

Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Committee

Open Agenda

Notice is hereby given that an ordinary meeting of Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Committee will be held on:

Date: Thursday 19 July 2018
Time: 10.00am
Venue: Matamata-Piako Civic Centre
Matamata

Membership

Mayor

Jan Barnes, JP

Cr James Thomas, JP

Cr Kevin Tappin

Mr Mokoro Gillett

Mrs Rangī Kaukau

Mr Mike Diamond

Phone: 07-884-0060
Address: PO Box 266, Te Aroha 3342
Email: corp.legal@mpdc.govt.nz
Website: www.mpdc.govt.nz



ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
------	-------------------	------

Procedural

1	Meeting Opening	5
2	Karakia	5
3	Present	5
4	Apologies	5
5	Notification of Urgent Business	5
6	Confirmation of minutes	5
7	Urgent Additional Business	

Officer Reports

8	Executive	
7.1	November 2018 Meeting	7
7.2	Long Term Plan 2018-28 Update	9
7.3	Representation Review	15
7.4	Marae Underpass Update	23
7.5	Marae Entrance, Parking Arrangements	29
7.6	Aerodrome Fees and Charges	41
7.7	Waharoa Aerodrome Budget 2018/19	45
7.8	Health and Safety Report	47
7.9	Vists to Whitianga Aerodrome and Tauranga Airport	49
7.10	Reserve Management Plan Update	51

1 Meeting Opening

2 Karakia

3 Present

4 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

5 Notification of Urgent Business

Pursuant to clause 3.7.5 and 3.7.6 of the Standing Orders NZS 9202:2003 and Section 6A (7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the Chairman to enquire from members whether there are any additional items for consideration which qualify as extraordinary or urgent additional business.

6 Confirmation of minutes

Minutes, as circulated, of the Ordinary Meeting of Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Committee, held on 22 March 2018

November 2018 Meeting

Trim No.: 2029815

Item 7.1

Executive Summary

The next meeting date and venue of the Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Committee (the Committee) to be confirmed.

It is proposed the November meeting date be changed from Thursday 22nd to Tuesday 20th November 2018. The proposed venue for the 20th November meeting is the Rangauiti Marae, with Rangi Kaukau to confirm availability.

Recommendation

That:

- 1) The information be received.
- 2) The Committee confirm the next meeting;
 - a. date as Tuesday 20th November 2018.
 - b. venue as Rangauiti Marae.
 - c. meeting start at 10.00am.

Legal and statutory requirements

Standing Orders 2.15

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

Advertising deadline of 15 October 2018.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Vicky Oosthoek Committee Secretary	
Approved by	Sandra Harris Acting Strategic Policy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Long Term Plan 2018-28 Update

Trim No.: 2027345

Executive Summary

At its meeting on 27 June 2018 Council adopted the final Long Term Plan 2018-28 (LTP) and other associated documents:

- Development Contributions Policy 2018-28
- Revenue and Financing Policy 2018-28
- Fees and Charges 2018/19
- Policies on Remissions and Postponement of Rates
- Financial Strategy
- Infrastructure Strategy

Council also received the Audit NZ Opinion and Letter of Representation for Audit NZ at this meeting.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.

Content

Background

Long Term Plans

Under the Local Government Act 2002, Council has to set out its long term plans for the community. The LTP:

- identifies the key projects to take place over the next 10 years
- provides an overview of each activity Council will carry out and the services Council will provide for the next 10 years
- determines how much this will cost and how Council will fund it.

The LTP must be adopted by 30 June 2018. The project timeline for a Long Term Plan is typically 14-18 months and involves staff across the whole organisation, Councillors and the community.

Council adopted its Consultation Document for the 2018-28 LTP at its meeting of 7 March 2018. The Consultation Document and supporting information provided the basis of the consultation undertaken with the community from 28 March to 29 April 2018.

Council also consulted the community on the following:

- Development Contributions Policy
- Revenue and Financing Policy
- Fees and Charges 2018-19
- Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies:
 - Policy on the remission of rates on land protected for conservation purposes
 - Policy on the remission of penalties on unpaid rates
 - Policy on the remission of rates: other categories
 - Policy on the remission of small rates balances
 - Policy on the remission of rates on Maori freehold land

- Policy on the postponement of rates on Maori freehold land
- Policy on remissions for metered water leaks
- Policy on remissions of pan charge targeted rates based on water use
- Policy on remissions of pan charge targeted rates for Educational Establishments
- Draft Policy on the remission of rates on abandoned land (*new policy*)
- Draft Policy on the remission and postponement of rates for natural disasters and emergencies (*new policy*)

The final LTP was submitted to Audit NZ for its review on 28 May 2018. Council received an unmodified audit opinion from Audit NZ.

How the LTP has been presented

The LTP consists of information:

- about Council, its structure
- its financial strategy
- its infrastructure strategy
- information about the district, population growth and its economy
- community outcomes
- the activity plans and activity group funding impact statements
- significant assumptions that have been made in preparing the plan
- forecast financial statements
- mandatory policies.

Issues

Submissions received

Council received 198 submissions, with 221 submitters. 37 people/organisations presented their submissions at the hearing. The submissions covered a range of Council activities and themes. Council's heard from submitters who wished to present their submission in person on Wednesday 16 May and deliberated on all submissions on Thursday 17 May 2018.

Council decisions

Council considered all feedback given by the community and have made the following key decisions:

Our Finances - Following feedback (54% in support, 33% not in support and 13% 'other') we have decided to stick with our plan to; maintain or improve the services we currently provide, limit rate increases to 4% and actively seek to live within this limit, and limit debt to 150% of our annual revenue.

Economic Opportunities – The majority of feedback (70%) indicated support for increasing economic development in our community so Council has decided to proceed with our proposals to employ an economic development resource using existing budgets and invest in regional economic development. Other economic development proposals include increasing funding to Morrinsville Chamber of Commerce and Matamata Public Relations Association, marketing and promotion for the Hauraki Rail Trail, funding the planning of revitalising our town centres and encouraging events in our community by providing funding to support them.

Vibrant Cultural Values – The majority of feedback (67%) backed our proposal to do more to support our vibrant cultural values. So Council has decided to proceed with providing funding for the Matamata-Piako Volunteer Youth Ambassadors, increasing grants to a range of community groups and working closer with Iwi.

Connected Infrastructure – Following feedback (52% in support, 27% not in support and 21% ‘other’) Council have decided to progress the Matamata bypass by budgeting for feasibility studies, design work (depending on the outcome of the feasibility studies) and the net purchase of land. This still gives Council the opportunity to review the need if the Waikato Expressway alleviates pressure on Matamata’s roads. We have decided to remove the designation for the Morrinsville bypass.

