

ORDINARY AGENDA

CORPORATE AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, 27 May 2009

TIME: 9.15 am

VENUE: Council Chambers
Matamata Piako District Council
35 Kenrick Street
TE AROHA

MEMBERSHIP – Quorum (6)**Members:**

Mayor G W H Vercoe QSM, ED, JP
Cr J E Barnes
Cr S D Gillard JP
Cr C L Greenville JP
Cr M L Gribble
Cr J W Harris
Cr P M Jager
Cr T J M Johnston JP
Cr R J McGrail
Cr G R Stanley
Cr M P Steffert
Cr L M Tisch

Information and recommendations are included in the reports to assist Corporate and Operations Committee in the decision making process and may not constitute Corporate and Operations Committee's decision until considered by Corporate and Operations Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	MEETING OPENING.....	1
2	PRESENT.....	1
3	APOLOGIES	1
4	NOTIFICATION OF URGENT BUSINESS.....	1
5	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	1
6	OFFICER REPORTS.....	2
6.1	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS REPORT FOR APRIL 2009	2
6.2	CIVIC ASSURANCE	3
6.3	SUMMARY OF CONSENTS RECEIVED	4
6.4	PARK CHECK 2007, 2008 & 2009, AND WINTER PARK CHECK 2008	5
6.5	TRANSFER STATION PRICE REVIEW 2009.....	20
6.6	QUOTABLE VALUE PRESENTATION.....	23
7	URGENT ADDITIONAL BUSINESS	24
8	EXCLUSION FROM THE PUBLIC.....	24
9	CLOSURE	24

1 MEETING OPENING**2 PRESENT**

MEMBERS PRESENT

OFFICERS PRESENT

IN ATTENDANCE

3 APOLOGIES

MEMBERS APOLOGIES

4 NOTIFICATION OF URGENT BUSINESS

Pursuant to clause 3.7.5 and 3.7.6 of the Standing Orders NZS 9202:2003 and Section 46A (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.

5 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes, as circulated, of the Ordinary Meeting of the Corporate and Operations Committee, held on 22 April 2009.

[Minutes April 22 2009 Corporate and Operations Committee.doc](#)

DRAFT RESOLUTION

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Corporate And Operations Committee held on 22 April 2009 be confirmed and signed as true and correct.

6 OFFICER REPORTS

6.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS REPORT FOR APRIL 2009

File No: SUP164201
Attachments: [Major Projects May 2009.Doc](#)
[CEO Report for April 2009.doc](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A copy of the Chief Executive Officer's report for the period April 2009 is attached.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Chief Executive Officer's report for April 2009 be received.

6.2 CIVIC ASSURANCE

File No: SUP163804
Attachments: [Civic Assurance Statement of Intent.TIF](#)
Responsible Officer: D McLeod
Chief Executive Officer
Author: J Payze
Committee Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New Zealand Local Government Insurance Corporation Limited, trading as Civic Assurance has issued the Statement of Intent for the year ended 31 December 2009. A copy of the Statement of Intent is attached.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no issues.

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Civic Assurance Statement of Intent for the year ended 31 December 2009 be received.

6.3 SUMMARY OF CONSENTS RECEIVED

File No: DEM0208R01
Attachments: [Consents Received - April 2009](#)
Responsible Officer: D Bellamy
Environmental Services Manager
Author: K Rogers
Planning Administration Assistant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A summary of the resource consent applications received for the month of April 2009 is attached.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the information on the Summary of Consents for April 2009 be received.

6.4 PARK CHECK 2007, 2008 & 2009, AND WINTER PARK CHECK 2008

File No: PRE520401
Responsible Officer: G Ridley
Infrastructure Manager
Author: R Marshall
Community Facilities Planning Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

'Park Check' is a survey of park users and is undertaken annually by a number of Council's throughout New Zealand.

