

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Deliberations Decisions

Table of Contents	Page No.
District-Wide Matters	4
Financial Position	9
Our District & Communities	26
Financial Strategy	40
Forecasting Assumptions	44
Funding	49
Water Supply	53
Wastewater	60
Stormwater	65
Services Overall - Stormwater, Water Supply	68
Whitianga Town Centre Upgrade	73
Aquaculture Infrastructure Expansion	89
Revenue and Financing Policy	91
Funding	92
District Transportation	93
Cemeteries	97
Public Conveniences	98
Solid Waste	100
Local Government Funding Agency	122
Transfer of Seaview Reserve - Te Puru	129
Economic Development	131
Rates Remissions Policy	138
Activities	141
Harbour Facilities	144
District Transportation	146
Local Transportation	150
Solid Waste	152
Local Advocacy	154
District Leadership	159
Strategic Planning	183
Landuse Planning	186
Hazard Management	187
Natural and Cultural Heritage	189
Emergency Management	200
Cemeteries	204
Building Control	219
Community Health and Safety	227
Community Centres and Halls	228
Social Development	234
Landuse Management	237
Libraries	241
Land Information Memorandum	247
Parks and Reserves	248
Public Conveniences	
Swimming Pools	
Ten Year Plan Process Overall	
Wide Scope of the Ten Year Plan	
Contribution to Decision Making Process by Maori	
Miscellaneous Fees and Charges	

Other Ten Year Plan Matters	250
Community Board Areas	
Thames Community Board Area	253
Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area	291
Mercury Bay Community Board Area.....	311
Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area	353
Whangamata Community Board Area	389

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan Deliberations - District-Wide Matters

Financial Position

1. Overall - Reducing Expenditure

There are nine submission points in the staff submission concerning reducing expenditure. One relates to the operational budgets where the organisation was challenged to prepare proposals for a 5% and 10% budget reduction in January 2012.

These proposals have been worked through and amended to ensure that the Council does not become under resourced or in a position to under-deliver.

Staff request that Council amends the operational budget on confirmation of figures and on discussion surrounding the potential impacts on operations.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the operational budget on confirmation of figures and on discussion surrounding the potential impacts on operations.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopt the amended operational budget, as prepared by staff and presented at 14 May 2012, and on discussion surrounding the potential impacts on operations.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council staff have been working solidly on budgets but were not able to present these prior to notification due to timeframes.

The amended budgets are not projected to impact on Council's delivery of services or levels of service and so do not require a separate consultation in their own right.

If the amended budget is to be adopted by the 2012/13 financial year, then it needs to be adopted by Council prior to that date as part of deliberations.

Council Resolution

That the Council adopt the amended operational budget, as prepared by staff and presented at 14 May 2012, and on discussion surrounding the potential impacts on operations.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

Council staff have been working solidly on budgets but were not able to present these prior to notification due to timeframes.

The amended budgets are not projected to impact on Council's delivery of services or levels of service and so do not require a separate consultation in their own right.

If the amended budget is to be adopted by the 2012/13 financial year, then it needs to be adopted by Council prior to that date as part of deliberations.

Discussion

- The March Budget review will have an impact.
- The 5-10% exercise and organisational review have been undertaken.
- The Chief Executive is comfortable that reduced budgets can be met without change to level of service.

Financial Position

2. Overall - Updated Financial Information

The staff submission includes a request that the Council updates the financial information to reflect opening balances and revised estimates as a result of the September 2011 current year budget revisions.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council updates the financial information to reflect opening balances and revised estimates as a result of the September 2011 current year budget revisions. Note that the March 2012 budget revision should be used if it is available in time.

Staff recommendation

That the Council updates the financial information to reflect opening balances and revised estimates as a result of the September 2011 current year budget revisions. Note that the March 2012 budget revision should be used if it is available in time.

Staff reason for recommendation

Since the draft Ten Year Plan budgets were compiled, management will have undertaken a further review of the current 2011/2012 financial year budgets which may result in some projects being carried forward into the next financial year.

Unless this information is updated there is a danger of double counting projects. In addition the review affects such items as the opening balance of financial reserves upon which the Ten Year Plan is anchored.

Financial Reporting Standard Number 42 deals with information and format of Prospective Financial Statements.

This standard requires the Council to use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

Council resolution

That the Council updates the financial information to reflect opening balances and revised estimates as a result of the September 2011 current year budget revisions. Note that the March 2012 budget revision should also be used if it is available in time.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Since the draft Ten Year Plan budgets were compiled, management will have undertaken a further review of the current 2011/2012 financial year budgets which may result in some projects being carried forward into the next financial year.

Unless this information is updated there is a danger of double counting projects. In addition the review affects such items as the opening balance of financial reserves upon which the Ten Year Plan is anchored.

Financial Reporting Standard Number 42 deals with information and format of Prospective Financial Statements.

This standard requires the Council to use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

Discussion

- The March budget review is now available.
- There has been a substantial review of the capital budget for IT.

Financial Position

3. Overall - Updated Financial Information

The staff submission includes a request that the Council updates the financial information to reflect updated forecast interest rate information.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council use, if available, updated information on the forecast Interest Rate for 2012-2022 to inform the financial information contained in the financial budgets.

Staff recommendation

That the Council use, if available, updated information on the forecast Interest Rate for 2012-2022 to inform the financial information contained in the financial budgets.

Staff reason for recommendation

Preparation of the Prospective Financial Statements are governed by NZ IAS42 which requires that Council use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

The allocation of interest costs will impact on the rates for Districts ratepayers for 2012-2022.

Council resolution

That the Council use the latest available updated information on the forecast Interest Rate for 2012-2022 to inform the financial information contained in the financial budgets.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Preparation of the Prospective Financial Statements are governed by NZ IAS42 which requires that Council use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

The allocation of interest costs will impact on the rates for Districts ratepayers for 2012-2022.

Discussion

- Updated interest rates have been used - figures from April 2012.
- There will be an impact in the outer years as interest rates are predicted to go up.

Financial Position

4. Overall - Updated Financial Information

The staff submission includes a request that the Council updates the financial information to reflect the current year valuations.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council use, if available, current year valuations for Land and Buildings, Wastewater, Water, Stormwater, Solid Waste, Parks and Reserves Improvements and Harbours.

Staff recommendation

That the Council use, if available, current year valuations for Land and Buildings, Wastewater, Water, Stormwater, Solid Waste, Parks and Reserves Improvements and Harbours.

Staff reason for recommendation

Preparation of the Prospective Financial Statements are governed by NZ IAS42 which requires that Council use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

At the time the draft Ten Year Plan was put together, these valuations were not available. Finance have been working with our valuation service providers with the intention that most if not all of these valuations will be available in time for inclusion in the final document.

Council resolution

That the Council use the latest current year valuations for Land and Buildings, Wastewater, Water, Stormwater, Solid Waste, Parks and Reserves Improvements and Harbours.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Preparation of the Prospective Financial Statements are governed by NZ IAS42 which requires that Council use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

At the time the draft Ten Year Plan was put together, these valuations were not available. Finance have been working with our valuation service providers with the intention that most if not all of these valuations will be available in time for inclusion in the final document.

Discussion

- The latest figures have been used in the revised financial information presented to the Council on 14 May 2012.

Financial Position

5. Overall - Updated Financial Information

The staff submission includes a request that the Council updates the property information used to calculate individual rates to the latest information available.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council updates the property information used to calculate individual rates to the latest information available.

Staff recommendation

That the Council updates the property information used to calculate individual rates to the latest information available.

Staff reason for recommendation

Between drafting the budget information for the draft Ten Year Plan and the final version to be adopted by the Council, the rating information database will have been updated with new properties as a result of subdivision and new values applied to these properties.

Also, additional improvements to properties will have been valued and applied to the property information. By using these latest additions, the rates burden is spread over a larger number of properties and brings a slight reduction in the average increase per property.

Financial Reporting Standard Number 42 deals with information and format of Prospective Financial Statements. This standard requires the Council to use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

Council resolution

That the Council updates the property information used to calculate individual rates to the latest information available.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Between drafting the budget information for the draft Ten Year Plan and the final version to be adopted by the Council, the rating information database will have been updated with new properties as a result of subdivision and new values applied to these properties.

Also, additional improvements to properties will have been valued and applied to the property information. By using these latest additions, the rates burden is spread over a larger number of properties and brings a slight reduction in the average increase per property.

Financial Reporting Standard Number 42 deals with information and format of Prospective Financial Statements. This standard requires the Council to use the best information that could reasonably be expected to be available at the time the statements are prepared.

Discussion

- Not yet incorporated in revised financial figures presented this morning (14 May 2012), this is done at the end of the process.

Our District & Communities

6. Our Challenges and Opportunities - Moanataiari

A staff submission was made which requested an update to the Ten Year Plan to reflect what is further known about the situation at Moanataiari.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adjusts the Ten Year Plan to reflect what is further known about the situation at Moanataiari.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. *add additional text to the "Our Challenges and Opportunities" section to acknowledge that lead has been discovered at elevated levels at Moanataiari.*
2. *acknowledge the remediation of Moanataiari as a major project in the Hazard Management activity.*
3. *allocate \$86,000 in the 2012/2013 year to cover a shortfall in the Moanataiari project budget for phases two, three and four.*

Staff reason for recommendation

Lead has been discovered at elevated levels at some properties on the eastern flank at Moanataiari. The health advice remains unchanged for residents, despite this new issue. The lead results may have implications on the remediation and mitigation strategies, but it is too early to be sure. Remediation and mitigation strategies will be known by September/October 2012.

By signalling the remediation as a major project in the Hazard Management activity this is signalling that remediation works that Council funds will be funded through the Hazard Management activity (district wide).

The remediation of Moanataiari is a joint project between the Ministry for the Environment, Waikato Regional Council and TCDC. The Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund (through MFE) is contributing 50% of the project costs for phases two, three and four of the remediation project. The remediation itself (phase five) remains un-quantified at this stage and will likely be borne by MFE and TCDC.

Due to early remediation works and an underestimation of project costs, there is a shortfall of \$86,000 required as a contribution from TCDC for the 2012/2013 year.

\$250,000 in 2011/2012 has been funded from TCDC's Disaster Reserve Fund. Staff suggest the shortfall of \$86,000 required in the 2012/2013 year be funded from the Hazard Management activity as a new project.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. *add additional text to the "Our Challenges and Opportunities" section to acknowledge that lead has been discovered at elevated levels at Moanataiari.*
2. *acknowledge the remediation of Moanataiari as a major project in the Hazard Management activity.*
3. *allocate \$86,000 in the 2012/2013 year to cover a shortfall in the Moanataiari project budget for phases two, three and four.*

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Lead has been discovered at elevated levels at some properties on the eastern flank at Moanataiari. The health advice remains unchanged for residents, despite this new issue. The lead results may have implications on the remediation and mitigation strategies, but it is too early to be sure. Remediation and mitigation strategies will be known by September/October 2012.

By signalling the remediation as a major project in the Hazard Management activity this is signalling that remediation works that Council funds will be funded through the Hazard Management activity (district wide).

The remediation of Moanataiari is a joint project between the Ministry for the Environment, Waikato Regional Council and TCDC. The Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund (through MFE) is contributing 50% of the project costs for phases two, three and four of the remediation project. The remediation itself (phase five) remains un-quantified at this stage and will likely be borne by MFE and TCDC.

Due to early remediation works and an underestimation of project costs, there is a shortfall of \$86,000 required as a contribution from TCDC for the 2012/2013 year.

\$250,000 in 2011/2012 has been funded from TCDC's Disaster Reserve Fund. Staff suggest the shortfall of \$86,000 required in the 2012/2013 year be funded from the Hazard Management activity as a new project.

Discussion

- Hazard Management is district funded.
- The \$86,000 shortfall is our share of the project in phases two, three and four. This reflects the fact that the original estimate (\$400,000) was too low as not enough was known to make an accurate funding assessment.
- \$57,000 overrun on early remediation of contaminated soil to landfill.
- \$90,000 background assessment.
- \$235,000 required for stage four that was not originally budgeted for.
- Majority of the spend to date on the school and early learning centre.
- Landfill costs have increased as it is difficult to get rid of contaminated soil.
- Council has invoiced MFE for just over \$100,000.
- We are making sure we get funding applications in early to ensure we do not miss out.

Our District & Communities

7. Choosing Futures

Five submitters request that all references to Choosing Futures Thames-Coromandel be deleted from the Ten Year Plan until consultation via a statutory process has been carried out.

Another three submitters request that all references to Choosing Futures Thames-Coromandel be deleted throughout the Ten Year Plan permanently.

The reasons outlined are:

- *The submitters consider the document lacks validity because it was not tested through a statutory consultative process; it was driven largely by planners and agencies and has not been endorsed by the community.*
- *Some submitters consider the document is an invention of outside pressure groups.*

Submitter numbers are: 13, 63, 90, 158, 199, 341, 663 and 680.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains Choosing Futures in its performance management framework, or not.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. *note the submitters concerns*
2. *continue to refer to Choosing Futures in its performance management framework for the purposes of the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan*
3. *consider the place of Choosing Futures in the performance management framework as part of the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan process.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The Choosing Futures statements (also previously known as the Community Outcomes) were developed via a statutory and legislative process.

The requirement to retain the Choosing Futures statements has since been removed from the Local Government Act which occurred during the development of the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

It would be logical for the Council to reconsider the place of Choosing Futures when it commences work on its next Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. *notes the submitters concerns*
2. *continue to refer to Choosing Futures in its performance management framework for the purposes of the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan*
3. *reconsider the place of Choosing Futures in the performance management framework as part of the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan process.*

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The Choosing Futures statements (also previously known as the Community Outcomes) were developed via a statutory and legislative process.

The requirement to retain the Choosing Futures statements has since been removed from the Local Government Act which occurred during the development of the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

It would be logical for the Council to reconsider the place of Choosing Futures when it commences work on its next Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- This is not the Blueprint.
- 'Choosing Futures' is found on page 20 of volume one.
- The statements do not commit the Council to anything.
- The Performance Management Framework is under review at the moment.

Our District & Communities

8. Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint

Seven submitters request **that all references to the Coromandel Blueprint be deleted from the Ten Year Plan until consultation via a statutory process has been carried out.**

Another four request **that all references to the Coromandel Blueprint be deleted from the Ten Year Plan permanently.**

The reasons outlined include:

- The submitters disagree with a number of directions outlined in the Blueprint.
- One submitter cites the bullet points on page 22 as an example of where the Blueprint is being used prematurely.

Several of these same submitters also request that the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint Steering Group be disbanded.

The reasons outlined include:

- The submitters consider that having the group would cost more than anticipated through a complete lack of understanding of the district and its people.
- It is an obstructive waste of time and money.

Submitter numbers are: 13, 63, 90, 157, 199, 237, 341, 512, 663 and 680.

Two submissions were received in support of the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint, requesting that the Council:

- **Retains the focus on the implementation of the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint including the district plan review as a priority** (#280, Waikato Regional Council)
- **Notes the submitter's support for the focus on implementation of the Blueprint throughout the Ten Year Plan** (#524, NZTA)

Reasons outlined by NZTA include:

- The submitter has worked with the Council throughout the development of the strategy and supports growth planning to ensure coordinated and affordable development occurs.
- The submitter considers that the Ten Year Plan has an important role in ensuring that Council's services and facilities align with the Blueprint.
- The New Zealand Transport Agency requires certainty that activities put forward for funding are part of a comprehensive approach to planning for growth and development for investment and prioritisation decisions, and considers that the Blueprint provides certainty that this planning has taken place.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the place of the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. note the submissions received
2. retain the placement of the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
3. consider further community consultation on the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint to occur alongside the District Plan formal review in 2013.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff understands that the Council support many of the Blueprint concepts, however note concerns from some of the community that the Blueprint was not adopted with a robust submissions and hearings process.

Recent discussions have occurred with the Regional Council regarding this Council's desire to undertake further consultation on the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint, and this is being considered alongside the District Plan Review.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions received
2. for clarity note that the "Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint" is taken to mean the District Blueprint and not the Local Area Blueprints
3. retain the placement of the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
4. requires further statutory community consultation on the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint to occur alongside the District Plan formal review in 2013
5. notes that the Local Area Blueprints will be considered through Community Boards Plans in 2012/2013.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

The Council support many of the Blueprint concepts, however note concerns from some of the community that the Blueprint was not adopted with a robust submissions and hearings process.

Recent discussions have occurred with the Regional Council regarding this Council's desire to undertake further consultation on the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint, and this is being considered alongside the District Plan Review.

Discussion

- The submissions received did not distinguish between the Coromandel District Blueprint (adopted in 2009) and the Local Area Blueprints (received only, not adopted).
- The Blueprint is a significant driver of the District Plan.
- The "first cut" of District Plan is due out in October 2012.
- These deliberations are not the appropriate forum to overturn the Blueprint.
- There is a review of the Blueprint mentioned in the Ten Year Plan currently.
- The Local Area Blueprints can be dealt with through community empowerment.

Our District & Communities

9. Who Are We

Submitter #292 requests that the Ten Year Plan be amended to recognise the many visitors (including local residents) who prefer to explore the District in certified self-contained motor caravans, want to freedom camp responsibly, and require basic amenities including public dump stations to do so.

The reasons outlined are:

- Over 1,700 members reside in the District, with thousands more travelling to the region during holiday excursions each year
- The Ten Year Plan provides the District with an opportunity to accommodate the growing motor caravan visitor market by supporting freedom camping, and protecting public health and the environment through the provision of appropriate infrastructure.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the Ten Year Plan to recognise more explicitly the many visitors and residents who want to freedom camp responsibly.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission and makes reference to the Council's support of responsible freedom campers in the Economic Development activity section of the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Refer to Item No. 65 - Economic Development submission regarding the work programme around Freedom Camping.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submission
2. makes reference to the Council's support of responsible freedom campers as described in the glossary in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

To provide further clarity about what the Council means by Freedom Camping.

Discussion

- At this stage there is no 'freedom camping' as such in the District as they are allocated specific areas in which to stay overnight.
- The project has been put on hold until the Area Managers have been appointed.
- There are instances when the company hiring out the van can be fined, not just the person hiring the van.
- A paper will be coming back to Council on the Freedom Camping Policy.

Our District & Communities

10. Council Outcomes

The Council set three Council Outcomes as a means of articulating its direction and contribution to the District. The three Council Outcomes are:

- A prosperous district
- A liveable district
- A clean and green district.

Five submissions were received regarding the Council Outcomes. The submissions express support for the Direction of the Council, but do suggest modifications to strengthen the Outcome statements.

A Prosperous District

Submitter #503 requests that the fourth area of focus for achieving a prosperous district be modified to read: "Maximising economic opportunities from the Peninsula's natural setting **and rich historic heritage**". The submitter considers that valuing historic heritage is a factor in creating a prosperous district.

Submitter #680 requests that the Council

- note the submitters support for the focus on a prosperous economy
- add a fifth bullet point as follows: "ensure that existing activities and businesses including farming remain viable".

A Liveable District

#96 - That the Council notes the submitters support for the Plan's focus on sustainable communities in terms of Prosperity, Liveability and a Cleanness and Greenness, but concern that the Coromandel-Colville ward is not included in this. The reasons provided are:

- Together these outcomes could lead symbiotically to a strong district.
- However the towns of Whitianga, Whangamata and Thames are the clear beneficiaries under this plan.
- The Plan does not say how the Council intends to foster the ward's distinct community of interest over the next 10 years.

A Clean and Green District

- Submitter #252 notes that 'clean and green' were great words and great sentiment, but requests that the Council consider where in its plan it will be carbon neutral and embrace energy efficiency.
- Submitter #619 requests that the Council support environmental protection initiatives.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers amendments to its Council Outcome statements, or adopt as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions but makes no changes to the Council Outcomes.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council Outcomes are intended to be short, succinct statements outline what the Council's contribution will be. These are to be read in conjunction with the Council's direction.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no changes to the Council Outcomes.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The Council Outcomes are intended to be short, succinct statements outline what the Council's contribution will be. These are to be read in conjunction with the Council's direction.

Discussion

- Suggested that reference to the District's history be included.
- It was noted that the District's history is already mentioned.

Our District & Communities

11. Overall Direction

A number of submissions were made regarding the overall direction of the Council, both in support of and opposition to its overall direction. Two strong themes that emerge from the submissions received is support for focusing on essential services and keeping rates low, and support for Council's increased support for Economic Development.

A question was included on the feedback from that asked submitters "In general, how comfortable are you with what we have proposed, overall?"

209 submitters answered the question.

Of those, 36 responded to say that they had no opinion.

78 responded to say that they were comfortable or very comfortable.

95 responded to say that they were uncomfortable or very uncomfortable.

Comments in support of Council's Direction include:

Submitter #203 supports the overall thrust of the draft Plan with its focus on economic growth and the creation of local jobs.

Submitter #512 requests the Council notes the submitter's view that overall the Council is trying to make sensible decisions.

Four submitters specifically note that the Council return to providing essential services (56, 157, 243 and 523). Reasons outlined by submitters include:

- The cost of running the present system is unaffordable.*
- Too much emphasis is placed on social activities and planning.*
- While the submitter applauds the proposed rates reduction on their property, the rates are still far too high*
- One submitter also requests a focus on maintaining what we've got.*

Submitter #199 requests that the Council proceed with taking a conservative approach. The submitter makes specific reference to controlling spending, through restricting the Council to core services.

Submitter #119 suggests that a number of the (non-essential) projects while desirable, are not essential and be deferred until the financial climate is better, and that a statement be made to that effect.

Submitter #472 submits that the Council focus on infrastructure development that will make the Coromandel more attractive to new residents, visitors and new investment (#472).

Submitter #291 requests that the Council notes the submitter's support for reducing spending and keeping rates down and explaining the expenditure in everyday language.

Comments not in support include:

Submitter #204 notes the Council's aim for 'sustainable development' with population growth has ignored how it is not sustainable. The reason outlined are:

- The drive for development has been at the expense of the environment, therefore is opposed to a 'clean and green district'.*
- If the drive for local jobs was strong, corporations from outside the District would not hold sway.*

Submitter #243 notes the draft Ten Year Plan will only offer more disillusion and poor performance. The reason provided is that present Council staff have own personal agendas, little management skills and arrogance to ratepayers.

Other comments

Submitter #472 requests that the Ten Year Plan include a greater focus on a higher level strategic consideration of positioning the Coromandel for the future through:

- Demonstrating that TCDC and Hauraki District Council take a lead towards broader regional alignment and reflect the signal from Central Government that Council should be refocused on core business.
- Consider rebranding of TCDC, possibly one that would include Hauraki District Council.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers its overall direction as appropriate given feedback received.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions received and make no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Overall, the submissions demonstrate a reasonable level of comfort with the direction provided by the Council. The Council has the ability to deliberate on specific matters, suggestions and concerns raised by submitters as part of the deliberations meeting.

A change in overall direction at this point does not appear to be warranted, nor would be in the interests of a sound public consultation process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions received
2. make no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Overall, the submissions demonstrate a reasonable level of comfort with the direction provided by the Council. The Council has the ability to deliberate on specific matters, suggestions and concerns raised by submitters as part of the deliberations meeting.

A change in overall direction at this point does not appear to be warranted, nor would be in the interests of a sound public consultation process.

Discussion

- Not sure that everyone that ticked the box understood the question.
- Noted that ratepayers groups actually represent many members of the association.
- The submission form and the questions on it will be reviewed as part of a ten year plan project debrief.

Our District & Communities

12. Community Empowerment

At its meeting on 18 April 2012 the Council endorsed a Community Empowerment model. Some submissions have been received, particularly from Community Boards concerning matters that are addressed in the Community Empowerment model.

Submitter #581 (Whangamata Community Board) requests that the Council note:

- the submitter's support for its direction and leadership and progress towards implementing the Empowerment Model
- the submitter's view that critical success factors of the Empowerment Model will include: formalising the organisational structure; appointing area management; and documenting delegated authorities to Community Boards.
- The submitter's willingness to assist if requested.

The Whangamata Community Board also note that much has been achieved in a very short time frame and management have the Empowerment Model process well under control, and that simplicity is key when developing funding models to support the empowerment approach. They also note that they have yet to see any outcome of work on funding models.

Several other submitters also note support for Community Empowerment and support for decision making returning to each board area and would like to know how to join in. The reasons outlined include:

- It will be very important to confirm with locals the way community board plans to spend money.
- Once the community empowerment model is put in place one submitter believes that the allocation of community grants will be more fair and equitable.
- It will ensure individual communities can use local knowledge and volunteer services to reduce costs, resulting in lower rates or project credits for their community.
- It will provide avenues of opportunity to reduce the current high Council overheads on local budgets.

Submitter #520 (Thames Community Board) note their support for the community empowerment model that allows a Community Board to rate locally for any top up of district wide funding for local economic development projects and/or services pertaining to visitor information provision, event management and business support.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends its Ten Year Plan to reflect its adoption of a Community Empowerment Model on 18 April 2012.

Staff recommendation

That the Council

1. notes the submissions received
2. adjusts the Ten Year Plan text to make reference to the Community Empowerment model adopted by the Council
3. instructs staff to continue to develop detailed implementation plans for the Community Empowerment model.

Staff reason for recommendation

This is in accordance with the direction of the Council.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions received
2. adjusts the Ten Year Plan text to make reference to the Community Empowerment model adopted by the Council
3. instructs staff to continue to develop detailed implementation plans for the Community Empowerment model.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

This is in accordance with the direction of the Council.

Discussion

None

Our District & Communities

13. Community Activities

Submitter #472 requests that the Council transfer community halls, pools, sporting facilities to a CCO charged with operating them along commercial lines. The Council continue owning the assets but the CCO to evolve the business model more into a user-pays system.

The reasons outlined are:

- *For delivering efficiencies.*
- *The submitter notes that this model could be applied to other areas of the TCDC business.*

Submitters #649 and #696 request that the Council support community action projects that already have community support (such as the Zoom Zone, Tairua skate park and Tairua Youth Zone projects) rather than starting new projects from scratch.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers transferring the management of some community activities to a CCO.

Staff recommendation

That the Council

- 1. note the submissions but make no changes to the Ten Year Plan*
- 2. consider the structure of the community activities as part of the Community Empowerment implementation.*

Staff reason for recommendation

This is in accordance with the direction of the Council.

It is not possible to revisit the structure of these activities in time for the adoption of the 2012 Ten Year Plan. However, as part of the Community Empowerment implementation, the structure of these activities will be revisited as part of the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process. Community Boards will be involved in this process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

- 1. notes the submissions*
- 2. make no changes to the Ten Year Plan*
- 3. consider the structure of the community activities as part of the Community Empowerment implementation.*

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

This is in accordance with the direction of the Council.

It is not possible to revisit the structure of these activities in time for the adoption of the 2012 Ten Year Plan. However, as part of the Community Empowerment implementation, the structure of these activities will be revisited as part of the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process. Community Boards will be involved in this process.

Discussion

None

Our District & Communities

14. New Chums Beach

Two submissions have been received requesting that the Council consider a role in the protection of New Chums Beach.

Submitter #338 requests that the long-term environmental protection of New Chums be mentioned in the Council activities. The submitter suggests including the wording "the Thames-Coromandel District Council recognises the strategic importance of preserving New Chum in its current pristine condition as a significant natural area. We will continue to work collaboratively to find a way to ensure sustainable access to this beach for all New Zealanders while at the same time protecting and enhancing the natural features of this catchment area".

Submitter #288 requests that funds be provided to address specific matters raised in the Financial Sustainability Strategy, including:

- land use planning issues in terms of the level of protection that should be given to important natural features and landscapes such as New Chums Beach and Cathedral Cove, and
- the need to ensure that it is consistent with the vision that the community have for the district as a whole and their individual communities.

This same submitter also requests that the Council investigate and facilitate the purchasing of sensitive areas such as New Chums, by local, regional and central government.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a greater role in the protection of New Chums Beach and other areas of significance.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submission but that no additional funding be made at this time
2. further notes that Council works with other agencies, such as the Waikato Regional Council (which administers the Natural Heritage Partnership Programme), to try and achieve positive outcomes on the ground and that positive outcomes are also able to be achieved through the review and implementation of the Council's District Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is currently a resource consent application relating to a potential subdivision in the vicinity of New Chums Beach. The application is being considered through the Resource Management Act process and in accordance with the provisions of the Thames-Coromandel District Plan. Council supports the protection of areas of significance on the Coromandel Peninsula through the application of its District Plan and also by working with other agencies (such as the Waikato Regional Council which administers the Natural Heritage Partnership Programme) to secure funding where public ownership would be beneficial. The Council is currently reviewing its District Plan to better identify, manage and protect the special values and places on the Coromandel Peninsula. The District Plan review process is informed by community preferences that have been expressed over the last few years.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submission but that no additional funding be made available at this time
2. further notes that Council works with other agencies, such as the Waikato Regional Council (which administers the Natural Heritage Partnership Programme), to try and achieve positive outcomes on the ground and that positive outcomes are also able to be achieved through the review and implementation of the Council's District Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Councillor Brljevic noted a conflict of interest regarding his wife being on the committee and being Tangata Whenua. He did not participate in the discussion and did not vote.

Reason for resolution

There is currently a resource consent application relating to a potential subdivision in the vicinity of New Chums Beach. The application is being considered through the Resource Management Act process and in accordance with the provisions of the Thames-Coromandel District Plan. Council supports the protection of areas of significance on the Coromandel Peninsula through the application of its District Plan and also by working with other agencies (such as the Waikato Regional Council which administers the Natural Heritage Partnership Programme) to secure funding where public ownership would be beneficial. The Council is currently reviewing its District Plan to better identify, manage and protect the special values and places on the Coromandel Peninsula. The District Plan review process is informed by community preferences that have been expressed over the last few years.

Discussion

- Additional submission points as heard on Friday 11 May (during the Ten Year Plan hearings) from the Preserve New Chums submitter were presented.
- They have asked for a partnership between Council, WRC, Iwi, DoC and themselves and funding of \$30,000 from Council for a catchment management plan.
- The land is currently privately owned.
- Next meeting of District Plan Review Committee will include discussion on SNA's.
- Council can work with other agencies with no funding implications if desired.

Our District & Communities

15. Working With Others

The Waikato Regional Council made the following submission points with respect to the Waikato and Bay of Plenty Waste Liaison Group.

- a) *That the Council notes the Waikato Regional Council's acknowledgement of the valuable participation of TCDC in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty waste liaison group, and looks forward to its continued input and participation.*

This group brings together waste officers, planners and managers to discuss national and local issues and policies, share information and resources and foster collaboration on waste minimisation projects and initiatives.

- b) *That the Council continues to participate in sharing waste data and information*

This will assist councils to prioritise waste issues and measure improvement in alignment with waste management and minimisation plans.

- c) *That the Council notes the Waikato Regional Council's appreciation of the Council for its valuable input and contribution into the development of the draft Waikato Waste and Resource Efficiency Strategy 2012.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its participation in the waste liaison group.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and continues participation in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty waste liaison group.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Waste Management Minimisation Plan says the Council will collaborate with other agencies. Participation in the Waste Liaison Group forms part of this commitment.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. continues participation in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty waste liaison group.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Waste Management Minimisation Plan says the Council will collaborate with other agencies. Participation in the Waste Liaison Group forms part of this commitment.

Discussion

- Councillors McLean and Fox represent Council on the Waikato and Bay of Plenty waste liaison group.

Financial Strategy**16. The Cost of Doing Business**

Submitter #280, the Waikato Regional Council requests that the Council notes the Waikato Regional Council's assumption that adequate funding is provided in the draft Ten Year Plan for current and future resource consents obtaining, implementation and compliance.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council provides adequate funding for current and future resource consents obtaining, implementation and compliance.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions and make no changes to the Councils' financial strategy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council has submitted to the Waikato Regional Council's plan to oppose their raising of consent fees and informing the Waikato Regional Council that this Council has not budgeted for rises in consent fees. Waikato Regional Council was reminded that increases in this Council call on the same ratepayers.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no changes to the Councils' financial strategy.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Council has submitted to the Waikato Regional Council's plan to oppose their raising of consent fees and informing the Waikato Regional Council that this Council has not budgeted for rises in consent fees. Waikato Regional Council was reminded that increases in this Council call on the same ratepayers.

Discussion

None

Financial Strategy

17: The Financial Challenges We Face - Economic Climate

Three submissions have been received requesting that the Council acknowledges that population and business decline can be attributed not only to a financial downturn, but also to the unaffordable process/excessive rules and regulations associated with doing business with the Council. (#63, 341, 663)

Similarly, submitter #90 requests that the Council acknowledges that population and business decline can be attributed to the obstructive and vindictive nature of Council staff and that gaining approval to achieve any progress in the TCDC is prohibitive.

The submitters provide examples. Please refer to the submissions.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council acknowledges that the cost of doing business with the Council is a factor in population and business decline.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submitters concerns and does not make any changes to the Financial Strategy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Population and business decline are complex issues and while the Council certainly has a role to play the Council is signalling strongly in its draft Ten Year Plan increased support for economic development to promote economic activity in the District.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submitters concerns
2. does not make any changes to the Financial Strategy.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Population and business decline are complex issues and while the Council certainly has a role to play the Council is signalling strongly in its draft Ten Year Plan increased support for economic development to promote economic activity in the District.

Discussion

- Council is currently reviewing resource consent issues.

Financial Strategy

18. The Financial Challenges We Face - Affordability

With respect to affordability and willingness to pay the following submissions were received.

Submitter number 90 requests that the Council

- a) only implement directives if it is affordable to the ratepayer and,*
- b) not be burdened with many management staff that are unaffordable.*

The reasons outlined by the submitter include:

- *Local Government legislation allows for councils to not implement a directive if it is unaffordable*
- *What the ratepayer cannot afford, should not happen*

Four submitters requested that:

- *That the Council keep spending to a sensible limit / keeps rates down.*
- *That local government rating needs to be re-examined.*
- *Expressed views that rates should not exceed CPI.*

Reasons provided include:

- *One submitter comments that they pay huge rates in Tairua and should benefit in the same ways where rates are lower.*
- *Older people's inability to pay.*
- *Those on a fixed income are disadvantaged.*
- *Only a minority of residents can sustain even the present level of rating let alone any increase.*
- *The Council must live within its means.*

Submitter numbers include: 105, 22, 210, 636, 692

Another submitter, #284 requests that the Council retain its proposed direction of developing a more sustainable budget by way of keeping to core services, encouraging and supporting community groups to fund raise and seek alternative funding before approaching the Council for funding of local community initiatives.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council further acknowledges affordability concerns within its Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submitters concerns and does not make any changes to the Financial Strategy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Affordability has been a focus for the Council in preparing this draft Ten Year Plan. Since the writing of the draft Plan the organisation has undertaken a further review of its budgets and an organisation review, both of which have been intended to create a lower financial baseline for the Council.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submitters concerns
2. does not make any changes to the Financial Strategy.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Affordability has been a focus for the Council in preparing this draft Ten Year Plan. Since the writing of the draft Plan the organisation has undertaken a further review of its budgets and an organisation review, both of which have been intended to create a lower financial baseline for the Council.

Discussion

- Affordability has been a continuing theme of this Council.
- Some submitters ask that rates be kept low but also ask for more capital projects. The strategy does allow for this - if they are willing to pay they can have it.
- Community Boards needs to manage expectations. This will also fall to the yet-to-be appointed Community Development Officers.

Financial Strategy

19. Rates Increases

The draft Ten Year Plan proposed that rates increases be limited to CPI, but with an upper limit of LGCI + 2%.

Several submitters made comments to rates increases as follows:

- *That the Council notes Hauraki Coromandel Federated Farmers' compliment on its efforts to cut costs and limit rate increases*
- *That rates be reduced to the national average through providing essential services only, starting no new projects but only maintaining what we already have.*
- *That the Council decrease the [unspecified] rate to a level of that of 2002 plus increases of the CPI or less.*
- *That the Council does not have rate increases.*
- *That rates increases should be at nil for at least two or three years.*

Submitters to this category include: 85, 237, 90, 186, 197

In addition, staff have made a submission suggesting that the rates increases parameter be adjusted to CPI + property (rating unit) growth to align more closely with the direction signalled from Central Government in its Better Local Government reforms package.

The reasons for this request are:

- *The Better Local Government local government reform presented by Central Government in March 2012 outlined proposed financial limits for local authorities.*
- *Whilst a proposal, it is a strong indication from Central Government that they are looking to standardise financial limits across the sector.*
- *The Council should note that the proposal outlined by Central Government is for CPI + population growth. If that parameter were to be confirmed it would have reasonably serious implications for our district, with our 50% absentee ratepayer situation and a projected static (declining in parts) population.*
- *This is something that staff and the Council will actively and formally submit on and are already making known to Central Government. The Chief Executive has spoken to the Minister directly about this point.*

As such, for now, staff believe it prudent to revise the parameter concerning rates increases to CPI + property growth (rating units)

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that the Council note the submitter welcomes the production of final budgets that truly reflect Community Board planning. The Board notes:

- *They have worked hard to pursue a zero rates increase, considering rates were excessive*
- *Changes arising from many budget meetings have created a constantly moving target so that the financial outcomes are not known.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers revising its proposed rates increases limit.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions and revise the rates increases parameter to CPI + property (rating unit) growth.

Staff reason for recommendation

The draft Ten Year Plan includes strong focus on keeping rates increases to a minimum level.

Council shares the aspiration to reduce rates as far as practicable and is working on a new baseline of costs. Of course, this must not erode asset condition or levels of service.

The Council is well aware of its challenges with respect to increasing local government costs and has undertaken an organisation restructure and review to ensure that it is operating as efficiently as possible.

In March 2012, Central Government announced a reform package which proposes a national limit on rates increases to CPI + growth. The details of the reform are expected to be worked through throughout 2012. In the interim staff suggest that the rates increases parameter be adjusted to CPI + property (rating unit) growth to align more closely with the direction signalled from Central Government.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. revise the rates increases parameter to CPI + property (rating unit) growth calculated cumulatively.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The draft Ten Year Plan includes strong focus on keeping rates increases to a minimum level.

Council shares the aspiration to reduce rates as far as practicable and is working on a new baseline of costs. Of course, this must not erode asset condition or levels of service.

The Council is well aware of its challenges with respect to increasing local government costs and has undertaken an organisation restructure and review to ensure that it is operating as efficiently as possible.

In March 2012, Central Government announced a reform package which proposes a national limit on rates increases to CPI + growth. The details of the reform are expected to be worked through throughout 2012. In the interim staff suggest that the rates increases parameter be adjusted to CPI + property (rating unit) growth to align more closely with the direction signalled from Central Government.

Discussion

- This is where the decision whether CPI should be considered annually or cumulatively should be made.
- "CPI plus property growth" (upper limit) has been suggested because property growth increases costs. Leaving it at CPI only does not allow for some local government realities and is an aspirational target.
- Central Government support CPI plus population growth which does not suit TCDC with our non-resident ratepayers and declining population..
- Central Government is more concerned about the affordability to who is paying rather than the actual costs of local government.
- Need to be cognisant that local communities can't always come up with their share of funding (eg pool in Cambridge that had to be put in hold last week).
- The Council further noted the letter tabled by the Whangamata Community Board.

Financial Strategy

20. Borrowing Levels

Five submissions have been received regarding Council's proposed borrowing levels that submit the following:

- *That the Council does not extend the borrowing limit of 150% of revenue*
- *That debt levels be reduced to zero.*
- *That the Council note the submitter's concern at the rapidly rising level of debt in the Plan.*

Reasons provided by submitters include:

- *It is fiscally unsound.*
- *So that servicing debt is not a burden to our children.*
- *The Council should live within its means and not borrow.*

Submitters include: 100, 85, 636, 199, 204

One submitter, #512 requests that the Council develop a policy that allows projects or part projects within Council and/or Community Boards to be rated over one to five years rather than incurring debt. The submitter suggests a limit of \$500,000 per Board.

The reasons provided include:

- *This would allow the item to be paid in cash.*
- *Debts and interest payments are sending the District into bankruptcy. Council must live within its means.*
- *This is no different from requiring development contributions up front.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its borrowing levels or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions but adopts the borrowing limits as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The draft Ten Year Plan does not exceed the borrowing limit.

Further, the recent organisational restructure and efficiency review is intended to further reduce Council's borrowing position.

Borrowing cannot be reduced to zero, as Council's are required to share the cost of the services over those who benefit from them (intergenerational equity). Because of the life span of some of its assets, borrowing is a means of ensuring the costs are shared across those who benefit.

With respect to submitter #512, in staff's view this suggestion would mean not paying bills for costs incurred until the rate is collected. Borrowing is a 'bridging' mechanism to assist with the financing required for the construction of long-term assets. The debt still needs to be repaid from other sources of revenue.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. adopts the borrowing limits as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The draft Ten Year Plan does not exceed the borrowing limit.

Further, the recent organisational restructure and efficiency review is intended to further reduce Council's borrowing position.

Borrowing cannot be reduced to zero, as Council's are required to share the cost of the services over those who benefit from them (intergenerational equity). Because of the life span of some of its assets, borrowing is a means of ensuring the costs are shared across those who benefit.

With respect to submitter #512, this suggestion would mean not paying bills for costs incurred until the rate is collected. Borrowing is a 'bridging' mechanism to assist with the financing required for the construction of long-term assets. The debt still needs to be repaid from other sources of revenue.

Discussion

None

Financial Strategy

21. Essential Services Approach

The draft Ten Year Plan proposed that the Council views five of its activities as essential (water, wastewater, stormwater, district transportation and solid waste). The Council has taken the view that everybody in the District, regardless of where they live benefits from the provision of these services in some way and as such, proposed a number of changes to the funding of some of the essential services.

A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether submitters agree with the proposal to change how the district funds services that it views as essential. 159 people answered this question. 67 of those agreed. 40 disagreed and 52 indicated no preference.

Submissions in support of the proposal

In addition to the fixed questions, two submissions (#291 and #340) specifically requested the proposal to move to funding essential services on a district wide basis be retained. They outlined that at some point all townships will need significant expenditure for one of these activities, and given the small size of our ratepayer base it makes sense to share these costs.

Submitter #340 suggests that this should be applied to the biosolid compost facilities proposed for Tairua (and therefore should not be included in local rates levied on Tairua and Pauanui).

Submitter #291 requests that the UAGC portion be increased over time. The reason outlined is that at some point all townships will need significant expenditure for one of these activities, and given the small size of our ratepayer base it makes sense to share these costs.

Submitter #581 requests that the Council note the submitter's support for the principle of district funding but that the submitter has serious concerns in respect to the following:

- *Discussions to date have focused on the three waters alone*
- *An overnight policy change would be grossly unfair and inequitable on a single community*

The submitter considers the integrity of the proposed new structure must be supported by district/local funding mechanisms which are fully aligned to centralised/devolved activities and the change phased in.

Those not in support for the proposal

#210 and #204, oppose the proposal fund essential services on a district wide basis with reasons outlined as follows:

- *The community made it clear to the prior council that this proposal was unacceptable.*
- *Why should ratepayers incur the costs of supplying their own services as well as the same services to urban households and businesses?*
- *While the proposal may help administration, appear to lower rate and hide unaffordable actions it is not equitable.*

Submitter #680 requests that the Council explain how its aim that communities throughout the District should have (over time) equitable access to essential services can possibly happen in the more remote areas of the district.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains the view that there are district-wide benefits from the provision of the five essential services, and that the District community should contribute in some way to the funding of these services.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. *retains its view that there are district-wide benefits from the provision of the five essential services, and that the District community should contribute in some way to the funding of these services*
2. *notes that decisions regarding the funding of each individual activity are still to be deliberated and considered on an individual basis.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The submissions suggest a reasonable level of support for this principle. The Council still has the opportunity to deliberate the funding of the activities on an individual basis.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retains its view that there are district-wide benefits from the provision of the five essential services, and that the District community should contribute in some way to the funding of these services
2. notes that decisions regarding the funding of each individual activity are still to be deliberated and considered on an individual basis.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The submissions suggest a reasonable level of support for this principle. The Council still has the opportunity to deliberate the funding of the activities on an individual basis.

Discussion

- Specific funding of activities will be addressed separately.

Financial Strategy

22. Use of User Fees & Charges

A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether submitters agree with the proposal to increase user fees and charges to keep rates low? 163 people answered this question. Of those, 107 agreed. 28 disagreed and 28 indicated no preference.

Comments include:

- The submitter considers that only those who benefit should pay for expensive facilities and that a user pays system for each area should apply.
- Many ratepayers are on low fixed incomes.
- These are ways of getting the responsible party to pay for necessary council services as well as protecting the ratepayer from the consequences of unchecked problems from waste etc.
- Submitter #655 specifically requested that all district and local roading expenditure be paid for by each community who benefits from them.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains its view that a user pays approach should apply where it is affordable to do so.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. retains its view that that a user pays approach should apply where it is affordable to do so
2. notes that decisions regarding the funding of each individual activity are still to be deliberated and considered on an individual basis.

Staff reason for recommendation

The submissions suggest a strong level of support for this principle. The Council still has the opportunity to deliberate the funding of the activities on an individual basis.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retains its view that that a user pays approach should apply where it is affordable to do so
2. notes that decisions regarding the funding of each individual activity are still to be deliberated and considered on an individual basis.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The submissions suggest a strong level of support for this principle. The Council still has the opportunity to deliberate the funding of the activities on an individual basis.

Discussion

None

Financial Strategy

23. Just in Time Approach

Two submissions were received regarding the Council's "Just in Time" approach to provision of infrastructure.

Submitter #252 noted their support for the proposed and outlined reasons as follows:

- *If people really know the cost they are carrying for the size of our wastewater treatment built for the big waterways they would be sick.*
- *It is wrong that so many people on small incomes are subsidising that development.*

Submitter #524, NZTA, noted their interest in further discussions about the 'just in time' approach and the potential impacts on the District's transportation networks.

NZTA noted that they are currently in the process of developing assessment procedures for Asset Management Plans that may be impacted by this proposal and would be interested in further discussion. They note that proactive asset management to reduce the longer term replacement costs or extend replacement timing is key to applying the 'just in time' approach.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains its view that a "just in time" approach provision of essential infrastructure is applied.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains its view that that a just in time approach to the provision of essential infrastructure is applied.

Staff reason for recommendation

The submissions don't suggest a strong level of opposition that would warrant Council's reconsideration of its position, and neither does Council's professional advice.

Council resolution

That the Council retains its view that that a just in time approach to the provision of essential infrastructure is applied.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The submissions don't suggest a strong level of opposition that would warrant Council's reconsideration of its position, and neither does Council's professional advice.

Discussion

None

Financial Strategy

24. Overhead Allocation

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) and the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that the Council review the overhead allocation to local activities.

The reason provided is that the scale or amount currently charged to overheads in local activities is too high and this needs reviewing to make activities more affordable.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers reviewing the overhead allocation to local activities

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions and makes no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is not possible to revisit the overhead allocation in time for the adoption of the 2012 Ten Year Plan. However, as part of the Community Empowerment implementation, the overhead allocation will be revisited as part of the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process. Community Boards will be involved in this process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

It is not possible to revisit the overhead allocation in time for the adoption of the 2012 Ten Year Plan. However, as part of the Community Empowerment implementation, the overhead allocation will be revisited as part of the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process. Community Boards will be involved in this process.

Discussion

- Some of the outcomes of the organisational review have been included in the revised financial figures, but not all.

Financial Strategy

25. The Costs of Doing Business

Several submitters request that the Council provide an answer to how the cost for changes to population and land use estimated to be \$76.5 million was arrived at, when an average increase of 276 dwellings has been identified.

Submitter #157 requests that the Council revisit the information on page 42 (the cost of delivering this proposal) and clarify whether the additional capacity is for planned growth areas, existing serviced areas or summer peak predictions.

Submitters to this matter include: 63, 90, 663 and 157

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers providing an answer to this submitter.

Staff recommendation

That the Council provide the submitter with an answer to their question as follows.

An average increase of 276 dwellings is per annum, which over ten years equates to 2,760 dwellings. \$76.5 million is the costs associated with growth over the ten year period, and over the 2,760 dwellings.

In addition the infrastructure identified to cater for growth is not just connected to growth within the next ten year period, but beyond due to the long life span of a number of these assets.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staffs view is that the context has been slightly misinterpreted in this situation and that a response to the submitter should be provided.

Council resolution

That the Council provide the submitter with an answer to their question as follows.

An average increase of 276 dwellings is per annum, which over ten years equates to 2,760 dwellings. \$76.5 million is the costs associated with growth over the ten year period, and over the 2,760 dwellings.

In addition the infrastructure identified to cater for growth is not just connected to growth within the next ten year period, but beyond due to the long life span of a number of these assets.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

The view of staff is that the context has been slightly misinterpreted in this situation and that a response to the submitter should be provided.

Discussion

- Appears that information has been taken out of context.

Forecasting Assumptions

26. Fuel Supply

One submission (#202) was received requesting that the Plan be rewritten so that it places the likelihood of liquid fuel supply/price increase at the centre of the forecasting assumptions.

The reason outlined is that the Ten Year Plan contains flaws in that it fails to acknowledge and provide for the imminent liquid fuel price and supply crisis and its impacts.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its assumption regarding liquid fuel supply and associated price increases.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

- 1. note the submitter's concern*
- 2. reconsiders whether its current assumptions regarding fuel and energy costs is appropriate*
- 3. if the Council wishes to reconsider its assumption, staff would suggest reinstating a sustainability work programme (sustainability strategy) by providing resource to undertake this work or agree to a reprioritisation of current work programme.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The draft Ten Year Plan contains the following assumption regarding fuel and energy costs.

(Volume 1, page 252)

Assumption - The assumption is that energy supplies and costs will not limit development but may affect the affordability/viability of some business and communities if prices rise too steeply.

Risk - Fuel and energy costs continue to rise steeply.

Level of Uncertainty - Medium

Reasons and Financial Effect of Uncertainty - Higher fuel and energy costs will place pressure on operating budgets but are expected to be manageable. Higher costs may affect resident and business affordability with implications for rates.

In 2010 the Council embarked on a sustainability work programme within the organisation. This work has been put on hold due to staff vacancies. The responsibility for this work programme sat with the Strategic Planning Team, which at present will not be resourced to undertake this work in the near future.

Should the Council wish to signal a stronger priority for this work, it will require additional resources to do so (suggest 0.5 FTE) or a reprioritisation of the current work programme.