Environmental Sustainability – The majority of submitters (60%) agreed with our decision to up our game in waste minimisation, which includes changes to how we fund rubbish and recycling to a more ‘user pays’ system. This includes users purchasing official rubbish bags for \$2 from retailers or Council offices rather than paying for the bags through their rates. Targeted rates will go down (from \$153 to around \$30). This also includes increasing the transfer station fees to help cover more of the costs of the facilities. There was a common concern through the submissions that this change to a more ‘user pays’ system may increase illegal dumping within the district. Council will develop strategies to reduce this risk. Council will also develop a business case for a joint waste minimisation position within the Eastern Waikato, improve the recycling facilities at our three transfer stations, look at the viability of a resource recovery facility, and extend the EnviroSchools programme in the district.

Healthy Communities – Following feedback, (49% in support, 32% not in support and 19% ‘other’) we have decided to proceed with ‘focusing on the little things’ (such as rubbish bins, toilets, and gardens) that make our district an attractive place. Council decided to go ahead with extending the cycleway to points of interest, then from Matamata to Piarere. Council also decided to complete major renewals to Headon Stadium as planned and allocate a further \$2 million for an indoor stadium for Matamata; this will depend on the results of the feasibility study.

Council made decisions on all submissions, these decisions have been communicated back to the relevant submitters and where required have been incorporated within the LTP.

Some of these noteworthy decisions include;

- The inclusion of funding for a playground in Waharoa, \$75,000 in 2018/19.
- The living wage will be adopted for Council staff as the minimum median (100%) rate for all roles effective from 1 July 2018.
- Inclusion of funding for equipment for Event/Civic Centres, up to \$50,000 in 2018/19.
- A grant of \$4,000 per year to Creative Waikato who provide support, build capability and advocate in respect of arts for our community.
- A grant of \$1,000 per year to the Friends of Local Community Rapurapu Reserve Committee to maintain the Rapurapu reserve.

The total rates increase for 2018/19 is 3.07% and an average rates increase over the 10 year period (2018-28) of 3.30%. This is in line with the proposals in the CD.

Analysis

Legal and statutory requirements

The development of the LTP is to meet Council’s responsibilities under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002).

There are an array of legislative requirements for the LTP set out in the LGA 2002, the Local Government (Financial Reporting and Prudence) Regulations 2014 and Local Government Rating Act 2002.

Impact on policy and bylaws

This process will set new policies for Council.

The LTP is the 'cornerstone' of the LGA 2002 planning process. Once adopted, the LTP will set the direction for Annual Plans and Annual Reports over the next three year cycle. For that time, it becomes Council's primary strategic planning reference point.

Section 96 of the LGA 2002 states that when a Council adopts a LTP it is providing a formal and public statement of the Council's intentions; but a resolution to adopt a LTP does not constitute a decision to act on any specific matter included within the plan. There are statutory restrictions if Council wants to deviate from the direction established in the adopted LTP.

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

The LTP is a significant issue in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, as they relate to issues around affordability, levels of service, community wellbeing, rating, and debt levels. Once the LTP is adopted Council may be restricted in its ability to change its direction at a later date.

For this reason the LTP was subject to public consultation in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure (Section 83) of the LGA giving effect to the principles of consultation in section 82. Other documents such as the Development Contributions Policy, Fees and Charges, Rates Remissions and Postponement Policies and Revenue and Financing Policy were consulted on separately but alongside the LTP.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

The community consultation process has been completed. Council informed key stakeholders and interest groups of the Consultation Document (CD) and other proposals.

The CD and supporting information was made available at all Council offices and libraries and could be viewed on the Council website and submissions could be made on-line through the website.

Council used several communication tools to encourage the community to take part in the consultative process including:

- Circulation of the CD through the Piako Post/Chronicle newspapers – approximately 16,000 properties.
- Advertisements in Council in Focus – our fortnightly newspaper page.
- Council Office and library displays/posters.
- Use of Facebook.
- Local press coverage.
- Promotion on the Council website.
- Attending Market/Open Days where people could come and ask questions of staff and Councillors about the plan and find out about the proposals.
- Meetings with town business associations, community groups such as Greypower associations.
- Consultation with the Te Manawhenua Forum
- Updates to the Aerodrome Committee meetings
- The CD was mailed to out of district ratepayers.

Subsequent actions

As required by section 93(10) of the LGA, once the Plan is adopted the Council has one month to:

- Make the LTP publicly available (including advertising its availability) – via the Council website, with copies also available in offices and libraries for reference via the electronic kiosks and computers.
- Send copies of the Plan to those who are required to have a copy (as outlined in the LGA).

All submitters have been notified of the outcome of their submission and Council staff have been notified of any follow up actions required as a result of the submissions and Council's deliberations on these.

Consent issues

There are no consent issues.

Timeframes

A summary of the process is outlined below:

Process	Start	Finish
LTP Consultation Document approved for consultation (and supporting information)	7 March 2018	7 March 2018
Submissions open	28 March 2018	29 April 2018
LTP hearing	16 May 2018	16 May 2018
Audit and Risk Committee review	26 June 2018	26 June 2018
Council adopt final LTP and other documents	27 June 2018	27 June 2018
Rates struck for 2018/19		
LTP and other documents in force	1 July 2018	30 June 2021 (Long-Term Plan) Fees and Charges apply for 2018/19

The other consultation documents were adopted for consultation separately in 2017 and early 2018.

Contribution to Community Outcomes

The LTP incorporates community outcomes with Levels of Service being linked to one or more of the community outcomes. There were no specific impacts on the community outcomes as a result of the decisions made following the LTP consultation process.

Financial Impact

i. Cost

The total budget for the development of the LTP 2018-28 is \$135,000 (funded \$45,000 per year) and \$90,000 for external audit fees (funded \$30,000 per year). The total budget covers specific tasks undertaken externally such as population projections, legal advice/peer review, printing and distribution of the consultation document, newspaper advertisements and Audit NZ fees.

ii. Funding Source

The LTP is a General Rate funded project.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Acting Senior Policy Planner	
Approved by	Sandra Harris Acting Strategic Policy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Representation Review

Trim No.: 2027680

Executive Summary

This report provides an update on the representation review process to the Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Committee (Committee) and invites submissions on Council's initial proposal.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.
2. Members consider making a submission on Council's proposal.

Content

Background

The Local Electoral Act 2001 ("Act") requires Council to review its representation arrangements every six years. Council conducted its last review in 2012; therefore a review must be undertaken in 2018.

Issues

The representation review looks at the makeup of our Council - for example how should people be represented in their community, how many Councillors should there be, and what are the major communities of interest.

Through this process Council reviews:

- the basis of election by wards
- the structure and boundaries of wards
- the number of elected members (including the number of elected members per ward)
- the establishment of Community Boards and
- the establishment of any Maori ward.

Maori Wards

The Local Electoral Act 2001 (Act) provides an opportunity for Councils to establish Maaori wards. The issue of Maori Wards has been previously discussed by Te Manawhenua Forum and Council has made a decision not to establish a Maori Ward in the Matamata-Piako District for the 2019 triennial general election.

If 5% or more of electors in the district (approximately 1,100 people of approx. 22,000 electors) sign a valid poll demand, a poll must be held on the Maori Ward issue. No poll demand has been received.

Pre-consultation

Council undertook preliminary consultation to understand the communities of interest that exist within the district and whether these have changed over time. The results of this consultation are available on the Council website.

