

Council Briefing Agenda

Date: Thursday, 29 April, 2021

Time: 9:00 am

Location: Council Chamber
Forum North, Rust Avenue
Whangarei

Elected Members: Her Worship the Mayor Sheryl Mai
(Chairperson)

Cr Gavin Benney

Cr Vince Cocurullo

Cr Nicholas Connop

Cr Ken Couper

Cr Tricia Cutforth

Cr Shelley Deeming

Cr Jayne Golightly

Cr Phil Halse

Cr Greg Innes

Cr Greg Martin

Cr Anna Murphy

Cr Carol Peters

Cr Simon Reid

For any queries regarding this meeting please contact
the Whangarei District Council on (09) 430-4200.

1. Apologies

2. Reports

2.1. LTP Issues and Options

1

3. Closure of Meeting

2.1 LTP Issues and Options briefing

Meeting: Council Briefing
Date of meeting: 29 April 2021
Reporting officer: Dominic Kula (General Manager Strategy and Democracy)

1 Purpose

To work through the draft Issues and Options report for the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan (LTP) and concurrent consultations.

2 Background

Over the course of 2020 Council had had a large number of Briefings, Workshops and meetings centred around development of a draft LTP for consultation.

These began with the establishment of the priorities, strategic drivers and vision for the LTP, before shifting into information/activity Briefings and early direction setting. Council then moved on to prioritising areas of new spend from asset management processes alongside those identified by councillors.

This process culminated adoption of the draft Consultation Documents and Supporting Documents for Audit on 17th December 2020

On 25 February 2021, Council adopted for consultation the following document which are subject to the Special Consultative Procedure process under the Local Government Act 2002:

These documents were available to the community for consultation between 1 March to 1 April 2021 in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002

A total of 2886 formal submissions were received (this figure has been adjusted to reflect final submissions analysis) with 125 submitters scheduled to speak at the Public Hearings over the week of 12 April 2021.

3 Discussion

With Council now having received and heard submissions staff have undertaken a high level summary and analysis of submissions in a draft Issues and Options Report (Attachment 1). It is important to note that this is a rough/high level analysis that is subject to refinement and change.

While some options/recommendations have been presented Council direction in the Briefing of 29 April 2021. This is necessary for a final report to be tabled for formal deliberations and decision making at the Council meeting of 12 May 2021.

Report structure and approach

In compiling the report staff have analysed submissions to identify where issues and requests are already provided for within operational programmes/budgets, or within the 10 year capital programme. A number of matters raised in submissions fall into this category.

In addition staff have identified those requests that are not specifically provided for under existing programmes or budgets, but could be added to programmes for consideration/prioritisation alongside existing requests (i.e. requests for road sealing, footpaths, slow streets etc).

Alongside this staff have looked at where timing changes to programmes could meet submitters needs within existing parameters, while maintaining our ability to deliver the programme within any given year (notably in Parks). This approach has resulted in staff being able to make recommendations that will enable a number of submissions to be addressed within existing constraints.

Outside of this staff have recommended some minor changes for consideration of Council, highlighting areas that Council may want to consider and/or where political direction is required.

Suggested approach for this Briefing

Changes to opex are likely to result in a need for further rates revenue. It is becoming increasingly evident that Waka Kotahi will not fund us to the extent we have requested. This, along with cuts made to opex through COVID, means that opex is tight.

Any changes suggested to opex as a result of submissions have therefore been highlighted within the report for the consideration of Council. For this Briefing it is proposed to:

1. Provide an overview of financial parameters
2. Touch on and known risks that could impact on our ability to deliver the plan (i.e. three waters, NZTA subsidy, supply issues etc)
3. Update Council on any known changes
4. Summarise key themes from submissions and any staff recommendations
5. Undertake a facilitated session to work through councillors feedback and priorities (it is anticipated that the majority of the Briefing will be the facilitated session).

As discussed following hearings Council is on very tight timeframes for the back end of the LTP process. We will need clear direction from this session in order;

- To formally deliberate on 12 May 2021
- Compile a draft LTP document for Audit
- Work through the Audit process prior to adoption of the LTP on 24 June 2021

4 Attachments

Draft issues and options report LTP 2021 – 2031

Issues and Options Report LTP 2021 - 2031.docx

DRAFT

APRIL 29, 2021
WHANGAREI DISTRICT COUNCIL

Table of Contents

Background	3
Formal submissions & analysis	3
Consultation and Engagement Programme	4
Analysis of feedback	5
Part One – Submission Summary	6
QUESTION 1 - How will we pay for what we need: Rates Options	6
QUESTION 1 - Proposed changes to value-based general rates rating categories	8
QUESTION 2 - Spaces for Gathering: Oruku Landing / Hihiaua / Forum North	9
QUESTION 3 - Climate Change & Sustainability: Options for funding	11
QUESTION 4 - Revitalising our city centre: Options for funding	13
QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think	15
A. Transportation	16
B. Water / Wastewater / Stormwater	21
C. Solid Waste	22
A. Flood Protection (Hikurangi Flood Protection Scheme)	23
B. Community Facilities and services – including Housing	25
C. Governance and strategy	36
D. Planning and regulatory services	41
E. Support Services	43
F. CCO Governance	43
J. Bulk submissions	44
G. Māori Relationships	48
Part Two – Te Karearea Feedback	50
Feedback considered by Te Karearea on 21 March 2021	50
Hapū Capacity building	50
Support for non Council managed cemeteries/urupa	52
Part Three – Concurrent Consultations	53
Draft Revenue and Financing Policy	53
Draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policy	54
Draft Early Payments of Rates Policy	54
Development Contributions Policy	55
Fees and Charges	57
Part Four – Late submissions	59

Background

Public consultation on the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 was undertaken for one calendar month between 1 March 2021 and 1 April 2021.

The Consultation Document, adopted by Council on 25 February 2021, presented five items for community feedback:

- Rating options (COVID-19 catch up)
- Spaces for gathering – event facilities at Oruku, Hihiaua, and improvements to existing facilities at Forum North
- Climate change and sustainability
- Revitalising our city centre – improvements to James & John St
- Have Your Say – Kōrero with Council

Formal submissions & analysis

Formal submissions were able to be made online, electronically, verbally over the telephone, via post and/or delivered to Council offices.

Submissions closed at 5.30pm on Thursday 1 April 2021.

A total of 2886 formal submissions were received as follows:

- 455 (16%) on-line submissions
- 116 (4%) by email
- 2301 (80%) delivered to Customer Services, these consisted of the Ruakaka Recreation Centre bulk submission and a large number of the Cat control bulk submission
- 14 (0%) delivered post

The submissions were received from members of the public, organisations, groups and businesses, the following is a breakdown of the percentages:

- 735 (25%) – General submissions:
 - Submissions directly associated with the questions posed within the Consultation Document
- 2151 (75%) Submissions were received as bulk submissions:
 - 1019 (35%) – Development of a cat bylaw
 - 970 (34%) – Ruakaka Recreation Centre
 - 162 (6%) – Beach Road, Onerahi
- 17 – Concurrent Consultations
 - 7 – Fees & Charges
 - 10 – Covering all of the concurrent consultations:
 - Statement of proposal on rates remission and postponement policy & early payment of rates policy
 - Statement of proposal on revenue and financing policy
 - Statement of proposal on development contribution policy
- 9 duplicates across all consultations
- 4% (125) of our submitters were scheduled to speak at the Public Hearings over 2 ½ days which also included several speakers dialling into Chambers via telephone or MS Teams. It is noted that some submitters did change their views during the hearings, that level of detail will not be identified in this report.

Consultation and Engagement Programme

Public meetings were held during the period of 24 February 2021 – 26 March 2021, which included a total of 325 people attending at least one public meeting

- 15 public meetings around the District (the public meeting (held at Forum North) was livestreamed to Facebook which included a sign language interpreter)
- Hui with Nga Hapū o Whangārei at Terenga Parāoa Marae

A first for the LTP was the inclusion of a Family Fun Day which took place on Saturday 26 March 2021 at Pohe Island. This event was a huge success and attracted an estimated crowd of 3000 over the event period between 10am – 1pm.

Distribution and promotion of the Consultation occurred through multiple channels during the consultation period. Website interactions showed the following statistics:

The Have Your Say pages and feedback forms

Page	Page views	Unique Pageviews	Avg. Time on Page
Have Your Say > LTP Consultation 2021-2031	3802	3026	2:56
LTP Consultation 2021-2031 Feedback Form	1089	956	5:08
Have Your Say > Policy Consultations alongside LTP 2021-2031	181	152	2:34
Policy Consultations alongside LTP 2021-2031 Feedback Form	82	70	2:53

Here are some statistics on the News Stories we added to the website (under News and notices):

Page	Page views	Unique Page views	Avg. Time on Page
Long Term Plan is opening for consultation (24/02/2021)	119	104	1:05
Key issues for consultation in 2021-31 Long Term Plan (03/03/2021)	98	84	1:41
Family fun planning Whangārei's future (31/03/2021)	5	4	0:47

Social media campaign

This campaign aimed to inform people within a social-media environment and give them what they needed to give meaningful feedback on the Long Term Plan.

The campaign included some innovative features like a live-streamed version of the LTP Public Meeting including interactive Q&A, use of video-snippets covering one topic each to drive discussion, a major family-friendly event, and live-streams associated with that event.

We also made 5 posts on Neighbourly and saw some discussion generated from each of those.

All paid promotion was targeted to people living in Whangarei District.

Key figures and estimates

Estimated total campaign impressions: 80,000

Estimated total single-impression population reach through social media: 33%

Hero video: 19,000 views (10 seconds or more, includes paid promotion)

Video snippets combined: 9323

LTP Family Fun Day FB event page: 26,000 people reached, 1500 responses. Various posts supporting this page / event also reached 10k+

Infographic post: 5k reach

Other photographic posts: approx 5k reach

Livestreamed public meeting:

- Peak 45 live viewers on the night
- 1200 views (3 seconds or more)
- 600 views (10 seconds or more)
- Around 10% watched for 10 minutes or more
- Questions asked on chat were answered on live video

Analysis of feedback

This report is split into four parts:

Part One – Submission Summary

- Analysis of feedback on the consultation questions through formal submissions.

Part Two – Te Karearea Feedback

Part Three – Concurrent Consultations

- Analysis of feedback on the consultation questions through formal submissions:
 - Draft Revenue and Financing Policy
 - Draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policy & Early Payments of Rates Policy
 - Development Contributions Policy
 - Fees and Charges

Part Four – Late submissions

- Formal submissions received after the deadline of 1 April 2021

Part One – Submission Summary

QUESTION 1 - How will we pay for what we need: Rates Options

OPTION 1: Council preferred Option:

- Rates increase in year one (2021) of 2% + 2.5% Local Government Cost Index (LGCI) + 2% 'catch up'. Rates increase in years two and three (2022-23) of 2% + 2.5% LGCI

OPTION 2:

- Limit the rates increase to LGCI plus 2% only across ten years of the plan

Feedback from consultation

Submission analysis:

Submissions received that included a preference for this consultation question showed, 260 (58%) were in favour of option 1 and 191 (42%) were in favour of option 2

Issues raised from submissions

The 258 submissions supporting option 1 are summarised below:

- Need for the 'catchup' to meet increasing costs
- need to fund improvements, climate change, biodiversity, housing, parks, community gardens, recycling,
- need to fund rural roading, infrastructure rebuilds
- support economic progress
- larger increase sought (i.e. 12%)
- need to bring vibrancy to CBD
- allow for contingencies, e.g. COVID-19 pandemic, floods, tsunami
- pay more to reduce debt

The 191 submissions supporting option 2 are summarised below:

- COVID-19 pandemic is impacting rates affordability for homeowners and businesses
- potential recession looming
- a gradual rise preferred for pensioners
- spread increase over a number of years
- spend more on sport and safety, less on theatre and CBD
- focus on core services, essential projects only
- rural community struggling
- allocate spending to: Ruakaka, Waipu
- reduce staff
- reduce winter foreshore maintenance of Sandy Bay
- alternative income from property portfolio

We received 355 other submissions supporting neither option 1 or 2. Comments received from these submitters cover a range of issues. A summary of comments on the rates increase are provided below:

- no wish to pay more for poor service, pay too much
- 0% or 1% increase, 1% each 2 years
- reduce commercial rates and increase residential rates, reduce rates so it's more attractive for businesses to return to the city
- establish an external committee to increase revenue other than rates

- introduce targeted rate for communities that have destroyed vegetation
- do not combine district-wide refuse rate and uniform annual general charge
- seal extensions: Helmsdale, Neville, Hosking, Waikiekie, Walker, Otuhi, Mititai, Codlin, McLean Roads
- sell leasehold assets

Staff analysis:

The proposed rates increase is to ensure Council has a balanced budget that provides adequate funding for our infrastructure and other spending, enables growth and preserves our current level of service. The rates rebate system supports low income households and we proactively help our ratepayers to benefit from this facility.

