

DANNEVIRKE COUNTY COUNCIL SURVEY

HEATHER CARTER

Kellogg New Zealand Rural Leadership Programme

April - July 1985

Umutaoroa,
R. D. 8,
DANNEVIRKE.

DANNEVIRKE COUNTY COUNCIL SURVEY

To all Ratepayers and Residents,

As part of my programme for the Kellogg N.Z. Rural Leadership Course, I am conducting this survey of Dannevirke County Ratepayers and Residents. It is possible with the approval and co-operation of Council and with much assistance from County Clerk Tony Rogers and his staff.

I feel that Councillors receive little indication of what we all think, so here is your chance. With your co-operation and a little time and thought, I hope that we will produce useful results, which I will publish in August.

The questions cover the central issues and philosophies and seem to work from the premise that we want to retain, and even increase, rural populations and quality of life.

Please bear in mind throughout that whatever services we demand of Council, we ratepayers must fund those services.

Every ratepayer and resident is welcome to complete a questionnaire and if we have not enclosed sufficient forms for your household, more may be obtained from the County Office or by contacting me or from the various County Libraries.

Any comments will be appreciated and I would welcome any queries on phone 5885.

You may return the completed questionnaire with your rate payment to the County Office or directly to me or use the reply envelope provided.

All questionnaires will be treated in strict confidence and must be returned before 4.00 p.m. on Thursday 20 June 1985 for inclusion in the survey.

I hope sincerely that you will participate and thank you in anticipation.

HEATHER CARTER

Umutaoroa
R.D. 8,
DANNEVIRKE.

Phone: 5885

1 May 1985

DANNEVIRKE COUNTY COUNCIL SURVEY

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER

Your Riding _____

Ratepayer
Resident

Structure:

Council has 12 members representing nine ridings for our total population of approximately 4500. Area population and capital value determines Council representation.

1. How many ridings or divisions should we have? _____
2. What number of Councillors would you prefer? _____

District Councils have replaced Borough and County Councils in other small areas to increase efficiency of plant and services, with rural dwellers retaining their influence.

3. Do you consider that a District Council would better serve the needs of ratepayers and residents in the Dannevirke Region? Yes
No

Communication:

Council sends out two reports a year.

4. How often should Council report to us? _____ times per year
5. Should Council inform us of pending issues? Yes
No
6. If you were informed of pending decisions, would you contact your riding member(s) with your opinions? Very likely
Sometimes
Not likely

Rating:

Rates presently are determined on the basis of land value with uniform annual charge to each ratepayer of \$50.00.

7. Do you favour the concept of minimum rate as in the uniform annual charge? Yes
No
8. What should this rate be? \$50 \$75 \$100 \$150
9. Would you prefer a basis other than land value for determining rates? Yes
No

If yes, please explain _____

10. Should Council operate riding accounts, whereby works rates raised in a riding are spent in that riding? Yes
No

"User Pays" Principle:

Council applies the "user pays" principle to water and sewerage schemes and uses its subjective judgement when supporting other amenities and services

11. Do you favour the concept of "user pays"? Yes
No

The County makes annual grants to the Borough Council for amenities and services such as the library, cemetery and rubbish dump which are used by County Residents./

12. Do you want Council to support other local concerns, such as the Citizens Advice Bureau and the Community and Recreation Advisor, on your behalf? Yes
No

13. Do you want Council to support concerns outside this region, such as the H.B. Art Gallery and Museum, on your behalf? Yes
No

14. Do you want Council to support charities, such as the Royal Humane Society, on your behalf? Yes
No

Planning and Development:

15. Should Council have a policy of setting aside funds to assist in the replacement of assets such as buildings and depots? Yes
NO

Council is developing a 550 hectare forestry block with Forestry Encouragement Loans that should generate income from 1995.

16. Should Council increase
maintain
decrease its involvement in forestry? Yes
No

17. Should Council become involved in farming activities? Yes
No

18. To facilitate development and economic activity should Council be involved in the provision of commercial, industrial and/or residential land? Yes
No

19. Should Council develop facilities at Akitio Beach?
e.g. Shower and Toilet Block Yes
No

Works:

20. Recognising that situations differ, in major works programmes should Council
tend towards employing contractors
generally employ its own labour and plant
or insufficient information to answer.

For every 44 cents that Council spends on roading, Central Government contributes 56 cents up to a maximum amount.

