

**SOUTH WAIRARAPA DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING
ANNUAL PLAN HEARINGS
Agenda 10 June 2020**

NOTICE OF MEETING

The meeting will be held in the Martinborough Town Hall, Waihinga Centre, Texas Street, Martinborough and will commence at 9.00am. The meeting will be held in public with the express purpose of hearing and deliberating on submissions to the Annual Plan 2020/2021.

SWDC Affirmation

We pledge that we will faithfully and impartially use our skill, wisdom and judgement throughout discussions and deliberations ahead of us today in order to make responsible and appropriate decisions for the benefit of the South Wairarapa district at large.

We commit individually and as a Council to the principles of integrity and respect, and to upholding the vision and values we have adopted in our Long Term Plan strategic document in order to energise, unify and enrich our district.

1. **Apologies**
2. **Conflicts of Interest**
3. **Submissions Hearings as per Schedule**

Schedule of Submission Hearings 10 June		
Sub. No.	Submitter	Start Time
36	Janine Price	9.05am
938	Campbell Moon	9.15am

Schedule of Submission Hearings 10 June		
Sub. No.	Submitter	Start Time
61	Tim Fenwick, Jenna Telford, Edwin Read for Greytown Rugby Football Club	9.25am
171	Jeremy Thompson	9.45am
475	Rachel Clifford	9.55am
656	Tessa Bunny via Zoom	10.05am
908	Daphne Geisler	10.15am
185	Jackie Gray, Greytown Community Sports and Leisure Society	10.25am
Morning Tea		10:35am
604	Ed Cooke	10.55am
907	Ann Rainford and Shelley Symes, Greytown Community Board	11.05am
349	Minty Hunter	11.15am
147	Gary Hall	11.25am
173	Peter Ratner	11.35am
77	William Cole (not confirmed)	11.45am
142	Liz Mellish	11.55am
889	Mike Gray	12.15pm
574	Principal Simon Fuller and students Briar Matthews, Whai Haami, Te Aorangi Kingi, Amelia O'Connell, Serenity Wilson, Alex Mason, Kuranui College	12.25pm
Lunch		12.35pm
582	Featherston Rugby Club (not confirmed)	1.05pm
675	Graeme Thomson	1.15pm
692	Alex von der Beeck	1.25pm
724	Chris Hodson	1.35pm
876 & 877	Pauline and Jim Hedley	1.45pm

Schedule of Submission Hearings 10 June		
Sub. No.	Submitter	Start Time
850	Michael Jones (not confirmed)	1.55pm
737	David Famularo	2.05pm
751	Warren Woodgyer	2:15pm
764	Dean di Bona	2:25pm
821	Neil Galbreath	2.45pm
826	Bob and Jenny Tosswill	2.55pm
Afternoon Tea		3.05pm
892	Graham Evans	3.25pm
871	Neil and Gregory Montgomerie-Crowe	3.35pm
880	Brian Baxter and Alan Percy, Cobblestones Museum	3.45pm
896	Phil Gibbons, Sport Wellington via Zoom	3.55pm
890	Colin Wright	4.05pm
633	Neil McCallum	4.25pm
958	Narida Hooper, Riki Hiemer, Karen Mikaere and Warren Maxwell for Pae tū Mōkai o Taurā	4.35pm

Recommended Council Resolution (required from 3:00pm):

That the Annual Plan 2020/21 submissions hearings and deliberations meeting on **10 June 2020** continue beyond the six-hour time limit on meetings prescribed by South Wairarapa District Council's Standing Orders.



**SOUTH WAIRARAPA
DISTRICT COUNCIL**
Kia Reretahi Tātau

**SOUTH WAIRARAPA DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING
ANNUAL PLAN HEARINGS
Agenda 11 June 2020**

NOTICE OF MEETING

The meeting will be held in the Martinborough Town Hall, Waihinga Centre, Texas Street, Martinborough and will commence at 9.00am. The meeting will be held in public with the express purpose of hearing and deliberating on submissions to the Annual Plan 2020/2021.

SWDC Affirmation

We pledge that we will faithfully and impartially use our skill, wisdom and judgement throughout discussions and deliberations ahead of us today in order to make responsible and appropriate decisions for the benefit of the South Wairarapa district at large.

