

Options: District-wide

Options have been proposed to address each of the key issues raised in the six parts of the Assessment. Some of the issues and options are specific to individual communities and these are addressed in the following section. Key district-wide options considered in the Assessment include:

Service	Issue	Projects / Options	Council Role	Estimated Cost	2009 Update
All services	Council has limited budget and resources, and needs to manage spending in the most cost effective manner possible.	Continue existing asset management programmes to manage operational and capital works for Council-provided services.	Service provider.	Funded in the LTCCP.	<i>Will be continued.</i>
Water	There are a significant number of households and businesses supplied with water from sources other than RDC reticulated systems. Some of these are community water supplies which are defined as having 25 persons resident for more than 60 days per year. Council proposes to take an advisory and educational role with respect to these community and private supplies to ensure that any public health risks are minimised.	Community supplies: Option to establish a database of community supplies in the district for information collection purposes and to facilitate the distribution of advisory material.	Facilitator.	Cost to be determined.	<i>No progress, has not been considered a priority for RDC. Need will be reviewed during 2010 WSSA in consultation with MoH.</i>
		Community supplies: Investigate the costs and a potential funding model for a water quality testing programme for community water supplies.	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Cost to be determined.	<i>Basic water quality testing is provided by the Environmental Health Officers.</i>
		Community and private supplies: Investigate the most cost effective means of preparing advisory material on the correct operation and maintenance procedures for water supplies.	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Cost to be determined.	<i>Information is available on rainwater tanks, bores and water conservation. Preparation of further materials and promotion will be looked at next.</i>
		Central government funding may be available for some community water schemes. RDC to support eligible communities in funding applications.	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Cost to be determined.	<i>This is a MoH role, but RDC can be involved as required.</i>
Wastewater	Storm and groundwater infiltration and inflow into wastewater network - compromises system ability to deal with wastewater flows. Priority areas are Warkworth, Red Beach and Stanmore Bay.	Continue infiltration and inflow investigations to identify where remedial work is required.	Service provider.	\$120,000 per annum.	<i>Programme is ongoing and budget included in LTCCP 2009 – 2019.</i>
		Continue infiltration and inflow remediation programmes to resolve problems identified.	Service provider.	\$450,000 per annum.	<i>As above.</i>

Service	Issue	Projects / Options	Council Role	Estimated Cost	2009 Update
Wastewater	A number of RDC wastewater treatment plants are of an older design and struggle to achieve the modern discharge standards required. In addition, RDC budgets are limited and spending needs to be prioritised.	Implement an environmental monitoring programme in the district to assist in determining the most appropriate upgrade for each Council treatment plant. Expenditure priorities (in descending order) are Helensville, Army Bay, Warkworth, Snells/Algies Bay, Waiwera, Wellsford, Huapai and Omaha.	Service provider.	Cost to be determined.	<i>As part of consent requirements, monitoring occurs at Army Bay, Snells/Algies Bay, Huapai, Helensville, Waiwera and Wellsford.</i>
	A number of factors dictate the need for RDC to clearly define where public reticulated wastewater systems will be provided in the district. This has been completed in the form of a policy on public wastewater systems.	Option to adopt RDC policy on public wastewater systems (discusses implementation of defined area plans specifying current serviced areas & future serviceable areas; and introduces development restrictions on the type of wastewater systems that will be approved in defined areas, e.g. no private cluster systems, must be built to Council standards, taken over and managed by Council).	Service provider.	Policy adoption.	<i>No progress.</i>
	The provision of private wastewater treatment systems (septic tanks or community treatment systems) in the district has been assessed as resulting in varying levels of risk to public health. Contributing factors are poor system design, poor ground conditions, poor understanding by property owners and poor maintenance and management. RDC's response to the risk has been to prepare a policy on private wastewater systems. The policy proposes a number of options to protect public health. The option/s applicable to a system are dependent on the size and location of a property in the district. Key options are included in this table, however if you wish to examine all of the options and controls proposed for development, it is suggested that you obtain full copy of the policy. Consultation on these options will be undertaken with affected communities.	Prepare or source homeowner and developer guidelines for private systems and encourage all property owners to regularly maintain their on-site system. <i>Option applies to all private systems.</i>	Service provider/ Facilitator.	\$40,000 per annum. Self funded.	<i>No progress, has not been considered a priority for RDC. Need will be reviewed during 2010 WSSA in consultation with MoH.</i>
		RDC or ARC to provide training and certification of service providers. <i>Option applies to all private systems.</i>	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Cost neutral.	<i>As above.</i>
		Subdivisions to identify minimum suitable site area for on-site treatment and disposal. >4,000 m ² and slope less than 24 degrees. <i>Option applies to all private systems.</i>	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Policy adoption.	<i>As above.</i>
		Limit servicing of properties by private systems in urban areas. Developments of more than 2 properties will be required to investigate providing a public system in association with Council. <i>Option applies to all private systems in urban areas.</i>	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Policy adoption.	<i>As above.</i>
		Future developments of 200 or more residential properties to be designated as urban areas and required to provide public reticulated wastewater systems. <i>Option applies to large developments.</i>	Advocate/ Facilitator.	Policy adoption.	<i>As above.</i>

Service	Issue	Projects / Options	Council Role	Estimated Cost	2009 Update
Wastewater		<p>We propose to consult with urban communities on the establishment of an on-site system Warrant of Fitness (WOF) and pump-out scheme. Elements of this scheme could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building a database for recording private on-site wastewater systems • education program • 5 yearly WOF inspections of private wastewater systems • sludge removal as required at 5 yearly inspection (this cost is already allowed for in the annual charge). <p><i>The communities in which this programme is proposed to be implemented are included in the following section.</i></p>	Service provider.	<p>Self funded programme.</p> <p>\$50-\$69 per property per annum.</p>	<i>No progress, has not been considered a priority for RDC. Need will be reviewed during 2010 WSSA.</i>
Stormwater	A number of RDC programmes are already in place to deal with the stormwater public health issues identified. Priority areas for stormwater works are listed under individual communities.	Continue with catchment management plan programme.	Service provider.	Identified in LTCCP budgets.	<i>Programme ongoing.</i>
		Continue discharge consent programme.			<i>Programme ongoing.</i>
		Continue with drain safety programme.			<i>Programme ongoing.</i>
		Continue with Safeswim programme.			<i>Discontinued due to consistently clear results.</i>
	Flooding risks in some rural areas as drain management responsibilities are not well defined.	Maintenance responsibilities and policy need to be clearly defined for drain management, especially in rural riparian areas.	Service provider/ Advocate.	Not scoped.	<i>No progress, is part of 2008 Asset Management Plan improvement programme.</i>
Sanitary services	The only key district-wide sanitary services issues related to public health that were raised were in relation to public toilets.	Option to consider the assessment grading scores when developing upgrading and replacement work programmes.	Service provider.	Identified in LTCCP budgets.	<i>No progress. Will be reviewed as part of 2010 WSSA.</i>
		Option to monitor the ability of public toilets to cope with existing and future demands.			<i>No progress, will be carried out as part of 2010 WSSA.</i>
		Option to complete a demand analysis for the district, looking at future needs.			<i>As above.</i>