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Introduction

Background

1. New local government legislation administered by the Department of Internal Affairs (the Department) was enacted in 2001 and 2002. This report presents the results of a case study of the perceived effects of the legislation upon Tararua District Council. It is part of a series of nine case studies providing a rich and deliberately detailed account of how these local authorities have adapted to the 2001 and 2002 legislation, and in particular Part Six of the Local Government Act (the Act) relating to planning, decision-making, and accountability.

2. These case studies were requested by the Manager of Strategic Analysis and Information of the Local Government and Community (LG&C) Branch of the Department as part of the research programme as laid out in the Strategy for Evaluating Local Government Legislation. This long-term research programme is intended to run until 2013 to understand whether the new legislation is operating effectively. Work completed so far on this programme has produced a strategy and a framework for the evaluation programme, and a report on the roll-out of the legislation.

Research objectives

3. The purpose of the case studies is to provide an in-depth and detailed analysis of how local government has reacted to, interpreted and applied the new Act. This research will contribute to the local government sector’s knowledge of the effects of the new legislation.

4. The specific objectives of the local government case studies are:

   • How local authorities have implemented and addressed the new legislation’s provisions around planning, decision-making and community outcomes
   • How local authorities worked with their communities to develop community outcomes
   • How local authorities developed and implemented their Long-Term Council Community Plans (LTCCPs) and involved communities and stakeholders in the process
   • How local authorities have used the LTCCPs within their organisation
   • How local authorities have consulted and interacted with their communities and stakeholders over decision-making
   • How communities and stakeholders are interacting with local authorities.

5. In considering these objectives the case studies have evaluated local authorities’ application of community outcomes, strategic planning and decision-making. These three components are critical in achieving the Act’s aims of promoting democratic accountability and sustainable development of local government.

6. Insight into the new legislation, provided by the case studies, will also allow the Department to identify opportunities for further research to improve understanding of the effects of the 2001/2002 legislation.

Legislative intent

7. The Act “is designed to provide democratic and effective local government that recognises the diversity of New Zealand communities.” The Act enables local authorities to use a sustainable development

---

1 Local Government Act 2002; Local Government (Rating) Act 2002; Local Electoral Act 2001
approach to promoting community wellbeing. To help make local government more effective, their powers were altered by the Act – they moved away from the prescriptive and restrictive nature of the previous legislation to an empowered environment. Balancing this empowerment, the Act also promotes accountability and transparency in local authorities, as detailed in Part 6.

8. The responsibility for facilitating the development of community outcomes with their communities is a new role for all local authorities. Some local authorities had already started a process for setting targets, goals and outcomes for community development, and facilitating other processes that identified strategic direction for their communities, before the enactment of the legislation.

9. While strategic planning was part of the traditional role of local authorities, the legislation emphasises longer-term planning functions and responsibilities (e.g. the LTCCP) to improve the way local authorities undertake strategic planning. Further, the Act requires councils to identify links between strategic planning and the community outcomes identified by the local authority’s communities.

10. The Act requires local authorities to be more considered and transparent in their decision-making. Local authorities need to identify options for achieving the objective of the decision and assess those options by considering the benefits and costs in terms of the present and future wellbeing of the community and alignment with community outcomes. It is expected therefore community outcomes will affect local authorities’ decision-making. The Act continues to require local authorities to use a special consultative procedure (SCP) for consultation on particular issues and decisions. Further, the Act also now requires local authorities to establish and maintain opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision-making.

**Case study methodology**

11. The case study method was adopted to provide an in-depth and detailed analysis of how local government has reacted to, interpreted and applied the three elements of the Act. In particular, the case studies provide the ability to select councils with significant differences in terms of population, location and nature; and contrasting responses to the legislation.

12. Local authorities were selected using the following purposive sampling criteria:

1. Type of local authority (regional council / territorial local authority)
2. Sector (metropolitan / provincial / rural as defined by Local Government New Zealand membership)
3. Councils who have not participated in previous or proposed future studies to expand knowledge about local government in New Zealand
4. Rate of general population growth to ensure inclusion of councils experiencing extremes of population growth / decline
5. Proportion of Māori residents to ensure inclusion of councils with high Māori populations
6. Location (North / South Island) to ensure inclusion of geographical spread across New Zealand and factors such as degree of urbanisation.

**Tararua District Council case study specifics**

13. The case study of the Tararua District Council was undertaken by Litmus – an independent Wellington-based research company. The research for this report was conducted to the ethical standards of the Association of Social Science Researchers and the Australasian Evaluation Society. This case study report was prepared from the review of key documents and interviews with key informants listed below.

14. Documents reviewed:

- Tararua District Community Outcomes Monitoring Report (30 June 2008)
- Tararua District Council Consultation Policy (adopted February 2008)
• Tararua District Council Advocacy Policy (adopted February 2008)
• Your future…Tararua District Community Outcomes Action Plan 1 July 2006 – 30 June 2016
• Community Plan of the Tararua District Council: 1 July 2006 – 30 June 2016
• Your future…Tararua District Community Outcomes 2005
• Tararua District Council LTCCP 2004 – 2014.

15. Key informants interviewed

• Four Tararua District Council officers and contractors
• Two elected officials
• Iwi representative
• Two community / business stakeholders
• Two community board / community committee3 representatives.

16. Those interviewed were identified by council officers as knowledgeable about one or all of the three of
the LGA elements being examined in the case. They were recruited to the case study by Tararua District
Council. Face-to-face interviews were conducted by Litmus during March 2008. Interviews lasted one
hour or more, and were digitally recorded. On request, interview notes have been made available for
review by participants.

17. Participants were informed that the Department and Litmus will seek to keep their information
confidential, and steps have been taken in the preparation of this report to reduce the likelihood they will
be identified by their comments. All participants provided informed consent for their interview.

Case study scope and analysis criteria

18. The information and data available to address the evaluation objectives are qualitative in nature.
Interviews were conducted with a limited range of informants who agreed to participate. Litmus has
undertaken a thematic analysis of the qualitative information to identify emerging themes, and to elicit
differences across different stakeholders. Themes emerging were collaborated through triangulation of
interviews with analysis of secondary data and documents. Key findings in the research are judged by
the regularity with which they are mentioned by informants, and where there is significance difference in
opinion on the same theme.

19. The case study report is therefore indicative, not definitive. That is, we are unable to categorically say
whether or not the themes noted throughout the case study report are held by all stakeholders of the
Tararua District Council, or the strength of views held. We are, however, confident that this report
accurately represents the views and perceptions of participants who contributed to this case study.

