

Economic Development Strategy – Next Steps

Economic Development Strategy – Next Steps

Earlier this year, the Council published an Economic Development Strategy, prepared by consultants MartinJenkins, and invited stakeholders and the wider community to provide feedback on the proposals. The Council considered all the submissions and has developed an amended schedule of actions and a set of questions for a second round of consultation. The Council will consider the feedback and a final draft of actions in February. Funding will be included in the draft 2015-25 Ten Year Plan. As a result of feedback from the first round of consultation, the Council has parked five of the proposals contained in the original draft Strategy. These are not under consideration at this time: Assessment of the effectiveness of the existing RTO Model, evaluation of the return on investment of marketing and promotion. Rating for Economic Development Establishing an Economic Forum Establishment of an Investment Panel Private Sector Groups This survey will close on 2 February 2015. All comments will be considered by elected members and will be made publicly available. [Click next to begin submitting your feedback.](#)

Contact Details:

I am submitting feedback as;

- An individual
- An organisation

Name of Organisation:

- Please also include my name on this submission.

First Name:

Last Name:

Email Address:

B. Recommended Actions:

1.

Establish senior economic development capability and/or funding within the Council, with a focus on: providing district-wide economic policy and community development advice, coordinating and monitoring economic development collecting and analysing economic and industry data, liaising with the local business community and regional and national economic development experts. considering and supporting community development opportunities developing relationships within Council and the business community to support, facilitate and advocate the streamlining of business regulatory and infrastructure processes. Supporting the community in the development of an Economic Development Unit (as per Action 2.)

Do you agree with establishing a district-wide economic development resource within the Council?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Do you agree with the focus of the role?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Any other suggestions?

2.

a. Encourage expanding economic development activities for the District to include: knowledge-base, industry development, education and investment promotion alongside screen production promotion and facilitation. b. Supporting the community in the development of a District-wide(?) Economic Development Unit with a recommended focus on: Governance Structure (including options outside of Council) Funding Model Purpose Stakeholder Feedback Potential liaison group structures including: Investment Panel, Private Sector Group (including health, education, knowledge-based, professional etc).

Do you agree with encouraging expansion of the economic development activities?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Do you want to add anything?

Do you agree that Council should support the community in the development of an Economic Development Unit?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Do you agree with the focus?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Items 3-7 are either substantially unchanged but in some cases have been simplified. Please indicate whether you agree, disagree or feel neutral about each one.

3.

Finalise the convention centre proposal and construct the convention centre at Lakeview. The final proposal should ensure there is a clear and realistic articulation of the overall economic benefits and costs.

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

4.

Support the ongoing improvement of town centres in the district.

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

5.

Continue to develop Council's business relationship model to support the streamlining of major investment projects and consent processing (as per Action 1)

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

6.

Council will continue to review options for funding core and other infrastructure in the 10 Year Plan process.

- Agree
- Disagree

- Neither Agree or Disagree

7.

Continue to investigate all options for improving housing affordability in the district.

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

C. Guiding principle – Strategy Overview.

Our aspiration - economic development that protects and enhances our district's unique environment: A higher value and more diverse economy – higher value jobs and industries; higher quality urban and natural environments.

Do you agree with the change to the guiding principle (placing more emphasis on the environment)?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Please explain:

D. Priorities

1. Enhance the quality of our natural, business and living environments: to encourage business practices that support our environment, our community and our economy. 2. Facilitate the growth of knowledge-based industries: Facilitating growth in knowledge-based industries and other innovation-based industry around our core strengths. 3. Encourage higher contribution visitor activity: growing the contribution by visitors, encouraging visitors to spend more and/or make a greater contribution to the district and further reduce visitor seasonality. 4. (Unchanged) Future proof infrastructure: Expanding funding options for investing in infrastructure; ensuring that adequate investment is made to maintain high quality infrastructure; and ensuring that funding sources and investment reflect the incidence of costs and benefits.