When comparing non residential rates to other districts it is important to ensure that all relevant charges, fees and/or targeted rates are taken into account (i.e. an apples for apples analysis). Non residential rates have for Whangarei District have been found compare favourably with those of other Councils.

The Uniform Annual General Charge and District-Wide Refuse Rate are charged on the same basis and combining these together will reduce confusion.. It will also improve internal efficiency and simplify the rates notice.

Staff Recommendation

- That the proposed rates of 6.5% increase is implemented.
- That the Uniform Annual General Charge and the District-Wide Refuse Management rate are combined as proposed.

Financial impact

- No impact.

QUESTION 1 - Proposed changes to value-based general rates rating categories
Feedback from consultation
Proposed changes to value-based general rates rating categories

The proposed changes value-based general rates differential definitions for rating categories are in the Funding Impact Statement (2021-31) Long Term Plan supporting document.

Issues raised from submissions

One submitter suggests the proposed changes are not made on properties with a current private plan change which would modify that zoning, or the Marsden Primary Centre Environment should be excluded from the commercial and industrial category.

Another submitter questions whether the proposed new rating differential definition for commercial / industrial land complies with the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

The third submitter considers that determination of the rating category is subjective for staff. Also, ratepayer dissent is caused by the higher differential for commercial and industrial properties.

Staff analysis:

The incidence of value-based general rates on a property, are differentiated by its rating category. The rating categories are defined in the Funding Impact Statement and are: residential, multi-unit, miscellaneous, commercial and industrial and rural and are determined on use or zoning.

The intent of the proposed rating policy is that vacant and unused properties are rated as they are zoned. If the properties are vacant or "land-banked", even if used for grazing or cropping typically of an occasional nature, Council's intent is they should be rated as commercial and industrial.

This change is proposed as the current policy allows a property with a commercial or industrial zoning to be rated as rural by grazing a few stock or growing a small crop, even if the modifications to allow an agricultural use are uneconomic if looked at in isolation.

Excluding specific properties from a rating category could be considered unfair to the other ratepayers in that sector.

All proposed changes to rating policies have had external legal reviews to check compliance.

Staff Recommendation

- That Council adopts the proposed changes to the rating categories for value-based general rates

Financial impact

- N/A

QUESTION 2 - Spaces for Gathering

OPTION 1: Council preferred Option:

- Allocate budget across three sites (Oruku Landing Conference and Events Centre, Hihiaua Cultural Centre, and existing facilities at Forum North).

OPTION 2:

- Put budget towards only ONE of the following: Oruku Landing Conference and Events Centre, Hihiaua Cultural Centre, and existing facilities at Forum North.

OPTION 3:

- Either Council or the Forum North Trust 2013 could build a new 800-1000 seat theatre on the current Forum North site once the Council offices have moved

Feedback from consultation

Submission analysis:

Submissions received relating to the options for this consultation question indicated 212 were in favour of Option 1, 167 were in favour of Option 2 and 105 were in favour of Option 3. 90 other submissions were received stating that they supported none of the given options.

OPTION 1:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 1 include:

- Economic growth in Whangarei would increase by having both sides of the harbour as vibrant, bustling areas.
- Delivering cultural infrastructure plays a role in creating great places that bring people together, great places to live, work, visit and do business.
- All three projects fit with providing focus and vision for Whangarei

OPTION 2:

There were a variety of comments. The percentages 'for' and 'against' putting budget towards only one of the sites were as follows:

- Oruku Landing: For 17% / Against 9%
- Hihiaua: For 30% / Against Less than 1%
- Forum North upgrade: For 8% / Against 4%
- The remaining submissions (35%) chose Option 2 but did not express a preference.

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 2 include:

- Hihiaua Cultural Centre has the least risk and financial impact on ratepayers and as outlined in the LTP this grant would be spread over years 2 and 3 of the LTP
- Hihiaua should be the priority for Council to support
- Hihiaua Cultural Centre is seen as a fantastic asset to the community and should be used more widely
- Council should support Hihiaua with associated infrastructure
- Opposition for the Oruku Landing development, with some submitters citing this project as a waste of money and one that should be developed by the private sector
- The \$60m government grant for Oruku Landing is an opportunity that ratepayers should not miss out on
- Oruku Landing is a fantastic opportunity for growth, would create jobs and increase the skillset in Whangarei.

OPTION 3:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 3 include:

- Too many arts and cultural centres; funding should be directed towards other more important projects in the District
- Support for Lyric Theatre / New Theatre at Forum North
- WDC to build, own and manage a theatre
- This option will deliver a venue that will attract large events and meet requirements of the performing arts sector

Staff analysis:

Councils purpose includes promoting the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future. Not supporting investment in spaces for gathering would miss the opportunity to develop the cultural and economic resources of the district in line with population growth.

Investment in spaces for gathering will contribute to:

- Social wellbeing by providing places for people to come together
- Economic wellbeing by encouraging locals and visitors to come into town, increasing use of cafes, bars and restaurants; and in the case of Oruku Landing, encouraging the development of a hotel.
- Cultural wellbeing by enabling more performance arts to be delivered locally and developing Whangarei as a recognised site for touring productions.

It would also align with Experience Local – Whangarei Events Strategy 2019 – 2024.

Of those with a preference 41% of submissions on this question supported investment in three projects: Oruku Landing, Hihiaua Cultural centre and upgrades to Forum North (Option 1). The timing of projects in option 1 are spread out to ensure that whilst external funder requirements are met, the increased capacity also keeps pace with demand for these facilities. There were also submissions which supported putting more funding into one of those projects (Option 2). From submitters who supported Option 3 were a number who wanted to see investment in a large performance/ lyric theatre. Of note in these submissions was a desire to better understand the difference in costings between the Trust option and a Council owned facility. Staff are working through requests for information and clarification.

Staff acknowledge that investment in a conference/events centre, cultural centre, Forum North upgrade and performance/lyric theatre would be great for the central city area and provide extra momentum towards economic recovery. If a decision is made to build a new theatre it is recommended that this start no earlier than year 3 of the LTP.

Whilst the cost of Option 1 is assumed within the LTP budget assumptions, any increase in funding to the Hihiaua cultural centre (part of Option 2) or investment in a new performance/lyric theatre would have a direct impact on rates and/or debt.

Of note in submissions relating to Hihiaua was the potential for Council contribution to capital projects relating to the project, and the desire of the trustees to work with Council to better understand the quantum and timing of costings. Options that Council may want to consider if Hihiaua is preferred through the deliberations process are the potential for investment in associated infrastructure and services and how the timing of grant funding (i.e. is a contribution required in year one in order to establish the project and commence professional services).

Options will be discussed with Council in the Deliberations Briefing of 29 April

•

QUESTION 3 - Climate Change & Sustainability: Options for funding

OPTION 1: Council preferred Option:

- Put \$3.7m of new funding towards climate change mitigation and adaptation and waste minimisation

OPTION 2:

- Put \$7.4m of new funding towards climate change mitigation and adaptation and waste minimisation.

OPTION 3:

- No new funding towards climate change or waste minimisation.

Feedback from consultation

Submission analysis:

Submissions received that included a preference for this consultation question showed ,178 were in favour of Option 1, 224 were in favour of Option 2 and 156 were in favour of Option 3. Three other submissions were received supporting none of the given options.

1. OPTION 1:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 1 include:

- Recognition of the importance of climate change in relation to hazards, infrastructure, growth and community wellbeing.
- Option one strikes the right balance between council responsibilities and the role of central government.
- Some sought a greater emphasis on waste minimisation rather than climate change and sustainability

2. OPTION 2:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 2 include:

- Climate change is a significant issue that needs more funding to address properly
- Some submissions sought more than the \$7.4m proposed in Option 2, recognising the scale of the climate change issue
- Additional funding in Option 2 to support more waste minimisation outcomes, such as community composting
- Additional funding to support sustainability actions alongside climate change adaptation.
- Option 2 funding shows a commitment to the Climate Emergency

3. OPTION 3:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 3 include:

- Climate change is an issue that should be addressed by central government rather than local government. Funding should not be committed until we know central government funding
- Climate change is not occurring and is not a key issue and there are more important issues that Council should be focusing on.
- Climate change and waste minimisation should not be combined. Do not fund climate change and instead focus on waste minimisation and management

All options unsupported:

Three other submissions that didn't support any of the options given were received, the main points raised are noted below:

- Budget should be ring fenced and finalised when the intention of the Climate Change Act is more broadly understood and where the responsibility will lie between Central Government and Local Government

- Supportive of funding in this area, but the submitter does not understand how WDC have arrived at the chosen amounts within the options given

Staff Analysis

Council is responsible for a range of functions to both manage and minimise waste and respond to climate change. An approach of not funding a response to climate change and insufficient funding for waste minimisation will:

- Mean we will not be able to meet our current and future statutory obligations
- Put assets and infrastructure at risk which will impact on service delivery
- Put our communities at risk without a clear plan of how to respond to a changing climate
- We will not meet the community's expectations of action on waste minimisation, climate change and sustainability.

If supported by Council, additional resourcing as proposed in Option 2 could be used in the following areas:

- Increasing resourcing to support for delivery of climate change, sustainability and waste minimisation;
- Additional support for the Climate Change Risk Assessment programme including incorporation of Hapū based risk assessments and spatial planning.
- Potential to undertake a larger scale adaptive planning project such as the City Centre or Ruakaka. However, undertaking a large-scale assessment without completing a small-scale pilot (as proposed in option1) may create risk to project and outcome.
- Bring forward the medium-term actions from the draft Climate Action Plan and the Corporate Sustainability Strategy, Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.
- Greater ability to respond to future reforms/legislative changes from central government

It is noted that an increased budget would need to be phased in Years 1 and 2 to ensure there is sufficient capacity and capability to deliver.

It is noted a number of submissions requested we focus on specific projects or programmes, such as:

- Electric Vehicle infrastructure and usage
- Waste minimisation and recycling initiatives
- Sustainable procurement
- Water efficiency and renewable energy opportunities

Staff acknowledge both Option 1 and 2 would enable significant progress towards climate change and waste minimisation outcomes. Option 2 would provide funding to do more for existing Council committed programmes such as the sustainability strategy.

If Option 2 is supported this will have the following impact, as outlined in the Consultation Document:

- An additional \$370,000 per annum (\$700,000 per annum in total) resulting in a potential rates increase of 0.4%

Staff Recommendation

Option 1 as per the Consultation Document.

Financial impact

No impact

QUESTION 4 - Revitalising our city centre: Options for funding

OPTION 1: Council preferred Option:

- Spend \$13m to make improvements to James and John St.

OPTION 2:

- Spend \$21m to make improvements to James and John St as well as either Robert St or Cameron Street.

OPTION 3:

- No additional funding for the city centre.

Feedback from consultation

Submission analysis:

Submissions received that included a preference for this consultation question showed, 195 were in favour of Option 1, 121 were in favour of Option 2 and 151 were in favour of Option 3. Three other submissions were received supporting none of the given options.

1. OPTION 1:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 1 include:

- Improvements into the city centre are needed to support businesses and attract more people to the city
- Create space that have better amenity, accessibility and safety. Support an attractive and inviting central area / main street in Whangarei
- Better link between the CBD and the Town Basin / New Town Basin Park.

2. OPTION 2:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 2 include:

- Extension of the city centre improvements to include more streets such as Robert St.
- Funding to create or enable more inner city living
- More funding to support accessibility and safety in the city centre
- Support a greater scale of improvements (some other New Zealand and overseas example have been provided by submitters)

3. OPTION 3:

The key points raised by submitters supporting Option 3 include:

- Too much money and there are other more urgent projects across the District
- No point improving the city centre if there is nowhere to park. Okara and Kensington is where people visit. Why put money in to streets where no one goes?
- Vehicle access to the city centre should not be reduced. Most people do and will continue to use private vehicles to get around, so we need to accommodate them.
- Instead of spending this money on street improvements, look towards a cover mall type development (the example of Westfield Mall).

Additional issues raised:

Pedestrian overbridge on Dent Street

A number of submissions have either suggested or questioned the feasibility of a pedestrian overbridge

An overbridge has been looked at through the City Core Precinct Plan and the Complete Streets Masterplan.

Staff Recommendation

Through the adopted City Core Precinct Plan and the Complete Streets Masterplan, Council considered two options for the Dent St crossing

- Short term – improve the pedestrian crossing to support both the New Town Basin Park (Underway).
- Medium to Long term – investigate a building to building crossing over Dent Street, which is contingent on redevelopment of both sides of Dent Street.