Acknowledgement

20. Litmus and the Department wish to express our thanks to all those who contributed to this case study.
We would especially like to thank Tararua District Council for assisting us in recruiting key informants
and those who gave time and reviewed the draft case study.

---

3 Community committees advocate for, and represent the interests of, their community. The role of community committees are similar to
that of community boards with the distinction that functions of community committees are defined by contact with the council rather
than prescribed by statute.
Community Outcomes

Legislative intent

“The Act promotes greater accountability between local authorities and their communities and a long-term focus for the decisions and activities of the local authority. The Act requires local authorities to facilitate a process with their communities, at least every six years, to identify community outcomes for the intermediate and long-term future of the district or region. The role of the local authority is to facilitate the process, with the community having ownership of the identified outcomes.

Identifying community outcomes is designed to promote better co-ordination and application of community resources, and inform and guide priorities for activities undertaken by local authorities and other organisations. Local authorities’ role is to facilitate the contribution other local authorities, government agencies, local organisations and the business sector make to the outcomes and priorities identified by the community.

Local authorities can decide what processes to use to identify and prioritise community outcomes but they must ensure that the processes encourage the community to contribute. They also must, before deciding on the process, identify other organisations and groups capable of influencing either the identification or the promotion of community outcomes, and, if practicable, secure their agreement to the process.”

Tararua District Council community outcomes process: response to the legislation

21. The Tararua District Council’s community outcomes process took place from October 2004 to April 2005. Tararua District Council undertook a comprehensive consultation process with the Tararua community to identify and develop the community outcomes, which were fully incorporated in the council’s 2006 -2016 Long-Term Community Council Plan (LTCCP). This document is referred to by the Tararua District Council as a Community Plan.

Tararua District Council community outcomes process


Community outcomes identified in 2004

23. As provided for under the Act, for its first LTCCP in 2004 the Tararua District Council devised community outcomes utilising information available from seven years of consultation on key council plans, community surveys and from consultation with community boards and community committees. The council identified 10 community outcomes grouped within the four well-beings. The Council consulted with the community on these outcomes through a survey published in the ‘Bush Telegraph’, a free weekly publication delivered to all households in the district, and through subsequent discussions with community boards and community committees.

24. The 10 community outcomes were presented in the 2004 LTCCP as they relate to council’s activities. The 2004 LTCCP indicated that the council’s intended to undertake a more substantial community

---

5 These are social, economic, environmental, and cultural outcomes.
8 This process is outlined in Tararua District Council’s LTCCP 2004 - 14, p17.
engagement in relation to the community outcomes and to identify agencies and businesses prepared to work with council in achieving the community outcomes for the 2006 LTCCP.

**Community outcomes identified in 2005**

25. Following the local elections in October 2004, the Tararua District Council began a substantial community outcomes consultation process to identify community outcomes to be incorporated within the 2006 LTCCP. 7

26. The council appointed a Community Outcomes Manager from December 2003 through to June 2006 with sole responsibility for developing and facilitating the second community outcomes process. This role ended following the identification and finalisation of the community outcomes. It is not clear how the previously identified outcomes were used during the 2005 community outcomes process.

27. From the outset Tararua District Council undertook initial groundwork to identify and secure participation of key organisations and groups to assist in the identification and promotion of community outcomes.

28. Tararua District Council staff were also informed of the intended community outcomes process prior to engagement with the community to ensure a good understanding of community outcomes and the processes being undertaken. Councillors appeared to have a limited role in the process which involved attending public meetings to identify community outcomes purely in a ‘listener’ capacity. As indicated by one councillor “councillors’ role is one of oversight and there was a danger that if councillors were too involved they could be seen to skew the results”.

**Key stakeholder involvement**

29. Existing council databases, central government publications and information sharing with the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Community Outcomes Group and other councils, enabled the Tararua District Council to identify organisations and groups considered able to influence either the identification or promotion of community outcomes in the district. A list of key stakeholders was developed and grouped according to the four well-beings. Each stakeholder was then written to by the council seeking formal agreement to the process and given an opportunity for feedback. Of the 27 stakeholders contacted, 25 responded and supported the proposed process and timeframe. Appendix One lists the 27 stakeholders that were contacted.

30. Two iwi of the district, Rangitane O Tamaki Nui A Rua, and Ngati Kahungunu, were also invited to engage in the community outcomes process, and to provide feedback on how Māori in the district wished to engage in the process.

31. There was also uncertainty around how to best facilitate separate Māori engagement. Initially it was considered that a ‘marae-based’ consultative approach could be utilised. However, it appears that an iwi spokesperson indicated that Māori did not require separate engagement. Engagement with Māori was therefore undertaken through the same channels as the wider community. In the case of Rangitane O Tamaki Nui A Rua this involved a one-to-one meeting between a representative of the iwi and a senior council officer. In retrospect, the council considered that it may have been better to have sought advice from the Department of Internal Affairs or Te Puni Kōkiri about alternate ways to engage separately with Māori.

32. A wider group of stakeholders were also invited to discuss and identify possible community outcomes at one of four stakeholder meetings scheduled according to the four well-beings, the council considered they had a reasonable turnout to these meetings, with stakeholders providing valuable contributions to community outcomes discussions.

**Publicity campaign and community engagement**

33. From mid-October until the end of December 2004 the council undertook a publicity campaign to engage the Tararua community in the development of the community outcomes. The publicity campaign included:

---

7 The following discussion of the community outcomes identification process is in the main taken from the report: “Your future…Tararua District Community Outcomes 2005”.

---
• A flyer ‘insert’ in the ‘Bush Telegraph’ (delivered free to every household in the Tararua district) on 2 November 2004. The flyer informed the public of the community outcomes process and how submissions could be made to contribute to the identification of the community outcomes. A submission form was attached to the flyer. To encourage participation and a prize (a mobile telephone) was available for all people who submitted by 17 December 2004.

• **Media releases** were made in the ‘Bush Telegraph’ on almost a weekly basis to keep the community notified and up-to-date on progress

• **Council website** contained information on the project and had an electronic form for people wishing to make a submission online

• **Promotional displays** and submission forms were available from the Dannevirke, Eketahuna, Pahiatua and Woodville service centres and libraries

• **Eighteen public meetings** were held across the district in November and December 2004 to obtain community feedback and perceptions of the state of the district, and hopes for the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of the district. The council also approached community leaders and groups to host public meetings with their communities. The meetings were hosted by community boards and committees and facilitated by the Community Outcomes Manager, with councillors invited to attend in a ‘listener’ role. Attendances ranged from two to 35 people. Notes from the discussions at these meetings were incorporated into a community outcomes database.