Council resolution

That the Council:

- 1. notes the submitter's concern*
- 2. strengthen reference to fuel and energy costs assumption in the Ten Year Plan.*

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The draft Ten Year Plan contains the following assumption regarding fuel and energy costs.
(Volume 1, page 252)

Assumption - The assumption is that energy supplies and costs will not limit development but may affect the affordability/viability of some business and communities if prices rise too steeply.

Risk - Fuel and energy costs continue to rise steeply.

Level of Uncertainty - Medium

Reasons and Financial Effect of Uncertainty - Higher fuel and energy costs will place pressure on operating budgets but are expected to be manageable. Higher costs may affect resident and business affordability with implications for rates.

Discussion

- Work was started in 2010 on the sustainability work programme but has been put on hold.
- The question was asked about what assumptions you have to make to recalculate the figures for fuel supply.
- The Chief Executive stated that if Council wished further work to be done on fuel supply issues that a person would be brought in rather than have existing staff look at it therefore there would be associated costs.
- Increases in fuel rises have already been factored into the Ten Year Plan assumptions (approximately 65% inflation over the ten years)
- Fuel increases come through straight away through contracts.
- The bitumen index is reviewed quarterly.

Forecasting Assumptions

27. Growth

Four submitters made comments to the Council's growth assumptions, with three of the opinion that the draft Ten Year Plan was contradictory between pages 19 and 25.

- That the Council develops a formula to obtain best information for growth projections. The submitter notes that information on page 25 is contradictory to information presented on page 19. (#157)
- That the Council notes the submitter's comment that Council has stated on page 19 that the number of houses has continued to increase at a high rate but has stated on page 25 that the **number of new dwellings is only expected to grow by 276 on average a year.** (#63 & #663)
- That the Council notes the submitter's comment that Council has stated on page 19 that the number of houses has continued to increase at a high rate and the submitter notes that **Coromandel Town is experiencing low growth** and local builders and tradespeople are unemployed, the number of properties for sale are at a record low (#90)

Submitter #157 also notes that the statement "the number of houses has continued to increase at a high rate" and "we've had to spend more to cater for that increased growth as well as catch up" indicates that past information has been wrong and there are now infrastructure deficits.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its growth (dwelling and rating unit) assumptions.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions but makes no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The growth projections have been revised throughout the Ten Year Planning process to ensure that the Plan was founded on a more conservative growth model.

The submitters note a contraction between pages 19 and 25, but omit the mention of the text in brackets on page 19 as follows [underlined below for emphasis]

The number of houses has continued to increase at a high rate (although it has slowed more recently) which has meant that in recent years we've had to spend more to cater for that increase growth...

Staffs view is that the context has been misinterpreted in this situation. The purpose of including this statement is to acknowledge that it was due to our previous high growth that we have some of the infrastructure we do, and with that the cost of maintaining and operating that infrastructure.

Council Resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. adjust the text on page 19 to reflect the lower growth rate in the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The growth projections have been revised throughout the Ten Year Planning process to ensure that the Plan was founded on a more conservative growth model. The Council agreed that this could be expressed more clearly on page 19 and that the existing statement was confusing.

Discussion

- The Council agreed that this could be expressed more clearly on page 19 and that the existing statement was confusing.

Water Supply Activity (Funding)

28. One-District Funding Proposal

Four submissions were received concerning the one-district funding proposal.

- Two submissions requesting the funding be retained.
- One requesting the proposal be withdrawn and another suggesting a user pays approach.

In a bit more detail, submitter #65 requested that the Council withdraw the proposal to charge for reticulated water on a one-district basis.

- The submitter considers that the changes are ill advised and that the real rating impacts on different areas will be unknown until the projects are physically undertaken.
- The submitter also noted that as variations become apparent the Council will seek to provide these services on the basis of financial neutrality rather than on the basis of actual need.

Two submissions were received that requested that the proposal for water supply to be funded district wide be retained.

- Submitter #291 and #217.
- Submitter #217 suggested that the proposal is consistent with district funding of essential services.

Submitter #204 requested that the Council institute a user pays approach to water supply services.

- The reason outlined was that the one district proposal ignores efforts by people who harvest roof water and subsidises those who choose to build where they wished causing extra reticulation costs.

Submitter #579 requests that the Council

- note the submitter's disappointment at the impact on Whangamata ratepayers of the proposed changes
- consider alternatives such as a mix of District and Local funding
- offset the cost reductions achieved by TCDC against the increased burden for Whangamata ratepayers
- phase in both increases and decreases over 5 years if the proposed increases go ahead.

Similarly, submitter #585 requests that increases [for Whangamata] are introduced through a stage implementation. The submitter notes that the proposed changes are unfair to Whangamata especially as the full impact is felt in one year.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the one-district water supply funding proposal, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. retain the one district funding approach to water
2. may wish to create two separate activities and therefore rates for treated and untreated water supplies but this will come at a significant cost for the untreated supplies
3. debate the matter further.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is acknowledged there would be winners and loser if funding were to revert back to individual scheme. However due to affordability issues with a number of the smaller schemes this approach is not advocated. It is for this same reason that wastewater is district wide funding. We have water schemes that pay upwards of \$800 and other who pay only around \$250. It is also the reason the District Transportation activity is funded District Wide. If it were not Coromandel community board rates would increase by such an amount as to make it unaffordable for most to pay their rates.

For reasons of equity is also recommended that the funding structure for water and wastewater be consistent. That is they are both district wide funded or they are not.

Water Charge 2012/2013

	UAGC	Metered	Total	Increase
<i>Draft TYP</i>	\$ 22.48	\$211.23	\$233.71	
<i>No UAGC</i>	\$ -	\$258.76	\$258.76	\$25.04
Rural Split - No UAGC				
<i>District</i>	\$ -	\$289.43	\$289.43	\$55.72
<i>Rural Water Scheme</i>	\$ -	\$551.18	\$551.18	\$317.47

Unmetered

	UAGC	Unmetered	Total	Increase
<i>Draft TYP</i>	\$22.48	\$427.71	\$450.19	
<i>No UAGC</i>	\$ -	\$475.23	\$475.23	\$25.04
Rural Split - No UAGC				
<i>District</i>	\$ -	\$462.82	\$462.82	\$12.64
<i>Rural Water Scheme</i>	\$ -	\$886.14	\$886.14	\$435.95

Serviceable

	UAGC	Serviceable	Total	Increase
<i>Draft TYP</i>	\$22.48	\$320.78	\$343.26	
<i>No UAGC</i>	\$ -	\$356.42	\$356.42	\$13.16
Rural Split - No UAGC				
<i>District</i>	\$ -	\$347.12	\$347.12	\$3.86
<i>Rural Water Scheme</i>	\$ -	\$664.60	\$664.60	\$321.34

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retain the one district funding approach to water
2. in the 2012/2013 year continue to review the implications of the one district approach for existing Council schemes for communities with water loan charges and communities currently with untreated water supplies
3. within that review consider a fair and equitable approach to the funding of water supply.

Moved - French

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

For reasons of equity the funding structure for water and wastewater should be consistent.

Discussion

15 May 2012

- Relates to Water being spread evenly of area of benefit.
- This decision doesn't change the lump sum loan repayments that are in place in Coromandel
- A funding option could be capital as local, and maintenance as district.
- Suggested that the meeting is suspended and the Mayor and Chief Executive read the reports that lead to the issues in Cooks Beach wastewater lump sum scheme and come back to the meeting to ensure the issue doesn't happen again.
- The lump sum agreement is registered on the property titles.
- Lump sums were for capital only.
- Repayment by lump sum by those that chose the drip feed approach is offered every two years.
- How will communities that are metered be dealt with?
- Suggested that there should be consistency between water and wastewater funding.
- In the past for district wide for wastewater all costs associated were added together and then divided across all connections.
- Suggested stay with status quo with wastewater and look at other essential services in their own right.
- Paper taken to Council last year around funding option for Wastewater to be taken off district wide.

- Staff to look at splitting capex and opex over local and district and what that means. There is a possible issue with debt.
- Chief Executive stated that once figures are known then 'out lyers' would have to be addressed.

16 May 2012

- If need to adjourn to wait for water and wastewater information there are ten year plan project constraints to consider (i.e Audit NZ who are booked for 28 May and availability of elected members to come back for two days end of next week).
- Going to capital with wastewater would not stand up.
- Chief Executive suggested that areas that have done lump sums or drip feed could be ring fenced to make the decision more equitable. There will always be winners and losers, but over time it would even out.
- Could Council decide that no one pays for more than one scheme at any time?
- Using retained earnings could dampen the rates rise if UAGC taken off - would equate to \$20 rather than \$40.
- The move from \$470 to \$880 (based on \$10m capital project) in Thames Valley/Matatoki is due to reallocation of United Waters costs and the hectare charge no longer being present. Are there any options to soften this?
- Thames Valley/Matatoki have come from a very different funding structure than the other water supplies.

Water Supply Activity (Funding)

29. Equal Charge to Every Rateable Rating Unit Proposal

NB: a variety of terminology has been used by submitters regarding this topic. Some submissions refer to "no option to connect" whereas others refer "not receiving the service". The Council's basis for this proposal was that all benefit from provision of these services, however, in this context, "not receiving the service" has been taken to mean the same as not connected.

55 submissions were received, including one with 30 signatories from "Concerned Local Ratepayers" of Coromandel (#681) requesting that the proposal to introduce an equal charge to every rateable rating unit for water supply be withdrawn.

The reasons for this request include:

- The proposal is unfair, unreasonable, idiotic and unwarranted as rural ratepayers already bear the full cost of their own water systems and receive no benefit from council water services
- Rural ratepayers have no option to connect to council services
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Council's proposal of a user pays approach, and represents a subsidy by non-users
- The proposal is not consistent with the Local Government Act 2002 requirements to identify the distribution of benefits when establishing a targeted rate.
- The proposal represents a large rates increase.
- The Council has given inadequate sensitivity to the understanding of or concern for the effects of this plan.
- One submitter notes a 24% increase in their UAGC charges which this wastewater proposal contributes to.
- Ratepayers within serviced areas had the opportunity to comment on the capital works implemented and their financial impact but it's unfair to apply it to other ratepayers after the changes have been made.
- There is a public good from ratepayers supplying their own services that should be recognised.
- The beneficiaries are clearly identifiable - those who are connected and can use the service
- One submitter disputes the rationale that rural ratepayers use the service when they visit urban areas and states that they cannot just go into town and use water services at any house and business
- Public toilets are already included as a separate charge in the rates so ratepayers should not have to pay again for the water and wastewater for this service
- One submitter has the view that the cost of this service to provide public benefit is compensated for by other cross subsidies because of the funding policies of the council and the use of value based rating.

Submitter numbers are: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 32, 33, 35, 38, 52, 53, 65, 70, 78, 87, 104, 113, 134, 146, 147, 190, 191, 199, 204, 211, 213, 217, 224, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 241, 245, 287, 299, 339, 410, 470, 507, 508, 512, 523, 557, 596, 628, 680 and 681 (30 signatories)

One submission (#217) requested that the proposal to introduce an equal charge to every rateable rating unit for water supply be retained.

The reason outlined by the submitter was that the proposal is consistent with district funding of essential services.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the water supply funding proposal, whereby 10% of the water supply activity is funded from the Uniform Annual General Charge, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council either:

1. adopt the water funding proposal, whereby a percentage of the activity is funded from the Uniform Annual General Charge, or
2. debate the proposal further.

Staff reason for recommendation

The initial proposal recognised that funding decisions in regards to water and wastewater brought consistency of funding methods.

It has long been contested that those rate payers residing outside the urban areas receive no discernible benefit for the amount they contribute through their rates.

Rural ratepayers contribute approximately \$4m per year towards Councils rates this represents some 6% of the total rate take.

Council currently spends some \$5.7M on maintaining rural roads that service these same rural ratepayers.

It is contested that these same properties benefit from the existence of the urban centres scattered throughout the district.

To exist these urban centres require reticulated water and wastewater services. Urban centres attract businesses to set up to service these urban areas, creating employment. These businesses not only service those located within the urban boundaries but those in the rural areas too. Examples include petrol stations to hairdressers, schools to supermarkets.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. withdraw the water and wastewater funding proposal, whereby a percentage of the activity is funded from the Uniform Annual General Charge
2. retain the status quo as per the 2009-2019 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

In response to feedback received from the community, this proposal is being withdrawn.

Discussion

- This decision is required to inform the figures that staff are asked to put together on decision 28.
- Suggested that people outside the area of benefit do actually benefit from the service being at the town whether they actually use the service themselves.
- There are activities that urban ratepayers subsidise rural (eg roading), not just rural subsidising urban.
- Only those that are connected or have wastewater running past their gate pay for wastewater.
- If wastewater and water has UAGC taken out then we drop to \$3million under the 30% cap.

Wastewater Activity (Funding)

30. Equal Charge to Every Rateable Rating Unit Proposal

NB: a variety of terminology has been used by submitters regarding this topic. Some submissions refer to "no option to connect" whereas others refer "not receiving the service". The Council's basis for this proposal was that all benefit from provision of these services, however, in this context, "not receiving the service" has been taken to mean the same as not connected.

83 of submissions were received requesting that the proposal to introduce an equal charge to every rateable rating unit for wastewater be withdrawn.

The reasons for this request include:

- *The proposal is unfair, unreasonable, idiotic and unwarranted as rural ratepayers already bear the full cost of their own wastewater systems and receive no benefit from council water services*
- *Rural ratepayers have no option to connect to council services*
- *The proposal is inconsistent with the Council's proposal of a user pays approach, and represents a subsidy by non-users*
- *The proposal is not consistent with the Local Government Act 2002 requirements to identify the distribution of benefits when establishing a targeted rate.*
- *The proposal represents a large rates increase.*
- *The Council has given inadequate sensitivity to the understanding of or concern for the effects of this plan.*
- *Onsite wastewater schemes (not just reticulated urban schemes) help ensure that harbours, sea and soil are kept clean to environmental standards with flow on effects to public health.*
- *One submitter notes a 24% increase in their UAGC charges which this wastewater proposal contributes to.*
- *Ratepayers within serviced areas had the opportunity to comment on the capital works implemented and their financial impact but it's unfair to apply it to other ratepayers after the changes have been made.*
- *The beneficiaries are clearly identifiable - those who are connected and can use the service*
- *One submitter disputes the rationale that rural ratepayers use the service when they visit urban areas and states that they cannot just go into town and use water services at any house and business*
- *Public toilets are already included as a separate charge in the rates so ratepayers should not have to pay again for the water and wastewater for this service*
- *One submitter has the view that the cost of this service to provide public benefit is compensated for by other cross subsidies because of the funding policies of the council and the use of value based rating.*
- *The submitter considers that their plant is required to meet national standards in waste treatment and therefore has met their obligation to the "District wide benefit" Council is proposing to charge for.*

Submitter numbers are: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 32, 33, 35, 38, 52, 53, 65, 70, 78, 87, 104, 134, 146, 147, 190, 191, 199, 206, 211, 213, 224, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 241, 245, 287, 299, 339, 410, 470, 507, 508, 512, 523, 557, 596, 628, 675, and 681 (30 signatories).

One submission (#213) requested that rather than spending time allocating costs, the Council focus on improving the costs of the water and waste services. The submitter further notes some points for consideration (please refer to the submission).

Submitter #579 requests that the Council

- *note the submitter's disappointment at the impact on Whangamata ratepayers of the proposed changes*
- *consider alternatives such as a mix of District and Local funding*
- *offset the cost reductions achieved by TCDC against the increased burden for Whangamata ratepayers*
- *phase in both increases and decreases over 5 years if the proposed increases go ahead.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the wastewater funding proposal, whereby 10% of the activity is funded from the Uniform Annual General Charge, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopt the wastewater funding proposal, whereby a percentage of the activity is funded from the Uniform Annual General Charge.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff suggests that the funding decisions in regards to water and wastewater are the identical for reasons of consistency.

It has long been contested that those rate payers residing outside the urban areas receive no discernible benefit for the amount they contribute through their rates.

Rural ratepayers contribute approximately \$4m per year towards Councils rates this represents some 6% of the total rate take.

Council currently spends some \$5.7M on maintaining rural roads that service these same rural ratepayers.

It is contested that these same properties benefit from the existence of the urban centres scattered throughout the district.

To exist these urban centres require reticulated water and wastewater services. Urban centres attract businesses to set up to service these urban areas, creating employment. These businesses not only service those located within the urban boundaries but those in the rural areas too. Examples include petrol stations to hairdressers, schools to supermarkets

It is envisaged that wastewater rates would increase as follows:

Wastewater Charge 2012/2013

	W/wtr charge	UAGC	Total	Increase
Draft TYP	\$673.02	\$36.74	\$709.76	
5% UAGC	\$710.41	\$18.37	\$728.78	\$19.02
No UAGC	\$747.80	\$ -	\$747.80	\$38.04

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. withdraw the water and wastewater funding proposal, whereby a percentage of the activity is funded from the Uniform Annual General Charge
2. retain the status quo as per the 2009-2019 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

In response to feedback received from the community, this proposal is being withdrawn.

Discussion

None

Wastewater Activity (Funding)

31. One-District Funding

Two submissions were received concerning Council's one-district funding of wastewater, requesting this approach be amended/withdrawn.

Submitter #65 requested that the proposal for one district funding of wastewater be amended to apply 50/50 with area of benefit and one district funding. The reason provided is so to restore the logic of "relative neutrality" across the different wards/schemes.

Submitter number 204 requests that the one district funding of wastewater be withdrawn. The reasons provided include that:

- *the one district wastewater charge was inequitable when introduced as it lowered the pan charge for eastern seaboard ratepayers and approximately doubled the Thames and Coromandel pan charge.*
- *eastern seaboard ratepayers do not help pay the submitter's costs of maintaining their own septic tank.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the one-district approach to funding of wastewater, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retain the one district funding approach to wastewater.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is acknowledged there would be winners and losers if funding were to revert back to individual scheme. However due to affordability issues with a number of the smaller schemes this approach is not advocated. It is for this same reason that water is proposed to go to district wide funding. We have schemes that pay upwards of \$800 and other who pay only around \$250. It is also the reason the District Transportation activity is funded District Wide. If it were not Coromandel community board rates would increase by such an amount as to make it unaffordable for most to pay their rates.

Council resolution

That the Council retain the one district funding approach to wastewater.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

It is acknowledged there would be winners and losers if funding were to revert back to individual scheme. However due to affordability issues with a number of the smaller schemes this approach is not advocated. It is for this same reason that water is proposed to go to district wide funding. We have schemes that pay upwards of \$800 and other who pay only around \$250. It is also the reason the District Transportation activity is funded District Wide. If it were not Coromandel community board rates would increase by such an amount as to make it unaffordable for most to pay their rates.

Discussion

None

Wastewater Activity (Funding)

32. Trade Waste Charges

Three submissions were received regarding the proposal to gradually implement trade waste charges.

Two submissions (#291 and #340) request that the Council retain the proposal for trade waste charges.

The reason provided was that it fits with user pays but hopefully will also provide an incentive for industry to improve management and recovery of trade waste.

Specifically, submitter #340 suggests that a portion of the charges are put aside to assist businesses to become 'greener'.

Submitter #197 requested that the Council note the submitter's dissatisfaction that the impost of a waste levy on industrial zonings is detrimental to local industry and ignores urban residential contributions to the problem.

The submitter's reasons included:

- *The impost of what appears to be annual levies of \$800,000 on SMEs will discourage business activity without benefit.*
- *The submitter proposed and submitted broader and equitable charging to enforce compliance with the new bylaw, but this was previously ignored.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the gradual implementation of trade waste charges, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retain the gradual implementation of trade waste charges.

Staff reason for recommendation

Indicated revenue from Tradewaste charges is less than \$300,000 (GST inclusive). This will offset wastewater charges required from those paying the wastewater charge.

The aim of the tradewaste bylaw and associated charge is not to offset the rates required from other ratepayers connected to Councils schemes but to reduce the levels of undesirable "tradewaste elements" from commercial activities entering Councils wastewater system.

Council resolution

That the Council retain the gradual implementation of trade waste charges.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

Indicated revenue from Tradewaste charges is less than \$300,000 (GST inclusive). This will offset wastewater charges required from those paying the wastewater charge.

The aim of the tradewaste bylaw and associated charge is not to offset the rates required from other ratepayers connected to Councils schemes but to reduce the levels of undesirable "tradewaste elements" from commercial activities entering Councils wastewater system.

Discussion

None

Stormwater Activity (Funding)

33. Changes to Catchments

Seven submissions have been received concerning the proposals to change the stormwater catchment areas.

Six submitters were requesting that the proposal to increase stormwater charges as a result of the catchment changes be withdrawn, for the following communities:

- Te Kouma (#191, #241, #250)
- Opoutere (#194)
- Kennedy Bay (#191)
- Tuataewa (#191)
- Otama (#507, #508)

Reasons for these requests include:

- There is a public good from ratepayers providing their own services that recognised.
- The absence of any stormwater infrastructure should not be rated for.
- These residents will not benefit from stormwater charge increases.
- Maintenance of the roadway affected by stormwater problems has been carried out and funded by residents [Te Kouma specifically].
- There has been no meaningful consultation with residents and ratepayers.
- Communities with sealed roads do have a need for a stormwater system.
- The impact on these small rural communities is significant and many view that there is no system other than road drains to be maintained.

Submitters also offered alternative suggestions including:

- That the Te Kouma's targeted rate for stormwater should be at the same level as that applied for stormwater in the general rate i.e. a low differential rate of 0-33%, in recognition of the significant cost saving to the Council not having to provide Te Kouma with utilities stormwater infrastructure (#241)
- One submitter (#250) submits that the 75% fractional charge for stormwater be withdrawn, and previous charges to date be withdrawn.
- The roading activity should be responsible for maintaining the road side drains.

In addition to the above, one submitter (#193) requested that the Council advise why the Rings Beach community **have been removed** from the Stormwater charging regime and **reinstate Stormwater charges for that community to a 75% rate.**

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the stormwater catchments as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan or amend.

Staff recommendation

1. That the Council retain the stormwater catchments as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.
2. That the Council considers the removal of properties 399;401;403;405; and 407 Te Kouma Road, Te Kouma as these properties are considered to be outside the catchment boundary for Te Kouma.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council provides what can be considered a stormwater disposal service through both its stormwater and roading activity. While the assets maintained through the roading activity are arguably primarily focussed on the disposal of stormwater generated on the roading network the distinction between the two activities is not always clear and the roading stormwater assets do contribute to the disposal of stormwater in urban areas. The assets are classified differently between these two systems based on:

- Roding – catchpits, catchpit leads, culverts, and some outfall structures

- *Utilities – pipe networks, manholes, pumpstations and outfall structures*

The stormwater activity is currently funded on the following basis:

- a) district general rate - 30%*
- b) community board stormwater charge - 17.5%*
- c) community board stormwater rate (value of improvements) - 52.5%.*

Acknowledging the variations indifferent stormwater catchments

- *Communities with a stormwater rating unit asset value of \$1,000 or greater a full charge on lines B&C above.
(Note Assets such as culverts beneath roads have been excluded from this exercise as it can be argued they provide limited benefit to stormwater generated from properties.)
Calculation (Value of Infrastructure divided by number of rating units in the catchment)*
- *Communities with a stormwater rating unit asset value of less than \$1,000 pay a 0.75 differential charge on lines B&C above.*

Properties located in the following communities would attract a 0.75 differential under the proposal:

- *Hikutaia*
- *Kennedy Bay*
- *Kuaotunu West*
- *Simpsons Beach*
- *Opoutere*
- *Te Kouma*
- *Tuateawa*

Under the changes proposed in this revised report, a number of settlements within the Thames and Coromandel stormwater catchment areas will move to a nil charge. This is due to there being no stormwater surface channel assets within the roading activity. This is viewed as being fair and equitable.

Properties in the following communities will no longer be subject to the Urban Stormwater charge B&C lines above:

- *Kauaeranga*
- *Matatoki*
- *Otama*
- *Puriri*
- *Rings Beach*
- *Whakatete Bay*

The request by Te Kouma submission to further reduce this differential on Lines B&C above is not supported at this time.

The Request by the Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) to include Rings Beach in the 0.75 Differential class is supported due to the recent work undertaken by Council on stormwater infrastructure in that area. However Staff will not be in a position to accomplish this in time for the adoption of the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan. As such it proposed that it will be addressed in the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process.

Motion

That the Council amend the proposed stormwater catchment differential charges as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan from 0.75 to 0.5.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Lost

Against - six

Council resolution

That the Council amend the proposed stormwater catchment differential charges as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan from 0.75 to 0.6.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Against - one

Cr Brljevich requested his vote against be recorded.

Reason for resolution

To provide for a fairer approach to the funding of stormwater.

Council resolution

That the Council removes properties 399; 401; 403; 405; and 407 Te Kouma Road, Te Kouma as these properties are considered to be outside the catchment boundary for Te Kouma.

Moved -Brljevich

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

To provide for a fairer approach to the funding of stormwater.

Council resolution

That the Council instruct staff to review the approach to Rings Beach in 2012/2013 year, so as to be addressed in the 2013/2014 Annual Plan.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Brljevich

Reason for resolution

In response to the Mercury Bay Community Board's request for this review.

Discussion

- Similar situation in Opoutere, but Opoutere had an element of roading that Te Kouma does not have.
- Suggested that Council would be open to challenge with a targeted rate.
- Council does what it can through roading budget, but sometimes has to be picked up through utilities.

Stormwater Activity (Funding)

34. Funding

Seven submitters made comments requesting changes to the funding of the stormwater activity, as follows:

Submitter #204 requests that a **one district approach not be applied to stormwater services**. The reasons provided include:

- Stormwater works are pertinent to each area and people have chosen to live there and are thus accountable.
- To apply a user pays approach.

Submitter #29 requests that a **levy toward stormwater be applied to all forestry operations**. The reasons provided include:

- Most streams and rivers that flood do so because of existing or previous afforestation.
- Forestry operations do change water courses and silt raises the river levels.
- These are commercial ventures that make profit from the steep land and higher rain fall but the damage done is probably irreversible and ratepayers suffer.

Two submitters (12 and 199) request that **property owners providing their own systems are not required to contribute funding to Council systems**. The submitters consider that the proposals are not fair and logical.

Submitter #157 requests that **any stormwater charges on the submitter's property be removed, other than that which every property contributes to by way of UAGC toward essential services**.

Submitter #579 requests that **information about the impact on Whangamata ratepayers of the proposed change to district-wide funding of stormwater be provided**.

Submitter #585 notes concern that **no one is aware of the full consequences of stormwater funding changes intended in 2015**.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the funding of stormwater as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retain the funding of stormwater as proposed.

Staff reason for recommendation

Forestry operations contribute towards the funding of the stormwater activity through the district general rate which contributes 30% towards the funding of the stormwater activity throughout the district.

Submitter #579 requests that information about the impact on Whangamata ratepayers of the proposed change to district-wide funding of stormwater be provided. Based on the 2011/2012 Annual Plan rating requirements the impact of District wide funding of the Stormwater Activity would be around \$40-\$45 per ratepayer but this will vary based on property value.

Council resolution

That the Council retain the funding of stormwater as proposed.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Forestry operations contribute towards the funding of the stormwater activity through the district general rate which contributes 30% towards the funding of the stormwater activity throughout the district.

Submitter #579 requests that information about the impact on Whangamata ratepayers of the proposed change to district-wide funding of stormwater be provided. Based on the 2011/2012 Annual Plan rating requirements the impact of District wide funding of the Stormwater Activity would be around \$40-\$45 per ratepayer but this will vary based on property value.

The Council considers that for the time being this is the most appropriate approach to funding the stormwater activity.

Discussion

- The proposal was clarified as status quo.
- Can stormwater from forestry be picked up anywhere else? No it is regional council.

Stormwater Activity (Services)

35. Services - Decrease Levels of Service Proposal

In the draft Ten Year Plan the Council proposed a reduction to the overall levels of service for the Stormwater activity. A specific question was included in the feedback from to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal.

161 submitters responded to the question. Of those, 46 were in agreement, 58 disagreed and 57 had no preference.

There were few comments to accompany these responses, as follows:

There was one comment in support of the proposal to reduce levels of service:

- *Reducing the level of service for this essential service (by reducing the level of improvement programme) is an acceptable approach to reducing Council costs in the short term.*

Four submitters not in support of the proposal consider:

- *this service to be a basic council function / basic need*
- *that stormwater service is essential*
- *that the proposal contradicts with the Council's strong focus on essential infrastructure*
- *that stormwater needs to be monitored as flooding can occur.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintain its position and reduce the level of service for stormwater as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the content of the submissions and retain the proposed level of service for the duration of this Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Although stormwater is an essential service for Council, the cost to provide the existing level of service has become unsustainable for the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan. The proposed level of service is intended to still protect habitable areas, with little provision to protect uninhabitable areas such as roads and sections.

This level of service will now drive improvements to be only undertaken if there is a risk of inundating a habitable area (this excludes sheds and garages). The level of service for stormwater infrastructure would limit spend to cater only for the highest priority works and maintain overall rates at a sustainable level.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the content of the submissions
2. retain the proposed level of service for the duration of this Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Although stormwater is an essential service for Council, the cost to provide the existing level of service has become unsustainable for the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan. The proposed level of service is intended to still protect habitable areas, with little provision to protect uninhabitable areas such as roads and sections.

This level of service will now drive improvements to be only undertaken if there is a risk of inundating a habitable area (this excludes sheds and garages). The level of service for stormwater infrastructure would limit spend to cater only for the highest priority works and maintain overall rates at a sustainable level.

Discussion

None

Water Supply Activity (Services)

36. Services - Overall

Submissions made regarding the water supply activity overall are as follows:

Submitter #197

Requests that the Council seek independent management and legal help with respect to running its water and wastewater schemes.

The submitter refers to object contract management in the past as their reason for this.

Submitter #63

Requests that the Council does not proceed with any further upgrades of water supplies at this time unless that is the desire of the communities directly affected.

The reasons outlined include:

- *The legislation allows for councils not to proceed if water supply upgrades are unaffordable.*
- *Water supplies have been operating sufficiently for many years now and there is no imperative to make the changes proposed.*

Submitter #577

That the Council do not adopt the drinking water standards if the community cannot afford them.

The reasons outlined include:

- *The community does not have to adopt the standards where they cannot afford them.*
- *They are an unnecessary financial burden on a struggling community.*

Three submitters have also commented to the Council's approach to the Water Supply activity.

These three submitters request:

That the current approach to water supply be changed so that the primary domestic supply is from tanks and secondary supply and seasonal loading is from reticulated services.

Specifically, that the Council:

- *Declare the residential areas of smaller settlements such as Tairua, as semi-rural to bypass the Government's requirements for water provision that apply to fully-occupied towns.*
- *Develop a policy that supports existing residential landowners in the provision of tanks as a prime source of water*
- *Require all new residential buildings to have a tank of sufficient size to supply domestic water for a minimum anticipated demand of four months*
- *View water provision by way of a reticulated supply as secondary to the primary role of residential tanks. Such reticulated provisions are to meet non-residential needs and those of the fire service.*

Other submitters (113, 135 and 657) requests the Council encourage the use of rainwater tanks and systems for grey water treatment, through rebate or other means, to put less pressure on the mains supply.

The reasons for the request include:

The major problem with water supply is the huge variation in seasonal demand, and this requires a different response to water supply and use than for towns with a predominantly resident population.

Submitter numbers include: 113, 135 and 222

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider changing its approach to the water supply activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. investigates the potential for use of rain tanks and re-use systems and where they would be considered appropriate. Budget and resource will be required to continue these investigations and encourage their use. If these measures are implemented, they should be incorporated into the Engineering Code of Practice and District Plan review
3. continue with the service delivery mechanism review in terms of its contract management for this activity
4. continue to operate within the required legislation for this activity.

Staff reason for recommendation**Rain tanks and re-use systems:**

There has been increasing focus at a governance level for investigating storage and demand management measures for the district's water supplies. There are some issues surrounding the use of rain tanks especially in relation to Drinking Water Standards. Rain tank systems (even with a two stage filter and UV, point of entry system) will not meet the requirements under the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand. Water from these tanks however can be used for boat wash-down or irrigation purposes. There is potential to install these systems on new dwellings, however the current Drinking Water Standards are still an issue.

Fire demand (flow rate and volume) has a higher requirement on the water reticulation and storage than normal demand and even with rain tanks or re-use systems installed; Council will still need to meet these requirements. Fire fighting requirements is the main driver for reticulation sizing and storage requirements, if residential demand was significantly reduced or removed, there would be a minimal reduction to reticulation sizing and storage capacity.

Rain water and grey water re-use systems can be of some financial benefit to ratepayers if water meters are installed and used for charging.

Contact management:

Council is in the process of reviewing the management of this activity and how the activity is provided. This process should continue.

Meeting Legislation:

Council is looking at its obligations to supply water to meet the Drinking Water Standards quality parameters. There may be some difficulty with this as Councils townships are all over the maximum population limits that would enable a lower level of treatment. It is because of this staff recommend that Council should be budgeting and preparing to meet the requirements under the relevant standards. Although this is currently being investigated by staff, there are only some areas that this could be possible in this district.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. pursue the use of rain tanks and re-use systems and where they would be considered appropriate. Budget and resource will be required to continue these investigations and encourage their use. Measures should be incorporated into the Engineering Code of Practice and District Plan review.
3. continue with the service delivery mechanism review in terms of its contract management for this activity.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution**Rain tanks and re-use systems:**

There has been increasing focus at a governance level for investigating storage and demand management measures for the district's water supplies. There are some issues surrounding the use of rain tanks especially in relation to Drinking Water Standards. Rain tank systems (even with a two stage filter and UV, point of entry system) will not meet the requirements under the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand. Water from these tanks however can be used for

boat wash-down or irrigation purposes. There is potential to install these systems on new dwellings, however the current Drinking Water Standards are still an issue.

Fire demand (flow rate and volume) has a higher requirement on the water reticulation and storage than normal demand and even with rain tanks or re-use systems installed; Council will still need to meet these requirements. Fire fighting requirements is the main driver for reticulation sizing and storage requirements, if residential demand was significantly reduced or removed, there would be a minimal reduction to reticulation sizing and storage capacity.

Rain water and grey water re-use systems can be of some financial benefit to ratepayers if water meters are installed and used for charging.

Contact management:

Council is in the process of reviewing the management of this activity and how the activity is provided. This process should continue.

Discussion

- Suggested that part two of the resolution be strengthened.
- Need for part four around legislative requirement around operations questioned. Taken out and dealt with in decision 37.

Water Supply Activity (Services)

37. Drinking Water Standards

A submission was received regarding the Council's approach to drinking water standard.

Submitter #237 requests that:

- *The Council notes the submitters disappointment that more pressure has not been put on the government and the regional council to be more conciliatory.*
- *That the Council look hard at different water supply issues. For example the Omaha water supply has run for 100 years quite satisfactorily.*

Reasons:

The Council is adopting a welfare state mentality of attempting to provide schemes ratepayers will spend years for. The schemes are grandiose gold rather than silver.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers an advocacy role regarding drinking water standards and water supply provision.

Staff recommendation

That the Council continue to operate within the bounds of the required legislation as far as practicable. It is recommended however, that Council work closely and communicate with other Councils and Government organisations, to ensure that the relevant legislation is not forcing a higher level of risk mitigation than is required and restricting the use of some cost effective options.

Staff reason for recommendation

Increasing Standards for Drinking Water:

By 2016 all of Councils water supplies will be required to meet the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008) as opposed to the current 2000 standard. This increase in standard will require more intensive monitoring and upgrades to the existing infrastructure. This increase to monitoring and the required upgrades will result in capital expenditure and has been allowed for under the proposed budgets in the draft Ten Year Plan. Council is exploring options for water upgrades including seeking government approval for breaching the timeframe if required.

Restricting use of Other Technologies:

Under the existing standards, and also the 2008 standards, Council is unable to utilise technologies such as household Point of Entry (PoE) system (two cartridge filters and UV disinfection). There is a section of the 2008 standards that has not been completed for Rural and Agricultural supplies. It was intended that this section would be completed to cater for areas such as Matatoki and Thames Valley; however recent communication from the Ministry of Health has indicated that when this section is completed PoE systems may not be acceptable.

Council resolution

That the Council continue to operate within the bounds of the required legislation as far as practicable. It is recommended however, that Council strongly advocate to Regional and Central Government to ensure that the relevant legislation is not forcing a higher level of risk mitigation than is required and restricting the use of some cost effective options.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution**Increasing Standards for Drinking Water:**

By 2016 all of Councils water supplies will be required to meet the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008) as opposed to the current 2000 standard. This increase in standard will require more intensive monitoring and upgrades to the existing infrastructure. This increase to monitoring and the required upgrades will result in capital expenditure and has been allowed for under the proposed budgets in the draft Ten Year Plan. Council is exploring options for water upgrades including seeking government approval for breaching the timeframe if required.

Restricting use of Other Technologies:

Under the existing standards, and also the 2008 standards, Council is unable to utilise technologies such as household Point of Entry (PoE) system (two cartridge filters and UV disinfection). There is a section of the 2008 standards that has not been completed for Rural and Agricultural supplies. It was intended that this section would be completed to cater for areas such as Matatoki and Thames Valley; however recent communication from the Ministry of Health has indicated that when this section is completed PoE systems may not be acceptable.

Discussion

- Should we be asking LGNZ to advocate on our behalf? Suggested that we would be more effective advocating for ourselves.
- Suggested that harder wording required in the resolution around self sufficiency.

Whitianga Town Centre Upgrade

38. Reduction to Project Budget

A significant item in the draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan is the Whitianga Town centre upgrade.

The submission form specifically asked submitters whether they agreed with a town centre upgrade in Whitianga. 165 submitters responded to this question. 48 of submitters who responded agreed with the proposal, 47 disagreed and 70 had no preference.

A comment box was provided on the form. Comments in support of the proposal include:

- The roads are very wide and can be marked at a relatively small cost, for bike lanes and there should be an integrated approach for parking, cycleways and traffic flow
- It is cheaper to encourage bikes, walkways and maybe over the Christmas period a town shuttle rather than a carpark building
- It is sensible to upgrade services prior to the superficial street side stuff
- Whitianga is a popular tourist location and upgrades will enhance if done well, cheapest is not always the best in the long-term
- Agreement for this proposal but only if funded locally from subdivision reserve account and not from district rates (#152)
- This project should be brought forward and completed as an immediate priority, has been due for a long time the years (#131)
- Essential to continued tourism growth in the region (#573).

Comments in opposition to the proposal include:

- Enough money has been spent on Whitianga and there is a lot of seasonal money in the form of baches
- Thames and Thames coast residents are always paying for an area that they do not benefit from
- Do not agree with this project, but if it were to proceed then it should be funded locally.

The Mercury Bay Community Board (submitter #193) requested amendments (decreases) to the Whitianga town centre upgrade budget for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and local transportation activities. The Board considers amendments are required to the four activities contributing to this upgrade to reflect a more realistic project cost and timeline. Refer to submission for full details.

Further comments from submitters include that the Council and Mercury Bay Community Board commit to **consult with young people** when considering any upgrade of the Whitianga Town Centre.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan the Whitianga town centre upgrade project, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the draft Ten Year Plan budget for the Whitianga Town Centre upgrade in line with the Community Board's submission.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is understood that the revised budgets presented in the Community Board submission are based on a conceptual design. Until detailed design and cost estimates are completed, there is a level of risk around the revised budgets. The contingency included in the cost estimates is very light given the early stage of the project and the robustness of the estimates. Budgets may need to be revised once the detailed design is complete.

Staff confirmed that Year 1 relates to the first year of construction and is 2013/2014 and estimate the indicate rating impact as follows:

Total Spend							
	Water	Wastewater	Stormwater	Roading	Total		
Draft TYP	\$ 2,716,840	\$ 5,508,013	\$ 2,889,461	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 13,114,314		
Submission	\$ 1,005,077	\$ 1,374,039	\$ 1,496,436	\$ 2,874,749	\$ 6,750,301		
Difference	\$ (1,711,763)	\$ (4,133,974)	\$ (1,393,025)	\$ 874,749	\$ (6,364,013)		
Total Rating Impact (based on property receiving metered water charge & connected to wastewater)							
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Mercury Bay	\$ (0.01)	\$ (0.66)	\$ 1.68	\$ 3.47	\$ (18.40)	\$ (32.34)	\$ (28.71)
Rest of District	\$ (0.01)	\$ (0.67)	\$ 0.09	\$ 0.82	\$ (16.01)	\$ (25.02)	\$ (21.75)
Breakdown by activity and year in more detail:							
Water							
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Per UAGC charge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ (0.33)	\$ (0.63)	\$ (0.44)
Per Metered charge	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.11	\$ 0.15	\$ (8.08)	\$ (7.59)	\$ (5.21)
Per Unmetered charge	\$ -	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.11	\$ 0.15	\$ (8.08)	\$ (7.59)	\$ (5.20)
Per Serviceable charge	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.08	\$ 0.11	\$ (6.06)	\$ (5.70)	\$ (3.91)
Wastewater							
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Per UAGC charge	\$ -	\$ (0.06)	\$ (0.02)	\$ 0.04	\$ (0.58)	\$ (1.28)	\$ (1.23)
Per Wastewater charge	\$ (0.02)	\$ (0.63)	\$ (0.17)	\$ 0.45	\$ (6.48)	\$ (14.31)	\$ (13.69)
Stormwater							
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Per Local rate/charge	\$ -	\$ 0.01	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.34	\$ (4.21)	\$ (9.39)	\$ (9.25)
Per General rate	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.15	\$ 0.17	\$ (0.54)	\$ (1.20)	\$ (1.18)
Local Transportation							
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Per Local rate/charge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.39	\$ 1.31	\$ 1.82	\$ 2.07	\$ 2.30

Council resolution

That the Council amends the draft Ten Year Plan budget for the Whitianga Town Centre upgrade in line with the Community Board's submission.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - McLean

Summary of Written Submissions Received and Decisions Made

Reason for resolution

It is understood that the revised budgets presented in the Community Board submission are based on a conceptual design. Until detailed design and cost estimates are completed, there is a level of risk around the revised budgets. The contingency included in the cost estimates is very light given the early stage of the project and the robustness of the estimates. Budgets may need to be revised once the detailed design is complete.

Discussion

None

Aquaculture Infrastructure Expansion

39. Harbour Facilities Activity - Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area

Submissions have been received both for and against this project. Two submissions request more detailed information about this financial risks associated with this project.

Submissions in support of the proposal

Five submitters specifically noted that the proposal to expand wharfing infrastructure to support the aquaculture industry be retained.

One submitter (Coromandel Marine Farmers Association, #231) supports the budgetary provision conditional on a number of criteria:

- *The Coromandel Marine Farmers association has full input into the development including all relevant decisions and cost sharing*
- *That it must be at Sugarloaf*
- *That the budgetary period be extended from a 3 year 'window' to a 5 year period to allow greater flexibility.*

Greenshell NZ (#203) submitted in support of the expansion project and the means by which it is proposed to be funded. The submitter affirms that they are committed to funding the costs via a line-levy over an agreed timeframe.

Whilst not specifically mentioning this project, the Waikato Regional Council (#280) requests that the Council notes the Regional Council's appreciation for its support for the aquaculture sector and the partnership approach, and looks forward to continuing to work together. They note that the aquaculture sector could be a valuable opportunity for the district and region.

Reason for support include:

- *the marine farming industry creates considerable importance and benefits for the district, region and New Zealand.*
- *the marine farm industry is currently planning for significant expansion in area and production volumes over the coming decade and expect that all this product will need to be landed and serviced from Coromandel.*

Submitter numbers in support include: 191, 203, 231, 242 and 340.

Submissions opposing the proposal

- *Two submissions were received opposing the proposal, requesting that funding be removed.*
- *One submitter requested that instead the funding be applied to services which benefit those paying the rates.*
- *Another submitter requested that the Council thoroughly research whether further aquaculture is viable before giving further support to expanding this industry.*
- *Another requesting that the Council looks after what is has and stops being conned by the thought of extra money through such possible disasters as fin fishing.*

Reasons for opposition include:

- *It should be up to the industry to provide its own facilities.*
- *If aquaculture industry does not increase at the rate hoped for than ratepayers will be left picking up the tab.*
- *It is highly likely that if fin fish farms eventuate the catch would be landed on the other side of the Firth for transport to Auckland rather than on the Peninsula.*
- *Imported fish food uneaten would put further pollution into our waters. (NB: #349 also notes that the submitter notes more marine reserves will create a safe increase in local fish.)*
- *These businesses make enough money to pay their own way.*
- *The wharfing infrastructure seems to be designed to encourage and support an industry which many people don't want here.*
- *This activity is going well beyond the provision to essential services to ratepayers.*
- *This funding would set a dangerous precedent as other areas would want the same.*
- *There is considerable concern in some segments of the industry that mussel yields are decreasing in the Gulf, and there are insufficient nutrients to support increased farming.*

Submitter numbers in opposition include: #85, 287, 291, 349 and 577

Submissions requesting further information

Two submissions were received requesting further information and/or consideration be given to the project. Including:

- that the number of questions on the financial risk inherent in this project are answered before proceeding with it, including:
 - where is the evidence of the written legal commitment of the users of the project?
 - where is the guarantee of the Council's retained ownership of the facility?
 - has the wharf site ever been gazetted as industrial and is the District Plan going to do this?
 - what are the implications for neighbouring residents?
 - how will the Council deal with resulting nuisances (e.g. noise, bright lights)
 - will there be recognition of the effect of the development on property values?
- Another submitter (250) submits that they cannot support the proposal until some basic cost-benefit analysis is available for consideration.

The reason for further information being requested:

The submitter is concerned at the lack of financial detail in the draft Plan and the absence of a financial risk assessment. It does not seem to be prudent financial management.

Submitter numbers who requested further information: 241 and 250

Request for consultation

The Coromandel-Colville Community Board requested in their submission that the decision on the preferred site and proposed development be undertaken in partnership with the Community Board (#191)

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the Aquaculture Infrastructure Expansion as planned.

Staff recommendation

That the Council proceed with the Aquaculture Infrastructure Expansion as planned subject to the Business Case and a workable management plan being approved by the Council.

Staff reason for recommendation

At its Council meeting held on 18 April 2012, the Council selected Sugarloaf as its preferred location for an expansion to the wharf and boat ramp. Sugarloaf is an existing facility located just south of Coromandel Town.

The Council has agreed to proceed only to the next stage of the project, which is a business plan and draft resource consent application, which will require a further approval.

The Business Case will outline the funding intended which has been signalled as paid by the industry. It has also been noted that TCDC has requested that Regional Council partner in upfront loan provision and that talks have begun with the Government on its role in funding.

Submitters to the Ten Year Plan will have more opportunities to have their say about this project as it progresses through its stages towards a notified resource consent process.

Council resolution

That the Council proceed with the Aquaculture Infrastructure Expansion as planned subject to the Business Case and a workable management plan being approved by the Council.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

At its Council meeting held on 18 April 2012, the Council selected Sugarloaf as its preferred location for an expansion to the wharf and boat ramp. Sugarloaf is an existing facility located just south of Coromandel Town.

The Council has agreed to proceed only to the next stage of the project, which is a business plan and draft resource consent application, which will require a further approval.

The Business Case will outline the funding intended which has been signalled as paid by the industry. It has also been noted that TCDC has requested that Regional Council partner in upfront loan provision and that talks have begun with the Government on its role in funding.

Submitters to the Ten Year Plan will have more opportunities to have their say about this project as it progresses through its stages towards a notified resource consent process.

Discussion

- The budget for Sugarloaf wharf is approximately \$3million.
- A higher figure was in the draft Ten Year Plan to allow other more expensive locations to be considered.
- Majority of risk if the resource consent fails falls on the industry.

Aquaculture Infrastructure Expansion

40. Harbour Facilities Activity - Reducing Expenditure

There are nine submission points concerning reducing expenditure have been received from staff. One relates to a reduction of the aquaculture infrastructure expansion in Coromandel for 2012/2013. The budgets for 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 will remain unchanged until more detailed business planning is undertaken.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reduces the allocated budget of the aquaculture infrastructure expansion in Coromandel.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes that the 2012/2013 budget allocated for aquaculture infrastructure expansion in Coromandel be reduced from \$1.45M to \$850,000 including carry over from 2011/2012 year for the resource consent. The budget for 2013/2014 be removed and for 2014/2015 be increased to \$2.3m, plus inflation, for capital expenditure. That the Council notes that a more detailed business plan is being brought forward.

Staff reason for recommendation

- If the Council approve a wharf location this year, the next step involves developing a business plan, which once approved by Council, will trigger a resource consent process. The budget for the resource consent process needs to be reduced after taking advice from the aquaculture industry's planning consultant. The budget required for the resource consent is advised to be reduced to \$850,000. This would not include the improvements to the Te Kouma/SH25 intersection, which if approved, will be part of the district roading budgets to potentially attract NZTA subsidy.
- The aquaculture industry will be funding the resource consent by introducing line levies to effectively reimburse Council for the upfront payments to fund the consenting part of the project. Exact details for the funding arrangements will be developed and approved by Council at the business planning stage of the project.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes that the 2012/2013 budget allocated for aquaculture infrastructure expansion in Coromandel be reduced from \$1.45M to \$850,000 including carry over from 2011/2012 year for the resource consent
2. remove the budget for 2013/2014
3. increase the budget for 2014/2015 to \$2.3m, plus inflation, for capital expenditure
4. notes that a more detailed business plan is being brought forward.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Brljevich

Reason for resolution

- If the Council approve a wharf location this year, the next step involves developing a business plan, which once approved by Council, will trigger a resource consent process. The budget for the resource consent process needs to be reduced after taking advice from the aquaculture industry's planning consultant. The budget required for the resource consent is advised to be reduced to \$850,000. This would not include the improvements to the Te Kouma/SH25 intersection, which if approved, will be part of the district roading budgets to potentially attract NZTA subsidy.
- The aquaculture industry will be funding the resource consent by introducing line levies to effectively reimburse Council for the upfront payments to fund the consenting part of the project. Exact details for the funding arrangements will be developed and approved by Council at the business planning stage of the project.

Discussion

- The \$850,000 is for the resource consent only.
- Total cost in the draft was \$7.23million, revised figure \$3.15million - see below

	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Total
Draft TYP	\$1.1m	\$1.449m	\$3.465m		\$7.23m
Revised resource cost	\$225k	\$85k			
Revised capex				\$2.3m plus inflation	\$3.15m

Revenue and Financing Policy

41. Tairua and Pauanui Communities

Submitter #217 requests that the Council:

- continues with its agreement to monitor the collection and application of rates spending within the Tairua and Pauanui individual communities, and
- from 2013 the rates collected in the categories identified (in attachment F of the submission) be wholly allocated to the community they are collected in.