MPDC has surveyed its park users using Park Check on four occasions from 2007 to 2009. Three surveys were carried out during the summer months of 2007, 2008 and 2009. MPDC also participated in a Winter Park Check survey in 2008, to see if winter sportsfield users were satisfied with reserve facilities.

Survey participants were asked to provide feedback on various facilities such as public toilets, playgrounds, ground maintenance, etc. Results and trends from all four surveys undertaken in the 2007 – 2009 period are discussed in this report.

Robert Marshall and Steve Fabish will also provide a presentation at the Council meeting to highlight key results and trends.

BACKGROUND**PARK CHECK 2007, 2008 & 2009**

People using the districts parks were approached during summer at the beginning of 2007, 2008 and 2009. They were asked questions to help Council identify if adequate levels of service were being provided at our reserves. The number of people surveyed ranged from 182 (in 2007) to 231 (in 2009). Between nine and eleven other Councils also participated in 'Park Check' each of these years.

For reporting purposes, reserves were identified using the following categories:

1. Destination Parks – The "major" reserve in the area it is located. Residents and visitors are likely to be willing to travel to, and, from the community that they live in to access the reserve e.g. Hetana Street Reserve (Matamata), Te Aroha Domain (Te Aroha), Howie Park (Morrinsville)

2. Neighbourhood Parks – Developed urban reserve designed for ease of pedestrian access (Passive Reserves) e.g. Centennial Drive Reserve (Matamata), Holmwood Park (Morrinsville), Lockerbie Park (Morrinsville)

3. Sports Grounds - Reserves designed for, and used for, organised sport (Active Reserves) e.g. Herries Park (Te Aroha), Matamata Domain (Matamata), Morrinsville Recreation Ground (Morrinsville)

4. Other - This category incorporates other parcels of reserve that don't fit into the categories above e.g. Morrinsville Streetscape (Morrinsville), Te Aroha Cemetery, Waharoa Aerodrome (Matamata)

Park Users were asked how important the following reserve facilities were to them using a scale of 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important):

- Gardens and Trees
- Children's Playground
- Seats and Tables
- Toilets
- Grounds Cleanliness
- Grass Maintenance
- Paths and Tracks
- Shade
- Signage
- Security
- Vehicle Parking

Users were then asked to rate how satisfied they were with each of the above facilities using a scale of 1 (very unsatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

Results of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 surveys are shown below. **Please Note:**

- Where satisfaction ratings are higher than importance ratings it indicates that user expectations are being exceeded
- Where satisfaction ratings are similar to importance ratings it indicates that we are providing the level of service our users' desire.
- Where satisfaction ratings are lower than importance ratings it indicates that we are not meeting user expectations.

The results were as follows:

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Gardens & Trees

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	4.13	4.17
	Neighbourhood	3.80	3.77
	Sports Ground	3.65	3.81
	Other	N/A	N/A
2008	Destination	4.42	4.29
	Neighbourhood	4.28	4.18
	Sports Ground	4.24	3.63
	Other	4.18	4.00
2009	Destination	4.77	4.69
	Neighbourhood	4.85	4.56
	Sports Ground	4.73	4.15
	Other	4.65	4.68

The above results show MPDC park users consider gardens and trees to be very important for all park categories. Satisfaction levels have risen over the three years and are more or less meeting public expectations.

MPDC's gardens and trees satisfaction ratings were better than most other Councils in 2009.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

A number of operational improvements have been made to improve gardens and trees in Council reserves. More garden bed mulching is being used, which improves the appearance of the garden and improves the health of the plants due to water retention and suppressing weeds. New designs and standards are being used for bedding plant displays. There has been an up-skilling of the KVS gardening crews, who also now visit parks on a shorter rotation (resulting in a higher standard and quicker solving of any site issues that arise). Additionally, shrubberies that become uneconomic to maintain are now replanted annually.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Children's Playground

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	2.73	3.33
	Neighbourhood	3.33	3.89
	Sports Ground	3.29	3.56
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	3.56	3.47
	Neighbourhood	3.20	3.61
	Sports Ground	3.74	3.36
	Other	2.53	3.44
2009	Destination	3.33	3.29
	Neighbourhood	2.96	3.13
	Sports Ground	4.27	4.04
	Other	2.56	3.55

MPDC park users generally do not consider children's playgrounds to be significantly important. Results show satisfaction ratings often exceed importance ratings.