• **Youth participation** through a presentation and discussions with senior students of Totara College and an invitation for them to submit. Two other high schools were invited to participate but were unable to do so due to timeframes.

34. In addition to the discussion notes from the 18 public meetings, a total of 110 individual and 10 group submissions were received on the community outcomes.

**Community outcomes identification**

35. The community consultation undertaken identified over 900 separate issues. These issues were entered into an initial community outcomes database and analysed by common themes across the four well-beings. Ten high-level community outcomes were identified at this stage. The high-level approach to the outcomes was considered appropriate by the council to ensure outcomes that were memorable and relevant to the community.

**Community outcomes prioritisation**

36. Further community consultation was undertaken from February to April 2005 to prioritise the identified community outcomes and to provide the community with an opportunity to further consider the outcomes identified during the earlier consultation. The process for prioritisation included:

• A self-completion questionnaire based on the six outcomes, published in the ‘Bush Telegraph’ on 14 February 2005. The community were asked to consider the outcomes and rank them in terms of importance. Thirty-eight responses were received

• A telephone survey of 200 randomly selected households (from the telephone directory) was conducted by an independent research agency from 17 March to 11 April 2005.

37. Following this process, the ten community outcomes were reduced to six and then prioritised according to selected importance. ‘Safe communities’, ‘high standard of infrastructure (particularly road network)’ and ‘access to services’ were ranked as the highest priorities from the consultation.

38. Appendix Two sets out the six community outcomes identified in 2005, as well as the earlier community outcomes identified by the council in 2004. Both sets of outcomes contain similar themes. The main
differences appeared to be that the economic and environmental outcomes identified in 2005 are broader than those identified in 2004. The environment outcomes in 2005 refer to sustainability and preserving the natural environment and the cultural outcomes also refer to preserving the community’s culture and heritage. The cultural outcomes in 2005 are for the community and are not specific to youth as they were in 2004. The 2005 cultural outcomes appear more defined and relate to community engagement. The social outcomes in 2005 also appear more defined relating specifically to safety and access to services.

Community outcomes in the LTCCP

39. The council’s Community Plan refers to council’s contribution to the community outcomes through its core activities and outlines the organisations that will work with council for the benefit of the community. The Community Plan also outlines council’s proposed community outcomes monitoring programme, which was signalled as having the agreement and commitment of key organisations.

40. The Community Plan clearly states that the community outcomes belong to the people of Tararua. Through the Community Plan, the council describes a variety of roles it will undertake to assist in achieving the desired outcomes, including: provider, funder, regulator, partner, collaborator, facilitator, advocate, leader and monitor.

41. As part of its commitment to undertaking this range of roles, the Tararua District Council employed a consultant (different to the Community Outcomes Manager) to develop an advocacy policy, adopted in February 2008. This policy recognises the importance of advocacy to the wellbeing of the community and as a way to help the community achieve their outcomes. The policy sets out situations where council will advocate and how it will do so.

Community outcomes action plan and monitoring

42. The consultant who developed the council’s advocacy policy also assisted with a process for monitoring of community outcomes. In conjunction with external organisations the council has devised a ‘Community Outcomes Action Plan 1 July 2006 – 30 June 2016. This document identifies performance indicators and targets to measure progress of the community in achieving their community outcomes. Each outcome has a range of performance measures and timescales, together with the lead organisations and how they their corresponding plans/strategies will contribute to the achievement of the outcomes.

43. Tararua District Council is currently finalising its Community Outcomes Monitoring Report. The report lists specific performance indicators and measures (including those identified in the Community Plan) and presents data from council and other organisations in order to indicate positive or negative trends. For example, the community outcome ‘a high standard of infrastructure’ uses indicators such as road safety, road access, heavy vehicles in CBD, road improvements, street lighting, flooding, grading of water, drinking water standards, and perceptions of townscape and amenities. In this case data is sourced from the council, the Communitrak Survey, and Land Transport New Zealand’s website.

Community outcomes benefits

44. The benefits of the community outcomes identified during this research relate mainly to the engagement and consultation process utilised by the council, the building of partnerships with a variety of groups and organisations, and the useful reference point provided by the outcomes.

Community engagement

45. Tararua District Council undertook an extensive engagement and consultation process with the community. This included recognition of the four distinct geographically spread communities within the District (Dannevirke, Pahiatua, Eketahunu and Woodville) and engagement through the established structure of community boards and committees.

46. From the perspective of an iwi representative interviewed they consider that they have a good relationship with the council. The key to this is a “reliance on trust” and that council “sees the appropriate
importance of it”. They considered that consultation over the community outcomes was a continuation of an already positive relationship.

47. The community outcomes were given widespread publicity through a number of different forums. A community board member noted that council “tried the utmost to implement consultation in light of the legislation and worked very hard to have a good rapport with ratepayers.” This translated into 110 individual submissions and 10 group submissions, and 18 public meetings.

48. The Community Outcomes Manager who was employed during the community outcomes identification process was also positively seen as an impartial liaison point between the community and the council.

Building of strategic partnerships

49. As noted in the Community Plan, for the council to work towards achieving the community outcomes it needs to continue to build strategic partnerships with representatives from local and central government, various community organisations, Māori and the private sector. The community outcomes process and the focus of the Act on the four well-being areas is seen as a key driver to the development of new stakeholder relationships. In the past relationships have mainly been centred around traditional areas such as infrastructure, and while these existing relationships remain important, the council is also seeking the input of other organisations in monitoring and achieving the community outcomes.

Reference point

50. A community board member and an elected official both referred to the usefulness of the community outcomes as being a useful reference point. It enabled them to better understand what the community aspires to, and therefore to justify actions taken in day-to-day work as well as guiding strategic planning.

Community outcomes issues

51. Tararua is a rural district with a small population geographically spread across four main centres, connected by a large roading network. As such it has a limited rating-base and limited government agency and industry presence in the region.

52. The district is required to comply with standards imposed by regional and central government (i.e. water quality and sewerage). It now also needs to consider social, cultural, and economic wellbeing, beyond the traditional focus on the environment and infrastructure. It is from this context that participants identified issues around community outcomes.

Time and cost

53. Councillors and stakeholders interviewed perceived the cost and time to develop the community outcomes to be a burden on their small council. A council committee member also considered the process to be slightly excessive which stretched the resources of the council. A stakeholder also considered the process used by the council to be relatively expensive process, when at the end of the day you still got the same ‘squeaky wheel’.