21. Should Council spend sufficient of ratepayers' funds to obtain the maximum National Roads Board subsidy available? Yes
No

Sub-Division:

Council has adopted three criteria for the approval of sub-division applications being:
a minimum lot size of 8000 square metres
effluent disposal on each respective lot.
not more than three houses on each 200 metres of road frontage

22. Health considerations being met, do you think any minimum lot size regulation is required? Yes
No

23. If yes, should a minimum area be not less than 2000 sq m ($\frac{1}{2}$ acre)
not less than 4000 sq m (1 acre)
not less than 8000 sq m (2 acres)

23. What other criteria, if any, should be necessary? _____

Housing:

25. Should Council be involved in the provision of rental accommodation? Yes
No

Employment:

Through the P.E.P. Scheme Council has provided employment for (currently) 77 persons engaged on scrub and noxious plants clearance.

The Scheme is financed by Central Government and by contributions from land owners who provide work for the Scheme.

Councils input is in administration and supervision of the Scheme.

26. Should Council be involved in Job Creation? Yes
No

27. If yes, do you think Council should

- (a) Operate its own "In House" Training Scheme e.g. train school leavers as drivers - operators Yes
No

- (b) Participate in Department of Labour projects for Young Persons e.g. School Leavers Employment and Training

Programme S.T.E.P.S.

Yes
No

Other Aspects:

28. Bearing in mind the financial implications, what amenities and services that are not available to you now do you believe Council could provide?

29. Any comments on any aspects of this survey:-

Thank you for your co-operation and assistance.

COMPOSITION

The content of the survey was determined by adding suggestions from the County Clerk and Councillors to our ideas.

It was a compromise between a questionnaire that was brief enough to obtain a good response rate and detailed enough to provide some background information and cover sufficient useful topics. While we received complaints of insufficient information, those who thought it too long or difficult, obviously, did not reply at all.

In relation to some questions, we were overtaken by events. After some questionnaires had been returned, there was much public discussion of District Councils and the prospect of amalgamation and the Council increased the uniform annual charge to \$70.00.

DISTRIBUTION

Besides being included with the rate demands, questionnaires were available from depots throughout the County. Publicity through advertisements and articles in the local newspaper ('Evening News') and radio news items (Radio 2XS) encouraged all residents to participate.

RESPONSE

Based on the Electoral Rolls of October 1983, the 307 returned questionnaires yields an approximate response rate of 14%. This varies from seven to 19% by ridings, as shown overleaf.

Although the return rate is slightly less than we had hoped for, apparently it is reasonable for this type of survey. Some surveys seek to sample only 10%.

The heartening part is the quantity and depth of comments made. Most respondents are very concerned about County issues, have many ideas on Council policy and functions and were very pleased to have an opportunity to pass these on.

One critic told me that a half-hour was long enough to spend on the survey, whereas we expect Councillors to devote one day a month to meetings, besides the preparation and associated meetings.

The response rate does not detract from the depth of feeling conveyed and it contains 307 specific opinions that were not known before. I hope that acceptance of the results is not selective.

RESPONSE RATE

<u>Riding</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Akitio	Akt	57	13
Dannevirke	Dvke	89	19.4
Mangatoro	Mang	26	12.3
Matamau	Mat	22	13.7
Ngapaeruru	Ngap	16	10.3
Norsewood	Nswd	26	11.1
Ormondville	Orm	36	15.1
Tiratu	Tir	17	9.9
Weber	Web	9	6.9
No riding shown	Rest	9	-
		<u>307</u>	<u>13.9</u>

Notes

- percentages are approximate because the current number of residents is unknown
- the five cases of dual riding qualifications were accredited to the first listed

RATEPAYER / RESIDENT

My first mistake. While we wanted to distinguish between property owners (as those who pay rates) and tenants and farm employees, the Ratepayer/Resident option did not make that clear.

Because of the number of replies marked neither or both, we have omitted this item from the results. However, as few extra forms were uplifted from the depots, we believe few non-ratepayers replied.

ABBREVIATION

N.R. denotes no response or no specific answer.

Structure:

Council has 12 members representing nine ridings for our total population of approximately 4500. Area population and capital value determines Council representation.

1. How many ridings or divisions should we have?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	14	18	20	N.R.
Akt	4			3		2	1		25*	3	5*				14
Dvke	1			4	3	8	1	4	51	3	1				13
Mang	1			1	1				15	1	1			1	5
Mat				3	2			2	6		2				7
Ngap					1	4			10						1
Nswd			1	1		2		1	15				1		5
Orm						4			25*		3	1			3
Tir				1		1			6		2				7
Web	1					1	2		5						
Rest	1	1							7*						
	8	1	1	13	7	22	4	7	165	7	14	1	1	1	55
%				20.5					53.7				7.8		17.9

* or fewer

While 54% favoured the status quo (nine), 21% suggested fewer ridings for a mean of eight.