Legislative Requirements

The Act sets out the requirements for representation reviews. Councils are required to determine by resolution:

- whether members (other than the Mayor) are to be elected by electors of the district as a whole (At Large) or by electors of 2 or more wards, or in some cases by a combination of the electors of the district as a whole (At Large) and by electors of wards
- the proposed number of members to be elected At Large/Ward/a combination
- the proposed name and boundaries for each ward.

Key Principles

In reviewing representation arrangements, local authorities are required to provide for effective representation of communities of interest and fair representation of electors. There are three key factors to consider:

- communities of interest (places people associate with)
- effective representation of communities of interest
- fair representation of electors (each Councillor must represent a similar number of people).

Process

In summary, the process to be followed when reviewing representation arrangements is:

1. Identify the communities of interest of the district.
3. Consider whether effective representation for the identified communities of interest is best achieved by electing members At Large or by Wards or a combination of the two.
4. Consider the fairness of representation by making sure each Councillor must represent a similar number of people.
5. Determine whether community boards are to be established.

Communities of interest in Matamata-Piako

Geographically, Matamata-Piako is relatively compact comprising an approximate total land area of 1,755 sq kilometres.

Within Matamata-Piako, geographically defined communities of interest can be identified by reference to the main towns of Morrinsville, Matamata and Te Aroha. The main towns provide services and facilities such as schools, libraries, retail shopping, sporting facilities and clubs.

There is also a large rural component to the district, and scattered rural settlements/ villages throughout. Many rural residents use of one the main towns as a service centre.

The current three wards are considered to reflect the district's communities of interest.

Effective Representation

The current total membership of Council is 11 Councillors plus the Mayor. Effective representation will provide reasonable access between residents/communities and Elected Members. The ward structure ensures that there is a fair geographical coverage of Elected Members from across the district.

Fair Representation

The requirement is that the ratio of population per Councillor for each ward is within +/-10% of the total population divided by total number of Councillors (called the +/- 10% rule).

The latest population estimates (as at 30 June 2017) obtained from the Statistics NZ result in the following:

Status quo – current representation

Ward	Population	Councillors	Average People Per Councillor	Difference from Average People Per Councillor	% Difference from Average People Per Councillor
Matamata	13800	4	3450	293	9.27%
Morrinsville	12700	4	3175	18	0.56%
Te Aroha	8230	3	2743	-414	-13.11%
Totals	34730	11	3157		

The above table shows that the Te Aroha Ward does not currently comply with the +/-10% rule as each Councillor is representing only 2,743 people whereas in the Matamata Ward each Councillor is representing over 3,400 people. The Matamata Ward is close to non-compliance but currently complies with the +/-10% rule.

Community Boards

Council have indicated that elected members engage with residents/communities effectively at present and thus consider it is not necessary to establish community boards for the 2019 local election.

Initial proposal

Council's initial proposal is to retain the status quo arrangements. The current arrangements and the reasons for maintaining the status quo is outlined in the attached public notice.

Alternative Options:

Council has been considering the best way forward through a number of workshops. It has considered a number of options including creating a rural ward/s, shifting ward boundaries, combining wards, increasing or decreasing the number of Councillors, or electing some Councillors at large. Some of the alternative options considered were:

- Option 1: Decreasing to 8 Ward Councillors (no change in ward boundaries)
- Option 2: Increasing to 13 Ward Councillors (no change in ward boundaries) with Morrinsville and Matamata Wards increasing by one Councillor each
- Option 3: 8 Ward Councillors + some Councillors elected at large (no changes in ward boundaries)

These options would comply with the +/- 10% rule.

TimeframesNext steps - timeframes

The proposed timeframe for the process is as follows:

- Council determined its initial proposal – 13 June Council meeting
- Public notice of initial proposal – 20 June
- Submission period - 20 June – 20 July
- Hearing/deliberations - 15 August
- Council to determine its final proposal – 15 August (or 22 August)
- Public notice of final proposal – 29 August
- Appeal/objection period – 29 August – 30 September
- If no appeals or objections are received and the arrangements comply with the +/- 10% rule, then Council's proposal becomes final - October
- If appeals or objections are received and/or Councils proposal does not comply with the +/- 10% rule' the LGC makes a determination - by 10 April 2019

Once Council has received and considered any submissions received on its initial proposal, it is able to make amendments prior to adopting its 'final' proposal. This will then be subject to any appeals and objections to the Local Government Commission. The final representation structure will apply for the 2019 and 2022 elections.

If the status quo becomes Council's final proposal (following the submissions and hearing) the issue must be referred to the Local Government Commission, irrespective of any other appeals or objections. This is because the current representation arrangements do not comply with the +/- 10% rule.

Consultation

The Committee or individual members may wish to make a submission on the representation review proposal. Submissions forms will be circulated separately.

The proposal was advertised in the Piako Post and Matamata Chronicle on 20 June 2018 and a range of consultation activities have taken place. Submissions close, 5pm, 20 July 2018.

Attachments

- A. Current Ward Map
- B. Representation Review Advert

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Acting Senior Policy Planner	
Approved by	Sandra Harris Acting Strategic Policy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	



WHO REPRESENTS YOU?



We are required by law to review our 'representation arrangements' at least every six years to ensure our community is fairly and effectively represented. This includes reviewing things like the number of Councillors and wards we have, whether each Councillor represents roughly the same number of people in the district, and whether we should have community boards.

What do we currently have?

We currently have one Mayor (who is elected by the whole district) and 11 Councillors - our representing the Matamata Ward, four representing the Morrinsville Ward and three representing the Te Aroha Ward. We do not have any community boards.



What are we proposing?

We're proposing to stick with the same ward boundaries, number of Councillors, and to continue with no community boards for the next two Council elections. One of the legal requirements is ensuring each Councillor represents roughly the same number of people in the district (known as the +/- 10% rule). If we stick with the same number of Councillors, that means each Councillor should represent between 2,842 - 3,493 people in our district. Matamata and Morrinsville Wards are within this range, however, the Te Aroha Ward is just outside this range (by 99 people per Councillor).

Why are we proposing to retain the status quo?

Despite being slightly outside the required range, we believe that our current Council structure effectively represents our community. Councils can choose not to comply with the +/- 10% rule if they believe it would divide a community of interest or unite communities of interest with few commonalities. We think this applies in our case, because for the Te Aroha Ward to comply and stick with the same number of Councillors we would need to change the ward boundaries (i.e. shift some people who are currently in the Matamata and/or Morrinsville Wards into the Te Aroha Ward).

Based on the feedback the community gave us last year, we believe this would divide some people from their community of interest and will mean they have few commonalities of interest (e.g. they may work/shop/identify with Matamata or Morrinsville, but be required to vote for Te Aroha Councillors).

