

**NOTICE OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETINGS**

**RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**TO:** Penny Webster - Mayor (Chairperson)  
Crs Ross Craig  
Pat Delich  
Michael Goudie  
Gaye Harding  
John Kirikiri  
Dave Parker, QSM  
Grahame Powell  
Zane Taylor  
June Turner  
Grev Walker  
Wayne Walker  
Suzanne Weld

An Extraordinary Meeting of the Rodney District Council will take place on Friday, 22 May 2009 commencing at 9.00 a.m. in the Catholic Church Hall, 6 Alnwick Street, Warkworth for the purpose of hearing submissions from the Northern Ward to the 2009 - 2019 Long Term Council Community Plan.

for: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
Rodger Kerr-Newell

OREWA  
15 May 2009

\* \* \* \* \*

**I N D E X**

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Apologies	1
2.	Hearing of Submissions to the Long Term Council Community Plan	1

\* \* \* \* \*

ITEM NO: 1

---

**APOLOGIES**

ITEM NO: 2

---

**REPORT**



**TO** Council  
**ON** 22 May 2009  
**FROM** Ellen Barrett – Democracy Services Manager  
**APPROVED BY** Rodger Kerr-Newell – Chief Executive  
**SIGNATURE**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Rodger Kerr-Newell", written over a horizontal line.

**SUBJECT** HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE LONG TERM COUNCIL  
COMMUNITY PLAN 2009 – 2019

**FILE REF** DG/11/3

---

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

**IMPLICATIONS:**

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? Possibly – depending on particular decisions made.
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan/Annual Plan? Yes – changes may be made to the Long Term Council Community Plan as a result of the hearing of submissions.
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? Yes – submissions have been received on various Council policies.

(v)	Is a budget amendment required?
	No
(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?
	Yes – submissions have been received from members of the public.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding & rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

#### SUMMARY:

The hearing of submissions to the Long Term Council Community Plan 2009 – 2019 from the Northern Ward has been scheduled for Friday, 22 May 2009 commencing at 9.00 a.m. At the time of writing, session schedules were still being finalised with submitters. These schedules, showing submitters and the times at which they will speak, will be distributed at the meeting.

An Index of all Submissions received from the Northern Ward, by Number, is attached as **Appendix 1**. The Topic Summary Sheets attached as **Appendix 2** note the issues raised, including topics raised by submitters who have not asked to speak in support of their submissions, and the submission numbers allocated to those commenting on each topic.

Copies of all submissions to the Long Term Council Community Plan have been circulated to councillors and are available for public inspection at the Council's Orewa Office and at the Warkworth, Helensville and Huapai Service Centres. Submitters have been advised that they have been allocated a maximum of ten minutes to speak in support of their submissions and to answer questions from councillors.

The purpose of this hearing is simply for submitters to present their cases and answer questions from councillors; it is not intended to debate the merits of the submissions or make decisions at these meetings. Separate Extraordinary Council meetings are to be held during the week 25 – 29 May to deliberate on all submissions and agendas for these meetings will be distributed separately.

# APPENDIX 1

# INDEX OF ALL SUBMISSIONS, LISTED BY NUMBER

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0001	Darren and Angela Peterson
N0002	Wellsford Citizens Advice Bureau
N0003	Ian and Susan Flint-Hartle
N0004	Jay Farnworth
N0005	Sandspit Residents' amd Ratepayers' Association
N0006	V Mckellar
N0007	D G Whitehouse
N0008	P J R Pinder
N0009	Richard Gerard
N0010	The Roberts Family
N0011	Martin Louw
N0012	Judith Bettley
N0013	Moreen Taylor
N0014	Matariki Forests and Others
N0015	John A Hayward
N0016	Residents of Ahuroa
N0017	Mr Hugh McKergow and Others
N0018	Oliver and Stephanie Watson
N0019	Netball Rodney Centre Inc
N0020	Whangateau Hall and Reserve Advisory Committee
N0021	Glen Reid
N0022	Kay and Shaun Wilkinson
N0023	John Pryor
N0024	Denise Mathers
N0025	AC and C and NI Capener
N0026	Janet and Colin Wightman
N0027	Kim McDell
N0028	Juliet Pope
N0029	Cheryl Voigt
N0030	Nick Cressey
N0031	Verne Linkhorn
N0032	Linda Petersen
N0033	J V Bilger
N0034	JCM Deveraux and BJ Harris
N0035	D S Kingston
N0036	Kay Peterson
N0037	Graham Barker
N0039	Jonathon Koea
N0040	P J Costello
N0041	Russell and Jan Hughes
N0042	Colin A Greenslade
N0043	Alison and Stephen Haycock
N0044	Kevin Banton

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0045	Annette Jones
N0046	Ian and Liz Packer
N0047	Staniland West
N0048	Bryce Howard
N0049	S Cometti
N0050	Cheryl Montague
N0051	Simon Dickie
N0052	Peter and Anne Scott
N0053	Long Family Trust
N0054	Jabez Ltd
N0055	Ben Auger
N0056	Ilona Warren
N0057	Monica Saunders
N0058	Fiona MacDiarmid
N0059	Elise Harper Trustee
N0060	Peter Clark
N0061	Linda Osborne
N0062	Graham Dawson
N0063	Alex Rodgers
N0064	Ian and Ruth Henderson
N0065	D and A Whitehouse
N0066	KC Ewington
N0067	Martin Duytshoff
N0068	B J Wenzlick
N0069	B M Wenzlick
N0070	Nick Holding
N0071	Peter Ranson
N0072	Peter Jones
N0073	Alan Stevenson
N0074	Elizabeth Shepherd
N0075	David Addis
N0076	Margaret Ingleton
N0077	David Warren
N0078	Lin and Larry Pardey
N0079	Hugh McKergow
N0080	Toni Robertson
N0081	John A Brunette
N0082	Graham Gibbs
N0083	Ian Horsley
N0084	Herb Fava
N0085	John McDermott
N0086	Craig Betley
N0087	Max Templeton
N0088	Andrew Stone
N0089	Jackie Underhill and Sue Hannon

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0090	Cath Thompson
N0091	Benna Byrne
N0092	Andrew Thompson
N0093	Paul Harper
N0094	Terrence Bartlett
N0095	GW Boyrs
N0096	Jon Mayes
N0097	Fleur Auber
N0098	Paula Budgen
N0099	NH Harvey
N0100	Peter Niepel
N0101	John G Ross
N0102	Dr Hans Van der Velden
N0103	TE Sharp
N0104	Glennis Flintoff
N0105	Simon Buckley
N0106	John and Melda Brunette
N0107	Christine Armstrong and Garth Liddell
N0108	Jennifer McGreal
N0109	Eric Raymond Weaver
N0110	Peter Buckton
N0111	Graeme Phipps
N0112	Jan Hollway
N0113	Gordon Price
N0114	Laurel Constance Horner
N0115	RG Souness
N0116	Stephen Hudson
N0117	Ann Franich
N0118	Dale Hammond
N0119	Doreen Phipps
N0120	Elizabeth Foster
N0121	Jock Bilger
N0122	Susan McGaw
N0123	Linda Pattullo
N0124	Jenny Spring and Jennifer Seel
N0125	Marie Brigenshaw
N0126	Ray and Jan Lowe
N0127	Foster Archer
N0128	Jo and David Floyd
N0129	Wayne Green
N0130	R H Morton
N0131	Simon Pirie
N0132	Romily Holding Ltd
N0133	Mark Hurley
N0134	Susan Cox

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0135	Keith Ayton
N0136	Linda Osborne
N0137	Jane Myhre
N0138	Kate Jones, Angela Jones and Heather Jones
N0139	Not Allocated Not Allocated
N0140	Michael J Beehan
N0141	Not Allocated Not Allocated
N0142	Vicki Van Dam
N0143	Steven Van Dam
N0144	Ken and Audrey Wells
N0145	Wayne Frost
N0146	Matthew Jeffreys
N0147	Peter Schmidt
N0148	The Friends of Wellsford Library
N0149	Catherine Danks
N0150	Sim Family Trust
N0151	Peter Morton
N0152	Simon Archer
N0153	Stephen and Cheryl Hoyle
N0154	Jennifer Mercy
N0155	Gabrielle Wilson
N0156	Jocelyn Wilson
N0157	James and Patricia Emtage
N0158	David and Helen Jeffery
N0159	Joan Tunnicliffe
N0160	Ross West
N0161	Kathryn J Sinclair
N0162	J G Gardner
N0163	Brenda McKellar
N0164	Kilbirnie Trust
N0165	Jane Upton
N0166	Peter Clark
N0167	Warkworth Town Hall Advisory Committee
N0168	John N Duder
N0169	Stevenson Family Trust
N0170	Wellsford Promotions Group
N0171	Highfield Garden Reserve Advisory Committee
N0172	Colin Robottom
N0173	David Ramsbottom
N0174	Shirley Ramsbottom
N0175	Jill Hetherington
N0176	Derek Barker
N0177	Christine Armstrong and Garth Liddell
N0178	Murray Dixon
N0179	Rachel Rush

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0180	Susan Dickson
N0181	Chris Dickson
N0182	John Pettit
N0183	Neville and Barbara Kidd
N0184	Janice Green
N0185	Fleur Auber
N0186	P J and H D Southerden
N0187	Lindsay Watson
N0188	Kim Christensen
N0189	Caleon Trust
N0190	Jennifer and Mark Battersby
N0191	Te Hana Community Development Trust
N0192	Arthur Beale
N0193	Michael Marris
N0194	Lyn Hume
N0195	Alan Hume
N0196	Graeme Wicht
N0197	Peter Cunningham
N0198	Sean Beehan
N0199	Jean Barton
N0200	Marie Zylstra
N0201	Cire Perdue Family Trust
N0202	Mr and Mrs G D Pinnegar
N0203	Graeme Horsley
N0204	Ross Sutherland
N0205	Judith Danks
N0206	Tony Drayton
N0207	Roger Hatrick-Smith
N0208	Stephen Lee
N0209	Les Mellars
N0210	P C Jones
N0211	Michael Edwards
N0212	Heather Edwards
N0213	Frank and Patricia Walton
N0214	Kevin Findlater
N0215	Dr Simon Hatcher
N0216	Val Wicht
N0217	Shelley Futcher
N0218	Gael Archer
N0219	Bevn Woolley
N0220	Rainbows End and Rivers Environmental Group
N0221	Maris Zylstra
N0222	Hatti Wilson
N0223	Reuben Zylstra
N0224	Eileen Crisford

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0225	Tracy Murphy
N0226	Caroline Sloan
N0227	Carol Andrews
N0228	Kathryn Smith
N0229	Warkworth & Districts Push Play Collective
N0230	Ruth MacClement
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc
N0232	Judge Dale and Dr Hugh Clarkson
N0233	David Coshan
N0234	Simon Palmer
N0235	Joanna McKenzie
N0236	Stephen Horsley
N0237	Kevin Walker
N0238	Noel Wordworth
N0239	Richard M Poynter
N0240	Grant Corlett
N0241	Godon Trainer
N0242	Peter and Rosie Shaw
N0243	Daniel Holt
N0244	Linda Christensen
N0245	Murray D'Ath-Weston
N0246	Ron Way
N0247	Kim Crisford
N0248	Trevor Bruce
N0249	Terence and Beatrice Nuthall
N0250	Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Association
N0251	Not Allocated Not Allocated
N0252	Steve Dodd
N0253	K-H Peter Kammler
N0254	Wellsford Ward Citizens & Ratepayers Association
N0255	Richard Wintle
N0256	Leigh Lomas
N0257	Mrs P M Aubertin
N0258	Monique Wilford
N0259	Ann Clegg
N0260	Valerie Burrows
N0261	Lesley McLean
N0262	Anne Beecher
N0263	Dale Ritter
N0264	Marjorie Pictor
N0265	Glenis Carew
N0266	Roy Shadick
N0267	Faye Brown
N0268	Joyce Goodhue
N0269	Carol Steen

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0270	W J Preston
N0271	Geraldine Taylor
N0272	Bruce Stevens and Denis Barlow
N0273	Jude Wood
N0274	Hugh Findlater
N0275	Paul Cato
N0276	Ben Hewson
N0277	Phillippa Tabron
N0278	Gerard Lieshout
N0279	Patricia Roberts
N0280	John Draper
N0281	Bob and Sandra Nelson
N0282	Martin Gillman
N0283	Petronella Lieshout
N0284	Beryl Oliver
N0285	Jenny and Richard Paine and sons
N0286	Scofield Family
N0287	Stacey Hoggard
N0288	Elizabeth Davie-Martin
N0289	Mahurangi Gymnastics Club
N0290	Guido Lochler
N0291	Elisa Duder
N0292	Elaine Read
N0293	Michael Lieshout
N0294	Julian Feary & Katharine Heron
N0295	Matthew Morton
N0296	Annette Foulds
N0297	Ruth Mills
N0298	Barbara Nustrini
N0299	C M Monsborough & E T M Hermse
N0300	Hodi Poorsoltan
N0301	Simon Cox
N0302	Matakana Community Group
N0303	Murray Dawson
N0304	Anna & Scott Macindoe
N0305	Gregor Fyfe
N0306	Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association
N0307	Louise Gray
N0308	Peter Warren
N0309	Greg Tabron
N0310	J. Lindsay Kirby
N0311	Greg Fry
N0312	Rufus Scott
N0313	Davide & Gabrielle Reeke
N0314	Graham Dallow

<b>SubNo</b>	<b>Name</b>
N0315	Stephen Robinson
N0316	Michelle Sullivan & Shaun Lott
N0317	Womens Centre Rodney
N0318	Terry Debenham
N0319	NorthTec
N0320	Willy Sussman
N0321	Kane Hurley
N0322	John Crisford
N0323	Coco Crisford
N0324	Max Crisford
N0325	Bailey Crisford
N0326	Thomas Crisford
N0327	Rolf Keppler
N0328	Aine Margrain
N0329	Beverly Simmons
N0330	Warkworth Business Association
N0331	Point Wells Community and Ratepayers Association Inc
N0332	D G Galbraith Family Trust
N0333	New Ascot Nominees Limited
N0334	Christopher Miller and Catherine Wenzel
N0335	D R Galbraith Trust
N0336	Springboard Community Works
N0337	Sally Meiklejohn
N0338	Richard Didsbury
N0339	Robert and Clare Barnes and Lucy Arona
N0340	Wellsford Primary School
N0341	Mahurangi East Community Centre/Goodall Reserve etc Advisory Cttee
N0342	D E and G R Chown
N0343	Chris Baker
N0346	Nevan Rowe and Kevin Hayward
N0347	Peter Donald Allbon
N0348	Puhoi Community Forum Inc

**No. Submitters 345**

# APPENDIX 2

## Communication

TN0001

a) Governance and Democratic Processes

### *Submission number and name*

N0306 Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) feels there is still gaps in the communication process - their understanding of the Council organisations, of how it makes its decisions. The submitter feels that a better process of informal regular communication is needed and proposes to work towards improved communications with Council staff over the coming months.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Councillors' Remuneration

TN0002

a) Governance and Democratic Processes

### *Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that the Mayor and councillors forego the pay rise determined by the annual assessment, as others mayors, councillors and government ministers throughout New Zealand have done.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Leadership

TN0003

a) Governance and Democratic Processes

### *Submission number and name*

N0183 Neville and Barbara Kidd

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0183 asks that the Council exhibit leadership in these times of economic hardship, noting that this has not been evident at this stage.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Memorandum of Understanding with NorthTec

TN0004

a) Governance and Democratic Processes

*Submission number and name*

N0319 NorthTec

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0319 (NorthTec) would like to work with the Council to lobby for increased tertiary education opportunities in the district and finalise a memorandum of understanding, suggesting that a network of tertiary and secondary school providers is the best outcome for the district.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Working with NorthTec

TN0005

b) Iwi Relationships

*Submission number and name*

N0319 NorthTec

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0319 (NorthTec) would like to work alongside iwi and the Council to improve educational outcomes for Maori.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Leigh Town Centre Upgrade

TN0006

a) Future Planning

*Submission number and name*

N0052 Peter and Anne Scott

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0052 requests infrastructure improvements to Leigh township, including upgrading of Hauraki Corner as the entrance to Leigh, paving of the footpath on the shop side of the road, undergrounding of the power lines and replacement of the light at the school, suggesting that the \$15,000 in building consent contributions he made recently be used for the footpath and power undergrounding.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Regional Growth

TN0007

a) Future Planning

*Submission number and name*

N0073 Alan Stevenson

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0073 asks that the Council not stifle initiatives, but allow capital growth and ratepayers the opportunity to increase income from their land, thus increasing the revenue from rates. The submitter also comments extensively on what he believes to be the lack of planning and vision for North Rodney, noting that executive members of the Council have not listened to those living in this area who have the experience to make wise decisions. He asks that attitudes change and employees be more responsive and positive, so that the vision and desirability for Warkworth can determine its growth.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Sandspit-Snells Beach-Algies Bay Structure

TN0008

a) Future Planning

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) comments that the Sandspit-Snells Beach-Algies Bay Structure Plan is 10 years old, but the Council has done nothing to fulfil the commitment made at that time.