2. What number of Councillors would you prefer?

	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	15	16	17	18	20	24	N.R.
Akt	1					1	2	1		32*	3	1					2	14
Dvke				3	2	8	12	1	4	41*	4		1					13
Mang		1	1		1		4			13					1	2		3
Mat				2			3	1		11*								5
Ngap				2						13								1
Nswd						1	6			11					2			6
Orm						3	4			22				1				6
Tir				1		1				8								7
Web			1			1		2		5								
Rest				1						8*								
	1	1	2	9	3	15	31	5	4	164	7	1	1	1	3	2	2	55
%				23.1						53.4			5.5					17.9

* or fewer

Comments

- fewer, more specialised and qualified manager/councillors as Council is a big business, perhaps having to pay more (2)
- all population should have equal representation
- reduce numbers

Again, the status quo (12) was preferred by 53%, with 23% wanting fewer Councillors and an overall average of 11.

District Councils have replaced Borough and County Councils in other small areas to increase efficiency of plant and services, with rural dwellers retaining their influence.

3. Do you consider that a District Council would better serve the needs of ratepayers and residents in the Dannevirke Region?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>%</u>
Akt	20	35	30	53	7	12
Dvke	29	33	52	58	8	9
Mang	14	54	10	39	2	8
Mat	9	41	11	50	2	9
Ngap	9	56	6	38	1	6
Nswd	10	39	13	50	3	12
Orm	18	50	16	44	2	6
Tir	7	41	5	29	5	29
Web	4	44	5	56		
Rest	3	33	6	67		
	<u>123</u>	<u>40.1</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>50.2</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>9.8</u>

Comments

- yes, but Borough may benefit more (2)
- yes, but Borough may have reservations
- no, but combine some technical and administrative aspects
- the sooner the better
- would help share the costs of community amenities
- co-ordinate with rarely-used plant

While total opinions were nearly evenly divided over this issue, the ridings varied from 33 to 56% in favour, for no obvious reason.

Communication:

Council sends out two reports a year.

4. How often should Council report to us?

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	1	36	1	8	4	1	6
Dvke	4	51	2	17	3	2	10
Mang	1	11		11	1	1	1
Mat	1	12	1	6		1	1
Ngap		9		5			2
Nswd		19		6	1		
Orm	1	21	1	9	1	1	2
Tir		9	2	3			3
Web		7	1		1		
Rest		4		2	2		1
	<u>8</u>	<u>179</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>26</u>
%	2.6	58.3	2.6	21.8	4.2	2	8.5

Comments

- more riding meetings, direct reporting (3)
- because most people do not read, two comprehensive reports more cost-effective
- reporting system to better inform ratepayers
- meet more openly, more answerable
- encourage involvement, riding meetings, publish agendas, public venues at least twice a year

These opinions produce an average of three times a year, with 58% preferring the present system.

5. Should Council inform us of pending issues?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	47	7	3
Dvke	79	6	4
Mang	25	1	
Mat	22		
Ngap	15	1	
Nswd	25	1	
Orm	33	3	
Tir	16		1
Web	9		
Rest	9		
	<u>280</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>
%	91.2	6.2	2.6

Definitely.

6. If you were informed of pending decisions, would you contact your riding member(s) with your opinions?

	<u>Very likely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Not likely</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	26	24	5	2
Dvke	38	38	10	3
Mang	15	9	2	
Mat	8	12	1	1
Ngap	9	7		
Nswd	6	18	2	
Orm	15	17	4	
Tir	7	9		1
Web	6	3		
Rest	4	5		
	<u>134</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>
%	43.6	46.3	7.8	2.3

Quite likely, as one would expect from these respondents.

Rating:

Rates are presently determined on the basis of land value with a uniform annual charge to each ratepayer of \$50.00.

7. Do you favour the concept of a minimum rate as in the uniform annual charge?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	46	9	2
Dvke	64	18	7
Mang	20	1	5
Mat	17	5	
Ngap	12	4	
Nswd	24	2	
Orm	26	5	5
Tir	10	5	2
Web	9		
Rest	6	3	
	<u>234</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>21</u>
%	76.2	16.9	6.8

A generally-accepted idea at 76% support.