In addition to these criteria, we have also considered:

- In last year's community survey, 64% of respondents told us that the ward they live in reflects their community of interest and 60% of respondents told us they think the current representation system fairly reflects their community.
- We only just fall outside the allowable range for the number of people per Councillor in the Te Aroha Ward (by 99 people per Councillor or 297 people overall for the Te Aroha Ward).
- Our current representation arrangements have been in place for many years and are familiar to the community.
- We no longer have community boards (which a number of other councils have, in addition to Councillors).
- We could comply with the +/- 10% rule by changing the ward boundaries, or increasing or decreasing the number of Councillors. However, our community have told us they believe the current representation works well, so we don't believe these changes are required.

Communities of interest

We used last year's community survey to identify if all the 'communities of interest' (the places people associate with) in the district are fairly represented. We have identified our three main towns, Morrinsville, Matamata and Te Aroha, small rural townships, rural, and Maori as our communities of interest. We believe that these are all effectively represented by what we are proposing.

Where can I get more information?

This is a summary of what Council is proposing. For further information including the full proposal, options considered and information about the legal requirements please visit mpdc.govt.nz or any Council office or library.

How can I make a submission?

We want to hear your thoughts on this proposal. To make a submission:

- fill in the submission form at mpdc.govt.nz
- drop your submission in to the Te Aroha, Morrinsville or Matamata Council offices
- speak to your current local Councillors at one of our market days or café sessions:
 - Te Aroha - 4 July, 10-11am, Councillor café session at Ironique Café on Whitaker Street.
 - Morrinsville Market on Canada Street - 7 July
 - Matamata Market at Matamata Primary School - 14 July

What happens next?

Council will consider community feedback on this initial proposal, hold a public meeting (hearing) and then decide on a final proposal. People will then have the ability to raise an objection/appeal on our final proposal to the Local Government Commission. If Council confirm the status quo as the final proposal or if there are objections/appeals, we'll need to send this to the Local Government Commission. They will make the final decision, which will apply for the 2019 and 2022 Council elections.

MAKE A SUBMISSION BY 5PM, 20 JULY AND GO IN THE DRAW TO WIN A \$200 MTA GIFT CARD.

(See terms and conditions at mpdc.govt.nz).



Marae Underpass Update

Trim No.: 2027339

Executive Summary

There is an underpass under the State Highway which is currently in a state of disrepair. Ngāti Haua Iwi Trust representatives have been in contact with NZTA. The members may wish to verbally update the Committee on the latest progress of these discussions and any works that have been undertaken.

At the 22 March 2018 meeting members verbally updated the Committee on the latest progress of these discussions and any works:

- underpass now in working order
- planting has been undertaken
- drainage pipe installed
- mural may follow
- Lisa Gardiner to continue to work with Marae and NZTA.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.

Content

Background

State Highway 27 adjoins the Raungaiti Marae entranceway. The latest measured traffic volume is 9,157 Average Daily Total (ADT) with a 20% of the volume being heavy vehicles. The speed limit in the vicinity of the Marae vehicle crossing is 100 km/h.

There is an underpass under the State Highway which has been in a state of disrepair. Ngāti Haua Iwi Trust representatives have been in contact with NZTA, this report seeks to update the Committee on the latest progress of these discussions.

Issues

There is an underpass under the State Highway which is currently in a state of disrepair. Ngāti Haua Iwi Trust representatives have been in contact with NZTA, the attached letter was provided at the last Committee meeting on the latest progress of these discussions.

It is understood that the main barriers for use of the underpass have been lighting and water that pools in the underpass. Vandalism has caused most of these issues. Council's records show that the underpass was built in approximately 1997, with the contract being managed by Council. It is Council's understanding that once built the underpass would become an NZTA asset and the marae would be responsible for the maintenance and operating costs of the underpass (i.e. power).

Analysis

Options considered

There are no options considered, the Marae is working with NZTA on this matter.

Analysis of preferred option

There are no preferred options.

Legal and statutory requirements

There are no legal or statutory issues.

Impact on policy and bylaws

There is no impact on policies or bylaws

Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan

Not applicable.

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

This matter is not significant.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

The Marae is working with NZTA on this matter.

Consent issues

Council staff are not aware of any consent issues at this stage.

Timeframes

No timeframes have been discussed by the Committee.

Attachments

A. NZTA letter regarding marae underpass

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Acting Senior Policy Planner	
Approved by	Sandra Harris Acting Strategic Policy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	



19 May 2017

Weka Pene
Ngāti Hauā Iwi Trust

by email: Weka@ngatihauaiwitrust.co.nz

Level 1, Deloitte Building
24 Anzac Parade
PO Box 973, Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240
New Zealand
T 64 7 958 7220
F 64 7 957 1437
www.nzta.govt.nz

Tēnā koe Weka

Raungaiti Marae underpass

Further to our recent discussions, please find outlined below a summary of what is proposed to get the underpass outside Raungaiti Marae back into an operational state. The aim is for the underpass to be a more attractive option for residents, school children and Marae users wishing to cross State Highway 27 so that the number of pedestrians crossing over the highway is reduced, thereby improving safety for all concerned.

In addition to the underpass, we also briefly touched on the speed limit and issues with the Marae entrance. As discussed, while these matters are outside the scope of the current proposal, the Transport Agency is aware of them and will continue to consider options and seek to work with the Council, NHIT and the Marae to improve safety along this corridor. You also queried whether it was possible to install a bus shelter – as far as I am aware, the Transport Agency does not provide these facilities, however, I will investigate further.

Proposed works

1. Painting – the underpass will be painted in a standard neutral colour in the first instance. You have confirmed there is desire to develop a mural(s), design and location to be determined. We discussed the potential to protect the paintwork with graffiti guard and we undertook to investigate the cost and availability of this further. In terms of ongoing maintenance of the paintwork, it is noted that the Agency is unable to provide for the ongoing upkeep of any mural. For the base colour, however, any damage (e.g. graffiti) can be reported and corrected by the Transport Agency's contractors. Another option would be for the Marae to take on this responsibility with the Agency providing the appropriate paint.
2. Vegetation (residential side) – the contractors will remove the existing vegetation with the exception of the large harakeke. The existing silver birch trees may also be retained but trimmed and lifted – if necessary, however, (or if preferred by the Marae) they will be removed completely also. The area will have weedmat installed and be replanted and mulched – a list of the proposed species to be used is attached. All species are NZ natives as discussed.
3. Fencing (residential side) – the contractors will remove the existing fence and replace with a closed-board wooden fence, similar to that on the Marae boundary.
4. Lighting – it is proposed to install three vandal-proof lights within the underpass, with a floodlight at either entrance.

5. Drainage – following our discussions, Broadspectrum have investigated the pump situation further. They have identified that the pump is still in place but requires servicing. The Transport Agency will arrange for the pump to be repaired or replaced as necessary.

With the possible exception of the painting mentioned above, the ongoing maintenance will be undertaken by the NZ Transport Agency. Any issues should be reported to the relevant Contract Manager as soon as possible. As discussed, even the planting will be maintained by the Transport Agency due to health and safety requirements for working within the road reserve.