We commit individually and as a Council to the principles of integrity and respect, and to upholding the vision and values we have adopted in our Long Term Plan strategic document in order to energise, unify and enrich our district.

1. **Apologies**
2. **Conflicts of Interest**
3. **Submissions Hearings**

Schedule of Submission Hearings 11 June		
Sub. No.	Submitter	Start Time
922	John Gilberthorpe	9.05am
879	Aidan Ellims	9.15am
268	Alistair and Jenny Boyne	9.25am

Schedule of Submission Hearings 11 June		
Sub. No.	Submitter	Start Time
429	Alistair Holmes and Frank Aldridge	9.35am
42	Jack Shepperd	9.55am
887	Jack Shepperd for Wairarapa Moana Trail Group	10.05am
852	Karen Krogh	10.25am
Morning Tea		10:35am
954	Dan Riddiford	10.55am
829	Kim Hewson, Greytown Swimming Club	11.05am
779	Steve Carlin, Greytown NZ Football Skills Centre	11.15am
564	Rachel Gawith, Greytown Junior Football Club	11.25am
775	Sue Fox	11.35am
610	David Binning (not confirmed)	11.45am
690	Ritchie Wards	11.55am
748	David Montgomerie	12.05pm
953	Kevin Murphy, Greytown Trust Lands	12.15pm
Lunch		12.25pm
959	Rates and Sports Hub Petition	1.00pm
961	John Hayes	1.10pm
477	Gary Hewson	1.20pm

4. Deliberations


4.1 Annual Plan Report (Report to be tabled, appendix attached)

Recommended Council Resolution (required from 3:00pm):

That the Annual Plan 2020/21 submissions hearings and deliberations meeting on **11 June 2020** continue beyond the six-hour time limit on meetings prescribed by South Wairarapa District Council's Standing Orders.

APPENDIX 1 - ANNUAL PLAN CONSULTATION 2020/21

ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS



APPENDIX 1 - SUBMISSIONS ON THE ANNUAL PLAN CONSULTATION

This document provides an analysis of submissions on the proposed Annual Plan for 2020/21. It has been prepared to assist the Council in its decision-making. Council will hear members of the public who wish to present their submissions in person and take into account the views of submitters before making decisions on the proposals.

The community were encouraged to have their say on the [South Wairarapa District Council Plan for 2020/21](#) between Friday 24 April 2020 and Sunday 24 May 2020. Submissions could be made in a variety of ways including online, by email, fax, post, phone or by dropping a paper copy to the library or Council Office when venues were open.

We received a total of 955 submissions. 792 submissions were received online through the link provided on the Council website (83%), 32 submissions were received through the link via our ratepayer email database (3.4%), 78 submissions were received by email (8.2%), 52 submissions were received in paper form (5.4%); one submission was received by phone call (0.1%) and there were no submissions received by fax.

Submitters were asked to provide details of whether they were an urban, rural or commercial ratepayer, or a non-ratepayer. The breakdown is as follows:

- Urban (54% of all submitters)
- Rural (23% of all submitters)
- Commercial (2.5% of all submitters)
- Non-ratepayer (17% of all submitters)


Ratepayer details were not provided for 6.4% of submitters.¹

¹ Note the ratepayer percentages sum to more than 100% because some submitters selected multiple responses.

Graph 1: Ratepayer Status of Submitters

Ratepayer

Answered: 894 Skipped: 61



We also received two petitions outside of the consultation process and timeframe. One petition was on the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal and stated to be on behalf of 383 people and the other was on rates and operational spending and stated to be on behalf of 336 people. These petitions have been included as a submission under the name of the petitioner for the purposes of this analysis.

TOPIC 1: WATER SUPPLY AND WATER RESILIENCE

Water Supply

Submitters were asked if they agree that the water supply should be Council's main focus next year. Of the total 955 submitters, 657 responded to this question (69%).

Of everyone who answered the question, 80% agreed water supply should be Council's main focus next year (524 from the 657 that responded) and 20% did not agree (133 of the 657 that responded).

Water Conservation Action Plan

Submitters were asked if they think it is important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan. Of the total 955 submitters, 662 responded to this question (69%).

Of those that responded, 93% thought it is important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan (615 from the 662 that responded). Forty seven respondents did not think it is important (7% of those that responded).