2. N0249 asks whether the budget income and expenditure of Sandspit Car Park for the 2009/2010 year was based on 85% occupancy, and why the rate of return on income has been reduced while car park charges have been increased.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Warkworth - Future Development

TN0009

a) Future Planning

*Submission number and name*

N0043 Alison and Stephen Haycock

N0210 P C Jones

N0330 Warkworth Business Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0043 requests that there be no supermarket built in the central area of Warkworth (the area bounded by Mill Lane and Neville Street), rather that any bulk retail-based area be developed in the Perendale site in Woodcock's Road and that another level be added to the existing car park building

rather than introducing metered parking or another car park elsewhere.

2. N0330 (Warkworth Business Association) asks that stage 2 of the Warkworth Township upgrade proceed as soon as practicable, with infrastructure works in particular being carried out at one time rather than in a piece meal fashion. The Association also asks that the top storey of the car park be added quickly as without access to parking both locals and visitors will soon choose to take their business elsewhere, to the detriment of their members.

3. N0210 asks RDC to listen to and act upon the suggestions made by the Warkworth Business Association.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Matakana Urban Environment

TN0010

b) Urban and Rural Design

*Submission number and name*

N0302 Matakana Community Group

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0302 (Matakana Community Group) requests an immediate review of the Matakana urban environment, which should include:

- pedestrian flow and safety;
- short and long term parking;
- turning zones (including truck/bus turning);
- traffic control at Torea Road;
- speed zones and speed reduction strategies;
- consistency of landscaping materials and features;
- transport planning (e.g. link road behind pony club to connect to Matakana Valley and Matakana Roads).

The group stresses the importance of landscape quality, including underground power lines, street tree planting, covers for deep concrete drains (e.g. boardwalks) and safe, attractive pathways and public open spaces. It also requests the \$1.5 m planned expenditure for Matakana stormwater and structure plan consequences that has been removed from the plan be reinstated and additional monies added to cater for the above-mentioned needs.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Climate Change

TN0011

c) Natural and Coastal Environment

*Submission number and name*

N0013 Moreen Taylor

N0319 NorthTec

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0013 suggests that making provision for climate change is a function of central, not local government, and that there should be no rush to fix the problem during the next ten years.

2. N0319 (NorthTec) would like to work with the Council to develop climate change related information

and courses on sustainable urban and rural development to help the Council achieve its outcomes.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Glen Eden / Matakana River Catchment area

TN0012

c) Natural and Coastal Environment

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that its community be removed from the Snells Beach / Algies Bay Mahurangi East Catchment area and included in the more appropriate Glen Eden / Matakana River Catchment area for planning purposes, together with Kawau Island, Rainbows End and Matakana.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Glen Eden / Matakana River Channel

TN0013

c) Natural and Coastal Environment

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) suggests that, irrespective of the results of the proposal to construct a marina at Sandspit, future funding of the previously approved dredging of the Glen Eden / Matakana River channel from the wharf berths to the refuelling dock at Lees Boatyard be incorporated in the long term planning budget.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Opahi Bay

TN0014

c) Natural and Coastal Environment

*Submission number and name*

N0108 Jennifer McGreal

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0108 asks that the LTCCP acknowledge the need to protect the unique beauty of Opahi Bay by planning to provide alternative facilities for the increasing requirements of commercial operations and boat owners from Greater Auckland trying to access the Mahurangi Harbour through Opahi Bay.

More specifically, the submitter asks that the Council:

- determine, in association with the Auckland Regional Council as required, whether the activities require a resource consent or are prohibited activities under the District Plan or Regional Plan Coastal;
- initiate appropriate action in terms its findings in relation to the above point;
- provide an alternative boat launching facility(s) serving the Mahurangi West area in consultation with the local community;
- implement appropriate management regimes to control beach parking and commercial use (if permitted); and
- enforce existing and proposed parking and commercial use (if permitted) activities as undertaken on a regular and consistent basis.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Sandspit Foreshores

TN0015

c) Natural and Coastal Environment

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that the current programme of restoration of the Sandspit foreshores with the removal of noxious weeds and the replanting of appropriate species be continued.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## District Plan

TN0016

d) District Plan

*Submission number and name*

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0348 supports the development of a new District Plan by 2019 and the provision of a budget to complete the Structure Plan process for Puhoi, noting the speed at which the area is changing due to the completion of the Alpur project and the planning to extend the motorway to Warkworth. The submitter further notes that sufficient resources need to be made available now to prepare a draft of the next District Plan by 2012 if it is to be fully adopted by 2019.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Property Sales

TN0017

e) Property Holdings

### *Submission number and name*

N0057	Monica Saunders
N0183	Neville and Barbara Kidd
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc
N0249	Terence and Beatrice Nuthall

### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0057 asks that if property is sold it be non-revenue generating property and that it not be to the detriment of long term plans.
2. N0183 asks that the Council only sell property if it can make a profit.
3. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) is concerned about the property sales process whereby the sales are managed by a Council-controlled entity with two Council-appointed directors without prior public consultation and believes the process should be transparent without any potential for perceived conflict of interest.
3. N0249 wants to know how it is proposed to appoint the three external directors.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Provision of Parking, Warkworth Town Centre

TN0018

e) Property Holdings

### *Submission number and name*

N0046	Ian and Liz Packer
N0306	Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association

### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0046 asks that the open area behind the Old Town Hall, which is vacant and not used at all, be sealed so that the owners and staff of business and retail could park there all day, thus increasing the parking spaces available in the main shopping area of the district, adding that there have been no new parking allotments in Warkworth main streets over the past ten years.

The submitter also asks that the vacant area at the end of Baxter Street, where the new Community Centre WAS to be built, be used more efficiently as a parking area, noting that it served the town very well over the holiday period.

N0046 suggests that seeing Warkworth has no civic amenities, the Unified Civic Amenities Charge could be used to pay for the provision of these two parking facilities.

2. N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) supports more effective parking options and more effective policing of parking times in Warkworth, but does not support parking meters. The submitter also asks why the option of putting a third parking floor on the existing building has been abandoned when it matches several criteria that are important, for example takes long-term parked cars off the streets, meets user pay criteria with simple features instead of expensive parking meters and completes an existing structure. The submitter acknowledges that costs of adding the storey would need to be written back in to the LTCCP 2009/2019.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Development Contributions - Kawau Island

TN0019

a) Resource Consents and Monitoring

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) suggests that, because of a gross breakdown in the Council's planning regime, additional parking for new Kawau Island residents at Sandspit and enhancements to the Sandspit Road access way to Kawau Island could not be provided because Moores Bay Limited, which developed the subdivision at Pah Farm on Kawau Island, was not required to pay development contributions.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Satisfaction Survey

TN0020

a) Resource Consents and Monitoring

*Submission number and name*

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0348 questions the methodology used to obtain the figure quoted in the Draft LTCCP reflecting public satisfaction with resource consent services, noting that the people surveyed should only be those who have used the service. The submitter also comments on the target improvement of only one percent per year for the years after the first year when a 5% improvement is aimed for (based on flawed methodology) that reflects a culture of poor performance being acceptable. N0348 recommends that all customer surveys be rated on polls of those who use the particular service only and the target performance be at least 90% within three years.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Leaky Buildings

TN0021

b) Building Consents

*Submission number and name*

N0249 Terence and Beatrice Nuthall

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0249 suggests provisions be made for claims on RDC after allowing for costs covered by insurers and asks how many claims are on Council files at present.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Pay and Display Bylaw

TN0022

d) Bylaws

*Submission number and name*

N0046	Ian and Liz Packer
N0063	Alex Rodgers
N0097	Fleur Auber
N0110	Peter Buckton
N0226	Caroline Sloan

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0046 asks that parking meters not be installed in the Warkworth retail shopping streets and further asks:

- why the Warkworth Business Association hasn't been provided with the nine reports supplied to councillors (quoted by Cr Weld at a recent Council meeting); and
- why the business community has never been contacted and asked what it wants in the matter.

2. N0063 requests that parking meters not be installed in local towns as they restrict time, annoy people, do not benefit retailers and overseas towns have found this out to their detriment.

3. N0097 would like to know the reasoning behind the idea for pay and display parking in Warkworth, suggesting that;

- there are always plenty of parking in Queen Street, Mill Lane, Alnwick and Neville Streets;
- pay and display is not the answer to parking problems as all this will do is encourage people not to come into town, which isn't what the residents and business owners of Warkworth want;
- the solution for future parking problems is to have the people who create them pay for them through development contributions;
- there are already parking restrictions in Warkworth of 10 - 90 minutes, though some time restricted areas show no logic in their locations.

4. N0110 objects to the proposal to introduce pay and display parking in Warkworth, suggesting that a better alternative would be to reduce the present 1 hour parking to 30 and 15 minute spaces.

5. N0226 asks that parking meters not be installed in Warkworth and listed in detail the negative aspects of having parking meters: Please refer to submission.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Conical Peak and Govan Wilson Roads,

TN0023

a) Transport planning

*Submission number and name*

N0014	Matariki Forests and Others
-------	-----------------------------

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0014 requests that the Council expedite the legalisation and take the lead in partial realignment of Conical Peak Road, which is used as part of the Te Araroa walkway from Govan Wilson Road and provides access to land owned by Mr Andrew Ion and the Department of Conservation, advising that the Council has been promising legalisation since 1988. (Refer to submission for detailed outcomes sought by the submitters.)

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Penlink

TN0024

a) Transport planning

*Submission number and name*

N0013	Moreen Taylor
N0187	Lindsay Watson
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0013 asks that the Penlink road be tolled.
2. N0187 believes that user pays should be applied to the Penlink project so that the people of Whangaparaoa who will use the road, and not those in the North and West who won't, pay for it.
3. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) asks the Council to consider the balance between the expenditure on this project who will benefit only a small section of the Rodney community and expenditure of completing the sealing of other roads in the Rodney region.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Public Transport - Warkworth

TN0025

a) Transport planning

*Submission number and name*

N0046	Ian and Liz Packer
-------	--------------------

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0046 asks why Warkworth doesn't have public transport, despite the Warkworth business area supporting a far larger and more disperse population than either the Hibiscus Coast or Orewa, which have public transport.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Worker Road Extension

TN0026

a) Transport planning

*Submission number and name*

N0072 Peter Jones  
N0103 TE Sharp  
N0254 Wellsford Ward Citizens & Ratepayers Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0072, N0103 and N0254 (Wellsford Ward Citizens' and Ratepayers' Association) request that the extension of Workers Road, Wellsford (900 metres of road), be opened as per the Wellsford Structure Plan, noting that there is no western outlet from Rodney Street and that this would be an alternative route north for holiday traffic.

2. N0254 (Wellsford Ward Citizen and Ratepayers Association) requests the completion of the Worker Road Intersection (there is 900 m of roading left to upgrade).

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Ahuroa Road, Ahuroa

TN0027

b) Roding and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0016 Residents of Ahuroa

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0016 (submission signed by 50 residents) asks that Ahuroa Road be sealed in the immediate future.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Anderson Road, Warkworth

TN0028

b) Roding and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0001 Darren and Angela Peterson  
N0003 Ian and Susan Flint-Hartle

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0001 and N0003 (submission signed by 10 residents) request the sealing of a 0.7km portion of Anderson Road between the first bridge and Westminster Glen that is unsealed.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Boat trailer parking - Ariki Road

TN0029

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0306 Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) requests more boat trailer parking at the bottom of Ariki Road which is the access to the most used boat ramp on the Snells Beach front. The submitter further suggests a rearrangement of the fences and playground to accommodate this.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Chemical spraying

TN0030

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0063 Alex Rodgers  
N0098 Paula Budgen  
N0100 Peter Niepel  
N0101 John G Ross  
N0147 Peter Schmidt  
N0187 Lindsay Watson  
N0242 Peter and Rosie Shaw

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0063 asks that the Council stop using dangerous chemicals for the control of weeds and instead use organic alternatives, working together with members of the public to reach a solution.

2. N0098 asks that the Council take the lead in saying 'no' to toxic spraying and instead move to a healthier option which would do the job, in addition to applying a 'where needed only' basis on verges.

3. N0100 would like to see a decrease in the use of chemicals. The submitters states that chemicals get into waterways and into the sea, spray drift is blown into cars and properties and the impact on people's health and the environment is unknown

4. N0101 asks that the Council not POISON susceptible ratepayers with chemical sprays when keeping its roads free of weeds for safety and other maintenance reasons, noting that other councils have banned their use and that recent medical evidence suggests that they have exacerbated existing medical conditions in some people and cause d ME in others. The submitter asks how 'clean and green' Rodney justify the use of chemical sprays and that it the Council move towards banning them and introducing more health and environmentally friendly systems of weed control.

5. N0147 asks that the Council abandon the use of toxic glyphosphate for roadside and reserve weed control and, in assessing the cost-effectiveness of eco-friendly alternatives, take long term family health costs into account and keep New Zealand's ecological footprint low.

6. N0187 asks that the Council take a proactive approach to finding ways to control grass (mainly

kikuyu) that doesn't involve harmful chemicals, trialling alternatives in a road or small area.

7. N0242 requests Council looks at alternatives to roadside chemicals currently used as it affects the health of people.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Engine Braking

TN0031

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0255 Richard Wintle

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0255 asks that the Council impose a ban on engine-braking in all of Rodney, other than on the main highway.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Footpaths

TN0032

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0004 Jay Farnworth

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

N0024 Denise Mathers

N0120 Elizabeth Foster

N0254 Wellsford Ward Citizens & Ratepayers Association

N0306 Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association

N0331 Point Wells Community and Ratepayers Association Inc

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0004 requests that a footpath be constructed on Pulham Road between the new Meadows subdivision and the new end of Alnwick Street.

N0004 also requests a dedicated clear access way for pedestrians on Whitaker Road outside the Shell petrol station - cnr Whitaker Road and Mill Lane.

2. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that the footpath along Sandspit Road be extended from Beach Street to the intersection of Sharp Road.

3. N0024 asks that a footpath be installed on Ahuroa Road, from West Coast Road to Ahuroa Primary School.

4. N0120 requests safety footpaths in Whangtatau to protect residents of Waioma Rest Home and school children.

5. N0254 (Wellsford Ward Citizen and Ratepayers Association) requests that footpaths be installed along Centennial Park Road for safety reasons (refer to submissions for photos).

6. N0331 (Point Wells Community and Ratepayers' Association Inc) notes that Waimanu Place is the only street in Point Wells village that has the benefit of footpaths and asks that the remaining six, particularly Point Wells Road (initially from the beginning of the 50 kph speed zone to Harbour View Road, but extended in future), which has heavy pedestrian and cycle use, be included in the plan for consideration. The Association suggests that a great opportunity exists to link a footpath/cycleway to Omaha Flats Road via the paper road, creating a local network linking Omaha and Point Wells.

7. N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) requests further footpaths to be constructed wider and to foresee usage that allows for walking, cycling and other uses.

N0306 requests footpaths from Muncaster Road along the south west side of Mahurangi East Road towards the BP Station.

N0306 further noted that the 1999 Structure Plan commented on the unsatisfactory nature of the pavement on the north east side of Mahurangi East Road and the fact that so many properties have direct access onto the road. Since that time the situation has been made worse by the addition of ramps and access ways and the footpath is an obstacle race for anyone who attempts to walk, cycle, push or drive on it.