54. A councillor also perceived that the Act appeared to force councils into consultation that was time consuming and expensive, and that their council “didn’t need to go to the expense that it did. The results came out as we would have expected.” While the process to identify community outcomes is not prescribed by the Act, a participant considered that the extensive process undertaken reflected the “importance that council staff gave to the community outcomes”. This participant also considered “there was some reservation by some councillors” who did not seem to see the role of council as extending easily into the four wellbeing areas. This may in part be due to the limited role that councillors played in the community outcomes process.

Process did not add value

55. While some participants recognised that community engagement was a benefit deriving from the community outcomes process, others believed that despite the extensive process utilised, the process did not seem to add value to the council. This may be attributed to the overall satisfaction with pre-
existing relationships and engagement with council and a level of trust in their elected officials to represent the community.

56. A community board member spoke of public meetings undertaken by the board six months prior to the community outcomes around main street beautification that also identified community priorities for the area. From their perspective, they were uncertain as to the value of the community outcomes in relation to this previous consultation. They queried whether it might not be better to utilise such existing engagement methods to consult on community outcomes on a yearly basis, rather than expend resources on employing a Community Outcomes Manager. They believe this would lead community outcomes consultation being conducted on a “smaller scale” more often and at a reduced overall cost. This perspective was supported by a community committee member.

Raised expectations

57. Most participants were concerned that the community outcomes raised community expectations. The perception was that the process had encouraged communities to come up with a range of aspirations that in turn unduly raised expectations as to what the council can or should be delivering. They felt this was exacerbated, as the community outcomes process made no reference to cost – “there’s no economics around it.” For example, having clean water can be costly, however this was not clearly identified when the community selected this as a desired outcome. Most participants considered that the associated costs of community outcomes should be the basis for discussion in the next round of community outcomes.

Role of central government agencies

58. Participants queried the role of central government in furthering the community outcomes. While they perceived the introduction of the Act (by central government) had placed additional requirements on local government, they queried how central government was involved in the furthering of the outcomes:

59. “It’s good we’re working closely with central government but central government have to be listening too, at the same stage and not saying ‘oh you do all this.’ I mean I sometimes feel there are things we are prescribed to do whereas central government itself doesn’t impose that type of standard on its own organisation and its own processes.”

60. Some lead agencies within the region were thought to have had a slow reaction to furthering the community outcomes. This reaction was not helped by staff turnover and an apparent lack of understanding as to what had previously been agreed. From this perspective, it was considered that there was a need for a Community Outcomes Manager-type role beyond community outcomes identification, progressing into implementation. Alternately, establishing an umbrella interagency group of council and members from external organisations may help to maintain momentum around community outcomes.

Focusing on the four well-beings

61. Some participants expressed concern that the Act and associated community outcomes over extended the role of local authorities into social, cultural and economic well-being, and that this was a further example of central government overburdening councils and further devolving responsibilities onto local government. This was particularly prevalent for a rural district where infrastructure continues to be of prime importance – “Council is about infrastructure – not social activities. Even cultural and economic development is central government’s concern.”

Impact of community outcomes

62. Tararua District ran an extensive community outcomes engagement and consultation process. Some participants considered this to be beneficial for developing relationships and understanding community aspirations. However others considered this needed to be weighed against the actual time, cost and perceived value of the outcomes, together with the issue of raised expectations within the community.
63. The community outcomes in the 2006 - 2016 LTCCP are linked to the activities of the council. Council has developed an advocacy policy as part of an overall focus towards achieving community outcomes which suggests they are looking at different ways they can respond to the communities’ outcomes. The council has also developed relationships and has been working with external agencies toward the achievement of the community outcomes, although some participants questioned the commitment of some central government agencies to this process.

Future community outcomes

64. Between 1991 and 2001 Tararua district faced a 10% decrease in population. The district has also had to contend with a decline in services, the closure of local post offices and school mergers. Core issues facing the community relate to retaining and attracting people to the district, retaining services and maintaining and developing a high quality infrastructure.

65. Given the small population and limited rating-base, achieving community outcomes in the future needs to centre on realistic considerations and actions, including the role of stakeholders. Participants therefore consistently identified that the next round of discussions on the community outcomes must ensure that financial considerations are an integral part of the consultation “We will ask what are you prepared to pay, so that if you want that outcome you will know what it will mean in terms of cost.”

Reflections of Tararua District Council’s implementation against the legislative intent

66. The table below summarises the legislative intent and Tararua District Council’s implementation of the mandated community outcomes process. In reviewing the table, it needs to be acknowledged that only one formal round of community outcomes has been held that directly involved the community in identifying community outcomes. Therefore the community outcomes are at an early stage in their implementation with lessons to be learned and new processes to be developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative intent</th>
<th>Tararua District Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process to identify other organisations and groups capable of influencing either the identification or the promotion of community outcomes</td>
<td>The council initiated a process to identify organisations and continues to work with organisations that contribute to the development of community outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes to encourage the community to contribute</td>
<td>An extensive engagement process that included two rounds of consultation was undertaken. The first round used a range of methods to identify the community outcomes. The second round used a questionnaire and telephone survey to attempt to prioritise the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community outcomes for the intermediate and long-term future of the district or region</td>
<td>Tararua District Council identified six community outcomes and incorporated these into their LTCCP, an Action Plan and Monitoring Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term focus for the decisions and activities of the local authority</td>
<td>Community outcomes are linked and referenced to councils’ activities in council’s Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide priorities for activities undertaken by local authorities and other organisations</td>
<td>Six community outcomes were prioritised by the community. The Community Plan and Action Plan indicate how council and other organisations will contribute. The Monitoring Report indicates lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Legislative intent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative intent</th>
<th>Tararua District Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community having ownership of the identified outcomes</td>
<td>The Community Plan clearly states that the community outcomes belong to the community. It has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficult to identify community ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater accountability between local authorities and their communities</td>
<td>It is too early to determine this. Participants indicated that there has always been good engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between the council and community. While participants do not see the outcomes as having a significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact on engagement, they are seen as a reference point to understand community aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better co-ordination and application of community resource</td>
<td>Tararua District Council is continuing to build relationships with external organisations. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Report (which the Act requires the council to produce) will provide an overall picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the communities progression to community outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. Tararua District Council undertook extensive consultation to identify the community outcomes. While some participants valued the process used, others raised issue associated the time and cost of the process relative to its perceived value. Issues were also identified relating to rates increases, infrastructural concerns and tensions with the role of central government in the achievement of community outcomes. As a result of the process Tararua District Council has further developed relationships with organisations across the well-beings and is continuing to develop these through the monitoring process.