Importance and satisfaction ratings were both low compared to other Councils in the 2009 survey.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

The fact that satisfaction ratings are lower than other Council's is not of great concern because they are in line with importance ratings. Results show MPDC park users do not desire a particularly high level of service for playgrounds. Draft Reserve Management Plans have identified many playgrounds will be upgraded as demand increases.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Seats and Tables

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
------	---------------	---	---

2007	Destination	3.97	3.73
	Neighbourhood	3.87	3.27
	Sports Ground	3.81	3.04
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	4.03	3.34
	Neighbourhood	3.79	3.35
	Sports Ground	4.12	3.03
	Other	3.73	3.77
2009	Destination	4.56	4.00
	Neighbourhood	4.49	3.45
	Sports Ground	4.73	4.15
	Other	4.56	4.34

The above short term trend suggests seats and tables are becoming more important. The table also indicates park users' expectations are not quite being met.

MPDC seats and tables satisfaction levels were above the average for all Councils which participated in the 2009 survey.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

All seats and tables have been site identified using GPS. Staff will now be looking at the location of present assets with the aim of moving ones that are not located in ideal places.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Toilets

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	4.18	3.79
	Neighbourhood	3.17	3.50
	Sports Ground	4.10	3.46
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	4.06	3.19
	Neighbourhood	3.65	2.88
	Sports Ground	4.22	2.75
	Other	3.76	3.70
2009	Destination	4.86	4.34
	Neighbourhood	2.91	1.90
	Sports Ground	4.74	2.48
	Other	4.54	4.19

MPDC park users consider 'destination', 'sports grounds' and 'other' park toilets to be very important. Satisfaction levels from 2007 – 2009 indicate they would prefer toilets to be of a higher standard (particularly in neighbourhood parks and sports grounds).

Satisfaction levels with 'destination' and 'other' toilets were above the average rating for all Councils in 2009. They were below average for the 'neighbourhood' and 'sports ground' categories.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

An improvement has already been achieved due to the contractor lifting the level of cleaning. New toilets are to be constructed in the Morrinsville Recreation Ground, and the Studholme Street and Thomas Park toilets are being upgraded. The Tahuna Domain toilets have already been upgraded, the Hetana Street toilets have had urinettes installed and the Waharoa Reserve toilets have had a new water main installed. Toilets at Firth Tower are now available seven days a week with longer opening times. Due to vandalism the toilets in Anderson Park and Rapurapu reserve have recently been removed.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Grounds Cleanliness

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	4.33	4.06
	Neighbourhood	4.10	3.83
	Sports Ground	4.06	3.64
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	4.38	4.11
	Neighbourhood	4.30	3.98
	Sports Ground	4.39	3.21
	Other	4.39	3.98
2009	Destination	4.58	4.59
	Neighbourhood	4.64	4.03
	Sports Ground	4.65	4.21
	Other	4.75	4.48

From 2007 – 2009 park users have consistently considered grounds cleanliness/ lack of litter/ lack of graffiti to be of high importance. Satisfaction ratings peaked in the latest survey indicating the preferred levels of service are close to being achieved.

In 2009 satisfaction levels were above average for all park categories (when compared to other Councils).