WATER SUPPLY AND WATER RESILIENCE

DISCUSSION TOPIC

1

Do you agree that the water supply should be Council's main focus next year?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you think it's important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you support any of the proposed water resilience actions (as detailed on page 3)? (Tick all that you support otherwise leave all blank)


- ☐ Reducing the water allowance per property
- ☐ Removing the Water by Meter Write-off Policy
- ☐ Offering subsidised water tanks, at cost, paid back over a period of time
- ☐ Requiring new builds to have their own water storage solution
- ☐ Installing smart meters to monitor water consumption and leaks

Do you have any other comments you would like to make on the actions proposed above or have other ideas for the Action Plan?

Graph 2: Water Supply

Water supply should be Council's main focus next year

Answered: 657 Skipped: 298




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	80%	524
No	20%	133
TOTAL		657

Graph 3: Water Conservation Action Plan

It is important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan

Answered: 662 Skipped: 293



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	93%	615
No	7%	47
TOTAL		662

Water Resilience Actions

Submitters were asked if they support any of the proposed water resilience actions as detailed on page 3 of the [Consultation Document](#), including:


- Reducing the water allowance per property;
- Removing the Water by Meter Write-off Policy;
- Offering subsidised water tanks, at cost, paid back over a period of time;
- Requiring new builds to have their own water storage solution; and
- Installing smart meters to monitor water consumption and leaks.

There was greatest support for requiring new builds to have their own water storage solution (410 submitters) and offering subsidised water tanks, at cost, paid back over a period of time (406 submitters). 334 submitters supported installing smart meters to monitor water consumption and leaks, 136 submitters supported reducing the water allowance per property and 52 submitters supported removing the Water by Meter Write-off Policy.

Graph 4: Proposed Water Resilience Actions

Level of support for proposed water resilience actions

Answered: 582 Skipped: 373



Comments Received

Submitters were asked if they had any other comments on the actions proposed or had any other ideas for the Action Plan and 206 submitters provided comments. Many of those that commented expressed support for improved household, network or reservoir storage to reduce outage impacts or drought impacts. A significant amount of comments focused on giving households the tools, such as live consumption data and bigger rain tanks, to manage their own demand before a blanket reduction in allowance or removal of policies.

Additional suggestions, or points of note, include:

- Supporting the retrofitting of grey water use in existing homes;
- Subsidising home leak survey and repairs;
- Encouraging increased tree planting (where appropriate) to reduce garden water losses;

- Communications with commercial and agricultural consumers on water conservation measures;
- Dry River Creek usage;
- Community engagement in water issues to capture local knowledge;
- User pays for water consumption;
- Partial reduction in allowance (or none) and policy changes but only when data and self-management of consumption is enabled;
- Concern at the cost of district-wide cost of water meter installation;
- Concern at the disproportionate impact of reducing allowance on larger households;
- Promoting compostable toilets to reduce wastewater demand; and
- Council demonstrating best practice by capturing its own building rainwater and reusing it to keep trees/grounds alive in summer.

TOPIC 2A: CONTINUE EXTENDED HOURS FOR SWIMMING POOLS

Submitters were asked if they agreed that we should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours next summer. Three quarters of submitters responded to this question (714 of the total 955 submitters).

Of those that responded, 90% agreed that Council should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours next summer (644 of the 714 that responded).

CONTINUE EXTENDED HOURS FOR SWIMMING POOLS

DISCUSSION
TOPIC

2^A


Do you agree that we should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours next summer?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Graph 5: Trialing Extended Swimming Pool Hours

Council should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours

Answered: 714 Skipped: 241



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	90%	644
No	10%	70
TOTAL		714

Comments Received

491 submitters provided comments about the extended swimming pool hours trial. Of the 435 submitters who supported the trial and provided comments:

- 252 consider swimming pools to be a beneficial resource that provide positive outcomes for families and communities, including learning to swim, exercise for all ages, entertainment, building community culture and general wellbeing; and
- 226 noted opening hours need to suit the range of residents in the community.

It is evident from the comments that there is a wide group of users and they all have different needs; commuters want opening times in the evening, seniors want time alone without children, people who exercise want dedicated swim lanes and children want time on the weekends.