### Strategic Planning (LTCCP)

#### Legislative intent

"The LTCCP describes the community outcomes and priorities and the activities the local authority will undertake to contribute to the outcomes. The plan is designed to integrate decision-making and include information on the key policies of the local authority. It also describes linkages between activities and how they are funded."

Included in the LTCCP are financial reporting requirements. Significant examples of this include making “adequate and effective provision for expenditure” by showing estimates for the next ten years of the council’s activities. The LTCCP includes statements of service performance and shows from what sources of council revenue they will be funded. An LTCCP is auditable as are any amendments to it. The Annual Plan reports a council’s progress to the LTCCP.

An authority must consult its “wider communities” over its LTCCP. The Act states that the authority must use a SCP to consult, although a council can use other consultation methods in addition to this.⁸

---

**Tararua District Council LTCCP - response to the legislation**

68. Tararua District Council adopted its LTCCP: referred to as the ‘Community Plan 1 July 2006 – 30 June 2016’ on 28 June 2006. The Community Plan was developed in-house and involved extensive input from managers responsible for budgets and associated activities.

69. Councillors were extensively involved throughout the preparation of the Community Plan. They were kept informed of the proposed consultation and the results of that consultation (submissions) as they were received.

70. The Community Plan presents the district’s community outcomes upfront and addresses how council’s activities will contribute to the six community outcomes identified. The Plan also lists the groups and organisations council is working with to further the community outcomes.

**LTCCP consultation process**

71. The council adopted its draft Community Plan for consultation on 12 April 2006. The Act required the council to prepare a summary of the Community Plan and this was delivered to all ratepayers and was made available at service centres and libraries. It was also mailed to all on council’s mailing list and sent to anyone who requested a copy. The ‘Bush Telegraph’, council website and community committees and community boards also promoted the draft for consultation.

72. The council considers that it sought wider community involvement beyond the minimum requirements set down in the Act. This included an extensive meeting schedule for the elected members and the management team who visited most communities in the district.

73. “They went all over the place; anywhere anybody wanted them to go they went. Golf clubs or service clubs or organisations, small rural communities. If they were asked or if there was some sort of structure they approached them and said would you be interested in somebody coming to explain the LTCCP and getting your feedback?”

74. Ten public meetings were held throughout the district, with approximately 282 people attending. A total of 131 submissions were received on the draft Community Plan, many on more than one subject. In May 2006 31 submitters were heard in Pahiatua and Dannevirke. All submissions were subsequently considered, debated and reviewed at a council meeting on 14 June 2006. As a result of consultation, changes were made to the plan in areas relating to funding, roading and the budget. The Community Plan was adopted by the resolution of council on 28 June 2006.

75. The council has made two amendments since the adoption of the Community Plan. One amendment related to the Dannevirke main street refurbishment (due to the significant change in the budget). The other amendment was perceived to be minor, relating to a change in the Funding Policy around payment for use of council’s landfill.

**LTCCP benefits**

76. The key benefits of the Community Plan were seen around long-term vision and long-term planning. Councillors, council officers and a community board member all considered the long-term focus of the Community Plan provided stability and structure for future planning.

77. The Community Plan was seen to guide the future of the district irrespective of whether the make-up of council changes or new issues of the day arise. “It stops the target moving all of the time, as well as the issue of rates being a core driver to your planning activities.” The council’s planning process is now considered to be more grounded and based on outcomes or results which guide the council direction.

78. The long-term planning focus also meant that council projects were carefully considered before inclusion in the Community Plan. Inclusion in the plan therefore implies a considered commitment made to the future of a project, rather than them being the result of ad hoc decisions made at the last minute. A community board member indicated “it means that a proposal cannot just come out of the left-field.” The
long-term commitment to projects and associated expenditure was considered particularly important to large infrastructure projects that had significant sums of money attached.

79. The Community Plan was also considered to be important by the council’s senior management, as it was seen to provide an oversight of where the council is, and where it wants to be. This approach will help keep the council focused on the bigger picture, and ground the decisions made by the council.

**LTCCP issues**

80. For a small council, such as Tararua District Council, a key issue in the development of the Community Plan has been the time and resource allocation required to develop and consult on the Community Plan and the costs of audit. Attracting the interest of the community was noted as challenging and some participants also regarded the 10-year focus of the Plan as problematic due to the impact of unforeseen events. Several issues were also raised in relation to the process for amendments to the Community Plan.

**Time and resource required**

81. Developing a document the size and scope of the Community Plan was seen to be “hard for small councils with limited staffing resources to complete the process.” The time and resource required was said to have placed a significant burden on council staff. Some participants also considered the Act to be prescriptive and potentially overwhelming.

82. Reflecting on the completion of the first full Community Plan, a council officer considered that the council was highly pressured for time towards the end of the process. This may have been a result of the council under-estimating the time required to develop the Plan. The tight timeframes were seen to have resulted in elected members being pressured to make decisions, which meant that issues about the process dominated discussions on the Plan. This was perceived as contributing to some councillors not fully accepting ownership of the Community Plan.

**Audit**

83. Both councillors and council officers considered that audit costs were problematic, with some of them observing that such costs have recently “skyrocketed”. These councillors and council officers argued that for a small council with a limited rating-base, the costs incurred in auditing the LTCCP of between $170,000 and 180,000 were significant. It should be noted that the fee charged to the council for auditing the LTCCP was $37,531. This was the fee originally agreed between the council and the auditors at the beginning of the audit process, and this fee was not raised during that process.

84. While the participants recognised the value of audit and independent assurance, having to justify the costs to the community was challenging as “the community would prefer to see the money spent on roads or sewerage or water than on audit fees rather than making sure that a big book which very few people ask for or read is technically correct and complying.”

**Community consultation**

85. Council officers considered that getting greater involvement of the wider community in LTCCP consultation was difficult. This reflects the difficulties of generating interest if the matter is not of particular concern or there is no controversial issue. In essence “We seem to get the same people and groups submitting each year on the same types of issues.” Techniques such as presenting to interest groups and using community boards and committees were recognised as ways to overcome this challenge.

**Ten-year planning focus**

86. While some participants recognised the long-term benefits of the LTCCP and saw merit in the 10-year focus (particularly in relation to asset management), a community board member, councillor and council staff member all saw the 10-year focus as being too long. This reflected their concern about the ability to
meaningfully project costs and projects this far ahead. Financial forecasting was seen to be potentially affected by uncontrollable events, such as inflation or extreme weather. The latter is particularly top of mind for Tararua District has recently experienced flooding, and a drought both of which have impacted on the rural economy.

