

## Council Briefing Agenda

**Date:** Thursday, 3 May, 2018

**Time:** 9:00 am

**Location:** Council Chamber  
Forum North, Rust Avenue  
Whangarei

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

Cr Stu Bell

Cr Gavin Benney

Cr Crichton Christie

Cr Vince Cocurullo

Cr Tricia Cutforth

Cr Shelley Deeming

Cr Sue Glen

Cr Phil Halse

Cr Cherry Hermon

Cr Greg Innes

Cr Greg Martin

Cr Sharon Morgan

Cr Anna Murphy

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

**1. Apologies**

**2. Reports**

2.1	Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Consultation Issues and Options Report	1
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------	---

**3. Closure of Meeting**

## 2.1 Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Consultation: Issues and Options Report

**Meeting:** Council briefing  
**Date of meeting:** 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2018  
**Reporting officer:** Jill McPherson (General Manager Strategy and Democracy)

### 1. Purpose

To brief Council on the key issues and recommended options based on submissions on the Consultation Document for the draft Long Term Plan.

### 2. Discussion

This report outlines a high-level summary of the key issues and options from staff based on the submissions received on the Consultation Document. Attachment A includes a more detail overview of the key issues by Activity Profile.

At the briefing further information, will be provided. This includes:

- A presentation on the issues and options by activity.
- A schedule of projects requested through submissions and costs where they have been provided

#### 2.1 Financial/budget considerations

Over and above the budget established for the Consultation Document, a review has established:

- \$500k Opex
- Small amount of debt head room which can be used (Exact amount to be confirmed at the briefing).

Any projects exceed these amounts will need to be included through either a substitution of an existing project or an increase in rates. Council also have the option of using these funds to pay down debt or ameliorate the rates increase.

## **2.2 Summary of issues and options by activity**

The following section outlines the key issue for each Council activity. This is not an exhaustive list. A full analysis of submission issues is provided in Attachment A. This will be used to inform the deliberation report at the Council Meeting on 16 May.

### **Transport**

72 submissions were received in relation to sealing gravel roads, these included requests for specific roads and general requests for more funding to be allocated.

Staff acknowledge Council has allocated \$5.4M for new seal extensions. Of this \$2.1M has been allocated for completing the seal on Wrights Rd. Council has also made application to NZTA for a 53% subsidy for these sealing works. If this is successful, then the remaining Council share of funding would be available for other seal extensions.

Optionality also exists to increase the funding to a total of \$1m per year over 10 years. This will enable Council to work through a new list of priority seal extensions faster (list to be developed).

### **Water**

Key issues raised include fluoridation, water quality and security of water supply. Staff acknowledge the submissions and recommend an option of no further changes. Staff note that additional funding may be needed for the Whau Valley Treatment Plant, but at this stage that cannot be quantified.

### **Solid waste**

Key issues relate to recycling and rubbish bin provisions. Staff acknowledge the submissions and consider issues have been addressed in the Waste Minimisation Strategy. Staff recommend an option of no further changes.

### **Waste water**

Key issues relate to support for continued investment in our wastewater infrastructure. Staff acknowledge the submissions and recommend an option of no further changes.

### **Stormwater**

A number of requests were received around site specific stormwater issues and investment in infrastructure. These issues can be addressed through the \$33.8m increased funding for stormwater as outlined in the Consultation Document. A majority of submissions supported this increase. Staff therefore recommend as per Option 2 in the Consultation Document that funding is increased by \$33.8m over 10 years.

### **Flood Protection**

Key issues relate to the need for continued support for the Hikurangi Swamp Scheme and investment in 'eel friendly' pumps. There is potential for a Provincial Growth Fund application to fund the replacement pumps which will be investigate by staff. Staff acknowledge the submissions and recommend an option of no further changes.

## **Community Facilities and Services**

### Community property

Community property funding received a number of requests relating to building maintenance. Options to support specific projects include \$22k for Company of Giants at 116 Bank Street.

### Community led development

A number of requests were received to support community led development projects including in Onerahi, Tikipunga and Raumanga. This can be addressed in part through the increased funding for Community led development as outlined the Consultation document. The allocation of the additional funding will be guided by the Community Development Framework that has been presented to the Community Development Committee.

Staff recommend the option to increase the funding for Community Led Projects by \$4.5m as outlined in the Consultation Document.

### Parks Sports Facilities

A large number of submissions were received which covered multiple topics in relation to sports facilities. This included a number of submissions relating to sporting facilities in Ruakaka and Waipu.

In response, staff recommended options for the following:

1. Bring hockey turf replacement forward to Year 1 from Year 2 and await recommendations from Recreation Strategy before committing to fourth turf development.
2. Swap the Oakura hard court project (Year 7 and Year 8) with Hard Court to Multi-Court (Year 4 and Year 5).
3. That Council reviews Ruakaka/Waipu sports facility priorities once the Recreation Strategy is finalized.

### Parks – Skateparks and Playgrounds

A detail schedule of proposed playground projects, including timing, location and costs will be provided to Councillors.

## **Planning and Regulatory Services**

A small number of submission were received which have not raised issues that warrant any changes. Staff acknowledge the submissions and recommend an option of no further changes.

## **Democracy and Strategy**

A small number of submissions were received in relation to democracy functions, these could be address through the Civic Centre project as relate to improved chamber facilities

A number of submissions were received in relation strategies including Climate Change, Recreation and City Centre, all of which are underway.

## **Support services**

A small number of submissions were received. Key issues raised included staff numbers. Staff acknowledge the submissions and recommend an option of no further changes

## **2.3 Civic Centre**

A separate presentation will be given on the Civic Centre project.

We asked the community for feedback on their preferred site for a new civic centre. This included Option 1 – Forum North, Option 2 – RSA Site and Option 3 – A new CBD development. Of the three location options:

- 22% (91) preferred the RSA site
- 38% (161) preferred the current site at Forum North
- 30% (125) preferred a CBD location
- 11% (45) did not select any of these as a preferred site.

Nearly all of the issues submitters raised have been considered during the development of the three options presented for consultation. The views presented are diverse, with no overwhelming support for any one option. Whilst Forum North was the most popular site mentioned it is also the most difficult and costly. Staff recommend that Expressions of Interest are called for a CBD site with the RSA site as a back up.

## **2.4 Development Contribution Funding**

Council received 10 separate submissions to the draft Development Contributions Policy (DCP). These covered a range of factors including:

- what development contributions are spent on
- how they are accounted for(including whether they are spent on operational budgets)
- the timing of projects
- where the development contributions are spent
- one lot inner city subdivisions should pay less
- the use of development contributions for heritage buildings
- amendments and additions to the draft DCP regarding Papakāinga housing
- wastewater development contributions for the Marsden Point/Ruakaka catchment including:

- the calculation of development contributions
- household unit equivalent (HUE) sizing
- projects included in policies
- capacity and anticipated growth.

A full analysis of the submissions is included in the attached report, along with staff recommendations. Generally points raised are either not provided for within the scope of the legislation, are funding/timing decisions to be made within Long Term Plan deliberations and/or are covered by Council's modelling and accounting practices (i.e. the legislation does not allow the use of DCs for opex and Council's Policy, modelling and accounting preclude this). For those submissions no changes are recommended.

The areas that staff have highlighted as potentially requiring further review, and/or changes to the DCP, as a result of submissions received include the need for the:

- DCP to reflect any changes to projects as a result of LTP deliberations
- DCP to define Papakāinga and provide for assessment based on impact
- growth model to be amended to address an immaterial error identified by Audit in the Tikipunga west mesblock
- wastewater projects within the Marsden Point/Ruakaka to be reviewed (and amended if necessary) once outcomes of negotiations on the Bream Bay Landowners Association developer agreement are known.

While the attached report includes draft staff analysis and recommendations legal advice has been sought on some of the points raised, the outcomes of which will be available within the briefing and included in the final report.

## **2.5 Rating Policy and Review**

A separate presentation will be given on rating policy and the rates review.

We asked the community for feedback on their preferred rating system. The options were Option 1 Modified status quo or Option 2 Transport fixed rate on capital value, plus modified status quo. Of the two options:

- 69% (260) preferred the Modified status quo
- 31% (121) preferred the Transport fixed rate on capital value, plus modified status quo.

## **3. Attachment**

Draft LTP 2018 – 2028 Consultation: Issues and Options Report





# LTP Consultation Issues and Options Report.docx

## Table of Contents

Civic Centre .....	2
Transportation .....	6
Seal Extensions .....	7
Footpaths .....	8
Parking: General .....	8
Walking and cycling .....	9
Rooding .....	9
Alternative Transport .....	14
Water .....	15
Fluoridation .....	16
Water - General .....	16
Water - Quality .....	17
Solid Waste .....	18
Recycling .....	19
Rubbish .....	19
Transfer stations .....	20
Waste Minimisation .....	20
Wastewater .....	21
General .....	22
Storm Water .....	24
Key Issue 1: Storm Water .....	25
Flooding and drainage .....	26
Storm Water - General .....	27
Flood Control – Hikurangi Flood Protection Scheme .....	28
Community Facilities and Services .....	29
Key Issue 3: Community Led Projects .....	30
Community Development .....	31
Community Property .....	38
es and Events .....	39
Parks and Recreation .....	41
Governance and Strategy .....	52
Planning and Regulatory .....	62
Support Services .....	65
Concurrent Consultation: Rating Policy and Review .....	72
Concurrent Consultation: Fees and Charges .....	78
Concurrent Consultation: Development Contributions .....	83

# Civic Centre

## Civic Centre

### Issues raised from submissions:

A total of 422 submissions have been received on this issue.

Submitters were asked which of three options they preferred for the location of a new civic centre and why, as well as any further comments they wished to make.

Of the three location options:

- 38% (161) preferred the current site at Forum North
- 30% (125) preferred a central business district location
- 22% (91) preferred the RSA site
- 11% (45) did not select any of these as a preferred site

A wide variety of comments supporting these choices were made, with the main underlying themes being:

#### For Forum North – of the 38%

- 20% simply ticked Forum North without adding a comment
- 10% said we should stay in the existing building as it is adequate
- 2% said it is a good central location with ample parking and good access
- 2% said we should focus on other priorities

#### For a central business district location – of the 30%

- 13% simply ticked a central business district location without adding a comment
- 7% said it will act as a stimulus for revitalisation and development of the city centre and/or will create linkages to the Town Basin
- 2% said it 'makes sense'
- 2% said it allows the return of Forum North to the community as an arts/cultural precinct
- 2% said it will allow the best access if designed well

#### For the RSA site – of the 22%

- 6% simply ticked the RSA site without adding a comment
- 5% said it is a good central location with ample parking and good access
- 5% preferred it as the land is already owned and/or it 'makes sense'
- 4% said we should consolidate Council administration and performing arts / cultural spaces in the wider Forum North precinct

#### Some other general points were also raised:

- there is no need for a new facility
- Council should not be investing in this project as there are higher priorities (with roading the most commonly cited example)
- the options quoted are all too expensive
- it should be sited away from the city centre e.g. Blue Goose or Barge Park

**Staff analysis:**

Nearly all of the issues submitters raised have been considered during the development of the three options presented for consultation. The views presented are diverse, with no overwhelming support for any one option.

However, there appears to be an underlying sentiment that if Council is to proceed with the development of a new civic centre for Council administration, there is an expectation that it would incorporate the expansion of arts/cultural facilities in the wider Forum North precinct.

Factors to consider in deciding the best location include:

- What is best for WDC from a purely business operations perspective?
- What is best for Whangarei District from a more holistic perspective? i.e.
  - Which option best supports the implementation of the City Centre plan?
  - What economic benefits would each option provide?
  - Which option best enables the development of other facilities needed for our district?
- Which option/s provides the optimum use of financial resources? For example, leasing a private development in the CBD could release capital funding for a new performing arts centre

While Forum North is supported by the largest number of submitters, it is not recommended as the site for redevelopment. Analysis completed prior to consultation has shown that:

- Refurbishment of the existing facilities will result in a building that is more expensive to operate and maintain than others options
- Whether refurbishing the existing building or demolishing and erecting a new facility, there will be considerable cost in decanting staff during construction and major disruption to the delivery of services for up to two years.

Based on this information, staff recommend the following course of action:

**Ask for Expressions of Interest (EOI) in the development of a new civic centre in the central business district**

- this would be based on a specification developed by Council within an indicated budget
- based on responses received, Council will be able to determine whether this is a viable and suitable way forward
- as developers would incur considerable cost in preparing their EOI's, it would be reasonable for them to expect Council to proceed with a selected viable development
- this approach was used for the design and construction of Te Matau a Pohe
- this would allow the RSA site to be used for another purpose e.g. performing arts, parking or resale – with capital funding released if it was leased rather than owned

**In the meantime, progress the RSA site as a back-up option**

- While the RSA site was the least favoured option by submission numbers, many submitters who indicated support for Forum North added comments that they wished to see civic administration and performing arts facilities combined in the wider Forum North precinct
- If a central business district site is not attractive, construction of new administration premises on the RSA site will minimise service disruption while keeping redevelopment options for Forum North open
- Preliminary planning for construction on this site (such as preparation of specifications for contestable procurement) can be progressed to avoid future delays
- A decision on the future use of the current Forum North administration premises (e.g. performing arts or education) can be made at a later date.

**Staff recommendation:**

- That the central business district is the preferred site for development of a new Civic Centre
- That Expressions of Interest are called for by the private sector, with a clearly defined specification and budget
- That the RSA site is retained as an alternative location for Council's administration functions should a central business district site be unviable
- That staff investigate options of the re-purposing of Council's current administration facilities at Forum North.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

At this stage the current budget estimates still appear to be appropriate. However, it is probably prudent to spread the funding over a slightly longer period (see table below).

\$ Million	Y0 C/fwd	Y1 2018	Y2 2019	Y3 2020	Total
Current LTP Capex:	7.0	14.9	15.3	-	37.2
Proposed revision to:	7.0	3.2	15.0	12.0	37.2

Corresponding adjustments would also be made to operating cashflows to reflect this revised timing.

# Transportation

## Seal Extensions

### Issues raised from submissions:

72 submissions were received relating to seal extensions for the following roads:

- Albany Road (2 submissions)
- Attwood Road (6 submissions)
- Otuhi Road (3 submissions)
- Nook Road (1 submission)
- Pigs Head Road (1 submission)
- Knights Road (3 submissions)
- Rockell Road (9 submissions)
- Helmsdale Road (1 submission)
- Wright Road (1 submission)
- Pyke Road East (1 submission)
- Brooks Road (5 submissions)
- Crows Nest Road (3 submissions)
- Snooks Road (2 submissions)
- Otakairangi Road (1 submission)
- One Tree Point (1 submission)
- Mclean Road (1 submission)
- General (31 submissions)

Of these both, Attwood and Brooks Road residents requested the council consider a subsidized or ratepayer contribution scheme in order to have their Roads completed.