Of the 52 submitters who did not support the trial and provided comments:

- 14 consider there is not enough use to warrant extended pool hours; and
- 14 consider longer hours not to be a priority for council and that money would be better spent elsewhere.

Other comments, or points of note, include:

- There was some support for user-pays or gold coin donations for adults, especially to help fund swimming pools;
- A small number of respondents did not appear to know swimming pools are currently free;
- There was a suggestion council could sell advertising within pool complex to help fund swimming pools; and
- There was a suggestion to have one covered pool with extended hours and close the other two pools.

TOPIC 2B: GREYTOWN SPORTS AND RECREATION HUB

Green Space in Greytown

Submitters were asked if they think that Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown. Ninety two percent of people responded to this question (876 of 955 submitters).

Of those that responded, around three-quarters (74%) of submitters thought Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown.

GREYTOWN SPORTS AND RECREATION HUB

DISCUSSION
TOPIC

2B

Do you think that the Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you support funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal (as detailed on page 4)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partial

If you selected 'Partial' as you support funding for parts of the proposal, but not all, tick all that you support

☐ Contribution to the Kuranui College gymnasium replacement

☐ Purchase of the Rugby Club land


☐ Purchase of the Bowling Club land

Why is this?

Graph 6: Space for Sports and Recreation in Greytown

Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown

Answered: 876 Skipped: 79



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Yes	74%	652
▼ No	26%	224
TOTAL		876

Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub Proposal

Submitters were also asked if they support funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal as detailed on Page 4 of the [Consultation Document](#).


Of those who made a submission on the consultation, 98% provided a response to this question (940 of the 955 that submitted).

Of those who responded to this question, 63% supported funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub, 28% did not support it and 9% supported funding for parts of the proposal but not all of it.

Graph 7: Funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub Proposal

Support for funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal

Answered: 940 Skipped: 15



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Yes	63%	589
▼ No	28%	264
▼ Partial	9%	87
TOTAL		940

Of those that supported partial funding of the proposal:

- 70% supported contribution to the Kuranui College gymnasium replacement (61 of 87);
- 36% supported purchase of the Rugby Club land (31 of 87); and
- 31% supported purchase of the Bowling Club land (27 of 87).²

Comments Received

Submitters on this question were asked to comment on the reasons for their response and 751 submitters (80%) did so. Common themes from submitters who supported funding all or part of the proposal include:

- A concern regarding the lack of, or loss of, current green space (209 comments) and the need to accommodate growth in Greytown (97 comments);
- The need for recreational and sporting space for children and families (144 comments);
- The community benefit including providing a social focus (96 comments);
- The benefits of sport and recreation for health and wellbeing (88 comments);
- Support for a multi-use space (58 comments); and
- A concern for the potential loss of the clubs and the historic contribution they and sports in general have made to the town (37 comments).

² Note these percentages sum to more than 100% because submitters who partially supported funding of the proposal could support more than one of the three components.

Common themes from submitters who did not support funding all or part of the proposal include:

- A desire to make better use of existing facilities in other towns (103 comments);
- Essential infrastructure seen as a higher priority (83 comments); and
- Economic concerns including unaffordability in the current climate and rates affordability (69 comments) and the view that the proposal should not be funded through borrowing as fundraising or via financial reserves should be preferred (48 comments).

Themes in relation to the contribution to the Kuranui College Gymnasium include:

- Submitters in support recognised that the facility would be available for all the community to use (17 comments); and
- Submitters who did not support the contribution considered that the gymnasium upgrade should not be the responsibility of ratepayers but funded by the Ministry of Education or through other funding (38 comments).

Other comments, or points of note, include:

- A full needs analysis/business case should be undertaken which includes the whole district and available facilities, all options and a whole-of-life cost analysis;
- The need to investigate other funding approaches, including Lottery and community funding, Greytown targeted rates, selling Council assets, contributions from other councils in the region, and the Pain Farm Estate;
- The Greytown Trust Land Trust's role in providing for the Greytown community; its ability to sell the land; the view that the land is already a community asset; concerns there is undue pressure on the Council to buy the land, that market rates should not be paid or that the land should be gifted to Council;
- Council's role in managing the Kuranui College Gymnasium and funding a government asset; the risk of capital cost increase; and the gym's limited availability to ratepayers at inconvenient times;
- The need to consider the impact of Covid-19 on the proposal including the community's economic position, the need for Covid-friendly pastimes and impact on participation models;
- A perceived lack of consistency and investment across the towns; and
- The Fire Service's need for open space for emergency helicopter landings in Greytown.