8. What should this rate be?

	<u>\$50</u>	<u>\$75</u>	<u>\$100</u>	<u>\$150</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	23	5	10	3	5
Dvke	33	10	11	5	5
Mang	12	1	3	2	2
Mat	10	3	1		3
Ngap	5	1	5	1	
Nswd	13	2	7	1	1
Orm	16	3	3	2	2
Tir	5	1	1	2	1
Web	4	2	1	1	1
Rest	3		2		1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	124	28	44	17	21
%	53	12	18.8	7.3	9

Comments

- sufficient to cover the cost of administering multiple rate demands
- increase with rate increases
- increase with inflation

While 53% of those who answered "Yes" to the previous question voted for \$50.00, the average was \$72.00.

9. Would you prefer a basis other than land value for determining rates?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	11	43	3
Dvke	22	61	6
Mang	4	17	5
Mat	5	13	4
Ngap	3	13	
Nswd	14	9	3
Orm	9	26	1
Tin	1	10	6
Web		9	
Rest	1	6	2
	<u>70</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>30</u>
%	22.8	67.4	9.8

If yes, please explain -

Citizens tax	6
- citizens and land value	2
- citizens and central government	2
- citizens and area	1
	<u>11</u>
Productivity - profit	4
- earning capacity	2
- stocking rate	1
- profit and distance	1
- capacity and distance	1
- turnover	1
	<u>10</u>
Area	6
- frontage and area	1
- frontage	1
- land value and area	1
	<u>9</u>
Differential	2
Capital value	2
Distance	1

Central government	1
User pays	5
No specific alternative	29

The present basis is quite accepted, although several asked for possible alternatives.

10. Should Council operate riding accounts, whereby works rates raised in a riding are spent in that riding?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>%</u>
Akt	14	25	38	67	5	9
Dvke	60	67	24	27	5	6
Mang	17	65	9	35		
Mat	10	46	10	46	2	9
Ngap	2	13	13	81	1	6
Nswd	17	65	9	35		
Orm	16	44	17	47	3	8
Tir	8	47	8	47	1	6
Web	3	33	6	67		
Rest	5	56	4	44		
	<u>152</u>	<u>49.5</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5.5</u>

Comments

- no, we are one county
- no, provided each riding getting fair share over time
- one united county
- those who now pay a lot for a little should be pleased their roads are so good
- amalgamate smaller ones, their roads are satisfactory
- maintain Dannevirke riding, not all to Akitio

The composite result is fairly even, but individual riding support varied from 13 to 67%. This has appeared, in my opinion, because of the way in which individuals see their position in the current system.

For example, many Dannevirke riding residents are dissatisfied that a large proportion of their rates is spent in other areas, such as Akitio. Therefore, they would like to have a system which accounts for the different riding requirements. The high level of negative vote (67 and 81%) in the three less-densely populated ridings (Akitio, Ngapaeruru and Weber) would suggest that the same parochial reasoning has produced the contrary vote.

"User pays" Principle:

Council applies the "user pays" principle to water and sewage schemes and uses its subjective judgement when supporting other amenities and services.

11. Do you favour the concept of "user pays"?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	50	2	5
Dvke	81	6	2
Mang	26		
Mat	20	2	
Ngap	16		
Nswd	25	1	
Orm	33		3
Tir	16	1	
Web	9		
Rest	8		1
	<u>284</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>
%	92.5	3.9	3.6

As well as 93% approval here, support for this principle was repeated in reply to other questions and in the final comments.

The County makes annual grants to the Borough Council for amenities and services such as the library, cemetery and rubbish dump which are used by County residents.

12. Do you want Council to support other local concerns, such as the Citizens Advice Bureau and the Community and Recreation Advisor, on your behalf?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	21	32	4
Dvke	31	54	4
Mang	13	11	2
Mat	11	9	2
Ngap	9	7	
Nswd	13	13	
Orm	18	17	1
Tir	9	7	1
Web	2	7	
Rest	6	3	
	<u>133</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>14</u>
%	43.3	52.1	4.6

13. Do you want Council to support concerns outside this region, such as the H.B. Art Gallery and Museum, on your behalf?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	10	46	1
Dvke	6	79	4
Mang	5	21	
Mat	7	15	
Ngap	2	13	1
Nswd	7	19	
Orm	9	25	2
Tir		16	1
Web	2	7	
Rest	2	7	
	<u>50</u>	<u>248</u>	<u>9</u>
%	16.3	80.8	2.9

Comments

- three replies specified the region to support

14. Do you want Council to support charities, such as the Royal Humane Society, on your behalf?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	6	49	2
Dvke	5	81	3
Mang	1	25	
Mat	3	19	
Ngap		16	
Nswd	2	24	
Orm	6	28	2
Tir	4	12	1
Web	1	8	
Rest		9	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	28	271	8
%	9.1	88.3	2.6

Comments on Qs 12, 13 and 14

- County could inform ratepayers of those concerns that would appreciate their individual contributions
- greater contribution to Borough for library and town hall for example

Respondents were slightly against Council support for local concerns and definitely against Council making a contribution to any other causes.