The submission includes a number of attachments by way of background and support for this position.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council

- a) continues to monitor the collection and application of rates spending within the Tairua and Pauanui individual communities
- b) from 2013 the rates collected in the categories identified (in attachment F of the submission) be wholly allocated to the community they are collected in

Staff recommendation

That the Council in relation to the above request, adopts the Revenue and Financing Policy as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is suggested that this issue of separating the funding and expenditure streams of some activities funded by the Tairua/Pauanui Community board area as a whole into separate Tairua and Pauanui areas be addressed as part of the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process. A paper on the timeframe will be prepared for an upcoming Board meeting.

The first part of the submission does not request a change to the Revenue and Financing policy, but rather requests Council continue to monitor the collection and spend of "locally funded rates" in relation to Tairua and Pauanui. Council will continue to do this.

The second part of the submission does request a change to the Revenue and Financing Policy. The concern is that Council did not consult on such a proposal as part of the 2012 Ten Year Plan Process and as such it is questionable as to whether Council could show that this particular matter as undergone appropriate consultation if it were to implement it as part of the Ten Year Plan process.

There is still a significant amount of work to go through such as determining funding boundaries.

Motion

That the Council in relation to the above request, adopts the Revenue and Financing Policy as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded -

Motion lapsed due to lack of seconder

Council resolution

That the Council in principle accepts rates be accounted for according to source and application of funds in the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

To provide some immediate resolve on this matter for the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board.

Discussion

- Staff recommendation has the communities remaining together.
- The Community Board submission represents 600 people from Pauanui.
- In the past a separate record was kept of what went where to help moderate discussions around fairness and equity across the two areas.
- Will the community empowerment model help?
- Likely that the rural base of 8% physically sits mainly in Tairua.
- Splitting the budgets is manageable.

Revenue and Financing Policy

42. Definition of Commercial

Two submissions have been received concerning the definition of commercial property types in the Revenue and Financing Policy.

Submitter #144 requests that the Council deem **those that offer accommodation for sale should be deemed commercial operators**. As such, they should equally share the burden of costs that local authorities are required to charge.

More specifically:

- That any property offering accommodation for less than a 28 day stay should be deemed commercial, regardless of its size.
- All properties offering commercial accommodation should be rated commercial for the commercial portion of their property.

The reasons provided include:

- The submitter provides a number of examples in support of their request.
- The submitter further notes that because the structure of the rating policies and the definitions applied, developers have taken advantage of the anomalies that occur to create accommodation options for the travelling public which do not contribute fairly to the TCDC rating pool.
- Further, the submitter believes that operators are compromising the safety and comfort of the guests because they do not apply commercial building standards to what is commercial accommodation.

Submitter #85 requests that **rating structures provide for all tourism good/service providers to pay for the full cost of the core essential TCDC provided services they use**, especially a new rating system that increases rates on Bed and Breakfasts in residential areas.

The reasons provided include:

- The beneficiaries of increased funding to Destination Coromandel and information centres are tourism facility and service operators, and their customers.
- It is not an essential service and there is no justification for homeowners to fund these services via rates.
- Those who do not own tourism facilities would like to see those businesses using some of their own profits to fund services such as Destination Coromandel.
- The guests of a neighbouring bed and breakfasts use 6-10 times as much water, sewerage, rubbish and recycling as the submitter's household.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its definition of 'commercial' or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council makes no change to the Industrial and Commercial Differential as stated in the draft Revenue and Financing policy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff have discussed this with other local authorities that have been through the process of amending their rating policy to capture all short term accommodation within the commercial differential. These projects have taken extended periods of time to investigate and implement the changes. In most cases it has been perceived that the application of two differential categories due to the split use nature of the property/s has been an expensive exercise.

It is staff's understanding that the final recommendation given to Wellington City Council by the contractor undertaking this project was the introduction of a uniform targeted rate for B&B and other non-commercial short stay accommodation

rather than imposing a commercial differential on all or part of a rating unit used for residential purposes e.g. B&B accommodation, and Bookabach properties.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. adjust the Revenue and Financing policy definitions for Industrial, Commercial and Residential removing references to Bed and Breakfasts or Homestay accommodation
2. instruct staff to undertake a full review of the rating policy within the 2012/2013 year to ensure all different commercial enterprises are considered or assessed
3. signal in the Ten Year Plan the Council intent to reconsider its approach to Bed and Breakfast and Homestay and other commercial enterprises.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Councillor McLean declared a conflict of interest and did not participate in the discussion or vote.

Reason for resolution

A further review of this is required before implementing this change. Signalling an intent of changes coming is appropriate.

Discussion

- It is expected to take up to 12 months to do a full scale review of all accommodation providers.
- A conservative approach would be taken with the review.
- The review will not mean extra rates, only that the burden is redistributed.
- The wastewater charge is the charge that will 'hurt' if you get zoned commercial.
- What difference to the rates would moving B&B's to commercial from residential create?
- Is targeting these ventures counter to economic development?
- Can commercial operations be charged via sewerage meters?
- Finance -high level movements based on a 5 bedroom house with 4 for accommodation if connected goes up \$1,145, non-connected \$370.

Revenue and Financing Policy

43. Definitions - Bed and Breakfasts

Submitter #518 requests that

- the last sentence of the definition for Industrial and Commercial be expanded as follows:
 - "For the purposes of clarify B&B and other similar short stay accommodation that utilise essential services over and above those considered standard for a residential property and activity advertise on the web, print, on air, or through information centres are classified for rating purposes as Industrial and Commercial"
- lines 5-9 of the definition for Residential ("Bed and Breakfast and homestay accommodation used.... will be treated as Residential") be removed.

The reasons for the requests include:

- For fairness and equity all businesses should be rated on a pro rata basis for services and functions regardless of size.
- The definitions in the draft Plan are ambiguous, open to abuse and need to be better defined.
- It would be too hard to police using the current definition (particularly around the word 'offered' in the definition of Residential).
- It is not the size of the building or number of rooms that place more costs on Council, it is the services the establishment uses.
- Other operators have to pay for these services and a level playing field is needed.
- The user should pay.
- The definitions need to be legally robust.
- All B&B and short stay accommodation should be classified as Industrial and Commercial where the activity is carried out for private pecuniary profit.
- The proposed changes would provide fairer outcomes and be easier to implement.
- See submission 518 for further details, queries and examples.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its definition of commercial bed and breakfast or adopts as proposed in the draft Revenue and Financing Policy.

Staff recommendation

That the Council makes no change to the Industrial and Commercial Differential as stated in the draft Revenue and Financing policy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff have discussed this with other local authorities that have been through the process of amending their rating policy to capture all short term accommodation within the commercial differential. These projects have taken extended periods of time to investigate and implement the changes. In most cases it has been perceived that the application of two differential categories due to the split use nature of the property/s has been an expensive exercise.

It is staff's understanding that the final recommendation given to Wellington City Council by the contractor undertaking this project was the introduction of a uniform targeted rate for B&B and other non-commercial short stay accommodation rather than imposing a commercial differential on all or part of a rating unit used for residential purposes e.g. B&B accommodation, and Bookabach properties.

Staff would recommend that a full review of the rating policy should be undertaken to ensure all different commercial enterprises are captured rather than a piecemeal approach to capture only commercial accommodation.

Further, small scale use as a Bed and Breakfast is about the proportion of the residence being used for that purpose thus allowing six bedroom home that offers only two rooms for homestay to remain in residential category.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. makes no change to the Industrial and Commercial Differential as stated in the draft Revenue and Financing policy.
2. instruct staff to undertake a full review of the rating policy within the 2012/2013 year to ensure all different commercial enterprises are considered or assessed.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

A further review of this is required before implementing this change. Signalling an intent of changes coming is appropriate.

Discussion

- As had for decision 42.

Revenue and Financing Policy

44. Small Business

Submitter #642 requests that the Council review its rating policy in respect of services provided to small business to make it more equitable.

The submitter considers the current policy relating to solid waste, stormwater, Thames water and wastewater places an unfair burden on small businesses in proportion to the services they use.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the Revenue and Financing Policy with respect to small business, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council makes no change to the Revenue and Financing Policy with respect to small business.

Staff reason for recommendation

Consideration would need to be given to the definition of small business e.g. should the floor area or the income/turnover of the business be used to determine this category.

Rather than a piecemeal approach to changes a full review of the rating policy should be undertaken to ensure consideration is given to the effect of proposed changes on all properties not just those thought to be currently "adversely" affected by the policy.

Council resolution:

That the Council:

1. makes no change to the Revenue and Financing Policy with respect to small business
2. instructs staff to undertake a full review of the rating policy within the 2012/2013 year to ensure all different commercial enterprises are considered and assessed with respect to the SUIP charges.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Rather than a piecemeal approach to changes a full review of the rating policy should be undertaken to ensure consideration is given to the effect of proposed changes on all properties not just those thought to be currently "adversely" affected by the policy.

Discussion

- As had for decision 42 and 43
- Only one rating notice is issued.

Revenue and Financing Policy

45. SUIP

15 submissions have been received, mainly from camp ground owners, operators or those who own caravans within such sites, regarding the way in which the SUIP is proposed to be charged.

The submitters are requesting that the Council:

- a) retain the proposal that in the case of camping grounds, consented use of the land will be the primary criteria when determining the rating category and that ownership and exclusivity not be taken into account as a relevant criteria when evaluating consumption of activities funded by Council.
- b) does not apply the SUIP definition to individual camp sites within camp grounds offering temporary holiday accommodation in accordance with the camping ground regulations 1985.

One submitter (195.1) suggests including the following working within the definition set out in draft Policy: "...or other agreement, except in relation to the use and occupation of temporary living places and travellers accommodation provided within commercial campgrounds..." [insertions underlined].

- c) That the Council clarifies the Revenue and Financing Policy with regards to the submitters questions below so that the Policy can be applied as intended.

The submitters note that pending the outcome of the Council's review of these submissions they reserve the right to submit further on the UAGCs and targeted rates causes and wording.

The submitters noted that two clarifications were asked of council staff however the submitter considers that responses weren't adequate and he was instead referred to this submission process.

- Attachment A: definitions - what category will campgrounds providing temporary accommodation fall within?
- Section 2: Uniform Annual General Charges - is it Council's intention to apply the SUIP policy to individual campsites within camping grounds?

Submitter number include: 103, 110, 121, 156, 195, 228, 317, 320 and 652

The reasons provided include:

- That the camping ground market is extremely price sensitive and will not stand the increases in cost if the submitter had to recover the addition of SUIP charges.
- This would go against the Council's economic development focus.
- The submitters consider that this is about "getting the balance right."

Another submitter (#145) considers that the Te Puru Holiday Park is not commercial but is a family oriented facility. This same submitter provides articles regarding the SUIP definition and Kaipara District Council.

More specifically, three submitters requested that the SUIP definition is not applied to Te Puru Holiday Park as follows:

- That the SUIP definition is not applied to the Te Puru Holiday Park regarding the individual sites within a camping ground/holiday park where the inhabiting of that site is limited by the TCDC District Plan - definition of Temporary Living Places
- That a blanket interpretation of the definition 'separately used or inhabited portion of a rating unit' is not applied by the Council and each case (including the Te Puru Holiday Park) be assessed on its merits.
- That the Council defines within the draft Ten Year Plan what definition for rating purposes camping grounds fall into.

The reasons provided include:

- One submitter again provides an extract from the Kaipara Council website in support of their submission.
- Submitter #383 notes that TCDC should not simply target soft targets like individual occupiers who are already paying them within their rental and/or camp fees.

Submitter #653 requests that no rates charges be applied per holiday camp site at Te Puru Holiday Park.

The reasons provided include:

- *The park is not commercial but is for holiday making and enjoyment.*
- *The charge will be imposed on campers and is on top of what park owners already pay. Park owners cannot afford to pay the rates.*
- *Campers should not have to pay the Council when they receive very little.*
- *Most campers are casual campers who already pay the park owners for the service they receive.*

Submitter #216 requests that the Council advise how it intends to improve the Te Puru Holiday Park facilities if the proposed SUIP rate is applied. The submitter asks whether the Council will be responsible for maintenance of access roads, street lighting, toilets and dump points. The submitter considers the Te Puru Holiday Park as being reasonably self-sufficient, and considers that freedom campers are welcomed at their expense.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains the SUIP definition as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains the SUIP definition as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Historically there have essentially been two "types" of camp grounds within the TCDC area, those that are owned and/or operated as commercial businesses and those that are owned by a number of individuals and used only by those individuals.

Where the camp ground is not been used as a commercial business, e.g. Waitete Bay, uniform charges have been assessed based on the number of exclusive use areas (per SUIP). On the other hand commercial camp grounds have been assessed as one SUIP on the basis that each site can be let out on a casual/short stay basis at the discretion of Camp Ground Management.

Although it is acknowledged that a number of the camp grounds have agreements in place with campers for their caravan to stay on site it is our understanding the location and availability of particular site remains at the discretion of the camp ground manager. The recent changes to the ownership structure that provide for specified sites to set aside for exclusive use by one party at commercial camp grounds bring them in line with the private camp grounds therefore it is appropriate that the same basis should be used to assess SUIP's in these instances. Where there is a mixed use of the campground, e.g. part continues to operate as a business (short term camping facility for the public) and the balance is set aside for exclusive use by the party with an interest a specific site it is appropriate to continue to assess SUIP's on the business component with a factor of one and the balance based on the number of separate exclusive use sites.

Currently mixed use camp grounds are treated as commercial however staff can see no reason to differentiate the privately owned sites from other fully private camp grounds where full separate use charges are imposed.

Council resolution

That the Council retains the SUIP definition as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Historically there have essentially been two "types" of camp grounds within the TCDC area, those that are owned and/or operated as commercial businesses and those that are owned by a number of individuals and used only by those individuals.

Where the camp ground is not been used as a commercial business, e.g. Waitete Bay, uniform charges have been assessed based on the number of exclusive use areas (per SUIP). On the other hand commercial camp grounds have been assessed as one SUIP on the basis that each site can be let out on a casual/short stay basis at the discretion of Camp Ground Management.

Although it is acknowledged that a number of the camp grounds have agreements in place with campers for their caravan to stay on site it is our understanding the location and availability of particular site remains at the discretion of the camp ground manager. The recent changes to the ownership structure that provide for specified sites to set aside for exclusive use by one party at commercial camp grounds bring them in line with the private camp grounds therefore it is appropriate that the same basis should be used to assess SUIP's in these instances. Where there is a mixed use of the campground, e.g. part continues to operate as a business (short term camping facility for the public) and the balance is set aside for exclusive use by the party with an interest a specific site it is appropriate to continue to assess SUIP's on the business component with a factor of one and the balance based on the number of separate exclusive use sites.

Currently mixed use camp grounds are treated as commercial however staff can see no reason to differentiate the privately owned sites from other fully private camp grounds where full separate use charges are imposed.

Discussion

- Hahei Holidays changed their position at their verbal submission and are happy with how SUIPs are applied after speaking with Council staff.
- Prior to 2007 Te Puru Camp Ground rates were \$2,700. In 2007 Council became aware of parts of Te Puru Camp Ground being sold as share titles allowing exclusive use to the owner.
- In 2011/2012 charged \$45,000 in rates. The owners of the sites pay towards the rates as part of their management fee (reviewable figure) - SUIP is \$360 per year plus GST.
- Te Puru is a combination public private camp ground.
- A temporary holiday site can't have consecutive occupation for more than 50 days as per camping regulations. People get around it by staying 50 days and then going away for a couple of nights.
- SUIP's fund things such as local advocacy and if they are removed from places such as the camp grounds then that person is not paying anything towards these.
- There are private campgrounds that may only have rights through their constitution. SUIPs have always been applied to them with no problem.

Revenue and Financing Policy

46. Sports Clubs

Two submissions (one with multiple signatories) have been received regarding the wastewater rate charges based on pans/urinals for sports clubs.

The Thames Squash Club (#678) requests that

- the Ten Year Plan clarify how targeted wastewater rate charges based on pans/urinals will be off-set for non-profit community sport and recreation clubs;*
- and, if no provision to off-set the charges has been made, that a differential rate be applied in these situations upon application by clubs.*
- Note: The submission is also supported by two other sports clubs.*

The reasons provided include:

- The Thames Squash Club provides a recreational facility that helps deliver health and community benefits at no cost to the ratepayer.*
- The club already bears significant running costs.*
- If sports and recreation clubs were not provided by the community, there would probably be a demand for Council to provide them.*
- Club members already pay District-wide wastewater charges*
- These are difficult economic times.*
- The Ten Year Plan aims to build 'stronger communities'.*

The Thames Community Board (#520) requests that a differential be introduced requiring sports clubs to pay 0.25 of the 'normal' charge

The reason provided includes:

- Many sports clubs are suffering financial stress which is aggravated by excessive rates and charges*
- It is Council's role to provide collective support for these community needs when individual support is insufficient.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its funding policy for sports clubs, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopts its funding policy as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council currently provides rates remissions for Community, Sporting and Other Non-profit Organisations under its rates remission policy.

Under that policy, upon application, the Council may remit up to 50% of rates and charges except that; no remission will be granted on targeted rates for water, wastewater, solid waste, or for loan charges.

It is appreciated that wastewater charges can make up a significant portion of the rates bill for sporting club or an incorporated society given the number of pans they may have. However, any potential extension of the remission policy into the area of wastewater charges especially requires careful and in-depth analysis, of the potential financial impacts of such a proposal.

Would council envisage incorporated societies such as the Whangamata Club and Workingman's Club incorporated to be included in such a proposal. Would the remissions be funded by Board Area or district wide?

If Council wished to investigate this proposal further it could instruct the Chief Executive to include it in the work programme to develop the 2013/2014 Annual Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. adopts its funding policy as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan
2. Instruct staff to undertake a review of rates for assisting non-profit organisations within the 2012/2013 year.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Brljovich

Reason for resolution

Council currently provides rates remissions for Community, Sporting and Other Non-Profit Organisations under its rates remission policy but would like to consider what further assistance or how it is best able to assist non-profit organisations.

Discussion

- Currently up to 50% of UAGC type rates can be remitted.
- Wastewater can be remitted if funded from the right budget such as local social development.
- The pan charge could be removed from places such as sports clubs that are not for profit and put on the residential ratepayer, this would increase the residential rates bill.
- The Squash Club rates have gone up because an error was uncovered as to how many toilets they had.
- Are toilets at places such as sports clubs quasi-public conveniences?
- The amount of pans does not dictate the load on the facilities, it's the usage. Could the charge be based on the amount of potential users?

Revenue and Financing Policy

4.7. Definitions - Farming and Horticulture

Submitter #512 requests that the differential of 0.6 to the Farming and Horticulture category be retained.

This goes some way to balancing the excessive rates for street lights, stormwater, footpaths, library and other items. The submitter mentions examples.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains the differential for Farming and Horticulture.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This is consistent with the Council's current policy.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

This is consistent with the Council's current policy.

Discussion

None

Revenue and Financing Policy

48. Instalment Due Dates

Submitter #512 requests that the phrase "or 1st day after" after each date to allow for weekends and public holidays on page 20, volume 3.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adjusts the instalment dates for rates as outlined on page 20 of the Revenue and Financing policy.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

- 1. notes the submission*
- 2. includes a note on page 20 of the Revenue and Financing that outlines that if the instalment dates falls on a weekend, the due date is the first business day following.*

Staff reason for recommendation

To ensure that the Policy is clear with respect to instalment due dates falling on weekends.

Council resolution

That the Council:

- 1. notes the submissions*
- 2. includes a note on page 20 of the Revenue and Financing that outlines that if the instalment dates falls on a weekend, the due date is the first business day following.*

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

To ensure that the Policy is clear with respect to instalment due dates falling on weekends.

Discussion

None

Revenue and Financing Policy

49. Instalment Due Dates - Incentives

Submitter #662 requests that the Council consider an incentive to ratepayers for paying their rates in full.

The submitter suggests by way of example that a 5% rebate could apply if paid by end of April.

This should allow the Council to reduce its overdraft, with only one account be mailed out, and reduce staff time and involvement in processing.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers an incentive for payment of rates in full.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and makes no change to the draft Revenue and Financing Policy.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council currently offers an automatic remission of instalment one penalty if the annual rates are cleared in full by 8 December (instalment 2 due date).

During the 2006 review of the Revenue and Financing Policy the Council considered offering discount for early payment. The amount of discount that could be offered, without other ratepayers generally subsidising the discount, would be so small as to provide no incentive to pay early. The Council at the time therefore declined to have a policy on this issue.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Revenue and Financing Policy.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Council currently offers an automatic remission of instalment one penalty if the annual rates are cleared in full by 8 December (instalment 2 due date).

During the 2006 review of the Revenue and Financing Policy the Council considered offering discount for early payment. The amount of discount that could be offered, without other ratepayers generally subsidising the discount, would be so small as to provide no incentive to pay early. The Council at the time therefore declined to have a policy on this issue.

Discussion

- A lot of people pay by instalments.
- Only an advantage if you have a lot of non-payers.

Revenue and Financing Policy

50. Advocacy to Central Government

Submitter #512 requests that the Council approaches government to remove the 30% cap for how rates are struck under the new local government legislation

The reason provided is so as to match local conditions and allow more flexibility.

Another submitter (#119) requests that the Council lobby the government for a better method of paying local government costs to be devised.

The reason outlined is that local government assesses rates valuation on the basis of what the land might be used for, not for what it is currently.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers advocating to Central government on these matters.

Staff recommendation

That the Council continues advocating to Central Government on possible amendments to the Local Government Rating Act 2002

Staff reason for recommendation

Council does, and will continue to, have dialogue with Central Government on all matters relating local government.

Council resolution

That the Council continues advocating to Central Government on possible amendments to the Local Government Rating Act 2002

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Council does, and will continue to, have dialogue with Central Government on all matters relating local government.

Discussion

- There has been lobbying in the past on the 30% cap.

District Transportation Activity

51. Funding

Five submissions were received concerning the funding of the District Transportation Activity, however, the Council should note that one of these submissions contained 30 signatories from a group of concerned local ratepayers in Coromandel/Colville community board area.

*One submitter (#237) requests that the **Council pressures the government to grant extra roading funding subsidies**, because the high influx of holiday and tourist traffic to our region should entitle us to subsidy percentages as high as regions such as Ruapehu.*

*One submitter specifically **noted their agreement with the Council's one-district approach** to the funding of this activity.*

*Submitters 557, 680 and 681 (30 signatories), request that the District Transportation Activity be **funded on a user pays basis and not on a district wide basis**. The reason provided is that the submitters object to paying for services they don't receive.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council wishes to reconsider how this activity is funded, or adopt as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Although Council (elected members and staff) will continue to advocate for increased central government investment in Council's land transport activity, the method of allocating funding from the National Land Transport Fund remains with Government, not Council.

The base financial assistance rate (subsidy) for each approved organisation is determined using the ratio of a district's road maintenance and renewal programme to that district's land value as a measure of a District's ability to pay. Unfortunately the current financial assistance rate assessment criteria does not allow for the proportion of visitor traffic to a district.

NZTA has signalled that the method of determining subsidy rates is likely to change from 2015/2016 and an opportunity will exist for Council to provide feedback and suggestions on these changes over the coming years.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Although Council (elected members and staff) will continue to advocate for increased central government investment in Council's land transport activity, the method of allocating funding from the National Land Transport Fund remains with Government, not Council.

The base financial assistance rate (subsidy) for each approved organisation is determined using the ratio of a district's road maintenance and renewal programme to that district's land value as a measure of a District's ability to pay.

Unfortunately the current financial assistance rate assessment criteria does not allow for the proportion of visitor traffic to a district.

NZTA has signalled that the method of determining subsidy rates is likely to change from 2015/2016 and an opportunity will exist for Council to provide feedback and suggestions on these changes over the coming years.

Discussion

- Ruapehu gets a higher subsidy than TCDC.
- TCDC gets less because of higher property values.
- Most cities get approximately 50% subsidy.

Cemeteries Activity

52. Funding

Submitter #657, the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board requests that consideration be given for this activity to be funded locally.

The reason provide is that local funding is in line with Council's new community governance approach and funding of essential services.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the funding for the Cemeteries activity, or adopts as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. *notes the submission but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan*
2. *requests staff provide options for the Council's consideration for implementation by the 2013/2014 year.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The decision on funding this activity locally is worthy of consideration, and should only be made after thorough analysis of the impact of making this decision. Other decisions regarding service levels, charging (particularly decisions on cost recovery which could lead to differing charges in each community board area), management and overhead costs need to be also considered when making this decision.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. *notes the submissions but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan*
2. *requests staff provide options for the Council's consideration for implementation by the 2013/2014 year.*

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The decision on funding this activity locally is worthy of consideration, and should only be made after thorough analysis of the impact of making this decision. Other decisions regarding service levels, charging (particularly decisions on cost recovery which could lead to differing charges in each community board area), management and overhead costs need to be also considered when making this decision.

Discussion

- Until options are worked through things stay as they are. They will be brought back for information.

Public Conveniences Activity

53. Funding

Submitter #657, the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board request that funding for Public Conveniences be split as follows:

- Capital Expenditure - 50% district and 50% local
- Operating Expenditure - 100% local.

The reason provided is that:

- This provides incentives for Community Boards to consider the need for new public conveniences and the levels of service required in peak and off peak periods.
- This is in line with the Council's new direction, community governance approach and funding of essential services.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the funding of the Public Conveniences activity, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. notes the submission
2. requests staff provide options for the Council's consideration for implementation by the 2013/2014 year.

Staff reason for recommendation

The decision on funding this activity locally is worthy of consideration, but should only be made on thorough analysis of the impact of making this decision. Other decisions regarding service levels, charging (particularly decisions on cost recovery which could lead to differing charges in each Community Board area), administration and overhead costs, need to also be considered when making this decision.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions, but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan
2. requests staff provide options for the Council's consideration for implementation by the 2013/2014 year.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The decision on funding this activity locally is worthy of consideration, but should only be made on thorough analysis of the impact of making this decision. Other decisions regarding service levels, charging (particularly decisions on cost recovery which could lead to differing charges in each Community Board area), administration and overhead costs, need to also be considered when making this decision.

Discussion

None

Solid Waste Activity

54. Funding

Several submissions, including one with 30 signatories, request that the Solid Waste collection be funded on a user pays basis and not on a district wide basis.

Submitter numbers are: 557, 680, and 681 (30 signatories)

The reason provided is that the submitters object to paying for services they don't receive.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the funding of the Solid Waste activity, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The funding mechanisms are already partially user pays with street collection costs only applying to areas of benefit and district Refuse Transfer Stations are available for all to use. Litter collection and landfill rehabilitation is set as a general rate as the benefits apply to the district as a whole rather than any specific person or group.

It is noted that the increase in rubbish bag prices are movement toward this principle.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The funding mechanisms are already partially user pays with street collection costs only applying to areas of benefit and district Refuse Transfer Stations are available for all to use. Litter collection and landfill rehabilitation is set as a general rate as the benefits apply to the district as a whole rather than any specific person or group.

It is noted that the increase in rubbish bag prices are movement toward this principle.

Discussion

None

Solid Waste Activity

55. Funding - Fees and Charges - Transfer Stations

The staff submission requested adjustments to fees and charges for Transfer Stations.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the fees for Transfer Stations in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

- 1) That the Council amends the fees for Transfer Stations in the Ten Year Plan as follows:
 - a) Car Bodies - stripped / per car - change from \$25 to "no charge".
 - b) Whiteware - per item - change from \$10 to "no charge"
- 2) That the Council removes the E-waste (electronic waste) fee item and associated notes from the fees schedule.

Staff reason for recommendation

- 1) Both items are considered recyclable as scrap metal and additionally charging may encourage illegal dumping.
- 2) E-waste recycling is currently being carried out by external service providers.

Council resolution

1. That the Council amends the fees for Transfer Stations in the Ten Year Plan as follows:
 - a) Car Bodies - stripped / per car - change from \$25 to "no charge".
 - b) Whiteware - per item - change from \$10 to "no charge"
2. That the Council removes the E-waste (electronic waste) fee item and associated notes from the fees schedule.

Moved - French

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

1. Both items are considered recyclable as scrap metal and additionally charging may encourage illegal dumping.
2. E-waste recycling is currently being carried out by external service providers.

Discussion

- It was clarified that staff are able to cope with the items.

Solid Waste Activity

56. Funding - Fees and Charges - Rubbish Bags

The draft Ten Year Plan proposed an increase to the cost of large rubbish bags from \$2.20 to \$2.25.

Not in support of the proposal

Two submissions (#49 and #157) were received requesting that the Council does not increase the cost of rubbish bags.

The reasons provided include:

- *A price increase would have the opposite effect of encouraging people to dispose of waste sensibly.*
- *So that all households contribute to the services they use.*

Submitter #49 requests that each ratepayer should be given an allowance of bags each time their rates are paid on time.

One submitter (#417) does not agree with charges for rubbish and green waste and considers that this should be maintained as a core council service.

Support for the proposal

Six submissions were received in support of the increased cost for the large rubbish bag.

Reasons include:

- *so as to better reflect user pays approach*
- *to encourage more recycling and composting and less waste disposal.*

One submitter suggests increasing the rubbish bag costs to \$2.50.

One submitter (#340) requests that the increased fees should fund waste minimisation initiatives such as subsidised compost bins for residents

Another submitter (#204) requests that the charge for Council rubbish bags reflect the true cost of disposal. The reasons for this include:

- *To allocate costs to the exacerbators, not people who make the effort to minimise waste.*
- *Fly tipping should not be a consideration in this decision (the submitter compares it to ATMs because they encourage theft)*

Submitters include: 204, 237, 252, 291, 340 and 679.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains its proposal to increase the cost of rubbish bags from \$2.05 to \$2.25, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and retains its proposal to increase the cost of large rubbish bags from \$2.05 to \$2.25.

Staff reason for recommendation

The increase from \$2.05 to \$2.25 for large rubbish bags represents an incremental shift towards greater user pays and also takes account of inflationary increases.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. retains its proposal to increase the cost of large rubbish bags from \$2.05 to \$2.25.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The increase from \$2.05 to \$2.25 for large rubbish bags represents an incremental shift towards greater user pays and also takes account of inflationary increases.

Discussion

- Rubbish does come out on top of what people want from Council.
- The contracts have cost increases built in.

Local Government Funding Agency

57. Participation in Scheme

Within its draft Ten Year Plan the Council proposed to participate in the Local Government Funding Agency as an Establishment Shareholding Local Authority.

A specific question was included on the feedback form which asked submitters whether they agreed with Council's proposal to participate in the Local Government Funding Agency.

148 submitters responded to the question. Of those, 56 agreed, 13 disagreed and 79 had no preference.

Comments include:

- *The Tairua/Pauanui community board submission noted their agreement with the participation in the LGFA as this may offer an opportunity for Council to reduce costs.*
- *One submitter noted support for the proposal only if there is no cost.*
- *One submitter considers that Council should keep it in our pockets, not other agencies like Environment Waikato.*
- *One submitter considers that the possible savings would be small and is not convinced that the benefit would be worth the risk.*
- *Two further submitters didn't respond to the question but noted that they needed further information.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council participates in the Local Government Funding Agency as an Establishment Shareholder.

Staff recommendation

That the Council proceeds with its proposal to participate in the Local Government Funding Agency as an Establishment Shareholder.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff are of the view that participation will enable the Council to borrow at lower interest margins, and that this benefit outweighs the costs and risks associated with the scheme. Further, the submissions do not indicate a strong opposition to the proposal.

Council resolution

That the Council proceeds with its proposal to participate in the Local Government Funding Agency as an Establishment Shareholder.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Councillors Wells and Brljevic requested their vote against be recorded.

Reason for resolution

Staff are of the view that participation will enable the Council to borrow at lower interest margins, and that this benefit outweighs the costs and risks associated with the scheme. Further, the submissions do not indicate a strong opposition to the proposal.

Discussion

- Council approved this to go out to public consultation.
- There are risks, if a Council falls over the remaining member Councils have to cover the default.
- Approximately 50 Councils have signalled that they will go into the scheme. Auckland City and Hamilton City are already members.
- TCDC has an amount of debt coming up for refinancing in October 2012 that could be obtained cheaper through the scheme than using banks.
- The Chief Executive supports the scheme.

Transfer Part of a Reserve in Te Puru

58. Proposal to Transfer Part of a Reserve in Te Puru

One of the specific matters for consultation in the draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan was that **the Council proposed to transfer the ownership of part of the Seaview Reserve in Te Puru** because an agreement between the Waikato Regional Council, TCDC, and the Te Poka Trust Board signed in 2011 requires the Council to transfer this land to Te Poka 3B1 Block owners as consideration for loss of land in 1982 and 2011.

A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether or not submitters agreed with the Council's proposal.

157 submitters responded to the questions. Of those, 25 were in agreement, 30 disagreed and 102 had no preference.

Comments from those who agreed:

One comment was made in support of the proposal as follows:

- The submitter queries whether the reserve will be transferred to the Te Poka Block to compensate for the Te Puru Creek works (#211).

Comments from those who disagreed:

- The submitter does not agree with this proposal as public space is considered important and in future years it will be more important as the population increases. The submitter considers that the buildings should be sold but the land kept as a reserve and used as a tourist stop point. The comment is made that the longer tourists stay in the Coromandel the more money that spend locally. (#31)
- The submitter queries to whom the reserve will be transferred to and does not support private ownership. (#483)
- The submitter considers that more information and research is needed to proceed. (#552)
- The submitter considers that the reserve should be available for all to use. (#602)

Five submitters did not indicate a preference but noted the following comments:

- The submitter request who this reserve was being transferred to (#178 and #695)
- The submitter notes they do not have any background to this issue and queries whom the reserve is being transferred from and to (#240)
- The submitter does not know anything about this (#258)
- The submitter is not sure about this as they have not researched (#692)

Similarly, two submitters who indicated 'no preference' made the following comments:

- The submitter makes the comment that this is not explained in the summary document, thus has no opinion (#104)
- The submitter considers that there is not enough information to be able to make a comment (#548)

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the transfer as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the council notes the submissions and proceeds to transfer the ownership of part of the Seaview Reserve in Te Puru as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan

Staff reason for recommendation

It is only part of the reserve, not the whole reserve that will be transferred to the Te Poka Hapu. The public will still have access through the remaining part of the reserve to the river mouth and sea foreshore, and both regional and local council will be able to continue to conduct maintenance as required. There are no buildings on the reserve - it is overgrown grass. The reason for the transfer is because the owners of Te Poka allowed the Te Puru flood protection wall to be constructed on their private land. This is of benefit to significant areas of Te Puru as the wall will stop flooding over much of Te Puru in heavy flooding situations.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. proceeds to transfer the ownership of part of the Seaview Reserve in Te Puru as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

It is only part of the reserve, not the whole reserve that will be transferred to the Te Poka Hapu. The public will still have access through the remaining part of the reserve to the river mouth and sea foreshore, and both regional and local council will be able to continue to conduct maintenance as required. There are no buildings on the reserve - it is overgrown grass. The reason for the transfer is because the owners of Te Poka allowed the Te Puru flood protection wall to be constructed on their private land. This is of benefit to significant areas of Te Puru as the wall will stop flooding over much of Te Puru in heavy flooding situations.

Discussion

- Was not well covered in the draft Ten Year Plan documents.

Economic Development Activity

59. Proposal to Increase Support for Economic Development

The Council proposed a greater focus and increased support for Economic Development activity in the district. A question was included on the feedback from that asked submitters "Do you agree that the Council should increase its focus on economic development and introduce a number of rates remissions to stimulate economic development in the District?"

181 submitters answered the question. Of those 118 agreed, 39 disagreed and 24 indicated no preference.

In addition to the fixed question, a range of submissions were received on this topic. Whilst there are submissions both for and against Council's proposals, there appears to be strong support from submitters for Council increasing focus on Economic Development.

Comments in support include:

- *That the economic development initiatives and any other measures that contribute to business development and employment be retained.*
- *The strengthening of financial support for Destination Coromandel and Information Centers be retained.*
- *That the emphasis on economic growth and the creation of new jobs and opportunities be retained.*

Reasons for support include:

- *That economic development can make the community grow stronger*
- *The Council's support is critical to ensuring that the District has the ability to market its unique natural advantages to the tourism and visitor population both nationally and internationally.*
- *Economic growth encourages more families to relocate to the District, encourages the young population to stay and creates a more vibrant and self-sustaining community.*
- *Population growth should be encouraged by economic activity.*

Specifically, the Waikato Regional Council (#280) applauds TCDC's commitment to achieving greater economic outcomes for the district. The Regional Council offers its support to TCDC in the form of economic data available and staff time to consider the issues, the regional economic profile.

One submission, #339 requested that the Council only facilitate business development if business is paying for it. The reason outlined is that there is no future in businesses that can't fund their own activities, both promotional and developmental.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain its proposal to increase its overall focus on economic development as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council increases the funding for the Economic Development activity as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan and that the outcomes sought by the Council from its funding be clarified further.

Staff reason for recommendation

Public submissions indicate a large volume of support for funding the economic development funding imperative for the district.

An Economic Development Strategy will be developed in 2012 to secure a long term strategy for the district for this activity and to outline outcomes sought from the investment. In addition, the Destination Coromandel planning outcomes be agreed by both lending councils.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. increases the funding for the Economic Development activity as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan
2. requests that the outcomes sought by the Council from its funding be clarified further.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Public submissions indicate a large volume of support for funding the economic development funding imperative for the district.

An Economic Development Strategy will be developed in 2012 to secure a long term strategy for the district for this activity and to outline outcomes sought from the investment. In addition, the Destination Coromandel planning outcomes be agreed by both lending councils.

Discussion

- Exactly what the funding will be used for is not yet determined and it needs to be workshopped with Council.
- The budget for the activity was presented and discussed, as follows:

	2011/2012	2012/2013
i-sites	\$205k	\$345k (district funded)
DC	\$256k	\$385k (minus \$25k payback)
Hauraki BDB	\$30k	\$30k
Projects	\$80k	\$110k

- The proposals to come after this will add to the funding requests and will affect the rates.
- Operating costs in the Ten Year Plan went up \$85,000 made up mostly of i-sites (from \$205,000 to \$345,000) and Destination Coromandel.
- It was stated that at least one i-site is on the brink of collapse.
- Part of the overheads in economic development includes legalities for leases. There is also property associated with this activity.
- There is a model that requires budget for events.
- What benefit do we get from Hauraki BDB? Could the \$30,000 be better used by us?
- There is a workshop on 6 June regarding the Economic Development Agency.
- Rail Trail is under District Rounding.

Economic Development Activity

60. Increased Support for Economic Development - Destination Coromandel

Five submitters made more specific references to Destination Coromandel.

Four of these submitters made specific references in support, but requested more detail be put around the arrangement.

Submitters in support include: 147, 251, 252, 338, 340

Request for more detail includes:

- *One submitter requests that a measurable improvement in operations and value agreement is put in place.*
- *One submitter adds that the continued funding be conditional on:*
 - *The Council actively encouraging an inclusive policy in the Destination Coromandel mandate and website*
 - *The Council requiring Destination Coromandel to give more detail on its website as to its aims and objectives.*

Reasons for these requests include:

- *Destination Coromandel needing to be impartial and requiring an inclusive focus*
- *Full disclosure of aims, objectives and management being made available to the public*

Submission of opposition to the proposal

One submission (#85) was received in opposition to the support for Destination Coromandel, requesting that the funding be removed.

The reason outlined was:

- *That those bodies [Destination Coromandel and i-sties] charge prices to operators which fully reflect their costs*
- *The costs should be paid by those they serve.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council continue with the funding for Destination Coromandel as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council continues with the funding for Destination Coromandel as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan but first be conditional on acceptance of the Destination Coromandel business plan by both Hauraki District Council and Thames-Coromandel District Council.

Staff reason for recommendation

Destination Coromandel has been restructured and has a new Board of Directors with a new vision and strategy. The submissions received were mainly positive about the changes made at the organisation, however robustness is needed to justify the expenditure.

A Key Performance Indicator has been added to the draft Ten Year Plan in relation to Destination Coromandel and its marketing strategy and business plan will be made available to the public.

Council resolution

That the Council continues with the funding for Destination Coromandel as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan but first be conditional on acceptance of the Destination Coromandel business plan by both Hauraki District Council and Thames-Coromandel District Council.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded -Bartley

Reason for resolution

Destination Coromandel has been restructured and has a new Board of Directors with a new vision and strategy. The submissions received were mainly positive about the changes made at the organisation, however robustness is needed to justify the expenditure.

A Key Performance Indicator has been added to the draft Ten Year Plan in relation to Destination Coromandel and its marketing strategy and business plan will be made available to the public.

Discussion

- John Sandford will be presenting at the Council meeting on 23 May. Council will be asked to consider endorsing the business plan that Destination Coromandel presents.
- The regional 'gateway', that will possibly be at Kopu, will not offer the level of service that an i-Site would.
- TCDC is in a confidence rebuilding phase with Destination Coromandel after the uncovering of its significant debt.

Economic Development Activity

61. Increased Support for Economic Development - Local Economic Development Agencies

Submitters made more specific references to the Council's proposal to increase funding to information centres.

Similarly, with the submissions received concerning Destination Coromandel, submitters have made specific references in support, but requested more detail be put around the arrangement.

Request for more detail includes:

- *One submitter (#340) supports the funding but suggests a rethink on the model and role of information centres.*
- *Another submitter (#209) also supports the funding proposed, but requests that a funding formula be created prior to 1 July 2012, that reflects the significant contribution that the Thames i-site makes to economic development in the region yet financially supports other i-sites around the Peninsula.*
- *Another submitter (#113) requests that operational expenditure for information centres should be funded district wide.*

The reasons in support of the proposal include:

- *The centers provide a fantastic service to locals and tourists mostly on a voluntary basis.*
- *Information centres are important for disseminating information to tourists, thus benefitting tourists and local ratepayers who make a living within the tourist industry.*
- *The control of premises, employment of staff and providing technology are key to a successful network which the Council should drive.*

Reasons specifically concerning more detail be put around the proposal include:

- *Submitter #209 notes that while the new funding has been set, the submitter is concerned that how this funding is apportioned hasn't happened yet.*
- *The submitter also notes that the Thames share of economic development rates is around 48% which is a large share, and*
- *future distribution of the funds must be based on a tangible, reasonable, logical and justifiable formula.*
- *The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) supports this strategy but would like some surety over what is locally funded and what is district funded.*

Submitter #472 requests that the plan provide for a review of the region's visitor information centres to define and measure the ratepayer value delivered from individual centres to:

- *Confirming and committing to those that are strategically important in meeting visitor needs and that deliver genuine ratepayer value. These would be owned by TCDC/HDC. And would be resourced to support the region's major events strategy.*
- *The future of those considered 'non-strategic' to be determined by the local communities.*
- *The region's visitor information centres be i-Site accredited.*
- *That each centre reflect the identity and heritage of its local community, especially relating to iwi.*
- *That the i Site network and Destination Coromandel rationalise spend, e.g. one brand, one visitor guide, one regional visitor website.*
- *A new world class centre to be developed at Kopu with a partnered presence with DOC and iwi led by Destination Coromandel, who would be head lessee.*

Other submissions in support

- *Two submitters (#27 and #28) specifically requested that the Council retain the proposal for extra funding of the Tairua information centre.*
- *Submitter #96, specifically notes their support for continued funding of the Coromandel Information Centre*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council continue with the funding for Local Economic Development Agencies and make available details as to how the funding will be apportioned throughout the District.

Staff recommendation

That the Council continue with the funding for Local Economic Development Agencies and make available details as to how the funding will be apportioned throughout the District.

Staff reason for recommendation

I-Sites play a critically important role for the district and need to be funded appropriately. Work has already commenced on working with the organisations to improve their collaboration and effectiveness as a network of visitor information centres.

The long term structure and funding arrangements for these organisations will be a subject in the Council's Economic Development Strategy, which will be distributed for public feedback in late 2012.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. continue with the funding for local information centres whilst it develops a model on for Local Economic Development Agencies in 2012/2013
2. make available details as to how the funding will be apportioned throughout the District
3. notes that a model being worked on and figures are subject to change.

Moved - Connors

Seconded -Bartley

Reason for resolution

I-Sites play a critically important role for the district and need to be funded appropriately. Work has already commenced on working with the organisations to improve their collaboration and effectiveness as a network of visitor information centres.

The long term structure and funding arrangements for these organisations will be a subject in the Council's Economic Development Strategy, which will be distributed for public feedback in late 2012.

Discussion

- This is a new activity in the Ten Year Plan.
- Text in the Ten Year Plan was written to make it clear that funding was not only for i sites.
- At the moment economic development is funded District - low UAGC component and 55% on targeted rate to commercial.
- I sites will possibly be going to local funding from district funding (model yet to be developed from 1 July 2013).
- A workshop is suggested for June 2012 to look at this model.
- Areas such as Whangamata, Tairua and Pauanui have limited commercial ratepayers to spread the cost over.
- Suggested that splitting i sites might not be the best idea.

Economic Development Activity

62. Increased Support for Economic Development - Event Funding

Three submitters made specific reference to Council's approach to event funding.

Submitter #472 requests:

- That the Council and Hauraki District Council establish a joint regional 'events committee', chaired by TCDC/HDC but with Destination Coromandel and possibly Waikato Regional Council membership.
- The submission further outlines the intention of the function of this committee. Please refer to the submission for more detail.

Submitter #113 requests:

- That the Council make available
 - a base figure for each information centre for events from a district-wide budget
 - a contestable fund for additional amount, with limits and safeguards to ensure the majority of funding is not used by a couple of bigger towns.
- The submitter further requests that event funding should be addressed in two categories - regular annual events and new events and that all information centres need access to professional advice before committing funds.

Submitter #154 requests:

- That the Council make funding available (in addition to the contestable community grant funding pool) for:
 - Brits on the Beach (\$5,000)
 - Tairua-Pauanui Summer Events Programme (\$10,000)
- The reason outlined is that the Tairua Information Centre cannot organise and sustain an annual events programme and on-going community projects without the certainty of long term funding. These events are key to promoting Tairua as a destination.

NB: Presently the Council provides funding for events through community grants, via the Social Development activity.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to and extent of event funding

Staff recommendation

That the Council reconsiders its current approach to and extent of event funding after an events strategy is developed and adopted by Council.

Staff reason for recommendation

An events strategy is required for the district, which is a project that the Council and Destination Coromandel will work on together before any new funding structures can be confirmed.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. develop an events strategy for implementation in 2013/2014 to create a consistent approach to events funding at a district and local level and to ensure events are effectively contributing to economic wellbeing of the Peninsula
2. allocate a budget of \$15,000 to local social development (Thames) events.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

An events strategy is required for the district, which is a project that the Council and Destination Coromandel will work on together before any new funding structures can be confirmed.

Discussion

- No extra money required in the first financial year.
- How events are funded after 2012/2013 will be worked through.
- Need for an events strategy.
- Beach Hop is a local social development grant.
- There is funding available for 'events' through Beach Hop, Whitianga fireworks, Summer Festival, MB destination events - can any extra ones be addressed through Community Board Treasure Chest? Majority of these events are funded through social development
- Thames does not have enough for events, they would ask for \$20,000.

	2011/2012	2012/2013
i-sites	\$205k	\$345k (district funded)
DC	\$256k	\$385k (minus \$25k payback
Hauraki BDB	\$30k	\$30k
Projects	\$80k	\$110k*

* this could be reduced to \$40k and \$70k used for events.

Economic Development Activity

63. New Initiatives and New Projects

A number of submitters outlined new initiatives and/or projects that they believe the Council should be involved in to generate economic activity in the District.

The new initiatives and/or new projects noted throughout the submissions are:

Request	Reason (if provided)	Submitter #
That the Council investigate creating a walkway/cycle track in the Kauaeranga Valley from the Racecourse to the DOC visitor centre. NB: see also Local Transportation (Thames) activity for a project regarding the Kauaeranga Valley	Such a track would increase the appeal of the valley to visitors and locals, increase safety and pedestrian use of this great natural asset.	133
That the Council be proactive and advocate for the removal of the 'limited access' highway restriction by the Te Kouma turn off.	This would give Coromandel the opportunity to be able to develop infrastructure and economic opportunities around the aquaculture industries.	63 and 90
That a fast boat connection across the Hauraki Gulf be provided for.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To get Auckland traffic onto the Peninsula. At the moment tourism in Coromandel with its seasonal downturn is hardly viable. 	96
That the Council assist the Tairua Pauanui Community Board to seek a subsidy from Waikato Regional Council for the Tairua ferry service.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide alternative transport between Tairua and Pauanui. To enable a regular service throughout the year. This is an important service between the two communities. 	657
That the Council ensure that wheelchair accessible tourist accommodation options are available throughout the region.	To ensure that scenic and tourist attractions within the region are accessible to everyone	256
That the Council develop/research the possible development of a walking track from Tairua (over the Pinnacles) to Thames.	The Tongariro Crossing attracts up to 75,000 visitors a year	28, 27 and 251
That the Council promote the investigation of additional walking/ cycling opportunities in the hills behind Thames, and inclusion of a water-powered lift and connecting cycleway along the route of the old water race.	This could be a great attraction for both visitors and residents.	644
That the Council consider and encourage modern underground mining in an environmentally acceptable manner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Coromandel is very mineral-rich. This industry could provide opportunities to expand our economy, grow funds for ten year plan initiatives, new jobs and keep young people working here. Modern underground mining has very little surface impact. 	287
That the Council work with Iwi and regulatory bodies to develop a wreck dive site near Shoe or Slipper Island and that it be funded outside of the Council.	To enhance Tairua's tourism product by enabling operators to attract more people, hold them longer and spread the peak periods.	251
That the Council develop a underwater sculpture park for divers and snorkelers at Slipper and that it be funded outside of the Council.	To enhance Tairua's tourism product by enabling operators to attract more people, hold them longer and spread the peak periods.	251
That the Council prepare the consents for and	To enhance Tairua's tourism product by enabling	251

Request	Reason (if provided)	Submitter #
<i>proactively seek a developer to build commercial accommodation on the old George Grey Hotel site in partnership with a smaller branded hotel chain.</i>	<i>operators to attract more people, hold them longer and spread the peak periods.</i>	
<i>That the Council partner with DOC on the development of a multi night walk on the Coromandel, recognising that there may well be opportunities to include a local Maori identify in Hut design, guiding etc.</i>	<i>To make the Coromandel more attractive to new residents, visitors and new investment.</i>	472
<i>The use of the Burke St landfill reserve as a possible outdoor events site</i>		644
<i>Development of the old Placemakers site as an iconic, bi-cultural, 'heritage hug' offering visitors and residents an experience of the Thames area's past, present and what it can offer in the future, including facilities for self-contained campervans and the potential for charging stations in the future for electric vehicles.</i>	<i>The old Placemakers site is highly visible, located on the main coast road and central to the historic end of Thames' main street.</i>	644 (733 is similar)
<i>That the Kennedy Bay-Whangapoua old public road be reopened as a cycling and tramping track.</i>		655
<i>That</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a coordinated strategic plan be put in place to develop a good coastal walkway around the peninsula's coast that ensures that when future subdivision takes place the future walkway should be taken into consideration</i> <i>Council commits funding a small portion of this walkway annually.</i> 	<i>This walkway would create more tourism opportunities than anything else that is not currently provided for.</i>	655

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider broadening the scope of the Economic Development activity, or adopt the plan as proposed.

