeking around \$500,000 of net operational funding after revenue from other sources. The Trust anticipates having approximately \$100,000 of unspent carry-over funding from the current year, hence the request for a further \$110,000 to be added into the Annual Plan. The budget provides for 3 staff from the start of the 2023/24 year – a GM (recently appointed), a Venue Manager and an Event Co-ordinator. These positions are seen as integral to the Trust meeting the demand of Council for it to 'activate' the Town Hall. A programme of events is provided for in the budget, again with focus on 'activation' with these events intended to be self-funding. The 2023/24 year will provide good indication of what value is being received from the Trust prior to the adoption of any future funding in the new LTP.

b. Separate to the Annual Plan Report, I would like to suggest that in our Financial Reporting, the Cambridge Town Hall should be a separate line item. This is because of the offsetting effect of the large transactions to the Trust which prevent us getting a clear picture of the wider activity under which the Cambridge Town Hall is reported on.

Response:

Council reporting is done at Significant Activity level, in line with our Long term plan. The reporting framework is set by legislation and the Cambridge Town Hall is reported under Communities and Facilities in line with this framework.

9. P 5/ p 31 Impact Hub

a. We were going to be provided with further information on the funding sources of the Youth Incubator. Has that been received yet?

Response:

The further information has not yet been provided to Elected Members. Staff's understanding is that the Te Awamutu Chamber of Commerce will be arranging to meet with and share this information with the Deputy Mayor in the coming weeks.

10. P. 45 Community Grants

a. Last on list is Waikato Screen showing only 1 year of funding. We talked about 3 years of funding so I understood we had already committed to another \$12,173 being allocated this year.

Response:

The submission from Waikato Screen requested funding for three years however the resolution only provided funding for the 2022/23 year.

11. P. 64 All 3 Waters Activities have reduced overheads and it sounded like the reallocation was internal between them. Yet none of them show an increase in overheads. Why is that?

Response:

This relates to salary costs which are now being directly charged into projects. In the past these costs had been charged against the activity and then adjusted through the internal charges adjustments.

12. P. 68 Support services

Could the individual amounts be split out so we can see how the components of electricity and vehicles have increased?

Response:

Similar to our previous comment, Council reporting is done at Significant Activity level, in line with our Long term plan. The reporting framework is set by legislation and these costs are reported under Business Support in line with this framework.

Annual Plan - Other Questions

13. P 43/p78 of agenda

a. Council Reserve Funds Movements and Balances
First figure column is labelled Forecast but it appears to be closing balance. Could
it be renamed to that?

Response:

The first column relates to the forecasted closing balance for the 2022/23 Financial year. It can only be labelled "forecast" as we have not yet reached the end of the 2022/23 financial year.

14. P 56/91 Depreciation and useful lives

Road pavement surfaces

a. Is this being reviewed in light of wet weather impacts on potholes etc? 6 - 65 years currently

Response:

The condition of our roads will be considered as part of the revaluation of our roading assets currently underway.

15. P 67/p 102 Districtwide funding of rates

- a. 3 waters services are funded via districtwide funding and there is a call through the 3 waters reform to
 - i. 1. Be transparent as to how 3 waters is funded eg what portion via rates and what portion via user charges.
 - ii. 2. Move to funding all waters services via user charges.
 - iii. 3. Demonstrate 'ring fencing' of water services revenue so it can be shown it is only spent on water.

Response:

Under the 3waters there is a portion funded through District Wide rates, this is the policy and monitoring aspects of the 3 waters.

The portions funded via user charges can be found in our Funding Impact statements for each of the Significant Activities. Other than the policy, monitoring and enforcement

aspect the remainder of wastewater and water are charged via user charges (either pan tax or metered water). Stormwater has its own rate.

The water services revenue is ring fenced through the use of separate balances in reserves.

b. I would like to know what the \$ amount funded via rates for the 3 waters services is, and start reporting that to our community, so possibly including it in this Annual Plan

Response:

This can be further considered in the development of this Annual Plan which will not be adopted until the end of June.