Do you agree with the changes to the priorities?

- Agree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree

Please explain:

Summary

I am submitting feedback as;

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
An individual		50.0%	6
An organisation		50.0%	6
Total Responses			12

Do you agree with establishing a district-wide economic development resource within the Council?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		36.4%	4
Disagree		45.5%	5
Neither Agree or Disagree		18.2%	2
Total Responses			11

Do you agree with the focus of the role?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		63.6%	7
Disagree		9.1%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		27.3%	3
Total Responses			11

Any other suggestions?

The 7 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.




Do you agree with encouraging expansion of the economic development activities?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		70.0%	7
Disagree		10.0%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		20.0%	2
Total Responses			10




Do you want to add anything?

The 5 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.




Do you agree that Council should support the community in the development of an Economic Development Unit?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		80.0%	8
Disagree		10.0%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		10.0%	1
Total Responses			10




Do you agree with the focus?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		60.0%	6
Disagree		10.0%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		30.0%	3
Total Responses			10




Item 3:

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		36.4%	4
Disagree		45.5%	5
Neither Agree or Disagree		18.2%	2
Total Responses			11




Item 4:

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		63.6%	7
Disagree		9.1%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		27.3%	3
Total Responses			11




Item 5:

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		72.7%	8
Disagree		9.1%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		18.2%	2
Total Responses			11




Item 6:

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		63.6%	7
Disagree		9.1%	1
Neither Agree or Disagree		27.3%	3
Total Responses			11

Item 7:

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		63.6%	7
Disagree		18.2%	2
Neither Agree or Disagree		18.2%	2
Total Responses			11




Do you agree with the change to the guiding principle (placing more emphasis on the environment)?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		90.0%	9
Disagree		0.0%	0
Neither Agree or Disagree		10.0%	1
Total Responses			10

Please explain:

There are no responses to this question.

Do you agree with the changes to the priorities?

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Agree		50.0%	5
Disagree		20.0%	2
Neither Agree or Disagree		30.0%	3
Total Responses			10

Please explain:

The 4 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

Appendix

Any other suggestions? |

#	Response
1.	Too (centralised) much power.Leads to a "nice to have" wish list type of policy making. Reduces locals input.
2.	An in-council resource focussed on the 'district good' aspects above is a critical component of implementing a smart, effective and efficient strategy.
3.	<p>The Chamber, having previously undertaken research on different operating models for economic development, disagrees with the establishment of a economic development resource within Council and prefers the model of Third Party Outsourcing where the board sits outside council. However, the Board would include both council and independent directors with Council appointing the Chairperson. Council would provide a fixed amount of funding (limited and defined) to the external entity, who then provide economic development services on behalf of the Council and the community.</p> <p>The strengths of this model are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Independent organisations can seek additional funding to supplement Councils contribution – this is not possible should the EDU sit in Council• An independent organisation with a Board and executive officer can be more entrepreneurial in their approach to economic development• An external organisation can work with Council without being part of Council. This can decrease inefficiencies and protect Council from controversy. It can also provide objectivity and freedom from political agendas• Developers and local businesses can work with an external body ‘in confidence’• An external body does not suffer from the conflicts between economic development and regulatory responsibilities as can happen within Council• Councillors and the Mayor can have much greater input via an independent organisation than they can through a council officer. <p>However, this can be an evolving model that changes as capacity and demand for services evolves. The model adopted for 2015 onwards does not have to be locked in for a long term - regular reviews can ensure that the communities economic development goals are being met in the most efficient and effective way possible.</p> <p>Regarding the focus of the role, the Chamber very much welcomes the initiative by QLDC to develop an Economic Strategy for the district, something we have long been a proponent of. The Chamber has been aware for some years now that there has been no structure or pathways for planned economic development in the District. Nor has there been the relevant economic data on which economic modelling could be undertaken. The Chamber therefore also welcomes the recommendation that collection of comprehensive data be undertaken.</p>
4.	<p>Economic development overseen by council must also recognise the importance of community development and the linking of these two.</p> <p>We ask the council to make bullet point 5 a priority (community development opportunitiess) and support projects and structures that develop this ie a community development officer</p>
5.	The economic development resource should be independent of council. Council should have minority representation in any economic development unit.
6.	Totally agree with having an Economic Development 'unit. Totally do NOT want this to be part of Council. It MUST be separated.
7.	Resources and / or funding for economic development should independent of council.