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

An improvement has already been achieved due to the contractor lifting the level of cleaning. A CPTED study was undertaken for the Morrinsville Recreation Grounds in 2007. A number of improvements resulted which have improved safety at the reserve. A graffiti rapid removal programme has also been established in Morrinsville. The Community Facilities Department have also established working partnerships with the District Police.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Grass Maintenance

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	3.83	4.14
	Neighbourhood	4.00	3.93
	Sports Ground	4.16	3.48
	Other	-	-

2008	Destination	4.13	4.05
	Neighbourhood	4.24	4.16
	Sports Ground	4.27	3.73
	Other	4.31	4.04
2009	Destination	4.49	4.72
	Neighbourhood	4.75	3.94
	Sports Ground	4.86	3.75
	Other	4.84	4.63

Results for each year show satisfaction ratings to generally be lower than importance ratings. Based on 2009 results, user expectations are not being met for 'neighbourhood' parks and 'sports grounds'.

Satisfaction levels with 'destination' and 'other' parks are above average when compared to other Councils.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

The 2009 Christmas /New Year period was particularly wet, producing extraordinary seasonal grass growth at a time when staff annual holidays meant that we did not have sufficient staff resources to keep up with the growth. KVS are putting systems in place to avoid this reoccurring in the future. KVS also have new mowing equipment and have recently changed mowing rotation schedules to ensure mowing standards are met.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Paths and Tracks

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	3.78	3.91
	Neighbourhood	3.80	3.70
	Sports Ground	3.32	3.96
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	3.97	3.90
	Neighbourhood	4.05	4.05
	Sports Ground	3.97	3.47
	Other	3.95	3.77
2009	Destination	4.04	4.12
	Neighbourhood	4.41	4.00
	Sports Ground	3.67	4.33
	Other	4.11	4.34

MPDC park users considered parks and tracks to be more important in 2009 than in the two previous years. They also indicated higher levels of satisfaction. Results indicate Council is providing the correct levels of service.

Satisfaction levels were similar to or slightly above average when compared to other Councils.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

A Track Strategy was adopted in 2008 which identified a series of upgrades to ensure tracks meet New Zealand Track Standards. Implementation of this strategy has begun.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Shade

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	4.21	3.99
	Neighbourhood	3.93	3.70
	Sports Ground	3.84	3.39
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	4.20	4.27
	Neighbourhood	4.21	4.15
	Sports Ground	4.15	3.52
	Other	4.09	4.04
2009	Destination	4.93	4.91
	Neighbourhood	4.79	4.61
	Sports Ground	4.80	3.83
	Other	4.73	4.75

Both importance and satisfaction ratings for shade have increased in the last couple of years. Results indicate there is adequate shade in all of our park categories except sports grounds.

Generally satisfaction levels with shade have been slightly or well above average when compared to other Councils.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

No action has been required for most park categories. Only sports grounds shading is of concern. Some draft Active Reserve Management Plans have management intents stating specimen trees are to be planted in appropriate locations at sports fields. Community Facilities staff will consult sports clubs in regards to this issue.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Signage

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Destination	3.78	3.63
	Neighbourhood	3.10	3.80
	Sports Ground	3.40	3.55
	Other	-	-
2008	Destination	3.67	3.57
	Neighbourhood	3.53	3.18
	Sports Ground	3.52	3.07
	Other	3.96	3.68

2009	Destination	4.09	3.85
	Neighbourhood	3.41	3.48
	Sports Ground	3.39	3.76
	Other	4.00	3.75

MPDC park users have been reasonably consistent from 2007 – 2009 when rating the importance of signage. Satisfaction ratings have generally been similar to importance ratings throughout the same period.

MPDC had higher signage satisfaction ratings (for all park categories) than the average across all Council's in 2009.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

The MPDC Signage Strategy 2008 has been adopted by Council. Money has been budgeted in the 2009-19 Parks and Reserves Asset Management Plan for new and improved signage.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Security (personal safety)

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
2007	Not Surveyed	-	-
2008	Destination	4.42	4.12
	Neighbourhood	4.30	3.41
	Sports Ground	4.45	3.45
	Other	4.30	4.05
2009	Destination	4.56	4.52
	Neighbourhood	4.61	4.12
	Sports Ground	4.92	4.04
	Other	4.55	4.41

MPDC park users were not surveyed regarding their feelings on security in 2007. However results show this was considered important in the 2008 and 2009 surveys. For all park categories, satisfaction ratings are slightly below importance ratings.