8. N0348 comments on the road safety issues in Puhoi Village (due to being the first stop at the end of the motorway and more people living in the valley) and notes that it is mostly caused by a lack of a continuous footpath through the village, particularly where pedestrians have to move into the path of traffic to cross the two relatively narrow bridges. The submitters requests that funding be made available for the proposed project of building pedestrian bridges attached to the road bridges and a footpath from the hall to the band rotunda as a matter of urgency.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Improvements in Falls Road area, Warkworth

TN0034

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0043 Alison and Stephen Haycock

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0043 requests the following improvements for safety reasons:

- reduction of speed limit to 50 kph on Falls Road, Viv Davie-Martin Road and Francis Place from the open road limit;
- permanent retaining work on the Woodcocks Road side of the approaches to the ford on Falls Road;

- improvements to the approaches and the sight lines to the new crossing over the ford, together with remedial work to subsidence in the area where vehicles pull over and stop at the Woodcock's Road end, and repairs to visibility posts.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Lower Brick Bay Road Carpark

TN0035

b) Roading and Streetscape

### *Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association

N0049 S Cometti

### *Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that the renewal project for the Lower Brick Bay Road Carpark formation and seal, included in the plan at a cost of \$85,000, be expedited as the proposal has been accepted by Sandspit residents and contractors are poised to implement the work.

2. N0249 suggests a restricted parking zone should be placed on 500m of parking at the bottom of Brick Bay Road with no parking on nearby grassed areas to increase occupancy. The submitter also suggests the Council should be able to carry out landscaping of \$34000 based on occupancy of 86-88%, whilst keeping the rate of return at approx 40%.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Matakana Valley Road

TN0036

b) Roading and Streetscape

### *Submission number and name*

N0280 John Draper

N0299 C M Monsborough & E T M Hermse

N0320 Willy Sussman

### *Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0280 requests the sealing of Matakana Valley Road from the ford on the north side of the hill section of Matakana Valley Road to join the section sealed in the 2008/9 works programme.

2. N0299 requests the completion of tar sealing on an unsealed portion of Matakana Valley Road – the Hill section from Govan Wilson Road to the north side near Rodney Aggregate Quarry. The submitter noted the significant travel time savings, safety issues with regards to the current poor conditions of the road and mechanical difficulties experienced due to dust problems. The submitter believes the road is eligible for funding under the LTCCP on the basis of economic growth and productivity for the whole area.

3. N0320 requests that serious consideration be given to sealing that part of Matakana Valley Road which remains unsealed, that is, the most dangerous stretch on which the volume of traffic has increased considerably.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Matakana/Green Road Intersection

TN0037

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0302 Matakana Community Group

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0302 (Matakana Community Group) supports the planned capital expenditure for improvements to the Matakana/Green Road intersection.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Monowai Road - Sealing

TN0038

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0021 Glen Reid

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0021 requests that Monowai Road be sealed between Nos. 122 - 210, which comprises approximately half a kilometre and a number of dangerous S-bends. The submitter has been in touch with Barry George (Group Manager: Transport Services) and Cr Suzanne Weld and notes that over 20 submissions have raised the same request over the last two years.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Noxious Weeds - Clearance

TN0039

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0018 Oliver and Stephanie Watson

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0018 requests that noxious weeds, which include jasmine and old man's beard) be cleared from between their rental property and the Mahurangi River on the reserve just up the river from the Bridgehouse Lodge. (Note: This has been brought to the attention of the Council and allocated job no. 600547, but the submitters have been told that the whole area is a major job and this is why it hasn't been done.)

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Omaha Valley Road

TN0040

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0255 Richard Wintle

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0255 requests the unsealed part of the road to be sealed in order to reduce noise and dust and further asks that the sealed part of the road be maintained on a regular basis.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Queen Street, Warkworth - Sealing

TN0041

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0046 Ian and Liz Packer

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0046 notes that the Council has not resealed the main road through Warkworth for over 11 years, despite his calculation that over the past year his transport rate was \$6,000 and if this was multiplied by the number of 20 similar-sized blocks in Queen Street over the last ten years it would equate to over \$1million.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Road Sealing General

TN0042

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0008 P J R Pinder

N0099 NH Harvey

N0126 Ray and Jan Lowe

N0128 Jo and David Floyd

N0183 Neville and Barbara Kidd

N0280 John Draper

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0008 requests that the Council be optimistic and continue to plan for road sealing as the depression will not last.

2. N0128 objects to the removal of the sealing programme (p.140 of the LTCCP - increasing the standard of high-volume unsealed roads to address safety, speed and dust reduction) and asks that the Council make allowance for sealing of at least 80 kms of unsealed road where the average traffic

count exceeds 250 vehicles per day and can be subsidised by Land Transport New Zealand, hoping that this will mean sealing of Upper Waiwera Road (their road) one day. The submitter also asks that;

- the Council give due consideration to the effect of development on communities living on unsealed roads rather than allowing subdivision to proceed without mitigation;
- the Council pursue other means of funding the dealing programme such as the development contributions and private agreements.

3. N0183 asks that the Council continue to fund seal extensions as not doing so will seriously inhibit Rodney's infrastructure and not advance its 'rural backwater' image.

4. N0191 (Te Hana Community Development Charitable Trust) asks that the paper road adjacent to the Council's sports field, Te Hana Orchard and Te Hana Te Ao Marama Cultural Village be sealed.

5. N0280 seeks the inclusion in the LTCCP of a programme for the sealing of metal rural roads.

6. N0348 requests that the programme for seal extensions be reinstated in the LTCCP and the cost be recovered by removing expenditure allocated to social issues that are the responsibility of central government. The submitter notes that even though the proposed total for the roading rate is increased by a substantial amount, the annual programme of seal extensions has been deleted and asks where money is going. The submitter refers to the majority of unsealed roads in the rural community and to the small number of capital projects in the Northern Ward compared to the rest of RDC, meaning that more of the rates being collected from the Northern Ward are being spent elsewhere.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Roading Projects General

TN0043

### b) Roading and Streetscape

#### *Submission number and name*

N0120	Elizabeth Foster
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc
N0253	K-H Peter Kammler
N0306	Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association
N0331	Point Wells Community and Ratepayers Association Inc

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0120 believes that too much money is being spent on roading for Perendale, which is on hold, yet there is no funding proposed to improve access to the East.

2. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) believes some of the dropped transportations projects should have been retained for public safety reasons, e.g. roading upgrade Matakana Village, Leigh Road pedestrian bridge over Matakana River, Walkway Matakana Road (Leathers Bridge to school) and Pt Wells path.

3. N0253 asks the Council to re-instate a capital expenditure for road improvements and to balance that expenditure by projected developer contributions.

4. N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) confirms roads (and not transport) is a mayor issue and requests that the Council looks at the following projects which have apparently been abandoned:

- An eastern bypass and bridge;
- Hamatana to Grange/Muncaster as an alternative route for the Mahurangi East people in event of any accidents;
- A link road from James Street towards Sandspit;
- Continuing the Western Corridor proposed from McKinney Road to Hudson Rd across SH1 In the

direction of Matakana/Leigh.

5. N0331 (Point Wells Community and Ratepayers' Association) asks that they be involved in investigations with relevant Council personnel into traffic calming initiatives to slow traffic to a speed suited to the rough and single track nature of village streets.

N0331 (Point Wells Community and Ratepayers' Association Inc) also notes that the paving of many roads in Point Wells Village has deteriorated significantly over the years of 'sticking plaster' repairs, in particular that on Riverside Drive, Harbourview Road and the Northern end of Point Wells Road, which all not require urgent repairs. The Association asks that the Council not continue with these patchy and temporary repairs which will just serve to exacerbate an ongoing problem.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Sandspit and Mahurangi East Roads -

TN0044

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association  
N0306 Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks for implementation of the following provisions, as per the current structure plan for Snells Beach-Algies Bay:  
- upgrading of both Sandspit and Mahurangi East Roads  
- detailed civil engineering investigations and/or feasibility design to confirm all collector and local road proposals and costings.

2. N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) requests ongoing allocation for continuing work on Sandspit Road.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Speed Limits

TN0045

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0255 Richard Wintle

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0255 asks that the 80 km speed limit between Warkworth and Matakana be extended from Matakana to Leigh and all other local roads where the open speed limit of 100 km is extremely dangerous.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## State Highway 1, Warkworth

TN0046

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0015 John A Hayward

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0015 asks if some of the proposed Warkworth improvements become obsolete if the Government fast tracks a new highway by-passing Warkworth and Wellsford?

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Te Hana Drains - Coronation and

TN0047

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0074 Elizabeth Shepherd

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0074 asks that the dangerous open drains on Coronation and Whakapirau Roads be enclosed urgently.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Tram Car Bay Bridge Renewal

TN0048

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0120 Elizabeth Foster

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0120 asks that the Tram Car Bay Bridge Renewal be removed from the budget as this is not wanted by the local community.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Walking Bridge between Ashton and Birdsall

TN0050

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0017 Mr Hugh McKergow and Others

N0079 Hugh McKergow

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0017 (submission signed by 419 people) and N0079 request installation of a walking bridge between Ashton and Birdsall Roads, near the historic Darroch Shipyard, Whangateau, advising that a free, recycled footbridge is available but the community needs support from the Council to install this.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Wellsford By Pass

TN0051

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0170 Wellsford Promotions Group

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) asks for a by pass of Wellsford to be constructed to alleviate problems with trucks roaring two abreast down its main street.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Wellsford Town Centre

TN0052

b) Roading and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0170 Wellsford Promotions Group

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) does not agree with trees being planted down the main street in Wellsford in place of car parks as there is a lack of parking. The submitter suggests that the trees will become a hazard as they will be knocked by large trucks and obscure drivers' vision, together with creating problems for retailers when their leaves fall. However, the Group would like to continue to work with the Council with regard to placement of the corrugated animals and signs, which it plans to install more of as money becomes available.

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) also asks for better provision for large trucks so that congestion can be relieved, suggesting that they be directed to the rear of shops to unload goods, although an upgrade to Hood Street and El Hama Lane will be required, with shops' backs being altered to accommodate this.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Wellsford Valley Road

TN0053

b) Rooding and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0191 Te Hana Community Development Trust

N0254 Wellsford Ward Citizens & Ratepayers Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0254 (Wellsford Ward Citizens' and Ratepayers' Association) requests that the monies to be allocated to Mt Brame Quarry (\$320,000) be used to seal (to include heavy armouring) the remaining 700 metres of Wellsford Valley Road at the Port Albert end and 2100 metres at the Wellsford end, half of which has already been upgraded. The submitter notes that as this road is classified as the Highway 16 by-pass and is often used when accidents occur on State Highway 1, the Council could pursue subsidy from Transit NZ.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Whitmore Road

TN0054

b) Rooding and Streetscape

*Submission number and name*

N0010 The Roberts Family

N0204 Ross Sutherland

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0099 asks that the sealing of Whitmore Road be completed during the 2009/2010 financial year, as the Council has promised since sealing of the first kilometre in 2006.

2. N0204 asks that the allocation for the improvement of Green Road intersection be re-directed to the sealing of Whitmore Road.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Fixed Charges for Water

TN0056

a) Water Supply

*Submission number and name*

N0337 Sally Meiklejohn

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0337 requests that the proposal to charge even non-users of reticulated water and those not

connected a fixed cost payment for water be dropped as it would mean non-users subsidising users.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

The Council currently has no intention of charging fixed charges for properties not connected to the water system.

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the wording within the LTCCP be checked to confirm that this is clear.

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

Current policy to prevail as we do not charge at present.

## Leigh Water Reticulation

TN0057

a) Water Supply

#### *Submission number and name*

N0052 Peter and Anne Scott

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

N0052 requests that a reticulated water system be provided for Leigh in the future.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Warkworth Water Upgrade

TN0058

a) Water Supply

#### *Submission number and name*

N0046 Ian and Liz Packer

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

N0046 asks that, due to an anticipated increase in population of over 20% over the next ten years and the subsequent increase in demand for quality drinkable water, the Council install a new water source or upgrade the existing filtration plant in Warkworth.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Matakana Wastewater

TN0059

b) Wastewater

#### *Submission number and name*

N0302 Matakana Community Group

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

N0302 (Matakana Community Group) supports planned expenditure for the Matakana wastewater

and pumping station works.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Reticulated Sewage System for Leigh

TN0060

b) Wastewater

*Submission number and name*

N0052 Peter and Anne Scott

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0052 requests that a reticulated sewage system be provided for Leigh in the future.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Warkworth Waste Water Upgrade

TN0061

b) Wastewater

*Submission number and name*

N0046 Ian and Liz Packer

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0046 asks that, due to an anticipated increase in population of over 20% over the next ten years and the subsequent increase in extra effluent in waste water, the Council install newer, more modern waste water facilities in Warkworth.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Aquatic Facility at Warkworth Showgrounds

TN0062

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0297 Ruth Mills

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0297 requests the inclusion of an Aquatic Facility for Warkworth within the proposed multipurpose centre on the Warkworth Showgrounds. The submitter believes there is a great opportunity to build an aquatic facility on the ground level of the proposed multipurpose centre and notes the major health benefits such a facility will offer to the entire community (refer to the submission for details). The submitter also believes the Council should look at partnering with SPARC and other interested parties when looking to finance such a project.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Centennial Park Footpath

TN0063

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0204 Ross Sutherland

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0254 (Wellsford Ward Citizens' and Ratepayers' Association) requests that footpaths be installed for safety reasons on State Highway 1 and Flagstaff Road (as indicated in the submission) on the perimeter of Centennial Park, a Council sporting facility which is used extensively all year round, for safety reasons.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Highfield Garden

TN0064

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0171 Highfield Garden Reserve Advisory Committee

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0171 Highfield Garden Reserve Advisory Committee) asks for funding for the following activities:

- (2009/2010) upgrading of Glade Track between Algies Track and Orchard (costs not yet established but expected to be modest), upgrading of Box Gate (\$150), planting and tree removal (\$500);
- (2009-2019) removal or making safe the Macrocarpa/Old Shelter Belt (part of action planned by the Council), sealing of main drive and summit car park to improve access to the summit and deter drivers from straying from the main drive.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Hockey Turf for Warkworth

TN0065

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0145 Wayne Frost

N0208 Stephen Lee

N0276 Ben Hewson

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0145 asks that the Council confirm and fulfil its stated obligation to help finance and complete the ground works for an Astroturf hockey ground at the Warkworth Showgrounds complex.

2. N0208 asks for action in forming the proposed full sized hockey turf in Warkworth.

3. N0276 supports the development of the Hockey Turf at the Warkworth Showgrounds.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Kowhai Park Reserve

TN0066

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0110 Peter Buckton

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0110 requests that the Kowhai Park walkway be continued through the Heritage Lane, Northwood Development to the Showgrounds and that this be made available for public use.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Lake Tomarata

TN0067

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0248 Trevor Bruce

N0271 Geraldine Taylor

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0248 asks the Council to commit sufficient funds to upgrade and improve the current lake Tomarata Management Plan and to ensure enough annual funds to maintain the continual upgrade and ongoing maintenance of the lake and surrounding reserve as per the Management Plan.

2. N0271 requests a review of the lake Tomarata Management Plan in the next financial year.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Mahu East Community Centre/Goodall Reserve

TN0068

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0341 Mahurangi East Community Centre/Goodall Reserve etc Advisory Cttee

*Summary*

## REQUEST

N0341 (the Mahurangi East Community Centre/Goodall Reserve/Te Whau Esplanade/Dawson Landing Reserve Advisory Committee) asks that the Council:

- replace the light fittings in the car park as these have required constant maintenance over the last five years (estimated cost \$75,000);
- provide funding for volunteers to concrete some of the paths in the western and south western areas to provide all weather surfaces from Hamatana Road to the south and east of the main reserve area, as well as a link to Te Whau Esplanade (global estimated cost \$50,000);
- provide \$500 to cover a selection of trees and shrubs that the Committee will choose, order and plant as part of an annual planting programme.

## STAFF COMMENTS

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

### Memorial Park - Wellsford

TN0069

a) Public Open Space

#### *Submission number and name*

N0170 Wellsford Promotions Group

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) would like to see Memorial Park utilised more fully, with adult activities along a pathway amongst an updated playground, suggesting that it needs to be fully drained and have a more distinctive approach with signage from the highway installed to make it more attractive to tourists.