Do you want to add anything? |

#	Response
---	----------

1. The council needs to be very careful about the development of a large conference ctr that would be most likely another white elephant-like Dunedin Stadium- that leaves an ongoing debt that compounds over years and could limit future economic activity. As a scientist I attend many conferences, some here, and eg. Rydges and Mellenium big enough for most. There will be competition for the very large conferences , eg Auckland, and NZ is expensive to come to for most international, thus I would expect that thsi would be underutilised. We don't need this large- oft time empty building in ctr of town. If Council still goes ahead should be in Frankton. Large infrastructure projects much more needed, to keep us healthy and keep our clean environment image, include a clean town water supply that isn't chlorinated (mountain / ground supply) and continued improving/ replacing existing sewer system to prevent surface water/ lake pollution.

2. It depends on what "expansion" results in, over the longer term. These aspects look like a reasonable basis to begin with. The key question is how the goverannce and funding models act together to ensure the focus of implementation of the strategy doesn't wander from a 'facilitative' or 'public good' approach into areas more traditionally considered the optimal domain of the private sector.

Federated Farmers primary concern in this area would be what the expansion would mean for council's expenditure overall, and how this may be reflected in farmers' rates. Specifically, we do not want to see an industry dominated stakeholder group comprised largely of those likely to benefit from implementation of the strategy, in combination with a funding model which places the costs of strategy implementation and/or the governance group on the general ratepayer base.

Our concern is that a funding/governance mixture of this nature would, particularly over time, decrease the incentives for efficient, disciplined and targeted economic development support.

3. As stated in the recent Draft Economic Development Strategy commissioned by the Council, the District has experienced very strong economic growth over the last decade – over double that of the New Zealand average. However the District is very concentrated and reliant on industries that service visitors and the growing population. The key strengths of the economy are summarised by the Study as the outstanding natural landscapes which underpin the tourism experience; the visitor economy which supports a range of industries such as accommodation and food services; the talent base (highly skilled population workforce) and the entrepreneurial culture of the residents. The economic constraints for the economy are listed as the being the relative size and location of District, the concentration of industry and housing affordability and the high cost of living. The Chamber agrees with these findings and therefore supports diversification of the local economy.

Further Comments:

Question 7:

Regarding improving housing affordability in the district - the Chamber agrees that all options should be investigated. However, there is concern about where the proposed land for development would be located. With limited roading options in the Frankton “quadrangle” (being from Remarkable's Park/Airport – BP corner – Eastern access highway – Remarkable's Park) the traffic is already heavily congested and this is before full development of Jacks Point and Shotover Country as well as other proposed subdivisions are completed. Therefore, Council should carefully consider the location of future affordable housing when there is currently no clear strategy as to how to relieve the traffic issues around the Frankton area.

4. We ask the council to look at local context within this regional wide perspective. Local businesses must engage with community development opportunities to bring about collective impact. Additional support needs to be provided to businesses to encourage this.

5. Yes, just please ensure that while Council should have a seat or two at the table but should NOT the economic development unit

Please explain: |

#	Response
---	----------

1. Future proofing infrastructure should be a higher priority

2. Don't

3. Number 3 Higher Value is misguided. The mix of visitors should continue and should be broad not overly focused on the Higher Value visitors the definition of which is not properly articulated.

4. There are too many priorities to be able to focus on achieving any of them.