Staff recommendation

That the Council support the development of an Economic Development Strategy to ensure potential projects are prioritised against strategic objectives adopted by Council.

Staff reason for recommendation

Before potential projects can be supported, a thorough Economic Development Strategy is required to ensure the projects with most benefit and alignment to strategy are selected.

Council resolution

That the Council support the development of an Economic Development Strategy in 2012/2013 year to ensure potential projects are prioritised against strategic objectives adopted by Council.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Before potential projects can be supported, a thorough Economic Development Strategy is required to ensure the projects with most benefit and alignment to strategy are selected.

Discussion

- There is no current strategy, it is being worked on now.
- The Wentworth Valley Three day walk was brought up, it was suggested it could be picked up as part of the Coromandel Walkway.

Economic Development Activity

64. New Initiatives - Heritage Branding

Five submitters specifically outlined new initiatives with regards to "Heritage Branding" throughout the District as a means of increasing tourism in the District.

Specifically that the Council

- *fully recognise the value of heritage to the peninsula*
- *recognises and supports Coromandel town as the cultural and heritage centre of the peninsula.*
- *recognises and supports Coromandel and Thames towns as the cultural and heritage centres of the peninsula.*
- *note the submitter's view that Coromandel is uniquely positioned to take advantage of its history as a Heritage Town.*
- *Upgrade the Heritage area of Coromandel (NB: see also Local Transportation Activity for Heritage Lights upgrade project)*

Submitter numbers are: 612, 677, 683, 677 and 679

Reasons for these requests are similar and include:

- *It brings tourists to the District, particularly to Thames and Coromandel towns*
- *Coromandel has a unique village atmosphere*
- *Emphasising the heritage features of Thames and Coromandel has economic potential.*
- *One submitter cites Arrowtown as an example of how heritage branding can attract high numbers of high-end visitors*
- *Thames is the gateway to the Peninsula for those travelling by car, but Coromandel has the potential to develop an alternative transport hub.*
- *The people of Coromandel have worked closely with the Council to develop a heritage area whose emphasis is the 'streetscape'.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider broadening the scope of the Economic Development activity to include support for "heritage branding", or adopt the plan as proposed.

Staff recommendation

That the Council recognises the merits of "heritage branding" and that this and other concepts be looked at further by Community boards as they input into the Economic Development strategy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Destination Coromandel are the owners of the Coromandel visitor brand and are the agency tasked with positioning our Peninsula appropriately in the market. This submission should be considered by that organisation. It is also recognised that local areas and their promotions functions take leadership of marketing local areas.

Council resolution

That the Council recognises the merits of "heritage branding" and that this and other concepts be looked at further by Community boards as they input into the Economic Development strategy.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Destination Coromandel are the owners of the Coromandel visitor brand and are the agency tasked with positioning our Peninsula appropriately in the market. This submission should be considered by that organisation. It is also recognised that local areas and their promotions functions take leadership of marketing local areas.

Discussion

None

Economic Development Activity

65. Services - Freedom Camping

Submitter #292 made specific reference to freedom camping, as follows:

The submitter requests that the Council:

- *set aside funds to promote responsible freedom camping along with the development of supporting infrastructure, and*
- *set aside funds to educate visitors on responsible freedom camping practices through appropriate signage and marketing collateral*

The reasons include:

- *Over 1,700 members reside in the District, with thousands more travelling to the region during holiday excursions each year*
- *Failure to accommodate responsible freedom camping will discourage visitors and therefore affect the many local businesses that rely on the patronage of touring motor caravanners.*

Submitter #472 requests that

- *freedom campers and motorhome users are directed to sites that offer toilet and parking facilities and that there be a (unspecified) charge for this infrastructure*
- *that provision be made for the development of a network of user pays motor home parks, possibly in partnership with a third party investor.*

The reasons include:

- *The submitter supports the Council's position on freedom camping but considers that the provision of these facilities to be more consistent with the aim of offering guests 'the world's warmest welcome'*
- *The submitter notes that motorhome users generate minimal economic returns for our communities.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council broaden the scope of the Economic Development activity to promote responsible freedom camping, or adopt the plan as proposed.

Staff recommendation

That the Council does not need to broaden the scope of the Economic Development activity to promote responsible freedom camping.

Staff reason for recommendation

The scope of the activity already caters for development of the freedom camping market, policy and infrastructure and is a project currently being worked on by staff to increase responsible self-contained camping on the Coromandel. Council staff and Community Boards are already undertaking an on-going process of relining the freedom camping provisions in each area.

Council resolution

That the Council does not need to broaden the scope of the Economic Development activity to promote responsible freedom camping as the Council is currently actively addressing these matters.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The scope of the activity already caters for development of the freedom camping market, policy and infrastructure and is a project currently being worked on by staff to increase responsible self-contained camping on the Coromandel. Council staff and Community Boards are already undertaking an on-going process of relining the freedom camping provisions in each area.

Discussion

- Work is being done around the Peninsula to identify areas that people wish to camp in.
- The Council is working with the Motor Caravan Association around dump sites.
- NZTA will part fund sites.
- Full marketing plan will be put out for summer.

Economic Development Activity

66. Services - Property Sales & Acquisition

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that:

- *the Council provide clarity regarding disposal and acquisition of properties, including the impact on Council's ability to sell or obtain properties prior to 2015.*
- *Proceeds from the sale of properties within a community go back to that community to purchase land or buildings that have a strategic value for that community.*

The reasons for the request include:

- *the Plan mentions that there will be disposal of surplus properties, but gives no indication of property acquisition.*
- *It is not known what the impact is on Council's ability to sell or obtain properties before 2015.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council provide further clarity regarding the disposal [and acquisition] of properties as proposed in its draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the appropriate Area Manager work with the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board on the details of its property strategy.

Staff reason for recommendation

More details will be worked through with individual Community Boards and Area Managers regarding these sorts of details and questions. A Property Strategy has been developed and more details are now being worked on with the Boards as the process moves into the implementation phase.

Council resolution

That the appropriate Area Managers work with the respective Community Boards on the details of Council's property strategy.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

More details will be worked through with individual Community Boards and Area Managers regarding these sorts of details and questions. A Property Strategy has been developed and more details are now being worked on with the Boards as the process moves into the implementation phase.

Discussion

- Part of the exercise undertaken four months ago on Council properties.
- Suggested that other board areas be included in the resolution.
- The boards will prioritise so a timeframe is not required in the resolution.

Economic Development Activity

67. Increased Expenditure and/or New Projects

As outlined in the staff submission, with Ben Day recently assuming the Economic Development portfolio, several adjustments have been requested by Ben to enable more work to be undertaken in the areas of freedom camping and promoting the Hauraki Cycleway project.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council allocates funding for Stage 2 Hauraki Rail Trail - Kopu to Kaiaua of \$150,000 in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

Staff recommendation

That funding be allocated for Stage 2 Hauraki Rail Trail - Kopu to Kaiaua of \$150,000 in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 (signal only for partner funding with HDC, Government and the communities).

Staff reason for recommendation

- To progress Economic Development opportunities to drive employment, tourism and support local businesses.
- It is important that we signal to the community and other agencies this Council's commitment to continue the extension for the Hauraki Rail Trail which will open up Thames and the wider Coromandel region to our largest market; Auckland based cyclists and tourists.
- The proposed budget is a signal only for partner funding with HDC, Government and the community of the commitment we have and would only be triggered if other partners agreed to the joint-funding of this next stage.
- The project would be funded from the District Roding activity (and not Economic Development as this is where the Stage 1 costs have been allocated). Stage two, Kopu-Kaiaua, is referenced as the next stage in the Memorandum of Understanding between HDC and TCDC regarding the overall rail trail project. Government funding is also being sought.
- The implication of an additional \$150,000 in years 2012/13 and \$150,000 in 2013/14 is approximately \$5.66 per rating unit in years 1 & 2.

Council resolution

That funding be allocated for Stage 2 Hauraki Rail Trail - Kopu to Kaiaua of \$150,000 in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 (signal only for partner funding with HDC, Government and the communities).

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reasons for resolution

- To progress Economic Development opportunities to drive employment, tourism and support local businesses.
- It is important that we signal to the community and other agencies this Council's commitment to continue the extension for the Hauraki Rail Trail which will open up Thames and the wider Coromandel region to our largest market; Auckland based cyclists and tourists.
- The proposed budget is a signal only for partner funding with HDC, Government and the community of the commitment we have and would only be triggered if other partners agreed to the joint-funding of this next stage.
- The project would be funded from the District Roding activity (and not Economic Development as this is where the Stage 1 costs have been allocated). Stage two, Kopu-Kaiaua, is referenced as the next stage in the Memorandum of Understanding between HDC and TCDC regarding the overall rail trail project. Government funding is also being sought.

- The implication of an additional \$150,000 in years 2012/13 and \$150,000 in 2013/14 is approximately \$5.66 per rating unit in years 1 & 2.

Discussion

- This project has come forward since the draft Ten Year Plan was endorsed.
- Is a partnership with Hauraki District Council.
- Hauraki District Council are submitting to their Ten Year Plan for the same amount.
- The Kaiaua to Kopu leg is important to Thames.
- Kopu to Thames (Rhodes Park) still a work in progress and is the focus of the Trust.
- Waikino to Waihi is being fundraised for.
- Discussion with Ngati Maru underway re use of the old rail corridor. There is a Plan B around going via Totara Palms.
- No money has traded hands under the MOU.
- There was fair recruitment for the PTO. The charitable trust will distribute all funds and approve concessions. There has been a lot of mis-information around this.
- The model has been set up so that it will not be a burden on ratepayers.
- 70-80 % of users of the trail will be 'random' users, rather than those that are on the trail via a commercial venture.
- The Trust needs a resource consent to access central government funding.
- Suggested that resource consent funding come from Hauraki BDB.
- Rail trails tend to take four years to reach full potential.
- Funding of \$150,000 for each year comes from District Roding not Economic Development.

Economic Development Activity

68. Increased Expenditure and/or New Projects

As outlined in the staff submission, with Ben Day recently assuming the Economic Development portfolio, several adjustments have been requested by Ben to enable more work to be undertaken in the areas of freedom camping and promoting the Hauraki Cycleway project.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council allocates funding for a freedom camping joint-venture and infrastructure development with NZMCA of \$20,000 per annum in 2012, 2013 and 2014.

Staff recommendation

That funding be allocated for a freedom camping joint-venture and infrastructure development with NZMCA of \$20,000 per annum in 2012, 2013, 2014.

Staff reason for recommendation

- To progress Economic Development opportunities to drive employment, tourism and support local businesses.
- The Council has opportunities to increase visitor numbers and drive higher yields from tourism by encouraging responsible freedom camping in self-contained vehicles and to effectively market the Coromandel -its events and attractions. The Coromandel is not well equipped with dump-stations or service facilities for campervans.
- It is suggested that this be funded from the wastewater activity.
- The implication of an additional \$20,000 in 2012/13 & 2013/14 and an additional \$20,000 in 2014/15 are approximately \$0.57 per rating unit in years 1 & 2 and \$0.76 per rating unit in year 3.

Council resolution

That the Council allocate funding for a freedom camping joint-venture (50/50 funding share) and infrastructure development with NZMCA of \$25,000 in 2012/2013 and \$20,000 in 2013/2014 and \$20,000 in 2014/2015 to be funded from the economic development activity.

Note: \$20,000 funded from current economic development projects budget. \$5,000 investigation from wastewater to economic development. \$20,000 out of wastewater in year two.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

- To progress Economic Development opportunities to drive employment, tourism and support local businesses.
- The Council has opportunities to increase visitor numbers and drive higher yields from tourism by encouraging responsible freedom camping in self-contained vehicles and to effectively market the Coromandel -its events and attractions. The Coromandel is not well equipped with dump-stations or service facilities for campervans.
- The implication of an additional \$20,000 in 2012/13 & 2013/14 and an additional \$20,000 in 2014/15 are approximately \$0.57 per rating unit in years 1 & 2 and \$0.76 per rating unit in year 3.

Discussion

- This project has come forward since the draft Ten Year Plan was endorsed.
- \$45,000 will provide one infrastructure development for a dump station.
- Would like to provide for three more dump stations on the Peninsula, there are currently five sites.
- For 2012/2013 put the \$5,000 already in wastewater for investigation of dump sites. Take out of wastewater and allocate to economic development.
- Use \$20,000 currently in Projects (see earlier table) in 2012/2013 for dump site.
- Move the \$20,000 allocated to wastewater to economic development for 2013/2014.
- NZMCA will also put in \$20,000 per year.
- Also looking at some land to lease to NZMCA.
- Should it be funded through wastewater or economic development? Economic development would put most of the burden on commercial ratepayers.
- Generally opex is not high if the site is connected to a scheme.
- Council could decide not to fund depreciation.

Economic Development Activity

69. Increased Expenditure and/or New Projects

As outlined in the staff submission, with Ben Day recently assuming the Economic Development portfolio, several adjustments have been requested by Ben to enable more work to be undertaken in the areas of freedom camping and promoting the Hauraki Cycleway project.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council allocates funding for tourism gateway signage for the Peninsula of \$25,000 for 2012 and 2013.

Staff recommendation

That funding be allocated for tourism gateway signage for the Peninsula of \$25,000 for 2012 and 2013.

Staff reason for recommendation

The funding will be used to install gateway signage welcoming visitors to the Peninsula at Kopu and Whangamata. Further signage will also be placed in Year 2 at locations close to Mercury Bay and Coromandel Town. The project will be funded from the Economic Development Activity and will also involve Destination Coromandel as a partner in this project.

Council resolution

That the Council allocate funding for tourism gateway signage for the Peninsula of \$25,000 for 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

Note: \$25,000 from the existing 'projects' economic development budget.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The funding will be used to install gateway signage welcoming visitors to the Peninsula at Kopu and Whangamata. Further signage will also be placed in Year 2 at locations close to Mercury Bay and Coromandel Town. The project will be funded from the Economic Development Activity and will also involve Destination Coromandel as a partner in this project.

Discussion

- This project has come forward since the draft Ten Year Plan was endorsed.
- The request is for \$50,000 total over two years.
- We have little or no signage at the moment.
- Will have areas on the signage to capture upcoming events.
- A sign for Kopu has been developed with the committee and a resource consent is about to be put through. NZTA have not been accommodating.
- Should the old Kopu Bridge be incorporated into signage?
- Consideration could also be given to the sea gateway.
- Can link to Destination Coromandel's local branding.

Economic Development Activity

70. Adjustments to Performance Measures

The staff submission also requested an adjustment to a performance measures for the Economic Development activity as follows:

Replace the performance measure "% increase in GDP in the District" with the following two performance measures:

1. % of key performance indicators achieved by Destination Coromandel (as set in its annual strategic marketing plan). Target: >85%
2. % of the District's business community that are satisfied or more than satisfied with the Council's overall performance in the economic development activity. Target: 2012/2013 - 33%, +5% per annum

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adjusts its performance measures for the Economic Development activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council replace the performance measure "% increase in GDP in the District" with the following two performance measures:

- 1) % of key performance indicators achieved by Destination Coromandel (as set in its annual strategic marketing plan). Target: >85%
- 2) % of the District's business community that are satisfied or more than satisfied with the Council's overall performance in the economic development activity. Target: 2012/2013 - 33%, +5% per annum.

Staff reason for recommendation

- The Council does not have ultimate control over the macro-economic forces which affect GDP, therefore the GDP measure is not suitable or relevant to measure the performance of the economic development activity.
- More relevant measures include the perception of the business community on the Peninsula about how the Council is performing in this activity and the setting of a performance target for the Regional Tourism Organisation to achieve high levels of performance against its own strategic marketing plan.

Council resolution

That the Council replace the performance measure "% increase in GDP in the District" with the following two performance measures:

1. % of key performance indicators achieved by Destination Coromandel (as set in its annual strategic marketing plan). Target: >85%
2. % of the District's business community that are satisfied or more than satisfied with the Council's overall performance in the economic development activity. Target: 2012/2013 - 75%

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

- The Council does not have ultimate control over the macro-economic forces which affect GDP, therefore the GDP measure is not suitable or relevant to measure the performance of the economic development activity.
- More relevant measures include the perception of the business community on the Peninsula about how the Council is performing in this activity and the setting of a performance target for the Regional Tourism Organisation to achieve high levels of performance against its own strategic marketing plan.

Discussion

- GDP is outside the influence of this Council.
- Visitor nights and increasing yield form part of Destination Coromandel's own targets.
- Council signs off on Destination Coromandel's annual strategic marketing plan.
- Chief Executive suggests that the target for satisfaction with Councils performance should be aspirational (75% rather than 33%) and it should be noted that it may not be achieved for a couple of years.

Rates Remission Policy

71. Remissions for New Subdivisions

Three submissions were received regarding the proposal to introduce remissions for new subdivisions. All three submitters were received were not in support of the proposal.

The reasons outlined include:

- The proposed policy will encourage developers to sit on their developments while waiting for the best time to sell and maximise profits, this amounts to rate payer funding for land speculators.
- The reality of this is morally untenable.
- Developers often make significant profits and their activities often do not benefit the activities in which they are undertaken.
- Further, the submitter does not think that Council has thought through how they would enforce the conditions in this policy.
- One submitter notes that the rules for development were tightened because developers overstepped the mark and found loopholes that meant they were able to avoid payments.

Submitter numbers include 65, 221, and 291.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the rates remission policy for new subdivisions as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopts the rates remission policy for new subdivisions as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

There are other tools available to developers who wish to limit the rating impact on their subdivision, e.g. holding all lots on one title until such time as they are sold. Although this could be perceived as a preferred solution it can potentially double the administrative time and cost for Council with the requirement for separate valuations to be undertaken each time a lot is sold off and a new title issued.

If all new titles are not issued from the onset they can be held as one for extended period thus reducing total value against which to assess rates. Also uniform targeted rates will be reduced to one until such time as the new title/s are issued.

Council resolution

That the Council withdraw the rates remission for new subdivisions as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Cr Brljevic declared a conflict of interest and was not present from 5:21 to 5:23

Reason for resolution

Based on feedback received, the Council has decided to withdraw this proposal. It believes that there are more effective ways to support economic activity in the District.

Discussion

- Development Contributions are paid on 224Cs, not the certificate of title.
- Development Contributions are assessed at point of resource consent and developers have seven years to pick up the 224c. They are not invoiced, considered unpaid or accrued for.
- Development Contributions as assessed at resource consent time are not included in financial statements.

Rates Remission Policy

72. Remissions for New Subdivisions

Submitter #512 requests that the following amendments be made to the Rates Remission Policy:

- *Page 31, pt 2.2, 3rd bullet point – remove discretion of the chairperson of that committee. Change may be appeals to...can be appealed.*
- *4th bullet point – this is not necessary as Council can organise the rebate when the title is issued.*

The reasons provided include:

- *The submitter supports the policy in principle but considers it contains unnecessary process and it neither accurate nor fully researched and considered.*
- *The submitter considers the requirement to apply creates unnecessary work as Council is informed when a sale takes place.*
- *There should have been an analysis of what council services are provided to this class of property so a relative differential could be justified.*
- *The costs should not require funding as there are no costs generally to fund.*
- *The level of increase in rates needs to be questioned rather than relying on additional properties to be counted to reduce the impact of uncontrolled spending.*
- *(Refer to submission 512 for further explanation of these points.)*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers the removal the discretion of the Chair of the committee and remove the requirement to apply for subdivision remission

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and makes no change to the Rates Remission Policy.

Staff reason for recommendation

Clear guidelines are provided to staff around the application of remission policies. There should not be a requirement or need for the committee to consider staffs application of the policy unless the chair believes that there are fairness and equity issues that may need to be addressed or the policy has not been applied correctly.

4th bullet point is part of the generic requirements and not just applicable to subdivision remissions.

Council resolution

That the Council withdraw the rates remission for new subdivisions as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Cr Brljevic declared a conflict of interest and left the room for initial discussions 11:13 to 11:28.

Reason for resolution

Based on feedback received, the Council has decided to withdraw this proposal. It believes that there are more effective ways to support economic activity in the District.

Discussion

- There is a time limit of the first two years.
- Proposed budget of \$98,000 per annum from District Social development budget (typo in draft Ten Year Plan document that states Local).
- Chief Executive suggested that property development does not build economic development and that it not be dealt with as a remission at all, and rather that it be used as a trigger to start charging rates.
- Huge incentive for the developer to get title to allow on-sale of the property.
- Suggested the budget should sit with economic development rather than social development.

Rates Remission Policy

73. Remissions for Economic Development

Eight submitters request that the Council retain the proposed rates remission for economic development policy in the Ten Year Plan.

The reasons provided include:

- *The submitter considers this a way of stimulating jobs and the local economy, while at the same time enhancing the community social wellbeing.*

Submissions in support are: 63, 90, 340, and 199

Conversely, two submitters (#85 and #242) request that the Council withdraws rates reductions for businesses.

The reasons provided include:

- *Businesses charge ratepayers/homeowners for their services. Our rates are then essentially subsidising them again.*
- *Businesses should succeed or fail on their own merits. Once government subsidises business at the ratepayers expense, it is no longer private enterprise and entering a socialistic economy.*
- *Rates are only a small portion of the overall costs.*
- *There are many other factors that need to be considered – has a profile been established of each community whereby a proposed business can get information on land availability and type? Resource consents are also a hurdle to overcome.*
- *It is equally important to maintain support for existing businesses.*

Another submitter, #291, notes that it is a poorly thought out policy. Citing reasons as follows:

- *If a business cannot afford to pay rates than it's unlikely to be successful.*
- *Further, the submitter does not think that Council has thought through how they would enforce the conditions in this policy.*

Another submitter, #644, requested that businesses specialising in renewable energy technologies receive special consideration for rates remission.

One submitter in support of the proposal, #340, suggests a greater focus on Thames for both retail and IT.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the rates remission policy for economic development as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopts the rates remission policy for Economic Development as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Under the proposed policy there exist a number of criteria the applicant must meet to apply for this remission. Even then satisfaction of these criteria does not guarantee remission of rates. Application for a remission of rates for economic development will be decided by full Council.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. withdraw the rates remission policy for Economic Development as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan
2. retain the budget of \$20,000 per annum in economic develop activity
3. develop a policy for an assistance package instead of rates remission policy.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The Council believes that there are more effective ways to support economic activity in the District with this funding.

Discussion

- Remissions have to be put against a budget as it is lost revenue.
- Budget of \$20,000 already exists in economic development.

Rates Remission Policy

74. Remissions for QEII covenants

Eight submissions have been received concerning the proposal to change to the remission for Land Held for Conservation and Preservation Purposes, so that the remission is only available for land covered by a Queen Elizabeth II Trust covenant.

Seven submissions are in support of the proposal, but do make further suggestions as to the mechanics of the remission. One submission is opposed to the proposal.

Comments to how the remission is calculated

*Two submitters (#235 and #282) request that the proposed rates remission on QEII covenants be based on a **portion of the total rate not on the value of the covenanted area**. The reason provided is that a separate valuation would not be required.*

*Another submitter (#266) requests that rates relief should be a **percentage of the land value equal to the covenant proportion** (outside of targeted rates)*

Duration of the remission

*Three submitters (#235, #266 and 282) request that the remission **should be available in perpetuity provided that the covenanted land is properly cared for**.*

Extent of support

Submitter #10 requests that the Rates Remission Policy is reviewed with a view to ensuring that the valuable contributions which covenants on private land make to the community and environment are recognised and encouraged, including:

- *offering rates relief to owners of council conservation covenants*
- *sending rates relief application forms to covenant owners before applications are due*
- *providing a permanent rates relief where the covenant is also permanently placed*
- *applying a specific valuation formula (please refer to the full submission for detail).*

The reason provided is that a financial contribution by the Council to the owner of a covenant will provide a financial incentive for new voluntary covenants and managing poor covenants to good condition. It is justified by the values being maintained on the land that the community appreciates.

Public access

Two submitters (#10 and #266) request that the Rates Remission Policy requirement for public access to covenants be removed, as per the Ten Year Plan proposal.

Reasons provided include:

- *To encourage covenanters to apply for rates remission who would otherwise have not applied because of their issues with public access on private land, and help them maintain the protected values.*
- *Allowing public access into areas protecting biodiversity can adversely affect those values.*

TCDC covenanted land

Two submitters (#282 and #291) request that the proposal to provide rates remission for QEII covenants be extended to TCDC covenants and any land under preservation, where the TCDC covenanted area is being appropriately cared for.

The reasons provided include:

- *There are a number of areas provided by TCDC covenants in the District.*
- *Objective 3.3.1 refers to the preservation and conservation of native land and its flora and fauna, but policy 3.3.2 only refers to QEII covenants.*

Finally, one submitter (#680) requests that voluntary conservation of land is not a burden on the district's ratepayers. The reason provided is that the large Department of Conservation estate on the peninsula should achieve the purposes of conservation for the Council.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the rates remission for QEII covenants as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopts the rates remission policy for QEII as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan

Staff reason for recommendation

Under the proposal only land/capital value based rates would be eligible for a remission under the policy. Under the proposal any services provided directly to the property would not be subject to a remission as they are not charged under a value based rate. For this reason it is not advocated that a portion of the total rate be remitted, on either portion of total property value or portion of total property area.

The attainment of a Council Covenant does enable the developer through the resource consent process to create smaller lots than they would otherwise have been allowable under the zoning of that property under the district plan.

Council resolution

That the Council adopts the rates remission policy for QEII as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Under the proposal only land/capital value based rates would be eligible for a remission under the policy. Under the proposal any services provided directly to the property would not be subject to a remission as they are not charged under a value based rate. For this reason it is not advocated that a portion of the total rate be remitted, on either portion of total property value or portion of total property area.

The attainment of a Council Covenant does enable the developer through the resource consent process to create smaller lots than they would otherwise have been allowable under the zoning of that property under the district plan.

Discussion

None

Rates Remission Policy

75. Rates Remissions - Administration

The staff submission presented the following matter for the Council's consideration.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers an extended application period be offered for the 'Rates Remission For Land Held for Conservation or Preservation Purposes' for the upcoming 2012/2013 rating year, and that the following note be included. "Applications for this remission for the 2012/2013 rating year will be accepted up to and including 30 September 2012."

Staff recommendation

That an extended application period be offered for the 'Rates Remission For Land Held for Conservation or Preservation Purposes' for the upcoming 2012/2013 rating year, and that the following note be included. "Applications for this remission for the 2012/2013 rating year will be accepted up to and including 30 September 2012."

Staff reason for recommendation

- *Implications of not adding this note would mean that ratepayers eligible for this remission would not have the opportunity to apply for the 2012/2013 rating year.*
- *The reasons for the request are: As there is no date specified in this particular proposed rates remission policy point four of the Generic Rates Relief Policy comes into effect and this requires all applications for rates remissions to be made prior to commencement of the rating year (1 July).*
- *Given the Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan is proposed to be adopted on 27th June 2012 this does not give rates team sufficient time to notify the applicable ratepayers of this change.*
- *There are no financial costs associated with this change that have not already been budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan.*

Council resolution

That the Council offer an extended application period for the 'Rates Remission For Land Held for Conservation or Preservation Purposes' for the upcoming 2012/2013 rating year, and that the following note be included. "Applications for this remission for the 2012/2013 rating year will be accepted up to and including 30 September 2012."

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

- *Implications of not adding this note would mean that ratepayers eligible for this remission would not have the opportunity to apply for the 2012/2013 rating year.*
- *The reasons for the request are: As there is no date specified in this particular proposed rates remission policy point four of the Generic Rates Relief Policy comes into effect and this requires all applications for rates remissions to be made prior to commencement of the rating year (1 July).*
- *Given the Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan is proposed to be adopted on 27th June 2012 this does not give rates team sufficient time to notify the applicable ratepayers of this change.*
- *There are no financial costs associated with this change that have not already been budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan.*

Discussion

- *Intent is to provide applicants a couple of months to make their application.*

Harbour Facilities Activity

76. Comments to Levels of Service - Overall

Submitters 63, 90 and 663 requested that the Council continue to provide boat ramp, boat trailer parking, wharf facilities and dredging facilities throughout the district.

One submitter (#512) requests that Council's proposals in regard to Harbours be retained.

*One submitter requested that the Council protect harbours by **not allowing commercial fisherman to use them**. No further reason was provided for this request.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council's reconsider its approach to commercial activity in its harbours.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is no intention to stop the provision of boat ramp, boat trailer, parking, and wharf facilities throughout the District. Commercial fishermen are welcome to use the facilities in the interests of maintaining a sustainable local economy, providing they comply with MAF rules and regional and local bylaws.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submission
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

There is no intention to stop the provision of boat ramp, boat trailer, parking, and wharf facilities throughout the District. Commercial fishermen are welcome to use the facilities in the interests of maintaining a sustainable local economy, providing they comply with MAF rules and regional and local bylaws.

Discussion

None

Harbour Facilities Activity

77. Fees and Charges - Overall

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that a complete review of wharf management be undertaken in the short term.

The submitter considers that

- *The current charges are unrealistic but the review process to date has been unsuccessful.*
- *Other partnership options can be explored.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders a complete review of wharf management.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The community empowerment model will delegate the harbour activity to the area Community Board. The Board through the Area Manager will be able to review wharf management.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The community empowerment model will delegate the harbour activity to the area Community Board. The Board through the Area Manager will be able to review wharf management.

Discussion

- The activity is moving under local areas.
- Coromandel-Colville Community Board would like to bring their fees up from \$6 to \$10, there is a specific decision coming up on this subject.

District Transportation Activity

78. Services - Overall Work Programme

A submission was received from NZTA (#524) requesting that:

- The Council notes the submitter has reviewed the major transportation projects on page 124 of the Ten Year Plan, that although there are some minor discrepancies, they largely match up with those put forward to the Regional Transport Committee for inclusion in the 2012-2015 National Land Transport Programme.
- The submitter expects that the list will be amended to represent the most current position following conversations with New Zealand Transport Agency.
- The submitter recognises that there is on-going discussion around project details between the Council and NZTA.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the work programme to align to the 2012-2015 National Land Transport Programme.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan
2. seek clarification over the recent funding signed by NZTA that they may not be able to guarantee their committed funding.

Staff reason for recommendation

Roading improvement projects detailed in the draft Ten Year Plan reflect those submitted as part of Council's 2012-15 National Land Transport Programme funding (subsidy) application.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan
3. seek clarification over the recent funding signed by NZTA that they may not be able to guarantee their committed funding.

Moved - French

Seconded - Brljevich

Reason for resolution

Roading improvement projects detailed in the draft Ten Year Plan reflect those submitted as part of Council's 2012-15 National Land Transport Programme funding (subsidy) application.

Discussion

- The Roding Manager has been in discussions with NZTA.

District Transportation Activity

79. Services - Alignment to Blueprint

NZTA (#524) request that any deletion or deferral of capital projects be done in the context of the Blueprint growth strategy and planning direction for the District, and that if deferral or deletion of projects compromises Blueprint direction and outcomes, that further consideration be given to the consequences.

The submitter understands the need for some capital projects to be deferred or deleted in light of the current economic climate but considers that affordability must always be considered alongside working towards a safe, reliable and responsive transport system.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council gives further consideration of the alignment of its work programme to the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Capital transportation projects included in the draft Ten Year Plan are consistent with the Blueprint growth strategy.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Capital transportation projects included in the draft Ten Year Plan are consistent with the Blueprint growth strategy.

Discussion

- NZTA currently reviewing district speed limits.

District Transportation Activity

80. Old Kopu Bridge

Three submissions were received requesting that the Council does not take responsibility for or bear the costs of any maintenance of the old Kopu Bridge.

Submitters to this category include numbers: 63, 90, 199 and 512

Reason for request as outlined by the submitters include:

- while the bridge is historic, it is unaffordable for the Council to take responsibility for it
- those who want it preserved should be gifted it
- it's a nice piece of history but it has now been replaced
- that the centre swing bridge be moved to dry land with on ramps and used as a tourist destination.

Council Decision Required

What is the Council's role with respect to the Old Kopu Bridge?

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The old Kopu Bridge is a New Zealand Transport Agency asset and Council signed an agreement with Transit (now NZTA) and Hauraki District Council in 2003, whereby following commissioning of the new Kopu Bridge, the cost of maintaining the old Kopu Bridge will be shared as follows:

- New Zealand Transport Agency (75%)
- Thames-Coromandel District Council (12.5%)
- Hauraki District Council (12.5%)

Any decision regarding the future of the old Kopu Bridge would require agreement between NZTA, HDC and TCDC as well the Historic Places Trust.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The old Kopu Bridge is a New Zealand Transport Agency asset and Council signed an agreement with Transit (now NZTA) and Hauraki District Council in 2003, whereby following commissioning of the new Kopu Bridge, the cost of maintaining the old Kopu Bridge will be shared as follows:

- New Zealand Transport Agency (75%)
- Thames-Coromandel District Council (12.5%)
- Hauraki District Council (12.5%)

Any decision regarding the future of the old Kopu Bridge would require agreement between NZTA, HDC and TCDC as well the Historic Places Trust.

Discussion

- Waiting on NZTA costings on options (retain, walk/cycleway, access to span piece, land based monument).

District Transportation Activity

81. Public Transport

Three submissions were received which speak to there being little public transport provision in the District.

Submitter #256

Submitter #256 outlines that public transport should be able to be used by everyone who wishes to do so, including those using mobility aids.

The submitter further outlines that people with disabilities should be able to actively participate in and contribute to their communities, and therefore communities must be designed to provide facilities and services in such a way that no human being is excluded or prevented from participation by poor design or service delivery.

Submitter #202

Submitter number 202 specifically requests that financial provision is made in the 2012/2013 year for public consultation on priorities for public transport provision in Thames and other towns, as well as links between towns, with a firm agenda to apply for the appropriate subsidies and implementation in the 2013/2014 year.

Reason for request as outlined by the submitter #202:

- *The Ten Year Plan contains flaws in that it fails to acknowledge and provide for the imminent liquid fuel price and supply crisis and its impacts.*
- *The result is strategic errors in the Plan for example, there is very little provision for public transport.*

Submitter #147 requests that the Council urgently look at public transport provision throughout the District and notes that people are spending a third to half their income to get to work.

Council Decision Required

Whether any changes to Council's Plan is warranted to reflect these concerns.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan, however it is noted that the Community boards will have new delegations over local transportation matters and may investigate these matters more.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) makes provision for public transport services within the Waikato District. Waikato Regional Council (WRC) is responsible for development of the RPTP with input from the Thames-Coromandel District Council (TCDC). Staff are not aware of any forecast increase in demand for passenger transport within the District that would justify increasing passenger transport services or facilities from those available at present.

The draft Ten Year Plan provides for part funding of public transport services in the Mercury Bay south area over the peak summer period, together with transport coordination for improved access to the Thames and Waikato Hospitals from the Thames-Coromandel and Hauraki Districts. Together with resources provided by Waikato District Health Board and Community Waikato the transport coordinator is funded by WRC - 50%, HDC - 25% and TCDC - 25%.

However, a number of Councils have adopted a "No Barriers" strategy to successively work toward enhanced urban and facility design for people with disabilities in their communities. This can include enhanced footpath design for mobility scooters and hard surface paths in reserves.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. make no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan, however it is noted that the Community boards will have new delegations over local transportation matters and may investigate these matters more.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Community Boards will have new delegations over local transportation matters and may investigate these matters more.

Discussion

- Thames Youth Forum has also requested public transportation, as did the presentation by Denis Tegg.
- Regional Transport Forum more focussed on providing public transportation in Hamilton.
- The trial scheme for getting people to Thames and Waikato hospital may be expanded.
- There are private operators that provide public transport on the Peninsula.
- Summer Shuttle in Mercury Bay will be dealt with later in the deliberations.
- Suggestion of an area to leave bikes that has a shower facility in Thames.

District Transportation Activity

82. Comments to Services & Overall Work Programme

Submitter #157 - Services generally

Submitter #157 requested that roading jobs be planned and supervised more efficiently.

The reason outlined for this request was that the same piece of road should not be done three times, and that roading is priorities by ratepayers at #8.

Submitter number #138 - Sealing of roads

Submitter #138 requested that roading upgrades that result in decreases in the amount of unsealed road available on the Peninsula not be undertaken.

The reason outlined for this request include:

- Non sealed back roads are part of the Coromandel experience and are considerably attractive to visitors.
- Unsealed roads lower the motorcycling casualty rate.

Submitter #280 - Road safety work

The Waikato Regional Council (#280) thanks TCDC for its road safety work including input to the Regional Road Safety Steering Group, coordinating the local Road Safety Action Plan and contribution to the 'Reduce the Risk' campaign.

The submitter notes that

- it is looking forward to continuing to work closely with the Council to deliver on national and regional road safety strategies, and the review of the Regional Road Safety Strategy.
- road safety is an important part of the Thames-Coromandel district roading programmes
- this district has considerable road safety issues.

Submitter #524 - Maintenance and renewals reduction

- That the Council note NZTA's view that reducing the amount spent on maintenance and renewals of the local road network is unsustainable and may negatively impact on safety and levels of service.
- The submitter notes that conversations between Council's roading staff and NZTA's investments staff will be discussing this matter further.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council would like to make any adjustment to its District Transportation services based on the feedback received.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Road maintenance and renewal programmes, together with improvement projects are planned through integrated forward work programmes and maintenance intervention strategies to maximise value for money by reducing the likelihood of sunk costs.

Seal extension projects are completed in line with Council's Land Transport Strategy. Seal extension is only undertaken where necessary to improve vehicle traction on steep gradients, on high maintenance sites such as unsealed bridge approaches and where road dust is causing a nuisance to adjoining properties.

Staff note that the majority of road safety issues in the district are associated with state highways and that Council roads have a low crash rate relative to other local authorities in the Waikato Region.

Staff also note that NZTA's submission raises concerns that reducing road maintenance and renewal expenditure may impact on safety and levels of service, this statement is contrary to the recent NZTA advice that funding available from the

National Land Transport Fund for the 2012/2013 -2014/2015 period will be based on a 2.3% increase from TCDC's approved 2009 - 2012 programme. This is a net funding decrease when inflation is considered.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. make no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Road maintenance and renewal programmes, together with improvement projects are planned through integrated forward work programmes and maintenance intervention strategies to maximise value for money by reducing the likelihood of sunk costs.

Seal extension projects are completed in line with Council's Land Transport Strategy. Seal extension is only undertaken where necessary to improve vehicle traction on steep gradients, on high maintenance sites such as unsealed bridge approaches and where road dust is causing a nuisance to adjoining properties.

The Council note that the majority of road safety issues in the district are associated with state highways and that Council roads have a low crash rate relative to other local authorities in the Waikato Region.

The Council also note that NZTA's submission raises concerns that reducing road maintenance and renewal expenditure may impact on safety and levels of service, this statement is contrary to the recent NZTA advice that funding available from the National Land Transport Fund for the 2012/2013 -2014/2015 period will be based on a 2.3% increase from TCDC's approved 2009 - 2012 programme. This is a net funding decrease when inflation is considered.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

83. Footpaths Levels of Service (overall)

The draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan outlined a reduction in levels of service for footpaths which meant that no new footpaths would be constructed unless they attract a NZTA subsidy on safety grounds.

A question was included in the feedback form specifically seeking feedback as to whether submitters agreed with this proposal. 170 submitters answered this question. Of those, 77 of respondents submitted in agreement, 49 disagreed and 44 had no preference.

A comment box was provided on the form and only comments opposing the proposal were received. A summary of these is as follows:

- Footpaths area basic need and a council function
- This approach does not encourage walking and cycling.
- That the Council should ensure that footpaths and walkways, in particular at scenic attractions, destinations, and within townships are able to be used by people using mobility aids such as walkers and wheelchairs so that these are accessible to everyone.
- Safe walking on footpaths is very important and contributes to the reduction of loading on emergency services and vehicle use.
- Specifically, one submitter noted that there are no footpaths on Ocean Beach Road in Tairua and very dangerous to walk along (#258)

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) submits that **the proposal** to allocate footpath spending on new footpaths that receive a safety subsidy from NZTA **be retained**.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council's proposal to decrease the footpath level of service be adopted as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan or amended.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff supports the proposed new level of service for footpath construction as based on the budgets in the draft Ten Year Plan the quantity of footpaths constructed will remain the same as previously for the near future due to the quantity of footpaths that qualify for NZTA subsidy. On average across the five Community Board Areas there is 30 years of footpath construction projects that qualify for NZTA subsidy. Community Boards may consider funding footpaths as part of their local services role in the future.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The Council note staff support the proposed new level of service for footpath construction as based on the budgets in the draft Ten Year Plan the quantity of footpaths constructed will remain the same as previously for the near future due to the quantity of footpaths that qualify for NZTA subsidy. On average across the five Community Board Areas there is 30

years of footpath construction projects that qualify for NZTA subsidy. Community Boards may consider funding footpaths as part of their local services role in the future.

Discussion

- Is a safety issue 'apparent' when a disabled person is forced on the road rather than the footpath?
- Local Community Board can prioritise their own footpaths.
- Good practice to have footpaths with linkages and not paths to nowhere.

Local Transportation Activity

84. Street Lighting Levels of Service (overall)

One submission (#287) requests that the Council expands its emphasis on street lighting from restricting the management of street light outages to include preserving the night time environment and darks skies by reducing unnecessary light pollution.

The reason for this request is outlined by the submitter as poorly designed street lighting is a major contribution to light pollution and energy wastage in the district

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council's approach to street lighting be adopted as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan or amended.

Staff recommendation

1. That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.
2. That staff explore options for motion sensitive lighting and report back to Council.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council's Code of Practice for Subdivision and Development is currently under review; the revised document includes new standards for streetlights and focus on addressing light spillage and improving energy efficiency. When undertaking streetlight replacements, existing lanterns that are at the end of their life are replaced with new low light spillage and energy efficient lanterns where applicable.

Council is aware of the new approaches to motion sensitive lighting being used internationally (which automatically adjusts the brightness to movement on the street). This issue will be researched.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan
3. instruct staff to explore alternative lighting solutions and report back to Council.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Council's Code of Practice for Subdivision and Development is currently under review; the revised document includes new standards for streetlights and focus on addressing light spillage and improving energy efficiency. When undertaking streetlight replacements, existing lanterns that are at the end of their life are replaced with new low light spillage and energy efficient lanterns where applicable.

Council is aware of the new approaches to motion sensitive lighting being used internationally (which automatically adjusts the brightness to movement on the street). This issue will be researched.

Discussion

- There are more options than just motion sensitive that can be explored.
- Council has already put in down lighting at new sites.
- Electricity supplier does need to have certainty about the lights and power they need to provide.
- There are 14 lights at a roundabout in Matarangi with no houses, this type of issue will be addressed in the code of practice.

Solid Waste Activity

85. Services - New Project

Submitter #261 requests that \$13,000 be provided per annum for the next three years to assist six Marae in the district to reduce waste by at least 50%.

The reason for the request is to divert waste from landfill.

The Para Kore programme contributes to economic development, provide sustainability education to communities, strengthen community leadership be part of developing a clean and green district which all leads to a stronger Coromandel.

Para Kore already has funding from the Ministry of the Environment and Hauraki Maori Trust Board.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a project to assist six Marae in the district to reduce waste.

Staff recommendation

That the Council does not fund a project of this type as a special project through the Ten Year Plan but invite the submitter to make application to the Solid Waste Disposal Levy Reserve through the Service Delivery Committee.

Staff reason for recommendation

Applications for waste minimisation initiatives are currently planned to be funded from the Solid Waste Disposal Levy Reserve Account as set out on page 59 in the Eastern Waikato Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP). The submitters are welcome to apply to this fund at their discretion.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. does not fund a project of this type as a special project through the Ten Year Plan
2. invites the submitter to make application to the Solid Waste Disposal Levy Reserve through the Service Delivery Committee.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Applications for waste minimisation initiatives are currently planned to be funded from the Solid Waste Disposal Levy Reserve Account as set out on page 59 in the Eastern Waikato Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP). The submitters are welcome to apply to this fund at their discretion.

Discussion

None

Solid Waste Activity

86. Services - Waste Minimisation

Two submissions received concern Council's approach to Waste Minimisation.

The Coromandel/Colville Community Board (#191) requests that **the goals and objective of this activity better align with the adopted Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP)**

The reasons provided are:

- The submitter supports the development of public private partnerships at a community level for recycling and reuse initiatives.
- The submitter supports Coromandel Independent Living Trust submission that seeks to ensure the goals reflect the recently adopted Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Submitter #672 requests that the **introductory section to the Solid Waste Activity Group be rewritten to reflect the overall intent of the joint WMMP** and to accurately represent the waste management hierarchy.

The reasons provided include:

- The submitter considers the goal is not well written and does not reflect the overall intent of the WMMP.
- The statement implies that resource recovery is the lowest point of the waste management hierarchy rather than an integral part of re-use and recycling.
- Disposal should be the lowest point.

Further, submitter #672 requests that provision be made in the Ten Year Plan to assist with the establishment of community based waste minimisation initiatives at each main centre throughout the District to support the objectives of the WMMP.

The reasons provided include:

- This is a specific objective (s3.3) of the WMMP.
- The proposal will assist community participation in waste minimisation activities at the local level.
- Local businesses and organisations are often better equipped than larger corporate companies to provide community based services.
- The submitter provides background information on a comprehensive Resource Recovery Centre at the Coromandel-Colville transfer station that has been recommended to the Community Board and to the Council's Operations Manager.
- The submitter notes that the only provision in the Plan for funding of solid waste for the Coromandel-Colville Area is the acquisition of a weighbridge in 2016/2017.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the alignment of the Ten Year Plan and the Waste Management Minimisation Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the proposed plan by adding the following to the introductory text to reflect full scope of Eastern Waikato WMMP goals and objectives:

- "We will seek opportunities for beneficial economic, environmental, social and cultural outcomes by investigating joint working and private and community sector partnership arrangements to maximise community benefit."

Staff reason for recommendation

- *The Solid Waste Activity Section of the Ten Year plan is not misaligned or contradictory to the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan but not include reference to the WMMP objective to investigate joint working and partnering opportunities.*
- *The waste management hierarchy summary in the Ten Year Plan is consistent with the expanded model in the WMMP and not subservient to waste disposal and hence does not require changing.*
- *By making the amendments the full scope of WMMP goals are reflected in the plan.*

Council resolution

That the Council amends the proposed plan by adding the following to the introductory text to reflect full scope of Eastern Waikato WMMP goals and objectives:

- "We will seek opportunities for beneficial economic, environmental, social and cultural outcomes by investigating joint working and private and community sector partnership arrangements to maximise community benefit."

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Solid Waste Activity Section of the Ten Year plan is not misaligned or contradictory to the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan but not include reference to the WMMP objective to investigate joint working and partnering opportunities. The waste management hierarchy summary in the Ten Year Plan is consistent with the expanded model in the WMMP and not subservient to waste disposal and hence does not require changing. By making the amendments the full scope of WMMP goals are reflected in the plan.

Discussion

None

Local Advocacy Activity

87. Overall - Services

Submitter #252 requests that Community Board meetings be monthly.

The reason provided was that the six week cycle was set up to save money but the chaotic schedule has effectively locked people out.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the frequency of community board meetings.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and requests that the frequency and cost of community board meetings be considered as part of the implementation of the new Council and Community Board governance arrangements.

Staff reason for recommendation

At its meeting on 18 April 2012, the Council adopted a new partnership approach to the governance of the District, which in particular focuses on the function and role of the five Community Boards.

The function of community boards (in entirety) is being reconsidered as part of this review, and it therefore makes sense that the frequency of community board meetings should be considered as part of this work. An initial view expressed on the matter is that there should not probably be a need for more meetings as Council, with comparable workloads, meets six weekly.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. requests that the frequency and cost of community board meetings be considered as part of the implementation of the new Council and Community Board governance arrangements.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

At its meeting on 18 April 2012, the Council adopted a new partnership approach to the governance of the District, which in particular focuses on the function and role of the five Community Boards.

The function of community boards (in entirety) is being reconsidered as part of this review, and it therefore makes sense that the frequency of community board meetings should be considered as part of this work. An initial view expressed on the matter is that there should not probably be a need for more meetings as Council, with comparable workloads, meets six weekly.

Discussion

- Suggested that with community empowerment the Boards will have more to consider, so monthly more appropriate.
- Conversely there was a suggestion that they go to two monthly to allow time for things to get done.

Local Advocacy Activity

88. Overall - Services

Submitter #472 requests that the Council review the role of community boards and the function allocations against measurable efficiency return on investment metrics and ratepayer-value metrics.

No specific reason was provided.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a review of the role of community boards.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and continues with its review of the role of community boards, through the new partnership approach (community governance) work as planned.

Staff reason for recommendation

At its meeting on 18 April 2012, the Council adopted a new partnership approach to the governance of the District, which in particular focuses on the function and role of the five Community Boards.

The submitter's requests are similar to the drivers of the community governance work programme.

The function and delegations of community boards (in entirety) is being reconsidered as part of this review and the submitter's queries are already planned to be considered as part of this programme.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. continues with its review of the role of community boards, through the new partnership approach (community governance) work as planned.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Brljevich

Reason for resolution

At its meeting on 18 April 2012, the Council adopted a new partnership approach to the governance of the District, which in particular focuses on the function and role of the five Community Boards.

The submitter's requests are similar to the drivers of the community governance work programme.

The function and delegations of community boards (in entirety) is being reconsidered as part of this review and the submitter's queries are already planned to be considered as part of this programme.