Security satisfaction ratings by MPDC park users were above the average for all Councils, with the exception of sports grounds (which was just below average).

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

A CPTED study was undertaken for the Morrinsville Recreation Grounds in 2007. A number of improvements resulted which have improved safety at the reserve. A graffiti rapid removal programme has also been established in Morrinsville. Works are also planned for Hetana Street Reserve to improve lighting, remove some vegetation and improve pathways.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Vehicle Parking

Year	Park Category	MPDC Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	MPDC Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)
------	---------------	---	---

2007	Not Surveyed	-	-
2008	Destination	4.01	3.55
	Neighbourhood	3.91	3.87
	Sports Ground	4.15	4.15
	Other	4.28	3.98
2009	Destination	4.79	4.30
	Neighbourhood	3.74	4.17
	Sports Ground	4.68	4.36
	Other	4.54	4.46

MPDC park users were not surveyed regarding their feelings on vehicle parking in 2007. Results show MPDC park users consider vehicle parking to be of particular importance at 'destination', 'sports grounds' and 'other' parks. Satisfaction ratings for 2009 indicate Council is providing (vehicle parking) levels of service very close to those desired by our park users.

Vehicle parking was an additional question MPDC included in its surveys. Therefore no comparison is available with other Councils.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for park users

In 2007 Council undertook Parking Studies in the Matamata and Morrinsville CBDs. These studies revealed that no significant parking changes are required.

Overall Satisfaction Rates

Survey participants were also asked to provide an overall satisfaction rating of the park they were surveyed in. The following table shows the overall satisfaction rating of MPDC parks has increased each year. In 2009 it reached 4.31 out of 5, exceeding the average satisfaction rating of all Councils.

Year	MPDC Satisfaction	Mean Satisfaction (all Councils)
2007	3.85 (out of 5)	4.25 (out of 5)
2008	3.97 (out of 5)	4.19 (out of 5)
2009	4.31 (out of 5)	4.25 (out of 5)

WINTER PARK CHECK 2008

The 2008 Winter Park Check Survey was a one off survey undertaken in July and August on sports fields during winter sports games. In winter conditions, sports fields are more likely to be vulnerable to damage from the weather. If users are happy with facilities at this time of year it is a strong indication that Council is providing good levels of service. During the survey period the weather was abnormally wet, resulting in numerous sports game cancellations and a lower survey sample size than desired.

Thirty users of each of the following sports fields were surveyed:

- Boyd Park
- Campbell Park
- Matamata Domain

- Morrinsville Recreation Ground

Council staff also intended to undertake surveys at Bedford Park, Waihou Recreation Reserve and Tahuna Domain. However this was not achievable during the survey period due to ongoing extreme weather conditions previously mentioned.

Note that Campbell Park and Bedford Park are owned by private trusts, but are mowed by Council. Both Trusts were consulted about ParkCheck Surveys being undertaken on their sports fields. Council maintains strong relationships with these Trusts and staff have also been assisting them in producing ten year business plans.