- 16. Not covered in the current draft of the Annual Plan
 - a. With Climate Change impacts, we can expect more very hot days during the summer months, acknowledging that this summer has not delivered that! Please could we introduce a section of reporting on Climate Adaptation Measures and formulate a policy for very hot days that will help our vulnerable community members. Overseas this has taken the form of opening for free admission those council owned or run facilities that have climate control, so provide a cool place for people to come to get out of the heat. These can be libraries, museums and swimming pools. We obviously have a 3 party managing our pools so an early conversation should be kicked off with them. Staff can give guidance on how libraries and other facilities could be managed under hot days.

Response:

This query can be further explored and considered as part of the Environment Strategy, Climate Change Policy, and Financial Strategy and Policies that are reviewed as part of the Long Term Plan.

17. To better understand the information on rates valuations and the indicator properties, can you provide the number of rateable properties in each of the ratepayer groups, e.g. Cambridge ward, rural residential Cambridge etc

Response:

It's important to note that the descriptors for the indicator properties are simply that. Basic descriptors of key categories of property. They do not necessarily account for all the properties in the district, in fact in the table we have compiled below, mainly from QV valuation information, we account for only 16,052 properties, while we have 24,254 rateable properties in the district.

| Area | Number of rateable units | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Cambridge Ward (Residential) | 4,940 | | |
| Rural Residential Cambridge | 2,185 | | |
| Commercial/Industrial Cambridge | 561 | | |
| Te Awamutu Ward (Residential) | 5,091 | | |
| Rural Residential Te Awamutu | 748 | | |

| Commercial/Industrial Te Awamutu | 446 |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Pirongia Ward – Rural | 511 |
| Pirongia Village | 402 |
| Ohaupo Village | 222 |
| Ngahinapouri Village | Very small number, and not shown on QV report |
| Kakepuku Ward (Rural) | 486 |
| Maungatautari Ward | 460 |

18. The are a number of funding requests we are considering for the annual of Ward targeted rates and \$ breakdown per recipient plan. A couple of them are suggested to be made from Targeted rates. Although the \$\$ amount is mentioned in the AP and the areas in which they are allocated, it doesn't give a breakdown. Can I request a current breakdown

Response:

Here is the breakdown of the Area Targeted rates – not broken down per property but total value of rates required for that activity in that Area.

| | CB Ward | Kak Ward | Maun Ward | Pir Ward | TAW Ward |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Damaaraay | | | | | |
| Democracy | 242.750.44 | - | 25 255 00 | - | - |
| Cambridge Community Board | 213,750.11 | 25 052 02 | 35,255.89 | | 400 070 77 |
| Te Awamutu Community Board | 00 000 00 | 35,253.23 | 44.000.00 | 20.004.40 | 189,273.77 |
| Grants - District | 86,233.82 | 12,108.11 | 14,223.38 | 30,261.16 | 65,008.16 |
| Grants - Cambridge / Maun | 96,057.33 | | 15,843.67 | | |
| Grants - Cambridge | 186,217.00 | | | | |
| Grants - Pirongia | | | | 44,042.00 | |
| Grants - Te Awamutu | | 12,972.26 | | | 69,647.74 |
| Grants - Pir / TAW/ Kak | | 4,833.44 | | 12,079.95 | 25,950.61 |
| Animal Control | - | - | - | - | |
| Building | - | - | - | - | - |
| Environmental Health | - | - | - | - | |
| Resource Management | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Engineering | - | - | - | - | • |
| Parks & Reserves | - | - | - | - | |
| Mighty River Domain / Gecks | | - | - | - | - |
| District Libraries (District Wide) | | | | - | |
| District Libraries (DW on TWR) | - | - | _ | - | |
| District Libraries (TAW) | | 30,262.21 | | 75,632.73 | 162,477.06 |
| District Libraries (CB) | 248,547.62 | 30,202.21 | 40,995.38 | 73,032.73 | 102,477.00 |
| District Pool Cambridge (District Wide) | 240,347.02 | | 40,333.30 | - | |
| District Pool Cambridge (CB) | 1,761,526.12 | - | 290,545.65 | - | - |
| Events Centre Te Awamutu (District Wide) | 1,701,320.12 | | 230,545.05 | | |
| Events Centre Te Awamutu (District Wide) | - | 136.815.69 | - | 341,936.19 | 734,560.12 |
| District Museums | | 130,013.03 | - | 341,330.13 | 734,560.12 |
| Museums (TAW) | - | - | - | - | 409,814.00 |
| Museums (CB) | - | | | | 409,014.00 |
| | - | | | | |
| Heritage | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cemeteries | - | - | - | - | |
| Public Toilets | - | - | - | - | - |
| Properties | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community Properties (Community) | 103,063.01 | | | • | 77,694.99 |
| Pensioner Housing & Own Your Own Housing | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rural Halls | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Town Halls (CB Town Hall) | 353,849.15 | | | | |
| Town Halls | - | - | - | - | - |
| Forestry | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rural Fire (DWF) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Civil Defence | - | - | - | - | |
| Litter Bins & Recycling | - | - | - | - | |
| Recycling - Waste Mngt | 22,619.20 | | 3,730.80 | | |
| Cambridge Gym | - | | - | | |
| Cambridge Gym (DWF) | - | - | - | - 1 | - |
| Cycling Centre of Excellence | 29,554.17 | 4,149.71 | 4,874.66 | 10,371.14 | 22,279.68 |
| Cycling Centre of Excellence (DWF) | - | | - | - | - |
| | | | | | |
| Roading & Carparks (DW) | 407.004.00 | - | 47.000.04 | - | |
| Passenger Transport CB | 107,301.69 | | 17,698.31 | | |
| Passenger Transport KK | | 19,733.38 | | 49,318.59 | 105,948.03 |