### Staff analysis:

Council has allocated \$5.4M for new seal extensions in the Draft LTP 2019-28. Of this \$2.1M has been allocated over the first 3 years of the LTP and this funding has been earmarked for completing the seal on Wrights Rd. Council has also made application to NZTA for subsidy funding for the sealing works on Wrights Rd as part of the Regional Land Transport Programme 2018-21. If this application to NZTA is successful, then 53% subsidy would be made available by NZTA and the remaining Council share of funding approximately \$1.1M would be available for Council to invest in a Ratepayer subsidised seal extension if approved.

### Staff recommendation:

Costs vary depending on the complexity of the individual project. Project identification and design must be completed the year before construction. There is no list of priorities at this stage. This will need to be developed, in the next few months.

That Council notes the submissions and that the budget for seal extensions be raised to \$1m each of the ten years in the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

The debt would increase by \$200,000 in the first two years, \$1m in the second two years.



## Footpaths

### Issues raised from submissions:

29 submissions were received in relation to maintenance or addition of footpaths within the district.

Submissions related to Whananaki, Waipu, Kensington, Ruatangata, Otangarei, One Tree Point, Ruakaka, Kamo, Riverside, central business district and Whangarei Heads.

Issues ranged from the need for new footpaths, improved pedestrian crossings, improved lighting, vegetation, and general maintenance.

### Staff analysis:

Council has allocated \$4.5M for the construction of new footpaths in the 10 years of the draft LTP 2018-28. The requests for new footpaths will be considered by Council and prioritised using the footpath prioritisation model recently approved. A prioritised list will be developed over the next few months.

The submissions relating to footpath maintenance (Otangarei, central business district and Whangarei Heads) will be assessed by Staff and repaired as needed from existing Operational Budgets.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Parking: General

### Issues raised from submissions:

21 submissions were made regarding upgrades to existing carparks or the establishment of new carparks. Areas where new carparks were requested included Onerahi, Waipu and central business district. Requests for upgrades to existing carparks related to Oakura Hall Park, Kamo shopping centre, Okara Drive, Maddren Reserve, Hatea Drive, Railway Road, Whangarei Heads Reotahi Road, Town Basin central business district.

There was also a request for council to undertake more enforcement to deter all day parkers in the main Kamo shopping centre and library carpark.

### Staff analysis:

Council parking is managed and reported to Council through the parking strategy; this only covers the CBD.

There are no provisions for new carpark facilities in the draft LTP.

Requests for enforcement of parking is an operational issue to be dealt with by staff from existing operational budgets.

### Staff recommendation:

Council note the submissions and no changes be made to the draft 2018–2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Walking and cycling

### Issues raised from submissions:

28 submissions were received in relation to walking and cycling across the Whangarei District. These included Tikipunga, Waipu, Kensington, Ngunguru, Kamo, Raumanga.

Several submissions were in support of council's investment in walking and cycling. Others suggested widening shared paths/roads to improve safety and to make paths/roads more bike friendly.

### Staff analysis:

Council has allocated \$15.8M for new shared path construction over the 10 years of the draft LTP 2018-28. This funding assumes an NZTA subsidy of 53% of the costs. Council has also made applications to the Provincial Growth Fund for additional funding to construct shared paths connecting Paihia to Whangarei and One Tree Point to Mangawhai as part of the Regional Walking and Cycling Strategy.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Roadway: Street Lighting

### Issues raised from submissions:

Six submissions were received in relation to streetlighting upgrades on Albany Road, Russell Road, Rathbone Street, Quarry Gardens and Ruatangata.

### Staff analysis:

Council is currently undertaking a \$6.6M project to replace all existing street lights on the network with new LED technology. This is funded by a 85% subsidy from NZTA. Most of the new street lights will just replace the existing lights, with improvements to meet new lighting standards only approved for major arterial roads. Once the project is complete staff will measure the lighting standards across the whole network. Dark areas will be prioritised for improvements from existing lighting renewals budgets. Council has also allocated \$100,000 annually, starting in year 3 of the draft LTP, for new installations and renewal of amenity lighting across the district. This covers the unsubsidised lighting not associated with the road such as halls and carparks. Prioritised lists for future work will be developed over the next six months.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Roading: Traffic Calming

#### Issues raised from submissions:

6 submissions were received in relation to traffic calming in Oakura, Kensington, Hikurangi and Parua Bay. These requests primarily related to a need to address perceived speeding problems in these areas.

#### Staff analysis:

Council funds traffic calming projects from the Minor Safety Improvements budget in a programme of works that requires NZTA approval each year. Council prioritises all the traffic calming requests based on several factors including road classification, pedestrian activity, crash history, road geometry, traffic volume etc. Based on an annual budget of approximately \$100,000 Council implements traffic calming on 1 or 2 streets each year, with NZTA approval.

The six requests for calming will be assessed for setting the 2019/2020 programme. It will not be until then whether they are the highest priority.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Roading: Speed Limit Management

#### Issues raised from submissions:

6 submissions were received relating to requests for speed limits to be lowered on Russell Road, Riverside Drive, Whangarei Heads Road, Kiteone Road, Nova Scotia Drive and in Takahiwai.

#### Staff analysis:

Council is currently undertaking a speed management review of the District's road network using the Speed Management Guidelines recently published by the Government. This requires the Council to review the suitability of all speed limits in the District and consider all requests from the community. Consultation with the community and stakeholders is required as part of the process. This will take at least 12 months.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Roading: Major Improvement Projects

#### Issues raised from submissions:

11 submissions were received relating to the Onerahi Road/Riverside Drive. Requests included:

- Improved Public Transport and promoting the use of the new cycleway rather than investing in more roading.
- Address congestion on road to Onerahi which is impacted by population growth in the Whangarei Heads area.

#### Staff analysis:

In the draft LTP 2018-2028, Council has proposed to upgrade the Riverside Drive and Onerahi Road route starting in 2024/25. \$24.5M has been earmarked for this project which would attract a 53% subsidy rate under current funding rules. The options for this project will be determined closer to the time and will require Council and NZTA approval and community consultation.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2018 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Roading: Pullover areas

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Several submissions were received requesting pullover areas, particularly on Whangarei Heads Road for "slow drivers".

#### Staff analysis:

No funding has been allocated for constructing pull over bays on Whangarei Heads Road in the draft LTP. Council is making applications to both NZTA and the Provincial Growth Fund for funding under the Twin Coast Discovery Business Plan for the introduction of the Visiting Driver Safety Programme in Northland which may include funding for pull over bays on the District's main coastal arterials. We are unsure if the applications will be successful.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Roading: central business district Congestion

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Several submissions were received requesting that Council address congestion within the central business district. These included the Porowini Ave and Tarewa Road intersection and congestion around the town basin. There were also requests for all ring roads in Whangarei to be clearways at peak traffic periods.

#### Staff analysis:

Over recent years Council and NZTA have completed a significant number of major projects to address accessibility and congestion throughout Whangarei. The next stage for Council is to address congestion issues at a series of intersections throughout the central business district to enhance the benefits from these major projects. Council has allocated \$13.5m in the draft LTP towards this work. NZTA still have several projects to be completed on the state highway network to complete their programme of upgrades. These projects are currently shown in the draft LTP.

#### Staff recommendation:

Pororwini Avenue and Tarewa Road will be put out for tender shortly.

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Roading: Berm Maintenance

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Several submissions were received in relation to berm maintenance for Okara Drive, Waipu and Whangarei entranceways, Russell Road and Takahiwai.

#### Staff analysis:

In the draft LTP 2018-28 Council has funded a capital project to upgrade the state highway berms along the state highway network in Whangarei and made provision for ongoing maintenance of the state highway roadside berms after agreeing to takeover this maintenance activity from NZTA. Council has also made provision in the draft LTP OPEX programme for berm maintenance for private berms over 100m<sup>2</sup>.

Noting that all proposed works will commence in 2018/2019. This will include Waipu and Whangarei Entranceways.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

Roading: Weeds and noxious plants
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>Eight submissions in relation to weeds and noxious plant control on roadsides, were received.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Weed and noxious plant control are maintenance issues. These are to be dealt with by staff from existing Operational Budgets. Council undertakes noxious weeds control on the District's roadside in accordance with the noxious weeds strategy agreed with the Northland Regional Council. The Northland Regional Council requires Council to have a programme to work to eradicate nominated weed species on our roadsides. Council uses glyphosate products to manage general vegetation control on the District's roadsides. The NZ Environmental Protection Authority has stated there is no concern if the products are used as directed.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, or work programme.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

Roading: General
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>Submitters also made requests relating to issues ranging from requests to not planting flowering trees, road widenings, road upgrades, opposition to bridge widenings and a request for a bridge from Pataua to Ngunguru Ford Road.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>In the draft LTP 2018-28 Council has allocated \$1.9M in 2025 for the upgrading of the Ruakaka Beach Road one lane bridge. No works are currently planned for the Ngunguru bridges.</p> <p>Many issues in this category relate to maintenance that will be dealt with by staff from existing Operational Budgets.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

## Public Transport

### Issues raised from submissions:

13 submissions were received in relation to public transport. Topics related solely to the public bus network and ranged from bus shelters, to bus terminus and bus services

### Staff analysis:

The provision of, and the management of, public transport services in the District is done by the Northland Regional Council. The District Council assists with the installation of bus services infrastructure, shelters, bus stop signage and road markings as requested by the Northland Regional Council. Council receives a 50% subsidy from NZTA through the Northland Regional Council for these approved works. Council has budgeted \$1.0M in the 10 years of the draft LTP for upgrades and renewals of bus infrastructure that support the bus services in the District. Council has also budgeted \$320,000 in year 3 of the LTP for the upgrade or relocation of the Rose Street bus terminus. The requests received for new and improved bus services in the District will be forwarded to the Northland Regional Council for their consideration.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Alternative Transport

### Issues raised from submissions:

3 submissions were received relating to the construction or revival of the rail network. These included supporting the construction of a branch line to Marsden Point.

### Staff analysis:

The provision of rail transport services and potential upgrades in Northland is a central government and New Zealand Rail matter. Northland local government may be supportive of the initiative and the Northland Regional Council have already designated the route for the branch line to Marsden Point.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

# Water



## Fluoridation

### Issues raised from submissions:

- 2 submitters registered their opposition to fluoridation of water supplies.
- Northland District Health Board recommend that WDC considers making provision for fluoridating eligible water supplies in their Long Term Plan.

### Staff analysis:

Whangarei does not fluoridate its water supplies and has not budgeted to do so. The last referendum held on the subject in 2002 showed 62% of respondents opposed fluoridation. However, the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill has passed through the select committee stage and is awaiting a second reading debate. This bill amends Part 2A of the Health Act 1956 by inserting a power for District Health Boards to make decisions and give directions about the fluoridation of local government drinking water supplies in their areas. If this bill is passed, Council may be directed by the District Health Board to add fluoride to certain supplies. The cost to fluoridate all supplies is estimated to be in the region of \$1.5M. It is possible that funding may be available to assist with the capital costs. Whilst no allowance has been made in the LTP to fluoridate water supplies, a space has been designed within the new Whau Valley Water Treatment Plant to accommodate fluoridation equipment should it be required in the future.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Water - General

### Issues raised from submissions:

- Northland Regional Council applauds WDC's proactive and excellent management of water supply and acknowledges that town water supplies in Whangārei district are all treated.
- Northland Regional Council encourages WDC to develop a drinking water strategy for the district and to consider establishing a dedicated drinking water supplier for Northland.
- One submission appreciates the need for expenditure on expansion and upgrades to the water supply, treatment and reticulation.
- One submission supports the upgrade of the water treatment plant on Cemetery Road.
- Water reticulation and storm water catchments are essential services and more important than developing new sports fields when there are clearly such facilities under utilised such as school grounds. Should be reviewing integration of water catchment areas with suitable stormwater runoff retention.

### Staff analysis:

Staff acknowledge the need to continuously review system and plant performance to ensure standards are met and growth is catered for. Staff believe the Water Services Activity Management Plan provides a sound basis to achieve this.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft LTP.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Water - Quality

### Issues raised from submissions:

A submission was received relating to cyanobacteria and the expectation of more frequent algal blooms. These affect public water supply and recreational use of water. Some algal blooms will have negative health impacts. Sufficient resource has not always been available to advise the public when these blooms occur (e.g. prompt installation of signage). Northland Regional Council asks that WDC address this in its public health and safety role.

### Staff analysis:

WDC are working with Northland Regional Council, Northland District Health Board and the other District Councils to determine a protocol for the management of algal blooms.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

# Solid Waste

DRAFT

## Recycling

### Issues raised from submissions:

Requests to increase the range of materials that are collected for recycling, specifically: batteries, e-waste, tetrapaks and more plastics.

### Staff analysis:

Council is always looking for ways to increase the amount that is recycled however there are limited facilities available for reprocessing materials in New Zealand.

### Staff recommendation:

Council shall continue to look at the options for increasing the range of materials that can be recycled.

That no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Rubbish

### Issues raised from submissions:

Thirteen submissions were received in relation to rubbish. These included requests for:

- Inorganic waste collection
- More regular roadside litter clearance
- Increased rubbish collection during holiday periods
- Extended collection in Takahiwai
- Review of the litter bin decisions at Bream Bay and Oakura

### Staff analysis:

Experience from this District and in other Councils indicates that inorganic collections create more problems than they solve. When the collections occur there is often a lot of uncontrolled dumping of commercial or hazardous waste. Dumping continues throughout the year regardless of advertised times. A lot of litter is created during the collection times. There are no practical restrictions on the amount of material that people dispose of and therefore the costs are difficult to control.

For these reasons WDC provide waste transfer stations throughout the District so that people can drop-off their waste and separate out their recyclables whenever possible.

Litter bins have been removed at the request of local ratepayers groups, generally removing the bins has been regarded positively as it encourages people to manage their own waste.

The current level of service regarding road cleaning or rubbish collection during the holiday period are considered to be high relative to other Districts. Further improvements will be sought under the current contracts.

### Staff recommendation:

No inorganic waste collection should be introduced.

The placement and provision of litter bins is continually under review. No immediate changes are recommended.

Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Transfer stations

### Issues raised from submissions:

Three requests were received in relation to transfer stations. They were:

- One submission requesting the rural transfer station at Parua Bay be moved elsewhere and for further consultation with community
- One submission to extend the opening hours for Uretiti transfer station
- One submission for free/low cost refuse and recycling facilities for visitors

### Staff analysis:

Consultation regarding the Parua Bay Transfer station has been ongoing. However the preferred option is to retain Parua Bay transfer station at its current location.