Discussion

None

District Leadership Activity

89. Advocacy Role

Submitter #161 requests that the Council submit to the Government that electoral terms be changed from three years to four years.

The reasons provided include:

- *The three year period is too short to achieve good practice outcomes and is unproductive.*
- *Changing it to four yearly would result in cost savings and continuity.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers submitting to the Government that electoral terms be changed from three years to four years

Staff recommendation

That the Council make a submission to Central Government requesting an increase in the term of office from three to four years for both Local and Central Government.

Staff reason for recommendation

This is a political decision to consider but, over a period of ten years, a four year term of office would result in one less election. This would contribute to savings of between \$160,000 to \$200,000 in a ten year period.

Council resolution

That the Council make a submission to Central Government requesting an increase in the term of office from three to four years for both Local and Central Government.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Against - Three. Councillor Hoadley wanted her vote against recorded.

For - Four

Carried

Staff reason for recommendation

This is a political decision to consider but, over a period of ten years, a four year term of office would result in one less election. This would contribute to savings of between \$160,000 to \$200,000 in a ten year period.

Discussion

- Three years works in with the electoral process for central government.

District Leadership Activity

90. Fees and Charges

Submitter #291 requests that the proposed fees for order papers be withdrawn.

The reason provided is that if savings need to be made in this area the submitter suggests that the way order papers be produced be reviewed as they often contain unnecessary repetition.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the District Leadership fees and charges.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and retains its charge for hard copy Order Papers.

Staff reason for recommendation

Order Papers can be viewed at no charge on Council's website, at its service centres, libraries and at its meetings. The cost of photocopying and posting an order paper is on average \$20. The ability to charge provides a control on this cost.

A review of the report template and order paper structure early in 2012 has resulted in less repetition within reports and subsequently smaller order papers. However, although the size of the order paper has reduced, there is little difference in the marginal costs to produce additional hard copies.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. retains its charge for hard copy Order Papers.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Order Papers can be viewed at no charge on Council's website, at its service centres, libraries and at its meetings. The cost of photocopying and posting an order paper is on average \$20. The ability to charge provides a control on this cost.

A review of the report template and order paper structure early in 2012 has resulted in less repetition within reports and subsequently smaller order papers. However, although the size of the order paper has reduced, there is little difference in the marginal costs to produce additional hard copies.

Discussion

None

District Leadership Activity

91. Increased Expenditure

A staff submission was received requesting an increase to budget for the District Leadership activity, for non-staff training.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council increases the non-staff training budget for District Leadership by \$10,000 per year.

Staff recommendation

That the Council increase the non-staff training budget for District Leadership be increased by \$10,000 per year.

Staff reason for recommendation

The current non-staff training budget seems insufficient to cover the training requirements of elected members in their move toward greater community empowerment.

As an example, Community Board Chair Keith Johnston has identified that additional funds may need to be made available in the District Leadership Activity budget (non-staff training) to allow him to undertake a training course with the Institute of Directors per his Audit Committee role.

Council resolution

That the Council increase the non-staff training budget for District Leadership by \$10,000 per year.

Moved - Fox

Seconded -McLean

Councillor Brljevic requested that his vote against be recorded.

Reason for resolution

The current non-staff training budget seems insufficient to cover the training requirements of elected members in their move toward greater community empowerment.

Discussion

- Community Board training should go under Local Advocacy, Councillors go under District Leadership.
- In the example the training is for a Council role being covered by a Community Board person.
- The courses are vetted by Council staff for suitability.
- Could training be provided in house to save money?

Council resolution

That the Council approve the non-staff training budget being aligned to the election cycle.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

During the course of the discussion on the previous item it was noted that the budget for elected member training post 2013 election was incorrectly allocated . There are Councillor training budgets that spike every three years at election time. This resolution enables a correction to be made.

District Leadership Activity

92. Adjustment to Performance Measure

A staff submission was received requesting the removal of a performance measure in the District Leadership activity.

Council Decision Required

That the Council removes one of the District Leadership performance measures from the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council removes the performance measure "% of eligible residents who voted in the local government elections" from the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The percentage of eligible residents who vote is not necessarily representative of how engaged a community is with the democratic process.

Local Government New Zealand, the Electoral Commission and the Electoral Officer (through the Council's communications team) jointly and separately undertake a widespread marketing and education campaign to encourage voter engagement. However, over the past years there has continued to be a decline in voter turnout in the local government elections.

A high voter turnout is generally seen as evidence that voters are engaged with what is happening, therefore it is assumed that low turnout is a reflection of disenchantment or indifference. However, high voter turnout could be an indication of dissatisfaction, and low turnout a reflection of contentment of voters. Voter turnout rates do not necessarily reflect disenchantment, indifference or contentment in the performance of Council or its Community Boards.

There is little value to be gained from aiming to maintain Council's position as highest polling local authority in the Waikato Region.

Council resolution

That the Council removes the performance measure "% of eligible residents who voted in the local government elections" from the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Brljevich

Reason for resolution

The Council were agreeable to the staff recommendation.

Discussion

None

Strategic Planning Activity (District)

93. Services - Overall

Five submissions were received requesting that the Council removes spatial planning from the Ten Year Plan

The reason provided is:

- *There is no legislative imperative to carry out spatial planning, and such a process would add to the Council's cost*
- *There are already lots throughout the organisation.*

Submitter numbers include: 13, 63, 90, 512 and 663.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers the removal of spatial planning from the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submitters' concerns but retain spatial planning (the Coromandel Peninsula District Blueprint) within its planning framework.

Staff reason for recommendation

Spatial planning provides consistency for long term planning and a vehicle through which to reconcile competing government policies and ensure that agencies are working toward the same common goals. It is for these reasons that the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint project was embarked upon as a multi-agency project.

Council's intent is to consult on the Blueprint as part of the Council consultation on the District Plan in 2013.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submitters' concerns
2. retain spatial planning within its planning framework.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Spatial planning provides consistency for long term planning and a vehicle through which to reconcile competing government policies and ensure that agencies are working toward the same common goals. It is for these reasons that the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint project was embarked upon as a multi-agency project.

Council's intent is to consult on the Blueprint as part of the Council consultation on the District Plan in 2013.

Discussion

- Separate from any decision on Blueprint as spatial planning is wider than the Blueprint.
- Local plans will be picked up in local areas.

Strategic Planning Activity (Local)

94. Services - Overall

The draft Ten Year Plan included a proposal to not fund the review of local community plans, just as it no longer required budget to develop the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint Plans. However, a new Thames strategic plan was included in budget for the 2012/2013 - 2013/2014 years. (NB: this matter is covered on the next page)

Two submissions were received regarding the proposal to not fund the review of local community plans.

Submitter #189 noted concern with the withdrawal of this funding. The reason provided was that this may create further isolation in rural communities and increase the level of inequality within the district.

Submitter #512 requests that the proposal to withdraw funding for community plans be retained. The reasons outlined by the submitter are:

- *Local community plans and local area blueprint cause distress and division in communities*
- *Landowners should be able to decide what should happen with their own properties*
- *There has not been meaningful consultation*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains its proposal to not fund community plans as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions and make no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council has recently adopted a Community Empowerment model which will involve planning at a community level. Staff suggest that making a further change to the Ten Year Plan at this point is premature and it is best to wait for the implementation of the Community Empowerment model.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submissions
2. make no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Council has recently adopted a Community Empowerment model which will involve planning at a community level. The Council note staff suggest that making a further change to the Ten Year Plan at this point is premature and it is best to wait for the implementation of the Community Empowerment model.

Discussion

- Does not compromise local plans under community empowerment.

Landuse Planning Activity

95. Services- Work Programme

Four submitters make reference to the work programme of this activity, as follows:

- *Submitter #63 and #663 requests that the Council monitors staff closely when undertaking 'other land use research, policy development, and planning initiatives'. The reason provided is so as to ensure that such activity is necessary.*
- *Submitter #90 requests that the Council proposal to undertake 'other land use research policy development and planning initiatives' be withdrawn and subsequently staff and rates be reduced.*
- *Similarly, submitter #512 requests that the Council monitors staff closely when undertaking 'other land use research, policy development, and planning initiatives' to ensure that such activity is necessary.*

Submitters (63, 341, 663 and 680) requests that the Council explains what "implementing and supporting appropriate land use management" means and if it means more controls outside the current district plan requirements that the Council then considers the negative effect on the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the district due to there the fact that there has already been an outcry over the prescriptive and overbearing approach by the Council.

Submitter #252 requests that the Council consider where in its plan it will be carbon neutral and embrace energy efficiency. The submitted noted that 'clean and green' were great words and great sentiment.

Submitters (90 and 157) requests that the Council explains what "implementing and supporting appropriate land use management" means because there appears to be a substantial body of change which is driven by staff, which needs to stop and that times are hard.

One submitter (157) then suggests deleting this point.

One submitter (#90) adds 'that no more exciting or expensive innovations be implemented'.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains or amends the work programme as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the concerns raised by the submitter but that no changes be made to the Ten Year Plan as the 'other landuse planning' part of the Landuse Planning Activity is relatively minor but necessary.

Staff reason for recommendation

The 'other landuse planning' that Council undertakes is mainly in response to initiatives by other agencies that may affect the Thames-Coromandel District. Recent examples include the preparation of submissions on: the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement; the review of Schedule 4 of the Crown Minerals Act; the Draft National Policy Statement on Biodiversity; the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry; the Draft Conservation Management Strategy, etc. In the past this area of activity has also included contributing to the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint project but this work is now complete. It is appropriate for Council to be involved in this work area so that the landuse planning of other agencies is assessed in terms of impact and relevance to the people and landowners of the Thames-Coromandel District. If Council wishes to monitor the work programme of staff in this function Council can request regular reporting from the Planning Manager.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the concerns raised by the submitter
2. makes no changes to the Ten Year Plan as the 'other landuse planning' part of the Landuse Planning Activity is relatively minor but necessary.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The 'other landuse planning' that Council undertakes is mainly in response to initiatives by other agencies that may affect the Thames-Coromandel District. Recent examples include the preparation of submissions on: the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement; the review of Schedule 4 of the Crown Minerals Act; the Draft National Policy Statement on Biodiversity; the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry; the Draft Conservation Management Strategy, etc. In the past this area of activity has also included contributing to the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint project but this work is now complete. It is appropriate for Council to be involved in this work area so that the landuse planning of other agencies is assessed in terms of impact and relevance to the people and landowners of the Thames-Coromandel District. If Council wishes to monitor the work programme of staff in this function Council can request regular reporting from the Planning Manager.

Discussion

- Most will be taken into account as part of District Plan review.
- Note that concerns be given back to Peter Wishart to be included in his review.

Landuse Planning Activity

96. Services - District Plan Review

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) request that no change be made to the Ten Year Plan but that resource be allocated to enable further Service Industrial land to be zoned in/around Whitianga.

The Board has identified a need for more service industrial zoned land but a lack of resource has meant this has not progressed to be part of the proposed District Plan review.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considering allocating additional resource to the District Plan Review.

Staff recommendation

That the Council accepts the decision sought of 'no change to the Plan', and refers the task of recommending the zoning of new Service Industrial land in Whitianga to the Mercury Bay Community Development Officer and Area Manager.

Staff reason for recommendation

As part of Council's Organisational Review and the subsequent restructure, Council has recognised that it needs extra staff in the area offices to do these sorts of tasks. A new position of Community Development Officer was created in the Whitianga, Whangamata and Thames offices to coordinate and drive these types of tasks - including coordinating the background and technical work required to rezone land from rural to industrial. It is anticipated that the person in this new position will work with the Community Board and the District Plan team on this matter.

Council resolution

1. That the Council:

- a) accepts the decision sought of 'no change to the Plan'
- b) refers the task of recommending the zoning of new Service Industrial land in Whitianga to the Mercury Bay Community Development Officer and Area Manager.

2. That the Council:

- a) notes the work regarding zoning that is being done
- b) refers to District Plan Committee.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

As part of Council's Organisational Review and the subsequent restructure, Council has recognised that it needs extra staff in the area offices to do these sorts of tasks. A new position of Community Development Officer was created in the Whitianga, Whangamata and Thames offices to coordinate and drive these types of tasks - including coordinating the background and technical work required to rezone land from rural to industrial. It is anticipated that the person in this new position will work with the Community Board and the District Plan team on this matter.

Discussion

- Do other community board areas need to be picked up or just Mercury Bay?

Landuse Planning Activity

97. Services - District Plan Review

Submitter #300 requests that the Council fulfil the District Plan in the Ten Year Plan.

No specific reason is provided, but the submitter makes reference to build a wooden bridge to create a double walkway as per the covenant in the District Plan.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the District Plan Review as proposed, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the point made in the submission but does not make any further comment due to legal proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. If the submitter has not already done so, he/she may wish to contact the Matarangi Ratepayer Association Inc. to ensure the matters raised are able to be considered through the Environment Court process.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is a Structure Plan in the operative Thames-Coromandel District Plan for part of the Matarangi settlement. An enforcement order has been filed by the Matarangi Ratepayer Association Inc. against Matarangi Beach Estates Ltd (with the Thames-Coromandel District Council as a second respondent) for alleged breaches of resource consent conditions and for non-compliance with the Structure Plan. It is anticipated that all issues associated with compliance, non-compliance, monitoring and enforcement will be raised through the legal process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the point made in the submission
2. does not make any further comment due to legal proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court.
3. notes that If the submitter has not already done so, he/she may wish to contact the Matarangi Ratepayer Association Inc. to ensure the matters raised are able to be considered through the Environment Court process.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

There is a Structure Plan in the operative Thames-Coromandel District Plan for part of the Matarangi settlement. An enforcement order has been filed by the Matarangi Ratepayer Association Inc. against Matarangi Beach Estates Ltd (with the Thames-Coromandel District Council as a second respondent) for alleged breaches of resource consent conditions and for non-compliance with the Structure Plan. It is anticipated that all issues associated with compliance, non-compliance, monitoring and enforcement will be raised through the legal process.

Discussion

None

Landuse Planning Activity

98. Services - General

Submitter #341 requests that that the Council define 'other land use research policy development and planning initiatives' including what it means, what specific areas are involved, what the costs are, why it is necessary in the current economic climate.

The reason for the request is that clear statements are necessary so that the implications can be well understood by ratepayers.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council provide further clarity regarding 'other land use research policy development and planning initiatives'.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the concerns raised by the submitter but that no changes be made to the draft Ten Year Plan as the 'other landuse planning' part of the Landuse Planning Activity is relatively minor but necessary.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council acknowledge the submitters' concerns and recognise that there is much uncertainty in the community about climate change. The issue has high significance for coastal homeowners, insurance, risk to Council and infrastructure placement. Council is charged through the Resource Management Act 1991 to have "particular regard" to the effects of climate change. The NZ Coastal Policy Statement also requires that hazard risk management strategies take account of climate change.

Central government also produces much advisory material, based on international research and consensus, and involves local government in developing adaptive strategies (such as the project referred to in the submission) to assist councils discharge their responsibilities, which, in the main, relate to three areas of council activity: natural hazard management, land-use planning and the design and location of new or replacement infrastructure (which typically have lifecycles measured in decades).

This work comes at no cost to Council and its ratepayers and reflects current Government's precautionary approach to the issue of climate change as reflected in statute (RMA) and high level policy directives (NZCPS).

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the concerns raised by the submitter
2. makes no changes be made to the draft Ten Year Plan as the 'other landuse planning' part of the Landuse Planning Activity is relatively minor but necessary.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Council acknowledge the submitters' concerns and recognise that there is much uncertainty in the community about climate change. The issue has high significance for coastal homeowners, insurance, risk to Council and infrastructure placement. Council is charged through the Resource Management Act 1991 to have "particular regard" to the effects of climate change. The NZ Coastal Policy Statement also requires that hazard risk management strategies take account of climate change.

Central government also produces much advisory material, based on international research and consensus, and involves local government in developing adaptive strategies (such as the project referred to in the submission) to assist councils discharge their responsibilities, which, in the main, relate to three areas of council activity: natural hazard management, land-use planning and the design and location of new or replacement infrastructure (which typically have lifecycles measured in decades).

This work comes at no cost to Council and its ratepayers and reflects current Government's precautionary approach to the issue of climate change as reflected in statute (RMA) and high level policy directives (NZCPS).

Discussion

- Addressed through decision 95.

Landuse Planning Activity

99. Adjustment to Performance Measure

A staff submission was received requesting an adjustment to a performance measure for the District Plan Review.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the performance measures for the District Plan Review so that it aligns with the amended project timetable.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the performance measure for the district Plan Review so that it aligns with the amended project timetable, as follows:

*Baseline: District Plan review project
 2012/13: Draft Plan released for comment (also referred to as the 'First Cut')
 2013/14: Proposed Plan notified for submission
 2014/15: Proposed District Plan hearings and decisions
 2015/17: Resolution/hearing of any appeals on decisions*

Staff reason for recommendation

- *The performance measure/milestones for the District Plan Review included in the draft Ten Year Plan need to be amended to better reflect project timeframes (the draft Ten Year Plan measure/milestones do not include reference to the 'Draft' Plan).*
- *An amendment to current project timeframes (to enable more in-depth Councillor engagement) was discussed at the District Plan Review Committee meeting on 15 March 2012, and this revised timetable reflects that discussion.*

Council resolution

That the Council amends the performance measure for the district Plan Review so that it aligns with the amended project timetable, as follows:

Baseline: District Plan review project
 2012/13: Draft Plan released for comment (also referred to as the 'First Cut')
 2013/14: Proposed Plan notified for submission
 2014/15: Proposed District Plan hearings and decisions
 2015/17: Resolution/hearing of any appeals on decisions

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

- The performance measure/milestones for the District Plan Review included in the draft Ten Year Plan need to be amended to better reflect project timeframes (the draft Ten Year Plan measure/milestones do not include reference to the 'Draft' Plan).
- An amendment to current project timeframes (to enable more in-depth Councillor engagement) was discussed at the District Plan Review Committee meeting on 15 March 2012, and this revised timetable reflects that discussion.

Discussion

- Issue came to the fore because of the SNA issue and the timelines have been pushed as a result.

Hazard Management Activity

100. Extent of Services - Waikato Regional Council Support

Support for Proposed Work Programme

The Waikato Regional Council (#280) requested that the Council note the following comments in support of the proposed work programme.

- the Waikato Regional Council's acknowledgement of the collaborative work being undertaken with the Council on managing flood hazards, and looks forward to future work together in the management of flood plains.
- the Waikato Regional Council's acknowledgement of the collaborative work being undertaken with TCDC on managing beach erosion and working towards long term solutions.
- the Waikato Regional Council's support for the Council's on-going commitment and support for the East Coromandel Tsunami Strategy and that it looks forward to working with the Council in the next stage of the project focusing on Tairua and Pauanui. The Waikato Regional Council further noted that the Whitianga stage of the East Coromandel Tsunami Strategy project has been extremely successful to date due to the high level of community involvement and engagement.

Wind Shear Project

The Waikato Regional Council requested Council note its commendation of its intention to commence a wind shear project, however notes that it [WRC] has made no provision for this project in its long term plan.

The reason outlined in support of the Council continuing with this work regardless is that the wind shear work is of value especially for future land use planning given previous events.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains or amends the work programme as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. receives the submission
2. notes the support of the Waikato Regional Council (WRC) for Council's work programme to manage risk from floods, coastal hazards and wind shear and to develop tsunami risk management strategies for the main settlements of the Coromandel Peninsula's east coast
3. welcomes the collaborative approach taken by both agencies to managing the effects of natural hazards and looks forward to continuing the relationship to benefit the wellbeing of communities through building resilience to natural hazards
4. retains the work programme as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council is required through its enabling legislation, including the Local Government Act 2002 and the Resource Management Act 1991, to address the risks to its communities from the effects of natural hazards. In undertaking this responsibility, Council has for a number of years been working closely and collaboratively with the Waikato Regional Council. In adopting this approach greater gains from shared resources and process efficiencies have been achieved through integrated management which benefits the district community, particularly that part at greatest risk from natural hazards. Staff also notes WRC support for the wind shear project and look forward to continued support once financial and information resources are available to allow the project to progress.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. receives the submission
2. notes the support of the Waikato Regional Council (WRC) for Council's work programme to manage risk from floods, coastal hazards and wind shear and to develop tsunami risk management strategies for the main settlements of the Coromandel Peninsula's east coast.
3. welcomes the collaborative approach taken by both agencies to managing the effects of natural hazards and looks forward to continuing the relationship to benefit the wellbeing of communities through building resilience to natural hazards.
4. retains the work programme as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Council is required through its enabling legislation, including the Local Government Act 2002 and the Resource Management Act 1991, to address the risks to its communities from the effects of natural hazards. In undertaking this responsibility, Council has for a number of years been working closely and collaboratively with the Waikato Regional Council. In adopting this approach greater gains from shared resources and process efficiencies have been achieved through integrated management which benefits the district community, particularly that part at greatest risk from natural hazards. Staff also notes WRC support for the wind shear project and look forward to continued support once financial and information resources are available to allow the project to progress.

Discussion

None

Hazard Management Activity

101. Extent of Services - Climate Change and Sea Level Rise

Four submissions were received that **oppose Council's involvement in activities related to climate change and sea level rise.**

Submitter numbers include; 63, 90, 663 and 287.

Specifically, the submitters request that the Council:

- abandon any proposals to carry work to related to supposed sea level rise
- withdraw completely from NIWA and Waikato Regional Council projects on climate change adaptation
- notes one submitters comment that presumably Thames, Matarangi, Pauanui, Tairua and Whitianga be relocated due to sea level rise.

The reasons provided include:

- to save costs
- nothing the Council does will make any difference.
- conditions imposed on any coastal property would have to be imposed the urban sector as the sea rises equally across all areas
- the Council has already done much work in this area.
- there is no proof that sea level rise is increasing any more quickly than it has in the past.

In addition to these four submissions, another two submissions were received on this topic, as follows:

Submitter #680 requests that any conditions applied to coastal property should equally apply to the urban sector under similar threat.

Submitter #512 requests that hard engineered structures are used to address coastal management issues where appropriate and scientifically supported. The reason provided is that the submitter considers that climate change is a natural process and should not be used to scaremonger decisions.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its coastal adaption to climate change work programme.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains its coastal adaption to climate change work programme.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council acknowledge the submitters' concerns and recognise that there is much uncertainty in the community about climate change. The issue has high significance for coastal homeowners, insurance, risk to Council and infrastructure placement. Council is charged through the Resource Management Act 1991 to have "particular regard" to the effects of climate change. The NZ Coastal Policy Statement also requires that hazard risk management strategies take account of climate change.

Central government also produces much advisory material, based on international research and consensus, and involves local government in developing adaptive strategies (such as the project referred to in the submission) to assist councils discharge their responsibilities, which, in the main, relate to three areas of council activity: natural hazard management, land-use planning and the design and location of new or replacement infrastructure (which typically have lifecycles measured in decades).

This work comes at no cost to Council and its ratepayers and reflects current Government's precautionary approach to the issue of climate change as reflected in statute (RMA) and high level policy directives (NZCPS).

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retains an active watch with respect to coastal adaption to climate change
2. notes that any budgetary requirements would be a matter to come to full Council.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

Council acknowledge the submitters' concerns and recognise that there is much uncertainty in the community about climate change. The issue has high significance for coastal homeowners, insurance, risk to Council and infrastructure placement. Council is charged through the Resource Management Act 1991 to have "particular regard" to the effects of climate change. The NZ Coastal Policy Statement also requires that hazard risk management strategies take account of climate change.

Central government also produces much advisory material, based on international research and consensus, and involves local government in developing adaptive strategies (such as the project referred to in the submission) to assist councils discharge their responsibilities, which, in the main, relate to three areas of council activity: natural hazard management, land-use planning and the design and location of new or replacement infrastructure (which typically have lifecycles measured in decades).

This work comes at no cost to Council and its ratepayers and reflects current Government's precautionary approach to the issue of climate change as reflected in statute (RMA) and high level policy directives (NZCPS).

Discussion

None

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

102. General Comments to Placement/Name of the Activity

Submitter # 282 notes *disappointment that the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity is combined with the Land Use Activity* and would prefer to see environmental services as a separate activity.

Reasons outlined include:

- It's difficult to tell how much will be spent on environmental initiatives from the figures given.
- Only 0.15% of the total budget is disappointing.
- The natural environment is what attracts tourists, residents and ratepayers.
- The scope of the activity is not reflected in the funds allocated.
- Environmental issues cannot be put aside until the economy improves as biodiversity and eco systems will continue to decline.

Submitter #96 requests that the Council notes the submitter's concern that the draft Ten Year Plan *confuses the terms natural heritage and cultural heritage to give the impression that it has dealt with them without doing so at all*. The submitter refers to definitions of historic heritage and natural heritage.

Submitter #503 requests that the term 'cultural heritage' be replaced with 'historic heritage' throughout the Ten Year Plan. The reasons outlined include:

- This will align with the Resource Management Act 1991 definitions.
- The submitter has included a summary of the Act definition.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the name of the activity, or adopts as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the points made in the submission but that no change be made to the name of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity.

Staff reason for recommendation

The suggestion to separate the 'natural' and 'cultural' heritage aspects of the activity could however be further considered through the activity planning process (and the associated budgeting process) that feeds into the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.

The 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council was established through the 2009-2019 Ten Year Plan process to help implement actions identified in both the Biodiversity Strategy (2008) and the Heritage Strategy (2008). There are actions within both strategies that are relevant to many different Council functions (e.g. maintenance of Council heritage buildings, advocacy, RMA functions regarding both biodiversity and heritage, reserve management, etc.). The idea behind the activity was to provide an increased and specific focus upon the management of natural and cultural heritage resources within the District. Specific RMA functions relating to 'historic heritage' are exercised through the Council's Landuse Planning (District Plan) and Landuse Management (resource consent) activities.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable biodiversity and heritage funds, building/tree maintenance assistance fund, Council employed biodiversity officer, etc.) however, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for the activity (e.g. \$10,000 for maintenance of Council heritage buildings, \$11,000 contribution toward Enviroschools programme, \$15,000 per annum toward heritage promotion).

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submissions
2. make no change be made to the name of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The suggestion to separate the 'natural' and 'cultural' heritage aspects of the activity could however be further considered through the activity planning process (and the associated budgeting process) that feeds into the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.

The 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council was established through the 2009-2019 Ten Year Plan process to help implement actions identified in both the Biodiversity Strategy (2008) and the Heritage Strategy (2008). There are actions within both strategies that are relevant to many different Council functions (e.g. maintenance of Council heritage buildings, advocacy, RMA functions regarding both biodiversity and heritage, reserve management, etc.). The idea behind the activity was to provide an increased and specific focus upon the management of natural and cultural heritage resources within the District. Specific RMA functions relating to 'historic heritage' are exercised through the Council's Landuse Planning (District Plan) and Landuse Management (resource consent) activities.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable biodiversity and heritage funds, building/tree maintenance assistance fund, Council employed biodiversity officer, etc.) however, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for the activity (e.g. \$10,000 for maintenance of Council heritage buildings, \$11,000 contribution toward Enviroschools programme, \$15,000 per annum toward heritage promotion).

Discussion

- Activity created in 2009.
- Creates a lot of interest in the community
- Most of the \$1.98m budget over the 10 years is overheads.

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

103. Extent of Council's Involvement in Biodiversity

Twenty submissions were received regarding the extent of Council's involvement in biodiversity initiatives. Submissions were received both in support and in opposition to Council's work in this area and are noted here under the following headings:

- a. Submissions in opposition to Council's involvement in biodiversity
- b. Submissions in support of Council's current work in the areas of biodiversity
- c. Submissions requesting more support for biodiversity
- d. Biodiversity Forum

A) Submissions in opposition to Council's involvement in biodiversity

Eight submitters request that the Council:

- **examine whether there is a legislative imperative to undertake biodiversity work** (one submitter requests that the Council does not implement biodiversity legislation to a more than cursory level)
- **cease any work affecting private property which seeks to identify that property with a view to imposing more rules and regulations** (or one submitter considers that individual property owners must be included in discussions on biodiversity protection on a one to one basis).
- **notes the submitters opposition to some of the natural and cultural heritage activity, in particular biodiversity initiatives, heritage and biodiversity forums**

Submitter numbers are: 13, 63, 90, 199, 341, 512, 663 and 680.

The reasons outlined include:

- That there is no legislative imperative regarding biodiversity, its identification or its mapping.
- There has been inadequate problem identification and intervention is not warranted.
- Such activities undermine the social, cultural and economic viability wellbeing of our communities.
- There is no justification for Council action when it will result in unwarranted cost and increased unaffordability.
- There will be likely referrals to the Environment Court.

Submitter #287 requests that the Council **withdraws funding for biodiversity strategies**.

B) Submission in support of Council's current work in the areas of biodiversity include:

One submission received is in support of Council's current work as follows:

- Submitter #194 requests that the proposal to provide the **'protection of heritage and biodiversity' service be retained**. The submitter cites that land and coastal area is significant in biodiversity terms and includes an area designated as a wildlife refuge.

Submissions requesting more support for biodiversity include:

Six submissions received request more work or more support be undertaken in this area, as follows:

Submitters #282 and #291 request that the Council **increase funding provided for environmental and biodiversity management and fund this by removing the proposed rates remission for developers**.

The reasons provided include:

- The Council needs to continue identifying significant natural areas and educating the public and landowners on their importance.
- Developers make significant profits often to the detriment of local communities.
- Ratepayer funds would be better used to protect the natural environment.

Submitter #266 requests that the Council **employ a full-time staff member to implement the actions of the biodiversity strategy** and other Council related biodiversity work such as monitoring of covenants.

The reasons outlined include:

- At present various staff members have aspects of biodiversity work incorporated into their present job tasks.
- A dedicated staff member responsible for this would mean the outcomes are less fragmented and more achievable.

Further, submitter #266 request that the Council note the Waikato Biodiversity Forum's support for the action in the Council's Biodiversity Strategy to **explore the establishment of a biodiversity fund with the Regional Council.**

Submitter #13 requests that the Council **supports biodiversity by hunting and trapping and cyanide.** No reasons were provided.

Submitter #49 requests that the Council **increases pest control, particularly rat control.** The submitter provides an example that rats are at epidemic levels in Flaxmill Bay

Submitter #135 requests that the Council encourage marine **reserves to promote biodiversity and protect certain species.** The submitter notes that this will in turn attract more tourists.

Biodiversity Forum

In addition to the above, a number of submissions were received regarding the Biodiversity Forum, as follows:

Four submitters request that the Council **continues to support the Waikato Biodiversity Forum.**

- However one submitter notes that it's not clear from the document what amount will be provided.
- One submitter requests that the Forum have a budget to be able to outsource assistance and advice (#291)
- Submitter numbers are: 266, 280, 282, and 291.

The reasons provided by submitters include:

- The forum performs an excellent role in supporting and educating many community groups.
- To assist and promote natural heritage conservation and enhancement.
- There is very little emphasis in the plan given to the natural environment of the Peninsula.
- It is our major asset and a draw card for most tourists.
- 0.15% for Natural and Cultural Heritage is an extremely small amount given the biodiversity of our region.

Submitter #157 requests that the Council **does not provide for the biodiversity forum.**

The reasons provided include:

- This is another non-infrastructure activity.
- The submitter considers that the Waikato Regional Council is responsible for these and any duplication of these and similar schemes should be eliminated from budgets.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the extent of its involvement in biodiversity, or adopts as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the points made in the submissions but that no changes be made to the draft budgets relating to the 'biodiversity' aspect of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council (ie. continued support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum, provision of information for owners of conservation covenants).

Staff reason for recommendation

Several submissions were received requesting that Council reduce its current level of funding for biodiversity initiatives. A similar number of submissions were also received requesting that Council increase its current level of funding for biodiversity initiatives.

Council's current involvement in biodiversity management (outside of the 'Landuse Planning' [District Plan] activity) is largely limited to working with other agencies, such as the Waikato Regional Council, the Department of Conservation and the Waikato Biodiversity Forum to promote positive biodiversity outcomes on the ground.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various biodiversity initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable biodiversity fund, Council employed biodiversity officer, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for biodiversity initiatives (ie. continued support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum, provision of information for owners of conservation covenants).

The operative Thames-Coromandel District Plan is currently being reviewed and the District Plan Review Committee will soon be making decisions in relation to biodiversity provisions as they relate to private land. The approach of the Committee to date has been to streamline the current District Plan and to focus upon promoting positive outcomes on the ground - in line with Council's legislative requirements.

Council's role in promoting positive biodiversity outcomes (increase/decrease) will be further considered through the activity planning process (and the associated budgeting process) that feeds into the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft budgets relating to the 'biodiversity' aspect of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council (ie. continued support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum, provision of information for owners of conservation covenants).

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Several submissions were received requesting that Council reduce its current level of funding for biodiversity initiatives. A similar number of submissions were also received requesting that Council increase its current level of funding for biodiversity initiatives.

Council's current involvement in biodiversity management (outside of the 'Landuse Planning' [District Plan] activity) is largely limited to working with other agencies, such as the Waikato Regional Council, the Department of Conservation and the Waikato Biodiversity Forum to promote positive biodiversity outcomes on the ground.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various biodiversity initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable biodiversity fund, Council employed biodiversity officer, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for biodiversity initiatives (ie. continued support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum, provision of information for owners of conservation covenants).

The operative Thames-Coromandel District Plan is currently being reviewed and the District Plan Review Committee will soon be making decisions in relation to biodiversity provisions as they relate to private land. The approach of the Committee to date has been to streamline the current District Plan and to focus upon promoting positive outcomes on the ground - in line with Council's legislative requirements.

Council's role in promoting positive biodiversity outcomes (increase/decrease) will be further considered through the activity planning process (and the associated budgeting process) that feeds into the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- Very little is done in this area.
- Funds the Waikato Biodiversity Forum and have done for 11 years - \$3,000.
- The Forum provides education and information.
- There are many definitions of Biodiversity.
- Council does not have in house expertise to check covenants so a local contractor is used.
- The \$1.98m spend being mostly overheads should be noted more clearly in the Ten Year Plan.

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

104. Extent of Council's Involvement in Heritage

A) Submissions in opposition to Council's involvement in protection of heritage

- Eight submitters note **opposition to some of the natural and cultural heritage activity, in particular biodiversity initiatives, heritage and biodiversity forums**. Submitter numbers are: 13, 63, 90, 199, 341, 512, 663 and 680.
- Submitter #287 requests that the Council **withdraws funding for Enviroschools and Biodiversity and Heritage Strategies**.

Submissions in support of the Council's involvement in protection of heritage

Eight submitters write in support of Council involvement in the protection of heritage. Several submitters make suggestions for where and how more support could be provided in this area.

Submitter #284 suggests that the Council allocates a clear segment of funding that can be accessed by ratepayers who own **heritage buildings or notable trees** to be used, for example for:

- Education
- Financial assistance to the Hauraki Coromandel Heritage Forum
- Building/resource consent fee reductions
- Free/reduced arborist advice and discount vouchers
- Council co-ordination of Hauraki-Coromandel Heritage Forum Group meetings and venues

The reasons provided include: providing the opportunity for education and assistance with Council related paper work, a climate will be encouraged where people will come to understand the need and thus be more willing to maintain heritage buildings and notable trees.

Submitter #612 requests that the Council provide **advice to owners of heritage buildings both on the Heritage Register and the Historic Places Trust Register, regarding their care and maintenance and indicating the value of the retention**. No reasons were provided.

Similarly, submitter #677 requests that the **Heritage Forum play an advisory role to aid owners of heritage buildings both on the Heritage Register and the Historic Places Trust Register, to care and maintain their buildings**.

Both #612 and #677 request that the **Council provide a Heritage Assistance Fund** to provide advice to owners of heritage buildings and including the tree register.

The Thames Community Board (#520) that the Council provide a nominal **\$15,000 constable 'incentive fund' for the retention of natural and cultural heritage**. The Board outline that this would allow staff to make a small contribution to the cost of preserving our heritage buildings and to demonstrate goodwill on the part of the Council.

#677 and #683 request that the Council **commits to provide adequate funding for heritage protection and enhancement**.

- Heritage is given a significant amount of recognition by TCDC but is totally underfunded.
- Heritage protection and enhancement is a vital part of the Council's brief from central government.

Three submitters (#96, 679 and 683) request that a **community heritage committee be established and funded**.

The purposes of the committee noted by submitters are to carry out its responsibilities outlined in the current District Plan and to provide greater protection for the town and surrounding areas.

- One submitter suggests the committee would include residents, specialists and council members.
- One submitter suggests this be funded through general rates.
- One submitter submits that the committee should work alongside Council and community boards on issues such as new developments.

Submitter #96 requests that the Council notes the submitter's view that **heritage needs to be addressed in any plan, and their concern over previous heritage issues in Coromandel township**. The submitter notes that heritage has to be managed because of its inevitable effects on tourism turnover and its impact on 'balance'.

Submitter #10 requests that the Council reassesses its approach to encouraging the protection and enhancement of the District's natural heritage. The submitter identifies inconsistencies between the district community aspirations for protecting their environment and the proposed Ten Year Plan:

- The district community has indicated a strong desire to ensure that the unique natural heritage of the Peninsula is protected and enhanced.
- The Council is in a position of being able to encourage protection in under-represented ecosystems that are critical to the ecological diversity of the District.
- The draft Ten Year Plan has no reference to the Council's Biodiversity Strategy despite the Strategy anticipating that future Ten Year Plans would include its initiatives.
- Only a small budget has been allocated to natural and cultural heritage.

Submitter #683 notes that in their opinion the Council is **obliged to recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate use and development** under legislation.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the extent of its involvement in the protection of heritage, or adopts as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the points made in the submissions but that no changes be made to the draft budgets relating to the 'cultural heritage' aspect of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council (ie. continued support for Heritage Hauraki-Coromandel Forum, retention of \$15,000 per annum heritage promotion fund).

Staff reason for recommendation

Several submissions were received requesting that Council reduce its current level of funding for heritage initiatives. A similar number of submissions were also received requesting that Council increase its current level of funding for heritage initiatives.

Council's current involvement in heritage management (outside of the 'Landuse Planning' [District Plan] activity) is largely limited to working with other agencies, such as the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and the Heritage Hauraki-Coromandel Forum to promote positive heritage outcomes on the ground.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable heritage funds, building/tree maintenance assistance fund, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for the activity (e.g. \$10,000 for maintenance of Council heritage buildings, \$15,000 per annum toward heritage promotion).

The operative Thames-Coromandel District Plan is currently being reviewed and the District Plan Review Committee will soon be making decisions in relation to the identification of heritage areas and associated provisions. The approach of the Committee to date has been to streamline the current District Plan and to focus upon promoting positive outcomes on the ground - in line with Council's legislative requirements.

Council's role in promoting positive heritage outcomes (increase/decrease) will be further considered through the activity planning process (and the associated budgeting process) that feeds into the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council notes the points made in the submissions but that no changes be made to the draft budgets relating to the 'cultural heritage' aspect of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council (ie. continued support for Heritage Hauraki-Coromandel Forum, retention of \$15,000 per annum heritage promotion fund).

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Wells

Revoking of Council decision

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

For - seven

Reason for resolution

Council resolved to increase funding in decision 110, requiring this decision to be revoked.

Discussion

- Budget of \$15,000 per annum.
- Used for things such as the Saxon Mine in Thames signage, Sugarloaf sign explaining the history.
- There is a list of signs to be developed. The Parks and Reserves officers often speak to the local residents and come back to the District Plan Manager for prioritisation.
- Some funding may be used to move the Cook monument in Kopu.
- \$10,000 per annum Building maintenance fund for Councils five heritage buildings (Tararu Art Centre, Carnegie Building, Coromandel Service Centre, Saxon Mine Shaft and Hauraki House).

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

105. Coromandel Heritage Trust

Two submissions were received regarding the Coromandel Heritage Trust requesting support, by way of operating and capital expenditure.

Submitter #227 requests that capital expenditure of \$80,000 be budgeted for the Coromandel Heritage Trust Archive. Reasons for this request are outlined in the submission.

Submitter #643 requests that provision be made in the Ten Year Plan for annual funding of an estimated \$90,000 for operational costs of the regional research and family history centre and archive.

Note: The Family History and Research Centre and Archive are seeking funding from both Thames-Coromandel and Hauraki Districts and suggests the contribution from each could be assessed in proportion of the number of rateable properties in each District.

The reasons outlined include:

- *The Coromandel Heritage Trust has successfully raised significant funds towards the construction of a proposed archive adjoining The Treasury.*
- *It is hoped that the building will be completed by January 2013.*
- *It will be critical that a full time curator and receptionist be employed at the Treasury given the addition of the archive and the importance of the collection.*
- *Around 70 volunteers already provide a considerable contribution but full time staff are needed to handle the workload.*
- *The Family History and Research Centre and Archive provides a service for the Thames-Coromandel.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers supporting the Coromandel Heritage Trust.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions from the Coromandel Heritage Trust but that no changes be made to the draft budgets for the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is noted that the Council could request staff to undertake further investigations and for a subsequent report to be submitted to Council for consideration in due course (if approved, funding would be 'unbudgeted').

Two submissions were received from the Coromandel Heritage Trust - one requesting \$90,000 per annum for the employment of a full-time curator and receptionist for the 'archive centre' (potentially to be split between the Hauraki and the Thames-Coromandel Districts), and the other requesting the allocation of \$80,000 previously raised by the Trust as a contribution toward the purchase of the proposed archive site (703 Queen Street).

Neither of these proposals have previously been considered for funding through the Ten Year Plan process and it is difficult to allocate such a high level of funding, particularly given the lack of funds for the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council, without further investigations being undertaken.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions from the Coromandel Heritage Trust
2. makes no change to the draft budgets for the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

It is noted that the Council could request staff to undertake further investigations and for a subsequent report to be submitted to Council for consideration in due course (if approved, funding would be 'unbudgeted').

Two submissions were received from the Coromandel Heritage Trust - one requesting \$90,000 per annum for the employment of a full-time curator and receptionist for the 'archive centre' (potentially to be split between the Hauraki and the Thames-Coromandel Districts), and the other requesting the allocation of \$80,000 previously raised by the Trust as a contribution toward the purchase of the proposed archive site (703 Queen Street).

Neither of these proposals have previously been considered for funding through the Ten Year Plan process and it is difficult to allocate such a high level of funding, particularly given the lack of funds for the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council, without further investigations being undertaken.

Discussion

None

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

106. Monitoring of Conservation Covenants

Two submissions have been received in support for the monitoring of conservation covenants.

Submitter #266 **notes the importance of the Council's conservation covenant monitoring work** and supports the continuation of this work so that landowners are reminded of their responsibilities.

The same submitter suggests that the Council employ a full-time staff member to implement the actions of the biodiversity strategy **and other Council related biodiversity work such as monitoring of covenants.**

The submitter also notes that the QEII National Trusts successful system of monitoring and support is a model of covenant management which the Council could adopt to ensure compliance and encourage biodiversity management on council covenants.

Submitter #10 suggests that the Council **retain the council covenant monitoring work, but amend its performance targets as follows:**

That the target for the "number of Council covenants in 'good' condition" performance measure, be increased from 60% to >90%.

The reason outlined is that the submitter considers that the measure is the most accurate, but that the **proposed target is uninspiring and inadequately relates to the community desire to protect and maintain these areas of natural heritage.**

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its approach to the monitoring of conservation covenants or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. note the points made in the submissions
2. confirms that no changes be made to the draft budgets of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council
3. adjusts the performance measure target for the 'number of Council covenants in 'good' condition' so that this be increased from 60% to 70

Staff reason for recommendation

Submitters noted the importance of Council's conservation covenant monitoring programme but requested additional biodiversity resources and a higher performance measure be adopted relating to the number of Council covenants assessed as being in a 'good' condition.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various biodiversity initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable biodiversity fund, Council employed biodiversity officer, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for biodiversity initiatives (ie. continued support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum, provision of information for owners of conservation covenants).

Given the continued commitment of Council to monitoring its Council/landowner conservation covenants, and an increased focus upon the provision of education material, it would seem appropriate to raise the performance measure target from 60% to 70%.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submissions
2. confirms that no changes be made to the draft budgets of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council
3. adjusts the performance measure target for the 'number of Council covenants in 'good' condition' so that this be increased from 60% to 70%.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Councillor Brljevic declared a conflict of interest and did not vote.

Reason for resolution

Submitters noted the importance of Council's conservation covenant monitoring programme but requested additional biodiversity resources and a higher performance measure be adopted relating to the number of Council covenants assessed as being in a 'good' condition.

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various biodiversity initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable biodiversity fund, Council employed biodiversity officer, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for biodiversity initiatives (ie. continued support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum, provision of information for owners of conservation covenants).

Given the continued commitment of Council to monitoring its Council/landowner conservation covenants, and an increased focus upon the provision of education material, it would seem appropriate to raise the performance measure target from 60% to 70%.

Discussion

- QEII National Trust have a target of 95% for their covenants.

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

107. Measuring Our Performance

Several submissions have been made concerning the way that performance is measured for the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity.

Submitter #194 requests that the Council notes the discrepancy between the baseline figure of 173 in the 'number of resources formally protected' performance measure, and the figure of 190 in the 2011/2012 Annual Plan.

Submitter #503 requests that the Council **consider more appropriate measures for protecting heritage**, for instance, measures around numbers of historic heritage features whose retention is attributable to scheduling.

Submitter #503 also requests that the Council notes the submitter's view that the **performance measure of ownership of five heritage buildings by the Council appears to contradict the assertion that there is no capital expenditure associated with this activity.**

A staff submission was also received requesting several adjustments to the performance measures for this activity as follows:

- 1) That the wording for the measure "number of cultural/natural heritage resources formally protected in our district plan" be amended to read "number of historic buildings and sites formally protected in our district plan".
- 2) That the Council agrees to reduce the number of groups represented at the "Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum" be reduced from 20 to 10.
- 3) That the Council agrees to amend the name of the "Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum" be changed to "Heritage Hauraki-Coromandel" in the document.

Reason for the changes by staff include:

- 1) The Council have not made any formal decisions whether or not to show natural heritage resources such as SNA's and landscapes on the District Plan Maps at the time of writing.
- 2) The measure is not achievable as there would not be 20 heritage groups in the Coromandel.
- 3) The name of the forum is currently incorrect.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders how it measures its performance or adopts as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. notes the points made by the submitter
2. amends the performance measure relating to the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity as follows:
 - a. That the wording for the measure "number of cultural/natural heritage resources formally protected in our district plan" be amended to read "number of historic buildings and sites formally protected in our district plan".
 - b. That the Council agrees to reduce the number of groups represented at the "Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum" be reduced from 20 to 10.
 - c. That the Council agrees to amend the name of the "Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum" be changed to "Heritage Hauraki-Coromandel" in the document.

Staff reason for recommendation

The development of meaningful performance measures for monitoring outcomes in relation to natural and cultural heritage is notoriously difficult. This is even more the case when direct Council involvement in the activity is limited. Several changes to the performance measures have been suggested (including via staff submission) and these will be able to be further considered through the decision-making process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made by the submitters
2. amends the performance measure relating to the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity as follows:
 - a. That the wording for the measure "number of cultural/natural heritage resources formally protected in our district plan" be amended to read "number of historic buildings and sites formally protected in our district plan".
 - b. That the Council agrees to reduce the number of groups represented at the "Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum" be reduced from 20 to 10.
 - c. That the Council agrees to amend the name of the "Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum" be changed to "Heritage Hauraki-Coromandel" in the document.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The development of meaningful performance measures for monitoring outcomes in relation to natural and cultural heritage is notoriously difficult. This is even more the case when direct Council involvement in the activity is limited. Several changes to the performance measures have been suggested (including via staff submission) and these will be able to be further considered through the decision-making process.

Discussion

- There would be at least 20 heritage groups in the Coromandel, but not all are prepared to attend the Hauraki-Coromandel Community Heritage Forum meetings.
- The groups look to Council for information sharing.

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

108. Enviroschools

Three submitters request that the **funding for the Enviroschools funding be retained**. However one submitter notes that it's not clear from the document what amount will be provide for.

Submitter numbers are 266, 280, and 282.

The reasons provided include:

- Enviroschools are working hard to reduce waste, recycle, add native plantings to increase biodiversity and increase the use of sustainable transport amongst many other things.
- This is a positive way of educating young people in environmental and conservation values.

Submitter #287 requests the Council **withdraws funding for Enviroschools and Biodiversity and Heritage Strategies**. The submitter considers that the Waikato Regional Council is responsible for these and any duplication of these and similar schemes should be eliminated from budgets.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintains its support for the Enviroschools programme as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council reconsiders its commitment to the Enviroschools programme in light of other requests for funding against the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity.

Staff reason for recommendation

Four submitters have submitted in support of the Enviroschools programme and one submitter has requested Council funding be withdrawn. The current level of Enviroschools funding was agreed to as a result of submissions and decisions on the 2009-2019 Ten Year Plan. The Enviroschools programme is run by the Waikato Regional Council and Thames-Coromandel District Council contributes \$11,000 per annum (11 schools are part of the Enviroschools programme). The amount that Council contributes to Enviroschools is significant within the context of the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity and Council may wish to reconsider its commitment given the requests that have been received for increased funding in other areas of the activity (eg. increased funding for heritage promotion, etc.).

Council resolution

That the Council confirms its commitment to the Enviroschools programme.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The Council agrees that the Enviroschools programme is a positive way of educating young people in environmental and conservation values and would like to have a greater awareness of where and when the programmes are taking place and be invited to attend the schools that participate.

Discussion

- There are 11 schools in our District that receive funding.
- The scheme is run out of Wellington.
- The Council receives an Annual Report from them.
- Regional Council spends around \$100,000 per year on the scheme.
- Request that elected members be invited to attend the schools that participate.

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

109. Outside Scope of the Ten Year Plan

One submitter requests that the Council notes the submitter's intent to submit to the District Plan at the appropriate time that the Wharekawa Harbour and environs be included as a cultural/natural heritage resource to be formally protected, and:

- *seeks identification of the Wharekawa Harbour and environs as an **area worthy of formal protection on heritage and biodiversity grounds**, and*
- *seeks listing of the Wharekawa Harbour and environs in the District Plan register amongst those numbered in the performance measure from the date of adoption of the revised District Plan.*

The reason outlined by the submitter is that the land and coastal area is significant in biodiversity terms and includes an area designated as a wildlife refuge.

Council Decision Required

That the Council note the submitter's intent for the time being.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the points made in the submission and that the submitter be advised that there will be an opportunity to submit on the identification of natural features (and the associated reviewed land use provisions) in and around Wharekawa Harbour through the District Plan Review process ('first cut' due to be released in November 2012).