Many comments were made concerning the individual's right and ability to contribute to whatever she/he chose.

Planning and Development:

15. Should Council have a policy of setting aside funds to assist in the replacement of assets such as buildings and depots?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	39	17	1
Dvke	59	22	8
Mang	21	3	2
Mat	12	7	3
Ngap	10	6	
Nswd	19	5	2
Orm	26	7	3
Tir	17		
Web	7	2	
Rest	7	2	
	<u>217</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>19</u>
%	70.7	23.1	6.2

Judging by the variety of comments and provisos attached to these answers, there might have been insufficient understanding of the alternatives and methods of setting aside funds. In this instance, providing more background information and options would probably have added value to the replies.

Council is developing a 550 hectare forestry block with Forestry Encouragement Loans that should generate income from 1995.

16. Should Council increase, maintain or decrease its involvement in forestry?

	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Maintain</u>	<u>Decrease</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	16	25	11	5
Dvke	16	43	18	12
Mang	3	18	3	2
Mat	5	12	3	2
Ngap	5	7	4	
Nswd	4	18	3	1
Orm	12	16	4	4
Tir	5	10	1	1
Web	2	5	2	
Rest	5	2	2	
	<u>73</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>27</u>
%	23.8	50.8	16.6	8.8

Comments

- increase, lease land to forestry company
- increase, if supervised efficiently
- maintain, only if F.E.L. maintained
- maintain, a very poor choice of land but too late to change
- maintain, maybe problems with location, wind and transport
- maintain, too long-term
- decrease, not Council business
- forest manager better than more expensive forester, waste of money
- acceptable if done properly, but usual attitude prevailed and was not done well

With some comments suggesting that they have taken the view that it is too late to withdraw from the forestry venture, ratepayers accept maintaining the present development. Slightly more favour increasing than decreasing the involvement.

17. Should Council become involved in farming activities?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	2	53	2
Dvke	8	79	2
Mang	1	23	2
Mat		22	
Ngap	1	15	
Nswd	1	25	
Orm	3	30	3
Tir	1	16	
Web		9	
Rest	1	8	
	<u>18</u>	<u>280</u>	<u>9</u>
%	5.9	91.2	2.9

Comments

- no, no profit in it, why continue to lose money? (2)
- yes, in conjunction with forestry (2)
- yes, land settlement schemes if government bows out
- yes, if finances allow

Definitely not.

18. To facilitate development and economic activity, should Council be involved in the provision of commercial, industrial and/or residential land?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	22	32	3
Dvke	23	60	6
Mang	5	20	1
Mat	10	10	2
Ngap	3	12	1
Nswd	9	17	
Orm	15	19	2
Tir	3	12	2
Web	6	3	
Rest	2	7	
	<u>98</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>17</u>
%	31.9	62.5	5.5

Comments

- yes, if not otherwise available
- yes, in approved areas
- yes, if commercial and industrial interests help fund project

At 32%, there is not enough support to pursue this idea.

19. Should Council develop facilities at Akitio Beach, e.g. toilet and shower block?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	46	10	1
Dvke	49	33	7
Mang	19	7	
Mat	18	4	
Ngap	14	2	
Nswd	14	11	1
Orm	26	9	1
Tir	10	7	
Web	8	1	
Rest	6	3	
	<u>210</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>10</u>
%	68.4	28.3	3.3

Comments

- yes, on user pays (11)
- yes, if caretaker, kept clean (5)
- yes, toilets only (4)
- yes, if riding pays for it (5)
- yes, if sufficient visitors (3)
- yes, if part of general Reserves policy
- yes, if recreation grant from government
- no, maintain what is already there (4)
- no, private developer, service club (7)
- we have one beach resort, make most of it
- ablutions, power points, user pays, rubbish bins (3)
- ablutions, walk-way with Lands and Survey
- urgent, ablutions, water supply
- before more sections are developed, land owners should find water supply
- yes, but wait until I purchase my block

Although there is support for the idea, I am wary of these results. Many respondents seemed unaware of the facilities presently available and there were many provisos attached. There was a wide variation in the development visualised ranging from the bare essentials to camping facilities, walk-ways and water supplies.

Works:

20. Recognising that situations differ, in major works programmes should Council
tend towards employing contractors,
generally employ its own labour and plant
or insufficient information to answer?