Summer average rubbish tonnage at Uretiti Transfer Station is 110 tonnes per month. The summer opening hours are 43 hours per week: 8am-1pm weekdays and 8-5pm at the weekend. The average amount of rubbish per hour is approximately 600 kg which equates to between 10 and 20 vehicles per hour. This level of usage is relatively low and does not justify the additional cost of longer opening hours. Tonnage of rubbish collected at the site has been consistent over the last decade.

Extension of the opening hours at rural transfer stations is not believed to be justified at their current level of usage.

### Staff recommendation:

Parua Bay transfer station be retained at its current location, with mitigation for noise and improvements of site layout to help traffic flow.

There is no change to the rural transfer station opening hours.

Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Waste Minimisation

### Issues raised from submissions:

Desire for more to be done regarding waste minimisation including a “zero waste policy”

### Staff analysis:

The Whangarei Waste Management and Minimisation Plan was developed in 2017. A number of actions have been identified which Council is working through to improve the waste management system.

### Staff recommendation:

Council continue to work through the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan with the aim of reducing the amount of waste going to landfill.

Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

# Wastewater

## General

### Issues raised from submissions:

1. Several submissions supported ongoing improvements and upgrades to the sewage system, including specifically:
  - a. upgrades to the Ngunguru, Ruakākā and Waipū wastewater plants
  - b. Parua Bay, particularly Sunset Parade off Ritchie Rd
  - c. Hikurangi
2. Support for improved uptake to the sewer network, particularly for new and sold properties
3. Support for public dump stations
4. Support for improved on-site effluent treatment and regulation
5. Concerns by Tangata Whenua over the culturally inappropriate ocean disposal of effluent at the proposed Ruakaka ocean outfall

### Staff analysis:

1. Upgrades of the sewage network are currently funded in the draft 2018 -2028 Long Term Plan. Specific projects and funding is determined according to a prioritisation process, which includes community engagement.
  - a. Ngunguru, Ruakākā and Waipū wastewater plants – funding approved in the draft 2018 -2028 Long Term Plan
  - b. Parua Bay – part of Wastewater improvements
  - c. Hikurangi – funding approved in the draft 2018 -2028 Long Term Plan
2. Draft changes to the District Plan increase the obligation for new properties to connect to the sewer network where available. Properties being sold are not subject to specific consent changes, although they may require an inspection proving the proper functioning of the on-site treatment system
3. Council's Waste and Drainage team are investigating the installation of new dump stations at priority areas
4. On-site effluent treatment options are provided by the market. Council recognises all options that can achieve compliance with Northland Regional Council rules. Monitoring compliance of on-site treatment systems is currently reactive and carried out by Council's Building Compliance team.
5. The Resource Consent process in relation to the Ruakaka Ocean outfall, requires Council to look at alternatives before committing to its construction. Council is committed to considering alternatives and will look to avoid at best, or defer as far as practical, its construction. Unfortunately land disposal options are impractical for the ultimately forecast projections of increased growth in the area, an ocean outfall is considered the best method available to achieve disposal objectives in the long term at this stage.

**Staff recommendation:**

1. Continue with LTP funded projects. Assess minor wastewater improvement projects as part of normal prioritization process. (Sunset Parade to be assessed as such)
2. Continue with District Plan review. Investigate the possibility of on-site treatment system inspections for properties being sold.
3. Continue investigations into new dump stations.
4. Consider options regarding changes to compliance of on-site treatment system performance
5. Continue communications with Tangata Whenua regarding ocean outfall options analysis and possible pre-treatment.
6. Council note the submissions and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact.



# Storm Water

## Key Issue 1: Storm Water

### Issues raised from submissions:

#### 1. Against

- a. 5 submissions (out of 86 against) thought WDC already spent enough on stormwater
- b. 4 submissions thought that renewals should be a priority
- c. 4 submissions thought that maintenance should be the focus
- d. 2 submissions thought the costs should be borne by beneficiaries (i.e. people living in town as opposed to rural)
- e. 2 submissions thought that better systems of stormwater collection, storage and treatment should be used
- f. 2 submissions thought that funding should be spent on roads

#### 2. For

- a. 51 submissions – efficient infrastructure planning
- b. 25 submissions – protection of the environment
- c. 23 submissions – Climate change impacts
- d. 21 submissions – flooding
- e. 19 submissions – local issues (CRM-type comments)
- f. 8 submissions – population growth

### Staff analysis:

1. Almost all comments were supportive of improved work on the stormwater network, even where they disagreed with the funding. Some comments appeared unclear as to why they voted against extra funding as they were calling for additional stormwater measures such as treatment.
2. Very strong response overall in favour of improved stormwater management. Specific requests for work should go through normal channels as CRMs. A high number of environmental (25) and climate change-specific comments (23 out of 169).

In total, 19 out of 169 stormwater key issue submissions were a local request for service rather than a comment on the draft 2018 -2028 Long Term Plan.

### Staff recommendation:

There is overwhelming support by the community for the funding approved in the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan.

Infrastructure planning, environmental, flooding and population growth issues will be addressed through planning process of the draft 2018 -2028 Long Term Plan.

There is a high level of interest in climate change as an issue for Council which indicates a need for WDC Climate Change Adaptation policy to outline planning and infrastructure risks and opportunities.

Council note the submissions and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

May require consideration of staff resources to develop Climate Change Adaptation policy as well as required data gathering and modelling.

## **Flooding and drainage**

### **Issues raised from submissions:**

1. Numerous submissions made requesting specific minor works investigations and programs, including:
  - a. Webb Road stormwater runoff onto private property
  - b. Fencing stormwater ponds at Highfield Way
  - c. New stormwater drain at Takahiwai
  - d. Upgrade of drainage at Caledonian Park, Waipu
  - e. Improvements to drainage near Kensington Stadium, Russell Road
  - f. Flood prevention on the Hatea Drive
  - g. Drainage improvements in William Jones Drive, Tarairé Crescent and other areas in Otangarei
  - h. Drainage improvements to prevent common flooding issues at Russell Rd, Punuruku (9 submissions)
  - i. Upgrade to stormwater drains at Albany Road, Ruakaka (2 submissions)
  - j. Improvements to Argyle Street drainage
2. Requests for river dredging and/or maintenance, including:
  - a. Oakura – south end of the beach (flood prevention)
  - b. Tidal waterways near Waimahanga Drive, Onerahi (recreational access)
  - c. From Canopy bridge to Hatea Falls (recreation watercraft access).

### **Staff analysis:**

1. Minor works are considered and prioritised as part of our stormwater capital works renewals program, which has received additional funding in the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan.
2. Navigable waterways is generally a Northland Regional Council responsibility. Hence NRC would need to choose to dredge if appropriate.
3. In total, 19 out of 22 flooding and drainage submissions were a local request for service rather than a comment on the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan. These will be managed through Council's normal processes.

### **Staff recommendation:**

1. Submissions will be considered as CRMs (Customer Requests) and investigated through the current assessment processes.
2. Northland Regional Council be advised of the requests.
3. Council note the submissions and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### **Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

Storm Water - General
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One submission made requesting consideration and action on requirements of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.</li> <li>2. Waikato Regional Council requests a contribution of \$10,000/yr for three years to support research into native fish migration through flood control schemes.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is a reference document in the Stormwater Activity Management Plan. Council currently operates the stormwater network in accordance with resource consent conditions, which have discharge contamination requirements. In addition, resource consent conditions are likely to change under the new Northland Regional Plan, requiring more rigorous consideration of environmental contamination.</li> <li>2. WDC supports the research done by Waikato Regional Council as it has relevance to the issues faced by the Hikurangi Swamp Flood Control Scheme. Currently there is negative publicity surrounding the impact of the Hikurangi scheme on tuna (eel) populations. Council is seeking to resolve these issues with our stakeholders, including the allocation of funds in the Infrastructure strategy to replace current pumps with eel-friendly versions.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Waste and Drainage staff are to review the recommendations of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and assess requirements against the Stormwater Activity Management Plan and Improvement Plan. Council must operate the stormwater network as per resource consent conditions, but aim for improved environmental outcomes through the Stormwater Improvement Plan. Funding is under the current stormwater treatment program designed to reduce environmental contaminants from discharges.</li> <li>2. Staff to investigate terms of reference for the WRC project and assess the relevance of the project before committing funds.</li> <li>3. That there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

## Flood Control – Hikurangi Flood Protection Scheme

### Issues raised from submissions:

One submission was received requesting Council to accelerate a plan to replace the existing pumps in all seven pump stations with the Archimedes pumps. These are already in use in the WDC sewerage plant system.

### Staff analysis:

Archimedes pumps do not kill tuna, but do bruise them. They are being considered in other parts of NZ as part of research into tuna care. They are estimated to cost \$2m a pump. There are seven pumps in Hikurangi Swamp.

### Staff recommendation:

1. That an application is submitted for Provincial Growth Fund to replace pumps with Archimedes pumps.
2. Council note the submissions and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

# **Community Facilities and Services**

### Key Issue 3: Community Led Projects

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Submitters raised significant diversity in terms of projects, programmes and initiatives that would be enhanced or realised with increased Community Led Project activity and community funding. Projects ranged from specific site activity to district wide events, community initiatives and larger scale amenity development. From those opposed to increasing the budget for this workstream, the perspective was to concentrate on core infrastructure work as the main rationale. Observations about the future growth of the District's population were apparent in many of the submissions as was the need for Council to provide a key role in supporting community led projects. Submitters appear generally in favour of increasing this workstream and its associated budget, repeatedly noting the value in terms of a sense of ownership and sense of belonging that this approach would encourage. A number submitters advocated for an increase in funding levels as the District must keep up with population growth.

#### Staff analysis:

The response to Key Issue 3 outlined in the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan has been significant with over 430 submissions. Although 69 of the respondents opted not to increase this workstream, more than five times that number (364) supported an increase in Community Led Projects and community funding.

Feedback from the submissions saw several similar themes emerge, notably:

- The value of the Community Led approach and of developing active community participation in the process.
- The need to enhance the attractiveness and ease of access of entrances to the District to make Whangarei more of a destination.
- The value of developing district wide community and recreational activity centres.
- The need to keep up with population growth and avoid loss of momentum.
- The value of increasing the budget for Community Led Projects and community funding beyond the levels outlined in the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Staff recommendation:

To increase Community Led Project and Community Funding Pools in line with the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan and where appropriate beyond that level on a demand/needs basis.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development (CLP): Onerahi Village Planning Group

#### Key Issues:

Submitter identifies several work streams requiring cross departmental activity, notably roading:

- Design led Master Plan for Onerahi
- Beach enhancement/sand replenishment
- Walkways/Cycleways
- Roading improvements, bypass support and parking
- Hub development to provide services in one area on the same side of the road
- Maori culture in the mainstream

#### Staff analysis:

The submission highlights the value of the Community Led Projects approach outlined in the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan that will be used to help guide Council activity in a variety of areas from roading initiatives through to community infrastructure development that help to build a sense of place.

The submitter identifies a number of workstreams requiring cross departmental activity that can be well supported by a design led Master Plan for Onerahi. The submission highlights the value of the Community Led Projects approach outlined in the draft 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan that will be used to help guide Council activity in a variety of areas from roading initiatives through to community infrastructure development that help to build a sense of place.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development (CLP): Takahiwai

#### Key Issues:

There is a need for the critical role of tangata whenua in the development and implementation of community-led projects to be more clearly articulated within the Long-Term Plan. This could be achieved through specific use and reference to Te Aranga or alternative tangata whenua-developed design principles.

#### Staff analysis:

The Community-Led Projects approach forms part of Councils Community Development Framework. As such a critical component is for activity to be driven by energy from within the community. Tangata whenua involvement is therefore essential and use of tangata whenua developed design should be embraced within this workstream whenever appropriate.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact



### Community Development (CLP): Bland Bay Community Centre

#### Key Issues:

Submissions advocate for the construction of a multi-purpose community centre in Whangaruru North (Punipuni Road, Bland Bay) to get underway as it remains a key priority for the community. Although the site has been secured with Council assistance, and funding has been partially successful from external sources, the project is still at a standstill due to lack of funding. The positive community benefits and the breadth of community support, have been documented and presented to Council.

Submissions request that Whangarei District Council provide a grant to the Whangaruru North Residents and Ratepayers Association for \$125,000 for the Community Centre, to be allocated Year 1 within the draft 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Staff analysis:

Staff acknowledge the submission. Bland Bay Community Centre could be considered along with other project requests, through a community led development project to support the feasibility/planning work.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development (CLP): Parua Bay

#### Key Issues:

Submitter requests ongoing assistance to complete community endorsed projects and ongoing council community plans including implementing the Reserve Plan adjacent to the community centre.

#### Staff analysis:

The submission highlights the value of the Community Led Projects approach outlined in the draft 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan that will be used to help guide Council activity in a variety of areas from roading initiatives through to community infrastructure development that help to build a sense of place. However, the number of communities requesting financial support exceeds planned funding. Prioritisation criteria will need to be developed, noting Parua Bay has already benefited from village planning investment.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Community Development – Funding: Marae as community facilities

### Key Issues:

Three submission were received in relation to marae usage as community facilities and their importance. Wider community uses include: civil defence emergency centres, war memorial commemorations and social and health service centres.

Specific actions requested through the LTP could include:

- Initiation of a Council-funded needs analysis of both physical and the organisational infrastructure of all marae in the Whangarei District
- The establishment of a marae development fund to contribute to the development and maintenance of marae in Whangarei District. This could be funded through targeted rates
- The provision of in-kind support from Council to assist marae to manage their assets and built internal capacity
- Direct contribution from Council will also enable marae to meet co-funding requirements from other funders such as Foundation North
- Funding for war memorial hall on a marae at Takahiwai

### Staff analysis:

The inclusion of a marae development fund was considered by Council in 2016 as part of an initial review of community funding and declined. However, Council was willing to consider assistance to Marae used for Civil Defence purpose. As proposed in the draft 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan, increases in budget for community-led projects and community funding will enable Council to support the community to a greater extent. The proposed new funding strategy would remove existing barriers for Marae to apply for funding from Council.

### Staff recommendation:

Council note the submissions and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Community Development – Project Funding

### Key Issues:

37 submissions were received from community groups requesting funding for various projects. These included

- Jack Morgan Museum (request funding part time employee and assistance with advertising)
- Rolling Ball Clock
  - Submitter is seeking funding of \$20k immediately \$300k in outer years
- Whangarei Museum and Heritage Trust
  - Kiwi House \$500k
  - Clarke Homestead \$100k
- Whangarei Youth Space (\$100k annually)
- House of magic and dreams
- Community hub for elderly and disabled in Whangarei
- Ruakaka beach ambassador programme (no specific value supplied)
- Ruakaka Recreation Centre (\$2.17mil spread over years 1-3)
- SPCA (as much as possible, but ideally 1/3 of operating costs (operating costs being circa \$1m annually)

### Staff analysis:

As proposed in the LTP, increases in budget for community-led already funding projects and community funding will enable Council to support the community to a greater extent. The proposed new funding strategy would remove existing barriers to apply for funding from Council.

### Staff recommendation:

Council note the submissions and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development – Safety: CCTV requests

#### Key Issues:

Three locational requests for CCTV have been received for:

- Whangarei Men's shed
- Russel Road and Quarry Gardens
- Kamo

#### Staff analysis:

The value of CCTV in the City Centre has already been demonstrated through supporting of criminal convictions, reduction of anti-social behavior and for influencing where undesirable activity takes place. Some communities outside the City limits have undertaken their own fundraising initiatives to establish a level of CCTV coverage, though its effectiveness is yet to be established. Where possible Council will be expanding its CCTV coverage as indicated by the LTP, but individual organisations and groups should be encouraged to manage their own security arrangement as far as possible.

#### Staff recommendation:

That Council notes the submission and supports CCTV initiatives that align with current plans as per the LTP.

That there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development – Community Halls

#### Key Issues:

Two Submissions were received requesting funding for maintenance and improvements at the Ruatangata Hall.

#### Staff analysis:

The majority of community halls in the District are not Council owned; those that fall outside Council ownership can apply to other funders for support.

However, the value of Community halls is recognised as an important element for community cohesion and creating a sense of place. Council provides support to the many community-owned halls in the District through the Community Halls Fund and by providing free, professional building assessments on a no-obligation basis. Increases in Community Funding as indicated in the LTP and more flexibility around funding criteria would enable Council to consider providing additional financial support where needed, alongside building capacity and capability within these community groups.

#### Staff recommendation:

To increase Community Funding levels as indicated in the LTP

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development – General: Tutukaka

#### Key Issues:

- One submission was received requesting a plan to maximise the opportunities available to the Tutukaka community. The request covered a broad range of amenities and services to progress the community as a place to live and a place to visit.

#### Staff analysis:

Submitter identifies a number of workstreams requiring cross departmental activity that can be well supported by a design led Master Plan for Tutukaka. The submission highlights the value of the Community Led Projects approach outlined in the LTP that will be used to help guide Council activity in a variety of areas from roading initiatives through to community infrastructure development that help to build a sense of place.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Community Development – General: The role of tangata whenua

#### Key Issues:

There is a need for the critical role of tangata whenua in the development and implementation of community-led projects to be more clearly articulated within the Long-Term Plan. This could be achieved through specific utilisation and reference to Te Aranga or alternative tangata whenua-developed design principles.

#### Staff analysis:

The Community-Led Projects approach forms part of Councils Community Development Framework. As such a critical component is for activity to be driven by energy from within the community. Tangata Whenua involvement is therefore essential and utilisation of tangata whenua developed design should be embraced within this workstream whenever appropriate.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Community Development – General: Other

### Key Issues:

- Otangarei remains a problematic part of Whangarei. Culturally, politically and economically.
- Can we please have a drive through postal box in Kamo. Suggest back wall of post shop.

### Staff analysis:

- Otangarei is one of the District's more complex communities. Low socio-economic factors are balanced by many members within the community that working hard for and who are proud of the area. These individuals and groups should be encouraged to work together more in order to achieve positive outcomes for Otangarei.
- Drive through postbox - A drive through postal box request should be passed to NZ Post.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact.

## Community Property: General

### Key Issues:

17 submissions were received in relation to community property. Many articulated a concern that the funding made available to maintain community property, was below that needed to ensure these facilities remained operational. They supported a major increase in funding for community-owned buildings (comments were not considered on the key issue: community led projects).

Particular requests were made for the following properties:

- 116 Bank Street (\$22k to upgrade mens toilet and fire door)
- Kamo hall ceiling (\$10k)
- Tamaterau hall (\$10K to add a heat pump, under-sink mains pressure water heater be installed and men's toilets be upgraded)
- Old BNZ building, Hikurangi (provisions requested to preserve building and make it available for the use of small community groups)
- Hikurangi community library (request for funding to renovate building)
- Ruakaka library extension

Other proposals for future venues were also received:

- 12 submissions in support of a larger theatre or concert venue Funded NZSL learning and NZSL interpreters for community events
- Request for a boutique cinema and a sound shell

### Staff analysis:

Community facilities are recognised as important elements for community cohesion and creating a sense of place. Council provides 11 such community facilities in several areas within our District.

These Council-owned facilities require capital investment by Council to maintain the integrity of the buildings and to upgrade them to meet Health and Safety and accessibility requirements. Roof replacements, kitchen and bathroom replacements and accessibility have been identified as priority one works. Total cost of known upgrades and repairs are \$960,000 over 10 years.

### Staff recommendation:

Funding may need to be brought forward and the property budget be increased by \$540,000 in the next long term plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

Venues and Events: Toll Stadium
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>Two submissions were received in relation to events at Toll stadium. In particular requests for more events such as Six60 and better usage of the facility during the winter months.</p> <p>One submission supported the replacement of facility lighting given their age and the growth and prominence of events now held at the stadium.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Submissions will be considered as we develop a new event strategy.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

Venues and Events: Capitaine Bougainville
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>Two submission were received requesting council to invest in new technical capacity in the Capitaine Bougainville to enable films to be screened there in digital format.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Any further investment should be postponed until an outcome for the Civic Centre project have been decided – noting its impact on Forum North and a potential new theatre.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Council notes the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

Venues and Events: Cricket Oval
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>One submission received relating to the glare from cricket oval fence into my living room is unacceptable.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>This venue is managed by the Northland Cricket Association.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>That Council note the submission and refer the submission to Northland Cricket Association.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>



## Venues and Events: Hundertwasser

### Issues raised from submissions:

- Support Hundertwasser Center and build information centre on highway 1
- I am not sure why the Hundertwasser Centre is any way funded by Council! This should be an entirely private matter – especially given the amount needed for basic infrastructure works recorded in this plan. I find it problematic that this kind of building has any Council support since, from what I have seen, the numbers don't add up in terms of visitors. At the same time, it is apparent that the Whangarei Art Museum is badly in need of funding. The Council needs to rethink its commitment to this scheme.
- The town basin is not a proper location for the Hundertwasser and the cost will be grossly excessive. The focus should be on maritime history

### Staff analysis:

Staff acknowledge the submission. The Hundertwasser project is proceeding with Building Consent granted and funding secured. Noting that Councils contribution is less than 15% of the cost to build.

### Staff recommendation:

Council note the submissions and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

Venues and Events: Other
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>Several submissions were received in relation to desires to have more facilities available to the community. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuia 250 commemorations           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Te Au Mārie Trust submits that the Whangarei District Council make provision for resources in support of community engagement for the Taitokerau Northland events and infrastructure planned around the Tuia 250 commemorations of 2019. Te Au Mārie Trust's plans for events are already lodged with the Council. It is hoped that other community organisations will be encouraged to become engaged</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Whangarei Sculpture Symposium           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Whangarei Sculpture Symposium is a biennial event delivered by Creative Northland on behalf of Whangarei District Council. This event is held on the Hihiaua Peninsula between the Hihiaua Cultural Centre and the Waka Wave Sculpture. For the future of any event on this site and to ensure the grounds remain in tack after an event, we ask council to assign budget to review the costs and implement a ground water system that enables good drainage to this site for future events to take place.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Staff consider it vital to support a wide range of events and venues across the district. To enable this, our team will be completing an Events Strategy where these issues can be considered</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Consider the issues raised through the review of the Events Strategy.</p> <p>Council note the submission and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

Parks and Recreation: Cemeteries
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>Two submissions were received supporting the purchase of land in the Ruakaka area for a cemetery.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>The need for a cemetery in this area has been identified in the Parks and Reserves Asset Management Plan and approximately \$1.8m is provided for in Yr8 of the draft LTP. The next step is to identify suitable land i.e. good drainage and low water table, soils that will maintain stability during excavation, is reasonably separated from residential and industrial land and has reasonable road access. Council staff can then approach land owners and discuss purchasing land.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Council staff review the Ruakaka area for land suitable for a cemetery.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

## Coastal Protection and structures

### Issues raised from submissions:

24 submissions were received relating to coastal protection and structures. The main requests made by submitters are as follows:

- Show commitment to secure and protect the remainder of the Ngunguru sandspit
- Maintain and develop the Ngunguru foreshore to include walking paths, picnic spots, and trailer parking
- Takahiwai area should be developed with mangroves to clean storm water and floodwater
- Coastal protection measures are required along Wharf Road, Whananaki and Princes Road, Ruakaka
- Protection of infrastructure along the Lower Hatea River from sea level rising
- Support to find a solution to the One Tree Point West cliff erosion
- Improve safety of the One Tree Point boat ramp
- Any new seawalls or groins in the One Tree Point area need to consider the cultural landscape including sites of significance mahinga kai/ mataitai and access.
- Implementation of Onerahi Beach enhancement/replenishment.

**Staff analysis:**

- The remaining Sandspit land is in private ownership and there is no funding in the LTP for this type of purchase. The nature of the request is more in the realm of DOC as the main focus is wildlife protection.
- Foreshore protection in this area has either been renewed or is in the process of renewal. Amenity options are being scoped and are subject to funding. Trailer parking is catered for at the Tutukaka marina area, additional seasonal parking at the Tutukaka Green site is under consideration.
- There are many options for improving storm water quality and mangroves may be one of these options.
- Council's Coastal Erosion Protection Policy is to protect community infrastructure such as road. Council will monitor this area and will install coastal protection structures if required to retain the roads. Coastal protection programmes are revised every LTP to reassess priorities. Princess Road has been identified as a priority with works forecast for the 2018/19 year.
- Council's Coastal Erosion Protection Policy is to protect community infrastructure and for this reason as projects are developed along the Lower Hatea River consideration to increasing the height of seawalls is considered.
- The One Tree Point erosion protection strategy will consider solutions for the cliffs in this area.
- There is currently LTP funding for Groynes at the One Tree Point boat ramp to improve the safety of the facility.
- As part of the development of the One Tree Point erosion protection strategy Council is consulting with Iwi/Hapu to ensure cultural values are considered.
- Onerahi foreshore area enhancements are not currently funded in the LTP.

**Staff recommendation:**

1. Council staff continue to work with the community on Ngunguru foreshore amenity improvements.
2. Council staff continue to collaborate with Northland Regional Council and other stakeholders on storm water quality management in the Takahiwai area.
3. Council staff continue with the coastal protection programme including continuously reviewing priorities.
4. Council notes the other submissions and no changes are made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact.

Dog Exercise Facilities
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>A small number of submitters requested;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Completion of the Dog park, Dave Culham Drive particularly fencing</li> <li>○ More Dog Parks</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Increase in levels of service regarding Dog Park fencing happen in the next few weeks, prior to the LTP. Diamond mesh 900mm high will be attached to the base of the current fence, aiming to make dog park more secure for small dogs.</p> <p>Funding in place to provide more shade at the dog park and funding in place for 2018/2019 year to improve the drainage at the park. There is a number of trees at the dog park that in time will provide more shade. There is potential to plant more trees, but ground conditions and the clay cap restrict what can be planted.</p> <p>There are no plans to improve accessibility for disabled people or fence the park into separate areas. Dog bags are provided at the dog park, but there are no plans to provide bags at other dog exercise locations around the city as it is considered the owner's responsibility to provide their own bags.</p> <p>There are no plans for new dog parks.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council staff monitor the need for additional Dog parks.</li> <li>2. Council notes the submissions and no changes are made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

## Parks and Recreation – General

### Issues raised from submissions:

Many submissions covering multiple topics were received:

- Provide additional support to the Parua Bay recreation ground development plan
- Funding to support Oakura Wetland park
- Ensure the proposed Tutukaka Reserve Management Plan provides for the status quo including providing for over flow car parking
- Ensure parks provide for people across all ages
- Up-grade Maddren Reserve
- Support for the Blue-Green network
- Provide additional shade at Lake Waro e.g. shade structure estimated to cost \$25,500
- Northland Regional Council encourages WDC to identify areas suitable for tree planting and work together to make an application to the Provincial Growth Fund
- Continue to develop the Town Basin
- Against the car park to park project as it will reduce car parking
- Not supportive of the Mander Park whale entrance sculptures and would like the water fountains at this park re-established.
- Would like the addition of more water fountains along key walking routes
- Shackleton Sea Scouts wish to retain a suitable site with water access at Pohe Island

### Staff analysis:

In Yr2 Council has provided \$85k for upgrade work (drainage) of existing Parua Bay sports fields, and Yr5 funding for sports land acquisition \$1.1M however this is for Parua Bay/ Springs Flat. This funding is insufficient for both projects. The Springs Flat funding was to purchase additional car parking to support the new fields. Car parking issues are being managed at Springs Flat and the funding could be fully committed to purchase additional land at the Parua Bay growth node and support the Village Planning already undertaken by council.

A wetland design for the Oakura Recreation reserve was completed several years ago for the lessee of this land to pursue. No progress was made, but with a new committee of the Whangaruru Community and Sports Association, interest has been rekindled. This project would greatly enhance the reserve and aid in water polishing of the stormwater from this catchment (which includes council's sewerage system) before it enters the Whangaruru Harbour. A review of the design and a study of benefits and likely cost is required before council can assess what support it may wish to give. There is no funding in the LTP for this project.

Development of the Tutukaka Green Reserve Management plan is currently underway. The outcome of the Plan will depend on the submissions received from the wider public.

When developing Parks in the District Council considers the abilities of all ages e.g. Hatea Loop and Pohe Island developments. However, some existing Parks may not provide universal access to all abilities. As these Parks are renewed improvements will be made where practicable.

Maddren Reserve improvements are not currently budgeted for in the LTP.

Funding for the Blue-Green network is currently provided for in the LTP but it is insufficient to do all of the work.

Lake Waro Reserve improvements including a shade structure are not currently provided for in the LTP.

There are several sites that could be suitable for tree planting such as the de-forested areas of Parihaka and Whau valley dam areas as well as many esplanade reserves. Council staff can work directly with NRC should they wish to make an application to the PGF.

Council plans to continue developing and improving the Town Basin with several new projects e.g. Carpark to Park and renewal projects that are included in the LTP.

Mander Park drinking fountain was vandalized and will be replaced this financial year.

More Drinking Fountains – apart from funding, you need a water source close by, so many places are not feasible. With close by water source a new drinking fountain would be \$3 K to \$4K. Funding for new drinking fountains are not provided for in the LTP.

The Pohe Island RMP and Master Plan provides for the Shackleton Sea Scouts in a proposed marine hub near where they are currently located.

**Staff recommendation:**

1. Council continues with the development of the draft Tutukaka Green Reserve Management Plan.
2. That the \$1.1M sports land purchase Parua Bay/ Springs Flat in Yr5 be amended to Parua Bay only.
3. Council notes all other submissions and that no changes are made to the 2018-2028 draft Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

## Parks and Recreation: Walkways and Tracks

### Issues raised from submissions:

A small number of submitters suggest the following:

- Clean up the Waimahanga and Gull walking tracks and install interpretation signage
- Complete the Puna Rere walkway, Otangarei project
- General support for track up-grades
- General support for mountain bike tracks

### Staff analysis:

The Waimahanga Track (Boswell Track) has very good access for walkers but 500m at the Waimahanga Road end is currently inadequate for cyclists. It requires upgrade to bring this section up to shared path standard. NZTA funding can support this work but currently there is no funding allocated for this improvement. There is no funding allocated to remove any weeds outside the 1m strip maintained under the Walking Track Maintenance Contract.

The 'Gull Track' is approximately 200m long has been developed by enthusiastic locals and leads from the Boswell Track to the harbour water edge along the route of the former railway. Vegetation control could be adopted by WDC as a variation to the Walking Tracks Maintenance Contract if this is seen as a priority. Interpretative and directional signage would be possible. There is no funding for these variations to the maintenance contract in the LTP.

Puna Rere walkway was originally funded from the Otangarei Village Plan and is now included in the Walking Tracks Maintenance Contract although work is still being undertaken to bring it up to an appropriate standard.

Appreciate the support for Walking Track improvements.

Parks are entering a Contract for Services with the Whangarei Mountain Bike Club for them to maintain these tracks. The Club believe that they can undertake the work to a higher standard and achieve better facilities by using club members to undertake some of the work.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and no changes are made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact



## Parks and Recreation: Sports Facilities

### Issues raised from submissions:

A large number of submissions covering multiple topics relating to sports facilities were received. They have been classified below:

#### Requests relating to current developments:

1. Support for the continued investment in Otaika Sports fields and for considering developing it as a sports hub for southern Whangarei.

#### Requests relating to projects included in the draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028:

1. Converting the Whangarei Golf Club into 9-holes and use the remainder for sports fields
2. 32 submitters support the proposed investment in the Northland Football Hub at Tikipunga Sports Complex
3. Support for the investment proposed in the new "Kensington Park" and a request to bring this forward as well as continuing to purchase properties around the existing Kensington Park to increase its capacity
4. Request for assistance in relocating Old Boys Marist Rugby Club to Pohe Island
5. Request for improved sports fields lighting, drainage and toilet facilities at Fishbone Park
6. Support for the proposed investment in a hard court at Whangaruru and a request to bring this project forward
7. Request from Ngunguru Football Club to up-grade their fields

#### Requests relating to projects not currently included in the draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028:

1. Turn the ex-Countdown building Kensington into an indoor sports facility
2. Request for a permanent gymnastics facility at Whangarei heads/Parua Bay
3. 31 Submissions supporting a proposed contribution towards Trigg Arena's long term maintenance
4. Support for the investment in all the Pohe Island projects especially the bike/rugby facility
5. Whangarei Netball Centre request support for refurbishing their facility and feasibility of re-developing their site
6. Fix the heating in the Whangarei pool and consideration of partnerships with WDC/MOE for pool provision across the District
7. Whangarei Hockey has requested that the replacement of their turf be brought forward to year 1 of the LTP and a 4<sup>th</sup> turf be planned for year 2022/2023 with a \$1.1M WDC contribution

**Staff analysis:**Requests relating to current developments:

1. Current development at Otaika Sports park will provide 3 new fields and 1 upgraded field with training lights. There is no further funding in the LTP for more development.

Requests relating to projects included in the draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028:

1. Council acknowledges that Kensington Park is at capacity, and is looking to add to the active sport provision especially in the central/north area of the city. The council proposes provision of \$10m in this LTP for such an acquisition in Yr10
2. At Tikipunga field upgrades totaling \$640k are proposed for Yr2 along with the Football hub building feasibility \$50k. Proposed seed funding of \$450k for the Football Hub building at Tikipunga is in year 3 along with \$30k for sports lighting design, with installation the following year with funding of \$620k
3. Council currently proposes funding for a new urban park in Yr10. If the opportunity arises earlier Council may need to bring this forward
4. Old Boys Marist requested \$500k to assist with their relocation from Okara Park to Pohe Island. Council already has a grant commitment of \$450k this financial year that will be carried forward.
5. Proposed funding for lights at Fishbone Park (Otangarei Sportspark), is provided in years 5 and 6, \$10k and \$290k respectively. Drainage works at Central Reserve Otangarei are proposed in year 6, and Toilets at Fishbone Park Yr1
6. A hard-court development at Oakura is proposed for years 7 and 8 with funding of \$30k and \$170K respectively. This project can be swapped with Hard Court to Multi-Court Yr4 and Yr5. The location of the Hard Court to Multi-Court can be considered as part of the Recreation Strategy
7. Primary drainage work for Ngunguru football fields is proposed for year 5

Requests relating to projects not currently included in the draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028:

The seven projects that have been identified and not included in the Long-Term Plan will be considered for inclusion in the recreation strategy currently being developed by council. There is currently no funding available to support these projects.

**Staff recommendation:**

1. Bring hockey turf replacement forward to year 1 from year 2 and await recommendations from Recreation Strategy before committing to fourth turf development.
2. Swap the Oakura hard court project (Yr7 and Yr8) with Hard Court to Multi-Court (Yr4 and Yr5) and no changes to budget amounts.
3. That Council reviews sports facility priorities once the Recreation Strategy is adopted and make any necessary changes as part of the next LTP development.
4. Council notes the remaining submissions and no changes are made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

Impact of bringing \$300k hockey turf replacement forward to Yr1 from Yr2.

No impact overall.

Parks and Recreation: Sports Facilities – Ruakaka / Waipu
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>A number of submissions covering multiple topics relating to sports facilities were received from the Ruakaka - Waipu area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Request for an Aquatic Centre in the Ruakaka area</li> <li>○ 68 submitters support the proposed investment in sports fields in Ruakaka</li> <li>○ 90 submitters want Council to support a new multipurpose recreation facility planned for Ruakaka and provision of a 1/3 seed funding</li> <li>○ Request for support towards Waipu Croquet Club new clubrooms</li> <li>○ Request for Council to purchase land for recreational use in the Waipu area e.g. land near Nova Scotia Drive/Waipu River</li> <li>○ Request for a youth activity zone for Waipu</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>There is no funding in the LTP for a Ruakaka Aquatic Centre.</p> <p>Development of two new sports fields are programmed for Yr1 and Yr2 with proposed funding of \$900k and \$400k respectively.</p> <p>New Request for one third seed funding toward new facility planned for the Tiki Place Reserve, Ruakaka. There is no funding for this project in the LTP. The need for such a facility will be considered as part of the Recreation Strategy currently being scoped.</p> <p>New Request which may be able to be referred to Community Grants.</p> <p>The Recreation Strategy along with the Open Space strategy planned in Yr1 will indicate need for additional recreation land in this area.</p> <p>Funding of \$115k is provided in Yr2 for a youth activity zone for Waipu (under Community Amenities budget).</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council reviews Ruakaka/Waipu sports facility priorities once the Recreation Strategy is finalised and make any necessary changes as part of the next LTP development.</li> <li>2. Council notes all submissions and that no changes are made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

Parks and Recreation: Playgrounds and skate parks
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b></p> <p>A small number of submissions requested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Playgrounds at Parua Bay, Maungakarama, Oakura, and Ruakaka (pre-school),</li> <li>○ Youth activity zones at Hikurangi (renewal), Otangarei, and Kamo</li> <li>○ Amenities to support playgrounds such as drinking fountains, splash pads, and shade</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Council is required to match funding from the Children's Home for the Tikipunga playground. This has resulted in a change to the playground programme being amended to Tikipunga (gifted land from Children's Home) Y1, Tutukaka Green (subject to the Reserve Management Plan outcome) Y4 and Onerahi Y6 and Raumanga Yr9. The major change being Onerahi being changed from Y1 to Yr6.</p> <p>The Ruakaka Recreation ground playground was renewed this financial year and it provides for a range of ages including pre-school. There is no funding allocated in the LTP for new playgrounds at Parua Bay, Maungakarama, Oakura, Ruakaka (pre-school).</p> <p>The Maungakarama community are working towards developing their own playground. Funding is provided for in the LTP to renew the Hikurangi (Lake Waro) skate park in Yr3.</p> <p>There is \$115k funding for youth activity zones (described as Community Amenities in LTP) in Yr2, Yr4 and Yr6. The current programme is Waipu, Kamo, and Otangarei.</p> <p>Provision of shade sails and drinking fountains can be considered as playgrounds are renewed or newly built.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new playground programme be Tikipunga, Tutukaka Green (subject to outcome of RMP), Onerahi (Yr1, Yr4, Yr6)</li> <li>2. The Youth Activity Zones (described as Community Amenities in the LTP) programme be Waipu, Kamo, Otangarei in Yr2, Yr4, Yr6.</li> <li>3. Council notes all other submissions and that no changes are made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

# **Governance and Strategy**

## Democracy and Assurance

### Key Issues

Several submissions were made in relation to democracy services and the draft LTP consultation process. These included:

- Video link all Council meetings
- Have mics at all Councillors desk in the chambers with sound system to public area
- Sign langue at public meetings
- The wording of the online feedback form directs the respondent towards a response and excludes other choice preferences. As a feedback mechanism to extract public opinion, the process is therefore flawed
- Consideration of a Waipu Community Board for community-led infrastructure development.

### Staff analysis:

The ability to webcast public meetings was approved by Council and is included in Council's Standing Orders. The installation of audio-visual equipment in Council Chambers has been considered but budget has not been allocated towards upgrading the Council Chambers due to the planned new Civic Centre.

Council acknowledges Sign Language as an official language of New Zealand. Council staff require prior communication that a Sign Language interpreter is required for a meeting. Interpreters are paid by Council for their services. Interpreters are not needed to be present at every meeting but can be arranged when required. Council staff has also considered a Video Interpreting Service but this would require upgrading the audio-visual equipment in Council Chambers which is pending due to the planned new Civic Centre.

The LTP Consultation Document including the submissions form is governed by the provisions of the Local Government Act which sets the content and form of the Consultation Document. The Consultation Document must identify the key issues, the options and implications for addressing the issue, Council's proposal for addressing the issue and the consequences for proceeding with the proposal. The Consultation Document is used to provide an effective basis to consult with the public on the issues contained in the document. The Consultation Document was extensively audited by Audit NZ prior to consultation with the public. Audit NZ was satisfied that Council's statutory obligations in respect of the Consultation Document were met.

Waipu Community Board – Council is currently undertaking a community representation review which looks at how communities will be represented on council. Consultation will be undertaken on two options. Neither of which include community boards.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and no changes be made.

### Impact on LTP of staff recommendation (Financial and non-financial):

There is no impact on the LTP as recommendations to the submissions made are dependent on the Civic Centre project.

## Strategy: Biosecurity

### Issues raised from submissions:

- Submitter asks that WDC supports Northland Regional Council's marine biosecurity standards.
- Northland Regional Council is proposing an increase in pest management activity to move toward an aspirational vision of a 'pest free Northland', and asks that WDC supports Northland Regional Council in this.
- WDC to plan to be an active partner and supporter of long term pest management goals, including actively managing WDC land to control introduced pests, and to work toward pest-free urban spaces in Whangarei city, in collaboration with other stakeholders.
- Northland Regional Council would also like WDC to consider in their LTP supporting the establishment of an 'Environment Hub' for environmentally focused community groups and local organisations to use as a central base, facilitating cross-group and cross-organisational support.

### Staff analysis:

WDC currently undertakes or supports several environmental programmes which support biosecurity and pest management.

WDC is also encouraged by Northland Regional Council's proposal to increase pest management activity align with 'pest Free Northland'

An environmental hub was proposed to Council in August 2017. Further investigation work is required on the feasibility of such a hub along with stakeholder investigation

### Staff recommendation:

Biosecurity is the role of Northland Regional Council and outside of WDC's jurisdiction.

WDC undertakes a feasibility work for an environmental hub with stakeholder groups including Northland Regional Council to ascertain costs and benefits of an environmental hub

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

Continued support of environmental programmes already included in operational expenditure.

Environment hub feasibility covered in existing operational budget. Any future capital expenditure is not budget for as costs are unknown.

## Strategy: City Centre Plan

### Issues raised from submissions:

- Submitter requests funding support to implement their Bank Street revitalisation plan. There is no specific Bank Street budget.
- Council will have to continue to provide assistance to the central business district to continue its revitalization so that pedestrians are attracted into the area and the retail sector in particular can prosper..
- We did the easter steam train ride. Seeing the back of inner city buildings was a shock. Development of the inner core has to happen.
- Develop the Lower Dent Street/Hihiaua area as a shared space environment. Under the "Positive about the Future outcome" and "Getting setup for the future issue" possibly as a "community-led project".
- Support the recreational use of the Loop, Hihiaua Cultural centre, and the development of an innovative Business and Education precinct, including research capacity.
- Currently, it is a combination of light industrial and mixed-use (including our Kura). The increasing presence of heavy traffic using Herekino Street and Lower Dent Street as a thoroughfare is causing an unpleasant, unsafe environment for all users.
- A shared space, that is beautified would be ideal and add considerably to the amenity of the area.

### Staff analysis:

The LTP contains budget to begin to implement capital projects. Opex costs have also been included to proceed with precinct plans and urban design work to support the implementation of the City Centre Plan.

There is potential to use tactical urbanism to support shared space opportunities throughout the city centre including Hihiaua

### Staff recommendation:

1. Staff consider shared space development in Hihiaua as part of tactical urbanism opportunities and the implementation of the Hihiaua Precinct Plan.
2. Council note the submissions and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact.



**Strategy: City densification and inner city residential**
**Issues raised from submissions:**

City densification and inner city residential should be high on WDC priorities. This produces cost savings in so many areas, and has multiple flow-on effects for economic, social and cultural indicators.

I strongly oppose the sprawling growth in housing towards Whangarei heads and other rural areas and wish to see well planned medium and high density housing encouraged within a 400metre radius of the urban and suburban centres (Onerahi Kamo, Hikurangi etc.) that can enhance urban living and better public transport.

**Staff analysis:**

The City Centre Plan, City Core Precinct Plan and the Urban Review for the District Plan are aligned in enabling and encouraging higher density residential and mixed use development in our city centre

**Staff recommendation:**

1. Continue with the City Centre Plan implementation and support of the Urban Review of the District Plan.
2. Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

## Strategy: Climate Change

### Issues raised from submissions:

Several points were raised during the consultation process relating to climate change:

- A consequence of Climate Change is the progressive sea level rise, which will compound the flooding risk by increasing the base water level and reducing the rate at which flood water will recede.
- Climate change should be recognised in the LTP as the major determining factor for the future of this district. Future impacts of climate change be assessed and reported upon (cultural, environmental, economic and social)
- Development of a contingency plan for sea level rise. The Central business district of Whangarei is at risk of severe flooding when a worst case combination of the following factors occurs; king tide, heavy rain storm, low pressure due to storm or strong easterly on-shore wind
- Prudent for the Whangarei District Council to develop a contingency plan that could be implemented if Sea Level Rise turns out to be significantly more rapid than is currently predicted.
- An engineering investigation project should be initiated to assess the feasibility and cost of building a barrage across the lower Hatea River
- Increase public awareness of the impacts of climate change
- Support received for the development of a climate change strategy.
- Energy resilience is another aspect that together with Northland Regional Council and Northpower, the Council should be addressing in the Long Term Plan. Northland is at the end of the transmission line vulnerable to extreme weather events. The future is in local renewable regeneration/distribution systems rather than the existing large central grid system.

### Staff analysis:

WDC is currently drafting a two-part Climate Change Strategy. Part 1 is a corporate climate change policy which looks at how our organization operates and policies to make it more resource efficient. Part 2 is a climate change adaptation strategy.

Our adaptation strategy will consider issues raised in submissions, including flood risk for our central business district. This may result in recommended actions for continued investment in flood protection. However funds are limited. It should also align with the proposed Climate Change Adaptation Strategy to be developed by Northland Regional Council and any further Government Policy Statement on Climate Change and the Zero Carbon Act (being developed by central government).

Our climate change strategy will also further support the implementation of the Blue Green Network Strategy, particularly in relation to city centre flood protection.

Hapu will be key stakeholders for our climate change strategy and will therefore be appropriately consulted through the project.

### Staff recommendation:

Continue to develop the WDC Climate Change Strategy taking into consideration points raised through submissions.

Include a statement in the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan which articulates our position on Climate Change and our commitment to complete and implement a Climate Change Strategy.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

Strategy: GE/GMO Free	
<b>Issues raised from submissions:</b>	Several submissions were received in relation to GE/GMO usage in Whangarei District. Specifically, submitters requested that the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policy retained and strengthened in the current LTP. Wording amendments were also requested to include opposition/ concerns about risky new genetic technologies (proponents - including some who hold patents- want these risky new technologies to be used out of doors).
<b>Staff analysis:</b>	WDC supports a GE/GMO free Northland, including continued work through RMA appeals
<b>Staff recommendation:</b>	WDC continues to support a GE/GMO free Northland and a statement to this effect is included in the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.
<b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial):</b>	No impact

## Strategy: District Growth

### Issues raised from submissions:

Several submissions were made in relation planning for growth within the district.

Some submissions had concerns as follows:

- That the proposed Whangarei District Council's 2018-28 Long Term Plan did not adequately caters for the current, and forecast, rapid growth and urban development that has, and is occurring in Ruakaka.
- That Council staff still arbitrarily classify the whole District into either a City or a Rural sector. This classification is outdated and ignores the overall composition of the District.

Other submissions were received in relation to the following:

- Requests for separate Urban classification to planning
- Council to reduce its support for the Marsden/Ruakaka urban area expansion
- We need future planning based on sound statistics
- Planning for Whangarei should include tourism plans as well.

### Staff analysis:

The Whangarei District Growth Model 2017, which supports the LTP is based on Statistics New Zealand's most recent population projections. The Statistics New Zealand population projects is recognized as the most accurate data source for projecting population changes and is commonly used across Local Governments in New Zealand.

However, it is acknowledged that we will need to wait until the 2018 Census results are released before we get an accurate update picture of our current population, which may then in turn lead to changes to the Statistics New Zealand population projects. Any significant change may require amendments to the LTP which could be achieved through an Annual Plan if necessary or factored in to the next LTP in 2021.

While growth is currently strong and is expected to remain so, it was weak until 2015 resulting in planned infrastructure not being required for many years after.

Marsden Point/Ruakaka remains a crucial growth area for our district and plays an important role in ensuring we have enough housing capacity to meet growing demand. Growth in this area has been planned through the Marsden Point / Ruakaka Structure Plan.

### Staff recommendation:

WDC updates the Whangarei District Growth Model when the 2018 Census Data is released.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact.

## Strategy: Housing and related issues

### Issues raised from submissions:

Several submissions were received in relation to housing and related issues: It was submitted that Council should:

- Petition Central Government for increased funding to provide more affordable housing and special housing areas, and/or
- Enter into a public/private partnership with developers to provide affordable rental housing
- More should be done to connect its spending and investment priorities to ensure that everyone in the district has a decent place to live
- Develop and implement a strategy to increase the supply of low cost housing into its LTP.

### Staff analysis:

Staff recognise the importance of housing affordability. However social housing is clearly a central government responsibility funded by the taxpayer rather than the ratepayer.

Within our scope as a territorial authority, staff consider that the best way to assist in housing affordability is to ensure that we have enough land available for housing developments, regulation that enables and provides for housing choice and proactive relationship with housing developers and social housing providers.

To ensure this happens, WDC should continue with its Urban Review of the District Plan and its compliance with the Housing Capacity requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

### Staff recommendation:

To support improved housing affordability, staff recommend:

- continued support for the Urban Review of the District
- compliance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
- continued developer friendly customer service through the District Development Landing Pad and Resource Consent Pre-Application Meetings

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Strategy: Papakāinga

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Two submissions were received in reference to papakāinga. Specifically, that there is no reference to papakāinga in the Long-Term Plan. Submitters requested Council to:

- Establish a papakāinga development fund to cover consenting fees for papakāinga developments, feasibility studies / reports / expertise, and to help offset the cost of development contributions.
- In-kind support from council to assist owners of Māori freehold land to prepare papakāinga outline development plans.

#### Staff analysis:

WDC already has papakāinga enabling provisions in its District Plan supported by guidance through the papakāinga Toolkit and practice notes currently being developed.

#### Staff recommendation:

1. Staff recommend WDC continues to support papakāinga development through implementation of District Plan provisions and supporting guidance/practice notes.
2. Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact.

### Strategy: Pollution

#### Issues raised from submissions:

A small number of submissions were received in relation to air pollution and haze in Whangarei City. This has impact on our health and needs to be addressed through controls on air pollution and discharges to air.

#### Staff analysis:

Air pollution is managed through Northland Regional Council in its Regional Plan which is currently being updated

#### Staff recommendation:

This is a Northland Regional Council matter. The relevant submissions have been passed on to Northland Regional Council for consideration

Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

# Planning and Regulatory

## District Planning

### Issues raised from submissions:

Several submissions were received relating to district planning. Particular recommendations received were:

1. To add the Bank Street Heritage Area to the District Plan historic heritage schedule
2. A process for dealing with cross-boundary jurisdictions where resource consents affecting historic heritage are concerned
3. To protect and conserve stone walls and the need for Council to provide incentives
4. To ensure the provision of open space and parks are considered in residential subdivision
5. All new subdivisions be connected to reticulated services
6. Protecting and promote historic heritage and the need for Council to provide incentives
7. Provision for increased business zoned land to cope with the rapidly increasing population of Waipu
8. Provisions be made for dealing with the impact of increased residential density in Nova Scotia Estate and the increased risk of flood susceptibility
9. That fresh water should remain in the ground
10. Opposition to toxic mining at Puhipuhi, Whakapara
11. Request for assistance in dealing with dust nuisance from Jonda Quarry as a result of additional activity

### Staff analysis:

1. Council is undertaking a rolling review of the District Plan in accordance with the statutory process of the Resource Management Act 1991. Inclusion of heritage areas such as 'Bank Street' into the District Plan must follow the plan change process under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act.
2. Council will discuss with Northland Regional Council the potential for such transfers of power
3. Stone Walls are protected within the operative District Plan (rule BH.1.7.11). There is currently no funding to provide incentives and no future plan to provide incentives
4. Any future residential development will be required to comply with the provisions of the District Plan, and open space be designed in accordance with the Environmental Engineering Standards
5. The operative District Plan and Environmental Engineering Standards encourage connection to reticulated services.
6. Council is undertaking a rolling review of the District Plan in accordance with the statutory process of the Resource Management Act 1991. Inclusion of heritage areas into the District Plan must follow the plan change process under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act. However, no incentives are planned.
7. Rural plan changes have recently been made which has reserved additional business land in Waipu
8. Any future development of Nova Scotia Estate will be required to comply with the provisions of the District Plan, including suitable engineering assessment and design in accordance with the Environmental Engineering Standards.
9. Regulating water takes are a Northland Regional Council function. The submission has been forwarded to Northland Regional Council for their consideration



10. Mining proposal has been abandoned.

11. Jonda Quarry is operating under an existing resource consent, any concern regarding compliance with conditions of consent have been passed to RMA Consents Compliance

**Staff recommendation:**

Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact.

# Support Services

## Capital Projects and Planning: Airport

### Issues raised from submissions:

- What is the \$4million for the airport buy us?
- Council should not spend further funds on scoping a new airport but should be funding on extension to and closing off Church Road end and airport and this would provide suitable long term option for Whangarei with development of Riverside/Onerahi Road.
- I believe that any alternate airport to Onerahi should be a regional one at Kaikohe. 10 year projections for Onerahi airport could be a bit short to act on as developments in technology in the next 15 – 20 years could make Onerahi quite viable again. (already much bigger aircraft can land in Queenstown so the limiting factor of the hills around Onerahi can be overcome).
- Move and Develop Whangarei Airport to an international airport. Making the existing Airport land available for use for new schools in the area – (Primary, intermediate, and high school).
- An airport with sufficient capacity and capability to meet future demands is an essential element not only in creating a business-friendly environment but also to take advantage of ongoing visitor growth. We would encourage the Council to continue to progress this matter and give the issue some urgency given the time that implementing such a development may take and the previously stated importance of this asset to not only the visitor industry but the district's wider business community also. Extending Onerahi is not a viable option.

### Staff analysis:

Air transportation is a critical piece of infrastructure for both business and tourism within a growing city or District. The problems identified with the current airport have been examined and validated. Investigating alternative locations for an airport to meet future needs is vital.

Work done to-date has included assessment of district and regional airport options. The current project funding includes feasibility, options analysis, investigation, consultation, planning and business case, and costs are considered reasonable.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Capital Projects and Planning: Procurement, Contractors and Maintenance

### Issues raised from submissions:

- Council to hold an audit on all contractors across the board in reviewing costs and costs structures versus value for money. In bring operating costs down.
- Council review how they manage them self's and contractors across the board. (costs structures versus value for money)
- Council to review how they manage themselves and contractors across the board. (costs structures versus value for money)
- Where assets, the community has not had the benefit of systematic renewal spend. Instead the community has had to petition for new investment, which is contestable and limited. Investment in core facilities and infrastructure: lighting, bus shelters, seating as well as facilities and maintenance of parks and reserves should be considered 'business as usual', not new improvements.

### Staff analysis:

Procurements follow council policy which ensures that there is appropriate competition and value for money. Contractors are audited regularly to monitor performance and compliance. Review of the procurement policy is planned.

### Staff recommendation:

Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan..

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

<b>Civil Defence: Emergency Management and Civil Defence</b>
<p>A submission was received reminding Council that it has a duty of care to ensure that civil defence premises are 'fit for purpose' and assistance must be given to ensure they are properly maintained. This assistance must also be extended to the various marae, e.g. Takahiwai – especially to those used for other public purposes.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>Under the Civil Defence Act 2002 there is no requirement for duty of care to ensure premises are 'fit for purpose' or that assistance must be given to ensure maintenance of those buildings for the purposes of Civil Defence use. Any premises used during a Civil Defence emergency is by permission of the owner of that building (unless it has been requisitioned under a State of Emergency), which is 'fit for purpose' for its business as usual uses.</p> <p>Civil Defence can recompense costs incurred for attending to the basic initial needs of evacuees and those affected by a Civil Defence emergency. However, recompense will only be granted when an agreement has been made between Council and those providing assistance to affected persons during a Civil Defence Emergency at the nominated premises.</p> <p>Funding for upgrades to enhance building resilience can be sought through other channels. Civil Defence officials are willing to support funding applications to other grant suppliers, on a case by case basis, if it strengthens the funding application.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

## Maori Partnership: Partnership and engagement with hapu/iwi

### Issues raised from submissions:

- There was one submission from Hapu
- This submission stated that Council is a Treaty partner and should honour their role as a partner by giving tangata whenua input in the running of this council.
- The provision for Te Karearea and a few maori liaison staff is stated as not enough.
- The request is that council outline and make transparent to the wider rating base the strong rationale, with kaupapa maori objectives, for resourcing tangata whenua to be partners in all council operations.
- Also stated is that Tangata Whenua Relationships are invisible in the documentation
- More resources are requested via resourcing the treaty partners and building capacity for Whangarei Hapu to take up the partnership role within the WDC operations, including oversight of the roll out of the Papakainga plan change, infrastructure projects, cultural projects over the next 10 years, as well as strategic planning needs to be allocated within the rates base, ensuring transparency is upheld to ratepayers that their rates are supporting tangata whenua participation in operations. Consultation at the Resource Consent Application stage is too late, tangata whenua need an authentic way of supporting practitioners within te Ao Maori with hapu specific connections and oversight to engage with Council staff.
- Approve dedicated funding expenditure for Tangata Whenua and Māori engagement

### Staff analysis:

Council has been committed to building better relationships with Māori which is critical and essential as part of a mechanism moving into the Post Treaty Settlement era. Council will continue to comply with the provisions of the Local Government Act relating to Maori.

Legislatively the response to Māori participation is evolving and Councils throughout NZ are in equal situations and will need to develop new ways of relating to Maori in a Post Treaty Settlement era.

### Staff recommendation:

Council continue to build Hapu/Council relationships through Te Huinga, Te Karearea and the Maori Relationships team.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Maori Partnership: Maori engagement in the development of policies and strategies

#### Issues raised from the Submission from the Iwi CEO Group Amokura:

- Support the review of the Council's engagement policy with Maori to ensure that it is inclusive and effective in ensuring the interests of mana whenua are equitably catered for
- Develop and adopt a policy on tangata whenua and Māori engagement as well as involvement in decision making processes
- Acknowledge and Formally accept the Tai Tokerau Māori Economic Growth Strategy as an iwi planning document
- Agree to discuss and recommend options for a Unitary Authority
- Approve a new investment in developing a Water Allocation Strategy

#### Staff analysis:

Council is committed to meaningful engagement with mana whenua through the hapu-based Te Karearea partnership, The Te Huinga forum, The Iwi Local Government Agencies Chief Executives meetings, Mana Whakahono provisions and established Maori community networks.

Further consideration could be taken in terms of He Tangata, He Whenua, He Oranga – Tai Tokerau Maori Economic Growth strategy in the development of any Council economic development strategy. The Tai Tokerau Economic Iwi Strategy is not an RMA document. A Unitary Authority has been abandoned as a proposal by the Local Government Commission.

#### Staff recommendation:

Council, when developing any economic strategy, take account of the Tai Tokerau Maori Economic Growth strategy with a view to be well prepared for the Post Treaty Settlement process.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Maori Partnership: Bilingual Signage

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Should the kainga of Takahiwai that is located on the southern shore of Whangarei- Te Rerenga Paraoa, Whangarei harbour be taken as an example of Whangarei District Council's planning for the decade to come, then there should be: Bilingual Maori and English names of roads, bays, beaches, etcetera.

#### Staff analysis:

Te Reo has inherent mana and importance to the growing cultural landscape of New Zealand / Aotearoa. Following on from other Councils and their Te Reo policies the implementation of bi-lingual signage will enhance the partnership relationship as well as the values, joint history and whakapapa of the district.

#### Staff recommendation:

1. Council consider using bi-lingual signage.
2. Council note the submission and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## People and capability: General

### Issues raised from submissions:

Two submissions were made in relation to people and capability. They were

- Reduce Whangarei Council Staff numbers
- WDC getting bigger, staff doing less. Too many staff.

### Staff analysis:

Staff numbers are reviewed by the Leadership Team on at least every six months. Changes to resourcing are considered in relation to changes in the external demand for our services (eg Building Consents) and affordability. WDC has demonstrably lower staff levels than similar sized councils.

We currently participate in the Local Government Performance Excellence Programme. Our results from the 2017-year show that WDC employs 3.9 FTE (full time employees) per 1,000 residents. The results for the whole NZ Survey population show that 5.1 FTE (full time employees) are employed per 1,000 residents.

In addition, an independent external consultant, Martin Jenkins, undertook a review of the whole organisation in 2016. One of the considerations of the review was staff numbers.

The result of the review is detailed below. The findings indicated that WDC had the second to lowest level of personnel expenditure relative to other G7 Councils.

**Table 3: Staff comparison**

\$000	Tauranga	Hastings	New Plymouth	Wanganui	Rotorua	Palmerston North	WDC
Full time staff (FTE)	399	332	332	187	443	447	273
Part time staff (FTE equivalent)	85	67	147	46	72	61	52
<b>Total staff (FTE)</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>325</b>
Total personnel	552	415	557	313	567	546	357
Proportion of part time staff	18%	17%	31%	20%	14%	12%	16%
Personnel cost as percentage of total cost	21%	27%	27%	19%	28%	30%	21%
Non-personnel cost as percentage of total cost	79%	73%	73%	81%	72%	70%	79%

### Staff recommendation:

1. Staff numbers continue to be reviewed regularly with consideration to services provided and affordability.
2. Council note the submissions and no change be made to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact



# Concurrent Consultation: Rating Policy and Review

Note: The rate review is a key issue in the LTP. For clarity we have combined the key issue: rates review and the concurrent consultation: Rating policy.

## Rating policy

### Issues raised from submissions:

- Rates Remission and Postponement Policy - Maori Freehold Land should be standard across the Northland
- Rates Remission and Postponement Policy - Maori Freehold Land should be the same as Far North District Council

### Staff analysis:

The Rates Remission and Postponement Policies for Maori Freehold Land are scheduled to be reviewed as part of a Northland regional initiative to enable Maori economic development.

### Staff recommendation:

That the Rates Remission and Postponement Policies for Maori Freehold Land are reviewed as planned and that the submissions views are considered as part of this review.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Issues raised from submissions:

- That Council continue with its proposed rates postponement and remission for farmland policy and ensure that it is applied in a way that is fair and equitable across all rural Northland.

### Staff analysis:

The draft policy for rates postponement for specific farmland properties has been reviewed and updated. The changes made are for clarification and have not altered the relief available for qualifying properties.

### Staff recommendation:

That Council adopts the draft rates postponement policy for specific farmland properties.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Issues raised from submissions:

Those properties which undertake community benefit and especially social benefit must not be charged the same rates as commercial profit properties, to maintain a district with such huge variation in economic circumstances and poverty.

### Staff analysis

Community organisations already qualify for statutory and policy rates remissions, to enable community wellbeing. The draft rates remission policy for community organisations provides rates relief for qualifying organisations.

### Staff recommendation:

That Council adopts the draft rates remission policy for community organisations.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Rating review

**Issues raised from submissions relating to the choice between option 1 (modified status quo) and option 2 (modified status quo plus transport rate).** The submissions are summarized below:

- 69% of the submissions support the option 1
  - Modified status quo is fairer and why change if we are happy?
  - The proposed targeted transport rate does not reflect use or benefit of service.
  - The proposed targeted transport rate increases the burden for fixed lower income ratepayers with relatively high property values and in some cases, may be unaffordable.
  - The proposed targeted transport rate increases the burden for utilities.
- 31% support option 2
  - Capital value should be used for general rates
  - The proposed targeted transport rate is fairer.

### Staff analysis:

The rates review considered capital value rating for general rates, but this option was not pursued.

The proposal to change funding for transportation from general rates to a new targeted transport rate based on capital value, together with a reduction in the Uniform Annual General Charge reduces the rates burden on less improved properties but increases the rates burden for properties with higher value improvements.

The majority of submissions are opposed to the change.

### Staff recommendation:

That the rates for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan are set based on the modified status quo.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### Issues raised from submissions relating to the rates increase:

- Rates need to be increased – especially in the central areas like Kensington etc.
- Rates increase will place unnecessary strain on property owners and businesses in central Whangarei.
- Don't increase rates! Council always gets money from rates. Any more increases and I will have to reduce my family food bill.
- Sector splits are inequitable for commercial and industrial properties.

**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 should help our ratepayers to benefit from this facility.

The sector splits were considered as part of the rating review and it was decided not to change them, apart from re-classifying properties in the Multi-unit category.

**Staff recommendation:**

That the proposed rates increase is implemented.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

**Issues raised from submissions relating to Separately Used and or Inhabited Part of a rating unit (SUIP):**

- SUIP's should not be used.
- SUIP's are difficult to enforce and unfair for small businesses.

**Staff analysis:**

Rating based on rating units rather than SUIPs was considered but rejected due to the impact on ratepayers.

The revised definition of SUIP's aims to address the perceived inequity of SUIP's.

The trigger for a SUIP is mainly the processing of a consent or license.

**Staff recommendation:**

That the revised definition of SUIPs is adopted by Council.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

**Issues raised from submissions relating to non-licensed (liquor) accommodation providers:**

- Both options presented for consultation (modified status quo and a new transportation rate based on capital value) saw the re-classification of properties in the 'multi-unit' category to commercial
- Around 40 motels have been affected by this proposed change as they would be re-categorised as Commercial
- The combined effect of the transport targeted rates and reclassification of all accommodation as commercial rather than multi (twice residential) is unfair and unaffordable.
- For leaseholders the value of their lease will be significantly reduced.

**Staff analysis:**

Motels are commercial operations

A liquor license is irrelevant for rating classification as it is not one of the criteria issued by the Valuer-General for rating valuation purposes.

By using the liquor licence as a 'differentiator' motels have arguably -been 'under-rated' compared to other accommodation providers for a number of years

It is accepted that the proposed change will have negative financial impact.

It may be appropriate to transition the change over (say) 2-5 years.

A list of the properties affected by this proposed change is below with both rating options.

Property	2017-2018	Option 1 2018-2019			Option 2 2018-2019		
	\$	\$	Difference		\$	Difference	
23	9,194	14,051	\$ 4,858	53%	16,330	\$ 7,136	78%
10156	7,025	12,956	\$ 5,931	84%	13,306	\$ 6,281	89%
12525	8,304	13,121	\$ 4,818	58%	13,105	\$ 4,802	58%
12603	12,064	17,519	\$ 5,455	45%	19,232	\$ 7,169	59%
13603	14,969	24,222	\$ 9,254	62%	25,514	\$10,546	70%
16156	5,912	10,232	\$ 4,320	73%	11,013	\$ 5,101	86%
18103	11,631	19,173	\$ 7,543	65%	19,246	\$ 7,616	65%
18114	9,372	16,735	\$ 7,363	79%	17,040	\$ 7,668	82%
18173	8,938	15,267	\$ 6,329	71%	15,670	\$ 6,732	75%
18322	12,633	22,562	\$ 9,929	79%	22,903	\$10,271	81%
18640	7,458	11,301	\$ 3,843	52%	11,951	\$ 4,493	60%
18650	10,974	19,034	\$ 8,059	73%	19,986	\$ 9,012	82%
18971	5,189	9,866	\$ 4,678	90%	9,592	\$ 4,404	85%
19035	8,794	15,819	\$ 7,025	80%	16,070	\$ 7,277	83%
20264	11,897	16,954	\$ 5,057	43%	19,517	\$ 7,620	64%
20511	12,855	21,233	\$ 8,378	65%	21,103	\$ 8,248	64%
20681	13,922	21,724	\$ 7,802	56%	22,185	\$ 8,262	59%
22475	8,960	13,261	\$ 4,301	48%	14,609	\$ 5,649	63%
23133	10,196	17,440	\$ 7,244	71%	18,904	\$ 8,708	85%
24302	14,146	26,641	\$12,494	88%	25,859	\$11,713	83%
30873	15,662	31,768	\$16,105	103%	31,333	\$15,670	100%
70803	3,408	3,575	\$ 167	5%	4,026	\$ 618	18%
159890	4,844	9,740	\$ 4,896	101%	10,086	\$ 5,242	108%
163779	1,851	4,818	\$ 2,967	160%	5,516	\$ 3,666	198%
164227	7,803	11,427	\$ 3,625	46%	12,514	\$ 4,712	60%
165600	6,824	12,278	\$ 5,454	80%	12,662	\$ 5,838	86%
166515	10,919	17,805	\$ 6,886	63%	19,319	\$ 8,400	77%
166516	7,424	11,188	\$ 3,764	51%	13,204	\$ 5,780	78%
166517	11,019	18,144	\$ 7,125	65%	20,510	\$ 9,491	86%
167027	10,518	16,450	\$ 5,932	56%	17,521	\$ 7,003	67%
167054	5,260	9,067	\$ 3,807	72%	9,322	\$ 4,063	77%

**Staff recommendation:**

That the rates impact of reclassifying accommodation providers as commercial is transitioned over 2-5 years.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

Any rates relief during the transition period will be spread across the other rate payers in the commercial sector.

<p><b>Issues raised from submissions relating to targeted rates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snooks Road and Brooks Road seal extensions</li> <li>• Rating of sewerage, water and stormwater – should rural ratepayers fund these services.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>We have considered and approved targeted rates for seal extensions in the past where there is strong ratepayer support and there is adequate budget for Council's funding portion</p> <p>Targeted rates are already the charging mechanism for funding water and sewerage across the district. These rates are only charged if the property is connected (or available in the case of water). Stormwater is included in general rates as we consider that the whole district benefits.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>That we consider ratepayer-funded seal extensions if they are prioritised and budgeted within the Transportation program.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions relating to rates rebates:</b></p> <p>Council could provide a "pop-up" facility for rates rebates in the old BNZ building at Hikurangi</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b></p> <p>The feasibility of providing rates rebate services beyond Forum North could be considered. Areas of high demand and/or piggy-backing the Library Bus could be explored.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b></p> <p>That we investigate the feasibility of providing rates rebate services beyond Forum North.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b></p> <p>No impact</p>

# **Concurrent Consultation: Fees and Charges**

## Food

### Issues raised from submissions:

One submission was received in relation to Food laws costs and fee for licencing. A summary of comments from the submitter are as follows:

- It should be cheaper and easier to produce and sell locally prepared healthy food.
- Council should take a supportive approach rather than only an enforcement approach.
- Effects of the high fees of the new Food Act on small businesses, child care providers and charities providing healthy food that they prepare, is highly prohibitive.
- The submitter challenges the Council to show evidence of cases of food poisoning attributed to OSCAR programmes cutting up fruit
- Council should look at their funding structure so it is more supportive of small businesses, charities, child care providers
- Suggests having a component of the Councils environmental health work to be supportive and proactive in promoting food safety
- Suggests free registration for new growers and small scale producers in the region – helping the community to buy local.

### Staff analysis:

Costs and Charges are driven by government legislation which Council cannot control.

The Food Act 2014 (the Act) dictates under which risk-based measure (Food Control Plan or National Program 1-3), a food business must operate or whether a food business is exempt from registration.

Whether a food sector is exempt or under which risk category a food sector falls under the Act is determined by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI). Territorial Authorities (local councils), such as the Whangarei District Council have no say in how a food business is categorized.

Whilst the Act provides that councils can fully recover its costs of registering and verifying food businesses, the Whangarei District Council has previously determined that there is a “public good” component to food safety and thus agreed to subsidize the food industry by approximately 30% from general rates, i.e. 70% of our cost in registering and verifying food businesses are paid by the user (operator) versus 30% from ratepayers.

In addition, Environmental Health Officers or Food Act Officers provide a substantial amount of mentoring, guidance and advice, free of charge, to new operators, to not only encourage economic growth, but also operator’s compliance with this national legislation.

The Act already recognizes that growers of fruit and vegetables pose a very low risk to food safety and thus these growers are already exempt from the registration and verification processes and thus have no added compliance costs.



The Act has already allocated a lower risk factor and thus compliance cost to the Early Childhood sector and whilst the Act doesn't quite extend this to schools or the after-school care sectors, many of these school facilities in our district will also be exempt from registration and thus have no additional compliance cost. Early indications are that out of the 54 school premises providing food in our district, only five (5) are required to register and thus pay fees.

Legally, staff have no ability to allocate a lower risk category than that assessed under the Act and thus no ability to charge a lower fee or totally exempt specific food businesses, such as schools from having to pay registration and verification costs to council. However, Council could provide an ability to staff to exempt certain qualifying food premises from the requirement to pay fees.

**Staff recommendation:**

1. That the submitter be informed of the 'staff analysis' above and and told that the Environmental Health team will contact them directly with any specific questions or concerns in relation to cost reduction.
2. That Council considers whether schools, after-school care facilities and registered charities should be treated differently from other registered food businesses in relation to the payment of fees. If so, whether these food premises should pay any fees or a reduced fee for their registration and verification services.
3. Council should keep in mind that whilst on average the annual registration and verification cost per Food Control Plan is \$846, we are potentially only looking at five premises with a total cost of less than \$5000 per year, but by exempting these premises from the compliance cost, Council will make a big difference to their financial viability.
4. Where Council determines to either offer a reduced fee or to provide these services free of charge, that staff be authorised to develop and implement guidelines on how this concession will be implemented and under which circumstances food premises qualify, to ensure that this is applied equally and fairly and that the concession is not abused.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact.

## Pool Inspections

### Issues raised from submissions:

One submission was received in relation to pool inspections. Submitter requested that if a swimming pool is empty at prior inspection, a ratepayer should be able to sign an affidavit advising Council, that a swimming pool remains empty at the next inspection, just like spa pools. Submitter cannot see where the council comes up with a 10 minute check to rate payers costing \$141.

### Staff analysis:

The process for a swimming pool owner to make a declaration that their pool is empty is currently available. There is a \$39.00 Empty Pool Declaration Register administration charge. It should be noted that a random sample inspections of 'empty' pools will be undertaken and if the pool is not empty it will be assessed for compliance with the Building Act 2004 and the standard inspection fee of \$141.00 will be applied.

Inspections for pools registered on the Swimming Pool Register are currently contracted out to Armourguard. The fee not only covers the inspection but includes the updating of databases, follow up for pools with minor compliance issues and includes administration and staff costs, enforcement officer salary, vehicle and petrol costs, as agreed by Council.

Note: Armourguard only inspect registered pools, this only happens if CCC is issued – when a CCC is not issued our Building officers carry out an inspection but as the inspection is included in the consent (the fee is actually \$205) we do not charge an extra fee for those inspections unless we fail the inspection and need to carry out a follow up inspection as charged above.

### Staff recommendation:

1. Advise the submitter that they may apply for an Empty Swimming Pool declaration and pay a fee of \$39.00.
2. Council notes the submission and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## General

### Issues raised from submissions:

Two submissions in relation to building consents not meeting statutory timeframes were received.

### Staff analysis:

In the regulatory functions of Council, statutory requirements are constantly increasing and becoming more complex and staff resources are increased with increasing demand for skills to fulfil our statutory obligations.

In 2017 resourcing constraints and skill shortages affected WDCs ability to process building consents on time. However, with the recruitment of well qualified and experienced staff and the engagement of an external contractor, the throughput has improved significantly. In March 2018 94% of building consents were issued within the statutory timeframe and in April we are on target for 100% in 20 days.

**Staff recommendation:**

1. Continue to develop technical staff and engage overflow contractors to manage application demands and ensure Building Consents are processed within statutory timeframes.
2. Council notes the submissions and there be no change to the draft 2018-2028 draft Long Term Plan.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

# **Concurrent Consultation: Development Contributions**

### City Infill subdivisions

**Issues raised from submissions:**

Lower development contribution rate for city infill subdivisions.

**Staff analysis:**

The cost of infrastructure provision is not significantly less for the city. Most growth projects are for headworks infrastructure and not reticulation associated costs.

**Staff recommendation:**

That the submission be received and that the submitter be thanked. No change to the policy is recommended.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

### Built Heritage

**Issues raised from submissions:**

That development contributions be used to fund a heritage office or at the least a heritage building register.

**Staff analysis:**

The LGA legislation does not allow Territorial Authorities to recover any costs through development contributions for the suggested purpose.

**Staff recommendation:**

That the submission be received and that the submitter be thanked. No change to the policy is recommended.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

### Sports Field Land Purchase

**Issues raised from submissions:**

Timing of sports field land purchase.

**Staff analysis:**

The timing of any project is a decision that is made in the LTP. The Development Contributions Policy charges will reflect any changes in timing and costs.

**Staff recommendation:**

That the final modelling of development contributions include the outcomes of LTP deliberations, with the Development Contributions Policy being updated to reflect any resulting changes.

**Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)**

No impact

### Consistency matters within the 2015 LTP and DC Policy (Ruakaka/Marsden)

#### Issues raised from submissions:

2015 Policy - Items of expenditure for Ruakaka Wastewater catchment and, the growth predictions in the 2015 policy. The timing of proposed changes to the Ruakaka HUE size

#### Staff analysis:

While outside of the scope of consultation on the 2018 LTP and DC Policy it is important to note that Council decisions, including the 2015 LTP and DC Policy, are based on the best information available at the time. Marsden/Ruakaka has experienced high levels of growth and capacity issues in the past followed by a rapid and unexpected stalling of growth, resulting in a staged approach to the provision of wastewater infrastructure. Both the LTP and DC Policy are now being reviewed based on updated information. Refunds are required under legislation if Council fails to deliver, at an activity level, the service for which the contribution was required. This is not the case for wastewater in this catchment where updated growth projections, and the proposed HUE size change, are changing the timing of projects.

#### Staff recommendation:

That the submission be received and that the submitter be thanked. No change to the policy is recommended.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

### HUE volumes and financial effects (Ruakaka/Marsden)

#### Issues raised from submissions:

Calculation of HUE volumes and financial effects

#### Staff analysis:

Council undertook a review of the HUE volume for the Ruakaka / One Tree Point in 2017. This review was based on detailed wastewater flow monitoring, calibrated sewer network modelling and an accurate investigation of dwellings and non-residential properties connected to the wastewater system. Based on this information Council included a proposal to change from 800L per day per HUE to 500 L/d per HUE within the draft policy.

Although Council does not have similarly detailed information to assess other catchments an estimate was made using average flow versus number connections to determine if other catchments required further analysis. The assessment did not support a change to the current value of 800L per HUE per day in those catchments.

Council has updated its HUE volume based on improved data obtained for the Ruakaka area. This is both normal and appropriate. At this stage WDC does not have sufficient evidence to make changes on other catchments. Nevertheless, we will continue to review them and where the data is available will make changes.

#### Staff recommendation:

That the submission be received and that the submitter be thanked. No change to the policy is recommended.

#### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

<b>Past projects (Ruakaka/Marsden)</b>
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b> Inclusion of past projects and the validity of growth projections and consultation</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b> The Ruakaka Ocean Outfall consent is a past project within the DC Policy Schedules, not part of the LTP projects list. The DC Policy is a separate, but concurrent, consultation. It does not form part of the CD or supporting documents under the Act. The consent was part of the Ruakaka Wastewater Strategy which outlined a staged approach to the provision of wastewater infrastructure within the catchment in order to mitigate risks associated with growth, while providing for the prudent long term provision of infrastructure. Essentially infrastructure can act as an enabler for growth, or a brake, and the approach taken ensured that infrastructure is available as growth comes on stream, while minimising the inherent risk associated with growth projections. Extensive consultation was undertaken with the community and stakeholders in reaching this position, with the Ruakaka Wastewater Liaison Group being set up to ensure ongoing stakeholder/community engagement and monitoring. The staged approach outlined under the strategy has worked as intended and Council can apply to extend the consent prior to any lapse. The consent application had regard to the best information available at the time, including the Whangarei District Growth Strategy - Sustainable Futures 30/50. While the submitters preference to continue to use the Growth Strategy population predictions is acknowledged, 30/50 is now almost 10 years old and those predictions are out of date. As a result, Council, has used the most up to date growth projections for the DC Policy, Statistics New Zealand's projections with adjustments made to reflect known areas of higher growth. The subsequent growth model has been reviewed by Audit with one minor error found in the Tikipunga West mesh block. While the Audit considered that the error was immaterial, and it does affect Marsden/Ruakaka, it will slightly decrease DC charges, particularly in the City Catchment. As a result of concerns raised by the submitter regarding the integrity of growth projections it is recommended that the minor error be fixed. While the submitters relief to seek direction on legislative compliance from Audit is noted this is outside of the role of Audit, which explicitly excludes legislative compliance from any opinion provided. Council has had an independent legal review of the policy however.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b> That the growth model be amended to correct the error in Tikipunga West noting that this change does not materially impact proposed projects or revenue streams within the draft Long Term Plan.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b> No impact</p>

## Project Schedule

### Issues raised from submissions:

Perceived errors in the project schedule

### Staff analysis:

Projects for inclusion in the Long-Term Plan and Development Contributions Policy are identified as part of asset management processes using the best available information, including the most up to date growth projections and capacity information. While the submitter has raised a number of factors being considered through the review of the developer agreement with the Bream Bay Land Owners Association (BBLOA), negotiations are ongoing and the outcomes of the review are unknown. Specifically, in 2008, it was agreed that the existing capacity of the wastewater system was 660m<sup>3</sup>/day (resource consent limit) rather than the flow to the plant. The actual inflow to the plant was estimated to have reached 660m<sup>3</sup>/day some 3 to 4 years later by which time further treatment and disposal works had been commissioned. The DC charge calculation is undertaken on a project by project basis as required by the LGA. This provides a fairer means of ensuring that new lots are paying their share of the capacity that is required to service those lots. The BBLOA termination agreement is expected to provide for the uptake of most of the 700 HUE referred to by BBLOA by 2021, not 2018. It is apparent that the treatment and disposal capacity is being planned to match both granting of titles and the development of the sites that will ultimately generate waste water flows. It is also worth noting that the Local Government Act provides for the averaging/grouping of development contributions by geographical area and land use (i.e. not to individual project level) and given the staged approach to the provision of wastewater infrastructure in the Marsden/Ruakaka catchment new projects will be required to meet growth as capacity is taken up. While the projects within the Consultation Document and draft Policy are considered accurate based on the most likely scenario at the time of drafting it is recommended that, as a result of this submission, they be reviewed once the outcomes of negotiations on the developer agreement are known. The resourcing of development contributions is an operational matter and Council will continue to review and improve its processes in line with best practice. While the Development Contributions Policy is not part of the Long Term Plan, and independent legal advice has been sought on the draft Policy, there is alignment of the forward works programmes in both documents which Audit reviewed for consistency. Audit will be advised of any changes as part of standard practice.

### Staff recommendation:

That wastewater projects within the Marsden Point-Ruakaka catchment be reviewed, and amended if necessary, once the outcomes of negotiations on the BBLOA developer agreement are known.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

To be determined based on changes to be made as a result of new information available.



## Trunk Sewer System

### Issues raised from submissions:

Council is proposing a DC for the One Tree Point Trunk Sewer System – Upsize pump station and main with a planned capital expenditure of \$400,000. We believe that this is in error and the actual capital cost is \$2.8 million.

The BBLOA requests that Council revises the schedule for this project.

### Staff analysis:

While the submitter has highlighted a \$400,000 project cost there are two funding lines for this project within the draft Policy, totaling \$2.4 million. This is Council's contribution to the growth portion of the reticulation that developers are required to build under existing agreements and consents (known as Retic A). At the time of drafting the long-term plan and the development contributions policy the most likely scenario was that:

- Members of the Bream Bay Land Owners Association (BBLOA) would build Retic A
- Council would provide \$2.4 million to fund (in part through development contributions) a growth contribution to Retic A. This is the funding within the draft development contributions policy.
- Council would schedule \$2.8 million for the replacement of the Marsden Bay rising main (named Ruakaka Rising main renewal). This was planned as a renewal project (i.e. there was no growth component) and the funding is therefore in the Long-Term Plan, but not in the development contributions policy.

It is assumed that the project being referred to by the submitter is the Marsden Bay/Ruakaka rising main renewal, which has \$2.8 million funding provided for separately in the draft LTP. While projects within the draft development contributions policy and LTP are accurate based on the most likely scenario at the time of drafting, negotiations are ongoing on the BBLOA Developer Agreement which may affect these. It is therefore recommended that, as a result of this submission, wastewater projects within the Marsden Point-Ruakaka catchment be reviewed and amended (if necessary) once the outcomes of negotiations on the BBLOA developer agreement are known.

### Staff recommendation:

That wastewater projects within the Marsden Point-Ruakaka catchment be reviewed, and amended if necessary, once the outcomes of negotiations on the BBLOA developer agreement are known.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

To be determined based on changes to be made as a result of new information available.

Reduction of charges
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b> Development contribution charges for Whangarei Heads should not be reduced. Wastewater connection costs should be reduced.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b> The calculation of development contribution charges is based on the schedules of past and proposed works. The contribution charges only alter if the capital projects included in those schedules are changed, or the assumptions within the model change. The draft Policy is based on updated growth figures which predict higher levels of growth across the District. This is a key driver of the reduced charges, rather than reduced funding. The wastewater charge is already the subject of capping, with the resulting charge being comparable to the cost of an on-site system.</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b> That the submission be received and that the submitter be thanked. No change to the policy is recommended.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b> No impact</p>

Papakāinga submission 1
<p><b>Issues raised from submissions:</b> Papakāinga developments that have lodged a Papakāinga outline development plan and been granted consent under the Building Act should be eligible for an exemption/remission from development contributions. Option 1) Proposes an exemption from charging. Option 2) Allow remissions. Option 3) Council does not charge development contributions upfront and allows a postponement.</p>
<p><b>Staff analysis:</b> Option 1. This option is not supported as there is an impact that needs to be recognized in the uptake of capacity and future modelling. It would be clearer to provide a remission. Option 2. Development contributions are based on the impact a development has on infrastructure. Where a development has a less than average impact the Policy is able to take that into account (i.e. as the policy does for retirement villages). To assess the impact as accurately as possible is preferable to granting a remission. Option 3. The Policy currently allows for contributions to be paid at the time of building consent even if contributions are assessed on a land use resource consent, payment is not required until prior to the issue of CCC</p>
<p><b>Staff recommendation:</b> That Papakāinga be defined within the Policy to clarify that where there is demonstrably lower impact this is recognized in any assessment.</p>
<p><b>Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)</b> No impact</p>

## Papakāinga submission 2

### Issues raised from submissions:

Papakāinga developments that have lodged a Papakāinga outline development plan and been granted consent under the Building Act should be eligible for an exemption from development contributions.

### Staff analysis:

Development contributions are based on the impact a development is anticipated to have on infrastructure. Where a development has a less than average impact the Policy can take that into account (i.e. as the policy does for retirement villages).

### Staff recommendation:

That Papakāinga be defined within the Policy to clarify that where there is demonstrably lower impact this will be recognized in any assessment.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Seal Extensions

### Issues raised from submissions:

That seal extension budgets have been underfunded for many years with dust and safety issues increasing dramatically through rural subdivisions. Argued that development contributions are not used to fund seal extensions, but are absorbed into general revenue operating costs.

### Staff analysis:

The calculation of development contribution charges is based on the growth component of past and future works included in a Long-Term Plan. Development contributions are only used for the recovery of growth related capital expenditure, they are not used for operational costs. The funding of seal extensions will be considered through LTP deliberations. Should projects be changed then any growth component will be included in the final modelling of development contributions, with the Development Contributions Policy being updated.

### Staff recommendation:

That the final modelling of development contributions includes the outcomes of LTP deliberations, with the Development Contributions Policy being updated to reflect any resulting changes.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

## Funds used for operating purposes

### Issues raised from submissions:

Submitter asserts that development contributions are used to fund operating costs.

### Staff analysis:

Development contributions are only used for the recovery of growth related capital expenditure, they are not used for operational costs.

### Staff recommendation:

That the submission be received and that the submitter be thanked. No change to the policy is recommended.

### Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

No impact

DRAFT