Staff recommendation

The development of an overbridge was not prioritised through the LTP process and if Council wishes to progress this as a priority project, additional funding would need to be included to investigate options and undertake detailed design. Through the process Council considered options for the development of an overbridge, with a building to building option considered to be the most likely to be able to be delivered within the environmental constraints. Given that this project is contingent on building development on Dent St it is recommended that this be looked at alongside any future developments.

Car Parking Building

A number of submissions have requested a multi-story car parking facility or more off street carparking in the city centre. This is to serve both shoppers as well as commuters. Council have committed through this LTP to undertake a feasibility study for a car parking structure. Following the completion of the feasibility study, options will be presented to Council for consideration in the 2024 – 2034 Long Term Plan.

Staff Recommendation

Complete the feasibility study and use the outcome of this study to inform any future funding decisions in the 2024- 2034 Long Term Plan.

Tertiary education facility in the city centre

Submissions have identified an opportunity to the relocation of all or part of the NorthTec Campus from Raumanga into the City Centre.

Council is supportive of tertiary activities within the city centre. Students and employees of a tertiary institution will add vibrancy and activity to the area. WDC staff have been supporting NorthTec in locating floor space in the city centre including facilitating discussions with landowners and developers. This approach will continue as NorthTec look for future opportunities.

Staff Recommendation

Continue to support NorthTec and other stakeholders in identifying opportunities for the tertiary activity in the city centre.

Staff Recommendation

Option 1 as per the Consultation Document.

Financial impact

Nil

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

This was an open question to the community in order to receive any further comments on the key issues or other points raised within the Consultation Document, as well as any other issues the public would like to raise with Council.

The submissions received have been segmented across key activities that underpin this Long Term Plan

In order to provide Elected Members with the key issues regarding, we have broken down the main, high level queries and / or requests for each activity below.

Staff have reviewed each of the activity areas and have provided a summary of the key issues alongside their recommendations and any financial implications this may have on both opex and capex.

DRAFT

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

A. Transportation

Key issues 1 – Car parking

Submissions have raised the need for:

- More car parking in retail and urban areas.
- A car parking building
- More mobility parking in the city centre
- More car parking in the town and local centres across the District
- Offset carparking lost to other projects

Generally, there is a perception of either insufficient car park numbers and/or that the existing car parking is not in the best location.

Staff Analysis

A car parking building has been raised by submitters in relation to the funding options for the city centre. Staff analysis on this issue is provided in on page 15 of this report.

Council manages the usage of the available parking in the CBD by using a combination of time restrictions and charging to manage the supply of parking and making parking available to all types of users.

Council provides more than 50 mobility car parking spaces in the Council owned parking facilities both on and off road in the CBD. Additional mobility parking is provided in the privately owned facilities as required by the Building Act. Council also provides favourable parking rules under the bylaws for mobility parking in relation to fees and extended parking times.

Staff recommendation

No change to the programme and proceed with a car parking building feasibility study.

Key issue 2 – Cycleways and Shared paths

Submissions have generally supported the funding for cycle infrastructure and shared paths. There have also been a number of requests for new, extended or upgraded cycleways/shared paths, including:

- Walkway/cycleway at Whangarei Heads (Parua Bay to McLeod Bay) (Onerahi to Waikaraka/Tamatarau)
- More cycleways in the city and inner city. Safer cycleways
- Kamo to Hikurangi
- Hikurangi (Connecting the township to Lake Waro)
- Tutakaka coast (Kowharewa to Ngunguru)
- Share path in Maungatapere and a mountain bike park at Pukeatua Rd (along with walking tracks)
- Off road cycleways in Bream Bay (Ruakaka to Marsden) (Waipu to Ruakaka) (Langs Beach to Waipu Cove)
- Broader alignment of cycling opportunities with District growth and tourism
- Support for bike Northland

Staff Analysis

Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program for development of a network of shared paths in Whangarei City and Cycle Trails throughout the district. This includes funding for

- a cycle trail between One Tree Point and Waipu Cove.
- Maunu/Raumanga Trail in Years 4-6, however, does not include extension to Maungatapere.
- City centre and Whangarei Urban areas

Whangarei Heads Cycle Trail and Hikurangi to Whangarei cycleway are both identified in the Whangarei Walking & Cycling Strategy. However, Council currently has no funding allocation within the LTP 10 year program to deliver these cycleways and they will be considered for funding in the 2024 – 34 LTP.

The cycleway built on Te Toiroa Rd in Ngunguru is built on a legal public road which is also used by vehicles. Council considered a request to close the legal road in February 2019 and choose to leave the road as a shared path.

Staff recommendation

Council can consider additional cycleways and shared paths however they would have to fund it 100% as no submissions received will attract NZTA subsidy. Most of the submissions made, including the Cycle Trails, would be considered as part of Roding's prioritisation process.

Funding for community cycleway projects may be available through contestable grant processes

Key issue 3 – Sealing of roads / Maintenance of rural and coastal roads

A number of submissions have been received that raise concerns with the condition of roads in the District, with a specific focus on the poor maintenance (and performance of contractors) of rural and coastal roads.

Submissions have also been received on the sealing of gravel roads. This includes requests for:

- Helmsdate Road, Waipu
- General request for gravel roads which connect between two sealed roads
- Glenmour Road, Waipu
- McLean Road, Waipu
- Millbridge Road, Waipu
- Pyle Road East, One Tree Point
- McAuslin Road, Tutukaka Coast
- Prescott Road, Ruakaka
- Waiotoi Road
- Pukenu Road

Staff Analysis

Council has made provision of \$56.9m for seal extensions on the Districts road network within the LTP 10 year programme. Priority will be based on the seal extension matrix which considers a number of safety and Community benefit measures. The new requests will be added to the list for consideration.

Council has made provision in the LTP to provide the service level for maintenance of the Districts roads as defined in the requirements of the Maintenance Contracts. Council has a system of quality auditing and inspection included in these contracts that measures the performance with financial penalties for non-performance. Comparison amongst the five Northland maintenance contracts also allows benchmarking of performance. Council reports on Contract performance indicators on an annual basis and continues to work with our contractors to improve their performance. Many things impact the condition of the roads at any one time, with some matters outside the contractor's control. It is believed sufficient funding has been allowed in the LTP to provide the level of service required for the network.

Staff Recommendation

Include sealed road request into the seal extension matrix. Projects can be considered under existing programmes, no recommended changes to LTP.

Key issue 4 – Safety and speed

Submissions were received relating to safety for users of our transport network. This included submissions on:

- Speed limits
- Physical road improvements to increase safety and reduce vehicle speed
- Pedestrian safety and crossing points
- Addressing intersections with perceived safety risk (Kamo Rd/Nixon St/Kensington Ave)
- Street lights
- Pull-over bays/passing lanes on Whangarei Heads Road

Staff Analysis

The traffic control system for intersection of Kamo Rd/Nixon St/Kensington Ave was upgraded in 2020, Council installed a FLIR THERMICAN detector device to call a green arrow for vehicles waiting for the filter right turn. The intersection is now being monitored after the change and to date the accident rate has been significantly reduced.

Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program to implement traffic calming measures on suburban roads. Priority is based on crash risk, speed traffic flows. Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program for improvements to pullover bays along Whangarei Heads Road.

Council will be reviewing the speed limit of all roads within the district in a rolling program. Catchment areas are reviewed in priority order based on predicted reduction in death and serious injuries from crashes.

Council made provision in the LTP programme to continue with the LED street light upgrade project throughout the District.

Staff Recommendation

Work is already programmed for the LTP, no change required.

Key issue 5 – Footpaths

A number of submissions sought improvements to the existing footpath network and new footpaths. Some submissions sought additional funding for pedestrian crossing:

- Paranui Valley Road
- Ranui Road
- Kowi Lake subdivision (Wai place and Kamahi Place)
- Walking connection between One Tree Point and Ruakaka Town Centre
- General improvement to footpath condition and safety in the urban area
- Pedestrian crossing / underpass at Parua Bay
- Pedestrianisation of Reyburn House Lane
- Whananaki area
- Cemetery Road
- Cross outside Tikipunga High

Staff Response

Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program for development of new footpaths. Priority is based on safety and usage. Paranui Valley Rd is currently programmed for year 4. New footpath requests will be added to the programme list for consideration. Funding is included to undertake improvements to Whananaki Wharf. Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program to improve pedestrian crossing facilities within the district. Priority is based on crash risk and usage. Tikipunga High School road frontage is included in year 1

Reyburn House Lane needs to be considered against the outcomes Hihiaua Precinct Plan and future development opportunities. High level discussions have taken place, it recommended these progress further before committing funding in the LTP.

Staff are investigating options to improve existing footpaths for safety

Staff Recommendation

Include footpath requests in the programme list for consideration. Projects can be considered under existing programmes, no recommended changes to LTP.

Key issue 7 – Public transport

A number of submissions called for increased investment in public transport as well as more specific requests for services as well as infrastructure investment. This includes bus shelters and improving Rose St bus station.

Some submissions sought investigation and implementation of alternative public transport infrastructure including:

- Commuter rail for Whangarei and Whangarei to Auckland
- Ferries in the harbour
- Park and ride facilities

Staff Response

The provision of Public Transport in Northland is managed by the Northland Regional Council. The WDC provides PT infrastructure on the roads to support the PT services in the District. Council has made provision in the LTP 10 year program for Stage 1 upgrades to the Rose St Bus Hub (Stage 2 not currently funded), provision for new and upgraded bus shelters and street furniture along the bus routes, and for the introduction of bus lanes on major arterials of the city to support an increase in bus frequency on these routes by NRC.

Passenger rail would require significant investment and a larger population base to support. Currently the rail line priority is freight. Passenger rail has been identified as an opportunity in the Whangarei District Growth Strategy and the first step would be including this within the Northland to Auckland Corridor Plan (a high level strategic plan guiding growth and infrastructure between Northland and Auckland).

Staff Recommendation

No recommended change

Key issue 8 – Network improvements

Submissions have requested improvements to the transport network and a prioritisation of specific projects. This includes:

- City centre projects (covered in Question 4)
- General requests to improve the road network
- Port Road Kioreroa Road
- Riverside Drive improvements / Onerahi bypass
- Road improvements in Maungatapere and Maunu
- State highway improvements / Impact on the Raumanga community
- Kamo town centre (including streetscape improvements and pedestrian safety)

Staff Response

Provision for an upgrade of the Reyburn Street Bridge and roundabout is included in Whangarei Transportation Strategy but no provision for funding of this project is included in LTP 10 year program

Currently we have funding allocated for Kamo Town centre improvements which we will implement changes to the car parking areas. Any further improvements in Kamo are not budgetted for.

The main access to Maunu is via SH15 which is a Waka Kotahi/NZTA responsibility, which we can advocate for improvements, but cannot fund or deliver them ourselves.

Council has made provision of \$25.3M within the LTP 10 year program for the construction of the Riverside Dr / Onerahi Rd project commencing in 2024.

State Highway 1 improvements are being managed and delivered through Waka Kotahi/NZTA. Council staff can advocate for appropriate and meaningful engagement with the Raumanga community.

Staff Recommendation

Council projects are already programmed for the LTP, no change required.

Key Issue 9 – Contracting and procurement

A number submissions were received on greater priority to the procurement of local contractors

Staff Analysis

The use of contractors is managed through our procurement policy which sets out the procurement process. Elected Members have highlighted contractor use as a key issue which will be addressed through a dedicated Council Briefing.

Staff Recommendation

No change

Staff Recommendation

Include requests to programme lists for consideration/prioritisation where possible.

Financial impact

none

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think
B. Water / Wastewater / Stormwater
Key issues

A relatively small number of submissions were received in relation to water, wastewater and stormwater activities. Submissions received identified the following matters:

- Minimising impact and protection of natural environments (coastal areas, wetlands and waterways)
- Ensuring our networks can support growth and development
- Compliance with National Policy Statements and Environmental Standards for Freshwater
- Greater encouragement for water efficiency measures including water tanks
- Stormwater treatment

Staff Response

Council has spent over \$60M on storage and treatment facilities to hold and disinfect (UV light) wastewater during heavy rainfall. This significantly reduces wet weather sewage overflows into the Harbour. With that work now completed, a lot of the \$56M allocated for Wastewater in this LTP is focussed on increasing the capacity and reducing the leakiness of the sewer pipes so that less rainwater enters and overwhelms the piped system and wastewater treatment facilities. Just outside of the LTP timeframe Council will be spending many millions of dollars on a WWTP upgrades for Bream Bay

\$5.4M is planned in this LTP period for further stormwater treatment with \$120k to maintain them and \$4.5M for stream improvements specifically the blue/green network strategy and associated quality improvements to work towards meeting imminent NES targets.

The LTP includes funding for the Blue Green Network Programme with works such as stream improvements, flood mitigation, improvement of stormwater outfalls, removal of fish passage barriers, habitat restoration and water quality treatment. Further budgets are included for stormwater renewals and stormwater treatment. The city centre revitalisation work will include green infrastructure to improve water quality entering the Hatea River and Whangarei Harbour.

Water efficiency measures and education on water use is supported by Council, particularly in periods of drought or water restrictions. Additional support for water tanks or other efficiency measures is not currently funded. However, if there is Council support, these measures could be investigated through the Climate Action Plan or Sustainability Strategy work programmes.

The 30 year Infrastructure Structure Strategy and the Growth Strategy align future land use and development with infrastructure investment. This alignment is reviewed every 3 years to support both the LTP process and our requirements under the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.

Staff recommendation

No change

Staff Recommendation

No change
Financial impact
None

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

C. Solid Waste

Key issues / queries / requests:

- Grant funding for Community waste minimisation projects and operation of Community Recycling Centres
- Whangarei Heads Community Resource Recovery Charitable Trust
- Support for waste minimisation
- Green waste disposal and reusing as mulch.
- Transfer stations

Staff Response

Limited funding (up to \$50,000) is currently available for community waste minimisation projects and community clean ups through the Community Grant Fund.

However, within the term of the LTP Council will receive increased levy funding that could be available for waste minimisation projects such as the Whangarei Heads Resource Recovery Trust. It is therefore proposed to increase the contestable fund to \$200k p.a. Alongside this staff would work through increased operating costs for other activities to which the levy funding could be applied (including kerbside recycling or community education and engagement). This approach would enable Council to review, and potentially increase, funding within the contestable fund once operating expenses are known and levy funding comes on stream (i.e. through a future Annual Plan or LTP process). The environmental and economic cost of processing the green waste material into mulch would be more than the product is worth because of the amount of weeds within the greenwaste stream. No funding is currently available, but it could be looked at through the dedicated waste minimisation resource.

Recycling bins in public places are being installed in various locations. They are expensive to install and service and the material collected is so contaminated that it is normally too difficult to recycle.

The issue of transfer stations has previously been addressed by Council. No funding is available to extend operating hours for Transfer Stations. For areas where transfer station hours have been reduced in the past, or closed, the central Re-Sort centre is available for use and is a more efficient approach to the management of waste streams.

Staff Recommendation

It is recommended that the scale of the contestable funding for community waste minimisation projects and community clean ups is increased over to \$200k within the LTP, with a further review to be undertaken (and the potential for further increases to the contestable fund from available levy funding) once operating expenses are known. This could be funded from Waste Minimisation Fund income that comes from the Ministry for the Environment.

The contestable fund would be administered through the same channels as the Community Grant Fund, with money rolling over to the next year if not enough suitable applications were received.

Financial impact

Cost neutral

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think
A. Flood Protection (Hikurangi Flood Protection Scheme)
Key issues – Hikurangi Repo (Swamp)

A number of submissions were received in relation to the Hikurangi Flood Protection Scheme. The submissions received included the following points:

- Concerns were raised regarding the impact of the pumps on tuna (eels).
- Hapū raised the potential for a policy change to the Revenue and Financing Policy to allow for external funding to be considered rather than through user pays / targeted rates
- Funding to support hapu to catch and relocate Tuna to avoid the pumps.
- It was felt the scheme requires Central Government investment so that there is a sustainable plan to mitigate impacts
- An alternative approach raised was to return to a natural repo as part of the broader response to climate change.
- It was noted that urgent action is required.
- Request from scheme holders to reduce rates and remove identified Capex projects.
- Request from scheme holders to establish a Steering Committee working group to better plan improvements to the scheme

Staff analysis:

Landowners within the catchment pay targeted rates to run the Scheme.

While the potential for central government funding has been raised signals from government are that their funding pools will be extremely constrained going forward. A change in the Revenue and Financing Policy is unlikely to result in additional funding streams and is not considered to appropriately reflect where the benefits from the scheme are experienced.

However, it can be argued that protecting the eel population from flood events is a broader objective / outcome which aligns to Council's support for hapu as Kaitiaki. Currently there is no funding to pay hapū for either Tuna capture and relocation or monitoring associated with flood events. This could be addressed through additional funding to Te Karearea.

It is also acknowledged that Council, hapu and scheme holders have made good progress in forming a working group to build understanding and find pathways forward. While all parties have stressed the need for urgency it will take time for a collective position and recommendations to be reached. Increasing funding for kaitiaki initiatives such as this, with oversight of Te Karearea, could alleviate some of the tensions between potentially competing outcomes in the short term. This would enable the working group to considers medium to long term options to bring back to Council.

However, the scheme holders request to remove capex and reduce rates does not take into account inflationary pressures. There is also unpredictability around frequency, intensity and duration of rainfall events as well as potential increased operational costs required to meet more demanding environmental, cultural and ecological protection standards. In addition, ageing infrastructure - pumps, stop banks etc. are likely to require more reactive maintenance work as

failures happen. Lack of funding will inhibit investigations into innovative solutions needed to address many of the schemes operational problems - ecological and agricultural.

Should the scheme continue to operate at reduced or 'flat-lined' rates there is a very real possibility that it will end up in a position of debt again (as has happened previously), meaning current and future landowners will be burdened with unaffordable high rates.

While staff would support suspending planned renewals of pumps and pump stations in the first 24 months of the LTP until a workable solution can be found by the working group money will still need to be spent on research into solutions and emergency replacements as a result of breakdowns. A further reduction in rates is therefore not recommended.

Staff Recommendation

That Council, hapu and scheme holders establish a working group for the Hikurangi Repo

That Council suspend any planned renewals of pumps and pump stations in the first 24 months of the LTP until a workable solution can be found, with any projects being shifted to later years

That Council recognises the role of hapu as kaitiaki and provides an initial \$20k p.a. increase (note, this amount will not cover the estimated costs of hapu) in funding as part of a \$50k p.a. increase to Te Karearea's budget (this funding is discussed in more detail under the Te Karearea section of this report).

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

B. Community Facilities and services – including Housing

- Parks and recreation
- Libraries
- Community property
- Community development
- Venues and events
- Customer services

Key issue 1 – Neighbourhood reserves

Submissions have requested additional land for recreation purposes across the district.

Staff analysis

Council's District Plan does not require reserves to be set aside as part of subdivisions Council has chosen to collect development contributions to fund community infrastructure including purchasing neighbourhood reserves. However, as Council does not currently have a budget to purchase neighbourhood reserves, we do not collect funding for this project and cannot purchase land where there are shortfalls. A strategic approach to resolving this could be to set aside \$1,000,000 for the purchase of neighbourhood reserves. This could be funded by reducing Land Acquisition-Sports Parks from \$15,000,000 to \$14,000,000. This budget will enable the purchase of additional land when it is not being offered as part of a subdivision, or where a shortfall has been identified.

This approach should be considered alongside our Development Contribution policy and the ability to deliver public spaces through new development. This approach would also enhance our ability to leverage outcomes through developer agreements where appropriate.

Staff recommendation

Transfer \$1,000,000 from the Land Acquisition Sports Park budget to fund the purchase of neighbourhood reserves.

Key issue 2 – Park maintenance, upgrades and pest management

A number of submissions received sought improvements to our parks, reserves and public spaces including:

- Pesticide use
- Fruit trees and community vegetable gardens
- Destination playground should have a design theme that reflects Maori culture and native flora and fauna
- Roadside tree planting and maintenance
- Tidy up of the town basin area
- Management of weeds and enhancement of marine biodiversity
- Entranceways

Staff analysis

The use of pesticides is an effective measure to control weeds from a biodiversity (e.g. removal of invasive weed species) and asset management perspective (e.g. keeping stormwater drains

clear). The use of pesticides is carefully managed through health and safety requirements on our contractors.

In appropriate locations community gardens and tree planting can be positive, but they need to be properly maintained in the long term. The funding for these initiatives could come from Community Grant funding where appropriate and where the community takes the lead on implementation

Council has worked with local hapū to develop a cultural narrative for the Town Basin playground. This will be reflected in the second stage water feature.

There are no funds provided in the draft LTP for street tree planting programmes. However, any new developments are required to provide street tree planting, including Marsden City should the planned Plan Change be successful. Council is responsible for gorse on the road side but not on private property. Clearing of gorse and other noxious weeds is undertaken within existing roading budgets.

There are a number of new projects planned for the Town Basin area including bus parking improvements, new amenity lighting, Town Basin park and integration with the Hundertwasser building. These new developments will change the way this area is used. Until these projects are complete Council does not plan to undertake any further up-grades

Council has invested in significant funding in this LTP to implement the Blue Green network strategy which focuses on improving biodiversity along our streams. As well as this Council is a partner with Northland Regional Council in the Whangarei Predator 2050 programme to reduce mammalian predators.

The tidying up of the Whangarei main entrance is linked with the Waka Kotahi (NZTA) Whangarei to Port Marsden Highway programme and four laneing of our City entrance. Council is working in partnership to ensure a high level of amenity and connectivity is achieved between the Otaika shops and sports fields.

Staff recommendation

No changes

Key issue 3 – Support for active recreation and sports

Submissions have sought increased support for active recreation and sports activities and facilities including:

- Aquatic Centre hydrotherapy
- Sports grounds including Onerahi Football Club, Takihiwai, and Oakura
- McKay Stadium (upgrades and expansion)
- Outdoor Basketball and netball courts
- Ruakaka and One tree point area
- Pohe Island Masterplan
- Parua Bay sports hub (Squash Club, Bowling Club, Community Centre) and playing fields
- Hockey facilities and support for Hockey Northland
- Football facilities including a Northland Football Hub and field upgrades at Onerahi
- Increase in the Community partnership Fund
- Consistent approach to the renewals of key facilities such as Northland Hockey and the All weather (athletics) track

Staff analysis

Council provides a grant to Sport Northland to operate and management the Aquatic Centre, including the hydrotherapy pool. Council has also set aside funds in the draft LTP to prepare a district aquatic facility plan to consider the overall network including greater opportunity for increased warmer water facilities, learn to swim, competitive swimming, and access to Ministry of Education facilities.

The Active Recreation and Sport strategy has prioritised the development of a detailed indoor and outdoor courts and this is funded in the draft LTP. The intent of the plan is to consolidate/rationalise supply of courts, future casual 24/7 public court provision and improvements where needed and supported by evidence of community need.

Pohe Island junior skatepark is designed and is estimated to cost \$600k but not funded in the LTP, the Pohe Island destination playground is funded in the LTP, the water front pontoons are part of the marine hub planned for Yr2 - Yr6 of the LTP.

As recommended in the Active Recreation and Sport strategy Council has provided funds to establish a District Facility Navigator role to support the development of hub initiatives identified in the strategy such as Parua Bay. The role will help drive the development of projects and encourage the adoption of best practice and networking between users, codes, clubs. The role will involve stakeholder engagement, project management of needs assessments, feasibility studies, and business case development. Funding for new playing fields in Parua Bay, next to Parua Bay School is funded in the plan.

Council has made significant investment at One Tree Point/ Ruakaka area with new training lights, additional sports fields and improved car parking/footpaths at the Ruakaka Recreation grounds as well as possible funding of the car park component of the new Ruakaka Recreation Centre Wahitakaro & Northland Regional Volleyball Arena project. In partnership with The Landing developers we plan to develop another neighbourhood park and playground.

As recommended in the Active Recreation and Sport strategy Council has provided funds to undertake a detailed indoor and outdoor courts plan covering tennis, netball, hockey, basketball, roller derby and futsal provided by Council, clubs, schools and other providers to consolidate/rationalise supply of courts and to maximise their use in the future. This will be undertaken prior to Council committing to a 4th turf. Funding is provided for Northland Hockey in Yr 3 for turf and shock pad replacement and Y5 for turf replacement. In terms of the request for a loan, Council's Community Loans policy provides for community organisations to make an application for consideration outside of the LTP process.

Council's approach to renewals at key facilities such as the Northland Hockey and the All-weather (athletics) track is inconsistent. These facilities are cost effective long term. The maintenance cost of a sports field is \$13,500 per annum resulting in a cost of \$1,350,000 over 10 years. The cost to replace hockey carpet and underlay is \$350,000 every 10 years and athletic track \$600,000 every 10 years. Council has allocated \$300,000 in Yr1 towards this replacement.

It is recommended that Onerahi Domain field drainage is bought forward and renamed Onerahi Airport field development to increase the capacity of the Onerahi Airport sports fields by transitioning to a sand field and installing training lighting. The use of the Onerahi Domain fields is very low as clubs have not been active. The membership of the Onerahi Football Club has been growing for several years. This has put pressure on the existing soil-based fields. To increase the capacity of the fields they need to transition to a sand-base and install lighting. The additional funding is from reducing the budget in Yr7 for Morningside Sportspark development. This request is also supported by Northland Football Federation the regional sports organisation.

Northland Football Club asked that the funding for a new car park at Tikipunga Sports Park being part of the Northland Football Hub be brought forward from Yr7-9 into Yr1-3 of the plan. If the recommended timing changes for the capital programme are approved there will not be the capacity for delivery of this project. Additionally, staff do not consider there is demand in the first 3 years and would like to delay this project until Yr4 onwards so other projects such as footpaths, pedestrian refuge and a proposed roundabout are also aligned with it.

It is recommended that Oakura Sports Park Field development is brought forward from Yr 8/9 to Yr 4-6 and Oakura Hard Court is brought forward from Yr7/8 to Yr3/4. This reflects the timing of the projects in the last LTP. It is also recommended that ducting for lighting is installed as part of these projects, however lights are not currently funded within available budget.

It is recommended that Takahiwai field drainage is brought forward by one year to Yr3/4 and the description changed to Takahiwai Sports Park development. This is based on the high level of use requiring the need to increase the capacity of the fields along with lighting (lighting is included in the total project cost).

It is recommended that Otangarei central reserve lights is increased by \$225,000 to \$300,000 to reflect current actual costs of training lights.

It is recommended the Raumanga playground budget Yr3 is increased by \$50,000 to provide parking and connectivity such as safe road crossings. This also aligns with the delivery of a Public Toilet to this site.

Northland Athletics and Gymnastics Stadium Trust (NAGST) manage the Gymnastics Stadium and All-weather track. They have requested support for long term maintenance and have supplied a 10 Asset management Plan. The facilities are close to 10 years old and major maintenance is being planned. They have estimated they need on average a \$25,000 annual operational grant. There are peaks and troughs in the maintenance programme and as an example \$65,000 is required for roof painting in Yr2. If there was no All-weather track Council would need to provide a grass track at Kensington Park including.

Council has an on-going programme of sports field improvements with work already completed at William Fraser Memorial Park, Koropupu Sports Park, Otaika Sports Park and lighting at Hora Hora and Otangarei. Further work planned is Parua Bay, Ruakaka, Onerahi, Takahiwai, Portland and Oakura.

Staff Recommendation

- It is recommended that \$30,000 design in Yr8 and \$300,000 in Yr9 for Onerahi Domain field drainage is brought forward to Yr2 and Yr3 and further that the Morningside Sports Park project is reduced by bringing forward \$240,000 to Yr3. These budgets are combined to increase the capacity of the Onerahi Airport sports fields by transitioning to a sand field and installing training lighting. This request is also supported by Northland Football Federation the regional sports organisation.
- It is recommended that Oakura Sports Park Field development is brought forward from Yr 8/9 to Yr 4-6 and Oakura Hard Court is brought forward from Yr7/8 to Yr3/4. It is also recommended that ducting for lighting is installed as part of these projects (lights are not included in this budget)
- It is recommended that Takahiwai field drainage is brought by one year to Yr3/4 and the description changed to Takahiwai Sports park development (this project includes lights)
- It is recommended that Otangarei central reserve lights is increased by \$225,000 to \$300,000 to reflect current actual costs of training lights.

- It is recommended the Raumanga playground budget Yr3 is increased by \$50,000 to provide parking and connectivity such as safe road crossings.
- It is recommended that a \$25,000 annual operational grant is provided to Northland Athletics and Gymnastics Stadium Trust (NAGST) to fund the annual maintenance of the All-weather Track and the long-term maintenance of the building.

Key Issue 4 – Public Toilets and rubbish bins

A number of submission have requested new public toilet facilities in locations across the District including Ngunguru, Ruakaka, Raumanga and more generally at existing playgrounds.

A number of submission have sought new rubbish bins to be installed, including at beaches and tourist destinations.

Staff Analysis

The removal of Rubbish Bins from the beaches has been well received by many in the community and is believed to have led to an overall reduction in litter at the beaches. Therefore at this stage there are no plans to fund new rubbish bins in coastal locations

The LTP includes funding for public toilets. Ruakaka is programmed for Year 1 (dependant on Tourism Infrastructure Funding. Ngunguru and Raumanga are programmed for Year 2

Staff Recommendation

No change

Key issue 5 - Seawalls, Coastal infrastructure and wetlands

Submissions were received both requesting coastal structures including sea walls and boat ramps as well as opposition to coastal works. Sites include:

- One Tree Point boat ramp condition and safety
- Opposition to Sandy Bay sea wall
- Funding request for a resource consent to support community wetland project in Oakura
- Marine hub on Pohe Island

Staff Analysis

Funding has been set aside to improve boat launching and retrieval at the One Tree Point boat ramp in Yr 4 with consent and design funded in Yrs 1-3.

At Sandy Bay the project has previously been placed on hold. Any works in the coastal marine area will require community consultation as well as consent from the Regional Council and Department of Conservation. Funding for works at Sandy Bay is currently programmed for Yr 4-6. Alternatively, Council can cancel this project and consider relocation of the public toilets across the road to Council owned land in the event of further erosion

Council has previously supported the Oakura wetland project with a funding commitment of \$20,000 in 2019/20. In order for the project to proceed a resource consent is required. This will enable them to carry out the necessary works. It is therefore proposed that an additional \$30,000 funding is provided in addition to the \$20,000 already committed to support this project. The funding should be made available in Year 1.

Consultation and design of the Pohe Island Marine Hub project is planned for Yr2 and Yr3 and the build is planned for Yr4-6 of the LTP.

Staff Recommendation

Additional \$30,000 provided in Year 1 of the LTP to support the Oakura Wetland Project (in addition to the \$20,000 already provided).

Key Issue 6 – Land acquisitions

Submissions have requested support for the acquisition to two key sites:

- Kauri Mountain Farm
- Ngunguru Sandspit

Staff Analysis

Council developed an Open Space review as a high-level document to analyse existing current open space land resources for the District Plan Open Space Plan change. This review concluded that there was no requirement for further natural open space as a result of population growth as the current high level of provision is expected to cater for the needs of the projected population growth. The report also stated this did not preclude the need for future acquisition if specific sites were identified that warrant acquisition for the protection of ecological or landscape values such as Kauri Mountain.

The District Plan contains existing Resource Area overlays on the property, that provide protection of areas identified as Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features, and High and Outstanding Natural Character Areas.

In addition to the existing plan protection, a plan change to identify areas of significant natural areas, and high value biodiversity is planned for later in 2021. Preliminary mapping shows some of the Kauri Mountain farm and Ngunguru Sandspit protected by Significant Natural Area overlays, meaning there will be a level of protection through regulatory mechanisms

No funding has been provided in the LTP to purchase natural open space. In addition if the land were purchased it would incur operating costs which may fall to WDC.

Staff Recommendation

No change and proceed with the plan change process.

Key Issue 7 – Libraries

A number of submissions have been received that have requested:

- Expansion of the Ruakaka Library
- Increased funding for the Library services (across the District and the Central Library)

Staff Analysis

It is pleasing to see support for our library services come through submissions. Overall staff recommend that funding levels as proposed in the LTP are sufficient and no increase in funding is needed.

For the Ruakaka Library, the original design of the library/ service centre, allows for expansion of the library by extending out the back of the building. The information provided in the submission is seeking \$1.08m for the Ruakaka Hub project which will incorporate an extension to the Library. Currently there is no budget to enable the extension of the Library. Staff acknowledge that the Library is well-used and an important community facility and an expansion would service the growing population in Ruakaka. To progress this project is recommended that further discussion are needed around the role the service centre and the community Library as well as what the additional floor space would be used for, before committing funding. However, we envision the facility will expand as the need arises and we expect to see this project in the next LTP.

Staff Recommendation

No change

Key Issue 8 – Community development and Civil Defence

A number of submissions were raised in relation to community development activities, this includes:

- Safety and the City Safe service
- Accessibility issues for our venues and public spaces
- Community development support in Mangakahia/Maungatapere
- Support request from NRC for the Tsunami Siren Upgrade project and local response plans as detailed in the NRC LTP Consultation Document
- Support request from NRC for the Tsunami Siren Upgrade project

Staff Analysis

Concerns here are noted and the group referred to the Disability Advisory Group for further advocacy around these matters. This will help improve consideration of accessibility earlier in planning and on infrastructure projects to achieve better outcomes for the disabled members of our community.

The Community Led Programme (CLP) is already underway in Maungatapere with Maungakaramaea is next in line for the community led type of project that WDC advisors support through funding and through staff support. Discussions with NZTA regarding cycle ways are part of this.

The proposed LTP includes Civil Defence funding to support the Tsunami Siren Upgrade and response planning. No change in budget is required.

Staff Recommendation

No change

Key Issue 9 – Whangarei Arts Museum Trust

Submission received have requested funding support for the following:

- **\$200,000** (Quote based) one off grant to fix the air conditioning
- **\$100,000** p.a. increase to the annual grant from 2021/22 FY.

Staff Analysis

Staff note that the air conditioning issue is required to safeguard the future of the Council's \$8.2m art collection through the management of consistent temperature and humidity. Staff acknowledge the constraints of opex expenditure, but consider that the air conditioning infrastructure could be classified as capex which we would own and maintain. Staff also note ongoing discussions with WAMT relating to the air conditioning, with options for Council to replace like for like and request additional spend to be funded by WAMT, or to cover total capex for the upgrade. (The lease requires Council to fund the 'like for like' costs of replacement with the lessee picking up any additional costs.

Staff note the increase in the annual operating grant would, based on the submission, fund the following:

- to improve our visibility
- upgrade and maintain basic facilities

- deliver an education programme.

A more visible gallery will increase engagement by locals and visitors, as well as positive word-of-mouth for the region's attractions. A \$100,000 per annum increase to the annual grant would lift the total received to \$500,000. WAMT also receive a rent concession of \$171,000. If funding is increase Council will need to consider consistency with other organisations it funds.

Options include

- funding the 'like for like'
- funding the total cost of air conditioning as a Council asset
- \$100,000 increase to the annual grant
- No increased funding

Key Issue 10 – Hundertwasser entry costs

Submission received seeks Council funding to support one of two options for the entry costs to the Hundertwasser Arts Centre (HAC):

- a. Either discount the ticket price by 50% for Whangārei residents - estimated at \$200K pa
- b. Or cover the full entry for Whangārei residents - estimated at \$400K.pa

Staff Analysis

The rational for this requested is outlined in the submission from HAPT and relates to ongoing reporting and dialog between WAMT and Council.

In summary the funding is being sought to reduce entry costs for residents of Whangarei to enable more of the community to visit HAC without needing to pay full cost of entry at a time of uncertainty for the international tourism sector has it recovers from the COVID-19 disruption. It is understood from the submission that funding support is requested for the first three years of operation – at which point the submitter anticipates the tourism market will recover to the extent that support will not longer be need. However staff note the uncertainty in this space.

Options include:

- increased funding of \$200,000 for 50% discount price for Whangarei residents
- increased funding of \$400,000 for free entry for Whangarei residents
- No increased funding

Key Issue 11 – Community Fund and Partnership Fund

A number of submissions have been received that broadly relate to community funding approaches (note, many of these submissions are specifically addressed under staff recommendations elsewhere in this report).

While submissions were not specifically linked to the Partnership Fund or Community Fund these funds offer a potential pathway for requests to be considered. Broad examples of submissions that can be linked to each fund that are not specifically considered elsewhere in this report include:

Community Fund

- Community gardens / beautification projects
- Weed action
- Sports and arts initiatives
- Events

Partnership Fund

- Walking and cycling tracks
- Rowing club expansion (providing for other community groups)

Staff Analysis

Community funding is under pressure and is a challenging space. In developing the draft LTP Council prioritised a \$50k p.a. increase to both the Community Facilities Fund and Community Fund (resulting in a \$100k pa increase in grant funding in this LTP). However, a further \$400k increase in the Community Fund was not prioritised within the constraints faced.

While both the Partnership Fund and the Community Fund provide potential funding pathways both funds are currently oversubscribed. Of the two the Community Fund is considered to have a broader reach, being a flagship fund that supports a broad range of groups and initiatives. If Council were to consider an increase in Grant funding the Community Fund would therefore be a priority.

However, as any increase to grant funding would be opex, and given constraints already faced, no change has been recommended.

Staff Recommendation

No additional funding

Key Issue 12 – Universal design and access

A number of submission seek a greater prioritisation of accessibility and universal design principles in new development, including our own public space improvements

Staff Analysis

Accessibility is a key issue for our public space projects. Accessibility design standards for public spaces and publicly accessible buildings is managed through the Building Act.

Council has also recently developed Urban Design Guidelines to support our District Plan and RMA functions. Although they are only guidance document, they offer solutions to developers on how to achieve the maximum accessibility for people of all ages and abilities.

Staff Recommendation

No change

Staff Recommendation **Neighbourhood Reserves**

It is recommended that Council sets aside \$1,000,000 for the purchase of neighbourhood reserves. This could be funded by reducing Land Acquisition-Sports Parks from \$15,000,000 to \$14,000,000. This budget will enable the purchase of additional land when it is not being offered as part of a subdivision or where a shortfall has been identified.

Onerahi Football Club

It is recommended that \$30,000 design in Yr 8 and \$300,000 in Yr9 for Onerahi Domain field drainage and \$240,000 in Yr7 from Morningside Sports Park development is bought forward to

Yr2 and Yr3 to improve the capacity of the Onerahi Airport sports fields due to their high use and growing Club membership.

Oakura Sports Park

It is recommended that Oakura Sports Park Field development is bought forward from Yr 8/9 to Yr 4-6 and Oakura Hard Court is bought forward from Yr 7/8 to Yr3/4 (note, budget includes ducting but not lights).

Oakura Wetland

Additional \$30,000 provided in Year 1 of the LTP to support the Oakura Wetland Project (in addition to the \$20,000 already provided).

Takahiwai Sports Park

It is recommended that Takahiwai field drainage is brought by one year to Yr3/4 and the description changed to Takahiwai Sports park development (note, budget includes lights)

Otangarei Central Reserve lighting

That Otangarei central reserve lights project Yr3 is increased by \$225,000 to \$300,000 to reflect current actual costs of training lights.

Raumanga playground

That the Raumanga playground project Yr3 is increased by \$50,000 to provide parking and connectivity such as safe road crossings.

Northland Athletics and Gymnastics Stadium Trust

That a \$25,000 annual operational grant is provided to Northland Athletics and Gymnastics Stadium Trust (NAGST) to fund the annual maintenance of the All-weather Track and the long-term maintenance of the building.

Options for WAMT and Hundertwasser will be worked through with elected members in the briefing of 29 April.

Financial impact

\$25,000 on-going operational grant to NAGST

Additional \$50,000 capex in Yr3 for Raumanga playground development

\$50,000 Oakura wetland operational grant

The changes in timing of projects results in Yr3 Parks capital programme increasing to around \$6,300,000 which is consistent with what has historically delivered by the department.

DRAFT

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

C. Governance and strategy

- Democracy and assurance
- Strategy

Key issues 1

A concern was raised over transparency of the decision-making process.

Staff response

The submitter was worked through the submission analysis with examples provided of how their submissions had been considered in previous Annual plan processes.

Key issues 2 – Housing / Pensioner Housing

A number of submissions have sought a wider role for Whangarei District Council in addressing the housing issue within Whangarei. In summary this includes:

- Development of a housing strategy in partnership with the housing sector and central government
- Undertaking a housing needs assessment
- More proactive and visible advocacy and partnership with central government and Kāinga Ora specifically
- Potential to develop and manage our own 'affordable' housing portfolio
- Policy/regulation on housing – such as secondary dwellings and conversion of property to residential.

Submissions have also been received in relation to the pensioner housing portfolio, specifically:

- Support for the additional \$2m funding for new pensioner housing stock
- Request for funding over an above what is proposed in the LTP for an increase number pensioner units

Staff Response

The availability, affordability, suitability and quality of housing are key issues for our District. Views expressed through the Long Term Plan submissions are similar to what we have heard through engagement on the Draft Whangarei District Growth Strategy, Placemaking Plans, District Plan (Urban and Services Plan Change) and the Climate Action Plan.

Our approach to housing is currently to:

- Meet our statutory obligations under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development which includes enabling enough land for housing development to meet projected demand over 30 years.
- Identify opportunities for new housing developments in our Growth Strategy, Placemaking Plans and District Plan.
- Ensure areas for housing are aligned with infrastructure provision so that they are ready to be developed
- Working to meet our statutory requirements and process under the Building Act and the Resource Management Act for housing consents
- Working to support central government in the identification of land for housing with the outcome of getting houses built

- Working in partnership with central government on long term strategic plans such as the Northland to Auckland Corridor Plan which will identify opportunities for central government to enable housing delivery.
- Continue to manage Council's pensioner housing portfolio, and fund \$2m for expansion of pensioner housing (in partnership with other funders) in the first four years of the draft LTP

In considering its role Council noted that the delivery of public housing was a central government function, with Council's key funding role being in the management, and modest expansion, of its pensioner housing portfolio. This approach aligns with the statutory requirements of Council, and the position that Council took in considering Housing as one of its strategic priorities.

However Council could choose to play a greater role in a central government driven programme, with options including:

- Completing a housing needs assessment and strategy. This would require additional operational resourcing (estimated at \$250,000 over 3 years), or reprioritizing existing strategy and stopping work on some initiatives over the medium term. It is noted that a regional assessment is already underway and this could create duplication.
- A greater investment in pensioner housing within this plan and/or with Council budgeting the full cost of a Council delivered Pensioner Housing project, noting that the budget could still be utilized to leverage off a greater level of partner funding. However, as this is capex Council would need to own the resulting assets.

Staff recommendation

Continue existing housing related workstream. Where appropriate, continue to work alongside agencies such as Kāinga Ora to deliver new public housing in the District.

Acknowledging political direction is required, the proposed management of the pensioner housing portfolio, plus the additional \$2m is recommended for this LTP.

Key issues 3 – Enhancing local democracy

A number of submissions have requested changes to the way we communicate, engage and promote our policies and strategies

Staff response

Emails to our mail box generate an automatic response and will be entered into our Customer Response Management (CRM) process. Generally, rate invoices contain information on important consultations, such as LTP. Council engages with a Youth Advisory Group, Positive Aging Advisory Group and Disability Advisory Group to support decision making and provide a forum to discuss key policies.

Whangarei District Council regulations and policy requirements are all contained on our website and are publicly accessible. Staff will look at how these can be better promoted to our community through our communication channels.

Staff recommendation

Within existing resources, investigate ways to better promote our policies and processes.

Key Issue 4 – Local area development and placemaking

A number submissions have requested public space improvements or design-led planning process to identify opportunities for improvements and projects. This includes locations such as:

- Waipu
- Ruakaka

- Hikurangi
- Kamo
- Onerahi

Staff Response

Council have committed to a programme of Placemaking Plans across the District. The pilot plans in Hikurangi and Tikipunga will be completed this year. The next locations will follow as per the list below:

- Parua Bay 2021-22
- Waipu 2021-22
- Kensington 2022-23
- Marsden/Ruakaka 2022-23
- Maunu 2023-24
- Onerahi 2023-24
- Kamo 2024-25
- Raumanga/Otaika 2024-25

These plans will identify key strategic programmes and projects to be delivered over 30 years. A key focus is future growth and alignment with infrastructure. Streetscape and public space improvements will be looked at in alignment with Parks and Transport programmes. It is also noted that other programmes such as Community Led Projects and Community Grants can also be utilised to deliver public space improvements (e.g. Southern Entrance to Hikurangi, Public Art in Kamo).

Council recognises the need for a balanced approach to funding that meets the needs of all ratepayers. This is achieved through the development of programmes that service and connect communities across the District. Within this plan Council has proposed a significant increase in the funding for Transportation,

Staff recommendation

No change, proceed with existing Placemaking Programme.

Key Issue 5 – GMO / GE

A number of submissions have sought a continued precautionary approach by Council on the matter of Genetically Modified Organism and include a statement, similar to the 2018 – 2028 LTP. Submissions have also requested resources to support participation in the GE Free Forum.

Staff Response

Council has maintained and advocated for a precautionary approach through recent RMA plan making processes. As this is still Council policy approach, it is appropriate to include a statement in the 2021 – 2031 LTP.

There are currently no current RMA or plan making processes underway that relate to GMO / GE Free.

Therefore it is not considered that additional funding is required at this particular time. However, if the issue is raised through future plan making process then this position can be revisited.

The use of GMO's much comply with the GMO Chapter of our District Plan.

Staff recommendation

Include an appropriate statement on GMO / GE Free into the 2021-31 LTP:

The topic of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) came up throughout the consultation period and as a result, Council wishes to confirm its ongoing commitment to policy work in this area. Council has adopted a precautionary approach to the management of biotechnology, in general and to GMO land uses in particular. It will continue to investigate ways of keeping our District free of GMOs until outstanding issues such as liability, economic costs and benefits, environmental risks and cultural effects are resolved.

Through the Inter-Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation and Management Options, Council has committed to GMO provisions within the Whangarei District Plan which maintains precautionary approach.

Key issue 6 – Airport location

A small number of submissions questioned either the need to the location of a proposed new airport.

Staff Response

Our current airport has the shortest runway used by Air New Zealand. Although the airport is able to continue operating under Civil Aviation Certification, the airport would not meet Civil Aviation requirements regarding Runway End Safety Areas and obstacle limitation surfaces should CAA certification be applied for today. If circumstances change, and/or commercial aircraft that operate there now are phased out over the next 10-15 years, its short runway may see an end to operations there. We believe an airport that meets the long-term needs for Whangarei and Northland is important to our identity, our social well-being, our growth, and our economic prosperity. To future-proof air travel from Whangarei District, we have been exploring new airport locations

Staff recommendation

No change

Key issue 7 – Strategic partnerships and growth

A number of submissions received relate to how Council can partner with other agencies and stakeholder to deliver positive outcomes for our community. Submission have also raised concerns with other agencies projects that might impact a community and that Council should be advocating to get a better outcome. Examples include:

- State Highway improvements
- Rail improvements and the spur line to Marsden
- Housing
- Environmental outcomes
- Major projects such as the Dry Dock, Port Expansion, Hospital rebuild
- NIWA facility in Ruakaka
- District wide fibre rollout

A number submissions have also raised a number of points relating to growth

- Infrastructure needed to support growth
- Impact of COVID-19 on sectors such as tourism
- Continued growth is not a good thing and we need to be more sustainable
- How to manage growth and maintain good levels of service

Staff Response

Through partnership opportunities such as the Northland to Auckland Corridor Plan or Te Tai Tokerau Community Housing and Wellbeing Group, Council has the opportunity to advocate for

local communities and leverage positive outcomes for the District. It recommended that this approach continues and as other opportunities arise Council participates if there is a clear benefit for the District.

It is noted that through these partnerships Council will continue to advocate for:

- Governance oversight and decision making
- Appropriate and meaningful partnership with hapū and iwi

Whangarei District does not have the same exposure to the impacts of a decrease in international tourism as other parts of the country, with Council not being reliant on tourism revenue. While the potential for a decrease in both tourism and growth were considered in compiling the draft plan the effects of COVID-19 have not been as initially projected. In addition key projects proposed, such as the city centre projects, achieve multiple outcomes and benefits for the District.

Staff recommendation

No change

Staff Recommendation

No change

Financial impact

None

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

D. Planning and regulatory services

- District Planning
- Resource consents
- Building control
- Health and bylaws

Key issues – Resource consents and District Plan Rules

Submissions received related to our District Plan and Resource Management Process include:

- Include rules to require public land (parks and playgrounds) to be provided in new subdivisions
- Change the rural zoning (in particular the 20ha minimum) to enable more viable subdivision to occur
- Natural Hazards
- Request for funding support for land mapping project by Northland Regional Council
- Air pollution
- Freshwater, including the need to protect the Kaipara headwaters
- Mining

Staff Analysis

It is noted that a District Plan or RMA document cannot be changed through a Local Government Act process such as the LTP.

There are no mandatory rules in the District Plan which require open space to be provided. However, open space is often provided through esplanade reserves or walking tracks within larger greenfield subdivision and is typically considered when assessing the appropriateness of larger greenfield subdivisions.

The Rural Zoning was reviewed and changed in 2019. Council is required to review the zoning every 10 years. A private plan change may apply to amend the zoning or the rules prior to that timeframe. If Council wish to review that zoning, additional budget would need to be provided and there would also be a delay in current rolling review of the District Plan.

Council is in the process of reviewing the natural hazard maps and rules of the District Plan. The Natural Hazard Plan Changes seek to address issues of projected sea level rise and development in coastal hazard areas.

Staff acknowledge the mapping project (s-map) being undertaken by NRC. We also acknowledge it relates to a regional council function. Currently we do not have budget to support the project at this stage.

While freshwater management and air quality are predominantly Regional Council functions WDC have contributed to and supported discussions around the remediation of the Kaipara headwaters.

Council staff have previously sent the submitter a detailed response on the Puhipuhi mine. While modern mines/hazardous activities will often have consent conditions requiring the operator to undertake decontamination and rehabilitation following completion of the activity unfortunately we understand that this is not for historic mines. However, there are provisions in place that require decontamination and rehabilitation of the site before any new activities can take place. The mine remains a HAIL site and is subject to District Plan provisions.

Staff Recommendation

No change

DRAFT

Staff Recommendation

No change

Financial impact

None

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think
E. Support Services
Northland Emergency Services Trust (NEST)

Submissions were received on the NEST location and the increase in activities and noise for residents in the area surrounding Kensington Park.

Staff Analysis

Council is aware of the increase in noise complaints about the helicopter operation and that NEST is looking to move its operation and intends to exit the site on or before the expiry of its lease on July 31, 2023.

Staff Recommendation

Council will continue to work with the trust on their plans to relocate.

Financial impact

N/A

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think
F. CCO Governance
Northland Events Centre

Submissions were received on the proposal to establish a new trust for the Northland Events Centre. These included comments on the events centre being underutilised, support for the new trust, a desire for further information and a desire for mana whenua representation.

Staff Analysis

The Consultation Document outlined the expectations of the facility and the options considered. It is anticipated that the new trust will seek to maximise utilisation for both community and commercial events in line with those expectations. Mana whenua representation will be considered through the trustee recruitment process.

Staff Recommendation

That Council proceed with the establishment of a new trust.

Financial impact

N/A – costings are already provided for in the draft plan

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think**J. Bulk submissions**

In addition to the Activity based submissions Council received 'bulk submissions' on the following topics:

- Development of a cat bylaw:
 - 1019 submissions received in support
- Beach Road, Onerahi:
 - 162 submissions received
- Ruakaka Recreation Centre:
 - 970 submissions received in support

Bulk submissions are when the same submission has been submitted by multiple people or groups.

Cat Management
<p>Key issue:</p> <p>1019 submissions were received. These submissions highlighted the impact of lost and abandoned cats. A summary of those impacts are outlined in the submission.</p> <p>The submission includes two requests/recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introducing a new bylaw mandating that all companion cats are de-sexed, microchipped and registered by 6 months of age. 2. Provide and financially contribute to subsidized de-sexing, microchipping and registering programmes throughout the year for people on low incomes. <p>Staff Analysis:</p> <p>New bylaw to manage cats</p> <p>To manage cats through a bylaw would require council to undertake a formal bylaw making process and cannot be determined through an LTP. Council are about to undertake a review of our Animals Bylaw, proposed to commence this year. The bylaw review process would allow Council to consider whether the management of cats is an appropriate matter for the bylaw as well as the costs of a regulatory approach.</p> <p>Council will be receiving a briefing on the Animals Bylaw review on the 26 May. The purpose of the briefing is to seek feedback on the proposed scope for the review of the Animals Bylaw. Included in the report for the briefing will be a discussion of the options for the management of cats including the approach proposed by submitter and associated costs.</p> <p>Therefore it is recommended that any decision on the regulation for de-sexing, microchipping and registering through a bylaw is addressed through the review of the Animals Bylaw in 2021.</p> <p>Financially contribute to subsidizing de-sexing, microchipping and registering programmes</p> <p>Council could choose to provide regular funding to the SPCA or similar agencies that support de-sexing and microchipping. This would need to be additional operation expenditure not currently budgeted for. No budget was proposed by the submitter, but in the hearing this was clarified at \$50,000 per annum.</p> <p>Any such funding should be aligned to support the outcome of any future regulatory approach through the Animals Bylaw.</p> <p>Therefore, staff recommend any decision on funding support be made following the review of the Animals Bylaw once all regulatory options have been worked through and the costs of implementation are known.</p> <p>However, funding support has previously been provided through the community grants process. Grant funding was awarded in 2020. Currently no funding has been sought in 2021 but this may be a short term funding avenue.</p>
<p>Staff Recommendation</p> <p>That the decision on funding follow the outcome of the review of the Animals Bylaw</p>
<p>Financial impact</p> <p>None.</p>

Beach Road, Onerahi
Key issues / queries / requests:

Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program to implement traffic calming measures on suburban roads, shared paths and new pedestrian facilities. Priority is based on crash risk, speed and traffic flows.

Staff Response

Council has made provision within the LTP 10 year program to implement traffic calming measures on suburban roads, as well as new shared paths and new pedestrian facilities. Priority is based on crash risk, speed and traffic flows.

The footpath section on Beach Road is identified as a priority and is in our top 20 sites. It is anticipated that this project will be initiated within this LTP period if current programmes are accepted by NZTA. An assessment of options such as changing the layout of the roading network and additions of calming measures would be undertaken at this stage.

Staff Recommendation

- No change required

Financial impact

- None

Ruakaka Recreation Centre
970 submissions were received in support of the Ruakaka Recreation Centre bulk submission for a proposed new multi-purpose facility at Peter Snell Drive, Ruakaka.

The main submission from the Ruakaka Recreation Centre, submission ID #1747 attached the following:

- Feasibility Study
- Project Plan summary
- Architectural proposals
- Submissions in support of the application

The main reasons for this request has been summarized below:

WDC and Ruakaka Recreation Centre have worked for many years to implement improvements to the Ruakaka Recreation Ground, including new fields, skatepark and a new indoor facility, however a carpark is missing to accommodate those improvements.

A Partnership between the Ruakaka Recreation Centre and the Northland Volleyball Association will see a regional and national level volleyball and beach volleyball on the site. Hosting tournaments and bringing visitation to the area will increase the economic benefit to the Ruakaka area.

There are also several key stakeholders that support this project in principle and some from a financial perspective, these are:

- MBIE
- Northland Volleyball Association
- Patuhareke te Iwi
- Sport Northland
- Northland Sports Coalition
- Ruakaka Residents and Ratepayers Association

Staff Recommendation

- It is recommended that \$1,000,000 (the original estimate was \$735k) is budgeted for Council to construct a car park to serve the community led Ruakaka Recreation centre Wahitakaro & Northland Regional Volleyball Arena project and new sports fields

Financial impact

- \$1,000,000 CAPEX - Ruakaka Recreation Centre and sports field car park

QUESTION 5 – Have Your Say / Tell us what you think

G. Māori Relationships

Key issues / queries / requests:

- Te Huinga would like to request that the Okara Pa (Old boys rugby grounds) is set aside for Nga hapu o Whangarei determination of its future activities including the interests of Te Iwi Tahi Manihera whanau o Te Parawhau.
- A raised a number of concerns and grievances of the Crown and Councils, seeking independent investigations.
- Cultural wayfinding, kaitiaki, funding of sites of significance and representation/involvement in Council and non council projects
- Need for a new Kaumatua/Kuia/Hapū Hub
- Hone Nehua Bush Reserve flooding
- Te Karearea and Council should co-design a new rating system for Māori Freehold Land
- Maori representation, specifically noting that Te Huinga, Te Karearea and Maori Wards do not represent all

Staff Analysis

The request for Okara Pa to be set aside is acknowledged. While outside of the scope of the LTP process is recommended that this kaupapa be taken forward to Te Karearea for consideration and a recommendation to Council.

While limited detail regarding any investigation Council has made significant steps to enhance Maori participation in decision making and representation in this term. This work will continue to be built upon with a Treaty Audit undertaken to ensure that Council meets its legislative obligations going forward. While this is currently in the terms of reference for Te Karearea but additional funding will be required for implementation.

Cultural wayfinding, kaitiaki, funding of sites of significance and representation on Council and non council projects have been key themes across submissions. While there are specific processes through which some of these matters can be progressed (such as the Sites of Significance Plan change) both Council and hapū need to have resourcing and capacity. For Council, this is increasingly becoming a core component of major projects and programmes (Council can also advocate for representation in non Council projects) capacity and resourcing included in project budgets (i.e. for the Civic Centre). However, this places corresponding pressure on the time and resources of hapū (as has been seen in working through issues associated with the Hikurangi Repo). To address this and support these kaupapa it is proposed to increase the Te Karearea budget by \$50k per annum (inclusive of \$20k p.a. set aside for Hikurangi Repo, as outlined above this will not cover the estimates provided by hapu) with the Committee having governance oversight of funding for initiatives that fall within its Terms of Reference.

A new/accessible hapū hub is proposed as Part of Council's Civic Centre project (Council does not own the old Army Hall which has been identified by submitters as a possible site)

Flooding of Hone Nehua Bush Reserve will be logged and investigated as a operational matter.

Legislation does not provide for a separate rating system for Māori Freehold Land, however it does promote continued ownership and providing relief where appropriate. Council does not have the ability to change the legislation but will work in partnership with Te Karearea on feedback to any changes government proposes to the systems for rating Maori land going for.

Council has different tiers/mechanisms for Māori participation in decision making. While Maori Wards and Te Karearea provide governance mechanisms operational mechanisms include through projects, processes and/or other legislative mechanisms.

DRAFT

Staff Recommendation

That Te Karearea consider the request to set aside Okara Pa and make a recommendation to Council.

That the Te Karearea budget be increased to support hapū capacity and kaitiaki initiatives (discussed below)

Financial impact

Considered under the following section

Part Two – Te Karearea Feedback

Feedback considered by Te Karearea on 21 March 2021

A hui o Nga Hapū o Whangārei was held on 12 March 2021 at Terenga Parāoa Marae. Feedback from the hui was then summarised with staff analysis provided to Te Karearea for consideration and feedback on 21 March 2021. The outcomes of that hui are summarised here, along with staff recommendations.

Key issues / queries / requests:

Hapū Capacity building

- Te Huinga is currently managed on a voluntary basis – can this change?
- Through Te Kārearea, is there an option to increase funding for Secretariat support? Alternately could this be a role within Council?
- Hapū noted a need to also look at how this can be managed from their side
- Is there budget for hapū to be paid for their contribution to WDC projects, e.g. Three Waters kaupapa?
- Environmental impacts from a Te Ao Māori perspective – is there a cultural audit of AMPs/Infrastructure Strategy? How do we review progress and learn through each round? it possible to provide input into the AMPs / Infrastructure Strategy?
- Where are the outcomes of the Tane Whakapiripiri Report in the LTP?

Staff Analysis (inclusive of feedback from Te Karearea)

Staff provided an overview of the funding increase through the establishment of Te Karearea. Total budget increased from \$50k to \$150k, inclusive of a new FTE. The budget has \$50k which is currently unallocated and set aside for capacity building (in addition to a new internal position responsible for providing 'technical support through a cultural lens'). In addition to this Council currently funds Secretariat support for Te Huinga.

Staff outlined initiatives/funding already underway to support the implementation of Tane Whakapiripiri, and broader initiatives to increase hapū and Council capacity. These include the development of a Te Ao Māori framework for decision making, the mātauranga Māori GIS project and a treaty audit. While Te Ao Māori framework for decision making and the mātauranga Māori GIS project have received 3 waters funding from government the Treaty Audit currently has limited budget. If this or the remuneration of Te Huinga were recommended then budget would need to come from, or be supplemented by, the \$50k yet to be allocated for capacity building, or additional budget would need to be worked through for the LTP. At Te Karearea members treaty audit budget should come from Te Kārearea. Staff clarified that this was an action under Te Kārearea's Terms of Reference

Outside of the points above there is potential for capacity resourcing through individual projects (i.e. through key programmes such as climate change and through capital projects). This is already happening, but needs to be agreed by all up front (potentially via a contract or mana enhancing agreement)

Staff Recommendation:

That the Te Karearea budget by \$50k per annum (inclusive of \$20k p.a. set aside for Hikurangi Repo, as outlined above this will not cover the estimates provided by hapū) with the Committee having governance oversight of funding for initiatives that fall within its Terms of Reference.

Hikurangi Repo and tuna

- Concerns were raised regarding the impact of the pumps on tuna.
- Hapū raised the need for a policy change to the Revenue and Financing Policy to allow for external funding to be considered rather than through user pays / targeted rates
- It was felt the scheme requires Central Government investment so that there is a sustainable plan to mitigate impacts
- An alternative approach raised was to return to a natural repo as part of the broader response to climate change.
- It was noted that urgent action is required at all levels of government.

Staff Analysis (inclusive of feedback from Te Karearea)

At the hui Cr Halse outlined the history of the scheme and some of the challenges in balancing at times competing outcomes. There was consensus around the need to work through the issues, with hui subsequently being arranged.

Hapū raised the need for a policy change to the Revenue and Financing Policy to allow for external funding to be considered rather than through user pays / targeted rates. However, signals from government are that their funding pools will be extremely constrained going forward. A change in the Revenue and Financing Policy is unlikely to result in additional funding streams and is not considered to appropriately reflect where the benefits from the scheme are experienced.

However, it can be argued that protecting the eel population from flood events is a broader objective / outcome which aligns to Council's support for hapū as Kaitiaki. Currently there is no funding to pay hapū for either Tuna capture and relocation or monitoring associated with flood events. This could be addressed through additional funding to Te Karearea.

The establishment of a working group will provide for medium to long term options for the repo to be worked through by the parties, with a recommendation being brought back to Council.

Staff Recommendation:

That Council recognises the role of hapū as kaitiaki and provides an initial \$20k p.a. increase (note, this amount will not cover the estimated costs of hapū) in funding as part of the \$50k p.a. increase to Te Karearea's budget (this funding is discussed in more detail under the Te Karearea section of this report).

Youth

- There was discussion of support for youth within our district, and that not all activities cater for every need
- It was noted that the Youth Advisory Group and Clr Connop are specifically looking at how WDC can best engage with the wider youth community to ask them to advocate for what they want to do, rather than an assumption by community groups or by WDC.
- There was agreement that the solutions 'starts at home', and that there is a need for collective responsibility for taking care of our rangatahi
- The feeling in the hui was that youth support needs to be community driven, with support from WDC once the community aspirations are known

Staff Analysis (inclusive of feedback from Te Karearea)

While the potential for 'funding for youth facilities' was touched upon the direction staff took from korero at the hui was that community solutions were required first. It was felt that this was an area for Council and hapū to keep working alongside one another.

Staff Recommendation:

That Council and hapū to keep working together. No change required to the LTP.

Support for non Council managed cemeteries/urupa

Support for non-council managed cemeteries and urupa was noted as an area that has been raised by hapū and is currently not in the LTP. At Te Ke Karearea direction was sought on the nature of support required.

Hapū clarified that this is less about funding and more about including this in planning provisions and looking at innovative ways to manage these (i.e. ground penetrating radar to identify remains and systems for capturing data around these)

Staff Analysis and recommendation:

That Council and hapū to keep working together, with opportunities for support being worked through at Te Karearea. No change required to the LTP.

Staff Recommendation

That the Te Karearea budget by \$50k per annum (inclusive of \$20k p.a. set aside for Hikurangi Repo, as outlined above this will not cover the estimates provided by hapū) with the Committee having governance oversight of funding for initiatives that fall within its Terms of Reference.

That the

Financial impact

\$50k p.a. additional opex

Part Three – Concurrent Consultations

Draft Revenue and Financing Policy
<p>Key issues</p> <p>We received 4 submissions that provided feedback on the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy, along with feedback from hapū.</p> <p>The main comments made by submitters are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support investing in Oruku Landing and Hihiaua Cultural Centre, however not Forum North • Do not support 6.5% rates increase and should focus spending on core infrastructure, not tourism • Concerned about debt levels • Concerned about financial competency of elected members and staff • Reduce time between emailing rates notices and payment due date • Hapū raised the potential for a policy change to the Revenue and Financing Policy to allow for external funding to be considered for the Hikurangi Swamp rather than just user pays / targeted rates <p>Staff analysis</p> <p>The Revenue and Financing Policy we consulted on is fundamentally the same as the previous Policy with some minor changes including: improving readability, introducing information surrounding COVID-19 and our pandemic response, covering potential sources of funding for capital expenditure such as central government funding and providing additional flexibility in the Activity Funding Review attachment percentage ranges.</p> <p>Rates funding and affordability</p> <p>The proposed rates increase is to ensure Council has a balanced budget that provides adequate funding for our infrastructure and other spending, enables growth and preserves our current level of service. The rates rebate system supports low income households and we help our ratepayers to benefit from this facility.</p> <p>Debt funding</p> <p>Investment in infrastructure is partially funded by debt. This is to ensure inter-generational equity as infrastructure spend today often has an estimated life of 30-40 years.</p> <p>Rates notices</p> <p>The emailing date of rates notices is determined by statute.</p> <p>Hikurangi Swamp</p> <p>A change in the Revenue and Financing Policy is unlikely to result in additional funding streams and is not considered to appropriately reflect where the benefits from the scheme are experienced.</p>
<p>Staff Recommendation</p> <p>No changes recommended</p>
<p>Financial impact</p> <p>N/A</p>

Draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

Draft Early Payments of Rates Policy

Policy 21/105 Postponement of Rates – Extreme Financial Hardship

Issues raised from submissions

1 submission was received supporting postponement of rates for ratepayers in extreme financial hardship including first home buyers.

Staff analysis:

Current and proposed policy supports postponement of rates for ratepayers in extreme financial hardship, as does the rates rebate scheme for low-income home-owners.

Policy 21/107 Remission of General Rates for Qualifying Residential Properties

Issues raised from submissions

2 submissions were received that do not support discontinuing the remission on properties with more than one dwelling:

- “...this proposed change has no logical basis and is in fact detrimental to the long term objectives of WDC and NRC policy in preserving special character properties. It also works against small accommodation providers (typically retired host operators) who are the backbone of accommodation provision to Northlands tourism industry. The end result, if this rate remission ruling change is adopted, will be placing on the landowners affected, an unsustainable rates burden which is by any measure is unjustifiable.”
- rates relief for not-for-profit aged accommodation

Staff analysis:

38 letters were sent to ratepayers impacted by this proposed change. 2 ratepayers did not support the change for the reasons outlined in the submission. The discontinuing of the remission for properties with more than one dwelling is consistent with the broader approach and outcomes of the policy – particularly where there is additional income or revenue being received from the additional dwelling(s)

Policy 21/114 Remission of Rates on Maori Freehold Land

Policy 21/115 Postponement of Rates on Maori Freehold Land

Issues raised from submissions

- 1 submission was received supporting the changes to the policies
- 1 submission was received suggesting separate system for Maori

Staff analysis:

Statute does not permit a separate rating system for Maori Freehold Land, however it does promote continued ownership and providing relief where appropriate.

Policy 21/200 Early Repayment of Current Year Rates

Issues raised from submissions

- 1 submission was received supporting 0% discount
- 1 submission was received not supporting 0% discount

Staff analysis: The discount for early repayment of rates in the current year should be cost neutral to our ratepayers
Staff Recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change recommended
Financial impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact

Development Contributions Policy

Submission analysis:

The main submission received regarding this policy was from Summerset Group Holdings Ltd, submission ID #003 – concurrent consultation

Summerset Group Holdings Ltd is New Zealand’s second largest developer and third largest operator of retirement villages, which makes it one of New Zealand’s largest home-builders. Summerset currently operates 29 villages across New Zealand and provides a range of living options for more than 6,000 residents.

Summerset Group Holdings Ltd primary requests under this submission is to review the rates (see table below) and the timing of payment for large staged projects.

Development type	Activity	Unit of demand
Retirement unit	Transport	0.3 HUE per unit
	All others	0.1 HUE per unit
Aged care room	Transport	0.2 HUE per room
	Community infrastructure	0.1 HUE per room

Staff analysis:

Summerset are a retirement village developer and operator. They are currently developing a Retirement Village in Tikipunga adjacent to the Denby Golf Course.

Their submission is summarised below apart from a submission around timing of payments - this is already standard operating procedure for Council - however for clarity it is recommended that Clause 4.2 be amended to read:

As the assessments for Land Use consents and Building consents may be under different policies the current Policy allows an applicant to pay under whichever Policy is lesser - the legislation allows payment and assessment under each, this gives applicant more flexibility in choosing the timing of payments. It is recommended that the status quo be maintained.

See Table below:

Development Type	Activity	Submission wants / Relief sought	Current WDC	Suggested Change	Reason
Retirement Unit	Transport	0.3	0.44	0.44	Whangarei does not have the same level of public transport infrastructure or proximity to services that are enjoyed by larger centres. Lower occupancy acknowledges impact and is consistent with other comparable Councils.
	Libraries	0.1	0.44	0.44	
	Parks & Reserves	0.1	0.44	0.44	Submissions made to the LTP indicate that the retired community are actively seeking more facilities geared towards their particular needs
	Water	Watercare Actual impact from equivalent sites	Actual impact from equivalent sites	No change required	This is the current practice
	Wastewater	Watercare Actual impact from equivalent sites	Actual impact from equivalent sites	No change required	This is the current practice
Aged Care	Transport	0.2	0.23	0.23	No change required
	Water	Watercare Actual impact from equivalent sites	Actual impact from equivalent sites	No change required	This is the current practice
	Wastewater	Watercare Actual impact from equivalent sites	Actual impact from equivalent sites	No change required	This is the current practice
	Comm. Infrastructure	0.1	Does not require any contribution	No change required	Council considers these rooms to be the equivalent of hospital and therefore commercial and does not require

Staff Recommendation

- WDC maintain the status quo as the current policy recognises the lower impact and roading have advised that this impact is correct for provincial councils as opposed to Auckland's impacts.

Financial impact

- None

Fees and Charges

Consultation Summary

Submission analysis

We consulted on those fees that are subject to the Special Consultative Procedure process under the Local Government Act 2002. Accordingly the following fees and charges were part of the consultation process:

- Drainage (Waste Water and Trade Waste)
- Bylaw Enforcement
- Food Premises
- Gambling and Racing Act
- Health Act Registered Premises
- Public Places Bylaw
- Resource Management Act: Resource Consents and District Plan Development
- Resource Management Administrative Charges Council Professional Fees Monitoring and Land use District Plan/Private Plan Changes
- Rubbish Disposal
- Water Supply

Any changes (from 2020/21) in regards the above fees will be considered by Council in line with any feedback and adopted prior to 1 July 2021

Fees and Charges that were **NOT** part of the consultation process were:

- Animals: Dogs, Stock Control
- Building Control
- Cameron Street Mall Permits
- Cemetery Page
- Forum North Venue Hire
- Laboratory
- Library
- Official Information
- Parks and Reserves
- Photocopying
- Searches
- Swimming Pool Fencing Inspections
- Transport

Changes (from 2020/21) in regards the above fees have been considered by Council at their meeting of 25 February 2021 and adopted in that meeting (for implementation 1 July 2021).

Key issues

Submissions identify the following issues:

- Fees for kerbside rubbish collection and raising the fees for the rubbish bags and stickers to encourage waste minimisation
- Tiered water rates to promote water conservation
- Dog registration fees should be reduced

Staff analysis:

Solid waste

The fees are reviewed annually and set according to clause 2.9.1 of the Solid Waste Management Bylaw and also the Waste Minimisation Act 2008. Charges are required to be consulted on under s82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

Council has previously considered and agreed the user pay principle an effective way to encourage behaviour supporting waste minimisation goals as well as recovering costs of providing the service. Proposed for 2021/22: 65 litre rubbish bag charges are increasing due to inflation and the increase in the waste disposal levy. Other minor price changes have been made to better reflect the cost of providing the service or to simplify the price schedule. (No changes have been proposed to green waste charges).

Water

Fees and charges for water are authorised under the Water Supply Bylaw and must be consulted on in accordance with s82 of the LGA 2002. Council has considered scaled water charges and agreed that that is not appropriate for the district. For the 20/21 financial year (as per the Statement of Proposal Consultation document), it is proposed that water supply charges increased by the LGCI average inflation rate of 2.5 %.

Dog registrations

The Dog Control Act provides for the setting of annual dog registration fees. Council reviewed its Revenue and Financing Policy at their meeting of 25/2/21 and confirmed within the (now adopted) policy that dog owners fund for the most part (80% user pays), the cost of operating dog control services within the district. The proposed changes to dog (animal) fees for 2021-22, were not subject to consultation and on this basis were considered and adopted by Council at their meeting of 25/2/21. (NB the 25/2/21 Council meeting had been preceded by several Council workshop discussions on enhanced animal control and enforcement).

Staff recommendation

No change. That the proposed fees and charges subject to public consultation under Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002 (as detailed within in the Statement of Proposal and presented at the council meeting 25/2/21,) are adopted for implementation from 1 July 2021

Financial impact

None

Staff Recommendation

None

Financial impact

N/A

Part Four – Late submissions

Formal submissions received after the deadline of 5.30pm on Thursday 1 April 2021 have been treated as late submissions.

12 formal submissions were received late as follows:

Submitter number	Name	Topic	Action
1959	Teal Bay Residents and ratepayers association	Various	Included in 13 April agenda
1973	SPCA	Various	Included in 13 April agenda
1859	Kristi	Bulk – Beach road Onerahi	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1860	Maria	Bulk- Beach road Onerahi	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1861	Powell B	Bulk- Beach road Onerahi	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1862	Hicks M	Various	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1863	Garry M	Bulk- Beach road Onerahi	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1864	George	Bulk- Beach road Onerahi	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1865	Sharon	Bulk- Beach road Onerahi	Included in supplementary agenda for 13 April meeting
1866	Mitchell O and M	No increase in rates	Submission content already addressed in this issues and options paper.
1867	Bell K and B	Various	Submission content already addressed in this issues and options paper. One additional point that has not been included has been passed to the operational department.
2108	Cole P	Various	Submission content already addressed in this issues and options paper.