If you can confirm the above is satisfactory, including the list of proposed plants (attached), we will get on with ordering materials and arranging the work to be carried out. As discussed, no works are proposed within Marae grounds, however, the contractors may require some access. We are happy to discuss the proposal with Marae whānau and/or meet onsite if this is desired. Please let me know if you have any questions or amendments, otherwise I look forward to your confirmation and getting this project started.

Naku noa, nā

Jenni Fitzgerald
Planning & Investment Manager (Acting)

List of plant species proposed

Name	Botanical name
Karamū (shining karamu)	<i>Coprosma lucida</i>
Karamū	<i>Coprosma robusta</i>
Ti kōuka (cabbage tree)	<i>Cordyline australis</i>
Akeake	<i>Dodonaea viscosa</i>
Kānuka	<i>Kunzea ericoides</i>
Mānuka	<i>Leptospermum scoparium</i>
Ngaio	<i>Myoporum laetum</i>
Māpou	<i>Myrsine australis</i>
Akiraho (twiggy tree daisy)	<i>Olearia virgate</i>
Harakeke	<i>Phormium tenax</i>
Kōhūhū	<i>Pittosporum tenuifolium</i>
Kōwhai	<i>Sophora microphylla</i>

Item 7.4

Attachment A

Marae Entrance, Parking Arrangements

Trim No.: 2027337

Executive Summary

Safety issues at the Raungaiti Marae entranceway have been highlighted as an issue for the Committee's consideration. It has also been identified that there is not enough parking available for the Marae at times.

A preliminary study on the options of upgrading the entranceway and parking was completed and presented to the Committee on 28 May 2015, with further discussion at its August and November meetings.

At the August meeting committee members requested the staff further investigate option 1 - Parking on the north side of the proposed access road and as an alternative, parking on the state highway as proposed by the Soaring Centre was also discussed at the meeting that the option of shifting the power pole next to the entrance way should be investigated and prioritising the development of the entrance over developing further parking on the site.

At the November 2015 meeting the Committee requested staff mark out the proposed location of the entrances way for Committee members to view in February 2016. The marking of the entrance way and a site visit for Committee members was completed in February 2016. At the meeting in April 2016 Gary Thomson, Te Kaiwhakarite from Community Waikato also attended to assist with questions and discuss resources and support available in regards to funding opportunities.

This issue was considered by the Committee at each of the 2017 meetings. Discussion at the November 2017 meeting indicated Wharekai funding/feasibility study options are being investigated and consideration was being given to erecting an archgola over possible concrete apron beside wharekai which will give a big covered area. The carpark options are being included in this study.

The issue was further discussed at the Committee's March 2018 meeting and the information was received. No further work has been undertaken on this project by Council staff.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.

Content

Background

State Highway 27 adjoins the Raungaiti Marae entranceway. The latest measured traffic volume is 9,157 Average Daily Total (ADT) with a 20% of the volume being heavy vehicles. The speed limit in the vicinity of the Marae vehicle crossing is 100 km/h.

The road marking on the pavement in the surrounding area is marked for two single lanes, one in each direction, There is a marked right-turn bay for northbound traffic to enter the Marae and widening of 2.8m on the east side to allow left- turning traffic to turn into the Marae and be clear of south-bound traffic.

The access to the Marae building and other buildings is a narrow unsealed vehicle crossing off SH 27 on the southern boundary the Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome. This crossing is not wide enough for use by more than one vehicle at the same time.

The existing vehicle crossing is narrow and does not comply with current Matamata-Piako District Council and NZ Transport Agency standards. The current entranceway is not suitable to allow for safe traffic to enter the busy State Highway. There is also limited parking available on the site.

If the vehicle crossing is to be made safer, it has been recommended that the crossing be widened to allow for a separate entry and exit. The entranceway is also required to be sealed. Minor changes will also need to be made to the marking on SH 27. This involves the relocation of the right turn bay by some 4m to the north and deleting part of the painted median north of the crossing.

Separating the entrance and exit will allow right turning traffic to enter the property while a car is waiting to exit, a traffic movement which cannot occur with the present vehicle crossing.

A number of parking options were presented to the committee in May and August for their consideration and further discussed at the November meeting in 2015:

- Parking on the north side of the proposed access road

This area has a road length of 95m but about 74m are clear of any buildings. This can be set up for 45 degree parking (the usual angle) and 74 m can produce 20 carparks. This does require land from the Aerodrome Reserve to be utilised for the parking and access way.

- Parking on the north side of the existing road

This can be up to 74m in length and would accommodate 20 carparks. This length of parking involves fence relocation and tree stump removal this would also require land to be utilised from the Aerodrome Reserve.

- Parking on the south side of the existing road

There is a grass berm of about 7.4m wide between the Marae main building and the end of the fence that runs past the church. This berm would be reduced to 5.4m if the existing road was widened. This berm is some 55m length which can be set up for 45 degree parking and can cater for 15 carparks.

- Parking on the west side of State Highway 27

This would be the cheapest option but only provide 8 carparks. This requires the existing road berm to be used for parking and the underpass used to cross the State Highway.

- Parking by the church fence

Mentioned above is an internal road that is parallel to the highway. The distance between the boundary fence and the fence by the church is 13.3m of which there is about 6m of grass between the road and the church fence. This area is some 55m long which can be set up for 15 angle carparks. One negative with this option would be the manoeuvring and would need to be considered further.

- Soaring Centre alternative – parking along the state highway

At its meeting on 28 May, the Committee indicated that option one was the preferred option with consideration of moving two power poles which obstruct view for safety of vehicles exiting.

Following this staff undertook further consultation with Aerodrome users on the viability of this option as recommended in the previous report. The Soaring centre has advised that the proposed layout would block the glider exit and manoeuvring area at the rear of the closest large hangar. In order for this layout to be successful the area available for parking would need to be shortened to stop at the edge of the smaller square hangar, reducing the number of car parks that would be available with this design.

The Soaring Centre suggested an alternative option of parking along the front boundary of the aerodrome, staff advised that this option was unlikely to be acceptable to NZTA, this was confirmed at the November Committee meeting.

Issues

At the August 2015 meeting committee members requested the staff further investigate option 1 - Parking on the north side of the proposed access road and as an alternative, parking on the state highway as proposed by the Soaring Centre was also discussed at the meeting that the option of shifting the power pole next to the entrance way should be investigated and prioritising the development of the entrance over developing further parking on the site.

At the November 2015 meeting the Committee requested staff mark out the proposed location of the entrances way for Committee members to view in February 2016. The marking of the entrance way and a site visit for Committee members was completed in February 2016.

Preferred option – Parking on the north side of the marae entrance

Staff prepared a further plan and estimate based on the preferred option identified at the August Committee meeting. Maps and cost estimates were provided in November 2015 for consideration.

The proposal shows the reduced parking area to allow continued manoeuvring of aircraft in the adjacent hangars and the fencing is set back approximately 2 metres from the nearest hangar to ensure that this area can still be accessed for maintenance.

In order to reduce costs the proposal does not include a splitter island or any road markings directing vehicles (other than the vehicle entrance) or parking layout. This would mean that the parking area will be 'open' and parking configurations managed by the Marae as they do now with their current parking spaces.