## STAFF COMMENTS

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

### Public Toilets - Wellsford

TN0070

a) Public Open Space

#### *Submission number and name*

N0170 Wellsford Promotions Group

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) asks that new toilets be built in the centre of the town on the corner of Station Road and State Highway 1, suggesting that they include a small unisex toilet with a changing table and that they are designed to fit in with the town's corrugated theme. The submitter also expects that toilets will be rebuilt in either of the library sites, offering customers and tourists two alternatives.

## STAFF COMMENTS

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Public Toilets and Changing Rooms - Te Hana

TN0071

a) Public Open Space

### *Submission number and name*

N0191 Te Hana Community Development Trust

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0191 (Te Hana Community Development Charitable Trust) asks that the capital expenditure cost of \$212,000 (p. 11-13 of the LTCCP) for the Public Toilets and Changing Rooms be reinstated in the budget for 2008/2009 (sic) because of their regional and district significance.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Shoesmith Domain

TN0072

a) Public Open Space

### *Submission number and name*

N0288 Elizabeth Davie-Martin

N0289 Mahurangi Gymnastics Club

### *Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0288 requests that the Council fund a feasibility study for a new multipurpose building on Shoesmith Reserve. The submitter also requests that the Council should include in the LTCCP efforts to obtain adjoining land to Shoesmith for this purpose.

2. N0289 requests that the Council review future use of the domain and the siting of a multipurpose facility. The submitter further requests that the Council include in the LTCCP 2009 funding of \$50k for a feasibility study on a multipurpose facility on Shoesmith Domain and a further \$500k for 2010-2012 as a contribution toward the design, consenting and construction of the facility.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Sports and Recreation

TN0073

a) Public Open Space

### *Submission number and name*

N0210 P C Jones

N0229 Warkworth & Districts Push Play Collective

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

### *Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0210 asks that provision be made for sport and recreation for people of all ages.

2. N0229 (Warkworth and Districts Push Play Collective Inc) asks for long term planning to support the growing population's demand for high quality affordable sport and recreation opportunities. Of particular concern is the lack of direction and development for the Warkworth Showgrounds. N0029 also suggests the complete development of Goodall Reserve and links to Dawson Rd would provide a

useable space for locals and tourists.

3. N0348 refers to the Puhoi Reserve Management Plan currently being developed by the Council and requests that funding be made available for completion of the projects started, the upgrading of the sports field and the tennis courts, and to allow development of the new area to commence. The submitter further notes that a priority to the residents of Puhoi is to fence off areas of the hillside and the riverbank that are to be planted with native trees and to keep livestock out of the river.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Walkways - Wellsford

TN0074

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0170 Wellsford Promotions Group

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) would like to see more work done on walkways down Centennial Park and up Matheson's Road.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Warkworth Showground Reserve

TN0075

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

N0252 Steve Dodd

N0288 Elizabeth Davie-Martin

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0288 requests that the Council reinstate its funding for the development of the Warkworth Showgrounds.

2. N0252 requests that the Council re-allocate the proposed funding of \$1.5 m for 2014/2015 back to 2009/2015 to complete the Stage 4 upgrade as originally intended. At the very least, the rugby grounds carparks should be completed.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Whangateau Reserve

TN0076

a) Public Open Space

*Submission number and name*

*Summary*  
REQUEST

N0020 (Whangateau Reserve and Hall Advisory Committee) requests that:

- a storage shed be erected at the rear of the hall for storage, at an estimated cost of \$5,100;
- a fitness trail be established around the perimeter of the reserve;
- six new tables be provided at an estimated cost of \$1500;
- the seawall remedial work be completed;
- the field drainage be upgraded;
- the reserve hard court area be redeveloped.

(Note: The Committee advises that items 1 - 3 are considered to be essential to the ongoing development and success of a much valued community asset, while items 4 - 6 are seen as being desirable.)

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Wellsford Library

TN0077

b) Libraries

*Submission number and name*

N0080	Toni Robertson
N0104	Glennis Flintoff
N0148	The Friends of Wellsford Library
N0170	Wellsford Promotions Group
N0256	Leigh Lomas
N0257	Mrs P M Aubertin
N0258	Monique Wilford
N0259	Ann Clegg
N0260	Valerie Burrows
N0261	Lesley McLean
N0262	Anne Beecher
N0263	Dale Ritter
N0264	Marjorie Prictor
N0265	Glenis Carew
N0266	Roy Shadick
N0267	Faye Brown
N0270	W J Preston

*Summary*  
REQUEST

1. N0080, N0260, N0263, N0266, N0270 ask that a new library be built urgently at Wellsford.
2. N0104 asks that the new library for Wellsford be built as soon as possible, adding that the introduction of the Aotearoa Network has put even greater pressure on available space.
3. N0148 (Friends of Wellsford Library) asks that a new library for Wellsford be built immediately, as per LTCCP statements as the present library is unfit for staff and customers alike, with no hot water, a lack of available space, and only one entry/exit for emergency purposes. The submitter asks that, if the library can't be extended on the present site, a new library be built in Memorial Park on the eastern side with a car park behind it and entry from Port Albert Road, providing the library with a relationship with the Albertland Museum and the Wellsford Kindergarten.

4. N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) endorses the replacement of the Wellsford Library; however is not in favour of it being relocated to the Community Centre as there is too little parking and it is too far out of town, suggesting that it be built either at the back of the current section, with car parking in front, or alongside the museum, which would also need to be enlarged.

5. N0256, N0257, N0258, N0262, N0267 request that the Council builds the proposed new library as soon as possible as the current building is too small with limited resources.

6. N0259 requests that the Council builds the proposed new library as soon as possible as the current building is too small with limited resources. The submitter further requests that libraries should be promoted more.

7. N0261 requests that the Council builds the proposed new library as soon as possible as the current building is too small with limited resources. The submitter further asks for the new building to be built in Memorial Park because of easy access from Port Albert Rd and the fact that it neighbours the Albertland museum with the kindergarten close by.

8. N0264 requests that the Council builds the proposed new library as soon as possible as the current building is too small with limited resources. The submitter prefers Memorial Park as an ideal location. The submitter refers to the many young people who make good use of the broadband computers and adds that more space for this facility as well as improved and better space for teenagers and children could only add benefit all.

9. N0265 requests that the Council builds the proposed new library as soon as possible as the current building is too small with limited resources. The submitter feels that Wellsford is being neglected by RDC.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Moorings for Kawau Island

TN0078

e) Community Assets

#### *Submission number and name*

N0233 David Coshan

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

N0233 comments that the Council's inaction regarding mooring access at Kawau is pathetic, with the acceptance of a 50% mooring application fee nothing more than outright theft, given that Council does nothing about these applications

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Puhoi Cemetery

TN0079

e) Community Assets

#### *Submission number and name*

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*  
REQUEST

N0348 notes that the Puhoi Cemetery is a public cemetery open to all residents of Rodney and requests that funding be made available to the RDC for maintaining this historic part of Puhoi (up to now it has been maintained by the residents of Puhoi).

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Relocation of Wellsford CAB

TN0080

e) Community Assets

*Submission number and name*  
N0170 Wellsford Promotions Group

*Summary*  
REQUEST

N0170 (Wellsford Promotions Group) requests the CAB be relocated alongside the museum (with the library) to encourage new people to the area to go to the museum/library/playground while they are getting information from the CAB/information centre.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Sandspit Car Park

TN0081

e) Community Assets

*Submission number and name*  
N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association  
N0036 Kay Peterson  
N0249 Terence and Beatrice Nuthall

*Summary*  
REQUEST

(Note: 234 submissions were received regarding the proposed rates increases for Kawau Island, many of these commenting on the high fees (which have doubled in the last 5 years), poor state of repair and lack of security at Sandspit Car Park. Please refer to these submissions for further details if required.)

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that allowance be made for expanding the Sandspit Wharf parking area as a new marina as well as new Kawau Island residential sections will lead to the need for short term construction parking as well as permanent demand car parking in Sandspit.
2. N0036 asks for a review of Sandspit Car Park, stating that it is very badly run, provides no security for a high fee that keeps increasing with a corresponding fall in service.
3. N0249 asks whether the budget income and expenditure of Sandspit Car Park for the 2009/2010 year was based on 85% occupancy, and why the rate of return on income has been reduced while car park charges have been increased.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Warkworth Town Hall

TN0082

e) Community Assets

*Submission number and name*

N0167 Warkworth Town Hall Advisory Committee

N0317 Womens Centre Rodney

N0329 Beverly Simmons

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0167 (Warkworth Hall Advisory Committee) asks that adequate funding be allocated towards a staged upgrade of the Category 1, New Zealand Historic Places Trust listed Warkworth Town Hall, despite no funding having been allocated over the next ten year period. The submitter suggests that, because the proposed Warkworth Community Centre will not progress in the near future, it is imperative that a staged restoration commence as soon as possible to cater for the social and cultural well being of residents and those community groups which use the hall extensively. Estimated costs for 2009/2010 include: seismic upgrade \$100,000; fire compliance \$50,000; electrical upgrade \$50,000, and for 2010/2011 \$200,000 for roof, mezzanine floor, toilets and kitchen upgrades.

2. N0329 asks that the Council reconsider its level of funding for the maintenance of community halls, specifically the Warkworth Town Hall, which is a significant heritage item with an NZHPT category 1 listing.

3. N0317 (Women's Centre Rodney) asks the Council to consider ways of preserving this landmark of Warkworth and for this to be reflected in the budget of the 10-year plan. The submitter believes the town hall could continue to serve as an important hub of community activity if more attention was paid to its preservation and upkeep and also notes the part the town hall played throughout the years as a safe haven for the woman from North Rodney.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Whangateau Sea Wall

TN0083

e) Community Assets

*Submission number and name*

N0009 Richard Gerard

N0120 Elizabeth Foster

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0009 supports the proposed expenditure on the Whangateau Sea Wall, which is currently dangerous and unsightly, and suggests that the Whangateau Reserve probably has the highest use of any area within the Whangateau Harbour so a new wall would improve safety and add to the amenity values of the reserve.

2. N0120 supports the sea wall upgrade but asks that it be delayed a year and this budget used for the Birdsall Road bridge.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Point Wells Stormwater

TN0084

c) Stormwater

*Submission number and name*

N0331 Point Wells Community and Ratepayers Association Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0331 (Point Wells Community and Ratepayers' Association Inc) notes that stormwater works are to be completed for Matakana, Point Wells, Leigh and Omaha (p.224) but asks that the Council give development and maintenance of Point Wells stormwater drainage more urgent priority.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Te Hana Stormwater Drains

TN0085

c) Stormwater

*Submission number and name*

N0191 Te Hana Community Development Trust

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0191 (Te Hana Community Development Charitable Trust) asks that the existing stormwater drains in Whakapirau and Coronation Roads, and State Highway 1 (this work to be carried out with cooperation from NZTA) , Te Hana, be piped underground.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Rugby World Cup

TN0086

a) Economic Advocacy and Facilitation

*Submission number and name*

N0250 Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Association

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0250 (Mahurangi East Residents and Ratepayers Association) does not believe that the average Rodney ratepayer would benefit from the suggested expenditure of over \$1m from Rodney ratepayers funds (refer to submission for details).

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Tourism

TN0087

a) Economic Advocacy and Facilitation

*Submission number and name*

N0015 John A Hayward

N0253 K-H Peter Kammler

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0015 suggests that tourists entering New Zealand be made to pay \$250, to be shared between local and central government, to entitle them to enter parks and use other facilities.

2. N0253 proposes that the promotion of tourism be phase out over two years and that the tourism industry be encouraged to pay for its own promotion.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Affordable Housing

TN0088

a) Community Policy, Planning and Action

*Submission number and name*

N0008 P J R Pinder

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0008 asks that the Council land in Worker Road, Wellsford, be used for low cost housing.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Youth Forum / Festival

TN0089

a) Community Policy, Planning and Action

*Submission number and name*

N0055 Ben Auger

N0343 Chris Baker

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0055 supports the proposed youth forum / festival (though doesn't make it clear in his submission which he refers to).

2. N0343 seeks support for an annual youth festival in line with the 4Uth Strategy which will provide an opportunity to connect and consult with a large number of young people throughout the district, proposing that the Council facilitate an inter-school working group to organise this annual event - a music/education/consultative forum. The submitter notes that the event has the potential to be financially sustainable but will need start up funds for the first year to cover venue, travel and other associated costs, estimated at \$10,000, plus the commitment of a Council staff member to facilitate the working group.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Netball Rodney Centre Inc - Grant

TN0090

b) Community Grants and Levies

*Submission number and name*

N0019 Netball Rodney Centre Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0019 requests a grant of \$33,000 to assist in the installation of lights and resurfacing of 6 netball courts at Centennial Park, Wellsford. The Centre has raised funding of \$168,000 towards the upgrade, which includes a grant from the ASB Trust, but the shortfall of \$33,000 means that only stage 1 of the lighting, equating to only two of the courts, can be achieved.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Springboard Community Works

TN0091

b) Community Grants and Levies

*Submission number and name*

N0336 Springboard Community Works

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0336, a charitable organisation which provides a youth mentoring programme in North Rodney, has applied for a grant of \$20,000 towards the salary of a part-time mentoring coordinator.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureau - Grant

TN0092

b) Community Grants and Levies

*Submission number and name*

N0002 Wellsford Citizens Advice Bureau

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0002 (Wellsford Citizens' Advice Bureau) requests an increase in its grant this year to \$16,000. (Note: The 2008/2009 grant received by the Bureau was increased from the \$13,000 granted the previous year to \$13,400 to cover inflation.)

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Wellsford Primary School Playground

TN0093

b) Community Grants and Levies

*Submission number and name*

N0340 Wellsford Primary School

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0340 requests that the Council provide funding of \$10,000 immediately to assist with fencing, gates, paths and signage for a playground on school grounds which the community has funded (\$100,000) but plans to open to the public after school hours and at the weekends, plus ongoing maintenance costs of \$7,000 every five years, beginning in 2013. The school also seeks a commitment from the Council that it will repair any damage to the facility which results from vandalism.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Matakana Fire Tanker

TN0094

c) Safety

*Submission number and name*

N0302 Matakana Community Group

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0302 (Matakana Community Group) supports the planned capital expenditure to replace the Matakana Fire Tanker.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Fire Stations and Fire Protection

TN0095

e) Fire and Emergencies

*Submission number and name*

N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0348 requests that the Council replace the temporary facility (two containers with a joining roof on land owned by the local garage) as soon as possible and further asks the Council to assist in the provision or financing of land for this purpose and facilitate the zoning changes required to enable its use for a fire station.

N0348 recommends that the Council apply pressure for the New Zealand Fire Service to be responsible for all fires in New Zealand which will result in a saving to RDC of at least \$4.5m over the ten years and would also remove the anomaly whereby ratepayers are paying twice, once through their rates and secondly through the fire service levy on building insurance.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Municipal Bonds

TN0096

a) Rating Policy Review

*Submission number and name*

N0005 Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association  
N0022 Kay and Shaun Wilkinson

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) requests that the Council use the issuing of municipal bonds in place of taking out more expensive commercial bank loans, as well as altering its current approach to funding capital resource depreciation to allow future users to more adequately fund expansion or replacement of long lived capital facilities.
2. N0022 asks that the Council issue bonds to fund capital expenditure and in doing so reduce debt.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Rating Policy Review

TN0097

a) Rating Policy Review

*Submission number and name*

N0013 Moreen Taylor  
N0015 John A Hayward  
N0022 Kay and Shaun Wilkinson  
N0031 Verne Linkhorn  
N0049 S Cometti  
N0057 Monica Saunders  
N0066 KC Ewington  
N0068 B J Wenzlick  
N0069 B M Wenzlick  
N0073 Alan Stevenson  
N0077 David Warren  
N0089 Jackie Underhill and Sue Hannon  
N0099 NH Harvey  
N0120 Elizabeth Foster  
N0127 Foster Archer  
N0140 Michael J Beehan  
N0183 Neville and Barbara Kidd  
N0185 Fleur Auber  
N0186 P J and H D Southerden

N0197	Peter Cunningham
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc
N0249	Terence and Beatrice Nuthall
N0250	Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Association
N0253	K-H Peter Kammler
N0306	Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association
N0308	Peter Warren
N0318	Terry Debenham
N0338	Richard Didsbury
N0348	Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*  
REQUEST

(Note: Many Kawau Island submitters have referred to different aspects of the Rating Policy Review, particularly those of capital vs land value and the differential rating categories (Island and Sea Access), volumetric charging for wastewater and development contributions. These comments may be viewed under the Topic: Kawau Island Rates.)