19. Can you clarify that the current District Museum target in all wards goes towards the TEA Museum and Te Arawak/ And that the Cambridge Museum is paid by a grant but doesn't come from the District Museum targeted rate.

Response:

For the 2023/24 Annual Plan there is no District Museum levy in the area targeted rates. You will notice the cost of the Te Awamutu Museum is picked up in the Te Awamutu Area rate, as the cost of the grant for the Cambridge Museum is picked up in the Cambridge Area rate. There are no Te Ara Wai costs in this Annual Plan as it is not yet built.

The Sports Hall of Fame – if any grant was to be made to this external entity it would be classed as a grant, just like the Cambridge Museum grant is.

20. Query on page7 bullet point 4.

Does this mean that the grant for the new Cambridge Museum has now been totally removed from the LTP and that any future initiative would need to start from scratch. So even including any concept with library/Milisich Place, the museum funding would require a new funding request.

Response:

Due to indication late last year that the Cambridge Museum development was no longer going ahead, and with the disbanding of the fundraising group, the grant provided in the LTP for the Museum was not included in the 2023/24 Draft Annual Plan. The 2024/25 year will be the first year of a new LTP. Effectively this means that this matter will need to be reconsidered for inclusion in the new LTP via business case whether new or refreshed.

- 21. A further question I had a look at the operating expenditure across the departments. Can you point me to:
 - a. The budgeted expense for the cyclone cleanup Response:

The cost of the Cyclone clean-up will be a 2022/23 (current year) expense, it will therefore be included in the February forecast (currently underway), not the 2023/24 Annual Plan.

b. The budgeted earthquake strengthening works on the closed property across the road.

Response:

The budgeted earthquake strengthening for Roche Street is included in Support Services as Capital expenditure. As noted in the document, the budget figure will be critically reviewed in time for the adoption of the annual plan document as any significant spend on 135 Roche St would likely be deferred to the 2024-34 Long Term Plan in order for any options to be properly considered in light of information to be obtained from the Accommodation Strategy which is currently being developed. Current values included in the capital expenditure budget are \$902k for the Annex & \$439k for the TAW Museum, these will be insufficient anyway in light of recently obtained estimates.

22. I see in the report that the build cost for Te Ara Wai has been down streamed to year 4 of the current LTP but the design component is still there. I raised my concern about the total project cost of \$27 million quoted in the paper. We were advised that the Te ARawai Governance Committee is the appropriate place to look at that. Accepted. But with the perceived huge increase in project costs is it appropriate to continue with expenditure of this project until full and clear total expenditure on this project has been made transparent and further approved by council?
Response:

All construction costs of Te Ara Wai have been deferred, a full project cost update will be provided in line with the agreement reached at the last SP&P meeting on this matter.