Shifting the power pole

As requested at the August 2015 meeting, Staff contacted PowerCo and Northpower regarding the options and costs for shifting the power pole to improve the sight lines for vehicles turning right out of the Marae entranceway. This option plus costs were discussed by the committee in 2016, however the cost was viewed to be prohibitive when weighed against the small benefits in sightline improvement gained from shifting the power pole.

Underpass

It is understood that the main barriers for use of the underpass are lighting and water that pools in the underpass. Vandalism has caused most of these issues. Council's records show that the underpass was built in approximately 1997, with the contract being managed by Council. It is Council's understanding that once built the underpass would become an NZTA asset and the marae would be responsible for the maintenance and operating costs of the underpass (i.e. power).

Analysis

Options considered

The Committee could continue with the preferred option or consider an alternative option.

Analysis of preferred option

There are no preferred options.

Legal and statutory requirements

If some of the land from the Aerodrome is to be used for a new access way or car parking, a legal agreement would need to be developed to formalise this matter.

Impact on policy and bylaws

There is no impact on policies or bylaws

Consistency with the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan

This project has not been identified in Council's Long Term Plan or Annual Plan 2017/18

Impact on Significance and Engagement Policy

The Aerodrome is identified as a significant asset and therefore any formal or legal agreements around the land would have to be carefully considered and may require further consultation.

Communication, consultation and decision making processes

Initial informal consultation has been completed with the NZ Transport Agency around the entranceway and State Highway requirements but any final design to the entranceway and State Highway would need to be formally approved by the NZ Transport Agency.

The committee may wish to undertake further consultation with stakeholders from both the Aerodrome users group and the Marae prior to settling on a final option.

Consent issues

A Resource Consent is required for parking and changing the vehicle entrance way. Advice from the Council Planners is as follows:

The activity of providing parking for a Marae within the subject property triggers resource consent under the following rules:

- 2.2.6.3 – Marae, Wharehenui and housing developments where there is no Iwi Housing and Marae Development Plan or where the development is not in accordance with an approved Plan = Discretionary activity
- 2.2.7.2 – Activities (excluding buildings) on public reserves not provided by a Management Plan approved under the Reserves Act 1977, or by a Conservation Management Strategy under the Conservation Act 1987, or where there is no Management Plan = Discretionary activity.

The proposed vehicle entrance is unable to comply with the minimum separation distances required between other crossings and intersections. Therefore the following rule is applicable:

- 9.1.2(ii)1.4 - An existing vehicle crossing that changes in character, scale, or intensity of use or a new vehicle crossing:
 - Meeting the performance standards in 9.1.2(iii)(a)(i)–(iv); and:
 - There is no location anywhere along the site's frontage where the performance standards in 9.1.2(iii)(a)(v) can be met; and:
 - The vehicle crossing is not associated with a new subdivision.

It is assumed that the final layout of the parking area will demonstrate compliance with the minimum dimensions in the Development Manual in respect of the individual parking spaces and manoeuvring areas.

Potentially affected parties:

- NZTA in respect of the entranceway and potential traffic safety/efficiency effects.
- MPDC as the requiring authority for the designation. Approval is required from the requiring authority to undertake an activity not provided for under the designation.
- Occupiers of the two aerodrome sheds located directly adjacent to the new parking area. It is noted that additional aerodrome occupiers may be identified once final plans are provided and a site visit has been undertaken.

Timeframes

No timeframes have been discussed by the Committee.

Financial Impact

i. Cost

Estimated costs for the preferred option have been summarised below excluding GST. It should be noted that these estimates were prepared in 2015 and may now be out of date.

Project options	Entrance way and parking	Entrance way only	Parking only	Resource Consent	Total
One project	55,792	-	-	2,000	57,792
Staged project	-	38,676	28,077	2,000	68,753
Vehicle entrance only	-	38,676	-	2,000	40,676

Project costs

These have been broken down in to the following two options:

- Completing the entrance and parking work as one project
- Staging the project, with completing the vehicle entrance way first and the parking as a subsequent project

Committee members should note:

- Prices are exclusive of GST
- Prices are estimates only, based on the best information Council staff have at this time, actual costs would not be known until the project was tendered.
- Estimates were calculated in October/November 2015. Costs may increase over time and if the project does not proceed for any length of time revised estimates should be sought.

Estimated costs to complete the entrance and parking work as one project

Item	Description	Unit	Qty	Rate	Amount
5.0	Site Clearance				
5.1	Clearing and grubbing (Removal of 600 mm dia. tree stumps-15 Nos, and Removal of trees (450mm dia. 1 No, 400mm dia. 4 Nos, 300mm dia. 1 No)	LS	1	18000.00	18000.00
	Relocate the existing fence as indicated on the drawing	m	80	25.00	2000.00
6.0	Earthworks				
6.1	Excavation for the parking area and entranceway. Cut to waste.	m ³	250	15.00	3750.00
6.2	Excavation for the parking area and entranceway to be used for filling holes resulting from removal of tree stumps. Cut to Fill.	m ³	15	20.00	300.00
7.0	Pavement Construction				
7.1	Supply, spread and compact granular material of CBR >=10	m ³	154	45.00	6930.00
7.2	Supply, spread and compact WHAP40 Basecourse.	m ³	110	100.00	11000.00
8.0	Sealing				
8.1	Prepare surface, supply spray 180/200 Bitumen, spread and roll a) two coat grade 3 and 5 chipseal to road.	m ²	70	10.00	700.00
8.2	Supply, spread and compact AP20 (1 cu.m per 40 sq.m)	m ²	665	3.00	1995.00
9.0	Other Services				
9.1	Relocate the Fire Hydrant to a place as directed by the Engineer. Rate shall include cost of removal and installation.	LS	1	500.00	500.00
9.2	Relocate the 6.0m long existing benches (2 Nos) to a place directed by the Engineer	LS	1	500.00	500.00
9.3	Removing the existing markings for Right Turn Bay and remarking the RTB appropriate for the proposed entranceway.	LS	1	500.00	500.00
9.4	Preliminary and General	LS	1	5000.00	5000.00
9.5	Contingencies	%	10	46175.00	4617.50
Improvements to Marae Entrance (excluding GST)					55,792.50

Staging the project Stage 1 – vehicle entrance

Item	Description	Unit	Qty	Rate	Amount
5.0	Site Clearance				
5.1	Clearing and grubbing including Removal of tree stumps-600mm dia.- 4 Nos, 900 mm dia.- 9 Nos and 1200mm dia.-10 Nos, and Removal of trees 600mm dia.-2 Nos, 400mm dia- 4 Nos & 300mm dia.-1No	LS	1	16500.00	16500.00
5.2	Relocate the existing fence as indicated on the drawing. Rate shall include the cost of additional material if required.	m	80	25.00	2000.00
6.0	Earthworks				
6.1	Excavation for the entranceway. Cut to waste.	m ³	74	20.00	1480.00
7.0	Pavement Construction				
7.1	Supply, spread and compact granular material of CBR >=10	m ³	42	70.00	2940.00
7.2	Supply, spread and compact WHAP40 Basecourse.	m ³	32	120.00	3840.00
8.0	Sealing				
8.1	Prepare surface, supply spray 180/200 Bitumen, spread and roll a) two coat grade 3 and 5 chipseal to road.	m ²	210	15.00	3150.00
9.0	Other Services				
9.1	Relocate the Fire Hydrant to a place as directed by the Engineer. Rate shall include cost of removal and installation.	LS	1	500.00	500.00
9.2	Removing the existing markings for Right Turn Bay and remarking the RTB appropriate for the proposed entranceway.	LS	1	500.00	500.00
9.3	Project management, Design, Supervision, Health and Safety and Traffic Management	LS	1	4250.00	4250.00
9.4	Contingencies	%	10	35160.00	3516.00
Improvements to Marae Entrance (excluding GST)					38,676.00