1. N0013 asks that:

- rates be generated only on land value;
- waste water be billed by the flush method;
- he not have to pay more for driving on the road just because he has worked hard and built something for himself and the person who has never worked doesn't have to pay;
- services provided equal rates paid;
- user pays be applied when determining appropriate rating levels.

2. N0015 doesn't agree that rates should be based on either land or capital value, suggesting that the demand for Council services relates to people, not properties, with the exception of stormwater, which is related to area.

In relation to the Urban Residential rating category, N0015 asks:

- why those in Warkworth pay a transport rate when there is no public transport;
- why lifestyle properties that don't have a significantly higher traffic use like a commercial farm pay the same;
- that it be taken into account that domestic ratepayers cannot claim tax relief on rates, whereas property owners and property developers can.

N0015 also suggests that increases in land value when reclassified from rural to development should not go to developers but be shared by local and Central Government.

3. N0022 supports the rating base being changed to Capital Value providing values are correctly assessed, suggesting that none are at present because of the wide range of properties that exist and the variety of services provided in the district.

4. N0031 asks that the Council retain the current system of rating on land value, not capital value.

5. N0049 suggests that basing rates on capital value appears to be purely a device for raising rates.

6. N0057 asks that roading rates be based on land value, suggesting that rates should be fair and reflect use. The submitter also asks that, if it is fairer to change the basis for rates and the additional cost of determining the new basis for the rates is negligible, then a change be made.

7. N0066 supports Capital Value rating and partially supports an "Island and Sea Access Properties" rate, apart from those that those that result in unreasonable rates increases, unrealistic value on council services or cost of delivering services and not allowing for broader public use of council services. The submitter suggests new and realistic differential rating factors.

8. N0068 supports Capital Value rating, especially as a general rate; however is concerned about the transport differential rate on rural/farm properties.

9. N0069 agrees that capital value rating is fairer and would also like to see the general rate based on

capital value as soon as possible.

10. N0073 supports capital value or a mix and agrees that the proposed differential rating categories and factors are appropriate.

11. N0077 asks that the Council:

- NOT set the transport rate based on capital value rather than land value;
- NOT make changes to the rate in the dollar that different rating categories of properties pay, resulting in some properties paying more than they do now and others paying less;
- target rates more closely aligned to the services residents receive.

12. N0089 requests that Council remain with Land Value rating.

13. N0099 suggests that an argument can be developed in support of unimproved value or capital value, but that a mix of the two should not be used and that the Council should be consistent in its approach. The submitter asks for a specific explanation for the increase of 12% on his rates for the current year (assessed using the rate search facility on the Council's website).

14. N0120 supports the change to capital value but not the rating differentials, which she says are unfair. The submitter asks that the UAGCs be removed as they impact on the poor and advantage the wealthy, and that the rural residential and farm roading rate, which is based on incorrect information, also be removed. She adds that the differentials should only be applied where there are extreme cases of injustice in valuations, such as on Kawau Island.

15. N0127 asks why the Council proposes to change the basis of land value to capital value when the incoming government has let it be known that change should be kept to a minimum, suggesting that it would be fairer to continue on the present basis to dampen down the effects of the current recession.

16. N0140 asks that the Council decide:

- that the value of property be set on the land value, not capital value;
- that there be no differential in categories as under land value this is unnecessary and iniquitous;
- that rates be aligned in a transparent manner to the services residents receive.

17. N0183 asks that, as a caretaker council, RDC not contemplate such a wide reaching change as that of rating on capital rather than land value.

18. N0185 opposes the proposed roading differentials, which mean rural properties will pay more again for transport - 1.3 for rural residential and 1.75 for farms, asking what maintenance these increased charges will be used for. With regard to coastal properties, the submitter asks how a factor of 2 for roading was arrived at.

19. N0186 agrees with the differential rating categories but asks that the factors be reviewed as they are way out as far as the Kawau Island rates go.

20. N0197 asks that the Council continue to rate on unimproved value as opposed to capital value as the dwelling bears no relationship to the use of services provided (assuming water is metered).

21. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) asks that the Council retain the current system of rating, given the Auckland Governance changes. N0231 agrees to the following:

- the concept of differential rating categories and factors and asks that it be applied to Omaha;
- that there be a relationship between rates charged and rates benefits received;
- making use of targeted rates (refer to submission for example).

22. N0249 suggests Differential Rating is the most appropriate way to consider use of services and ability to pay when selecting rating tools and developing rating policy.

23. N0250 (Mahurangi East Residents and Ratepayers Association) requests the Council to apply the tools of Targeted Rates and Differentials to meet its guiding principles (refer to submission for details).

24. N0253 proposes that the roading rates be charged according to the number of people of driving age living at a given property; failing that the submitter favours capital value as the base for roading rates.

25. N0306 (Snells Beach Ratepayers & Residents Association) questions the timing of making changes to the rating policy in light of the super city proposal. The submitter also notes that changes to the rating formulas as well as waste water charges would not advantage Snells Beach Residents. The submitter further notes that rates should be applied equally and spent fairly and effectively.

26. N0308 totally objects to a change in policy. The submitter notes that the main difference is the transport component and he lives off an unsealed road.

27. N0338 (Richard Didsbury) asks:

- that the proposal to change from land value to capital value rating be modified to exclude the commercial sector, which provides a small component of the overall rates base, so that those commercial property owners who create employment and bring major investments and economic benefit to an area are not penalised;
- that a policy to progressively reduce the commercial differential to zero over five years be adopted so that businesses will be encouraged to remain/relocate to those areas where unemployment is high and so the sudden addition of \$2m in rates imposed on the commercial sector in 2008/2009 is reversed.

(Note: Please read submission for further details.)

28. N0318 feels the Council should not be contemplating significant changes to the rating system in light of the recommendation of the Royal Commission for a super city.

29. N0348 recommends that a land value base for roading be retained given the predominantly rural area of the district, but questions the timing to make changes due to the proposed changes to Auckland Governance.

N0348 agrees in principle with the system of differential rating as it places costs proportionately to the level of use, but for the same reason targeted rates are appropriate where the cost of, for example, a wastewater system is added to all properties in the area covered by the system.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

There are a significant number of issues in this topic but they can be distilled down to:

- a) capital versus land value;
- b) rates as a charge for service;
- d) the use of differentials;
- e) the use of a Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) on all properties to recognise the access that all the community has to the general activities of the Council (e.g. libraries, parks, planning, etc).

Rating is a tax and the Council does, wherever it is appropriate, levy targeted rates where there is a significant private benefit. The Council also recognises that a per property charge is appropriate for a number of services and has increased the per property charge to close to the maximum of 30%.

The Council has also debated at length the implementation of a capital value rate and has a desire to move to capital value rates for all its value based rating charges. It recognises that to do this all at once is not equitable and has signalled that it will, over time, adjust the differential down on capital and land values. It has gone some distance in its LTCCP to achieve that and will continue the process over the next two years. The number of submitters that favour capital value versus land value is based on the impact that it has on their particular property. The Royal Commission and the Shand rates review both recommend that capital value with targeted rates is the most appropriate mechanism to use. The use of capital value for transport rates does better reflect the use made of the Council roading network. The Council has reduced the burden on the capital and land value category such that it would be basically in line with the inflationary impacts that the Council has incurred over the last two years.

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

1. that capital value for transport rating be confirmed;
2. that the differential on island and sea access for transport be reduced to .2 from .4;
3. that the differential for transport on multiple units be reduced to 1 from 2;
4. that the differential for transport on utilities be reduced to 1 from 2;
5. that properties that are over the 4 hectares but not used predominately for farming be transferred to the Rural Other category;
6. that the UAGC be calculated at 25% of eligible rates;

7. that the Council reconfirm that rates are a tax and the Council uses targeted rates to best reflect the benefit accrued.

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

The number of properties at the top end of the increases and the number with large decreases will be reduced whilst still allowing for the principles that the Council supports being adhered to.

Properties of over four hectares that do not meet the farming criteria are in the process of being reclassified to the Rural Other category.

## Financial Divisions

TN0098

b) Financial Divisions

#### *Submission number and name*

N0013	Moreen Taylor
N0022	Kay and Shaun Wilkinson
N0057	Monica Saunders
N0073	Alan Stevenson
N0099	NH Harvey
N0120	Elizabeth Foster
N0186	P J and H D Southerden
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc
N0348	Puhoi Community Forum Inc

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0013 asks that financial data be kept in the one place so that it is clearer to read and less likely that double entry or mistakes creep in.
2. N0022 asks that the existing financial divisions be retained but, if not, that there definitely be specific funding areas created.
3. N0057 suggests that one efficiently run division must be better than two, no matter how efficiently run, providing no specific area details are forgotten.
4. N0073 suggests that, if the Hibiscus Coast is included in the greater Auckland City, one set of financial accounts would be sufficient for the remainder of Rodney. The submitter doesn't agree with two financial divisions and agrees that the time is right to treat the district as one Council area.
5. N0099 supports the abolishment of the two financial divisions, suggesting that Rodney should have been treated as a single local authority since its establishment in 1990.
6. N0120 supports one financial district until it changes.
7. N0186 asks that the proposed change to one financial division take effect immediately.
8. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) agrees it is time to have one Council area with specific funding areas identified only when needed, but then by specific location and not a generalised approach.
9. N0348 recommends the retention of the current system of the two divisions, Hibiscus Coast and Rural and townships, as these two areas are very different in their requirements. The submitter thinks it makes sense to retain the separate divisions as a starting point of future divisions of assets with the proposed changes to the Auckland Governance.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

The majority of submitters support the amalgamation, generally stating that there it is sensible to start accounting for one Council. There are provisos mentioned around the specific funding of some areas where appropriate, which is what Council is intending to do through targeted rating for Water Supply and Wastewater.

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the amalgamation of the two financial divisions be implemented as proposed within the draft LTCCP.

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

There is general support for the proposal, with most concerns able to be addressed through targeted rating where deemed appropriate.

## Wastewater Charges

TN0099

c) Volumetric Charging for Wastewater

#### *Submission number and name*

N0013	Moreen Taylor
N0015	John A Hayward
N0022	Kay and Shaun Wilkinson
N0068	B J Wenzlick
N0069	B M Wenzlick
N0073	Alan Stevenson
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc
N0331	Point Wells Community and Ratepayers Association Inc
N0348	Puhoi Community Forum Inc

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0013 asks that those who supply their own water and attend to their own sewage not be charged for stormwater, suggesting that this is in an effort to spread the load.
2. N0015 asks that when applying a volumetric charge for wastewater, account be taken of garden watering by discounting the associated total water usage, as Auckland City Council does.
3. N0022 asks that water, stormwater and wastewater be charged strictly on a user pays basis, including discharge usage, and that if one uses neither no charge be levied, i.e. people using the wastewater should not all be charged the same.
4. N0068 supports the move to replace pan charges with volumetric charging for wastewater.
5. N0069 agrees with the proposed volumetric charge, which is considered more in line with user pays and would discourage wastage.
6. N0073 agrees with volumetric charging for wastewater, suggesting that everyone receiving wastewater services should pay the same charges and that the district be broken into five areas, as for stormwater.
7. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) agrees with the volumetric charge for wastewater in principle, but notes that it would be fairer to use a metered system instead of an 'average cost' system for properties with no connection to Council water.
8. N0331 (Point Wells Community and Ratepayers' Association Inc) notes that a deduction of 25% for the wastewater utility property charge was agreed to in November 2008 and has since applied to Point Wells ratepayers whose properties have been connected to the PWC at great personal expense. The Association's members strongly disagree with the introduction of volumetric charging for wastewater in these cases as neither inflow or outflow of water/wastewater is metered and

therefore charges would be pure guesswork. However, should such a system be adopted, the Association requests that the 25% deduction for those properties involved continue to apply.

9. N0348 agrees with a system that is based on water usage as a user pays system gives an incentive to reduce use and suggests that all capital and maintenance costs of wastewater and water supply systems be a targeted rate on those properties that do or can get the advantages of installation; paying rates to provide systems that cannot be used (for example in Puhoi) would be completely unjustified.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

N0013 there is no correlation between those that provide their own water and wastewater services with the provision of stormwater services.

N0015 it is noted that a discount will apply so the request is agreed to.

N0022 the Council does charge for water and wastewater separately and the change to a volumetric charge is an attempt to better reflect the services provided. It would not be equitable to charge for stormwater on any other basis than property value unless all properties had their hard surfaces identified. It is felt that capital value would be the best method but the Council is only using the capital value basis for transport rates at this stage.

N0068 the submitter's support for the change to volumetric charging is noted.

N0069 the submitter's support for the change to volumetric charging is noted..

N0073 the concept of having targeted rates based on the wastewater system that a property is attached to, is a consideration that will be investigated as new schemes are proposed and is currently under consideration for the Kumeu/Huapai proposed wastewater project.

N0231 the use of a metered wastewater system would be too expensive, the use of averages for none connected residences is the mechanism that Metrowater currently use.

N0331 the Council is currently proposing that the 25% discount for pressure systems that are not stand alone, with no other connection, will continue.

N0348 all wastewater rates are targeted to connected properties or those that have an ability to connect.

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That stormwater continues to be a targeted rate based on land value with the long term objective of progressing to capital value.

That volumetric charging for wastewater is implemented.

That consideration be given to whether the Kumeu/Huapai wastewater system be a separately targeted rate in the 2010/11 financial year to ensure that the rest of the Rural and Townships ratepayers are not subsidising the 25% discount given to pressurised systems.

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

These recommendations are made as they align themselves with the Council's Revenue and Financing policy and the concept of treating Rodney as one district, with the ability to charge targeted rates for services received and that volumetric charging for wastewater is a more equitable means of distributing the costs.

## Development Contributions

TN0100

d) Development Contributions

*Submission number and name*

N0005	Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association
N0013	Moreen Taylor
N0015	John A Hayward
N0022	Kay and Shaun Wilkinson
N0042	Colin A Greenslade
N0068	B J Wenzlick
N0073	Alan Stevenson
N0077	David Warren
N0120	Elizabeth Foster
N0140	Michael J Beehan
N0220	Rainbows End and Rivers Environmental Group
N0253	K-H Peter Kammler
N0348	Puhoi Community Forum Inc

*Summary*  
REQUEST

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) asks that provision for claims on developers to pay for the impacts caused by their proposals be identified and included in long term conceptual documents such as the LTCCP Development Contributions Schedule. It also asks that plans involve future known developments such as Kawau Island and the proposed Sandspit Marina Projects.

2. N0013:

- asks that developers be made to pay the full costs of their developments and that they be made to pay up front, though he advises he believes in user pays, i.e. admission charges, unless a facility such as a swimming pool is located within a 5km radius of a property;
- doesn't support local reserve contributions being linked to proposed spending being reflected in the LTCCP, suggesting that if a local community wants a park, because they bought a cross-lease section they should pay for it;
- supports larger households having to pay higher rates to offset their greater use of services (units of demand for residential activity) and retirement unit dwellers paying less on the basis of their lower demand on infrastructure (units of demand for retirement units).

3. N0015:

- agrees with the proposal to fund borrowing costs through development contributions;
  - agrees with the proposal to set payment to the earliest opportunity, i.e. at consent granting;
  - agrees with the proposed areas of funding for wastewater and water, halls, libraries and stormwater; but
  - disagrees with the proposed areas of funding for transport;
  - doesn't support local reserve contributions being linked to proposed spending reflected in the LTCCP if this results in a diminution of funds for small reserves to subsidise the larger parks in Rodney; and
  - supports:
    - current business conversion factors being used pending a new comprehensive approach;
    - 1.0 unit of demand for urban dwellings without reduction for smaller units because people cause demand, not dwellings; but
- doesn't agree with lower units of demand for retirement units.

4. N0022 asks that:

- developers be required to pay more and that no development be allowed to proceed until adequate infrastructure is in place;
- charges be set at the earliest opportunity; and
- the proposed areas of funding be confirmed.