Amendments to LTCCP

87. The council’s experiences in undergoing two amendments to the Community Plan have raised several issues for the council in relation to the Act.

88. The first issue relates to a substantial amendment which changed the budget and scope of a project provided for in the Community Plan. While the council undertook specific consultation on the full proposal, an officer noted that had the council chosen to, the Act would not have necessarily prevented it from partially undertaking the project using the budget outlined in the Community Plan. Council would then have only needed to consult on the remaining part of the project that required additional budget. From the perspective of this council however, this would have been inappropriate as it is not true consultation. This raised the issue as to whether the Act is sufficiently prescriptive in certain aspects, despite it being considered too prescriptive in others.

89. The second issue related to the publication of an amendment to a LTCCP once it was made. The observation was made that there does not appear to be a requirement in the Act to publish the actual amendment once it has been consulted on and audited.

90. Further issues were identified as to the difficulty in determining whether a matter is a variation or amendment to an LTCCP. The example given was an opportunity to acquire fibre optic cable from the private sector. While council had budgeted for a wireless network it did not have the desired means to achieve this. This issue was resolved after the council sought advice from Audit New Zealand prior to making a determination as to whether this constituted an amendment or variation.

91. Concern was also expressed about the need to undergo consultation and audit for what were perceived to be minor amendments to an LTCCP when outside the annual plan or LTCCP process. A community stakeholder thought that the LTCCP “sets things in concrete” and that it was complicated and expensive to change things once they had been included in the LTCCP.

Impact and future of the LTCCP

92. The Community Plan was viewed as an important planning tool for councillors and council officers due to its long-term vision and planning focus. In particular, the Community Plan provided an important grounding for senior management and elected members in providing structure to future planning based on outcomes (rather than reactive decision-making).

93. However, the costs of audit have proved to be significant for council, and these are thought to have been compounded by the need to amend the Community Plan.

94. Council also considered that the limited timeframe and to prepare and adopt the LTCCP to comply with the Act resulted in some of their decisions being rushed. This situation may have potentially affected councillor buy-in, and could have had some bearing on the need to subsequently amend the Community Plan. A council officer indicated that for the next LTCCP, more time would be given to preparation and that the process would not be rushed.

95. “I think we’ve learnt, and it’s certainly reinforced by the Auditor General and his directives through our Audit Manager, to allow time to go through everything with a fine-toothed comb – although this takes extensive resources so that you comply with each requirement.”
Tararua District Council LTCCP against legislative intent

96. The table below summarises the legislative intent of the Act regarding the LTCCP and Tararua District Council’s implementation of the requirements. This table refers to the Community Plan 2006 - 2016, which was the first full LTCCP required under the new Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Intent</th>
<th>Tararua District Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTCCP describes community outcomes and shows local authorities contribution to them</td>
<td>The Community Plan lists the six community outcomes identified and shows how council activities will contribute to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wider community” is consulted on the LTCCP</td>
<td>Tararua District Council considers that it undertook broader consultation than the minimum required by the Act. The council sent a summary document to all ratepayers and widely publicised its availability and the submission process. Council also went out to the community to present the Community Plan and to seek feedback through 10 public meetings across the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTCCP is auditable and meets important financial reporting requirements</td>
<td>The Community Plan was audited and found to be a reasonable basis for long-term integrated decision-making by the council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97. In summary, Tararua District Council’s Community Plan is seen to fulfil the requirements of the Act. The Community Plan refers to the community outcomes upfront and demonstrates how council activities will contribute to them. The community outcomes and Community Plan provide a core basis from which council’s long-term vision and planning is determined, grounding and providing structure to council’s long-term planning.

98. The council considers that it undertook wide community engagement on the Community Plan and sought to encourage diverse community involvement. Of continued concern for participants is that of achieving wider community interest, the time and resources required for the development and auditing of the Community Plan, and difficulties in long-term financial forecasting when shaped by unforeseen events, such as flooding and drought, as recently experienced in the district.
Council Decision-Making

Legislative intent

“The Act requires local authorities to be more rigorous in their decision-making [than prior to the new Act] by identifying all reasonably practicable options for achieving the objective of a decision and assessing those options by considering the benefits and costs in terms of the present and future well-being of the community, and the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted. Depending on the significance, local authorities are also required to consider the impact of each option on their capacity to meet present and future needs in relation to their statutory responsibilities.”

Local authorities must be rigorous in their decision-making by identifying all practicable options for achieving an objective or resolving a problem. The costs and benefits of these options have to be evaluated against the achievement of the community outcomes and the present and future well-being of the community.

When making a decision a local authority must consider if consultation of “interested and affected parties” is required. The authority must undertake that consultation in accordance with certain principles, which broadly speaking, require the authority to:

- provide easy-to-understand summaries of proposals and plans (such as the LTCCP);
- identify who will be affected by decisions and encourage them to make their views known to the council – councils also must give reasons for their decisions;
- find out what all the practical options are for dealing with issues and carefully assess them.

A local authority has discretion in deciding how it interprets and meets the decision-making requirements of the Act. This discretion can be applied in terms of the significance of the decision. A council must develop a policy on significance that indicates what triggers must occur before undertaking a decision (although a council is not prevented from undertaking analysis or consulting on a decision that does not trigger this policy).

The Act also places requirements on council’s to involve Māori in their decision-making (especially regarding land and water), and to consider ways to foster Māori contribution to their decision-making processes.9

Tararua District Council approach to decision-making

99. Council officers and elected officials interviewed were all aware of the Acts’ requirements in relation to decision-making. Tararua District Council has developed a ‘Policy on Significance’ and consultation is carried out according to council’s ‘Consultation Policy’ (adopted in February 2008). The policy incorporates the principles outlined in the Act, identifies different levels of consultation and provides a summary of the special consultative procedure (SCP) required by the Act.

100. The Policy of Significance and Consultation Policy were seen to assist the council to determine the significance of issues and the nature of any consultation required. The council’s criteria to determine

---

significance was adopted from the Act, and includes an assessment of each issue on the basis of the following criteria:

• The current and future social, economic, environmental or cultural well-being of the district

• Any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the issue, proposal, decision or matter

• The council’s capacity to perform its role and carry out its activities, now and in the future, and the financial, resources and other costs of doing so.

101. The council also considers the importance of the decision in terms of its achievement or ability to achieve the community outcomes in the Community Plan. The Tararua District Council has elected not to determine thresholds to determine significance on the basis that the range of issues requiring decisions by council is very wide, and that it is not possible to foresee every possibility.