Staging the project Stage 2 – parking

Item	Description	Unit	Qty	Rate	Amount
5.0	Site Clearance				
5.1	Clearing and grubbing	LS	1	1000.00	1000.00
6.0	Earthworks				
6.1	Excavation for the parking area and entranceway. Cut to waste.	m ³	184	20.00	3680.00
6.2	Excavation for the parking area and entranceway to be used for filling holes resulting from removal of tree stumps. Cut to Fill.	m ³	10	20.00	200.00
7.0	Pavement Construction				
7.1	Supply, spread and compact granular material of CBR >=10	m ³	111	70.00	7770.00
7.2	Supply, spread and compact WHAP40 Basecourse.	m ³	83	120.00	9960.00
8.0	Sealing				
8.1	Supply, spread and compact AP20 (1 cu.m per 40 sq.m)	m ²	555	3.00	1665.00
9.0	Other Services				
9.1	Relocate the 6.0m long existing benches (2 Nos) to a place directed by the Engineer	LS	1	500.00	500.00
9.2	Project management, Design, Supervision, Health and Safety and Traffic Management	LS	1	750.00	750.00
9.3	Contingencies	%	10	25525.00	2552.50
Construction of Additional Parking Space (excluding GST)					28,077.50

Power pole costs

The total estimated cost for works to shift the power pole is approximately \$18,696 excluding GST. Usually when shifting poles Power Co funds the cost of materials for the work. Powerco sent through a letter of offer (circulated at the November 2015 meeting) setting out the contribution that would need to be made to shifting the power pole of \$12,697 excluding GST which would need to be funded.

Resource consent costs

The Resource Cost costs of Council are approximately \$1,500 and unlikely to exceed \$2,000. However this is on the basis that all affected party written approvals are obtained and no further information is required. If affected party approvals cannot be obtained then costs will be greater than this, as the consent would potentially need to be limited notified, and if affected party agreement cannot be reached a hearing on the consent application would need to be held.

ii. Funding Source

Council

Council does not have any funding for this project identified for this project. As part of the settlement negotiation there was no agreement on who would have responsibility for funding for this project. Council has contributed in kind, with staff time preparing plans and estimated of costs for this project.

Council recently consulted on its Long Term Plan – further details are set out in a separate report to the Committee, the Ngāti Haua Iwi trust made a submission to this process however no funding was specifically sought for the Marae entranceway and parking arrangements.

Council Resource Consent Grant

Council has set aside funding to assist non-profit community organisations to fund the costs of resource consent applications. The Ngāti Haua Iwi Trust may be eligible to apply for funding from this grant to assist with resource consent costs.

Applications can be made at any time, with a maximum of \$5,000 to be granted to each community group per project. The funding only covers the costs associated with Council fees to process resource consents. Any reports or consultants fees that the community group incurs as part of preparing their application will not be covered by the grant.

The group must be a non-profit community organisation and should:

- have a high ratio of volunteers to paid employees
- have a high degree of public access to the organisation
- primarily be funded from grants, donations, subscriptions or similar and not from fees, charges or funding from central government

Applications must meet the following criteria:

- the resource consent application must be for an activity within the Matamata-Piako District
- the project must have no commercial aspect, and must clearly demonstrate community benefit
- the group must have a business plan setting out in sufficient detail the proposal, timeline, long-term plans, confirmed and potential funding sources and any other relevant information for the project.

Lotteries

Council staff have also identified a Lottery Marae Heritage and Facilities grant (Te Tahua Marae Tuku Iho Me Nga Whakaurunga).

Some funding is potentially available for car parking and fencing that meet the rest of the funding criteria. However, the Lottery Marae Heritage and Facilities Committee does not fund carparks and roading outside the land boundary on which the project is situated, and groups are expected to source at least 1/3 funding themselves.

Further information on the above and other lotteries grants can be found at

<http://www.communitymatters.govt.nz/Funding-and-grants---Lottery-grants---Lottery-Marae-Heritage-and-Facilities>

Community Waikato

Community Waikato was established to provide practical support to social services organisations. Its work is the provision of capability and capacity strengthening services. Community Waikato works with and for tangata whenua, community and voluntary social service, health, education, disability, community development, culture & heritage, and environmental organisations in the Waikato region.

The Advisory team provides one-to-one advice, support and information on governance, management, strategic and operational planning, employment, resource development, legal structures, policy development, financial systems and funding, planning new services, projects and events and the myriad of other issues that come up for community groups. It tailors support and training to fit the needs of the organisations. We work with management and staff, volunteers and/or the board.

Gary Thompson, Te Kaiwhakarite for Community Waikato was invited to join the committee members to discuss the resources and support Community Waikato may be able to offer the Marae.

Gambling charity grants

Grants may also be available from the following organisations that operated within the Matamata-Piako District:

- Grassroots Trust Limited
- New Zealand Community Trust
- Pub Charity Limited
- The Lion Foundation

Trust Waikato

Trust Waikato donates money to community organisations and projects that focus on welfare, sport, recreation, youth, art, culture, and the environment, for the benefit of people in the Waikato region. Funding may be available from the trust to assist with costs. Further information can be found at <http://www.trustwaikato.co.nz>

Ministry of Culture and Heritage

The Regional Culture and Heritage Fund (the RCHF) replaces the Regional Museums Policy for Capital Construction Projects (the RMP). The RCHF eligibility criteria are sufficiently broad to enable the Fund to benefit a range of cultural organisations throughout New Zealand: in the broader art gallery and museums sector (including iwi museums/whare taonga), the performing arts, and the heritage sector.

The RCHF's focus is capital projects outside the main centres of Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch. Applications must relate to arts, culture and heritage facility projects focussed on renovating, restoring, adding to, and constructing buildings in which arts, culture and heritage activities take place. Grants will be for the construction of new buildings and basic infrastructural redevelopment work to existing buildings which may include permanent/long-lived specialist fittings.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Acting Senior Policy Planner	
Approved by	Sandra Harris Acting Strategic Policy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Aerodrome Fees and Charges

Trim No.: 2027347

Executive Summary

During the recent Long Term Plan 2018-28 consultation process a submission was received requesting annual landing fees at the Aerodrome rather than the daily rate we currently have. This report provides an overview of the submission, Council's decision and the next steps to be followed.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.