5. N0042 (Northwood Development Ltd - NDL) asks that development contributions not be increased as this would put the purchase price of sections beyond a level the market would support, thereby inhibiting development. NDL doesn't object to a proportionate contribution to wastewater treatment relative to its share of the increased capacity required but suggests it is unfair that it be rated beyond its proportion of this cost as this would price out growth.

6. N0068 supports the proposed changes to development contributions.

7. N0073 comments as follows:

1-Yes; 2-No. It should be broken into payments in stages during the development process; 2-Yes; 4-Yes, as long as progress is made quickly to the comprehensive approach; 5-Undecided; 6-Yes; 7-Uninformed on this issue.

8. N0077 and N0140 ask that the Council NOT introduce a new development contributions policy to replace charges levied under the existing District Plan rules.

9. N0120 fully supports the proposed changes.

10. N0220 (Rainbows End and Rivers Environmental Group (REaREG) :

- suggests developers should pay for the existing infrastructure their development will use before that infrastructure is used;

- suggests that where a development will result in future infrastructure costs for the RDC, those costs should be paid before the Council builds that infrastructure;

- suggests that developers should use their own sources of finance when purchasing RDC infrastructure or requiring new infrastructure and payment should be based on:

a. the current market value of the infrastructure (existing facilities)

b. the actual projected construction costs (new facilities the RDC must build);

- suggests the RDC must operate an efficient and cost effective method of recovering development contributions, for example:

a. no s224 certificate unless the payments are made

b. registering a statutory land charge over the land where no s224 will be issued but the payment is due on land use commencement.

11. N0253 proposes that the developer contribution to infrastructure be doubled immediately and that the amounts collected be used to upgrade the high-use rural roads to full tar seal (or at least traction seal).

12. N0348 supports a system that enables RDC to recover infrastructure costs caused by the developer, however, care should be taken that these costs are actual for that particular area.

N0348 agrees with the current system of charging the development levy on issue of title, since to charge it on issue of consent would not be justified should the developer not proceed.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## General Rates Queries

TN0101

a) Rates (Other than Consultation Issues)

*Submission number and name*

N0013 Moreen Taylor

N0120 Elizabeth Foster

N0185 Fleur Auber

*Summary*

REQUEST

1. Referring to the 6.4% rates increase for 2010/2011 forecast in the Financial Overview, N0013 asks whether, because we are at present experiencing negative growth and there is a risk of deflation, his rates bill will go down.

N0013 also asks whether:

- Matakana residents will be paying for the proposed Northern ward projects as over 50% of these are for Matakana;

- owners of coastal properties will be paying to protect these by building a sea wall;

and why his rates are going up, given that Wellsford property owners are paying for the upgrade of their water supply and their new library.

2. N0120, referring to pages 52 and 56, advises that her transport and Araparera Forestry rates will be \$106,401 and \$817 respectively!

3. N0185 asks to see the range of values (highest and lowest) as well as the standard deviation for the rates increases as most people she has canvassed will pay 10 - 26%. The submitter suggests that, as this increase will only cover the next 18 months until transfer to the new Auckland Council, the submitter asks whether it wouldn't be fairer to simply increase the individual rating components by their inflation factors so that everyone gets a 5.2% increase.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Kawau Island Rates

TN0102

a) Rates (Other than Consultation Issues)

#### *Submission number and name*

N0006	V Mckellar
N0007	D G Whitehouse
N0011	Martin Louw
N0012	Judith Bettley
N0023	John Pryor
N0025	AC and C and NI Capener
N0026	Janet and Colin Wightman
N0027	Kim McDell
N0028	Juliet Pope
N0029	Cheryl Voigt
N0030	Nick Cressey
N0031	Verne Linkhorn
N0033	J V Bilger
N0034	JCM Deveraux and BJ Harris
N0035	D S Kingston
N0036	Kay Peterson
N0037	Graham Barker
N0039	Jonathon Koea
N0040	P J Costello
N0041	Russell and Jan Hughes
N0044	Kevin Banton
N0045	Annette Jones
N0047	Staniland West
N0048	Bryce Howard
N0049	S Cometti
N0050	Cheryl Montague
N0051	Simon Dickie
N0053	Long Family Trust

N0054	Jabez Ltd
N0056	Ilona Warren
N0057	Monica Saunders
N0058	Fiona MacDiarmid
N0059	Elise Harper Trustee
N0060	Peter Clark
N0061	Linda Osborne
N0062	Graham Dawson
N0064	Ian and Ruth Henderson
N0065	D and A Whitehouse
N0067	Martin Duytshoff
N0070	Nick Holding
N0071	Peter Ranson
N0075	David Addis
N0076	Margaret Ingleton
N0077	David Warren
N0078	Lin and Larry Pardey
N0081	John A Brunette
N0082	Graham Gibbs
N0083	Ian Horsley
N0084	Herb Fava
N0085	John McDermott
N0086	Craig Betley
N0087	Max Templeton
N0088	Andrew Stone
N0089	Jackie Underhill and Sue Hannon
N0090	Cath Thompson
N0091	Benna Byrne
N0092	Andrew Thompson
N0093	Paul Harper
N0094	Terrence Bartlett
N0096	Jon Mayes
N0102	Dr Hans Van der Velden
N0105	Simon Buckley
N0106	John and Melda Brunette
N0107	Christine Armstrong and Garth Liddell
N0109	Eric Raymond Weaver
N0110	Peter Buckton
N0111	Graeme Phipps
N0112	Jan Hollway
N0113	Gordon Price
N0114	Laurel Constance Horner
N0115	RG Souness
N0116	Stephen Hudson
N0117	Ann Franich
N0118	Dale Hammond
N0119	Doreen Phipps

N0121	Jock Bilger
N0122	Susan McGaw
N0123	Linda Pattullo
N0124	Jenny Spring and Jennifer Seel
N0125	Marie Brigenshaw
N0127	Foster Archer
N0129	Wayne Green
N0130	R H Morton
N0131	Simon Pirie
N0132	Romily Holding Ltd
N0133	Mark Hurley
N0134	Susan Cox
N0135	Keith Ayton
N0136	Linda Osborne
N0137	Jane Myhre
N0138	Kate Jones, Angela Jones and Heather Jones
N0140	Michael J Beehan
N0142	Vicki Van Dam
N0143	Steven Van Dam
N0144	Ken and Audrey Wells
N0146	Matthew Jeffreys
N0149	Catherine Danks
N0150	Sim Family Trust
N0151	Peter Morton
N0152	Simon Archer
N0153	Stephen and Cheryl Hoyle
N0154	Jennifer Mercy
N0155	Gabrielle Wilson
N0156	Jocelyn Wilson
N0157	James and Patricia Emtage
N0158	David and Helen Jeffery
N0159	Joan Tunnicliffe
N0160	Ross West
N0161	Kathryn J Sinclair
N0162	J G Gardner
N0163	Brenda McKellar
N0164	Kilbirnie Trust
N0165	Jane Upton
N0166	Peter Clark
N0168	John N Duder
N0169	Stevenson Family Trust
N0172	Colin Robottom
N0173	David Ramsbottom
N0174	Shirley Ramsbottom
N0175	Jill Hetherington
N0176	Derek Barker
N0177	Christine Armstrong and Garth Liddell

N0178	Murray Dixon
N0179	Rachel Rush
N0180	Susan Dickson
N0181	Chris Dickson
N0182	John Pettit
N0183	Neville and Barbara Kidd
N0184	Janice Green
N0186	P J and H D Southerden
N0188	Kim Christensen
N0189	Caleon Trust
N0190	Jennifer and Mark Battersby
N0192	Arthur Beale
N0193	Michael Marris
N0194	Lyn Hume
N0195	Alan Hume
N0196	Graeme Wicht
N0197	Peter Cunningham
N0198	Sean Beehan
N0199	Jean Barton
N0200	Marie Zylstra
N0201	Cire Perdue Family Trust
N0202	Mr and Mrs G D Pinnegar
N0203	Graeme Horsley
N0205	Judith Danks
N0206	Tony Drayton
N0207	Roger Hatrick-Smith
N0209	Les Mellars
N0211	Michael Edwards
N0212	Heather Edwards
N0213	Frank and Patricia Walton
N0214	Kevin Findlater
N0215	Dr Simon Hatcher
N0216	Val Wicht
N0217	Shelley Futcher
N0218	Gael Archer
N0219	Bevn Woolley
N0221	Maris Zylstra
N0222	Hatti Wilson
N0223	Reuben Zylstra
N0224	Eileen Crisford
N0225	Tracy Murphy
N0227	Carol Andrews
N0228	Kathryn Smith
N0230	Ruth MacClement
N0232	Judge Dale and Dr Hugh Clarkson
N0233	David Coshan
N0234	Simon Palmer

N0235	Joanna McKenzie
N0236	Stephen Horsley
N0237	Kevin Walker
N0238	Noel Wordworth
N0239	Richard M Poynter
N0240	Grant Corlett
N0241	Godon Trainer
N0243	Daniel Holt
N0244	Linda Christensen
N0245	Murray D'Ath-Weston
N0246	Ron Way
N0247	Kim Crisford
N0249	Terence and Beatrice Nuthall
N0268	Joyce Goodhue
N0269	Carol Steen
N0272	Bruce Stevens and Denis Barlow
N0273	Jude Wood
N0274	Hugh Findlater
N0275	Paul Cato
N0277	Phillippa Tabron
N0278	Gerard Lieshout
N0279	Patricia Roberts
N0281	Bob and Sandra Nelson
N0282	Martin Gillman
N0283	Petronella Lieshout
N0284	Beryl Oliver
N0285	Jenny and Richard Paine and sons
N0286	Scotfield Family
N0287	Stacey Hoggard
N0290	Guido Lochler
N0291	Elisa Duder
N0292	Elaine Read
N0293	Michael Lieshout
N0294	Julian Feary & Katharine Heron
N0295	Matthew Morton
N0296	Annette Foulds
N0298	Barbara Nustrini
N0300	Hodi Poorsoltan
N0301	Simon Cox
N0303	Murray Dawson
N0304	Anna & Scott Macindoe
N0305	Gregor Fyfe
N0307	Louise Gray
N0309	Greg Tabron
N0310	J. Lindsay Kirby
N0311	Greg Fry
N0312	Rufus Scott

N0313	Davide & Gabrielle Reeke
N0314	Graham Dallow
N0315	Stephen Robinson
N0316	Michelle Sullivan & Shaun Lott
N0321	Kane Hurley
N0322	John Crisford
N0323	Coco Crisford
N0324	Max Crisford
N0325	Bailey Crisford
N0326	Thomas Crisford
N0327	Rolf Keppler
N0328	Aine Margrain
N0332	D G Galbraith Family Trust
N0333	New Ascot Nominees Limited
N0334	Christopher Miller and Catherine Wenzel
N0335	D R Galbraith Trust
N0339	Robert and Clare Barnes and Lucy Arona
N0342	D E and G R Chown
N0346	Nevan Rowe and Kevin Hayward
N0347	Peter Donald Allbon

*Summary*  
REQUEST

A total of 234 submitters have recorded their objections to the proposed rate rises for Kawau Island, individuals noting:

- the Residents' and Ratepayers' Association and the Kawau Emergency Response Trust have provided and financed virtually all of the emergency response services and facilities on the island;
- the introduction of an Island and Sea Access differential overturns past decisions made by the government appointed commissioner brought into place to replace a dysfunctional council to reduce rates to Island and Sea Access properties due to unfairness of charging for services not provided;
- there is considerable deferred maintenance on Council land on Kawau, including parks and reserves type services, sea walls and general reluctance by the Council to become involved in new projects;
- privately-owned Kawau Island jetties are required to be open to the public for public use at all times, yet the owners are required to fully-fund maintenance and upkeep costs, in addition paying the Council costs for inspection and imposed maintenance and improvement requirements;
- the rating of Kawau properties needs special treatment that is separate from the rest of the district and the country to reflect every aspect of community, physical isolation, scattered dwellings, volatile property values, huge seasonal population swings and very special historical and conservation values;
- objections to the introduction of a Transport Rate and the proposal to charge Island and Sea Access properties a Uniform Democracy and Development Charge and a Uniform Annual General Charge, noting that the previous Uniform Civic Amenities Charge was more reasonable;
- that there is no reason for the change other than the tar-sealing of the Sandspit car park;
- that, should the proposal be rubber-stamped, further action will be taken;
- they are prepared to pay the proposed 5.2% increase being levied across the rest of the district;
- the increased rates cannot be justified given the lack of amenities and services provided;
- the Council lied when Quotable Value NZ put ridiculous values on Kawau Island properties some years ago, saying it was not a move to hike rates;
- the Council does not supply the majority of services for which Kawau Islanders are being rated;
- the transport rate should not apply as there are no roads on the island and the majority of islanders pay this through their rates for mainland properties;
- islanders receive no services on the island and an analysis of services used on the mainland by property owners (say) nine times each year only includes rubbish at Sandspit, the local roads used to get to Sandspit, and the boats stored at Sandspit car park for additional costs of \$700 - 800 each year;
- the Council indicated at the recent charette that Kawau would remain the same for the next 50

years at least;

- the Mayor, Penny Webster, agreed that the proposed 121% average increase for Kawau Island properties wasn't reasonable;
- many services are NOT provided on the island, including emergency services and civil defence, and many tasks (such as clearing fallen trees, minor repairs to the Council-owned public wharf, construction of several emergency storage sites for fire pumps and medical equipment) are carried out by the community;
- Kawau ratepayers living outside Rodney use Rodney roads no more than Christchurch residents holidaying annually in Northland;
- contributions for roading are already made through petrol tax, GST and registration fees;
- (referring in particular to the differential transport rate proposed) imposing a 40% proportion of the rate that a Red Beach property owner pays for transport is a nonsense and 5% of that of a mainland property would also be excessive;
- the major change in the rates calculation contravenes the Government's instruction that during the transition to a greater Auckland regime, no drastic policy changes be made;
- quotes from the draft plan which indicate rates will be kept to a reasonable level;
- proof of inequitable charging for Rodney facilities being levied on people who make no use of them;

- details of the lack of services on the island;
- the high cost of car parking at Sandspit Wharf and its lack of security;
- community maintenance of facilities on the Island;
- the Island is not a refuge for rich people;
- the Islanders manage their own roading, utilities, water, property maintenance, rubbish removal and support and maintain a transport system to and from the Island, currently provided by Reuben's Cruises Ltd;
- that submitter N0040 will pay a transport rate of \$586.95 for driving the short stretch of road from State Highway 1 to Sandspit over the year;
- the proposed increases in rates on Kawau Island are unjustifiable and outrageous, particularly on a user pays basis;
- Islanders do a lot to contribute to maintenance on the island, spraying weeds, clearing the beaches and roads, having an annual controlled rubbish burn, and maintaining the reserves and roads after storms;
- Islanders support the local retailers and trades people, allowing these people to pay their rates;
- many Kawau Island property owners also own properties on the mainland so are paying twice;
- the CE repeatedly said at a meeting with respect to rates "you only pay for what you get";
- other Rodney ratepayers receive weekly rubbish collections, water, storm water and sewage reticulation, road maintenance etc and Kawau Islanders pay for their own barges to collect rubbish and parking for their cars at Sandspit Wharf (with no discount);
- promises made to keep rates at a reasonable level;
- the plan's comment that the average rise will be 5.2%;
- the average Kawau rate rise will be 221%;
- services offered on the island have decreased over the years;
- several submitters travel to Kawau is by sea (10% at least suggested) so seldom use Sandspit Road;
- Kawau Islanders are subject to compliance costs other Rodney property owners are not subject to (for maintenance, wharves and structures, moorings, paths and sea walls);
- there has been no increase in the services provided commensurate with the more than 200% increase in rates (services have in fact declined), on top of rates increases over the past five years which have substantially exceeded the cost of living;
- Kawau is a unique and largely self sufficient community and the Islanders supply or contribute significantly to many community resources and emergency services for both residents and visitors;
- written advice from the Council in 2004 indicated Kawau Islanders would not be charged for roading, storm water, sewerage or water;
- no government authority or provider of essential services such as gas, electricity, water and fuel would ever be able to justify a percentage increase of such magnitude without a long term implementation program;
- Kawau Island rates should decrease, given the average cost of Council rates collected and how applicable they are to the island;
- as well as no services, there are no bus stops, libraries, recreational facilities, dumps, public toilets, traffic lights, street lighting, public parks, control offices, police or community centres;
- most families with school age children, the elderly and the sick need to live off the island because of the lack of facilities available;
- on top of annual rates, some also pay a coastal permit licence of \$125 and a mooring fee of \$120 annually;
- the Consumers' Guarantee Act says it's illegal to charge for services that aren't provided;