TOPIC 3: LAND TRANSPORT

Submitters were asked what they thought about Council's proposals for land transport as detailed on Page 5 of the [Consultation Document](#) and if we should be doing more to promote walking and cycling in the district.

490 submitters provided comments. Of these:

- 259 supported the promotion of trails, both within the road corridor and across country. Comments suggest that this support has intensified due to the impact of the Covid-19 restrictions which saw an uptake in walking and cycling across the community. There was also support for cycling/walking connectivity between the three towns in the district;
- 94 submitters commented on pedestrian and cycle safety and the need to ensure any new facilities are safe;
- 22 submitters supported footpath improvements including infilling of missing footpaths;
- 33 submitters supported additional funding for roads; and
- 24 submitters commented on the street tree proposals with an even balance between those who did and did not support the proposals.

LAND TRANSPORT

DISCUSSION
TOPIC

3

What do you think about Council's proposals for land transport (page 5)? Should we be doing more to promote walking and cycling in the district?

TOPIC 4: WASTE MINIMISATION

Waste Minimisation Action Plan

Submitters were asked if they think it is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan. Sixty-eight percent of those who submitted responded to this question (647 of 955 submitters).

Of those that responded, 93% thought it is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan (599 of the 647 that responded).

DISCUSSION TOPIC

4

WASTE MINIMISATION

Do you think it is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you support any of the waste minimisation ideas proposed (as detailed on Page 6)? (Tick all that you support otherwise leave all blank)

☐ Moving to a more user pays model, i.e. increasing the cost of council rubbish bags

☐ Providing a wheelie bin for general rubbish, paid for through rates

☐ Providing recycling stations in urban areas

☐ Encouraging food composting


☐ Reducing the availability of Council agendas and papers at meetings

Do you have any other comments you would like to make on the proposed ideas above or any other ideas about what Council could do to help the district send less waste to landfill?

Graph 8: Waste Minimisation Action Plan

It is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan

Answered: 647 Skipped: 308



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Yes	93%	599
▼ No	7%	48
TOTAL		647

Waste Minimisation Ideas

Submitters were asked if they supported any of the waste minimisation ideas as detailed on Page 6 of the [Consultation Document](#), including:


- Moving to a more user-pays model i.e. increasing the cost of council rubbish bags;
- Providing a wheelie bin for general rubbish, paid for through rates;
- Providing recycling stations in urban areas;
- Encouraging food composting; and
- Reducing the availability of Council agendas and papers at meeting.

There was greatest level of support for encouraging food composting (448 submitters) and providing recycling stations in urban areas (407 submitters). 316 submitters supported reducing the availability of Council agendas and papers at meetings, 277 supported providing a wheelie bin for general rubbish, paid for through rates and 190 submitters supported moving to a more user-pays model (i.e. increasing the cost of council rubbish bags).

Graph 9: Proposed Waste Minimisation Ideas

Level of support for proposed waste minimisation ideas

Answered: 615 Skipped: 340



Comments Received

261 submitters provided additional comments about the waste minimisation proposals. The most common response was support for an expanded education programme for individuals and businesses to reduce waste. There were some concerns about the impact of price rises including that increasing the cost of bags will encourage fly-tipping. Some concerns were also expressed about the use of wheelie bins. These included health and safety issues, such as restrictions in the footpath space and use of bins in light of Covid-19. Some respondents also commented that wheelie bins provide a larger space for rubbish that may get filled at the expense of recycling. There was some aspiration to use non-plastic bags and to improve access to recycling facilities, such as extended opening times, locations, and more rural support.

Other ideas included:

- developing an upcycle/reuse facility like the one at Wellington City Council waste station;
- having different sized bags/bins;
- Council doing its own composting, although there were also concerns expressed about the current Greytown facility encouraging vermin and odour; and
- a need for greater communication about the success to date of minimisation efforts to show the benefits and encourage people to do more.

TOPIC 5: BUILDING CAPABILITY

Submitters were asked what they thought about the Council's proposals to build the organisation's capability and improve delivery of services, as detailed on Page 6 of the [Consultation Document](#).

There were 290 submitters who provided comments about building Council's capability. Of these, 194 submitters expressed a view about whether they supported the proposal or not:

- 145 expressed support (75%);
- 29 disagreed with funds being spent on building capability (15%); and
- 21 were unsure (11%).

Of the 290 submitters who provided comments:

- 57 commented that Council should invest in IT and systems to increase efficiency and work in alternative ways;
- 48 indicated that Council needed to undertake cost benefit analysis first and would want to see measurable differences for the money spent; and
- 8 supported some form of shared services but the comments suggest an assumption that this would come with cost benefits to ratepayers.

In addition, 20 submitters provided comments that suggested they did not fully understand the question.



RATES, FEES AND CHARGES

A number of submitters commented on the proposed rates increases, fees and charges as detailed on Pages 7 to 9 of the [Consultation Document](#).

66 submitters commented on rates increases:

- 13 supported a zero rates increase;
- 8 supported a reduced rates increase;
- 21 suggested that Council re-examine expenditure in light of the potential long-term impacts of Covid-19;
- 9 did not support Council borrowing to fund operating costs; and
- 15 commented that essential infrastructure should be prioritised above non-essential activities.

5 submitters commented on fees and charges:

- 4 did not support increased planning and building fees; and
- 1 did not support increased venue fees.

Note that comments relating to a proposed rates increase to pay for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub are addressed in the analysis of that question.

OTHER FEEDBACK FOR THE ANNUAL PLAN 2020/21

Submitters were also given the opportunity to provide other feedback on the Annual Plan and 220 submitters did so. Many points reiterated comments made about discussion topics and rates, fees and charges and have therefore been considered under those sections in this submissions analysis.

In addition, there were 12 comments regarding senior housing:

- 6 submitters considered senior housing should only be upgraded to minimum standards for healthy homes;
- 4 considered it should be a priority to upgrade or build more; and
- 2 considered that senior housing should not be provided by Council.

There were 18 comments regarding other amenities provided by Council:

- 5 submitters considered that other amenities should only be brought up to a standard that was a safe and acceptable state of repair; and
- 13 submitters provided general comments about particular Council amenities.

There were 46 comments (including those comments relating to rates and funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub) that supported a focus on spending on infrastructure rather than funding non-essentials.

There was a broad range of other feedback on different aspects of Council's service delivery, including contract management, events, governance and regulatory functions. There was some support for an increased focus on youth, the environment, health and wellbeing.

There were 22 comments that specifically mentioned the need for improvements in Council's building services function.

There were 36 comments from submitters who did not feel there was enough information or detail in the consultation document.

ONLINE SURVEY — NON-SUBMITTED RESPONSES

The online survey tool recorded submitters' responses as they progressed through the survey. There were 255 records of responses from those who had started the survey but did not go through to the end to provide their personal details and submit the submission. The tool records the responder's IP address, the date the survey was started and when a record has been modified. It is not possible to ascertain if the 255 responses are from the same person using a different device, from different persons using the same IP address or whether the responders intended to submit the form. The 255 responses are not considered to be submissions and have not, therefore, been included within the analysis of submissions. However, the analysis of the quantitative responses is included below for information.³ Here, the non-submitted responses are combined with the submissions in order to determine whether there is any difference in trends between the two.

The 255 non-submitted responses combined with the 955 submissions gives a total of 1,210 responses.

TOPIC 1: WATER SUPPLY AND WATER RESILIENCE

Water Supply


When considering both submissions and non-submitted responses, 835 provided a response to the question "Do you agree that the water supply should be Council's main focus next year?"

Of those that responded, 78% agreed and 22% did not agree. This is similar to the submissions-only response where 80% agreed and 20% did not agree.

Graph 10: Water Supply (submissions and non-submitted responses)

Water supply should be Council's main focus next year

Answered: 835 Skipped: 375



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	78%	655
No	22%	180
TOTAL		835

³ This means Topics 3 (Land Transport), 5 (Building Capability) and Rates, Fees and Charges are not included as these were in the form of qualitative responses.

Water Conservation Action Plan


When considering both submissions and non-submitted responses, 838 provided a response to the question “Do you think it is important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan?”

Of those that responded, 93% thought it was important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan. This is the same as the result from the submissions-only responses.

Graph 11: Water Conservation Action Plan (submissions and non-submitted responses)

It is important for Council to develop a Water Conservation Action Plan

Answered: 838 Skipped: 372



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	93%	778
No	7%	60
TOTAL		838

Water Resilience Actions


There was greatest level of support for requiring new buildings to have their own water storage solution (489 responders) and offering subsidised water tanks, at a cost, paid back over a period of time (485 responders). 422 responders supported installing smart meters to monitor water consumption and leaks, 157 responders supported reducing the water allowance per property and 68 responders supported removing the Water by Meter Write-off Policy.

The ranking order from most supported to least supported water resilience action is the same ranking order as the result from the submissions-only responses.

Graph 12: Water Resilience Actions (submissions and non-submitted responses)

Level of support for proposed water resilience actions

Answered: 738 Skipped: 472



TOPIC 2A: CONTINUE EXTENDED HOURS FOR SWIMMING POOLS


When considering both submissions and non-submitted responses, 880 responded to the question on whether Council should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours next summer.

Of those that responded, 90% agreed Council should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours next summer. This is the same as the result from submissions-only responses.

Graph 13: Trialing Extended Swimming Pool Hours (submissions and non-submitted responses)

Council should continue to trial extended swimming pool hours

Answered: 880 Skipped: 330



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	90%	792
No	10%	88
TOTAL		880

TOPIC 2B: GREYTOWN SPORTS AND RECREATION HUB

Green Space in Greytown


When considering both submissions and non-submitted responses, 1,072 responded to the question of whether Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown.

Of those that responded to this question, 76% thought Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown. This is similar to the submissions-only responses where 74% agreed.

Graph 14: Space for Sports and Recreation in Greytown (submissions and non-submitted responses)

Council should provide more space for sports and recreation in Greytown

Answered: 1,072 Skipped: 138



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	76%	814
No	24%	258
TOTAL		1,072

Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub Proposal

When considering both submissions and non-submitted responses, 1,150 responded to the question “Do you support funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal?”

Of those that responded to this question, 64% supported funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal, 26% did not support it, and 10% supported funding for parts of the proposal but not all of it. This is a similar result to the submissions-only responses where 63% supported it, 28% did not support it and 9% supported funding for parts of the proposal but not all of it.

Of the 112 that support parts of the proposal but not all:


- 68% supported contribution to the Kuranui College gymnasium replacement (76 of 112),
- 31% supported purchase of the Rugby Club land (35 of 112)

- 28% supported purchase of the Bowling Club land (31 of 112).⁴

Graph 15: Funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub Proposal (submissions and non-submitted responses)

Support for funding for the Greytown Sports and Recreation Hub proposal

Answered: 1,150 Skipped: 60



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
▼ Yes	64%	737
▼ No	26%	301
▼ Partial	10%	112
TOTAL		1,150

⁴ Note: These percentages sum to more than 100% because submitters who partially supported funding of the proposal could support more than one of the three components.

TOPIC 4: WASTE MINIMISATION


When considering both submissions and non-submitted responses, 719 responded to the question “Do you think it is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan?”

Of those that responded to this question, 92% agreed it is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan. This is similar to the completed responses where 93% agreed.

Graph 16: Waste Minimisation Action Plan (submissions and non-submitted responses)

It is important for Council to develop a Waste Minimisation Action Plan

Answered: 719 Skipped: 491



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
▼ Yes	92% 664
▼ No	8% 55
TOTAL	719

Waste Minimisation Ideas

There was greatest level of support for encouraging food composting (493 responders) and providing recycling stations in urban areas (451 responders). 344 responders supported reducing the availability of Council agendas and papers at meetings, 316 responders supported providing a wheelie bin for general rubbish paid for through rates and 204 responders supported moving to a more user pays model (i.e. increasing the cost of council rubbish bags).

The ranking order from most supported to least supported waste minimisation ideas is the same as the ranking order from the submissions-only responses.

Graph 17: Waste Minimisation Ideas (submissions and non-submitted responses)

Level of support for proposed waste minimisation ideas

Answered: 685 Skipped: 525