102. An example of Tararua District Council’s decision-making relates to the Dannevirke Town Centre refurbishment. The 2006 Community Plan was prepared on the basis of a “bare bone replacement budget based on changing cobblestones on the footpath and very little else.” Council subsequently decided to consult on a proposal to extend the refurbishment to a pedestrian upgrade, security cameras and further pavement works “which ended up increasing the budget three-fold.”

103. The updated proposal was developed by an architectural group, who also undertook extensive consultation with businesses in the main street and the council and achieved local buy-in for the proposal over a period of time. Council considered that the revised proposal significantly affected the cost of the activity as initially provided for the Community Plan. A special consultative procedure was therefore used outside of the LTCCP and annual plan process; this included a number of public meetings. Council received significant interest in the consultation process and a number of submissions were received.

104. The key issue framing the consultation related to the manner in which the project would be funded. Specifically, the proposal’s rate implications and the fact that while the cost would be met by all district residents, the proposal would primarily benefit residents of Dannevirke.

Community engagement in the decision-making process

105. Most participants viewed council’s actual engagement with stakeholders positively, and saw that it was proactive. Given this history of positive engagement, these participants did not appear to perceive any changes to council’s engagement that could be directly linked to the Act.

106. Council engagement with the community in relation to the town centre upgrade was also seen positively by participants. However concern was expressed by some participants about the way the council interpreted the submissions when making its final decision.

Engagement with stakeholders

107. Community stakeholders generally viewed council as doing a very good job of engaging with them, and considered that the council has done so prior to the implementation of the Act. “They bend over backwards to involve the community in decision-making.” From the perspective of the stakeholders interviewed, there appears to be faith and trust in the council, and a belief that the council at both a senior management and officer level will keep the community informed of important issues affecting the district as they are, “fairly proactive in eliciting views”.

108. On the other hand, one council committee member did not think that the council proactively engaged with the community, they thought that the council needed to involve stakeholders earlier in its decision-making process. The opportunity for input into council meetings was also seen to be limited due to the way in which speaking opportunities at council meetings were ordered. Another participant also expressed an opinion that there were also “a significant proportion of people not happy with council consultation, with a distinct North/South ward divide, particularly apparent from the results of council’s Communitrak survey which asked about satisfaction with council consultation.”
Engagement with iwi

109. Despite these generally positive views on council engagement, in reference to the town centre upgrade, stakeholders and a councillor considered that the majority of opinion was not well represented and there were questions about the manner in which the submissions were interpreted by the council. There was a feeling that the “project was predetermined before consultation.”

110. Tararua District Council has a Memorandum of Partnership with Rangitane O Tamaki Nui A Rua. The memorandum was established in 2000 (prior to the Act) following a process to determine the appropriate iwi for the council to consult with, as this had been an issue for some years. The establishment of the Memorandum was therefore seen to be enabling “the relationship between iwi and the council to become clearer and has given the council the confidence to consult with Rangitane O Tamaki Nui A Rua.”

111. The relationship between council and Rangitane O Tamaki Nui A Rua was viewed positively, with a spokesperson for the iwi confirming that the council involves the iwi in the decision-making process at an early stage. The council also meets regularly with the iwi to keep them informed about matters, and to seek their feedback and opinion. Formal meetings are held twice a year. The relationship is said by participants to be built on trust that when the council recognises an issue that is likely to impact upon Māori, the council will contact the iwi in relation to those matters.

112. Tararua District Council was seen by participants to be proactive and willing to have separate meetings and separate consultations with Māori at appropriate venues such as marae. These meetings were particularly in relation to environmental matters and issues relating to water. From the perspective of the iwi representative interviewed, the council has an obligation to ensure that Māori participate in its decision-making processes, although there is no expectation that this consultation should differ from that undertaken with other equally important stakeholders in the district.

113. Council’s ‘Policy on the Development of Māori Capacity to Participate in Council Decision-Making’ as given in the Community Plan, sets out possible initiatives to better enable Māori to contribute to Councils’ decision-making. The iwi representative reflected on how the capacity of Māori could be developed to better contribute to council decision-making. They indicated that council has signalled it is open to assisting with training and mentoring to enhance Māori representation within council, although the iwi would need to identify potential candidates for the council to up-skill, train and mentor.

114. It was considered that there was a positive relationship between Rangitane O Tamaki Nui A Rua and the council prior to the Act and the introduction of the associated policy on the development of Māori capacity. It is therefore difficult to determine the impact of the Act on this relationship.

Decision-making benefits

115. Participants did not generally perceive there to have been any changes in engagement with council around decision-making as a result of the introduction of the Act. The actual decision-making provisions of the Act were recognised to have enhanced the transparency of decision-making within council. A council officer indicated that the decision-making process in the Act had the benefit of creating greater “transparency” to council’s decision-making: it’s a matter of focusing on the decision-making process to ensure that it’s quite transparent and clear within the reasons taken into account and the criteria for that actual decision.

Decision-making issues

116. Achieving meaningful consultation and the subjectivity of determining significance were two issues raised in relation to decision-making under the Act.

Achieving meaningful consultation

117. From the perspective of a community committee member and councillor, the community is seen to be suffering from consultation fatigue and as a result they are apathetic in responding to council consultation. Furthermore, there was a perception that care is needed by the council in their interpretation of the Act, so that consultation is not seen to be required just for the sake of consultation.
(although this is not an assumption of the Act). They feel that the community has trust in their elected officials and “just want them to get on with it.”

118. This opinion may be contrasted with the interest received in relation to consultation on the specific issue based town centre refurbishment proposal; although stakeholders indicated that they are now questioning the value of engagement following the town centre refurbishment decision.

119. From the perspective of a council officer, it is difficult to achieve constructive input into decision-making using the submissions process when the responses do not appear to focus on the core issue at stake, but rather relate to wider issues (e.g. rates in general).

120. “Unfortunately a lot of the submissions aren’t helpful to the council if you get somebody writing in that their rates are too high. The community’s ability to pay, well that’s fine, but it would be helpful if they said well we don’t want the following and we’re happy for you to drop it.”

Subjectivity of determining significance

121. The Act’s decision-making process was seen to have provided an element of transparency to decision-making, however the council did have issues with the fact that whether a matter was significance or not could be quite subjective. This meant that some matters remain wide open for debate and decisions can be difficult to progress or opportunities lost while the relative significance of the matter is determined.

Impacts of the Act on decision-making

122. The council considers that engagement with the community in the decision-making process does not appear to have changed with the introduction of the Act. However, while the council has implemented a Policy of Significance as required by the Act, they have also recently introduced a Consultation Policy.

123. A council officer considered that some of the decision-making criteria in the Act may be subjective, and while they thought that the Act has prescribed the requirement to consult it also provided the council with a rationale for when consultation needs to be undertaken: “Before the Act the decision to consult was purely political. The Act has added the requirement that you actually do have to go out and consult and give that opportunity.” Therefore, while “we probably did a lot of these things anyway” the Act and associated polices were seen to have formalised council practice. In this way the Act has encouraged council to provide guidance and tools, and to look at the transparency of its processes as a basis for debate within council.

Tararua District Council decision-making against legislative intent

124. It is difficult to judge how the Act has been applied within a particular council without examining every decision made by a council – this is outside the scope of this report. Below are three intents of the Act’s section on decision-making that this report can offer some feedback on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Intent</th>
<th>Tararua District Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve community involvement in council decision-making</td>
<td>Community involvement in council decision-making is not seen to have changed as a result of the Act, as council is seen to have engaged well with the community prior to the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council decisions will be more strategic (including a longer-term focus) in nature</td>
<td>Tararua District Council has implemented a Policy on Significance which has had the effect of providing structure around the decision-making process. Council activities are embedded within the long-term focus of the LTCCP, although one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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recent decision was significantly different from what had been planned in the LTCCP

| Involve Māori in decision-making and help develop Māori capacity to contribute to council decisions | Council formalised its relationship with one local iwi though a Memorandum of Partnership and involvement in the council decision-making process prior to the introduction of the Act. The council has introduced a policy on the development of Māori capacity in council decision-making since the Act’s introduction and has indicated an openness to provide training and mentoring to develop Māori capacity in the decision-making process. It is not yet clear whether the scale of changes is a result of the Act, or as the natural progression of pre-existing relationships |

125. In summary, the decision-making provisions of the Act are not seen to have changed much in relation to council’s engagement with communities. The Act has however provided structure and transparency in the decision-making process, although issues remain as to the subjectivity of determining the significance of a matter. Achieving meaningful engagement through the submissions process remains a key issue for both the council and stakeholders participants interviewed.
Conclusions

In general

126. Tararua District Council undertook an extensive process to engage the community in the community outcomes process and in consulting on the Community Plan. This was in keeping with the positive nature of council’s engagement with its community prior to the Act’s introduction.

127. It is difficult to determine whether the community outcomes and the decision-making requirements of the Act have significantly changed the work of the council or the relationship with the community. The strategic planning provisions of the Act do seem to have contributed to the long-term planning focus for council activities, with the Community Plan showing a clear link between the community outcomes and council’s activities.

128. The community outcomes process and the Act’s focus on the four wellbeing areas has also led the council to develop relationships with external organisations and to further develop existing relationships in monitoring progress to the community outcomes.

129. For a small council with a rurally based population, extensive roading network and limited rating-base, the cost and time of what are seen as added requirements associated with the Act is of major concern to the council in terms of how they view the impact of the Act and its implementation.

130. Concerns were also expressed at what is seen to be an increasing burden of responsibility devolved to local government by central government. The council would also like to see more from central government in the furtherance of community outcomes.

Community outcomes

131. Mixed opinions were held by participants in relation to the value of the community outcomes process. While it was well recognised that the council had undertaken extensive engagement, some viewed this exercise as being expensive and time consuming, relative to the value attained. This was particularly so for a small council who considered they already engaged well with their community prior to the introduction of the Act.

132. Many people interviewed also felt that the development of the community outcomes had raised expectations as to what could be achieved and by whom. The role of central government in achieving community outcomes was also open for question. The consistent view was that the next round of community outcomes should also clearly identify issues of cost related to the achievement of the outcomes identified.

LTCCP

133. The LTCCP is positively viewed as a useful tool that provides structure and stability to council’s long-term planning. Again the cost, time and resourcing required to develop the LTCCP was a core issue for the Tararua District Council. In addition long-term financial forecasting is considered to be difficult in a district whose rural economy has been affected by the costs of inflation, and unexpected events such as flood and drought. Having said that, the Act does require an LTCCP to clearly identify all significant forecasting assumptions and risks.

Decision-making

134. Tararua District Council considers that it has always engaged well with the community in the decision-making process. Little was therefore seen to have changed in this regard as a result of the Act. The Act has provided structure and transparency in the decision-making process through the required Policy on Significance, and the councils subsequent completion of a Consultation Policy.
**Appendix One: Key Stakeholders**

Tararua District Council sought the formal agreement of the following stakeholders to the community outcomes process and their feedback.\(^\text{10}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ Police</td>
<td>Ministry of Economic Development</td>
<td>Ministry for the Environment</td>
<td>Te Puni Kokiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>NZ Trade &amp; Enterprise</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>Rangitane O Tamaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MidCentral District Health Board</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Nui A Rua Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social Development</td>
<td>Transit NZ</td>
<td>NZ Fire Service</td>
<td>Ngati Kahungunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing NZ Corporation</td>
<td>Transfund NZ</td>
<td>Horizons Regional Council</td>
<td>Creative NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Internal Affairs</td>
<td>Land Transport New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Historic Places Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Youth Development</td>
<td>Department of Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Community Employment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) As indicated in the report: “Your future…Tararua District Community Outcomes 2005”.
## Appendix Two: Community Outcomes Identified in 2004 and 2005\(^\text{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004 Identified Community Outcomes</th>
<th>2005 Identified Community Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC WELLBEING</td>
<td>ECONOMIC WELLBEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>A strong, prosperous economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standard of infrastructure</td>
<td>A high standard of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. roading, water)</td>
<td>(transport, well maintained towns, amenities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive towns</td>
<td>A sustainable natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced waste, more recycling</td>
<td>Effect &amp; efficient waste management for sustainability of natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal and plant pests under control</td>
<td>Protected/preserved natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better natural and built environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL &amp; CULTURAL WELLBEING</td>
<td>SOCIAL WELLBEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring, safe and friendly community</td>
<td>A safe community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to excellent local health, education, training</td>
<td>Access to local services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; economic opportunities for young people</td>
<td>CULTURAL WELLBEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A connected community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community has access to and participates in sport, recreation and social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community has greater say &amp; are listened to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; heritage is celebrated &amp; preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts &amp; culture supported by the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) The 2004 and 2005 community outcomes are taken from the 2004 - 2014 and 2006 - 2016 LTCCPs of the Tararua District Council.