Staff reason for recommendation

The submission refers to the need to identify natural and cultural heritage features/resources in and around the Wharekawa Catchment through the District Plan Review process - which is separate to the Ten Year Plan process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submissions
2. advises the submitter that there will be an opportunity to submit on the identification of natural features (and the associated reviewed land use provisions) in and around Wharekawa Harbour through the District Plan Review process ('first cut' due to be released in November 2012).

Moved - Wells

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The submission refers to the need to identify natural and cultural heritage features/resources in and around the Wharekawa Catchment through the District Plan Review process - which is separate to the Ten Year Plan process.

Discussion

None

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

110. Overall

One submitter (#503) notes that the amount \$1.98m allocated for Natural and Cultural Heritage would appear to be too little to meet the many demands as outlined on p.209.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintain or increase the budget proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan for the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity.

Staff recommendation

1. That the Council notes the submission but that no increased budget provision be made for the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity of Council.
2. Alternatively the Council could increase funding, for example, to increase the contestable heritage promotion fund from \$15,000 to \$30,000 per annum, with strict criteria to be developed.

Staff reason for recommendation

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable heritage funds, building/tree maintenance assistance fund, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for the activity (e.g. \$10,000 for maintenance of Council heritage buildings, \$15,000 per annum toward heritage promotion).

Increased funding in this area would mean there would be increased opportunities for heritage promotion/economic development in the District. There is a case to increase the heritage promotion fund, with strict criteria to be developed, from \$15,000 to \$30,000 per annum.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Additional cost to all ratepayer of \$0.55c per property.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. increase funding for the contestable heritage promotion fund from \$15,000 to \$30,000 per annum, with strict criteria to be developed.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

Councillor Wells requested that his vote against be recorded.

Reason for resolution

As part of the development of the 'Natural and Cultural Heritage' activity plan, several options were discussed for funding various initiatives/proposals (e.g. contestable heritage funds, building/tree maintenance assistance fund, etc.). However, due to the current economic climate, and Council's desire to reduce the burden on ratepayers, only very targeted and specific funds were made available for the activity (e.g. \$10,000 for maintenance of Council heritage buildings, \$15,000 per annum toward heritage promotion).

Increased funding in this area would mean there would be increased opportunities for heritage promotion/economic development in the District. There is a case to increase the heritage promotion fund, with strict criteria to be developed, from \$15,000 to \$30,000 per annum.

Discussion

- There are valuable heritage sites in Thames and Coromandel particularly.
- Over the years Council has waxed and waned over its commitment to this so it is not actively promoted.
- The District Plan needs to be written to allow heritage rules to be enforced.
- Maintenance of the five Council historic buildings can't be funded by depreciation as per Revenue and Financing policy.

Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

111. Funding

Seven submissions have been received concerning the way in which the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity is funded.

*Two submissions (113 and 194) request that the proposal to fund this activity by a **uniform charge district wide be retained**. No reasons were provided.*

*Three submitters (63, 90 and 663) request that the Council **does not charge ratepayers equally for this activity**. No reasons were provided.*

*Submitter #677 requests that **all funding for this activity come from general rates**. No reasons were provided.*

Submitter #503 requests that:

- *funding for 'natural heritage' matters be separate from that for 'cultural' (historic) heritage*
- *funding for historic heritage be sufficient to allow for a good programme of identification, assessment, scheduling, protection and direct and indirect financial assistance where that is warranted*
- *the **types of direct and indirect assistance should be specified** (e.g. waiver or resource consent fees, rates relief, etc.)*

The reasons outlined are:

- *The two items are generally treated as a composite in the plan.*
- *The two should be differentiated so each can get the attention it deserves and one cannot squeeze the other out of funding.*
- *The respective amounts for each should be identified in the interests of transparency.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintains its approach to funding the natural and cultural heritage activity as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the points made in submissions but that no change be made to the Ten Year Plan - the protection and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage benefits the District as a whole and it is appropriate that some contribution is made by the wider community.

Staff reason for recommendation

The protection and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage benefits the District as a whole and it is appropriate that some contribution is made by the wider community. It is also noted that the funds available through this activity are currently very small.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan
3. notes that the protection and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage benefits the District as a whole and it is appropriate that some contribution is made by the wider community.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The protection and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage benefits the District as a whole and it is appropriate that some contribution is made by the wider community. It is also noted that the funds available through this activity are currently very small.

Discussion

None

Emergency Management Activity

112. Overall - Services

A staff submission was received regarding a name change for Surf Life Saving New Zealand.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council changes references in the Ten Year Plan from Bay of Plenty Surf Life Saving New Zealand to Surf Life Saving New Zealand.

Staff recommendation

That the Council instructs staff to adjust references to Bay of Plenty Surf Life Saving New Zealand to Surf Life Saving New Zealand due to a name change for this organisation

Staff reason for recommendation

- *This was brought to attention at the community information sessions in Pauanui and Whitianga by Surf Life Saving New Zealand staff.*
- *This has been discussed with Pam Howat, the activity manager for Emergency Management and the name change confirmed as appropriate.*

Council resolution

That the Council instructs staff to adjust references to Bay of Plenty Surf Life Saving New Zealand to Surf Life Saving New Zealand due to a name change for this organisation.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

- This was brought to attention at the community information sessions in Pauanui and Whitianga by Surf Life Saving New Zealand staff.
- This has been discussed with Pam Howat, the activity manager for Emergency Management and the name change confirmed as appropriate.

Discussion

None

Emergency Management Activity

113. Surf Life Saving

A submission was received from Surf Lifesaving New Zealand (#218), requesting additional funding to what has been proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Specifically, the request is for increases to the following amounts:

- 2012/2013: \$118,874.45 (NB: budget currently is \$105,983)
- 2013/2014: \$137,224.63 (NB: budget currently is \$108,579)
- 2014/2015: \$155,058.98 (NB: budget currently is \$111,180)

The submission outlines that the funding will provide for:

- Increasing the lifeguarding service at Hot Water Beach from late November/early December until mid/late March, operating either side of low tide.
- extend the service at Onemana for an additional week in January
- extend the service at both Pauanui and Tairua by an additional week to cover the entire summer school holiday period
- extend the service at Whangamata into the first week in February
- (refer to full submission for details)

Reasons for the request include:

- to contribute to the Council Outcomes of sustained economic growth, safe and healthy communities and encouraging increased opportunities to participate in recreational, sporting and cultural activities.
- to extend the existing life guarding service.
- Surf Life Saving New Zealand acknowledges and values the on-going support of the Council and collaborative relationship, which provides positive impact to those who live and choose to recreate at beaches in the District.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council increases its level of service (and funding) for Surf Life Saving, or adopts the level of service as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council confirms its draft Ten Year Plan grant funding.

Staff reason for recommendation

While there is a need for extended surf lifesaving services, Council also needs to address its own financial position. Therefore, it is not recommended that the level of funding be increased.

Council Community Development staff will be able to explore options with SLSNZ if assistance is sought.

Council resolution

That the Council confirms its draft Ten Year Plan grant funding.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

While there is a need for extended surf lifesaving services, Council also needs to address its own financial position. Therefore, it is not recommended that the level of funding be increased.

Council Community Development staff will be able to explore options with Surf Life Saving New Zealand if that assistance is sought.

Discussion

None

Emergency Management Activity

114. Emergency Warning Systems

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that the Council continue to advocate for a National Tsunami Warning system to ensure every community utilises the same system across the country.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains an advocacy role with respect to National Tsunami Warning systems.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains an advocacy role with respect to a consistent national tsunami warning system.

Staff reason for recommendation

Through the Thames Valley Combined Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee and the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, Council has continued over many years to advocate at a national level for a consistent national tsunami warning system.

Council resolution

That the Council retains an advocacy role with respect to a consistent national tsunami warning system.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Through the Thames Valley Combined Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee and the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, Council has continued over many years to advocate at a national level for a consistent national tsunami warning system.

Discussion

None

Cemeteries Activity

115. Services (Overall)

Submitter #3 requests that eco places for burials be provided.

No reason was provided.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council provides eco-burial places.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and explores suitable locations for eco-burial at the guidance and direction of each Community Board.

Staff reason for recommendation

Eco-burials can already be made in any plot purchased in any of the Council's cemeteries. The recently revised cemetery management plan will shortly be circulated to Community Boards for input. In this plan it is suggested that specific Natural Burial areas be created at the new Kaimarama Cemetery in Mercury Bay and the Totara Cemetery in Thames.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submission
2. explores suitable locations for eco-burial at the guidance and direction of each Community Board.

Moved - Mclean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Eco-burials can already be made in any plot purchased in any of the Council's cemeteries. The recently revised cemetery management plan will shortly be circulated to Community Boards for input. In this plan it is suggested that specific Natural Burial areas be created at the new Kaimarama Cemetery in Mercury Bay and the Totara Cemetery in Thames.

Building Control Activity

116. Fees and Charges

Two submissions were received regarding the Building Control Activity and it relates to fees and charges.

Submitter #341 requests that the Council note the submitter's concern at the cost of building consents.

The reasons provided include:

- *There is widespread concern at the cost of doing business with the Council in the area of consents.*
- *It's not unusual for Council driven direct and indirect costs to be as high as 23% of the cost of any building project.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the fees & charges schedule for Building Consents in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council continues with the adoption of the proposed fees and at the same time reviews overhead allocation as a part of establishing the Building Business Unit.

Staff reason for recommendation

Fees remain well within the government requirements of between 1 to 2% of value, overall. The fees are not increasing for the 2013/14 year. The fee bands relate to market value of the work and as stated, overall they average out below the national figures. It is acknowledged that with some lower end value projects, the percentage values do increase; however the work required does not necessarily reduce, with all consents requiring a planning review for example and it is these projects that tend to get the greater portion of rates subsidy, in an attempt to keep fees down.

There is often a perception that the building consent fees are part of the resource consent costs and hence in reality the building consent fee is often considerably less than that perception. There is also a perception that TCDC fees are considerably less than surrounding councils. In reality the subsidy of rates input for surrounding councils' is notably higher; in some instances being double that of TCDC. This is a political decision in terms of how much rates input should be given to the consenting process. However in preparation for the establishment of the Building Business Unit, the overhead components will be reviewed and will reflect into the fees.

Council resolution

That the Council continues with the adoption of the proposed fees and at the same time reviews overhead allocation as a part of establishing the Building Business Unit.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

Fees remain well within the government requirements of between 1 to 2% of value, overall. The fees are not increasing for the 2013/14 year. The fee bands relate to market value of the work and as stated, overall they average out below the national figures. It is acknowledged that with some lower end value projects, the percentage values do increase; however the work required does not necessarily reduce, with all consents requiring a planning review for example and it is these projects that tend to get the greater portion of rates subsidy, in an attempt to keep fees down.

There is often a perception that the building consent fees are part of the resource consent costs and hence in reality the building consent fee is often considerably less than that perception. There is also a perception that TCDC fees are considerably less than surrounding councils. In reality the subsidy of rates input for surrounding councils' is notably higher; in some instances being double that of TCDC. This is a political decision in terms of how much rates input should be given to the consenting process. However in preparation for the establishment of the Building Business Unit, the overhead components will be reviewed and will reflect into the fees.

Discussion

None

Building Control Activity

117. Fees and Charges

Submitter #655 requests that temporary building fees for tents, etc., cover all tents not one fee per tent.

The submitter provides an example where an event would have to pay 10-12 permit fees at present.

Council Decision Required

Whether the adopts the fees and charges schedule for Building Consents as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains fees as they are proposed.

Staff reason for recommendation

Fees for marquees are not charged per marquee.

For a private event council currently has an exemption process to aid both speed and reduce cost.

For public events the Building Act is more limiting and council believes it more appropriate to follow the consenting process and carry out the inspection required. In these situations where multiple marquees are sought one fee is required and if necessary additional time could be charged.

For the Coro Gold event only one fixed fee was invoiced with no additional charges.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retains fees as they are proposed
2. instructs the Chief Executive to provide an easier, lower cost solution.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Fees for marquees are not charged per marquee.

For a private event council currently has an exemption process to aid both speed and reduce cost.

For public events the Building Act is more limiting and council believes it more appropriate to follow the consenting process and carry out the inspection required. In these situations where multiple marquees are sought one fee is required and if necessary additional time could be charged.

For the Coro Gold event only one fixed fee was invoiced with no additional charges.

Discussion

How does erection of marque attract a building consent - for fire egress etc

Can't we do away of the fee and the professional person erecting it provide a producer statement?

Community Health and Safety Activity

118. Fees and Charges - Dog Control

On the feedback form, a question was asked of submitters whether they agreed with the Council's proposal to introduce and increase user fees and charges to keep rates low.

145 submitters responded to this question. Of those 55 agreed, 10 disagreed and 80 indicated no preference.

Opposition to Council's proposal

21 submitters requested that dog registration fees do not increase as proposed. A number of these submitters also provided alternatives to the proposal including:

- *registering owners and not dogs*
- *part of the dog control charge be collected as a targeted rate from non-residential ratepayers (a \$10-\$20 charge) while allowing existing dog registration charges to remain static (#65 & #584)*
- *the Council charge a lower fee for safe category dogs that are neutered and micro chipped (#28, #193, #584)*
- *phasing any increase in and capping it (#340)*
- *remain static or limit any increase to the rate of inflation (#208 & #584)*
- *more robust application of fines*

Reasons provided include:

- *The submitters consider that the charge is already high with little value service received.*
- *They suggest increasing the charges for dog collection and callouts to reflect a user pays approach to dog control.*
- *The proposal penalises responsible dog owners.*
- *The proposal will not encourage dog owners to register their dogs.*
- *The situation has been mostly exacerbated by non-residential ratepayers / holiday makers who add threshold pressure beach communities over holiday periods and double the dog population by bringing dogs with them that are not even registered in this district.*
- *People's pets are their companions and dogs play a significant part in the wellbeing of the society.*
- *Dogs provide security for elderly people living alone.*
- *Many submitters consider that everyone in the District benefits from the safer community resulting from dog control.*
- *Some submitters question an inconsistency of the application of this user pays principle e.g. why the Council charges ratepayers who are non-users for boat ramps but expect a user pays approach to animal control.*
 - *Cats cause more damage than dogs.*
 - *This increase is difficult for some people to cope with, especially super annuitants*
 - *Dogs that are de-sexed cause less enforcements problems and therefore cost to Council.*

One submitter opposes the raising of fees for working dogs, but supports the suggested price rise for dangerous dogs and straying unregistered dogs (#237). The reason provided includes that farm dogs cause very few issues for dog control officers as are not involved with barking issues and stock control issues have not risen.

Similarly, submitter #242, considers that the proposed increase in dog fees are too high and comments that farm working dogs are part of farm management, therefore charges should be treated accordingly and be less.

Another submitter #291, proposes that the Council fund dog control:

- *on a district wide basis, with the exception of the portion of cost involved in the registration process*

- by increasing the fines for owners breaching the bylaws.

The submitter supports user pays where the major beneficiary is clear, and considers that it is the general public who benefit from dog restrictions and capture of dangerous dogs.

Submitters to this category (in opposition) include numbers: 11, 24, 65, 28, 27, 68, 187, 340, 235, 411, 208, 237, 193, 113, 242, 243, 157, 146, 470, 615, 680, and 584.

Support for Council's proposal

Three submitters were in support of the Council's proposal to increase dog registration fees (135, 237 and 650). No reasons were provided.

Council Decision Required

Whether the funding of dog control be adopted as proposed or amended.

Staff recommendation

That Council:

1. withdraw its proposal to increase dog control fees as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.
2. leave dog control fees as is in the 2011/2012 year and be revisited through the next Annual Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Traditionally this element is funded by UAGC charge as set out in the TYP plan to reflect the fact that it is problematic to recover from the offenders/perpetrators which to an extent are not accurately represented by those that are compliant ie who register their dogs. A fee structure that incentivises compliance in some areas may be an alternative in line with submitters comments.

Council resolution

That Council:

1. withdraw its proposal to increase dog control fees as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan
2. leave dog control fees as is in the 2011/2012 year and be revisited through the next Annual Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

In response to feedback received from the public, and also owing to the internal review currently underway about the delivery of the animal control service, the proposal to increase dog control fees as set out in the draft ten year plan is being withdrawn for the time being.

Discussion

- Fees and charges do not have to go through a Ten Year Plan process, this is a courtesy.
- Suggested that this decision be deferred for a year because dog control in the District is being reviewed.
- Suggested a 0.6 differential for working dogs up to 3 dogs and then free after that.
- Provision of the service costs twice the amount of fees received.
- Suggested the increase could be a CPI increase only.
- Suggested that the cost of recovering errant dogs be increased.
- If user pays goes down the UAGC will go up.

Community Health and Safety Activity

119. Fees and Charges - Stock Control

Submitter #237 requests that the Council increase the stock control charges.

The reason provided is to truly reflect the costs incurred of stock control.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider it' stock control charges.

Staff recommendation

That the Council consider the appropriateness of stock control charges and other elements of the delivery of this service when it reviews the proposal to bring in house these services.

Staff reason for recommendation

The organisational restructure has determined that a review of the management of many of the contracted serves in the relation to community health and safety activity be undertaken including the specific consideration of stock control.

Council resolution

That the Council consider the appropriateness of stock control charges and other elements of the delivery of this service when it reviews the proposal to bring in house these services.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The organisational restructure has determined that a review of the management of many of the contracted serves in the relation to community health and safety activity be undertaken including the specific consideration of stock control.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

120. Levels of Service - Enforcement

Submitter #135 requests that the Council considers stricter dog enforcement, particularly on beaches. No specific reason was provided.

Submitter #470 requests that the Council extend hours that dogs are permitted on the beaches at Kuaotunu during summer. They are dissatisfied with the current hours that dogs are allowed on the beaches making it unable for them to enjoy the beach. No further reason was provided.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider Dog enforcement on beaches.

Staff recommendation

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform it's scheduling of enforcement resource.

Staff reason for recommendation

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into deployment models.

Council resolution

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform it's scheduling of enforcement resource.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into deployment models.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

121. Levels of Service - Smokefree Outdoor Areas Policy

Submitter #189 requests that the Council consider the adoption of a smokefree outdoor areas policy, particularly in parks with children's playgrounds.

The reason provided is to reduce smoking being modelled to children as normal behaviour and consequently reduce smoking uptake rates.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider the adoption of a smokefree outdoor areas policy.

Staff recommendation

That the Council does not consider adoption of a smokefree policy at this time due to the likely additional requirement for resource.

Staff reason for recommendation

A shift to increase the amount of local community board input into local regulatory decision making and with the review of the provision of enforcement services in this area it may be ill advised to increase enforcement requirements at this time. It should be noted however that as a part of central government direction setting for this outcome in terms of health it may be prudent to consider taking a district wide approach rather than a local one when the enforcement considerations are reviewed.

Council resolution

That the Council does not consider adoption of a smokefree policy at this time due to the likely additional requirement for resource.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

A shift to increase the amount of local community board input into local regulatory decision making and with the review of the provision of enforcement services in this area it may be ill advised to increase enforcement requirements at this time. It should be noted however that as a part of central government direction setting for this outcome in terms of health it may be prudent to consider taking a district wide approach rather than a local one when the enforcement considerations are reviewed.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

122. Levels of Service - Parking Levies

Submitter #202 requests that the parking levies be reviewed.

The reason provided is to encourage public transport, walking and cycling.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to parking levies.

Staff recommendation

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform its enforcement priorities locally including parking.

Staff reason for recommendation

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into matters such as parking. A local community board may then for example choose to take such an approach.

Council resolution

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform its enforcement priorities locally including parking.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into matters such as parking. A local community board may then for example choose to take such an approach.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

123. Levels of Service - Horse riding on Beaches

Submitter #624 requests that the practice of horse riding on beaches be permitted to continue in Mercury Bay, with restrictions and education as appropriate to protect waterways and dunes.

The reasons provided include:

- *This is a tradition and a privilege.*
- *If horse riding on the beach is forbidden, the Council may have to provide alternative riding tracks.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to horse riding on beaches.

Staff recommendation

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform its enforcement priorities locally including horse riding on beaches, bearing in mind district wide good governance decisions may need to be made with regard to environmental protections in some cases.

Staff reason for recommendation

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into matters such as horse riding. A local community board may then for example choose to take such an approach.

Council resolution

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform its enforcement priorities locally including horse riding on beaches, bearing in mind district wide good governance decisions may need to be made with regard to environmental protections in some cases.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into matters such as horse riding. A local community board may then for example choose to take such an approach.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

124. Levels of Service - Freedom Camping Enforcement

Submitter #292 requests that the Council set aside funds to monitor and enforce areas where freedom camping presents significant issues. No specific reason was provided.

Submitter #680 requests that more attention be focused to control 'fly by night' campers, the fires they light, the excrement and rubbish they leave behind.

The reasons provided include:

- *This is an on-going problem on the Port Jackson Rd.*
- *Advantage is taken on the remote situation and assumed lack of authority in the area.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to freedom camping enforcement, or adopt as is.

Staff recommendation

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform its scheduling and prioritisation of enforcement resource.

Staff reason for recommendation

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into deployment models and prioritisation.

Council resolution

That the Council in moving to the community empowerment model seeks input from community board areas to inform its scheduling and prioritisation of enforcement resource.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Local regulatory targeting is under review in line with the bringing back in house of enforcement activities in this area. It is anticipated that a consistency of approach will be developed along with efficiencies and that this will factor in greater local community input into deployment models and prioritisation.

Discussion

None.

Community Health and Safety Activity

125. Levels of Service - Food Inspections

Submitter #85 requests that a service be established to provide health inspections for bed and breakfast kitchens/food handlers, and that the cost be recovered through charging a fee to the business being inspected.

The reasons provided include:

- *This is a much needed service to ensure that visitors are served breakfast safely.*
- *Most bed and breakfast operators have no food safety training at all.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to food inspections, or adopt as is.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopt its current approach to food inspections which does not preclude the inspection of bed and breakfast operators.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council currently manages a food inspection programme that can include this area of enforcement.

Council resolution

That the Council adopt its current approach to food inspections which does not preclude the inspection of bed and breakfast operators.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

Council currently manages a food inspection programme that can include this area of enforcement.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

126. Levels of Service - Environmental Protection

Submitter #85 requests that a service be established to provide environmental protection from business activities, and that the cost be recovered through charging a fee to the business being inspected.

The reasons provided is to protect the ratepayer from the consequences of unchecked problems from waste etc.

Submitter #135 also requested that the Council have more stringent control of environmental pollution, particularly burning of rubbish. No specific reason was provided.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to environmental protection.

Staff recommendation

That the Council does not extend its levels of service to reflect air quality environmental protections as this would overlap Waikato Regional Council areas of responsibility.

Staff reason for recommendation

WRC is best placed due to its legislative mandate to manage air quality concerns.

Council resolution

That the Council does not extend its levels of service to reflect air quality environmental protections as this would overlap Waikato Regional Council areas of responsibility.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

WRC is best placed due to its legislative mandate to manage air quality concerns.

Discussion

None

Community Health and Safety Activity

127. Levels of Service - Noise Control

Submitter #135 requests that the Council have more stringent noise control.

No specific reason was provided.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider its current approach to noise control, or adopt as is.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopts its current approach to noise control.

Staff reason for recommendation

No reason has been provided to indicate where the dissatisfaction arises. In addition to this it would likely require additional resource. The re-tasking of resource in this area as the operational review is undertaken is likely to produce additional effectiveness in this area.

Council resolution

That the Council adopts its current approach to noise control.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

No reason has been provided to indicate where the dissatisfaction arises. In addition to this it would likely require additional resource. The re-tasking of resource in this area as the operational review is undertaken is likely to produce additional effectiveness in this area.

Discussion

Have acceptable noise levels changed?

Community Centres and Halls Activity

128. Overall - Services

A staff submission was received requesting an update to the Community Centres and Halls Activity as follows:

That an adjustment be made to the Community Centres and Halls activity, page 146 to read as follows: The online community hall booking system for Whangamata, Whitianga and Thames community centres and will be introduced from 2014.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adjusts the Community Centres and Halls activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council make an adjustment to the Community Centres and Halls activity, page 146 to read as follows: The online community hall booking system for Whangamata, Whitianga and Thames community centres and will be introduced from 2014.

Staff reason for recommendation

Due to a reprioritisation in work programme, the online booking system will not be available from 1 July 2012 as planned, but will instead be available from 2014.

Council resolution

That the Council make an adjustment to the Community Centres and Halls activity, page 146 to read as follows: The online community hall booking system for Whangamata, Whitianga and Thames community centres and will be introduced from 2014.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Due to a reprioritisation in work programme, the online booking system will not be available from 1 July 2012 as planned, but will instead be available from 2014.

Discussion

None

Community Centres and Halls Activity

129. Services - Community Owned and Managed Halls

The draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan proposed a reduced involvement in community owned and managed halls (tier three halls).

The submission form specifically asked submitters whether they agreed with this proposal. 167 submitters responded to this question. Of those, 71 agreed, 54 disagreed and 42 had no preference.

In addition to the fixed question a further four submissions were received on this topic, not in support of Council's proposal. One of these (Kauaeranga Hall) included 73 signatories.

Puriri

- Submission #682, requests that the annual grant provided for the Puriri Hall be continued. The reasons outlined include:
 - The Hall could not function without the grant because of increasing costs of insurance, rates, power and would become derelict
 - The bulk of the maintenance is done by voluntary labour to keep costs low
 - The hall is used by the school, fire brigade and local community

Kauaeranga Hall

- Submission #645 requests that the Council reconsider its proposal to cease funding the Kauaeranga Hall and maintain an annual grant of \$2,000 (the average received per year over the last 6 years). The submitter has attached a supporting document containing 73 signatories. The reasons outlined include:
 - The Hall is frequently used for a range of events by a range of community groups
 - There is already a substantial community involvement in the maintenance of the hall (the submitter provides a number of examples)
 - The funding of the Hall represents a very small amount of the total TCDC budget and equates to less than 40c per Thames rates bill.
 - The Hall Society faces a number of fixed operating costs (power, rates, insurance) which are unavoidable
 - The Ten Year Plan 'talks the talk' about community (a number of examples provided in the submission) but is short on real community investment.
 - Although the Plan states the Council will look to local communities to tell us their priorities, the Hall Society found out about the proposed cuts via a pamphlet in the rates bill.
 - The Plan talks about empowering communities but this comes down to encouraging them to fund raise.
 - The Society has been fundraising and applying for grants for years, and the idea of fundraising is a little simplistic.
 - For community empowerment and partnerships to work, some 'base funding' is needed.
 - Kauaeranga does not have a high profile water processing plants, boat ramps, sports facilities, etc to get attention and 'slips under the Council's radar'
 - The Hall has architectural, historical and social significance as stated by the NZ Historic Places Trust
 - While other larger community facilities may be needed in other areas, this should not be at the expense of smaller halls providing a community benefit.
 - The continuation of the grant will enable the completion of current projects and planning of future projects to enhance the building.

Thames Community Board (#520)

- The Thames Community Board submit that the Council **not progress a District Policy regarding funding of Tier 3 halls**. The reason provided is that as the Thames Community Board funds five out of the six 'Tier 3' halls, the Board suggests such a policy is not necessary especially in light of the proposed Board delegations.
- **Alternatively**, the Thames Community Board request that the Council provide funding for 'Tier 3' halls in the Thames Community Board area, and that the proposed \$10,945 funding be pooled in a 'contestable' fund disbursed after the Board has considered applications for assistance. The reasons provided include:
 - To enable existing levels of support to be continued if required.

- The submitter provides details of current funding allocations.

Other comments against Council's proposal to reduce involvement in community owned and managed halls include:

- These halls are important community assets, mostly well run and the amount funded is good value for return
- This may create further isolation in rural communities and increase the level of inequality within the district
- Local halls are pivotal places for their communities, they are the hub and heart of a community, promote community wellness and Council involvement supports the local communities
- Thames Valley Motor Cycle Club supports continued funding to halls, as due to Council's support the halls have been available for use by the Club at reasonable costs
- Comparing the cost to fund the halls to the service they provide to the community, it is not reasonable to stop funding the halls and sacrifice their continuation without stable funding
- This is a basic council function

Comments in support of the Council's proposal to reduce involvement in community owned and managed halls include:

- Community boards and locals should pay for their own local halls.
- That community halls must stand on their own two feet. If they cannot meet their costs of operation then sell them (NB: this submitter, #197, also references the Kopu Hall being sold in 2008).

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the proposal to reduce involvement in community owned and managed halls, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council made a clear decision as part of the Ten Year Plan process to reduce its involvement with community based halls. They will continue to support the facilities we own but want communities to manage the development of what are their facilities.

The Thames Community Board want to grant the Puriri hall and Kauaeranga Valley hall a grant from their annual community grants, but this policy specifically excludes the funding of operational expenditure.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. reinstate funds for tier 3 halls in the Ten Year Plan subject to review by Community Boards as part of the community empowerment model.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

In light of the Council's community empowerment framework, the Council determines that the community boards should review whether or not to discontinue funding to certain community halls. The funding will be reinstated subject to further review by community boards.

Discussion

- This relates to tier three halls only.
- Is the tier system no longer relevant with community empowerment coming on line?
- Asked that the Kauaeranga Hall funding not be removed whilst community empowerment comes on line.

Community Centres and Halls Activity

130. Services - Council Owned/Community Managed Halls (Tier 2)

One submission (#482) requests that the Halls policy be reappraised to align with communities' aspirations and wellbeing and that the proposed Tier 2 Community Hall Policy be amended from 'No additional funding will be allocated to Tier 2 Halls' to 'That Hall funding is assessed and allocated as appropriate to maintain Community Tier 2 Halls'.

The reasons outlined by the submitter include:

- *The concept of tiers has some merit but does not consider the circumstances of each, e.g. community impact, utilisation history, financial management and building condition.*
- *Community centres as the 'hub' of small communities and provide a focus for many activities within these communities.*
- *The concept alienates the key stakeholder (Community Hall Centre) and transfers the financial burden and accountability to them.*
- *The submitter notes that \$596,000 is allocated in 2013/2014 from Pauanui/Tairua Reserve Funds for a proposed Community Centre in Pauanui. The submitter considers this a contradiction in the Halls policy that creates a precedent.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its approach to Tier 2 halls, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council made a clear decision as part of the Ten Year Plan process to reduce its involvement with community based halls. They will continue to support the facilities we own but want communities to manage the development of what are their facilities.

The only exception to this is the inclusion of the construction of new community facility at Pauanui which is to be funded and operated by the local Tairua/Pauanui rate.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. adjusts the Ten Year Plan text to reflect the community empowerment model.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

In light of the Council's community empowerment framework, the Council determines that the community boards should review whether or not to discontinue funding to certain community halls. The funding will be reinstated subject to further review by community boards.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

131. Overall Services - General Comments

Submitter #199 submits that the Social Development activity is not a priority for the Council.

The reasons provided include:

- *Housing affordability is the role of Housing NZ*
- *Other social issues are well catered for via other government social agencies*
- *TCDC's priorities should be providing core infrastructure services.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains the proposed services for the Social Development activity as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council provides a proportion of the total funding received by the district's social service providers and these are examples of collaboration between government agencies, Council and communities to enable efficient use of resources to achieve social outcomes.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. signals in the Ten Year Plan a review of the social development activity

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Staff reason for recommendation

Council provides a proportion of the total funding received by the district's social service providers and these are examples of collaboration between government agencies, Council and communities to enable efficient use of resources to achieve social outcomes. The Council however would like to review the effectiveness of this activity overall.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

132. Services - Social Services Waikato

Five submissions were received requesting that the Council withdraw funding for Social Services Waikato.

One submitter requests specifically that the funding be withdrawn unless it contributes to the infrastructure component of the Council.

The reasons outlined include:

- *The money could be better spent elsewhere*
- *It is ineffectual, unproductive and not needed.*
- *This is not a function of the district council.*
- *This should be a government responsibility.*

Submitter numbers are: 63, 90, 157, 512 and 663

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintain funding for Social Services Waikato, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council signals its intent for Social Services Waikato funding.

Staff reason for recommendation

Grant funding is a priority to be determined by Council.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retain Social Services Waikato funding for the 2012/2013 year
2. request further reporting back to Council on outcomes achieved
3. signal in the Ten Year Plan a review of the social development activity in the 2012/2013 year.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Grant funding is a priority to be determined by Council, however, the Council would like to review the effectiveness of this grant, and the social development activity overall, in particular given no formal request was received for this funding from Social Services Waikato.

Discussion

- Attention drawn to a paper from Central Government about what Councils should be involved in.
- Provide an advocacy role for the other social service agencies in the Waikato.
- Council has been giving them money for many years as a roll over.
- They are on an annual contract with a grant of \$22,000.
- No formal request has been received from them for funding.
- Each Community Board needs to look at their own area and go back to relevant staff member to review.

Social Development Activity

133. Services - Sport Waikato

Submitter #138 requests

- that the Council **does not fund organisations that are out of the area such as Sport Waikato.**
- The reason provided is that Sport Waikato has not been notable in support of the sport of ... (can't read rest).

Submitter #138 also notes

- that that the Council has a key partnership with at least one sport and recreational partner such as SPARC.
- the reason provided is sport and recreation are key elements in viable communities. If sports such as netball, rugby and motorcycling are not directly engaging with the Council, sports bodies such as SPARC should be approached to provide input.

Sport Waikato (#139) requests that the **funding for the Sport Waikato District Coordinator (\$77.672) continue at the same level with CPI adjustments.**

Sport Waikato has attached its draft 2012-2013 work plan to its submission

- In their submission, Sport Waikato note, by way of reason of their request that Sport Waikato contributes to building a stronger Coromandel through:
- providing for physical activity, physical recreation and sport.
- delivering of Sport Waikato's programmes in the District.
- accessing resources and resource people to add value to the District
- contributing to the Council's mission of delivering affordable quality services by making opportunities available.
- empowering communities to better provide for community needs
- supporting volunteers and the contribution they make to the area
- provides collaborative and co-ordinates delivery.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintain funding for Sport Waikato, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council has agreed to provide funding to Sport Waikato on agreement of the outcomes to be achieved from the funding.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The Council has agreed to provide funding to Sport Waikato on agreement of the outcomes to be achieved from the funding.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

134. Overall Services - Pensioner Housing

Two submissions have been received in support of the Council's involvement in pensioner housing.

Submitter #66 requests that the Council retain the annual grant to the Thames Pensioner Housing Trust.

The reason provided is to keep pensioner housing affordable.

Submitter #189 requests the proposal to continue leasing land for the purposes of pensioner housing be retained.

The reasons provided include:

- *The Thames-Coromandel has the highest proportion of residents aged over 65 in the Waikato Region.*
- *Housing is an important determinant of health and wellbeing and many health conditions have been associated with substandard housing.*
- *The provision of pensioner housing will help to reduce deprivation levels.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council continues to support the provision of residential housing for older persons, as per the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The submitter raises relevant points

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.
2. signal in the Ten Year Plan a review of the social development activity in relation to pensioner housing.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The submitter raises relevant points. The Council however would like to review the effectiveness of this activity overall.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

135. Overall Services - Age Concern

Submitter #610 requests that the Council support Age Concern's intention to offer more services within the Thames-Coromandel District and its intention to establish a base in Thames.

The reasons provided include:

- *Thames-Coromandel has the highest proportion of people aged 65+ in the region*
- *Positive aging will happen when older people feel they live in a society that values them, acknowledges their contribution and encourages their participation.*
- *Thames is considered to be the best centre for the establishment of an Age Concern for a number of reasons (see submission for details)*

The submitter has included a copy of Age Concern's 3-5 year plan for a Thames branch together with an implementation plan. Please refer to the submission.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council supports Age Concern to offer more services within the District and its intention to establish a base in Thames.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes this submission and further considers Age Concern's intention to offer more services within the District when developing the role of the Community Development Officers.

Staff reason for recommendation

As Council has now adopted a Positive Ageing Strategy this is a natural progression for future support and planning.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes this submission
2. further considers Age Concern's intention to offer more services within the District when developing the role of the Community Development Officers.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

As Council has now adopted a Positive Ageing Strategy this is a natural progression for future support and planning.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

136. Overall Services - Age Concern

Submitter #610, Age Concern, requests that the Council appoint a social development officer in 2013/2014 to support the progression of the Positive Aging Strategy.

The reasons provided include:

- To assist not only for older residents but also the wellbeing of all residents of the Thames-Coromandel and Hauraki districts.
- This resource will be needed relatively soon given the increasing proportion of senior citizens in the district.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers appointing a social development officer in 2013/14 to support the progression of the Positive Aging Strategy.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes this submission and considers the progression of the Positive Aging Strategy when developing the role of the Community Development Officers.

Staff reason for recommendation

As Council has now adopted a Positive Ageing Strategy this is a natural progression for future support and planning.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes this submission
2. considers the progression of the Positive Aging Strategy when developing the role of the Community Development Officers.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

As Council has now adopted a Positive Ageing Strategy this is a natural progression for future support and planning.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

137. Overall Services - Advocacy Role

Submitter #610, Age Concern, requests that the Council provides for formal representation on the Hauraki Agewise Forum, including participating in meetings and reporting back to Council.

Submitter #472 requests that the Council make provision for lobbying Government to implement satellite healthcare facilities in Whitianga as they have in Canterbury. The reasons provided include:

- *To make the Coromandel more attractive to new residents, visitors and new investment.*
- *The availability of high quality emergency and overnight care in Whitianga is a significant impediment to living long term in the Whitianga area.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers providing for greater advocacy within the Social Development activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes this submission and considers representation on the Hauraki Agewise Forum when developing the role of the Community Development Officers.

Staff reason for recommendation

As Council has now adopted a Positive Ageing Strategy this is a natural progression for future support and planning.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes this submission
2. considers representation on the Hauraki Agewise Forum.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

As Council has now adopted a Positive Ageing Strategy this is a natural progression for future support and planning.

Discussion

- Councillor Hoadley is willing to be the Councils representative.
- Mayor sees the Community Development Officer role as a vibrant role out in the community.

Social Development Activity

138. Overall Services - Age Concern

Submitter #610, Age Concern, requests that the Council:

- *notes the submitter's appreciation for the occasions where it has donated the use of a community facility for events for senior citizens*
- *continues to donate the use of these facilities for such events.*

The reason provided is that these events increase opportunities for social interaction that support improved quality of life and wellbeing, and are often put together with very little funding.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers to support Age Concern through the provision of community facilities for events for senior citizens.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. *notes the submission*
2. *continues to support the use of community facilities where possible for Age Concern events.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The submitter raises relevant points and this could be yet another way that Council contributes to and supports community wellbeing and empowerment for minimal cost.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. *notes the submissions*
2. *continues to support the use of community facilities where possible for Age Concern events and other not for profit community organisations.*

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The submitter raises relevant points and this could be yet another way that Council contributes to and supports community wellbeing and empowerment for minimal cost.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

139. Overall Services - Positive Aging Strategy

Submitter #610, Age Concern, requests that that the Positive Aging Strategy and its actions are transparent in the Ten Year Plan.

The reasons provided include:

- *No reference was found to the Strategy in the Ten Year Plan.*
- *It is important that the strategy does not stagnate.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council makes more transparent in the Ten Year Plan the Positive Aging Strategy and its actions.

Staff recommendation

That the Council includes reference to the Positive Aging Strategy in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council committed to developing this strategy to identify its own role in contributing to the needs of older people in order to support positive ageing. Following the engagement of Community Development Officers, the Positive Ageing Strategy will be a guiding reference for how Council intends to incorporate the specific needs of a substantial sector of the communities within the district.

Council resolution

That the Council includes reference to the Positive Aging Strategy in the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

Council committed to developing this strategy to identify its own role in contributing to the needs of older people in order to support positive ageing. Following the engagement of Community Development Officers, the Positive Ageing Strategy will be a guiding reference for how Council intends to incorporate the specific needs of a substantial sector of the communities within the district.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

140. Overall Services - Youth

Seven submissions have been received regarding the Council's services to youth within the District.

Working with Youth

Submitters 649, 696 and 697 request that the **Council work in collaboration with Thames/Coromandel youth to include a youth voice in decision making.**

- The reasons provided include: Youth involvement in the development of community spaces ensures they include consideration of youth friendly environment.
- To increase buy in from young people.

Submitter #696 requests that the Council (community board) **appreciate the importance of the view of young people and do not disregard their needs.** The Council and Community Board should develop a way of working with young people and those who support them. The reasons outlined include:

- Leading by example can change community culture.
- Young people will feel valued and more engaged in campaigning to local government.
- The submitter considers that the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board has disregarded on-going requests for a skate park/youth zone, resulting in survey results showing 54.3% of youth in this area believe their community is not youth friendly.
- If young people's view continue to be undermined, developing processes to work with youth will be futile.

Youth Policy

Six of the submitters request that the Council adopt a Youth Policy, (#232, 404, 649, 696, 697 and 416), and have included a draft youth policy with their submissions for consideration by the Council.

The submitters request that the Ten Year Plan includes a commitment to work alongside the Thames/Hauraki Youth Collective, Peninsula wide youth forums/advisory groups and their supporters to agree and adopt a youth strategy to guide future youth development initiatives in the region and allocation of resources to make it happen. The submitter notes that this should be identified as a priority in the proposed Social Wellbeing Strategy.

The reasons outlined include:

- To ensure a consistent strength based positive youth development approach for the Council to address youth priorities and concerns.
- A collaborative approach to meeting youth needs is required by central government through the Council, private sector and the community.
- The Council is responsible for implementing, monitoring and evaluating the Youth Policy.
- To show that the Council is proactive, provides leadership, is results-oriented and communicates with all sectors of the community.
- To provide youth with greater opportunities to participate in decision-making processes.
- To provide the council with an opportunity to support positive youth development.
- To acknowledge and value youth.
- The Thames Youth Forum have campaigned for a Youth Policy for many years.
- 70.8% of 208 Thames youth surveyed are in favour of a Youth Policy.
- 82.9% of 35 Tairua/Pauanui/Hikuai youth surveyed are in favour of a Youth Policy.
- A Youth Policy will support the societal, economic and health issues youth are vulnerable to.

Working in Partnership with Local Agencies

In addition to the request for a Youth Policy, the following more specific requests have been made.

- Submitters #404 and #416 request that the Council continues to support (in partnership) the work of local agencies who work directly with young people, and particularly that the Council to continue to offer a funding route through NZ government to providers can access funds to support youth activities/provision (e.g. CLT).

- Submitters #649, 696 and 697 request that all Thames-Coromandel communities, particularly the Thames Youth Forum be included in the support for youth through Coromandel Independent Living Trust's partnership agreement with TCDC and Ministry of Youth Development. The reasons outlined include:
 - Coromandel, Whitianga and Whangamata receive or are earmarked to receive support but Thames is not included.
 - The Thames Youth Forum has been running for the longest period, has supported many youth initiatives, has continuously campaigned for and assisted young people and has championed networks of which CILT is a part.
 - Support for only half of the communities does not create a sustainable foundation for meaningful youth involvement.
- Submitters #404 request that the Council provides on-going support to the Thames/Coromandel /Hauraki Youth Collective to act as youth representatives and leaders for their District.
- Submitters #649 requests that the Council note the submitter's acknowledgement of contributions to Fig Jam programmes for youth at risk, to Sport Waikato and the Thames Youth Centre.

Youth Projects & Services

- Submitter #404 requests that the Council supports the proposed campaign by young people to develop a youth building/space where they can socialize and engage with youth providers.
 - This has been identified as a major priority by Mercury Bay young people and the will be led by the Mercury Bay Youth Forum.
 - It is difficult to find space for young people to meet outside school due to have community use of public buildings.
- Submitter #649 requests that more youth oriented services are provided, including improved information technology, improved transport services, out of school opportunities to learn, that support youth to support their community.
- Submitter #649 also requests that more be provided by the Thames Youth Centre for youth aged 14+ or, if this is not possible, a separate venue be provided for youth. Reasons for this included:
 - There is ample provision for children 0-11 (parks and playgrounds) but not for youth 12-24.
 - Support allocated to youth is going to children.
 - Youth are not receptive to the centre as it is perceived as a place for children.

NB: in addition to the below, a number of youth wrote in support for other recreation type projects proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, including the Thames Swimming Pool, Thames skate park and Mercury Bay sports centre. Refer to Swimming Pools and Parks and Reserves Activity for details.

Funding for a Youth

- The Thames Community Board (#520) requests that the Council provide \$50,000 District funding for a Youth programme as highlighted in the recent "Coromandel Youth Survey, 2011"
- Submitters #404 and #416 request that the Council prioritise youth activity funding bids which come through Creative Communities. The reason provided is that [Youth] don't have as much money as adults and more would join if some activities were subsidised.

NB: Both Councillor Diane Connors and Board Member Gloria Giles were specifically thanked for their support by submitters.

Council Decision Required

Consideration by the Council for the extent of services and support it specifically offers to youth.

Staff recommendation

That the Council consider providing funding to enable some financial support for the investigation, development and implementation of programmes at both a district and local level.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council has been the recipient of grants from the Ministry of Youth Development in both the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 financial years to encourage youth participation in Council processes and decision making. Council is currently awaiting the outcome of a third and final funding application to support the on-going youth development within the district. This funding has enabled Council to develop a relationship with its youth and their support networks. Council needs to decide if it is committed to building on the foundations already developed, to work with youth to make some meaningful changes that will ensure we are growing capable responsible decision makers for the future of this district.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. instruct staff to partner the development of a youth strategy for consideration by Council in the 2012/2013 year.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Council has been the recipient of grants from the Ministry of Youth Development in both the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 financial years to encourage youth participation in Council processes and decision making. Council is currently awaiting the outcome of a third and final funding application to support the on-going youth development within the district. This funding has enabled Council to develop a relationship with its youth and their support networks. Council would like to commit to building on the foundations already developed, to work with youth to make some meaningful changes that will ensure we are growing capable responsible decision makers for the future of this district.

Discussion

- The \$50,000 requested by the Thames Community Board is not in the Ten Year Plan budget.
- TCDC has provided staff time and use of facilities in the past.
- Council needs to be satisfied that there is traction for any funding given.
- Look at it along with the whole social services funding review.
- Any youth strategy needs to include employment pathways.
- Developing a youth strategy is difficult at Council level.

Social Development Activity

141. Overall - Grants

Submitter #154 requests that the Council change the rules for the Treasure Chest grants programme so that:

- *one organisation may apply for funding for multiple projects at one time*
- *the funding is made available in July instead of September as at present, and may be carried over into the following financial year at the discretion of the community board.*

The reasons for the request are:

- *The Tairua Information Centre has plans to develop several new local events*
- *The current timing means that there is only 9 months for the programme to be completed, and is very close to the autumn shoulder and summer event window.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the rules for the Treasure Chest grants programme.

Staff recommendation

That the Council considers this submission when reviewing the Community Grants Policy.

Staff reason for recommendation

As the community grant process requires budgets to be confirmed, advertising for applications, assessment of applications and Community Board approval it is not possible to change timeframes to allow for distribution of grants money any earlier in the financial year.

It is agreed that funding should be project based and this can be addressed when reviewing the Community Grants Policy.

It is also requested that the correct terminology be used for these funds, being 'Community Grants' and the words 'Treasure Chest' not be used.

Council resolution

That the Council considers this submission when reviewing the Community Grants Policy in the 2012/2013 year.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

As the community grant process requires budgets to be confirmed, advertising for applications, assessment of applications and Community Board approval it is not possible to change timeframes to allow for distribution of grants money any earlier in the financial year.

It is agreed that funding should be project based and this can be addressed when reviewing the Community Grants Policy.

It is also requested that the correct terminology be used for these funds, being 'Community Grants' and the words 'Treasure Chest' not be used.

Discussion

- *Brits and the Beach and Flower Festival was brought up in a verbal submission.*

Council resolution

That the Council rename the 'Treasure Chest' to 'Community Grants'.

Moved - French

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

That the correct terminology be used for these funds, being 'Community Grants' and the words 'Treasure Chest' not be used.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

142. Overall - Funding

Submitter #217 requests that the Council question the excessive administrative costs associated with the allocation of grants.

The reason provided is that administration costs were as much as 50% of the Community Chest funds distributed by the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board in 2010 and 2011.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers the administrative costs associated with the social development activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council considers this submission when next reviewing its financial policy.

Staff reason for recommendation

The costs of this activity include a considerable amount of time on administering and accounting for grants.

Council resolution

That the Council considers this submission when next reviewing its financial policy.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

The costs of this activity include a considerable amount of time on administering and accounting for grants.

Discussion

None

Landuse Management Activity

143. Services - Overall

Submitter #31 requests that the Council increase district plan monitoring and enforcement. The reason outlined is that there are too many examples of non-compliance and this then undermining the communities' district plan aspirations.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the services of the land use management activity, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council maintains the current level of service in regards to District Plan monitoring and enforcement.

Staff reason for recommendation

While supporting the views of the submitter there is a tension in all New Zealand regulatory services between funding and levels of service. Council is working at providing strong outcomes within limited funding.

Council resolution

That the Council maintains the current level of service in regards to District Plan monitoring and enforcement.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

While supporting the views of the submitter there is a tension in all New Zealand regulatory services between funding and levels of service. Council is working at providing strong outcomes within limited funding.

Discussion

- Council is always open to criticism that not doing enough.

Landuse Management Activity

144. Services - Overall

The Thames Valley Motorcycle Club (#138) requests the following:

- *That the Council notes the submitter's view that the indirect support of sports clubs, such as the submitter's motorcycle club, over issues such as RMA expenses is vital.*
- *The members, sponsors and financial supporters of sport clubs have a reasonable expectation that their funds will be applied to the promotion of the sport.*
- *That RMA fee requirements do not destroy effective use of our finite land resources. If the criteria for land use becomes the greater return to the richest applicant rather than best use/s, the rationale of the RMA is effectively undermined.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the services of the land use management activity, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

1. *That the Council continue to meet statutory requirements of the Resource Management Act and assess resource consent applications in accordance with the District Plan provisions.*
2. *That overhead allocations are revisited in 2012/2013 to ensure they are an accurate reflection of support services provided to resource consenting.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The District Plan provides for Council and communities to manage the environmental effects of activities and the District Plan is written in accordance with the provisions of the Resource Management Act. The District Plan is currently under review and there will be opportunity for community groups (ie. sport club groups) to make submissions on activities that could be considered as permitted activities within the Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. continue to meet statutory requirements of the Resource Management Act
2. assess resource consent applications in accordance with the District Plan provisions.
3. revisit overhead allocations in 2012/2013 to ensure they are an accurate reflection of support services provided to resource consenting.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The District Plan provides for Council and communities to manage the environmental effects of activities and the District Plan is written in accordance with the provisions of the Resource Management Act. The District Plan is currently under review and there will be opportunity for community groups (ie. sport club groups) to make submissions on activities that could be considered as permitted activities within the Plan.