- processes should be in place to ensure poor management or inefficiencies do not cause costs to increase;
- costs and revenues should be actively managed to ensure increases are not passed on without improving services provided;
- rates must not be increased to compensate for the impact of increasing costs, inadequate provisions being made and / or falling revenues;
- Sandspit parking fees have doubled in the last five years, for the same poor level of administration and service;
- the Council should encourage more people to the island to enjoy its charming features;
- there is little crime on the island as the community is vigilant and there is little cause for policing islanders;
- Reuben's Cruises provide a 24-hour emergency water service for boats and boaties in trouble - almost always people not related to the island;
- that submitter N0060 owns the private wharf at Hokimai Bay, providing this and maintaining the foreshore for the benefit of visitors and owners, cleaning it of flotsam and maintaining the sea wall free of charge for the use of all property owners and not receiving a cent in contributions towards this from either the Council or other property owners;
- the proposed conversion from land value to capital value represents a dramatic and unacceptable rate of increase;
- there is no rationale provided for levying the uniform annual general charge, regional amenities & museums and democracy & development charges across the district;
- the district plan recognises Kawau's uniqueness, but the proposed funding plan does not;
- the annual cost of living (CPI) for the year ending March was only 3%;
- there are agreements in place between the Council and KIRRA (Kawau Island Ratepayers' and Residents' Group) that are being circumvented by this new proposal;
- in 1986 the Council provided free of charge or subsidised a bus to meet the ferry, transport to and from Warkworth, ferry travel, car parking at Sandspit (except during holiday periods), landing fees, four inorganic rubbish pick ups each year, building inspections, moorings and jetty licences once the structure was built;
- Islanders have planted native vegetation and cleared paths on which visitors walk;
- a former CEO told ratepayers that their rates paid for 'democracy' and that as they did not have roads, water, sewage or rubbish removal, they could expect their rates to remain quite low compared to mainland Rodney residents;
- the septic system warrant of fitness that has been mooted is another expensive and bureaucratic imposition, considered to be another means of the Council raising revenue, especially when the systems were installed privately;;
- the transport rate should be based on the land value of property as the value of a house doesn't determine whether the residents use the roads;
- rating should revert back to the 2008-2009 land value;
- it is no longer a cheap place to live;
- there is a major requirement for improvements to arterial routes (Highway 1), but this should be a shared financial burden, not just a cost to Kawau ratepayers, as should the maintenance and improvements to Sandspit Road, on which the Warehouse was allowed to develop;
- the rating proposal is out of line with current central government thinking on local taxation;
- 55c in the dollar Kawau ratepayers pay for their rates is not spent for the benefit of the community in which they live;
- of all the projects for each ward, the only one to benefit Kawau ratepayers is the upgrading of the Sandspit sea wall;
- the advisory and ratepayers' committees were not consulted before the LTCCP was printed, which is communist in attitude, yet a democracy charge is being levied;
- the Prime Minister has said that councils should only lift rates by the rate of inflation;
- those people building only have heavy usage (of facilities) for (say) three months and then revert to normal usage and this should be billed as part of the resource consent;
- the median income of residents is \$13,000 compared to \$19,500 for Rodney District;
- population percentages exceed that of the district in the 15 - 65+ categories;
- unemployment is higher than in Rodney;
- there are only 24 families permanently resident on the island;
- couples without children comprise 87.5% compared to 44.2% in the district;
- average household size is 1.7 people compared to 2.6% for Rodney;
- only 64.3% of the households have access to motor vehicles, compared to 94% for the district;
- the small amount of roading on the island is in a very bad state and is seldom looked after, as are the stormwater drains, which due to lack of attention are causing slips to develop;
- out of control noxious weeds are springing up all over the island with no remedial action being taken by the Council;
- criteria to be considered when setting rates are: who benefits from the services, how much they

are expected to benefit from services and who creates a need or demand for different services, but Kawau Islanders receive very little benefit from Council services;

- DOC takes care of the Mansion House and the surrounding park and toilets;
- capital values are currently inflated, therefore it is unreasonable to base rates on prices driven by property speculation;
- as it's likely the RDC will disappear in the proposed new structure for Auckland Governance, it's wrong for a caretaker council to make any major changes;
- there are only two very short pieces of road on the island;
- works are required to balance the books of equality between islanders and mainlanders, such as repairs to School House Road, which collapsed last winter after continuous rain;
- the Council now ignores damage to property on the island resulting from storms, terming it an 'act of God';
- the Council also gains revenue from parking fees at Sandspit, which are charged on an annual basis from the expiry of the previous permit, not from when a new permit might be required;
- the capital value system bears no relationship to market values;
- the community is trivialised by not being listed as a separate community (e.g. Silverdale, Orewa, Kumeu) and being expected to contribute to rates from which the residents will see no benefit;
- full payment of annual rates at the first instalment will no longer be an option so there will be more paperwork for the Council;
- islanders are an in-built resource of doctors, fire fighters, engineers and builders, providing private helipads for emergency purposes;
- the proposed increases are an abuse of power that may be subject to judicial review on the grounds that the proposals fail to take account of the unique circumstances pertaining to the administration and servicing of Kawau;
- there is a monopoly on the ferry service to Kawau, the fare for which costs twice as much as that to Waiheke, for half the distance;
- the Council made no provision for access to the property owned by submitter N0313 at the time of subdivision;
- from the breakdown the Council provided it is NOT true that 34c in the \$ will be spent on roading and footpaths, 21c in the \$ will be spent on water and wastewater, 17c in the \$ will be spent on community services such as parks and libraries and 7c will be spent on environmental services such as waste management and stormwater;
- requests for services from the Council, such as asking for installation of a 5 knot sign at the entrance to North Cove, are met with obstruction and refusal;
- to make a major change on how to rate properties on Kawau Island without full consultation is very undemocratic and this needs to be fully addressed before changes are made.

Submitters also ask:

- that Kawau properties be rated separately, maintaining independent and transparent accounts, with the general rate at 0.1 % for the general rate for the median value of mainland properties and all other rates set at zero;
- that the Council consult with KIAC to define the services RDC wants to provide, the services islanders want to receive and how these might be realistically funded in the future;
- for a long term resolution from the Council that Islanders will be treated equitably in future to prevent the need for submissions and arguments;
- for written assurance of the improved amenities and services to be expected for Kawau from the proposed increase in rates to allow Islanders to look at the cost/benefit;
- whether the issue is one of wharf maintenance and if so, could this be more equitably addressed by a special levy spread over 5 years so those on low fixed incomes could budget for such an expense;
- why were Kawau Island ratepayers not given prior notice of Council's intentions in this regard so that they would have a reasonable opportunity to absorb the proposal and have time to present fully researched arguments in response;
- why were KIAC and KIRRA not given prior warning of the proposals (they received notification at the same time as the ratepayers) and why has the Council representative not been involved in discussions with Island ratepayers about what was to be imposed on them;
- being charged for Rodney roads is unfair and inequitable;
- regional amenities are paid for on the ARC rates;
- that the LTCCP be rejected in its entirety as it applies to Island and Sea Access properties and that a more reasonable and fair methodology that reflects the remoteness of these properties be adopted;
- providing the total rate yield for Kawau Island is increased by no more than 5.2%, that a change to capital value as a means of determining individual rate assessments be introduced as this will help preserve the low density development characteristic of the island;
- that the Council confirm that rate yields from Kawau Island have been \$90,000 for 2004, \$180, 923

- for 2008 and would appear to be \$400,000 for 2009-2010 - all for the same services;
- that additional expenses for travel time for building inspectors visiting the island be taken into account when setting the rates;
- that any rates increases be used to acquire land for public walking tracks around the island and a rubbish collection, not new roads;
- that the reasons for the increase be explained, especially as past councils must have considered island property owners to be fairly rated;
- where fixed income earners (superannuitants) are supposed to get the extra money to pay for the proposed rate increase;
- that rates be reduced to a level which reflects a fair cost for the services provided;
- the Council take action with Quotable Value NZ to revise and explain how the property revaluations were derived;
- why have Quotable Value NZ values not been readjusted to realistic levels;
- what new services Kawau Island properties are to expect from the new uniform annual general charge, which appears to replace the uniform civic amenities charge that mainland Rodney residents pay, and why it has been decided that Kawau Islanders should now pay this;
- how the Council justifies its criteria for setting rates in terms of the Kawau Island increases (who benefits from the services?, how much are they expected to benefit from the services? and, who creates a need or demand for the different services?);
- how a 267% increase can be justified after a letter dated 3 April 2009 made mention of a 5.2% increase;
- for an explanation of the Uniform Democracy and Development charge and where the democracy comes in;
- that the Council not 'double-dip' with regard to the Auckland Regional Rescue Helicopter and MOTAT, which many Kawau Island ratepayers already pay on their mainland properties;
- what the island community would be getting to justify such an increase;
- that the a modest uniform percentage increase of less than 25% be applied as this would still see the Council's coffers swell;
- that the Council direct its officers to reconsider the rates increase for Kawau Island properties and come up with a policy which is consistently fair across the whole district;
- that the Council honour previous statements that Kawau Island ratepayers would not be charged a democracy and development charge, nor charges for roading, stormwater, sewerage, waste, transport, regional amenities and museums;
- that the rates charged reflect the existing socio-economic group;
- that the rates increase for Kawau Island be kept in line with inflation, as most other councils are doing;
- that the Council keep in mind that what it charges for rates should be commensurate with what it provides;
- (suggesting that the Council must have a separate account for Kawau Island, given the outrageous and rapacious increases suggested, which would show that rates collected over the years are not commensurate with the services provided) that this account be made public to justify the proposal;
- that the proposed rates increases be reversed and justified (given the isolation and lack of amenities on the island, the cost of rubbish removal, sewerage systems and water collection being borne by Islanders, high parking fees being paid at Sandspit to cover the cost of the wharf, roading being paid for through petrol taxes, the ferry service not being subsidised);
- that the calculation regime be reviewed to reduce the penalty proposed (several submitters say their Kawau Island rates are comparable to those for their mainland residences);
- how can Islanders contribute to a general fund from which the Council provides no reserves or facilities;
- how do Uniform Democracy Development charges apply to Kawau Island?
- that the Council acknowledge that the proposed Kawau Island rate is NOT in keeping with the average increase throughout the district and is demonstrably UNJUSTIFIABLE;
- the Council not change the rating methodology for Kawau properties from that which it has been in the past;
- that the Council review the uniqueness of Kawau Island, its community spirit which results in so many services and facilities provided to visitors and residents, and see fit not to rate the island in a manner similar to mainland towns and suburbs;
- that Kawau, because it is not developed, not be rated as a suburb;
- where else in Rodney does the Council gather revenue from parking other than the Sandspit car park?
- that the current rating structure be left as is;
- that the Council grandfather existing rate assessments and apply a rate increase that doesn't exceed the rate of inflation unless the property is sold or transferred to a non-relative, or the property is sub-divided or developed in some significant manner;
- that changing to capital value be carried out over a significant period of time with incremental

- changes prorated over (say) 20 years;
- that Kawau Island be removed from the general rating categories and a separate category be formed which acknowledges the very limited services provided by the Council;
- rate charges for islanders be reduced to those of 2007-2008 commensurate with the reduction in services since that time;
- acknowledge the amount of reserve funds already paid by islanders towards the maintenance of South Cove and School House Bay jetties since these were taken over by the Council, funds which have not been used for their intended purposes;
- projects proposed for the island be delayed or scrapped so that ratepayers can contribute at a lower and more realistic level of rate increases;
- that the change to capital value be abandoned on the grounds of Kawau's special character, i.e. very limited services;
- how much of the increased expenditure is correcting mistakes made in the past for short term benefits and how much is aimed at taking the long view?
- that the change to capital value for Kawau be abandoned, but if not, that services such as rubbish collection and adequate access be provided (by the Council purchasing and maintaining every single jetty and wharf), together with footpaths on coastal reserve land;
- that the rates be reduced by 300% to reflect the fact that values have fallen to 2003 levels;
- that breakdowns of the cost of running Kawau Island, the number of Kawau ratepayers who also own mainland properties and those who do not own mainland properties be provided;
- that Kawau Islanders be charged 20c in the dollar in total for roading and footpaths, environmental services, community development, community services as stated and for other community services such as maintenance of the rubbish depot at Sandspit;
- where is the accountability to Kawau Island ratepayers from the Council, required under Section C of the LGA 2002;
- compensate Islanders by way of free parking at Sandspit, removing wharf fees (the private use and ferry boat fees), commit to a full programme of regular maintenance for Sandspit wharf and the two public island wharves, provide limited free parking at Sandspit, provide a quarterly inorganic rubbish collection, adequately maintain the short sections of road at Schoolhouse Bay and South Cove;
- that the Council to put on hold the increases until the following is resolved: (a) first the Council needs to disclose where the existing rates from Kawau are being spent with full transparency for all to see, (c) second the Council needs to fully show what costs are not being covered by Rates from Kawau, (c) then decide with the rate payers what is a fair way for the necessary amount to be raised to ensure good governance with out excessive cost.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

The issues raised by the Kawau Island ratepayers largely revolve around the Uniform charges and the imposition of a transport differential. Council as part of its preparation of the Draft LTCCP undertook a process of analysing each group of activities to identify the reasons for the expenditure and the means by which it should be distributed. This work was undertaken in line with the Council's legislative obligations when identifying the distribution of its rating burden. The result of this exercise identified those activities that were district wide and were available to all households. The outcome of this process is set out in the revenue and funding policy starting at page two of chapter two of the draft LTCCP. The Council has a limit of 30% that can be charged by way of a UAGC (e.g. per separately used or inhabited part of a property) and has chosen to use that limit as the maximum SUIP charge. This charge falls to every ratepayer no matter where they are in the district. To recognise the increase that this imposed on the Kawau Island ratepayers the Council also chose to reduce the General rate differential, for islands and sea access from .497 to .20. The Council also concluded that the residents of the island do have an impact on the Council's roading network and that this network is important for many of the residents for access and supply. The Council resolved that in comparison to a normal property on the main land that an appropriate differential to reflect this access was 40% of a normal household.

A common concern also raised by many of the submitters is the perception that Kawau residents receive little in the way of services from the Council. There are many "hidden" services that ratepayers receive such as animal control, protection of the environment, meeting of health standards for shops and restaurants, navigation aids, toilets, playgrounds, etc. But just as important it has to be remembered that rates are fundamental as tax for being part of a wider community and not a fee for services received.

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the UAGC remain but the total collected by way of this mechanism be reduced to 25%, that the

Transport differential reduce from .4 to .2 and the General rate differential be increased to compensate to .30. This recommendation would reduce the average increase from \$502 to \$402 or on average a 97% increase. The reduction in rates would have little significance on other ratepayers but would push those with high land values slightly higher.

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

The incidence of rates on the Island and sea access has moved around considerably over the last few years. With a UAGC the Council must rate it on all properties within the district otherwise it is a targeted rate that can only be used for the activities it has been rated for. A UAGC is set based on the persons ability to access the general activities of council.

## Objections to Rates Increases

TN0103

a) Rates (Other than Consultation Issues)

#### *Submission number and name*

N0022	Kay and Shaun Wilkinson
N0032	Linda Petersen
N0240	Grant Corlett
N0249	Terence and Beatrice Nuthall

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0022 asks that the Council:

- dispose of all property for which it does not have a need or use to reduce debt;
- reduces the 25% increase in rates, suggesting this is not fair and reasonable given the minimal level of service provided in areas such as Pt Wells, and the fact that the neighbour opposite has a larger rural property receiving the same levels of service for significantly lower rates;
- only charge ratepayers for the services they use and the Council only provide the services those living in an area need or use.