Content

Background

During the Long Term Plan 2018-28 consultation process a submission was received requesting an annual landing fee at the Aerodrome.

Submission

The submitter advised they are a local airfield user who is not a member of the Matamata Aero club and is paying, with modest use, up to 10 times the annual landing fees of an Aero club member (\$50 per year for unlimited landings).

The submitter said they do not wish to join the Aero club and consider Council should introduce an annual charge, payable directly to council, similar to the Aero club annual charge, for non-Aero club airfield users. They considered given the Aero club members pay \$50 per year it seems reasonable that the non-members should pay no more than \$70 annually.

Council decision on the submission

Council have agreed in principle that there should be an annual landing fee at the Matamata Aerodrome. They have instructed Council staff to work through all of the Aerodrome fees not just establishing an annual landing fee to ensure all fees are consistent and fair.

Next steps

Council staff have been working through the current Fees and financial statements of the Aerodrome to obtain a current picture, staff are also scheduled to attend the Aerodrome users group meeting in July to discuss any issues/potential changes with the users.

If Committee members have any feedback regarding the current fees this can be provided to staff and Council to consider during the review.

Council is aiming to review the relevant fees so any changes can be included in the Fees and Charges for 2019/20. The Fees and Charges will be consulted on in early 2019 and will apply from 1 July 2019.

Attachments

A. 2018/19 Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Fees

Signatories

Author(s)	Niall Baker Acting Senior Policy Planner	
-----------	--	--

Approved by	Sandra Harris Acting Strategic Policy Manager	
	Don McLeod Chief Executive Officer	

Current Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Fees 2018/19

Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome		1 July 18 – 30 June 19
Airport landing fee		
Operator – cash	Per landing (maximum \$15.00 per day)	\$15.00
Operator – invoiced	Per landing (maximum \$40.00 per day)	\$40.00
<i>Note: The first of any of the following types of movements are charged at landing rates: landing, touch and go, approach and go, around, missed approach</i>		
Aircraft parking	Per day (24 hours)	\$6.00
Camping		
Unattended, un-powered site	Per day	\$2.00
Unattended, powered site	Per day	\$4.00
Adults		
Un-powered site	Per person/ per day	\$14.00
Powered site	Per person/ per day	\$16.00
Soaring Centre bunk room	Per person/ per day	\$14.00
Children		
Un-powered site	Per person/ per day	\$7.00
Powered site	Per person/ per day	\$7.00
Soaring Centre bunk room	Per person/ per day	\$7.00

Item 7.6

Attachment A

Waharoa Aerodrome Budget 2018/19

Trim No.: 2030037

Item 7.7

Executive Summary

The 2017/2018 budget for the Waharoa Aerodrome is provided for the information of the Committee.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received.

Content

Background

The Committee is to undertake a review of the approved financial plan for 2018/2019.

The financial budget has been approved as a part of Council's long term plan.

The approved budget is included below together with comparisons with the 2016/2017 actual expenses and revenues. The 2017/2018 actual figures are provisional and subject to final end of financial year processing. For example, there will be some outstanding creditor invoices for 2017/2018 that need to be processed.

A brief analysis is also provided.

Issues

2017/2018 Approved Budget

The approved budget is included in the

	Budget 2018/2019	Budget 2017/2018	Provisional Actual 2017/2018
Income (<i>Note 1</i>)	\$127,100	\$125,100	\$148,921
Expenses			
Operating (<i>Note 2</i>)	\$93,900	\$84,900	\$104,044
Building Maintenance	\$8,700	\$4,000	\$4,585
Depreciation	\$8,600	\$8,600	\$8,461
Overheads	\$35,100	\$33,634	\$32,112
Total Expenses	\$146,300	\$131,146	\$149,202
Net Cost (Funded from rates)	\$19,200	\$6,046	\$281

Note 1 Revenue

The 2017/2018 Revenue is further analysed below:

Item	2017/2018 Actual	Percentage of Total
Hangar & Ground leases	\$47,949	32%
Landing fees	\$42,890	29%
Walsh Memorial fees	\$19,336	13%
Mowing Contract	\$15,200	10%
Camp Ground fees	\$3,043	2%
House rental	\$12,190	8%
Bunk house fees	\$8,313	6%

Note 2 Operating Expenses

In 2017/2018 there were small increases in many expenses eg insurance. We incurred a number of one-off or extraordinary costs which are the main reason the budget was exceeded.

These are listed below:

Costs associated with lease administration	\$10,894
Runway repairs	\$ 7,813

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Bruce Langlands Facilities Operations Manager	
Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	

Health and Safety Report

Trim No.: 2030048

Item 7.8

Executive Summary

A Health and Safety report will be presented to the Waharoa Aerodrome Committee. The information will be circulated separately to the agenda.

Recommendation

That:

1. The information be received

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Bruce Langlands Facilities OperationsManager	
Approved by	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	

Visits to Whitianga Aerodrome and Tauranga Airport

Trim No.: 2029527

Executive Summary

Staff presenting an update on visits to Whitianga Aerodrome and Tauranga Airport.

Recommendation

That:

1. The report be received.

Content

Background

Staff were asked to investigate hangar development models at Whitianga Airfield and Tauranga Airport and arrange to visit the two facilities.

Information about the operations and hangar development models at the two aerodromes has previously been provided to the Committee.

In April 2018 Council's Facilities Operations Manager and Parks and Facilities Planner visited Whitianga Aerodrome.

A subsequent trip to Tauranga Airport to include Committee members did not eventuate as finding a time that would suit everyone could not be agreed to in the short term.

The option to visit Tauranga Airport remains and may be more feasible than earlier in the year.

Alternatively, Council Staff could visit Tauranga Airport and report back to the Committee with a slideshow presentation about both visits.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories

Author(s)	Mark Naude Parks and Facilities Planner	
	Bruce Langlands Facilities Operations Manager	

Approved by	Susanne Kampshof Asset Manager Strategy and Policy	
	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	

Reserve Management Plan Update

Trim No.: 2027734

Executive Summary

Council has resolved to review the Waharoa (Matamata) Aerodrome Reserve Management Plan. Xyst Limited has been engaged to prepare the Reserve Management Plan and Outline Plan under the Resource Management Act. Xyst staff will describe the review process and undertake a workshop to clarify key issues and discuss processes.

Recommendation

That:

1. The report be received.

Content

Background

Xyst have been engaged to prepare the review of the Reserve Management Plan and Outline Plan. Paul Wilson, Director of Xyst will be present to introduce Xyst and the proposed project plan.

It is proposed that following the formal meeting, Xyst will facilitate a workshop to discuss the consultation process and key issues.

The general outline of the work programme is attached (Attachment A).

Attachments

- A. Attachment A - Indicative Timeframes

Signatories

Author(s)	Mark Naude Parks and Facilities Planner	
Approved by	Susanne Kampshof Asset Manager Strategy and Policy	
	Manaia Te Wiata Group Manager Business Support	

Attachment A – Indicative Timeframes