The following Councils also participated in the 2008 Winter Park Check Survey:

- Hamilton City Council
- Rotorua District Council
- Taupo District Council

The format of the survey was the same as the (Summer) Park Check Surveys, although some of the categories they were asked to rate were different. Park Users were asked how important the following reserve facilities were to them using a scale of 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important):

- Sports field playing surface
- Children's playgrounds (Under 12 yrs)
- Grass maintenance (condition/maintenance)
- Toilets /changing facilities
- Signs in this park
- Cleanliness/lack of litter/lack of graffiti
- Shelter/spectator comfort
- Parking
- Training/playing lights
- Security – personal safety while in park

Users were then asked to rate how satisfied they were with each of the above facilities using a scale of 1 (very unsatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

The results were as follows:

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Sports Field Playing Surface

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.51	4.51
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.89	4.07

Winter sports field users rated playing surfaces to be of the same importance as the average of all Councils, but satisfaction ratings were slightly below the average.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

KVS also have new mowing equipment and have recently changed mowing rotation schedules to ensure mowing standards are met.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Children's Playgrounds

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.75	3.90
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.15	3.55

MPDC park users did not rate children's playgrounds to be as important as the other Councils. However, they were not fully satisfied with the playgrounds that were being provided.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

Draft Reserve Management Plans have identified many playgrounds will be upgraded as demand increases.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Grass Maintenance

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.32	4.32
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.66	3.94

Grass maintenance was a greater area of concern for MPDC park users than park users of other Councils.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

KVS also have new mowing equipment and have recently changed mowing rotation schedules to ensure mowing standards are met.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Toilets / Changing Facilities

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.43	4.41
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.06	3.26

Like all Council's surveyed, MPDC winter sports field users expectations are not being met in regards to toilet and changing facilities.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

An improvement has already been achieved due to the contractor lifting the level of cleaning. New toilets are to be constructed in the Morrinsville Recreation Ground.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Signage

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.58	3.72
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	2.84	3.10

Whilst signage was not considered as important as many other categories surveyed, user expectations were still not being met.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

The MPDC Signage Strategy 2008 has been adopted by Council. Money has been budgeted in the 2009-19 Parks and Reserves Asset Management Plan for new and improved signage.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Cleanliness / Lack of Litter / Lack of Graffiti

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.50	4.48
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.02	3.98

Satisfaction ratings with the cleanliness of our sports fields are just above the average for all Councils, but are below importance ratings.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

A graffiti rapid removal programme has been established in Morrinsville. CPTED work at the Morrinsville Recreation Ground has also led to a reduction in graffiti and increased cleanliness. The Community Facilities Department have also established working partnerships with the District Police.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Shelter / Spectator Comfort

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.30	4.08
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.08	2.89

MPDC is the same as other Councils in not providing shelter and spectator comfort to a level our winter sports park users' desire.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

Some draft Active Reserve Management Plans have management intents stating specimen trees are to be planted in appropriate locations at sports fields. This will assist with shelter and comfort for spectators. Community Facilities staff will consult sports clubs in regards to this issue.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Parking

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.41	4.40
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.90	3.80

Satisfaction ratings with parking at our sports fields are above the average for all Councils, but are below importance ratings.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

In 2007 Council undertook Parking Studies in the Matamata and Morrinsville CBDs. These studies revealed that no significant parking changes are required.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Sports Grounds Training / Playing Lights

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.76	3.97
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.64	3.67

MPDC importance and satisfaction ratings are quite similar; indicating current levels of sports ground lighting are adequate.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

Sports field users indicated current levels of service are adequate. Sports field lights are owned and operated by sporting clubs.

Importance vs. Satisfaction: Safety / Security

	MPDC	Average (all Councils)
Importance (1= very low, 5 = very high)	4.40	4.41
Satisfaction (1= very low, 5 = very high)	3.87	3.97

Satisfaction ratings with safety are slightly lower than the average of all Councils.

What Council has done / is doing to improve satisfaction for sports field users

A CPTED study was undertaken for the Morrinsville Recreation Grounds in 2007. A number of improvements resulted which have improved safety at the reserve. A graffiti rapid removal programme has also been established in Morrinsville. The Community Facilities Department have also established working partnerships with the District Police.

Overall Satisfaction Rates

Survey participants were also asked to provide an overall satisfaction rating of the sports park they were surveyed in. The following table shows the overall satisfaction rating of MPDC sports parks was slightly below the average for all Councils.