2. N0032 asks why the rates have gone up 5.2% when her pay hasn't gone up at all, suggesting the Council should take a long hard look at what it spends its money on and not spending money on what it can't afford until the financial times improve.

3. N0240 objects to rates in general and asks the Council to stop wasting money on projects such as the Matakana toilets and bronze plaques at Sandspit.

4. N0249 considers the proposed rates increase unfair and unreasonable, noting it should be reduced to 3%, and suggests the Council considers other ways to reduce expenditure.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

1. N0022 raises the issue that they should only be charged for the services used. Rates are a tax and the Council does, wherever possible, directly charge for services that convey an individual benefit. The Council also identifies the costs that are associated with people as opposed to those that relate to the use of the land such as transport. The driver of the rate increases are the transition to capital value for the transport rate, which better reflects the level of activity rather than land value where land can be sitting idle.

2. N0032 Council's inflationary drivers are not related to the CPI but more aligned to the construction index. The 5.2% increase reflects the cost of providing water, wastewater and roading which makes up 54% of the Council total expenditure.

3. N0240 the Council consults with the community as to the amenities they desire.

4. N0249 the Council considers the total impact of its rates on ratepayers and has made significant cuts to the proposed work streams to ensure that existing levels of service are maintained.

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the Council's final decisions are conveyed to the submitters, indicating that all proposed work was closely scrutinised before inclusion in the budget.

That some of the differentials, which affect the transport rates, be adjusted to reflect the use of the property and that the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) be reduced to 25% of the total rates, with the balance charged on a land value basis to all ratepayers.

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

Impacts on individual ratepayers will always vary depending on their value and location. The reduction in the UAGC to 25% will relieve the impact of the fixed charge per property.

## Regional Amenities Levy

TN0104

a) Rates (Other than Consultation Issues)

### *Submission number and name*

N0015 John A Hayward

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0015 is not totally opposed to the regional amenities levies but is against paying a transport levy for a non-existent service in Warkworth, suggesting that Auckland should also pay Rodney for the use and maintenance of its parks, beaches and coastal defences.

## STAFF COMMENTS

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Auckland Governance

TN0105

c) Miscellaneous

### *Submission number and name*

N0013 Moreen Taylor  
N0015 John A Hayward  
N0095 GW Boyrs  
N0173 David Ramsbottom  
N0174 Shirley Ramsbottom  
N0183 Neville and Barbara Kidd  
N0348 Puhoi Community Forum Inc

### *Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0013's comments on Auckland's Governance reflect his opinion that if it saves money and stops large forests of paper, it will be good. However, he also comments on having to pay for the Auckland Museum, suggesting that user pays should be applied in this case and that service won't be any different to what he receives now - he provides his own water and sewerage and has planted his own native trees so he is not only addressing his own stormwater but taking up the slack for all those concrete palaces.

2. N0015 asks why the Government can't learn from the mistakes made with other larger city reorganisations such as Brisbane, Australia, especially given the cost of \$550 per ratepayer suggested.

3. N0095 asks that all the Council's energy go into avoiding Rodney becoming part of the Super City, but that if it can't be avoided, the Northern Ward be left out so that rural Rodney is precluded from the development that the Hibiscus Coast has been subject to.

4. N0173 asks why the Council is bulldozing ahead with the ten year plan when they won't be reigning?

5. N0174 suggests that as a caretaker Council, RDC should not be making plans for the next ten years.

6. N0183 asks that the Council revert to a caretaker role and not make any radical changes to the existing District Plan or rating system.

7. N0348 asks that the Council not spend time on developing policies or make changes such as to capital value based rating when it is not known what the future policies of the Auckland Council will be (for example, the cost of a possible new computer programme for rating will be wasted if it is different from the one that is going to be used by all).

N0348 suggests that the Council include all the items that are considered important for the future in the LTCCP so that they can be picked up by the Auckland Council; for example, if the seal extension programme is deleted, it could be seen as an indication that no new road sealing is needed in the future.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

#### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Economic Situation

TN0106

c) Miscellaneous

#### *Submission number and name*

N0013	Moreen Taylor
N0057	Monica Saunders
N0183	Neville and Barbara Kidd
N0197	Peter Cunningham
N0319	NorthTec
N0348	Puhoi Community Forum Inc

#### *Summary*

#### REQUEST

1. N0013 asks that there be no increase in rates, no bonuses, no perks, no extravaganzas, no committees and no afternoon teas, suggesting that the sole purpose of the Council should be to provide water, sewerage etc and that if a community wants a community centre, it raises the funds and builds it themselves.

2. N0057 supports the way the Council plans to respond to economic conditions by keeping rates reasonable, maintaining existing services and standards and deferring unnecessary expenditure.

3. N0183 asks that the Council review its existing services and downsize, given that the current economic situation may be with us for some time, suggesting that this should include staff levels, contracts, overheads and projects such as the Matakana toilets, which should be taken off the drawing boards. The submitter notes that councillors are custodians of ratepayers' money and must implement zero budget principles and stop spending accordingly.

4. N0197 asks that the Council set rates with reference to inflation and the general economic climate, rather than setting the budget then striking the rates, suggesting that this may require a reduction in staffing levels and layers of bureaucracy.

5. N0319 comments that the numbers of Rodney residents commuting to the south for work poses a

risk if the economy deteriorates as many of these people will no longer travel and instead will use local services such as recreational facilities and libraries.

6. N0348 comments that although the Council has cut back on a number of Capital expenditure items, it does not seem to have applied the same discipline to administration and staff costs and recommends an immediate freeze on staff remuneration and numbers employed and suggests the introduction of a programme of reduction in line with what is happening in the private sector.

N0348 recommends that all aims and targets be quantified in numeric terms so that the result can be directly compared with the objective.

N0348 asks that funding for social initiatives that are not core activities should be diverted towards infrastructure that is of direct benefit to the ratepayers and that staff employed in 'event' or 'art advisors' roles should be removed.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

1. The Council's costs have increased by inflation, which then flows through into an increase in funding sources including rates. It is impractical to expect a nil rate increase unless areas of costs can be identified to reduce or eliminate. The areas identified by the submitter are either minor in impact or open to debate as there are many other submitters who requested some of the perceived non-core services that define and to some extent create a community.

2. Although the submitter has some serious concerns about the impact on Kawau Island rates, she agrees with the opening intentions as stated by the Council.

3. The Council is very aware of the economic situation and has acted as it believes accordingly without seriously jeopardising service levels. Staff cuts have been made, where vacancies are not to be filled, and the recent rollover of the Council's main physical works contracts resulted in substantial savings being achieved. But Council is also very aware of maintaining existing service levels and so the Council has attempted to cut costs without these resulting in noticeable differences to what the public see on the ground.

4. There are different inflation rates assessed and published for different parts of the economy, with the most relevant for the Council being how much the cost of constructing has moved over time. For the last year this has been independently calculated as 5.4% for Rodney District Council, and so this was resolved to be the upper limit for the average rate increase for next year. As noted above this limit was achieved by reducing overall staffing levels for the Council and identifying cost reductions in our main contracts.

5. There is a possibility that more people remaining within the Rodney District due to the economic climate may place extra demands on the Council's services but this is not anticipated to be significant.

6. As noted above the Council has limited staffing levels as part of an overall business redesign and subsequent hold on or removal of existing vacancies. Targets expressed within the LTCCP and correspondingly reported against within the Annual Report are quantified where appropriate, but some will continue to be reported against in qualitative or commentary terms. The definition of "core activities" is up for debate, with the current services being provided those that are deemed as appropriate to meet the community's desired outcomes.

#### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

1. That the request for no rate increase not be agreed to.
2. That the support for the Council's approach be noted.
3. That the intent of the request be agreed with.
4. That the intent of the request to set rates at the level of inflation be agreed with.
5. That the concern be noted.
6. That the requests be agreed to as far as the extent to which they have already been implemented.

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

1. To simply continue to provide the same level of service as is currently provided the Council's costs will generally go up by inflation, and rates must then increase if no other funding sources can be identified.
2. As in agreement with the intentions of the Council's actions.
3. The Council has already moved to address some of the concerns raised, such as reduced contract costs for the main physical works contract of the Council, and staff positions have been scrapped or put on hold where appropriate.
4. As the Council did start with inflation as the target for rating increases and worked very hard to limit any costs to this level.
5. As in extreme circumstances this may have an impact on Council services.
6. As the Council has reduced staffing levels, and quantified targets where possible, but is concerned about the implications of some of the other requested changes.

## Financial Assistance from Central Government

TN0107

c) Miscellaneous

### *Submission number and name*

N0015 John A Hayward

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0015 asks, because Rodney has little industry, large coastlines and parks, why the Government can't assist Rodney in coping with the expenses of these, which are national assets.

## STAFF COMMENTS

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Financial Overview

TN0108

c) Miscellaneous

### *Submission number and name*

N0194 Lyn Hume  
N0250 Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Association

### *Summary*

REQUEST

1. N0194 asks that the Council publish a totally transparent, easily read income and expenditure statement annually so that ratepayers can advise the Council how to achieve savings.
2. N0250 (Mahurangi East Residents and Ratepayers Association) is concerned about an unacceptably high burden of debt while yearly capital expenditure remains static. The submitter refers to the 10 year period forecast of a 66% increase in rates revenue and a 100% increase in the cost of finance (refer to submission for details).

N0250 also feels that the budget for Regional amenities & museums (50% of the Community Development Budget) should be invested in Rodney community development projects.

## STAFF COMMENTS

1. The simple income and expenditure statement that is requested is based on inputs (e.g. advertising, insurance, telephones), which would add very little value to the consultation process. A council exists to deliver various services to its communities, in the way of outputs (e.g. Water Supply or Building Consents), which are undertaken to achieve agreed outcomes (e.g. growing and resilient economy based on a wide variety of businesses that fit our character). At its simplest the Council appoints a Chief Executive and that person appoints the appropriate skilled staff to deliver those outputs within approved budgets. To enter into consultation around inputs would require the general public (and not just a select few) to have the same skills sets and understanding of local government management and administration as the employed staff. By way of example for the public as a whole to be able to assess whether the right amount of money has been spent on insurance, would require them all to understand what the risks are of running a \$1.6B organisation, what insurance is available to cover those risks and how much that insurance can be purchased for.

2. The Council is aware of the increasing debt levels over the ten year term of this LTCCP, and has looked to lessen the impact through the sale of surplus properties. As stated by the submitter, interest (or finance costs) are proposed to increase from \$19.9M to \$39.8M (in inflated dollars), which means that as a percentage of rates income it will move from 20% to 24%. This is not an uncommon trend in local authorities, especially for high growth councils, with work underway to ensure that this interest is recovered from the developments creating the cost. If it is accepted that capital works are to be undertaken and that these works will provide benefits over a period of time, it is deemed inappropriate to charge current ratepayers the full cost of that capital project, which is where the costs would fall if loans were not used to spread the costs.

3. The Council has similar concerns over both the magnitude and the relevance of these facilities for Rodney ratepayers. There is little doubt that \$2.6M or \$4.9M could achieve a substantial amount of community projects within the district, but three specific pieces of legislation have been passed requiring Council to contribute on behalf of its ratepayers.

## OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

1. That the request to annually produce an input based income and expenditure report not be agreed to.
2. That the request to note what is perceived to be an unacceptably high level of debt be noted but not agreed with.
3. That the request be agreed to in principle but Council must meet its legislative requirements.

## REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

1. As this would add no value to the consultative process, which should be considering how much it is costing to achieve the outputs (or outcomes) that the Council is here to deliver.
2. Debt is an appropriate method of allocating costs on an inter-generational basis, thereby avoiding placing too high a rates burden on current ratepayers.
3. The Council is required by law to pay the Museum and Regional Amenities levies that have been assessed as falling on Rodney District ratepayers.

## LTCCP Document

TN0109

c) Miscellaneous

### *Submission number and name*

N0005	Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association
N0008	P J R Pinder
N0042	Colin A Greenslade
N0231	Omaha Beach Community Inc

*Summary*  
REQUEST

1. N0005 (Sandspit Residents' and Ratepayers' Association) requests that Vision Rodney be reflected in the LTCCP and that capital projects deleted from the plan be reinstated so that there will be coherent guidelines for the new Auckland City.
2. N0008 notes that there were no numbers on the summary LTCCP document.
3. N0042 requests that the agreements and understandings given to Northwood Development Ltd (NDL) with regard to reserve contributions paid and subsequently passed on to those who purchased properties in Melwood Drive, Westpark Glen, Ashmore Crescent and Heritage Lane be documented in the LTCCP and carried forward to ensure that any future Greater Auckland City does not seek to sell the Atlas Site for industrial purposes or dispose of reserves (bush reserve adjacent to 6 Heritage Lane that effectively extends the Kowhai Park Reserve and a passive reserve adjacent to 8 Heritage Lane for which NDL provided the infrastructure). The submitter notes that covenants were enforced to ensure a higher standard of development and that this and the cost of development contributions paid by NDL were passed on to property purchasers, which raised the property values and resulted in a higher rate take for the Council.
4. N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) asks that the Council not spend further time on making more changes to the LTCCP document, knowing the Auckland Super City was to eventuate. N0231 further suggests that cancelling capital projects was an unsound decision that would leave the District on a minimal basis going into the super city.
5. N0348 is concerned that the work the RDC had done in the Puhoi area will stop as no capital items other than the fire appliances are include in the Draft Plan. The submitter feels it is important at this time to identify every project and service that the RDC would like to have completed in the next 10 years in this LTCCP so that it is in the system when the councils are combined. The submitter further notes that it is important that maximum value is obtained for every dollar spent and to achieve this the Council's way of operating has to be continually reviewed.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

## Merra Survey

TN0110

c) Miscellaneous

*Submission number and name*

N0250 Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Association

*Summary*  
REQUEST

N0250 (Mahurangi East Residents and Ratepayers Association) included the results of a survey conducted in the community (refer to submission for details).

STAFF COMMENTS

Results of survey noted.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the results of the survey be noted.

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

No action required on Council's part.

## Rating System for Omaha Stormwater

TN0111

c) Miscellaneous

### *Submission number and name*

N0231 Omaha Beach Community Inc

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0231 (Omaha Beach Community Inc) states that there is no stormwater network in Omaha and that Omaha ratepayers object to being rated for services not received.

### STAFF COMMENTS

The issue relates to the contention that no stormwater system is available. The Council has not, as part of this LTCCP, made any change to the areas that are covered by the stormwater rates and charges properties based on land value. Very little cost increases are being applied to this rate over the ten year period.

The Council uses general classifications for rating purposes, resulting in the serviced and unserved townships proposed in the LTCCP.

### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the request not be agreed to.

### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

No change had been promulgated in the LTCCP and there is no reason to change our current proposal.

These rating areas are based on general principles of serviced and unserved towns as it is impractical to have differential groups for all of the permutations that can exist.

## Rating System for Scotts Landing

TN0112

c) Miscellaneous

### *Submission number and name*

N0250 Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Association

### *Summary*

REQUEST

N0250 (Mahurangi East Residents and Ratepayers Association) asks that a correction be made to the stormwater rating system applied in the Scotts landing area. The residents of Scotts Landing area are forced to pay the same targeted rates as those receiving town standards of facilities.

### STAFF COMMENTS

The submitter claims they do not receive the services that a town would. The Council has not changed any of its classifications for the stormwater rates within the current LTCCP and very little increase has been budgeted across the 10 year period.

Council uses general classifications for rating purposes, resulting in the serviced and unserved townships proposed in the LTCCP.

### OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

That the request not be agreed to.

### REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION

The Council has not changed any of its stormwater rating areas and they are still based on land

value.

These rating areas are based on general principles of serviced and unserved towns as it is impractical to have differential groups for all of the permutations that can exist.

## Reuben's Cruises Ltd

TN0113

c) Miscellaneous

*Submission number and name*

N0039 Jonathon Koea

*Summary*

REQUEST

N0039 asks that the Council contribute to maintaining the viability of the boat service to Kawau Island provided by Reuben's Cruises Ltd, advising of a precedence in Auckland City where the local council subsidises bus companies on routes of borderline profitability in order to maintain the services, suggesting that support from the Council would safeguard the service and permit ongoing improvements in island infrastructure.

STAFF COMMENTS

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDED DECISION

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISION