



Southland District Council Long Term Plan 2024-2034

These are challenging times, Southland Murihiku

We are consulting on our long term plan and we want to hear from you. Our consultation document, called These are challenging times, Southland Murihiku, outlines the big issues and options facing Southland district and what Council is suggesting we do about them. We want to know what you think about our options. You can also find a lot more detail in the supporting information available on makeitstick.nz.

The easiest way to let us know what you think is to use our online form at www.makeitstick.nz

Or, if you'd prefer to write to us, just fill out this feedback form and get this to us by **noon on 5 July** by either:

Posting it to : 2024 LTP, PO Box 903, Invercargill 9840

Emailing it to: submissions@southlanddc.govt.nz

Delivering it to: one of our offices in Invercargill, Oban, Otautau, Riverton Aparima, Te Anau, Lumsden, Winton or Wyndham

Please note that all the information you provide in your feedback form (including personal details) will become public documents.

Name:

Address:

Phone number:

Email:

Do you want to speak to your submission at our hearings on 16 to 18 July?

Yes - we will be in touch to arrange a date/time

No I do not wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

LTP submission form

Our key issues and options

KEY ISSUE No 1 – Water services management

Water services are back now being funded from our small ratepayer base and we need to make sure we get the balance of doing what needs to be done – what is right environmentally, culturally and socially, with the affordability of rates increases for ratepayers. The costs for new statutory requirements and renewals of the assets have increased markedly in the past few years because of regulation to protect the environment and consumers, inflation and the reform changes. So, we have two options on how to manage this.

① Which option do you prefer?

- Option 1 - Do the work but slow it down (preferred option)
- Option 2 - Carry out the work as it falls due

Why do you prefer that option?

KEY ISSUE No 2 - Levels of service for roading

Council is continuing to face an ongoing and growing challenge about meeting present levels of services on our roads. These budgets continue to grow because of the increases in construction and material costs, and the economic environment we are working in.

We have 1990km of an aging sealed road network, 841 bridges (road bridges) with six closed, 61 posted bridges that are getting older, 13,000 aging culverts and so we need to look at levels of service. So, we have three options.

② Which option do you prefer?

- Option 1 - Reduce levels of service on roading, but maintain bridges budget (preferred option)
- Option 2 - Retain the present levels of service on our roads - what our network needs
- Option 3 - Further reduction in levels of service

Why do you prefer that option?

KEY ISSUE No 3 – Glass recycling

Government legislation requires councils to do a kerbside collection of glass by 2027, which we are already doing through glass going in the recycling bin. Wastenet, our shared waste management service with Invercargill City Council and Gore District Council, is recommending we separate the glass from the recycling now to not only meet legislative requirements but also to improve the way we manage our waste.

3 Which option do you prefer?

- Option 1 - Introduce a new 240-litre glass recycling bin monthly collection service (preferred option)
- Option 2 - Status quo
- Option 3 - Introduce a new 240-litre glass recycling bin fortnightly collection service

Why do you prefer that option?

KEY ISSUE No 4 – The Te Anau Airport Manapouri - District funding

Last year a working group was formed to deliver a review of the Te Anau Airport Manapouri. The review considered the challenges currently facing the airport and made recommendations to Council for its future direction. Great South is now leading work on an interim solution to allow the airport to establish a more commercial operation. The review also noted that while the airport delivers most benefit to the Fiordland community, there is a benefit to the whole of the Southland community as an alternative transport option with flow-on economic and emergency management benefits and Council was asked to look at district funding the airport.

4 Which option do you prefer?

- Option 1 - No change to funding for Te Anau Airport Manapouri
- Option 2 - 30 percent general rate funding for Te Anau Airport Manapouri
- Option 3 - 50 percent general rate funding for Te Anau Airport Manapouri
- Option 4 - 100 percent general rate funding for Te Anau Airport Manapouri
- Option 5 - Another suggestion for funding for Te Anau Airport Manapouri

Why do you prefer that option?

Other issues

Changes to targeted rates

Council is proposing some changes to the roading rate differentials and how some other local rates are set (more information on these changes are on make it stick)

5 Do you support the proposed changes to the targeted roading rate differential?

This involves adjusting the portion paid by heavy vehicle sectors so they continue to pay more of the roading rate, given the impact that heavy vehicles have on roads, as well as increasing the fixed charge portion that everyone pays

Can you tell us why you think this?

6 Do you support the proposed changes to other local targeted rates?

These changes include extending the Tokanui/Waimakaha and Wrights Bush/Waianiwa hall boundaries, removing the Stewart Island/Rakiura SIESA rate half charge (so everyone pays a full charge) and changing how we rate Te Anau Rural Water Supply consumers

Can you tell us why you think this?

Draft Development and Financial Contributions Policy

7 Do you support continuation of financial contributions for:

roading infrastructure, where the requirement for development, maintenance and upgrading of roading infrastructure serves a subdivision; reserves infrastructure, where additional, or minor improvements to, reserves are required in connection with subdivisions and towards reserves based on additional residential units and non-residential buildings

Yes No Comments:

8 If you oppose Council charging financial contributions, how would you prefer Council fund the additional costs for roading and reserves which these developments introduce?

Comments:

Development contributions

9 Do you support development contributions remaining in remission to continue to encourage growth?
(for water, sewerage, stormwater and other community infrastructure)

Yes No Comments:

10 If Council must invest in infrastructure to satisfy growth in demand for services, should developers contribute towards these costs?

Yes No

Supporting retention and use of Māori land

11 Is Council's proposal to consider remission of both development contributions and financial contributions in relation to Māori land an appropriate way for Council to meet this obligation?
If no, what other approaches could Council consider?

Yes No Comments:

12 Are there any further changes we could consider to the draft policy?

13 Have you got any general feedback?