Year	MPDC Satisfaction	Mean Satisfaction (all Councils)
2008	3.88 (out of 5)	3.98 (out of 5)

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no policy or bylaw issues.

LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Community Facilities

Asset Management Plans have been produced for the Community Facilities Department for the 2009-2019 LTCCP. The Community Facilities Activity Plans identify a number of upcoming projects which will further improve public satisfaction with public parks. These include:

- Producing a Reserves Strategy
- Producing a Disability Strategy
- Implementing management intents from the Reserve Management Plans
- Proposed relocation of Matamata soccer from the Matamata Domain to either Swap or Pohlen park
- Expansion of soccer facilities at the Morrinsville Recreation Ground
- Replacement and upgrade of Morrinsville public toilets
- Cemeteries signage
- Cemeteries expansions
- Landscaping works at the Morrinsville Cemetery
- Renewal of the Te Aroha Domain playground

Community Facilities are Council activities focused on recreational and cultural opportunities in the district. Previously, much of the work we have done in this area has been around the provision of services and assets, such as the libraries, swimming pools, parks and reserves and other public amenities. In the future, Council will be looking to see how it can enhance the provision of these services to the community through the forming of partnerships with other regional and national organisations focused on social and cultural wellbeing.

- *Parks and Reserves*
 - *Provide the linkage between Council's strategic goals for parks and reserves and the current levels of service of service*
 - *Identify opportunities for improvement and implications of those improvements*
- *Public Amenities*
 - *Provide the linkage between Council's strategic goals for public amenities and the current levels of service*
 - *Identify opportunities for improvement and subsequent implications of those improvements*

FOUR WELL-BEINGS

By ensuring we maintain parks at a standard our community is happy with, we also ensure they are well utilised. This allows us to contribute to well-beings. Positive effects of parks on well-beings include:

- Allows for physical activity and development
- Assists with improving health from the provision of open space
- Increased visitors due to district attractions
- Provides areas for community events

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

- Belonging to our Community
- Healthy Air, Water, Land: Healthy People
- Planning and Development

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

No financial resource impact.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive the information regarding Park Check results, trends and issues.

6.5 TRANSFER STATION PRICE REVIEW 2009

File No: SWM520402
Responsible Officer: G Ridley
 Infrastructure Manager
Author: D Locke
 Waste Management Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The cost of operating the Refuse Transfer Stations has increased since the last review and it is now appropriate to consider increasing the charges.

The cost of general refuse per tonne was increased in February 2008; however the cost of disposal has increased by 11.7% since then. Council needs to increase transfer station charges if we want to recover this additional cost.

This report evaluates current charges and benchmarks our charges against other Territorial Local Authorities.

BACKGROUND

Current charges applied to Council's Refuse Transfer Stations

All transfer station charges were reviewed in February last year and as a result the refuse per tonne charge was increased. No change was made to green waste, scrap steel or the minimum charges.

Comparison of our current charges to neighbouring Council's green waste, refuse and scrap steel charges

The following table illustrates the comparison between Matamata-Piako District Council transfer station charges and neighbouring Council charges.

	Matamata Piako	T.C.D.C	Hauraki	Hamilton	Tauranga	Waipa (private)
Green Waste Tonnage	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$70.00	\$73.00	\$80.00	\$20.00 per m3
General Refuse Tonnage(1 st July 2009)	\$110.00 (Presently)	\$145.00	\$145.00	\$112.50	\$140.00	\$135.00
Scrap Steel Tonnage	\$45.00 or \$12/m3	Free	Free	\$95.50	Free	Free

Council's green waste tonnage charge of \$60.00 per tonne compares favourably with neighbouring Councils.

Our scrap steel charge is more likely to represent actual cost whereas other Council's may be subsidising the cost of managing these items. If scrap steel were to be reduced the contractor who manages the transfer stations will still recover \$45 per tonne from Council for scrap metal, as negotiated in the Heads of Agreement.