	<u>employ contractors</u>	<u>own labour and plant</u>	<u>insufficient information</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	33	9	10	5
Dvke	48	14	19	8
Mang	16	4	3	3
Mat	9	5	3	5
Ngap	13	3		
Nswd	16	4	6	
Orm	22	6	7	1
Tir	10	2	2	3
Web	4	3	1	1
Rest	6		2	1
	<u>177</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>27</u>
%	57.7	16.3	17.3	8.8

Support for "tending towards employing contractors" at 58% is significantly greater than "generally employing own labour and plant" at 16%.

Many comments offered at the end of the questionnaire concerned Council inefficiency, correlating with this result which is contrary to present policy.

For every 44 cents that Council spends on roading, central government contributes 56 cents up to a maximum amount.

21. Should Council spend sufficient of ratepayers' funds to obtain the maximum National Roads Board subsidy available?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	45	8	4
Dvke	57	23	9
Mang	15	10	1
Mat	14	4	4
Ngap	13	2	1
Nswd	17	5	4
Orm	29	4	3
Tir	13	2	2
Web	9		
Rest	5	2	2
	<u>217</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>30</u>
%	70.7	19.5	9.8

Comments

- dependent on rate increase, ability to pay and N.R.B. criteria
- several provisos that the money is well spent and the work is necessary
- yes, while the subsidy is greater than 50%

71% support for this proposal is significant. However, final comments from many respondents suggest that Council has to achieve this without increasing the rates.

Sub-division:

Council has adopted three criteria for the approval of sub-division applications being:

a minimum lot size of 8000 square metres
effluent disposal on each respective lot
not more than three houses on each 200 metres of road frontage.

22. Health considerations being met, do you think any minimum lot size regulation is required?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>%</u>
Akt	26	46	25	44	6	11
Dvke	59	66	25	28	5	6
Mang	15	58	9	35	2	8
Mat	14	64	8	36		
Ngap	12	75	4	25		
Nswd	10	38	13	50	3	12
Orm	21	58	15	42		
Tir	13	76	4	24		
Web	4	44	5	56		
Rest	4	44	4	44	1	11
	<u>178</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>36.5</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5.5</u>

Comments

- worker may want to purchase house from farmer, so no set section size
- inadequate concerning building on Maori land
- encouragement of rural repopulation
- need to maintain rural atmosphere, not ad hoc residential regions

The composite result was in favour of a minimum lot size regulation, but this was not so for all the individual ridings.

23. If yes, should a minimum area be
 not less than 2000 square metres ($\frac{1}{2}$ acre)
 not less than 4000 square metres (1 acre)
 not less than 8000 square metres (2 acres)?

	<u>2000 m²</u>	<u>4000 m²</u>	<u>8000 m²</u>	<u>N.R.</u>	<u>Other</u>
Akt	16		7	3	
Dvke	14	7	32	4	2 - 1000 m ² 2 - 20,000 m ²
Mang	5	1	8	1	
Mat	5	2	5	1	1 - 1000 m ²
Ngap	3		9		
Nswd	5	1	4		
Orm	9	2	9	1	
Tir	2	4	7		
Web	1		2		1 - 1000 m ²
Rest		1	3		
	<u>60</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>
%	33.7	10.1	48.3	5.6	2.2

Of the 58% who wanted a minimum lot size regulation, 48% wanted the present standard maintained and 46% preferred a smaller requirement.

24. What other criteria, if any, should be necessary?

Aesthetics 6

- considering existing residents and in keeping with environment

Standards

- building and/or fencing 10
- County Association standards 2
- built in specified time 1

Physical

- water supply 5
 - including no cost to existing residents
- ground stability 1
- access 2
- future roading needs 1

Areas

- restricted to village areas 2
- marae concept 1
- concern at urban sprawl 2
- avoid high-density development 2
- minimum distance between houses 1

Use

- approved use/occupant 4
- economic unit 3
- related to use of land 2
- no change in existing use 1
- not on farm land 1

Housing:

25. Should Council be involved in the provision of rental accommodation?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	23	30	4
Dvke	20	64	5
Mang	3	22	1
Mat	9	12	1
Ngap	1	15	
Nswd	12	14	
Orm	13	23	
Tir	3	13	1
Web	2	7	
Rest	3	6	
	<u>89</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>12</u>
%	29	67.1	3.9

Comments

- yes, but staff only (11)
- yes, but pensioner only (19)
- yes, but only if unsubsidised (2)
- yes, but pensioner only if subsidised by government (2)
- yes, but only temporary
- staff housing should not have extras or be subsidised, equivalent of private rent

Quite a proportion (36%) of the votes "Yes" is for staff and/or pensioner accommodation only.