Discussion

None

Landuse Management Activity

145. Fees and Charges - Consents

Four submissions were received concerning consent charges.

Submitter #288 requests that developers pay the costs of all consent charges incurred by the Council including a fee to cover monitoring and enforcement costs.

The submitter notes that there could additionally be a bond, refundable after development is fully complete.

The reasons outlined include:

- *To ensure that the Council has no financial apprehension in evaluating and later enforcing development activity.*
- *To cover the cost to the Council of non-compliance enforcement action*
- *To discourage non-compliance.*

Submitters #63 and #663 request that the Council note the submitters opposition to the monitoring charges attached to land use consents.

Of note, Submitter #512 observes that it is interesting that Tauranga is dropping all fees to encourage economic growth.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the consent fees and charges as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That that Council notes the submissions but makes no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation for #288

The fixed initial deposit fee listed in the schedule of fees and charges for resource consents set out in the LTCCP generally covers the cost of processing an application. In the event that the cost of processing the application exceeds the fixed deposit fee then Council can recover the actual costs from the applicant in accordance with provisions within the Resource Management Act (the Act). There is also fixed initial deposit charge that is payable by the applicant for the monitoring of the consent and this charge can be increased depending on the complexity of the conditions that are required to be monitored. The inclusion of an upfront bond payment to cover enforcement would potentially stifle development and this is not considered necessary as there is already provision under the Act to cover costs as mentioned.

Staff reason for recommendation for #63, #512 and #663

The RMA allows Councils to recover actual and reasonable costs associated with a resource consent which includes monitoring charges. Council has a statutory obligation to monitor conditions to ensure that developments comply with the conditions of consent and consent holders are expected to pay the full cost of monitoring their activities otherwise this cost would be paid by the ratepayer. Similarly, if these fees and charges were reduced then a larger share of the cost associated with processing consents would be paid by the general ratepayers. There are some areas of service where Council is unable to recover costs or provides some community good, such as the free duty planner service and processing objections to conditions of consent and defending appeals.

Council resolution

That that Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no changes to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox**Seconded** - McLean**Reason for resolution for #288**

The fixed initial deposit fee listed in the schedule of fees and charges for resource consents set out in the LTCCP generally covers the cost of processing an application. In the event that the cost of processing the application exceeds the fixed deposit fee then Council can recover the actual costs from the applicant in accordance with provisions within the Resource Management Act (the Act). There is also fixed initial deposit charge that is payable by the applicant for the monitoring of the consent and this charge can be increased depending on the complexity of the conditions that are required to be monitored. The inclusion of an upfront bond payment to cover enforcement would potentially stifle development and this is not considered necessary as there is already provision under the Act to cover costs as mentioned.

Reason for resolution for #63, #512 and #663

The RMA allows Councils to recover actual and reasonable costs associated with a resource consent which includes monitoring charges. Council has a statutory obligation to monitor conditions to ensure that developments comply with the conditions of consent and consent holders are expected to pay the full cost of monitoring their activities otherwise this cost would be paid by the ratepayer. Similarly, if these fees and charges were reduced then a larger share of the cost associated with processing consents would be paid by the general ratepayers. There are some areas of service where Council is unable to recover costs or provides some community good, such as the free duty planner service and processing objections to conditions of consent and defending appeals.

Discussion

None

Landuse Management Activity

146. Fees and Charges - Encumbrance Monitoring Fee

A staff submission was received requesting an adjustment to the Encumbrance Monitoring Fee.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the encumbrance monitoring fee to reflect the outcome of the Council's consideration of this matter at their meeting of 18 April 2012.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amend the encumbrance monitoring fee to reflect the outcome of the Council's consideration of this matter at their meeting of 18 April 2012 as follows:

That the \$85.00 encumbrance monitoring fee be discontinued from 1 July 2012.

That the monitoring and compliance programme for encumbrances over accessory buildings be approved to consist of:

- i) A self-signed declaration to be required biennially*
- ii) Up to 20 properties to receive a monitoring visit each financial year.*

Staff reason for recommendation

A report on the monitoring of encumbrances was included on the Council agenda for 18 April 2012. This will give staff the opportunity to reflect any decision regarding the charging of the \$85.00 encumbrance monitoring fee in the Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council amend the encumbrance monitoring fee to reflect the outcome of the Council's consideration of this matter at their meeting of 18 April 2012 as follows:

That the \$85.00 encumbrance monitoring fee be discontinued from 1 July 2012.

That the monitoring and compliance programme for encumbrances over accessory buildings be approved to consist of:

- i) A self-signed declaration to be required biennially
- ii) Up to 20 properties to receive a monitoring visit each financial year.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Councillor Connors declared a conflict of interest and did not vote.

Reason for resolution

A report on the monitoring of encumbrances was included on the Council agenda for 18 April 2012. This will give staff the opportunity to reflect the decision regarding the charging of the \$85.00 encumbrance monitoring fee in the Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- Reflects Council resolution from April meeting.

Landuse Management Activity

147. Fees and Charges - Resource Consent Fees

A staff submission was received requesting an amendment to the Resource Consent Fees for the Fixed Initial Deposit charge.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the Resource Consent fees for the Fixed Initial Deposit charge in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the Resource Consent fees for the Fixed Initial Deposit charge reduced from \$960.00 to \$805.00.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Chairperson and Members recharge has been removed as the Local Government Elected Members (2011/2012) (Certain Local Authorities) Determination (No 2) 2011 only makes provision for the hearing time and mileage claims for resource consent hearings.

Council resolution

That the Council amends the Resource Consent fees for the Fixed Initial Deposit charge reduced from \$960.00 to \$805.00.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The Chairperson and Members recharge has been removed as the Local Government Elected Members (2011/2012) (Certain Local Authorities) Determination (No 2) 2011 only makes provision for the hearing time and mileage claims for resource consent hearings.

Discussion

- Result of staff error.

Landuse Management Activity

148. Fees and Charges - Resource Consent Fees

A staff submission was received requesting an amendment to the Resource Consent Fees wording.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the wording of the "Judicial Committee Review of Development Contributions" to "Development Contributions Review Hearings" in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the wording of the "Judicial Committee Review of the Development Contributions" to "Development Contributions Review Hearings" in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

To enables a hearing fee to be charged if the development contributions review hearing is undertaken by another committee of Council or full Council.

Council resolution

That the Council amends the wording of the "Judicial Committee Review of the Development Contributions" to "Development Contributions Review Hearings" in the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

To enables a hearing fee to be charged if the development contributions review hearing is undertaken by another committee of Council or full Council.

Discussion

- To not limit the taking of fees from the applicant.

Landuse Management Activity

149. Fees and Charges - Resource Consent Fees

A staff submission was received requesting an amendment to the costs for Judicial Committee.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers an adjustment to the costs for Judicial Committee.

Staff recommendation

That the Council remove the costs for judicial committee on page 193 of volume 2 of the draft Ten Year Plan and replace with "Costs for development Contributions Review Hearings - Council/Committee fees: set fee per hour \$517.00".

Staff reason for recommendation

The costs proposed for Development Contributions Review Hearings are not materially different, they have instead been combined into a single hourly fee of \$517.00 as opposed to having a separate hearing fee, admin fee & staff time (preparation) fee to make it easier for customers to know the actual costs. The charges for the Chairperson, Members and mileage have been removed as we are not permitted to charge these for this type of Hearing.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. amends the costs for judicial committee as per the table below.

Judicial Committee Reviews - Development Contributions

	Units	2011/2012	2012/2013
Costs for Judicial Committee	Set fee per: Per hour	\$306.67 plus below:	\$304.00 plus below:
Additional charges (e.g. disbursements, legal costs) as per Hearing costs above			
Administration	Per hour	\$70.00	\$72.00
Staff time	Per hour	\$140.00	\$144.00

2. review the fees and charges for this activity.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The costs proposed for Development Contributions Review Hearings are not materially different, they have instead been combined into a single hourly fee of \$517.00 as opposed to having a separate hearing fee, admin fee & staff time (preparation) fee to make it easier for customers to know the actual costs. The charges for the Chairperson, Members and mileage have been removed as we are not permitted to charge these for this type of Hearing.

Discussion

- It was suggested that feels the fees are too high.
- Should fees for resource consents and building consents be revisited?

Libraries Activity

150. Services - Overall

Two submissions received refer to the **overall (District) library services**, as follows:

Submitter #341 requests that the Council continues to provide public libraries. No reason was provided.

Submitter #147 requests that the Council:

- continue to invest in the District wide library service
- increase district wide finding
- continue improvements to LIANZA minimum standards and other information technology developments

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) submit that the Council **continue to support the community library model for Pauanui** and continue sharing its library management system as it currently does with Whangamata and Pauanui.

Council Decision Required

Whether to reconsider the extent of and funding of its library services, or adopts as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

1. That the Council continues to support the Community Library Model for Pauanui and that Pauanui continue to share the Council library management system.
2. That the Community Boards consider library services further under the Community Empowerment model.

Staff reason for recommendation

The community library model at Pauanui has offered an affordable library service for Council and is well used by those who subscribe to it. Customers also have access to the wider facilities of the Council library service so the two models complement each other.

A shared library management system is seen as more effective for a small community library both in terms of expertise and finance. The shared catalogue ensures the customers of both the community and Council libraries may share resources across the District, and wider.

The Community Board is now the key decision maker of local services including Libraries.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. continues to support Library services across the District
2. consider the library services further under the Community Empowerment Model.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The community library model at Pauanui has offered an affordable library service for Council and is well used by those who subscribe to it. Customers also have access to the wider facilities of the Council library service so the two models complement each other.

A shared library management system is seen as more effective for a small community library both in terms of expertise and finance. The shared catalogue ensures the customers of both the community and Council libraries may share resources across the District, and wider.

The Community Board is now the key decision maker of local services including Libraries.

Discussion

- Will not conflict with other decisions and there will be the ability to inter loan nationally.
- Whangamata Community Board resolved to work with the Area Manager who will work with the central library staff.

Land Information Memorandum

151. Services

One submitter (#512) requests that the Council verify that staff have accurate information for LIMs in regard to water and wastewater in rural areas.

The reasons for this request are:

- This service needs to have accurate information.*
- The submitter provides an example of LIMs containing a number of pages of useless or inappropriate information*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council verify that staff have accurate information for LIMs in regard to water and wastewater in rural areas.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and notes that staff will refine the information around water and wastewater in rural areas to ensure relevance.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff reviewed the information included from the Water and Wastewater Assessment Report and will ensure that urban data is not included for rural properties in the future.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. notes that staff will refine the information around water and wastewater in rural areas to ensure relevance.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Staff reviewed the information included from the Water and Wastewater Assessment Report and will ensure that urban data is not included for rural properties in the future.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

152. Services - Overall

Submitter #189 requests that the section on 'Contributing to our District' be amended to read:

"The Parks and Reserves activity contributes to a Prosperous District, a Liveable District and a Clean and Green District by supporting a range of recreation, lifestyle and economic opportunities, enabling the enjoyment of our unique natural environment and promoting good health and wellbeing while balancing environmental protection [insertions underlined]"

The reason for the request is to recognise the significant opportunities for physical activity and recreation which has a positive impact on health and wellbeing.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers amending the 'Contributing to our District' text for the Parks and Reserves Activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan other than the insertion of the wording as suggested.

Staff reason for recommendation

The suggested added wording helps to clarify the function of parks and reserves.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan other than the insertion of the wording as suggested.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The suggested added wording helps to clarify the function of parks and reserves.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

153. Services Overall - Accessibility of Services

Submission #256 from the CCS Disability Action concerns the accessibility of many of Council services. With regards to the Parks and Reserves activity, the submitter outlined the following requests.

Request

- That the Council ensures that playgrounds are accessible to disabled children and parents of unimpaired children.
- That the Council ensure that reserves and picnic areas are accessible to people using mobility aids.

Reason for the request

- To enable people with disabilities to actively participate in, and contribute to their communities.
- Communities therefore must be designed to provide facilities and services in such a way that no individual is excluded or prevented from participating by design or service delivery.
- To ensure that scenic and tourist attractions within the region are accessible to everyone.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider its levels of service for the Parks and Reserves activity to have greater consideration for accessibility, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

1. That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.
2. Council explore the "No Barriers" partnership to ensure facilities design caters better for people with physical disabilities.

Staff reason for recommendation

All new playgrounds and picnic areas are provided with barrier-free access where practical to do so.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.
3. explores the "No Barriers" partnership to ensure facilities design caters better for people with physical disabilities.
4. instruct staff to prepare a disability strategy for consideration by the Council in the 2012/2013 year.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

All new playgrounds and picnic areas are provided with barrier-free access where practical to do so. The Council would like to consider its overall approach to persons with a disability and prepare a disability strategy as a priority.

Discussion

- It was suggested that this be picked up through a disability strategy (not a policy) and that some funding be allocated to allow this to occur, along the lines of how the positive ageing strategy was handled and that it be in place within a year.
- Chief Executive noted that two policies under the social wellbeing strategy could be completed eg Disability and Youth in the 2012/2013 year.

Parks and Reserves Activity

154. Services Overall - Community Gardens & Food Bearing Trees

Submitters #202 and #644 requests that a:

- *comprehensive policy together with funding and land provision be established and implemented for community gardens throughout the District, and*
- *programme of planting food bearing trees on Council reserves be implemented*

Reason for the request

- *The Ten Year Plan contains flaws in that it fails to acknowledge and provide for the imminent liquid fuel price and supply crisis and its impacts.*
- *The result is strategic errors in the Plan for example, there is no financial provision for the building of self-sufficient and resilient localised communities such as providing for community gardens and encouraging the community to grow their own food.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider its levels of service for the Parks and Reserves activity to accommodate community gardens and/or fruit tree planting, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Leases may be considered for community groups should they wish to establish community gardens, where there is compliance with the Reserve Management Plans. To date there has been very little demand. Fruit trees are generally not considered for Council reserves because of the higher maintenance required for them over other more robust species. However, Council is open to community partnerships to overcome barriers.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
3. notes that this matter can dealt with at community board level through reserve management plans.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

Leases may be considered for community groups should they wish to establish community gardens, where there is compliance with the Reserve Management Plans. To date there has been very little demand. Fruit trees are generally not considered for Council reserves because of the higher maintenance required for them over other more robust species. However, Council is open to community partnerships to overcome barriers. This matter can dealt with further at community board level through reserve management plans.

Discussion

- Part of Community Empowerment.

Parks and Reserves Activity

155. Services Overall - Motorcycling Support

The Thames Valley motorcycle club (#138) requests that:

- *support for motorcycling be provided, in particular, the provision of suitable tracks for practice, introduction to the sport and general recreation.*

Reason for the request

- *Motorcycling brings benefits to the region including an outlet for youthful energy, visitor spend.*
- *Motorcycling can be enjoyed by a wide segment of the population.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider its levels of service for the Parks and Reserves activity to accommodate support for motorcycling, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council currently has a lease with the Thames Valley Motorcycle Club and through this provides a sizeable area for off-road motorcycling. Council would consider future partnerships, but other groups would need to take the lead.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Council currently has a lease with the Thames Valley Motorcycle Club and through this provides a sizeable area for off-road motorcycling. Council would consider future partnerships, but other groups would need to take the lead.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

156. Fees and Charges - Street Flags

A staff submission was received regarding the fees and charges for street flags.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council includes booking fees for the Street Flags in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council includes booking fees for Street Flags as follows:

- 1) commercial booking fee of \$100*
- 2) not for profit booking fee of \$50.*

Staff reason for recommendation

These fees were not included in error and are a slight reduction in fees from the 2011/2012 Annual Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council includes booking fees for Street Flags as follows:

1. commercial booking fee of \$100
2. not for profit booking fee of \$50.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

These fees were not included in error and are a slight reduction in fees from the 2011/2012 Annual Plan.

Discussion

None

Public Conveniences Activity

157. Services

Four submitters made comments against closure (seasonal or otherwise) of public conveniences, as follows:

- *That the Council does not proceed with closing any public conveniences in Whitianga (#636)*
- *That the proposed closure of toilet blocks (even if temporary) in Coromandel (specifically Wharf Road and Long Bay) be withdrawn (#238)*
- *That the Council does not close the Heards Bay, Te Kouma public toilet for parts of the year (#241)*
- *That the Council does not proceed with closing public conveniences for parts of the year to save costs (#284).*

The reasons provided by submitters were similar and include:

- *The public toilets are essential for a range of users*
- *For the Heards Bay toilet, specific comments included:*
 - *The toilet closure will not result in significant cost savings as it likely that the local foreshore will be used instead with detrimental effects on the environment and public health.*
 - *The Bay is used all year round*
 - *Access to the alternative toilet is limited*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will continue to consider closing some public conveniences for part of the year to save on costs.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The proposed community empowerment model would make any closures (seasonal or otherwise) a Community Board decision. The question of closures (temporary and permanent) has been discussed with Community Boards and the submissions should be referred to Community Boards. Other opportunities for efficiency gains such as public / private partnerships are also being investigated, where relevant.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The proposed community empowerment model would make any closures (seasonal or otherwise) a Community Board decision. The question of closures (temporary and permanent) has been discussed with Community Boards and the submissions should be referred to Community Boards. Other opportunities for efficiency gains such as public / private partnerships are also being investigated, where relevant.

Discussion

- Community Empowerment issue.

Public Conveniences Activity

158. Services - Increase

Submitter #292 requested an increase to levels of service regarding dump stations as follows:

- That the Council set aside funds to install new public dump stations in all main town centres built to NZS 5465:2001
- That the Council set aside funds to maintain existing public dump stations to NZS 5465:2001

The reasons outlined for the request are:

- Dump station facilities ensure the safe disposal of wastewater from the holding tanks of motorhomes, campervans and boats. Forced waste dumping on land or in waterways creates environmental and public health-related issues.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider an increased level of service for the Public Conveniences activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

There are already dump stations owned and operated by Council in Thames, Whangamata, Tairua, Whitianga, and Coromandel Town, all complying to NZS 5465:2001.

Council resolution

Refer to decision number 68, which reads that the Council allocate funding for a freedom camping joint-venture (50/50 funding share) and infrastructure development with NZMCA of \$25,000 in 2012/2013 and \$20,000 in 2013/2014 and \$20,000 in 2014/2015 funded from the economic development activity.

Note: \$20,000 funded from current economic development projects budget. \$5,000 investigation from wastewater to economic development. \$20,000 out of wastewater in year two.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

- To progress Economic Development opportunities to drive employment, tourism and support local businesses.
- The Council has opportunities to increase visitor numbers and drive higher yields from tourism by encouraging responsible freedom camping in self-contained vehicles and to effectively market the Coromandel -its events and attractions. The Coromandel is not well equipped with dump-stations or service facilities for campervans.
- The implication of an additional \$20,000 in 2012/13 & 2013/14 and an additional \$20,000 in 2014/15 are approximately \$0.57 per rating unit in years 1 & 2 and \$0.76 per rating unit in year 3.

Discussion

- Picked up through economic development activity decisions.
- There is a dump station in Pauanui.

Public Conveniences Activity

159. General Comments to Activity

Submitter #189 requests that the text under 'Significant Negative Effects' be amended to read: "We ensure than public conveniences are located, designed and constructed and maintained in a manner that has regard for public health and safety. No reason was provided for this request.

Submitter #284 requested that the Council retains the proposal of gradually refurbishing public conveniences and replacement with public conveniences that require lower on-going maintenance costs.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council amends the text under "Significant Negative Effects" to include the words "and maintained".

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan with the exception of the wording change to the text as suggested by Submitter #189.

Staff reason for recommendation

Maintenance, including the on-going refurbishment of toilets, is included in the Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan with the exception of the wording change to the text as suggested by Submitter #189.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Maintenance, including the on-going refurbishment of toilets, is included in the Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Swimming Pools

160. Services - Overall

Submitter #189 requests that the section on 'Contributing to our District' be amended to read:

"The Swimming Pools activity contributes to a Liveable District by supporting a range of recreation, lifestyle and economic opportunities and promoting good health and wellbeing. [insertions underlined]".

The reason for the request is to recognise the significant opportunities for physical activity and recreation which has a positive impact on health and wellbeing.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers amending the 'Contributing to our District' text for the Swimming Pools Activity.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan other than the insertion of the wording as suggested.

Staff reason for recommendation

The suggested added wording helps to clarify the function of the swimming pools activity.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan other than the insertion of the wording as suggested.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

The suggested added wording helps to clarify the function of the swimming pools activity.

Discussion

None

Ten Year Plan Process Overall

161. Comments to the Consultation Process

Several submissions were received which made comments to the Ten Year Plan consultation process and documents as follows:

Submitter #96 noted that the Council doesn't need to implement all the PR associated with the Ten Year Plan document and outlined reasons as follows:

- The submitter considers they need to be informed briefly without frills
- The submitter suggests using cost-free newspaper articles
- The submitter considers that the best PR is when the Council is approachable and responds to enquiries in a helpful way.

Other comments include:

- That the Council note the printed submission form is too easy to misread and this is not helped by tricky printing, and that the submitter queries why so much is spent on a glossy summary (#619)
- That the Council note the submitter's opinion that the questions in the submission form are inane and inappropriate (#581)
- Submitters making comments on difficulty/inability to use the Council's website to make a submission (#339 and #119)
- That the Council note a black and white print on spinal binding is all that is necessary for the ten year plan presentation (#197). The reasons outlined include:
 - The colour and art in the ten year plan presentation is costly and unnecessary.
 - The blue background on so many pages makes it very difficult to read and increases the cost of consumable for ink and toner for any printing.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its approach to consultation based on the feedback received.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions received and takes these into account during the Ten Year Plan debrief so that lessons can be learned for next time.

Staff reason for recommendation

No changes are required to the Ten Year Plan based on the feedback received.

A debrief of the effectiveness of the overall consultation process will be undertaken as part of the Ten Year Plan and will take into account any feedback received, including this feedback received.

With respect to costs, efforts were made to keep costs to a minimum for printing and distribution of the draft Ten Year Plan, including not distributing the full summary to every ratepayer, but instead sending a smaller flyer out with the rates notice.

Council resolution

That the Council notes the submissions received and takes these into account during the Ten Year Plan debrief.

Moved - French

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

No changes are required to the Ten Year Plan based on the feedback received.

A debrief of the effectiveness of the overall consultation process will be undertaken as part of the Ten Year Plan and will take into account any feedback received, including this feedback received.

With respect to costs, efforts were made to keep costs to a minimum for printing and distribution of the draft Ten Year Plan, including not distributing the full summary to every ratepayer, but instead sending a smaller flyer out with the rates notice.

Discussion

None

Ten Year Plan Process Overall

162. Comments to the Nature of and/or Requirement for a Ten Year Plan

Submitter #581, the Whangamata Community Board requests that the Council review the nature of the Ten Year Plan and the process of establishing it.

The reasons outlined include:

- *The submitter considers the process has been tortuous and inefficient, and has not done justice to the many capable and dedicated personnel who have had to steer a 'disjointed' course*
- *After endless meetings, locally important matters have not been included in the Ten Year Plan, for no apparent good reason*

Submitter #54 requests that the Council provide linkages from the Ten Year Plan document to worksheets that provide detail on what is proposed for each individual activity. The submitter read the full document but considered that the information was so aggregated that it didn't provide sufficient detail.

And finally, submitter #78 notes dissatisfaction with the content and nature of the Ten Year Plan. Further, they submit that:

- *It is called a ten year plan when it is amended every three years*
- *The three volumes are tedious and repetitive*
- *Rates and staff numbers could be halved through not spending on this and other mandatory reports.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reviews its Ten Year Plan process.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions received and takes these into account during the Ten Year Plan debrief.

Staff reason for recommendation

Debriefing is a valuable part of any project and should be used to refine processes and make improvements. Feedback from elected members and staff will be sought when preparing for the next Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council notes the submissions received and takes these into account during the Ten Year Plan debrief.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Debriefing is a valuable part of any project and should be used to refine processes and make improvements. Feedback from elected members and staff will be sought when preparing for the next Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- *Community empowerment will affect the structure of the document.*

Outside the Scope of the Ten Year Plan

163. Staffing

Several submitters make reference to staff and staff employment conditions as follows:

Submission point	Reason for request	Submitter #
<i>That the Council vets staff from making policy and those that have done so should be removed</i>	<i>Staff driven planning is totally undemocratic and undermines the elected councillors.</i>	90
<i>That the Council take control of the Council and remove staff who have their own agendas.</i>	<i>The submitter provides examples. Refer to submission.</i>	90
<i>That the Council reduce annual leave for staff back to four weeks.</i>	<i>This is what the average worker gets paid and four weeks annual leave is plenty.</i>	105
<i>That the Council decrease the absurdly high pay packets for the Council's top five or so employees.</i>	<i>A small enterprise such as TCDC does not need to pay its senior employees so much. It would still attract very capable personnel with lower remuneration bands.</i>	84
<i>That the Council reinstate and expand the number of strategic planning staff.</i>	<i>Clear headed, informed strategic planning is needed.</i>	202

Council Decision Required

OUTSIDE SCOPE – no decision sought

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council initiated an organisation review and restructure to address the alignment of the organization with its own direction and priorities. This process is being implemented at the time of writing.

Matters of senior staff remuneration and significant policies (such as leave) are included in the Governments present local government review to be announced soon.

Strategic planning has been broadened to include a wider team including the Chief Executive, Director of Strategic Relationships and Projects, Communications and Economic Development Manager and Community Development Officers. The function has been broadened, not scaled back.

Council resolution

That the Council notes the submissions.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Council initiated an organisation review and restructure to address the alignment of the organization with its own direction and priorities. This process is being implemented at the time of writing.

Matters of senior staff remuneration and significant policies (such as leave) are included in the Governments present local government review to be announced soon.

Strategic planning has been broadened to include a wider team including the Chief Executive, Director of Strategic Relationships and Projects, Communications and Economic Development Manager and Community Development Officers. The function has been broadened, not scaled back.

Discussion

None

Outside the Scope of the Ten Year Plan

164. Freedom Camping

Two submitters (#54 and #292) request that the Council set aside funds to make more areas available for freedom campers, especially self-contained campervans.

One submitter supports reasonable solutions to encourage responsible freedom camping e.g. in areas with no facilities restricting the activity to those in certified self-contained vehicles only.

A reason provided includes that the substantive ban in the District fails to accommodate the large motor caravan market, and this will discourage many responsible tourists from visiting the region.

Submitter #19 requests that the Council convert the land opposite 199 SH25, Kuaotunu into a public reserve for campervans.

The reasons provided include:

- *To better separate uses of reserve use on the existing Kuaotunu reserve (past #26 Blackjack Road),*
- *Give the tourist somewhere they are safe and in a prime spot for their holidays*
- *Give the local ratepayers and their families somewhere safe from big vehicle traffic and unfettered to enjoy one of the main reasons we live here, to enjoy ourselves in our backyard*
- *Give the dotterels a little more protection*
- *Not encourage non self-contained campervans to freedom camp overnight*
- *Keeping the recreational reserve for what it is intended as, recreation for all, access to beach, views, the boat, beach ramp, walking tracks and community activities.*

Council Decision Required

OUTSIDE SCOPE – no decision sought

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions and respond to the submitters to explain that the areas designated for freedom camping are set through the freedom-camping bylaw and not the Ten Year Plan and also outline what the Council is doing to encourage tourists and responsible freedom campers to the Coromandel.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council cannot make a decision regarding designated freedom camping areas as part of its Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. respond to the submitters to explain that the areas designated for freedom camping are set through the freedom-camping bylaw and not the Ten Year Plan and also outline what the Council is doing to encourage tourists and responsible freedom campers to the Coromandel.

Moved - French

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Council cannot make a decision regarding designated freedom camping areas as part of its Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Outside the Scope of the Ten Year Plan

165. TCDC's Jurisdiction

The following submissions were received but relate to matters outside of TCDC's jurisdiction or are matters set by law.

Submission Request	Reason for request	Submitter #
That commercial fishing in the Tairua Harbour be banned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If kids and retirees can't catch fish, Tairua will soon lose its appeal. 	251
That the Council notes the submitter's support for a more holistic approach to pest control that provides jobs for local people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trapping and other methods of control would create local jobs and training for young people Possum fur attracts excellent returns Many farmers in the area oppose the use of 1080 	624
That regional government be abolished.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> So that matters such as septic tank education revert to either district councils or central government. 	78
That a unitary council be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reason provided. 	243
That the Council must reduce the regulatory burden as much as possible; apply a least government is the best government principle and prevent the Waikato Regional Council from having any input into the TCDC area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Waikato Regional Council has become an instrument of oppression. 	90
That the Council does not have a Mayor as well as a CEO, and that the CEO fulfill this role as part of their job.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council should be run as a business and no businesses have mayors. There may be cost savings to be made. 	287
That the Department of Conservation be paying rates in at least some areas where there is a business component to its operation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoC land covers a significant proportion of the district and is becoming increasingly commercial. 	199
That the Treaty Settlement is treated careful to ensure New Zealanders and property owners still have a democratic right which is equal to all with the same privilege.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council is more aware than the general public with the Treaty settlement for the Coromandel. 	512

Council Decision Required

OUTSIDE SCOPE – no decision sought

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council cannot make a decision within its Ten Year Plan regarding these matters.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. Notes the submissions.
2. responds to submitters and refer to appropriate agencies.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The Council cannot make a decision within its Ten Year Plan regarding these matters.

Discussion

None

Outside the Scope of the Ten Year Plan

166. Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity

Submitter #192 requests that the Council notes the submitter's intent to submit to the District Plan at the appropriate time that the Wharekawa Harbour and environs be included as a cultural/natural heritage resource to be formally protected, and:

- *seeks identification of the Wharekawa Harbour and environs as an **area worthy of formal protection on heritage and biodiversity grounds**, and*
- *seeks listing of the Wharekawa Harbour and environs in the District Plan register amongst those numbered in the performance measure from the date of adoption of the revised District Plan.*

The reason outlined by the submitter is that the land and coastal area is significant in biodiversity terms and includes an area designated as a wildlife refuge.

Council Decision Required

OUTSIDE SCOPE - no decision sought

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the points made in the submission and that the submitter be advised that there will be an opportunity to submit on the identification of natural features (and the associated reviewed land use provisions) in and around Wharekawa Harbour through the District Plan Review process ('first cut' due to be released in November 2012).

Staff reason for recommendation

The submission refers to the need to identify natural and cultural heritage features/resources in and around the Wharekawa Catchment through the District Plan Review process - which is separate to the Ten Year Plan process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the points made in the submissions
2. advises the submitter that there will be an opportunity to submit on the identification of natural features (and the associated reviewed land use provisions) in and around Wharekawa Harbour through the District Plan Review process ('first cut' due to be released in November 2012).

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The submission refers to the need to identify natural and cultural heritage features/resources in and around the Wharekawa Catchment through the District Plan Review process - which is separate to the Ten Year Plan process.

Discussion

None

Outside the Scope of the Ten Year Plan

167. Zoning and Land Use

A number of submissions were received concerning zoning and land use matters that are outside the scope of the Ten Year Plan.

These are listed here for the information of the Council.

Submission request	Reasons outlined	Submitter #
That the Council does not proceed with its intent to give effect to the Coromandel Blueprint in the District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Plan provisions have yet to be tested through a statutory consultative process and statement of intent The District Plan provisions have yet to be tested through a statement of intent 	63 90
That the Council build a double walkway behind (existing) and before (no existing) the mangroves in Matarangi.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To create this double walkway TCDC have to build a wooden bridge from the reserve. 	300
That the registers of heritage buildings and trees be reviewed every 6 years for adding to the District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	612 677
That the Council ensure that applications for building permits or alterations to existing heritage buildings comply with all rules within the District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	612 677
That Pita Street, Coromandel be designated as an official road and that the walkway from Pita Street onto Wharf Road remains in place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pita Street is a paper road Designation is required for future growth and development 	612 677
That the Council designate the submitters mining licence site on Queen Street (between Waiotahi and Moanataiari Streets) as a Reserve for Historical/Cultural Use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landowner is the Council and the Crown (Department of Conservation Stewardship) and has historic buildings and roles. 	152
That the Council set measurable limits for noise db, frequency levels and other considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The present 'nuisance' criteria is open to abuse and argument. 	138
That the Council supports infilling as the preferred option to provide more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce land gobbling subdivisions. Rural subdivisions often cut off access to recreational areas or introduce resident populations that lead to the curtailment of previously acceptable uses. 	138
That the Council notes the submitter's appreciation for their collaborative approach with the New Zealand Transport Agency to developing the District Plan and that the submitter looks forward to continuing to work with the District Plan team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter takes a keen interest in District Plans as the integration of land use with transportation planning is key in achieving a safe, sustainable, efficient and effective transport network. The submitter's participation in District Plan reviews is intended to incorporate the principles of growth strategies that have been developed. 	524
That retention and indeed expansion of heavy industry in urban areas is the preferred development in the submitter's area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should reduce the pressure to subdivide (and alienate) previously untouched areas of the Peninsula. 	138
That the Council evaluate the importance of staff projects (regarding significant natural areas, heritage, landscape and natural character) and the necessity for doing them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmers feel frustrated that the Council has seen it necessary to spend many hours and costs enlarging on plans and creating rules without consultation with those people affected. Farmers in the region consider the work done on planning and implementation of these plans (significant natural areas, heritage, landscape and natural character) are one of the biggest threats of their rights to farm and make decisions on their land. 	237
That the SNAs should not be applicable to privately owned land and should only apply to crown (DOC) land and that they be removed from	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because it's totally restrictive and an insult to all landowners. There are enough controls that are required to oversee any development in a responsible way. 	215

Submission request	Reasons outlined	Submitter #
<i>the District Plan altogether.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>This will devalue land and reduce its resale.</i> 	
<i>That if the Council is really concerned about the public's ability to pay rates they halt the activities of the planning department, particularly in regard to private property and the identification of SNAs, biodiversity, heritage, natural character and amenity.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The submitter considers that huge costs have already been unnecessarily incurred and a great deal of stress imposed upon many ratepayers.</i> 	680
<p><i>That the Council note the submitter's concern that the SNA process effectively forces a potential covenant onto affected owners without consultation or recourse.</i></p> <p><i>Further, that there is a potential increase in direct costs through higher rates and consent fees as a result of the SNA process.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>It effects spread into the business community as well as private property owners.</i> <i>Any additional compliance costs associated from the SNA process would quickly become prohibitive.</i> 	341
<i>That the Council note the submitter's objection to SNAs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The submitter considers it insulting that bureaucrats try to tell them what to do with their own land in view of the on-going work she and her partner do to enhance and protect their property.</i> 	624
<i>That if the Council is really concerned about the public's ability to pay rates they halt the activities of the planning department, particularly in regard to private property and the identification of SNAs, biodiversity, heritage, natural character and amenity.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The submitter considers that huge costs have already been unnecessarily incurred and a great deal of stress imposed upon many ratepayers.</i> 	680

Council Decision Required

No decision required - OUTSIDE SCOPE

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

- note the submissions*
- confirms they are outside the scope of the Ten Year Plan*
- prepares a response to submitters to advise them of the District Plan Review.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council cannot make decisions on these matters within this Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

- notes the submissions*
- confirms they are outside the scope of the Ten Year Plan*
- prepares a response to submitters to advise them of the District Plan Review and that the submission will be referred on to the District Plan Review team for information as a part of the Ten Year Plan process.*

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The Council cannot make decisions on these matters within this Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Contribution to Decision Making Process by Māori

168. Policy overall

Submitter #78 queries the need for and appropriateness of specifically targeting consultation on the basis of ethnicity through compiling of a database of those who wish to be considered Maori.

The reason provided is that the submitter considers that no one plans to consult him on the basis of his ethnicity.

Council Decision Required

OUTSIDE SCOPE – no decision sought

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions and make no adjustment to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This Policy is a mandatory requirement for the Council. Staff would not recommend that changes be made to the Policy without firstly consulting the Maori community within the Coromandel as to how they would like to be engaged in decision making process.

The Policy notes that the Council intends to review the Policy once the Treaty settlement outcomes are known.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. make no adjustment to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

This Policy is a mandatory requirement for the Council. Staff would not recommend that changes be made to the Policy without firstly consulting the Maori community within the Coromandel as to how they would like to be engaged in decision making process.

The Policy notes that the Council intends to review the Policy once the Treaty settlement outcomes are known.

Discussion

None

Miscellaneous Fees and Charges

169. Rates for Official Information

Two submitters (#63 and #663) request that the Council answer the submitters question whether computer discs or memory sticks will be available and at what charge?

Council Decision Required

OUTSIDE SCOPE – no decision sought

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submissions and prepare a suitable response.

Staff reason for recommendation

The submitter has asked a question and it should be responded to.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. prepare a suitable response.

Moved - French

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

The submitter has asked a question and it should be responded to.

Discussion

None

Miscellaneous Fees and Charges

170. Development Contributions

A staff submission was received regarding the fees and charges for Development Contributions schedule.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council includes a footnote on the Development Contributions Schedule of Fees and Charges in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council includes a footnote on the Development Contributions Schedule of Fees and Charges stating "A moratorium on connections to the Thames Valley and Matatoki water schemes is currently in place therefore the water contribution is not payable on these schemes until connections are available"

Staff reason for recommendation

The Waikato Regional Council resource consent issued 11 March 2011 for the Thames Valley water scheme contains a condition restricting Council from allowing any new connections to the scheme with the exception of the three connections authorised via Landuse consent number RMA2007/72.

The Environment Waikato resource consent issued 11 March 2011 for the Matatoki water scheme contains a condition restricting Council from allowing any new connections to the scheme.

Council resolution

That the Council includes a footnote on the Development Contributions Schedule of Fees and Charges stating "A moratorium on connections to the Thames Valley and Matatoki water schemes is currently in place therefore the water contribution is not payable on these schemes until connections are available"

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The Waikato Regional Council resource consent issued 11 March 2011 for the Thames Valley water scheme contains a condition restricting Council from allowing any new connections to the scheme with the exception of the three connections authorised via Landuse consent number RMA2007/72.

The Environment Waikato resource consent issued 11 March 2011 for the Matatoki water scheme contains a condition restricting Council from allowing any new connections to the scheme.

Discussion

None

Other Ten Year Plan Matters

171. Community Spaces Activity Group

Submitter # 189 requests that the Council amends references to 'community wellbeing' on page 135 to 'community health and wellbeing [insertions underlined].

To reflect the numerous health benefits of many key programmes and facilities within the Community Spaces activity group.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its approach to consultation based on the feedback received.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The submitter has suggested several edits to Ten Year Plan text, which staff agree are useful to incorporate, mainly at the activity level. This one however would imply a greater focus on health than the activity group presently provides for.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The submitter has suggested several edits to Ten Year Plan text, which staff agree are useful to incorporate, mainly at the activity level. This one however would imply a greater focus on health than the activity group presently provides for.

Discussion

None

Other Ten Year Plan Matters

172. Grammatical and Formatting Corrections

A staff submission was received requesting that the Council instruct staff to make minor amendments throughout the Ten Year Plan to correct typographical, grammatical and formatting errors.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council makes minor amendments throughout the Ten Year Plan document.

Staff recommendation

That the Council instruct staff to make minor amendments throughout the Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan to:

- 1. correct typographical errors, and*
- 2. correct formatting issues.*

Staff reason for recommendation

It is prudent to ensure that if errors are identified that there is the opportunity to make amendments as appropriate.

Any improvements would not impact on Council decisions, but may increase the readability and understanding of the Ten Year Plan document(s).

Council resolution

That the Council instruct staff to make minor amendments throughout the Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan to:

1. correct typographical errors, and
2. correct formatting issues.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

It is prudent to ensure that if errors are identified that there is the opportunity to make amendments as appropriate.

Any improvements would not impact on Council decisions, but may increase the readability and understanding of the Ten Year Plan document(s).

Discussion

None

Other Ten Year Plan Matters

173. Definitions

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council includes, as appropriate a footnote provides a definition of grants.

Staff recommendation

That a footnote be included as appropriate that provides a definition of grants as follows: "Throughout this Ten Year Plan the term grant is used to describe grants, service agreements and purchase contracts. The Council has a Community Services Contracts and Grants policy which outlines the arrangements for use of each approach.

Staff reason for recommendation

To provide greater clarity and accuracy regarding use of the term grant in the Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council include a footnote as appropriate that provides a definition of grants as follows: "Throughout this Ten Year Plan the term grant is used to describe grants, service agreements and purchase contracts. The Council has a Community Services Contracts and Grants policy which outlines the arrangements for use of each approach.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

To provide greater clarity and accuracy regarding use of the term grant in the Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Deliberations - Thames Community Board Area

Table of Contents

Page No.

Economic Development	254
Strategic Planning	256
District Transportation	259
Local Transportation	260
Airfields	265
Community Centres and Hall	267
Harbour Facilities	269
Libraries	270
Parks and Reserves	271
Swimming Pools	277
Stormwater	281
Water Supply	285

Economic Development Activity

1. Increased Support for Economic Development - Thames iSite

Two submitters (#520 and #209) specifically request that financial support be provided for the relocation of the existing Thames iSite to a more suitable venue and site that allows for better promotion of the central township and the surrounding area.

The reasons for this request include:

- *The Thames iSite is the first 'port of call' for most visitors to the Coromandel and provides a service to the whole region.*
- *Two reports commissioned by the previous Council indicate that a regionally significant centre like Thames should have greater funding than others.*
- *Increased funding would enable the organisation to focus on event management and provide support to help build Thames as a destination.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider providing additional financial support to the Thames iSite to assist with relocation to a more suitable venue and site.

Staff recommendation

That the Council consider providing additional financial support of \$10,000 to the Thames i-Site to assist with relocation to a more suitable venue and site.

Staff reason for recommendation

The current location of the Thames i-Site is acknowledged as not ideal and is a location that is difficult for visitors to find.

Council resolution

That the Council provide additional financial support of \$10,000 to the Thames i-Site to assist with relocation to a more suitable venue and site.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - French

Councillor Connors declared a conflict of interest as she is a part time employee of Thames i-Site. The OAG has advised that the conflict of interest is only in force when discussing Thames i-Site in particular. Councillor Connors did not vote.

Reason for resolution

The current location of the Thames i-Site is acknowledged as not ideal and is a location that is difficult for visitors to find.

Discussion

1-Sites in general

- Community Boards will set some outcomes for local i-Sites in the future.
- In 2006 i-Sites started to be funded via District. This is the final year of district funding.
- Current funding is based on historic funding rather than any other methodology.
- The Economic Development Manager has based the funding request on the Annual Report from CCIC. This report is coming to Council on 23 May. This budget does not include events, it is a baseline to run the service.
- This is an interim year.

Decision 174

Placement of i-site needs to be able to accommodate buses.

Economic Development Activity

175. Old Placemaker's Site

Submitter #733 requests that the Council

- *support and assist the lease and tenancing of the old Placemaker's site on Queen Street Thames.*
- *Support the long term intention of the site by Council purchasing the freehold of the same and lease to a community organisation such as the present Lighthouse Foundry Incorporate.*

The reasons outlined by the submitter include:

- *Lighthouse Foundry Incorporated presently proposes to lease the site from the present owners, pain the buildings, tidy the yard, making the fences more attractive and then setting up the new Thames I-Site and bus depot there.*
- *The site would also be an ideal terminus for the new Hauraki Rail trail*
- *The rest of the buildings could be leased to a cafe, community radio station other community groups (the submitter details a number of these)*
- *Consistent with the longer term aim to grow the Grahamstown Market.*
- *The site is a crucial piece of land for the future development of the town.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its approach to consultation based on the feedback received.

Staff recommendation

This was a late submission. A staff comment will be provided at the Deliberations meeting.

Staff reason for recommendation

As above.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Staff and the Community Board will work further with the submitter. There is no adjustment to be made to the ten year plan at this stage as discussions are still premature.

Discussion

Further discussions are on-going with staff and the Thames Community Board.

Strategic Planning Activity (Local)

176. Thames Community Board Area - Strategic Plan for Thames

The draft Ten Year Plan included a proposal to not fund the review of local community plans, however, a new Thames strategic plan was included in budget for the 2012/2013 - 2013/2014 years. Four submissions were received regarding this proposal.

Support for the proposal:

That the Council retains the development of a strategic plan for Thames and notes that Waikato Regional Council welcomes early dialogue in this planning process (#280)

Support for, and variation to the proposal:

The Thames community Board (#520) request that the Council provide \$90,000 in Year 1 to provide for the development of a Strategic Plan for Thames that focuses on social and economic development.

The reasons provided include:

- The strategy has been proposed to enable Thames to protect its unique historical, geographic and social qualities while accommodating and benefiting from future growth and development.
- The submitter also considers the strategy will lift the profile of Thames and attract investment and visitors; support and clear commitment to a unique and attractive Town Centre; provide demonstrable certainty of outcomes and procurement processes.

Opposition to the proposal:

Three submission (63, 512 and 663) request that the Council delete the proposal for a strategic plan for Thames from the Ten Year Plan

The reasons provided include:

- The submitter considers that there have already been so many plans for Thames that surely there is enough on the shelves gathering dust already.
- There are already a number of plans.
- What Thames requires is some proper planning in zoning which needs to happen within the District Plan review.

Alternative proposal:

Submitted #90 asks 'why does the Council need to do a strategic plan for Thames', and further suggestions that the Council uses the plan drawn up by Morrie Dunwoodie.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the Thames Strategic Plan project as is in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Thames Community Board give guidance to the Council over the significance of the project and its community's ability to pay.

Staff reason for recommendation

A number of plans are already available in relation to Thames. Council staff have the ability to undertake this process without additional cost.

Council resolution

That the Council retain the Thames Strategic Plan as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

This is consistent with the priority of the Thames Community Board.

Discussion

- Currently there is budget of \$45,000 in year one and \$45,000 in year two. If all in year one this equates to \$18 on every Thames rates bill.
- The Community Board is looking for a design from someone such as a Beca including connectivities.
- Went through all the requests that Thames wants funded locally - Plan, Rail trail, percentage of car park, skatepark, community sports facilities (Rhodes park, indoor courts) The only new request is the \$20,000 for the car park.
- Thames Community Board has the vision that Thames will be a satellite town to Auckland and must therefore have facilities.

Strategic Planning Activity (Local)

177. Thames Community Board Area - Local Strategic Planning

Submitter #644 proposed a range of initiatives to provide for a more integrated community in Thames.

Specifically, that the Council

- *Promote an energy audit for domestic and commercial properties to investigate more efficient use of energy Thames-wide, and*
- *Promote the investigation of which natural resources could be used for energy generation.*

The submitter suggests this could be carried out in conjunction with the Thames Asset Mapping project.

The submitter notes that

- *In 2010 Prices Foundry expressed the opinion that Thames and Coast could be self-sufficient in energy in 5 years.*
- *This could attract visitors, tourists and businesses specialising in similar technologies.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider an energy audit as part of the Thames Asset Mapping project.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission and considers the inclusion of an energy audit as part of the Thames Asset Mapping project and/or the Thames Strategic Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The idea presented by the submitter is valid and it given the Board is about to undergo a planning exercise it would be remiss for them not to consider whether an energy audit, or some work in this area is within (or not) the scope of that work, and what value it may or may not add.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. refers the matter to the Thames Focus Group.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

The idea presented by the submitter is valid and suggest the matter is referred to the Thames Focus Group for further consideration and as the most appropriate forum for consideration of this matter.

Discussion

None

District Transportation Activity

178. New Project Request - Totara Valley Road - Ngati Maru Highway intersection

2 new projects were requested by submitters. There are as follows.

Totara Valley Road - Ngati Maru Highway intersection

Submitter number 290 requested that the council work with Transit NZ to redevelop the Totara Valley Road - Ngati Maru Highway intersection.

Reason for request as outlined by the submitter:

- The intersection has poor visibility and is unsafe.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider a project to redevelop the Totara Valley Road - Ngati Maru Highway intersection in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council will continue to advocate for NZTA to improve sub-standard state highway intersections the agency is responsible for. Intersection improvements, together with other safety improvements need to be prioritised as the value of projects is greater than the available government funding. Unfortunately a key component of priority assessment is vehicle crash history and although the intersection layout at the SH25 / Totara Valley Road / Waipapa Road intersection is sub-standard, the low crash history at this site means that intersection safety improvements would be ranked lower than many other projects throughout the Waikato region.

Staff note that NZTA has proposed that the current 100km/h speed limit is reduced on this section of SH25 and the outcome of this speed limit review is due for release prior to June 2012. A reduction in vehicle approach speeds on SH25 is likely to improve intersection safety in this area.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Council will continue to advocate for NZTA to improve sub-standard state highway intersections the agency is responsible for. Intersection improvements, together with other safety improvements need to be prioritised as the value of projects is greater than the available government funding. Unfortunately a key component of priority assessment is vehicle crash history and although the intersection layout at the SH25 / Totara Valley Road / Waipapa Road intersection is sub-standard, the low crash history at this site means that intersection safety improvements would be ranked lower than many other projects throughout the Waikato region. Staff note that NZTA has proposed that the current 100km/h speed limit is reduced on this section of SH25 and the outcome of this speed limit review is due for release prior to June 2012. A reduction in vehicle approach speeds on SH25 is likely to improve intersection safety in this area.

Discussion

None

Local Transport Activity

179. Cycleways

Two submissions were received in support of cycleways and one in opposition to.

Submitter #280, the Waikato Regional Council, noted its **appreciation for TCDC's on-going support of the Hauraki Rail Trail**. The submitter outlines that the Rail Trail has been identified as a strategic transport project that will provide significant economic and recreational benefits to the region.

Submitter #135 also noted their **support for the Council continuing to support the Hauraki Rail Trail**, but also requested that the Council **increase the amount of safe bike paths**. No reasons were outlined for this request.

Submitter #520, the Thames Community Board requests that the Council **provide \$30,000 in 2012/2013 and \$25,000 in 2013/2014 to bring the Rail Trail into the CBD area**, including linkages, urban concept design and signage. The reason provided is so to maximise the benefits Thames receives from the Rail Trail.