ISSUES

Implications of current charges applied to Council's Transfer Stations

At present Council's green waste charges are consistent with our neighbours.

There are plans to install a portable scale at Waihou (effective 1 June 2009) due to the large discrepancy occurring between volumetric charges in Waihou versus weighing at Tirohia landfill. There also needs to be consistency with transfer stations at Morrinsville and Matamata.

The cost of operating the transfer station's has increased significantly since green waste and minimum charges were last increased. These increasing costs are being funded through general rates, which is not consistent with Council's funding policy for transfer stations.

STATUTORY ISSUES

There are no statutory issues.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no policy or bylaw issues.

SIGNIFICANCE POLICY

This issue is not considered significant in terms of Council's Significance Policy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Our current refuse charges are \$110.00 per tonne. The true cost calculated on contract payment divided by tonnage disposed off would be around \$126.72 plus the additional waste levy cost of \$10.00, therefore our recommendation would be to increase the charge to \$137.00 per tonne, which is still in alignment with neighbouring Council charges.

OPTIONS

Green waste tonnage charge (All Transfer Stations)

- 1 Continue with current charge of \$60.00 per tonne.

Note: Aligning with neighbouring Council's green waste charges reduces the possibility of large green waste quantities being brought into our District.

Refuse tonnage charge (All Transfer Stations)

- 1 Continue with the current charge of \$110.00 per tonne
- 2 Increase refuse tonnage charge to \$137.00 per tonne to reduce subsidising from the general rate and to be more in line with Council funding policy and

the New Zealand Waste Management Strategy, 2002 objective of full cost recovery (100% user pays/targeted).

Note: This cost is significantly higher than current prices and could possibly lead to ratepayers not using the Transfer Stations and an increase in illegal dumping.

Scrap metal tonnage charge (All Transfer Stations)

- 1 Continue with current charge of \$45.00 per tonne.

Minimum charges (All Transfer Stations)

- 1 Continue with current charges.
- 2 Increase consistent with proposed increases in general refuse tonnage charge:

TYPE	REFUSE \$137/T		GREEN WASTE \$60/T	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
Bag	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$1.00	\$1.50
Car	\$6.90	\$9.00	N/A	\$4.00
Station Wagon /Ute/ Single Axle Trailer	\$14.90	\$19.00	\$8.90	\$9.00
Tandem Trailer/ Commercial	\$26.90	\$33.00	\$17.90	\$18.00

Note: Waihou Transfer Station will be consistent with the above charges effective 1 July 2009.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That:

1. the report be received.
2. the following proposals be accepted:
3. green waste tonnage charge to remain at \$60.00 per tonne.
4. general refuse tonnage charge increases to \$137 per tonne.
5. scrap steel tonnage charge to remain at \$45.00 per tonne.
6. increase minimum charges at the Refuse Transfer Stations to:

TYPE	REFUSE \$137/T	GREEN WASTE \$60/T
Bag	\$3.00	\$1.50
Car	\$9.00	\$4.00
Station Wagon /Ute/ Single Axle Trailer	\$19.00	\$9.00
Tandem Trailer/ Commercial	\$33.50	\$18.00

6.6 QUOTABLE VALUE PRESENTATION

File No: SUP562808
Responsible Officer: M Te Wiata
Community and Support Services Manager
Author: J Payze
Committee Secretary
Proposed Meeting Date: 27-May-2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.00 pm – 2.00 pm

Ms Melanie Gallagher, Ms Anna Krieger and Mr Richard Allen are to make a presentation to Council regarding the triennial revaluation 2009.

POLICY AND BYLAW ISSUES

There are no other Policy or Bylaw issues in relation to this matter.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the information from Quotable Value be received.

7 URGENT ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

8 EXCLUSION FROM THE PUBLIC

9 CLOSURE