Those repliers living near areas with such accommodation seemed more aware of the existence and demand for these categories. Had the question differentiated between them, the answers would have been more useful.

However, 67% of the replies to this question were against the provision of rental accommodation.

Employment:

Through the P.E.P. Scheme, Council has provided employment for (currently) 77 persons engaged on scrub and noxious plants clearance. The scheme is financed by central government and by contributions from land owners who provide work for the scheme. Council's input is in administration and supervision of the scheme.

26. Should Council be involved in job creation?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	32	23	2
Dvke	61	26	2
Mang	18	8	
Mat	13	7	2
Ngap	11	5	
Nswd	20	6	
Orm	23	12	1
Tir	12	4	1
Web	7	2	
Rest	8	1	
	<u>205</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>8</u>
%	66.8	30.6	2.6

Comments

- yes, but only P.E.P. (3)
- yes, if no cost to ratepayer (2)
- yes, if improved supervision (3)
- use P.E.P. scheme for beautification
- job creation vital
- workers need to be worthy of the job (2)
- County not a social institution

Two-thirds of the replies favour Council supporting job creation, mainly on the understanding that it is at no cost to ratepayers.

27. If yes, do you think Council should
 (a) operate its own "in house" training scheme, e.g.
 train school leavers as driver-operators?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	21	10	1
Dvke	46	14	1
Mang	12	4	2
Mat	10	2	1
Ngap	8	2	1
Nswd	16	4	
Orm	17	5	1
Tir	6	5	1
Web	7		
Rest	6	2	
	<u>149</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>8</u>
%	72.7	23.4	3.9

Comments

- yes, but only with competent instructors (2)
- yes, if required labour (3)
- yes, in limited way (2)
- yes, apprenticeship
- the Council should get the benefits

(b) participate in Department of Labour projects for young persons, e.g. School Leavers Training and Employment Programme.

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N.R.</u>
Akt	27	5	
Dvke	46	11	4
Mang	10	6	2
Mat	8	4	1
Ngap	7	2	2
Nswd	14	5	1
Orm	17	3	3
Tir	11	1	
Web	5	2	
Rest	7		1
	<u>152</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>14</u>
%	74.1	19	6.8

Comments

- yes, but no cost to ratepayer
- yes, in limited way

Of the total returns, there is 49% support for both these ideas. Comments suggest that benefits should be more concrete than social.

Other aspects:

28. Bearing in mind the financial implications, what amenities and services that are not available to you now do you believe Council could provide?

Far out-numbering any suggestions of extended services and amenities, were comments of "no more" and re-affirmations of Council's present priorities.

"No more"

The 19 comments along this theme ranged from those two words to asking "what would the rates be if they got their fingers into all the pies mentioned?" Most felt that the rates are too high now and would have to increase if more services were provided and that "user pays" and private enterprise should be used for expansion.

Roading

Another 19 respondents pointed out that roading was Council's prime, if not only, concern. While 15 others called for better maintenance, eight had seal extension as a priority. Some of the typical comments and suggestions are

- better maintenance preferred to poor sealing
- finer, cleaner metal (3)
- improve corners (3)
- road-men, maybe part-time, responsible for certain localities
- maintenance not left to become expensive works
- maintenance done mainly in summer
- metalled spaces for temporary parking of trailers
- metal (instead of wooden) barriers leading to bridges, would last longer and be better protection for motorist
- seal main roads and outside houses
- better signs on narrow, winding roads
- possibility of residents making once-only contribution to up-grade road
- grading and metalling of drive-ways at reasonable charge as go past?
- worst around, slack attitude and lack of planning

Two replies suggested fewer services, one by diverting some responsibilities to government departments. For the rates they are paying, two thought they should be receiving more services, such as rubbish collection and mown frontages.

Approximately 30 asked for extended or improved services, many of which are now listed.

Rubbish disposal

Over half of these were queries and suggestions of rubbish-dumping facilities.

- Borough dump - clarification of our rights (2)
 - official provision, even contribution (2)
- Ormondville dump - open all week-end
 - open every day
 - offal pit
 - open better hours, paper bags supplied
- need another one
- strategically-placed rural dumps
- somewhere to leave for collection (2)
- at Weber

Water supplies

- promotion of planned approach for whole county
- high pressure in settlements for reticulation and fire-fighting
- Makirikiri supply should be decreasing in cost as capital repaid

Others

- more noxious weeds inspections, higher fines
- inspect killing facilities, e.g. by P.E.P. worker, not fair on compliers
- re-open Fongaroa office (2)
- sewage schemes (2)
- better control unattended stock on roads
- outlet to Borough sewage ponds from west of Tapuata stream (2)
- develop recreational facilities with user pays
- services supplied by developer
- verge-mowing is most under-rated improvement
- Council promote special recreational needs but community finance

58% of the replies included comments at the end of the questionnaire, ranging from one word to the entire page. Comments relevant to earlier questions were included at that point.

Not specifically requested, but very revealing, were the thoughts on Council policy and actions. As in the preceding sections, not all can be recorded here.

In the entire 307 questionnaires, there were four (well, 3½) praising remarks.

- presently pretty satisfied (with services available)
- thank them for what they are doing
- doing good job presently (re sub-division)
- doing the best they can, but money not used well

I had not expected such a volume of harsh criticism concerning the rates and their increases, the administration and the staff. Even allowing for the fact that people seem to find it easier to criticise than to praise, the following indicates a high level of dissatisfaction, and perhaps lack of understanding, within the County.

"Empire building"

- seem to enjoy empire building, bad at controlling expenditure
- too much administration for too little results (2)
- cost of administration of great concern to many rate-payers
- less empire building
- keep its own bureaucracy in check

Staff

- Engineer should be only that, not Chief Executive Officer (4)
- greatest deficiency of Council is almost total job security at all levels, irrespective of competence
- most likely to encourage unwanted diversification
- more efficient workers (3)
- employees should be able to complain publicly through Clerk
- ratepayers would like to see more positive attitude, perhaps better supervision
- poor supervision, colossal waste of funds
- why allowed to use vehicles and fuel to get to and from work?

Inefficiency

- need financial and physical efficiency (2)
- whole management and staff more efficient and leaner
- better use labour and plant (4)
- reduce labour and plant (3)
- they can't run County efficiently yet (re farming)
- great concern and dissatisfaction at works and administration, value for money, inefficient

Works

- owner/drivers (3)
- hire out labour and plant at competitive rates, charge out too high
- contractors if cheaper than capital outlays

Rates

- now a mortgage
- collected fairly, spent wisely
- until equitable system, restrict spending
- greater than rental return (3)
- see little for rates other than access
- too high, more efficient management urgent, riding accounts necessary after amalgamation

Rate increases

- unanimous lack of appreciation of ratepayers' difficulties
- farm incomes down, yet rates 36% up (4)
- no longer open-ended cheque, costs held even at expense of service in current climate
- how long can we keep paying?
- need ratepayers' association for protection, Council does not earn money
- double national average
- keep within budget
- per stock unit, limit to what can stand

Respondents also included miscellaneous suggestions and thoughts in this section:

- get more roads taxes back
- should be open to new development, merit rather than precedent or tradition
- more information on District Scheme Review and adequate time for submissions
- how will Councillors communicate in civil defence call-out?
- more awareness of people and needs, unite town and county
- village concerns different from scattered districts
- encourage and fund seminars and educational programme to highlight development and diversification
- more information on what Reserves are available

29. Any comments on any aspects of this survey:-

While the previous question made depressing reading, this one was heartening and rewarding.

Many thought it a good idea and were pleased to have the opportunity to express their views. Several appreciated the preparation, looked forward to the results and hoped that the Council would heed them. Two optimistic souls hoped it would be a regular occurrence. Some regretted that they did not know enough about some topics.

Criticism included the survey's timing, with "heavy discontent re rates and performance", the absence of the "no opinion" option and that some questions were now irrelevant with the imminent amalgamation.

CONCLUSION

In most areas, the 307 replies favoured the status quo or little change. Comments stressed the need for Council to concentrate on performing its essential services efficiently, leaving social and development programmes to individuals, except for the present non-ratepayer-funded job creation.

One vote contrary to the present policy concerns works. Respondents were in favour of tending towards employing contractors for major works programmes, rather than continuing to use Council's own labour and plant.

The second exception to the status quo concerned Communications. With Council encouragement, ratepayers and residents seem prepared to play their part in more communication.

In view of the high level of dissatisfaction with Council performance expressed in the replies, more communication might be a remedy too. In completing this questionnaire, some people have had to realise how little they know of Council matters. Being better informed and encouraged to comment may help to diminish the misconceptions and discontent.

'JOCK'

COPYRIGHT T. D. HENSHAW



"It's the Otunui Ratepayers Association. They want a coupla bridges, the road sealed and that bad corner knocked off ... and could you cut the rates back please!"