Submitter #644 requests that the Council **consider including multiple elements, including art, sculpture, exercise stations to the cycleway** that could be developed by local iwi/schools/community groups. The same submitter also suggests ways to make Thames a more cycle friendly town, for instance provision of cycle racks, ensuring local accommodation and tourist operators are preparing for cycle visitors that will result from the Hauraki Rail Trail.

Submission #636 requests that the Council **does not provide funding for the Hauraki Rail Trail**. The reasons outlined include:

- This is a government initiative and the government should fund it.
- It does not affect people on the Coromandel.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the extent of its focus on cycleways / bike paths.

Staff recommendation

That the draft Ten Year Plan is amended to allow cycleway improvement required in Thames to be completed in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 as submitted.

Staff reason for recommendation

The draft Ten Year Plan includes \$55,000 between 2012/2013 - 2014/2015 within the Thames local transportation activity for cycle way improvements. Staff agree that the programme of improvement works is condensed allowing completion of these works in the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 years to ensure a good Thames experience for cycle way users.

Council has previously agreed to establish the section of Hauraki Rail Trail from Paeroa to Thames and to fund this from the District Transportation activity. Any improvements required within the Thames Township should be funded locally due to the area of benefit.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Additional cost per property 2012/2013 = \$0.27
- Additional cost per property 2013/2014 = \$0.05

Council resolution

That the Council amend the draft Ten Year Plan to allow cycleway improvement required in Thames to be completed in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 as submitted.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

The draft Ten Year Plan includes \$55,000 between 2012/2013 - 2014/2015 within the Thames local transportation activity for cycle way improvements. Staff agree that the programme of improvement works is condensed allowing completion of these works in the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 years to ensure a good Thames experience for cycle way users.

Council has previously agreed to establish the section of Hauraki Rail Trail from Paeroa to Thames and to fund this from the District Transportation activity. Any improvements required within the Thames Township should be funded locally due to the area of benefit.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Additional cost per property 2012/2013 = \$0.27
- Additional cost per property 2013/2014 = \$0.05

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

180. Thames Community Board Area- Request for New Project

Request for new project - Kauaeranga Valley Road Safety

Submitter #150 requests that:

- urgent road widening or footpath extension works be provided for on Kauaeranga Valley Road (the section from Water Race Lane subdivision to Parawai).

The reason for this request includes:

- this stretch of road poses a critical public safety risk for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
- the road contains three blind corners, there is no footpath or track and many types of road users.
- communities would be better connected.

The Economic Development Activity has reference to an investigation of additional walking/cycling opportunities in the hills behind Thames, and inclusion of a water-powered lift and connecting cycleway along the old water race. (#644)

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider a project to address Kauaeranga Valley Road Safety.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

All new footpath construction projects in each Community Board Area are prioritised based on pedestrian safety benefits and include factors such as pedestrian volumes, traffic volumes and available berm width and consulted with Board members. The section of footpath requested on Kauaeranga Valley Road is included on the Thames footpath construction programme, although outside the Ten Year Plan period. Based on the Thames footpath construction budget and this project's priority at this time, the expected timing for this project is 2027.

Road widening to improve pedestrian and cycling access is also a consideration when road reconstruction works are required throughout the district and this approach would apply for any future road reconstruction works required on this section of Kauaeranga Valley Road.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submission
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan
3. refer to Thames Community Board for further consideration regarding footpath provision and speed limits on the road.

Moved - French

Seconded - Hoadley

Staff reason for recommendation

All new footpath construction projects in each Community Board Area are prioritised based on pedestrian safety benefits and include factors such as pedestrian volumes, traffic volumes and available berm width and consulted with Board members. The section of footpath requested on Kauaeranga Valley Road is included on the Thames footpath construction programme, although outside the Ten Year Plan period. Based on the Thames footpath construction budget and this project's priority at this time, the expected timing for this project is 2027.

Road widening to improve pedestrian and cycling access is also a consideration when road reconstruction works are required throughout the district and this approach would apply for any future road reconstruction works required on this section of Kauaeranga Valley Road.

Discussion

- The Community Board could reprioritise the footpath.

Local Transportation Activity

181. Thames Community Board Area - Request for New Project

Two submissions have been received requesting a new project for a 'town square' in Thames.

Submitter #447 requests that the Thames Square (the area outside the civic centre) be pedestrianized.

Submitter #644 requests the creation of a town square on Mary Street between the Queen St roundabout and Pollen St.

The reason provided (#644) is that a town square would provide a restful haven for shoppers, a melting pot for activities and a place for significant community events

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider a Thames 'town square'.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

It is noted that the Thames Community Board is already considering funding for a project to plan the future of Thames CBD. Eventually funding will need to be scoped before inclusion in any future Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

It is noted that the Thames Community Board is already considering funding for a project to plan the future of Thames CBD. Eventually funding will need to be scoped before inclusion in any future Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

182. Thames Community Board Area- Request for New Project

Request for new project - Bowling Club Car Park

The Thames Community Board (#520) requests that:

- The Council provide \$200,000 in 2012/2013 to develop a car park on the Bowling Club land on Mackay Street.
- The submitter notes that this would not be commenced until the Thames Community Board's strategy for the lands medium to long term use has been developed.

Staff comment that the Council should note that no funds have been allocated in the draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan for the construction of the Thames Car Park on the Thames Bowling Club site.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider \$200,000 in 2012/2013 to develop a carpark on the Bowling Club land, Mackay St.

Staff recommendation

That the Council take advice from the Community Board to include a \$200,000 project in 2012/2013 of the draft Ten Year Plan for development of a public car park on land being acquired from the Thames Bowling Club.

Staff reason for recommendation

At the Council meeting on 22 December 2012, Council approved the recommendation to purchase a portion of the Thames Bowling Club land. Staff expects the land transfer process will be completed during 2011/2012. Resource consent has been granted for the car park development on the land being purchased. Staff also supports the need for the Thames Community Board to develop a medium to long term strategy for the use of the land prior to work commencing.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- It is currently unclear as to whether there would be an additional capacity portion to this project. The increased levels of service portion would be funded by Depreciation Reserves and the additional capacity portion by additional capacity Loan
- Depreciation and interest cost per property in the Thames Community Board area = \$3.85

Council resolution

That the Council take advice from the Community Board to include a \$200,000 project in 2012/2013 of the draft Ten Year Plan for development of a public car park on land being acquired from the Thames Bowling Club.

Moved - French

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

At the Council meeting held on 22 December 2012, Council approved the recommendation to purchase a portion of the Thames Bowling Club land. Staff expects the land transfer process will be completed during 2011/2012. Resource consent has been granted for the car park development on the land being purchased. Staff also supports the need for the Thames Community Board to develop a medium to long term strategy for the use of the land prior to work commencing.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- It is currently unclear as to whether there would be an additional capacity portion to this project. The increased levels of service portion would be funded by Depreciation Reserves and the additional capacity portion by additional capacity Loan
- Depreciation and interest cost per property in the Thames Community Board area = \$3.85

Discussion

Clarification sought on the land being referred to as Bowling Club Land as it is owned by Council.

Airfields Activity

183. Services - Thames Airfield

Submitters #63, 90, 512 and 663 request that the Council provides a sewage connection for the Thames Airfield, and allow for hangars with overnight accommodation to maximise the vast tract of land available for that purpose.

The reasons provided include:

- to realise an economic gain, jobs and community vibrancy
- the wastewater service was approved in the early 2000s.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council provides a sewage connection of the Thames Airfield and allow for hangars with overnight accommodation.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan at this stage.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Thames Community Board during the 2011 year reviewed the operation of the airfield and its associated 'master plan'. The connection of sewage and hangars with overnight accommodation were not identified as priorities for funding. The Council welcomes future guidance from the master plan in this respect, and no doubt discussions could raise the impact on local motels. However, staff also note that another concept of a transport museum has been mooted for the site and would require a connection if the concept proceeded further.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. request staff to investigate cost effective options and bring back to the Thames Community Board.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

The Thames Community Board during the 2011 year reviewed the operation of the airfield and its associated 'master plan'. The connection of sewage and hangars with overnight accommodation were not identified as priorities for funding. The Council welcomes future guidance from the master plan in this respect, and no doubt discussions could raise the impact on local motels.

Discussion

- Not an area that the Community Board has been hearing about from the community.
- Price of services range from \$50,000 to \$150,000.

Airfields Activity

184. Funding - Thames Airfield

Submitter #204 requests that the funding of the Thames Airfield be fiscally neutral or start paying back the loan from the TUGPRA account.

No reason was provided.

Further, the same submitter requests that the Ten Year Plan: Volume 2: p.107 be amended to include information on the revenue from the airfield, the amount that Thames ratepayers subsidise and where the operating costs arise.

The reason provided is provision of information.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the funding for the Thames Airfield activity, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Ten Year Plan reflects current policy including user pays wherever possible.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Brljevich

Reason for resolution

The Ten Year Plan reflects current policy including user pays wherever possible.

Discussion

None

Community Centres and Halls Activity**185. Services - Thames Community Board Area - WINTEC building**

Submitter #520, the Thames Community Board request that the property at 414 Queen Street occupied by Wintec be sold, and that no provision be made for remedial work prior to it being sold, and that the funds be returned to the TUGPRA account.

The reasons provided include:

- *The building was purchased primarily to assist the Thames RSA in 2002 using local TUGPRA funds.*
- *The need for Council to own the building ceased when the RSA ceased to exist.*
- *Any remedial works should be done with a clear commercial focus which would be best done by a commercial owner.*
- *Remedial works may create a risk of significant expenditure being made without a comparative commercial return.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the proposal to sell the WINTEC building.

Staff recommendation

That the Council acknowledges the Thames Community Boards recommendation from 1 May 2012 meeting.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is a report to the Thames Community Board's 1 May 2012 meeting about this building and a clear recommendation on the Boards position can be made. Council's position should be that the building be sold as it is not a core function of Council to operate property for lease.

Council resolution

That the Council acknowledges the Thames Community Boards recommendation from 1 May 2012 meeting which is to sell the WINTEC building as is.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

There is a report to the Thames Community Board's 1 May 2012 meeting about this building and a clear recommendation on the Boards position was made. Council's position should be that the building be sold as it is not a core function of Council to operate property for lease.

Discussion

- Add the recommendation from 1 May 2012 meeting to the resolution.

Community Centres and Halls Activity

186. Services - Thames Community Board Area - Fees & Charges

Submitter #520, the Thames Community Board submit that the Council notes the revised schedule of fees and charges for the Thames Civic Centre adopted by the Thames Community Board on 28 November 2011.

The reasons provided include:

- *The board revised the schedule to encourage greater use of the Civic Centre and provide a better public good and financial outcome.*
- *The submitter has attached a copy of the schedule with its submission. (Refer to submission for further details)*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the fees and charges for the Thames Civic Centre, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council change the plan to reflect the fees and charges recommended by the Thames Community Board.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Board operate this facility on behalf of Council and have recommended fees and charges for adoption by Council.

Council resolution

That the Council change the plan to reflect the fees and charges recommended by the Thames Community Board.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The Board operate this facility on behalf of Council and have recommended fees and charges for adoption by Council

Discussion

None

Harbour Facilities Activity

187. Thames Community Board Area -Funding of Thames Shortland Wharf

One submitter (#204) requested that the depreciation costs on the Thames Shortland Wharf be waived, and the tenants rent cover outgoing costs.

The reasons for this request were:

- *without dredging the wharf is only usable at full tide.*
- *the activity has been subsidised by ratepayers for too long.*
- *the wharf is a commercial site.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders how it funds Shortland Wharf in Thames.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan but pass the matter to the Thames Community Board for further guidance.

Staff reason for recommendation

Depreciation funding is a requirement unless the facility is to not be repaired or replaced. Delegated responsibility for this activity is to be passed back to Community Boards and the Thames Community Board may decide to review this. The tenant pays full commercial rate for the wharf building, but this does not cover the maintenance or depreciation requirements. TCDC cannot levy charges to berths off the wharf as this is not TCDC owned land.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
3. passes the matter to the Thames Community Board for further guidance.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Depreciation funding is a requirement unless the facility is to not be repaired or replaced. Delegated responsibility for this activity is to be passed back to Community Boards and the Thames Community Board may decide to review this. The tenant pays full commercial rate for the wharf building, but this does not cover the maintenance or depreciation requirements. TCDC cannot levy charges to berths off the wharf as this is not TCDC owned land.

Discussion

- The carpark around the wharf is mostly a Council responsibility.

Libraries Activity

188. Services - Thames Library

Submitter #520, the Thames Community Board requests that the Council increase the budget for repairs to the Thames library building to \$500,000.

The reasons provided include:

- *The leaks and subsequent water damage have become progressively worse over recent years.*
- *The preferred option as considered by the Thames Community Board includes ensuring the weather tightness of the building by removing and resealing windows, replacing cladding and increasing drainage.*
- *A small portion of the budget covers project management costs and providing increased library space.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the reconsiders the budget for repairs to the Thames library building.

Staff recommendation

That the Council maintains the current budget of \$506,000 in order to undertake the necessary repairs to Thames Library.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Thames Library building has been degraded by water damage impairing the water tightness.

Council resolution

That the Council maintains the current budget of \$506,000 in order to undertake the necessary repairs to Thames Library.

Moved - Hoadley

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The Thames Library building has been degraded by water damage impairing the water tightness.

Discussion

- The library may come under Thames Community Board under community empowerment.
- A portion of the funding for this project is district funded.

Parks and Reserves Activity

189. Thames Community Board Area - Thames Indoor Sports Facility

The draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan outlined a number of changes including a new indoor sports facility in Thames.

The submission form specifically asked submitters whether they agreed with this proposal. 283 submitters responded to the question. 202 people in agreement, 33 disagreed and 48 had no preference.

NB: the limitation of this question is that the feedback question asked whether submitters agreed with Council's proposal to build new sports facilities in Thames and Mercury Bay, in the same question.

Comments in support of the Thames indoor sports facility include:

- Council should support this project in partnership with local and other agencies
- Would provide a facility for hosting larger tournaments and events which will in turn promote the area to visitors
- The community needs to support our youth and promote active involvement in sport
- This venue would assist in promoting a healthy population to the region
- The Council should support Zoom Zone and needs to make a commitment to youth in Thames with the provision of a social/sports facility increases options for youth
- The need for this type of sports facility has been demonstrated over an extended period
- The project be brought forward.

Comments against the Thames indoor sports facility include:

- The proposed sports facilities in Thames does not seem to be funded by the sports concerned and the Thames Valley Motor Cycle Club is currently working through the RMA on a track at Rhodes Park. The club would consider extensive Council funding of facilities for other sports as inequitable.
- There is no proven need, and there are unused halls available.

The Thames Community board submission (#520) requests:

- The Council provide funding of \$4m during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 years to provide impetus for construction of adequate multisport facilities with the balance provided by community partnerships and external funding sources.
- The 'indoor sports facility' be redefined as 'community sports facilities'
- The Council consider including in the sports facilities a replacement grandstand at Rhodes Park

Reasons outlined by the Thames Community Board for their requests include:

- Redefining the project will engender collaboration, secure maximum external funding and meet the needs of the maximum number of sports codes at the most appropriate location.
- This project has been in development for more than a decade and was planned as a collaborative project with the High School and communities.
- Significant investment has been made in regard to investigation, concept development, construction and quantifying the cost of options.
- The Zoom Zone project received high levels of support in the previous Ten Year Plan process.
- The project will provide important recreational and therapeutic facilities to a wide range in the community.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the Thames Indoor Sports Facility as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The funding is provided in a way which is sustainable and has the least impact on future rates.

Council resolution

That the Council amend the draft Ten Year Plan and allocate \$1million per year for 2 years from 2013/2014 and \$2million in 2017/2018, retaining the same funding split as per the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

This reflects better the priority of the community and the Thames Community Board.

Discussion

- Timing slightly out - should start earlier.

Parks and Reserves Activity

190. Thames Community Board Area - Skatepark

Five submissions were received concerning the Thames Skatepark project. Submitters include: #138, 340, 520, 644 & 649.

The Thames Community board submission (#520) requests that the budget and timeframes be amended to provide \$50,000 in 2012/2013 and \$100,000 in 2013/2014.

Reasons outlined by the Thames Community Board for their requests include:

- This is a popular leisure activity for youth currently poorly provided for.
- The submitter anticipates that the amount will be able to be significantly reduced through community support and partnerships and external funding.

The other two submissions were in support of the project, but made comments to the funding of the project:

- A submitter (#340) requested that the proposal be retained, with the majority of it being locally funded.
- One submitter (number 138) noted that the Council should support such facilities but not be totally responsible for funding them, and suggested that the funding for projects such as the Thames skate park and parking lot seal at Rhodes Park be matched by input from the sports concerned.

Another submitter (#649) notes their support for the proposal and requests that the Thames Skatepark Revolution Crew continue to be involved in its development.

Reasons outlined by the Thames Skatepark Revolution Crew for their requests include:

- The Thames Skate Park Revolution Crew have been working hard over the last number of years campaigning for a new skate park.
- Involvement will provide opportunities for skill development, creates positive buy in, makes young people feel valued by the community and helps achieve a youth friendly outcome.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the Thames Skatepark project as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Funding is already committed for this project in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014. The funding provided will provide a minimum facility. If the Community want a more elaborate facility they should provide further funding as required from external sources.

Council resolution

That the Council retains the Thames skate park project but recognises \$75,000 external funding.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

Funding is already committed for this project in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014. The funding provided will provide a minimum facility. If the Community want a more elaborate facility they should provide further funding as required from external sources.

Discussion

- Need to recognise the external funding in the resolution.

Parks and Reserves Activity

191. Thames Community Board Area - Thames Coast Reserve Development

The Thames Coast Reserve Development project is not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal to not include this project in the Ten Year Plan.

171 submitters responded to the question. Of those, 67 people were in agreement, 31 disagreed and 73 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Thames Coast reserve development include:

- *Reserves, and the ability to enjoy them, are very important to the culture and lifestyle of the Coromandel*
- *Investing in reserves is investing in the economic future which will attract visitors and enhances the brand 'Good for your soul'.*

Comments against the Thames Coast reserve development include:

- *This project should not be funded from district rates*
- *This project is not a core responsibility of Council.*

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for the Thames Coast reserve development.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Priorities for the local board lie elsewhere at the present time. Providing funding for the development of the Thames Coast reserves can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. However, community groups willing to take a lead would be welcomed to partner with council in these areas.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

Priorities for the local board lie elsewhere at the present time. Providing funding for the development of the Thames Coast reserves can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. However, community groups willing to take a lead would be welcomed to partner with council in these areas.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

192. Thames Community Board Area - Thames Coastal Walkway

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council defers the Thames Coastal Walkway construction project.

Staff recommendation

That the timing of the Thames Coastal Walkway construction project is deferred until 2015/2016.

Staff reason for recommendation

To align the timing of the Coastal Walkway construction project with the Burke Street Landfill Landscaping project scheduled for completion in 2015/2016 (refer Appendix 3, Page 268).

Council resolution

That the Council defer the Thames Coastal Walkway construction project until 2015/2016.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

To align the timing of the Coastal Walkway construction project with the Burke Street Landfill Landscaping project scheduled for completion in 2015/2016.

Discussion

- Project sits in Local Transportation.

Parks and Reserves Activity

193. Thames Community Board Area - Tararu Beach Reserve Development

The Tararu Beach Reserve Development project is not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal to not include this project in the Ten Year Plan.

166 submitters responded. Of those, 68 were in agreement, 21 disagreed and 77 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Tararu Beach reserve development include:

- Two comments were received in favour of this project being included in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Comments against the Tararu Beach reserve development include:

- One comment was received opposing this project stating that it should not be funded from district rates.

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for the Tararu Beach reserve development.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Staff reason for recommendation

Priorities for the local board lie elsewhere at the present time. Providing funding for the development of the Tararu Beach reserve (North) can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. However, community groups willing to take a lead would be welcomed to partner with council in these areas.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - French

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

Priorities for the local board lie elsewhere at the present time. Providing funding for the development of the Tararu Beach reserve (North) can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. However, community groups willing to take a lead would be welcomed to partner with council in these areas.

Discussion

None

Swimming Pools Activity

194. Thames - Replacement Pool

A small number of submissions were received regarding the Thames replacement pool project outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan. Also, a question was included on the feedback form asking whether submitters agreed with the Council's proposal to build new sports facilities in Thames and Mercury Bay. A number of comments were received against this particular fixed question in support of the Thames pool.

Comments included:

- The proposal for a new swimming pool in Thames be retained (#340 and #179)
- A sports facility in Thames should include an indoor swimming pool (#259)
- Use pays approach should apply (#612)
- Similarly, the majority should be locally funded (#340)
- One submitter noted support for the use of innovative and sustainable options for building development (#644)

The Thames Community Board (#520) requested that \$5m be provided in the 2020/2021 year for a swimming pool with the balance of the project (total of \$12m) being funded from external sources through community partnerships; and that the development option chosen is Option B of the SGL report.

The reasons outlined by the Board include:

- The provision of a pool is part of an overall community facilities project.
- Placing the replacement pool into this Ten Year Plan ensures visibility of the project which will encourage the community to begin fundraising and incorporate it into planning.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the contribution of \$5m to the replacement pool in Thames in the 2020/2021 year as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council agrees with the Community Board's proposal that \$5m be provided in the 2020/2021 year for a swimming pool with the balance of the project (total of \$12m) being funded from external sources through community partnerships; and that the development option chosen is Option B of the SGL report.

Staff reason for recommendation

The current pool has an estimated life span of approximately seven years. However, we need to start taking steps to replace the current pool so we continue to provide a hub for all things aquatic within our community. Over the past year pool staff have built numbers in the programs up to a high level we have national champion age group swimmers in our squads and the community are using the pool for all sorts of programs. We want to be able to continue to grow the community use of the pool and be able to provide the community with access to a facility.

If it is included in the Ten Year Plan it will encourage the community to begin planning and looking for funding options.

Council resolution

That the Council agrees with the Community Board's proposal that \$5m be provided in the 2020/2021 year for a swimming pool with the balance of the project (total of \$12m) being funded from external sources through community partnerships; and that the development option chosen is Option B of the SGL report.

Moved - French

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The current pool has an estimated life span of approximately seven years. However, we need to start taking steps to replace the current pool so we continue to provide a hub for all things aquatic within our community. Over the past year pool staff have built numbers in the programs up to a high level we have national champion age group swimmers in our squads and the community are using the pool for all sorts of programs. We want to be able to continue to grow the community use of the pool and be able to provide the community with access to a facility.

If it is included in the Ten Year Plan it will encourage the community to begin planning and looking for funding options.

Discussion

- If Zoom Zone doesn't go ahead may have to find another place for the pool.

Swimming Pools Activity

195. Thames - Fees & Charges

The Thames Community Board (#520) submitted that:

- the fees and charges schedule in regard to Concession Fees and Learn to Swim classes are kept the same as 2011/2012
- the per head fee is removed for public schools and a standard facility fee imposed

The reasons for the request include:

- In light of the economic times, charges should be kept low so they do not become a disincentive for people to remain regular pool users.
- The Thames pool manager has built strong relationships with schools and encourages use of the pool for various programmes.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the fees and charges for the Thames Swimming Pool as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That:

- the Council keeps fees and charges for concession cards and learn to swim classes the same
- the per head fee is removed for schools when hiring the pool.

Staff reason for recommendation

The fees for the learn to swim programme have just had a price rise and we do not want to lose patrons due to another increase. As we are still in the process of building the swim school numbers up to a level where we will be at capacity.

The concession fees are targeted at our local swimmers which the majority are rate payers we want to offer them at a reasonable fair rate as these customers are our repeat clients we do not want to push locals away from using our pool because of price rises.

The Pool Manager spends a lot of his year building relationships with the local schools to get involved in programs we have on offer at the pool then has to charge the schools with a per head fee on top of the flat pool hire age rate at the end of year school sports if the per head rate was dropped we would get more usage throughout the year from school with our programs on offer.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. keeps fees and charges for concession cards and learn to swim classes the same as 2011/2012
2. removes the per head fee for schools when hiring the pool.

Moved -Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

Reason for resolution

The fees for the learn to swim programme have just had a price rise and we do not want to lose patrons due to another increase. As we are still in the process of building the swim school numbers up to a level where we will be at capacity.

The concession fees are targeted at our local swimmers which the majority are rate payers we want to offer them at a reasonable fair rate as these customers are our repeat clients we do not want to push locals away from using our pool because of price rises.

The Pool Manager spends a lot of his year building relationships with the local schools to get involved in programs we have on offer at the pool then has to charge the schools with a per head fee on top of the flat pool hire age rate at the end of year school sports if the per head rate was dropped we would get more usage throughout the year from school with our programmes on offer.

Discussion

None

Stormwater Activity (Services)

196. Services - Parawai Stormwater upgrade in Thames

The Parawai Stormwater upgrade in Thames is not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included in the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal.

160 submitters responded to the question. Of those, 55 were in agreement, 21 disagreed and 84 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Council allocating funds to the Parawai stormwater upgrade in Thames include:

- *One submitter is of the opinion that this project should not be funded by district rates*
- *This is not a core responsibility of Council.*

Comments in support of the Council's proposal to not allocate funds to the Parawai stormwater upgrade in Thames include:

- *One submitter considered this to be an essential project.*

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for the Parawai stormwater upgrade in Thames.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amend the proposed budgets and make provision for the Parawai stormwater upgrades in the fourth and fifth years of the Ten Year Plan as follows; Year 4 \$478,000 and Year 5 \$661,200. These figures are in 2011/2012 dollars.

Staff reason for recommendation

The final stage of the Parawai works is intended to complete the works undertaken over recent years (including the current works in Fenton and Rolleston Streets). These works include a new 1200mm stormwater line on Parawai road from Oakley Crescent to Brunton Crescent and disposing to the Kauaeranga River. Also an upgrade to the existing pumpstation at the southern end of Rolleston Street would be completed. These upgrades would complete the network and enable previously completed stormwater upgrades to function. This total project will offer protection to dwelling inundation to approximately 9 properties. The total cost to complete these works is in the range of \$1,140,000.

Council resolution

That the Council amend the proposed budgets and make provision for the Parawai stormwater upgrades in the fourth and fifth years of the Ten Year Plan as follows; Year 4 \$478,000 and Year 5 \$661,200. These figures are in 2011/2012 dollars and subject to inflation.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The final stage of the Parawai works is intended to complete the works undertaken over recent years (including the current works in Fenton and Rolleston Streets). These works include a new 1200mm stormwater line on Parawai road from Oakley Crescent to Brunton Crescent and disposing to the Kauaeranga River. Also an upgrade to the existing pumpstation at the southern end of Rolleston Street would be completed. These upgrades would complete the network and enable previously completed stormwater upgrades to function. This total project will offer protection to dwelling inundation to approximately 9 properties. The total cost to complete these works is in the range of \$1,140,000.

Discussion

- Not included in draft Ten Year Plan.
- Nine possible affected properties.
- Last in the steps that Council has been undertaking.
- Work already undertaken will not perform as should be until this work is done.
- Stormwater infrastructure is very degraded.
- Majority will be on Thames rate at a cost of \$15 per ratepayer.
- Has the work the WRC has undertaken left properties unprotected? Council waiting on a reply from WRC.

Stormwater Activity (Services)

197. Services - Transfer of Kopu Land Drainage to Stormwater Activity

In the draft Ten Year Plan the Council proposed to absorb the Kopu land drainage activity into the stormwater activity. Three submissions were received regarding this.

Submitters 63 and 90 request that the Council does not amalgamate the Kopu land drainage unless that is what the current Kopu land drainage Committee requires.

The reasons provided is that the committee has been a successful community run entity and the costs will no doubt increase once under the oversight of the Council.

Submitter #197, the Kopu Landowner & Occupiers Association and the Kopu Land Drainage Committee note that the agreement to come within the Thames area for rating purposes is agreed in principle but the protocols have not yet been agreed.

One non-negotiable protocol will be that Kopu's share of the Thames rate will (per annum) be no less than \$35,000 and adjusted annually for CPI held in a separate account and will not be subject to the present 70% deduction for administrative charges.

The submitter notes that since 2011 they have been paying a targeted rate in addition to the stormwater charge.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the proposal to absorb the Kopu land drainage activity into the stormwater activity, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council incorporate the Kopu land drainage activity into the stormwater activity as proposed.

Staff reason for recommendation

Incorporating the Kopu land drainage activity into the stormwater activity is the most pragmatic option for the future of this activity. Thames has over time developed south towards Kopu with the stormwater infrastructure also being developed to a point where Kopu can be considered part of the Thames system. Having a separate activity for Kopu is less effective and more costly compared to the amalgamation with the Thames stormwater activity.

Council resolution

That the Council incorporate the Kopu land drainage activity into the stormwater activity as proposed.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Incorporating the Kopu land drainage activity into the stormwater activity is the most pragmatic option for the future of this activity. Thames has over time developed south towards Kopu with the stormwater infrastructure also being developed to a point where Kopu can be considered part of the Thames system. Having a separate activity for Kopu is less effective and more costly compared to the amalgamation with the Thames stormwater activity.

Discussion

None

Stormwater Activity (Services)

198. Services - Thames Community Board Area

Submitter #22 requests that the Council replace the Kakaramata conduit as a top priority.

The reasons provided include:

- *It's older than the old Kopu bridge and is falling apart.*
- *If it collapses, three blocks of houses will be flooded.*
- *Doing it now will cost less than it would cost later.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider the replacement of the Kakaramata conduit in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change is made to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Any renewal of this infrastructure would be completed under the currently proposed Thames Stormwater Renewals budgets. Previous investigations indicated a satisfactory condition at that time. Further routine investigations will be undertaken within the coming financial years to determine condition, performance and renewal priority.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Any renewal of this infrastructure would be completed under the currently proposed Thames Stormwater Renewals budgets. Previous investigations indicated a satisfactory condition at that time. Further routine investigations will be undertaken within the coming financial years to determine condition, performance and renewal priority.

Discussion

None

Water Supply Activity

199. Services - Fluoridation of Water Supplies

A number of submissions were received regarding the fluoridation of water supply.

*Nine submitters requested that the Council **does not fluoridate its water supplies.***

Submitter numbers include: 67, 89, 182, 336, 337, 487, 504, 506 and 734

Some submitters (336 and 337) specifically suggest that the Council either:

- end water fluoridation permanently and pass a bylaw prohibiting the use of public water supply for medical intervention purposes (recommended), or*
- suspend water fluoridation indefinitely, until such time as the international scientific community has reached a consensus that water fluoridation is safe, and can adduce a significant body of scientific evidence of benefit that meets the standard classified as 'A' by the York Review Board in its systematic review published in 2000.*

Some submitter's present further research papers that they would like elected members to read (67 and 89)

The reasons provided include:

- Citizens should have a choice of whether or not to use fluoride.*
- Fluoride is not good for the environment or public health.*
- Fluoridation in water supply is a form of medication and that medicating the population is outside the Council's role.*
- Fluoride does not work by swallowing.*

*One submitter (#189), the Ministry of Health requested that the Council **does fluoridate its water supplies.***

The Ministry of Health states that water fluoridation is a cost effective population-based strategy to assist in the prevention of dental caries in communities of over 1000 people.

Another submitter (#520), the Thames Community Board submits that the Council retains its existing practices in relation to fluoridation of Thames water.

Their reasons for this are:

- The Thames Community Board is not in a position to recommend a change until it is satisfied the issue warrants review and the various viewpoints are considered, including a referendum.*
- There is little financial impact from adding fluoride.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with its current approach to water fluoridation, as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the content of the submissions and continues to fluoridate the Thames water supply.

Staff reason for recommendation

There are strong viewpoints both for and against adding fluoride to municipal water supplies within the scientific community. Although Council has received a number of submissions in opposition to adding fluoride to the Thames water supply, Council should be acting on the advice and viewpoint provided by the Ministry of Health.

The Thames Community Board will have the best understanding of what its community feels on this topic. The Board has expressed that the Thames water supply should continue to have fluoride added to the water. The costs for adding fluoride to the Thames water supply is not significant and discontinuing the addition of fluoride would not result in financial savings of any significance.

Motion

That the Council cease adding fluoride to Thames water supply from 1 July 2012.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

For - four

Against - five

Motion defeated

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the content of the submissions
2. makes provision for the Thames Community Board to take the matter out for consultation to the Thames Community Board area as part of the 2013/2014 Annual Plan process.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Hoadley

Staff reason for recommendation

There are strong viewpoints both for and against adding fluoride to municipal water supplies within the scientific community. Although Council has received a number of submissions in opposition to adding fluoride to the Thames water supply, Council should be acting on the advice and viewpoint provided by the Ministry of Health.

The Thames Community Board would like the opportunity to consult the community on this matter through a formal council process.

Discussion

- Suggested that Council endorse the staff recommendation to continue fluoridation and send the final decision to the Thames Community Board for a final decision.
- There should be a proper consultation before making a decision.
- Questioned that why if MOH agrees with fluoride isn't the rest of the District being fluoridated?
- Should it be taken out and it can be put back if the consultation supports it?

Water Supply Activity

200. Services - Thames Valley / Matatoki

Water Treatment Plant Upgrade

The Thames Valley/Matatoki water treatment plant upgrade is not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific feedback question was asked to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal to not include this project in the Ten Year Plan.

161 submitters responded to the question. Of those, 52 were in agreement, 18 disagreed and 91 had no preference.

NB: When considering the submissions, staff are of the opinion that submitters may not have distinguished between Thames Valley Matatoki water supply and water treatment when answering this particular question.

Submitters who answered in favour of Council allocating budget for the water treatment plant upgrade included:

- This project should not be funded from district rates
- Council should explore all options including residential roof water collection as well as other alternative options for farmers
- Council should be conservative because of the number of people affected compared to the huge cost.
- The Matatoki water project should be a top priority for health and water quality in terms of taste and odour which is still bad after filtering, so a full treatment system in Matatoki is needed and the existing system should be split to supply the rural sector only

Submitters who were opposed of Council allocating budget for the Thames Valley Matatoki water treatment plant upgrade included:

- The Thames Valley Motorcycle Club does not support the proposal not to fund the Thames Valley and Matatoki water treatment plant project as this could affect motorcycling in the area, and the Club considers this detrimental.
- Not a core responsibility of Council.

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for the Thames Valley/Matatoki water treatment plant upgrade.

Staff recommendation

That the Council signals the potential that it may have to commit funding to the Thames Valley/Matatoki upgrade, but continues to develop options.

Staff reason for recommendation

Costs for a treatment plant in this area are high over the number of rating units that will directly connected. There is still some uncertainty remaining around the future legislative requirements that will enable these supplies to remain untreated and have the treatment undertaken at the point of entry to a dwelling. Once some certainty is gained over the requirement for Drinking Water Standard quality water, Council could revisit its requirements over treatment quality.

Concerns were raised in regards to the impact on recreational activities in the Matatoki/Thames Valley area. Staff do not believe that the recommendation of not funding a treatment plant for this area would be detrimental to recreational activities, including motorcycling.

Staff are currently working on the range of options and involving the community.

Council resolution

That the Council signals the potential that it may have to commit funding to the Thames Valley/Matatoki upgrade, but continues to develop options.

Moved - French

Seconded - Leach

Staff reason for recommendation

Costs for a treatment plant in this area are high over the number of rating units that will directly connected. There is still some uncertainty remaining around the future legislative requirements that will enable these supplies to remain untreated and have the treatment undertaken at the point of entry to a dwelling. Once some certainty is gained over the requirement for Drinking Water Standard quality water, Council could revisit its requirements over treatment quality.

Concerns were raised in regards to the impact on recreational activities in the Matatoki/Thames Valley area. Staff do not believe that the recommendation of not funding a treatment plant for this area would be detrimental to recreational activities, including motorcycling.

Staff are currently working on the range of options and involving the community.

Discussion

- There is no capital project associated in the Ten Year Plan.
- If required the plant would possibly cost \$9m.
- Effects 450 properties, of which 300 are residential.

Water Supply and Reticulation

Responses include those in support of and opposition to the proposal for the water supply programme in Thames Valley and Matatoki.

Submitter #520, the Thames Community Board requested that the Council:

- ***proceed with its intended district water supply schemes** of \$7.9m for Thames Valley (\$7.9m) and \$3.4m for Matatoki to enable new supplies and reticulation to be provided*
- *budget to provide a core raw water supply to the rural properties that maintains a similar level of service and is affordable*
- *explore delivery options, financial models and partnership models in consultation with affected communities.*

The reasons outlined for this request include:

- *The original schemes were originally developed by local rural communities primarily to provide water for farming needs.*
- *There are pressures of limited water supply from existing sources, poor infrastructure and regulatory obligations.*

Two further submissions noted requests with regards to the Thames Valley, specifically:

- *That the \$11,000 of renewal sums for the Thames Valley and Matatoki **water supplies be removed** (#204)*
- *That the Thames Valley **water scheme upgrade be withdrawn** (#199)*

The reasons outlined for these requests include:

- *There are only 300 ratepayers to cover loan repayments.*
- *The provision of potable water is not mandatory for these rural supplies*
- *Many users have expended funds on storage, treatment, and filtering of this water on site.*
- *A substantial reduction in water can be achieved through metering.*
- *A submitter is happy with the Omahu supply*
- *The project is unaffordable*
- *Treatment can be managed via filters at house entry.*

Council Decision Required

That the Council notes the staff submission regarding options for lowering the cost of water supply projects in Thames Valley and Matatoki

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes that staff are committed to looking at options for lowering the cost of the water supply projects in Thames Valley and Matatoki, and note that at the time of writing options are being further investigated and costed.

Staff reason for recommendation

- *The Council has indicated to staff that the current costs of the water supply projects in Thames Valley and Matatoki were costly and that options for lowering the cost of these projects should be further investigated.*
- *Further details will be presented to the Council as part of the hearings and deliberations process.*

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes that staff are committed to looking at options for lowering the cost of the water supply projects in Thames Valley and Matatoki
2. note that at the time of writing options are being further investigated and costed.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

- *The Council has indicated to staff that the current costs of the water supply projects in Thames Valley and Matatoki were costly and that options for lowering the cost of these projects should be further investigated.*
- *Further details will be presented to the Council as part of the hearings and deliberations process.*

Discussion

None

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain or amend the Water Supply programme in the Thames Valley and Matatoki.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission points and adjust the budgets allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan once the options investigations are completed and discussed with Council at the hearing.

Staff reason for recommendation

Nil

Delivery Options:

Council staff are currently investigating a number of options to how Council provides this service in the future.

Preliminary investigations will be completed prior to the Ten Year Plan deliberations and will be discussed with Council at that time. The result of these discussions will inform the budget requirements in the Ten Year Plan. Once this range of options has been assessed, communications with the community will continue.

There are a number of issues with the two supplies including; availability of water, Drinking Water standards, aged and degraded infrastructure and percentage of water being used for agricultural purposes.

Renewals:

A significant part of the project is to renew the existing infrastructure due to minimal renewals being undertaken in the past. It is for this reason that the renewal budgets and new supply budgets remain until delivery options are assessed by Council.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submission points
2. adjust the budgets allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan from \$11.3m to \$3.1m (uninflated), over 10 years as follows:

Thames Valley										
Year	2012/ 2013	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017/ 2018	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021	2021/ 2022
New Supply & Reticulation	\$292,913	\$315,910	\$597,930	\$177,499	\$131,145	\$131,145	\$131,145	\$131,145	\$131,145	\$131,145
Matatoki										
Year	2012/ 2013	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/ 2018	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021	2021/ 2022
New Supply & Reticulation	\$125,534	\$135,390	\$256,256	\$76,071	\$ 56,205	\$ 56,205	\$56,205	\$ 56,205	\$56,205	\$56,205

1. notes further options are being investigated.
2. notes in the Ten Year Plan further detail regarding the options that have been explored.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

For reasons of affordability the large capital works have been reviewed and an on-going programme of improvements has been designed.

Discussion

- Staff have looked at the budget and advise that a provision of \$8.7m is a prudent figure to have in the Plan. Currently the plan has TV \$7.9 and Matatoki \$3.4m.
- Using a 'placeholder figure' in the Plan does not signal a desire for any particular option and text added to say that the budget depends on which option is ultimately chosen and how that was funded.
- Regional Council consents do require pipework to be done.
- Funds do need to be spent regardless of which option is chosen.
- Staff are working on a range of options, do the various options need to be included in the text?
- Possibly a working committee will be put together to deal with the issue.
- Staff provided lowest cost option. Leaves it open for discussion with the community around hand back or partial hand back. Figures are not inflated
- Renewals stretched out over a 25year period.

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Deliberations - Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area

Table of Contents	Page No.
District Transportation.....	292
Local Transportation	294
Community Centres and Hall	299
Harbour Facilities	301
Libraries	306
Parks and Reserves	309

District Transportation Activity

1. Port Jackson Road

Submitter #680 requests the following in relation to Port Jackson.

1. That the **road surface** on the hill south of Port Jackson Bay and on the Waikawau Hill on the Port Charles Road **be made safe**.

The reasons provided include:

- The activity is to provide for people and goods to move safely around the District.
- The surfaces of the roads have insufficient gravel and is down to base clay in places.
- Vehicles are losing traction.
- There are steep cliffs on either side of the road.
- The dangers are exacerbated in wet weather.

2. That the **creek crossings** on the Port Jackson Road, and especially those over the Ohinewai, Port Jackson's Pahi and Muriwai Creeks, **be made safe**.

The reasons provided include:

- Travellers frequently have problems with the creek crossings, especially visitors from out of town who attempt to cross at full flood,
- Some cases have been extremely serious and required considerable attention.

3. That metal used on the Port Jackson road **does not contain gorse**.

The reason provided is

- The submitter considers gorse infested metal unacceptable.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council wishes to reconsider its levels of service / work programme in Port Jackson.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

A programme of unsealed road metal replacement is included in the draft Ten Year Plan. The unsealed road metal replacement programme is based on NZ gravel loss research and field observations. Our metal replacement programme allows for the replacement of unsealed road base course and wearing course metal. Staff are confident that areas where the clay sub-base is exposed are a very isolated occurrence and where present would be programmed for repair as a matter of urgency where identified through contractor inspections or reported by the public.

The condition of fords is reviewed biennially in conjunction with bridge inspections and programmed for replacement when replacement is the lowest whole of life cost. The replacement of Port Jackson No. 2 (RP 18.5km) and construction of a new ford over the Muriwai Stream on Fletcher Bay Road are projects included in the draft Ten Year Plan.

An on-going programme of safety improvements across the district is included the draft Ten Year Plan. Projects in the northern Coromandel will continue to be prioritised against others in the district.

Quarries supplying aggregate used on Council roads are required to be free of plant pests such as gorse as an on-going condition of their resource consent to operate.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. make no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Leach

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

A programme of unsealed road metal replacement is included in the draft Ten Year Plan. The unsealed road metal replacement programme is based on NZ gravel loss research and field observations. Our metal replacement programme allows for the replacement of unsealed road base course and wearing course metal. Staff are confident that areas where the clay sub-base is exposed are a very isolated occurrence and where present would be programmed for repair as a matter of urgency where identified through contractor inspections or reported by the public.

The condition of fords is reviewed biennially in conjunction with bridge inspections and programmed for replacement when replacement is the lowest whole of life cost. The replacement of Port Jackson No. 2 (RP 18.5km) and construction of a new ford over the Muriwai Stream on Fletcher Bay Road are projects included in the draft Ten Year Plan.

An on-going programme of safety improvements across the district is included the draft Ten Year Plan. Projects in the northern Coromandel will continue to be prioritised against others in the district. Quarries supplying aggregate used on Council roads are required to be free of plant pests such as gorse as an on-going condition of their resource consent to operate.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

202. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area- Pottery Lane and Cemetery Carpark Project

The Coromandel/Colville Community Board (# 191) requests the Council retain the Pottery Lane and Cemetery Carpark Sealing project.

Three further submissions were received requesting that the Pottery Lane upgrade link through to Blacksmiths Lane. (#677, #683 and #679)

The reasons outlined by these submitters include:

- *To create a truly viable service lane.*
- *This will enable vehicles to enter or exit from Kapanga Road*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will reconsider the scope of the Pottery Lane.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council's District Plan includes an area of private land designated to extend Pottery Lane through to Kapanga Road. Land purchase would be required prior to or as part of any Pottery Lane extension project. There is currently no project in the draft Ten Year Plan for extending Pottery Lane. The estimated cost to complete the Pottery Lane extension project requested in the submission (including land) is \$160,000. Although staff do not believe an extension to Pottery Lane is a priority for effective traffic management in Coromandel Town, Council may wish to seek comment from the Coromandel-Colville Community Board prior to making a decision on this matter.

Indicative Rating impact would be:

- *Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves*
- *Have assumed project would take place in Year 10 as is not deemed a priority*
- *Depreciation and interest cost per property - \$5.67*

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

Council's District Plan includes an area of private land designated to extend Pottery Lane through to Kapanga Road. Land purchase would be required prior to or as part of any Pottery Lane extension project. There is currently no project in the draft Ten Year Plan for extending Pottery Lane. The estimated cost to complete the Pottery Lane extension project requested in the submission (including land) is \$160,000.

Indicative Rating impact would be:

- Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves
- Have assumed project would take place in Year 10 as is not deemed a priority
- Depreciation and interest cost per property - \$5.67

Discussion

- Community Board is talking with people about land swaps.
- The new Four Square will have to participate.
- Trucks can't access the back of some shops so have to park on the main road to unload.
- Pottery Lane is the one to focus on.
- There may be some extra budget because the new supermarket will be picking up some of the sealing work that Council would have done.
- Community Board supports what is currently in the Ten Year Plan.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will retain the Cemetery Carpark project in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This project is to seal the existing unsealed shoulder and pipe the open drain on the northern side of Buffalo Road to form car parking for the Buffalo Road cemetery. Staff support the Coromandel-Colville Community Boards request to retain this project in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Leach

Reason for resolution

This project is to seal the existing unsealed shoulder and pipe the open drain on the northern side of Buffalo Road to form car parking for the Buffalo Road cemetery. Staff support the Coromandel-Colville Community Boards request to retain this project in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- Large open drain next to the road that people have to jump across.
- Community Board supports what is currently in the Ten Year Plan.

Local Transportation Activity

203. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area- New Project

Submitter #679 requests that a pedestrian walkway be created through 115 Kapanga Road from the Pottery Lane service lane alongside the building occupied by Harcourts.

No specific reasons were provided for this request.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider a project for a pedestrian walkway through Kapanga Road.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and recommends change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan if the Board advises that the local community can afford the project and consider it a priority.

Staff reason for recommendation

Council's District Plan includes an area of private land designated to extend Pottery Lane through to Kapanga Road. A walkway from Pottery Lane to Kapanga Road could be constructed as part of this Pottery lane extension project, although this project is not included in the draft Ten Year Plan. The estimated cost to complete an extension of Pottery Lane including Kapanga walkway as requested in the submission (including land) is estimated at \$160,000.

A public walking between Kapanga Road and Pottery Lane would not be a priority for effective traffic management in Coromandel Town, and also note the Coromandel-Colville Community Board has not provided a submission in support of this project. However the Board could explore the concept further.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan
3. refers the matter back to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

Council's District Plan includes an area of private land designated to extend Pottery Lane through to Kapanga Road. A walkway from Pottery Lane to Kapanga Road could be constructed as part of this Pottery lane extension project, although this project is not included in the draft Ten Year Plan. The estimated cost to complete an extension of Pottery Lane including Kapanga walkway as requested in the submission (including land) is estimated at \$160,000.

A public walking between Kapanga Road and Pottery Lane would not be a priority for effective traffic management in Coromandel Town, and also note the Coromandel-Colville Community Board has not provided a submission in support of this project. However the Board could explore the concept further.

Discussion

- There is a childcare centre and gym that can't be accessed and this work would allow for that.
- This is a combination of safety and convenience.
- There is local transportation budget for Coromandel for footpath construction.

Local Transportation Activity

204. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area- Heritage Lights Project

Submitter #242 requests that the Coromandel heritage lights project be brought forward from 2013-2014 to 2012-2013.

Three submitters (# 677, #683 and #679) request that funding be made available to install heritage lighting, heritage telephone boxes and heritage-sympathetic signage in the heritage zone in Coromandel.

The submitters note their reasons as follows:

- *To complement the heritage centre*
- *The Star and Garter Hotel is the first vision valuable tourists seen as they arrive but the current phone box, garden box and signage outside are an embarrassment*

These three submitters also suggest bringing forward the budget for Coromandel street lighting and footpaths to 2012/2013 for this purpose.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will bring forward the Coromandel Heritage lights project from 2013/2014 to 2012/2013 and reconsider the scope of this project.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is no specific project in the draft Ten Year Plan for upgrading the existing streetlights in the centre of Coromandel Town to heritage style lights. Provision for heritage light upgrades is included as part of the Coromandel-Colville Board Area street light improvement programme within the draft Ten Year Plan.

The Coromandel-Colville Community Board decided at their 22 June 2011 meeting that they would proceed with replacing existing streetlights in the CBD with heritage streetlights when existing streetlights were due for replacement.

This approach to upgrading to heritage lights ensures the work qualifies for NZTA subsidy. This upgrade programme would not qualify for NZTA subsidy if existing streetlights were upgraded before being due for replacement.

There is no project in the draft Ten Year Plan for replacing telephone boxes or signage in Coromandel Town with heritage style and any proposal to modify the town's appearance should be considered as part of an overall heritage plan for the town centre. Should the Coromandel-Colville Community Board support the need to develop a heritage plan for the town centre for implementation during the 2012-22 period, the Board may request a local budget is provided for inclusion in the next Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan budget
3. adjusts the text to better reflect the project.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

There is no specific project in the draft Ten Year Plan for upgrading the existing streetlights in the centre of Coromandel Town to heritage style lights. Provision for heritage light upgrades is included as part of the Coromandel-Colville Board Area street light improvement programme within the draft Ten Year Plan.

The Coromandel-Colville Community Board decided at their 22 June 2011 meeting that they would proceed with replacing existing streetlights in the CBD with heritage streetlights when existing streetlights were due for replacement.

This approach to upgrading to heritage lights ensures the work qualifies for NZTA subsidy. This upgrade programme would not qualify for NZTA subsidy if existing streetlights were upgraded before being due for replacement.

There is no project in the draft Ten Year Plan for replacing telephone boxes or signage in Coromandel Town with heritage style and any proposal to modify the town's appearance should be considered as part of an overall heritage plan for the town centre. Should the Coromandel-Colville Community Board support the need to develop a heritage plan for the town centre for implementation during the 2012-22 period, the Board may request a local budget is provided for inclusion in the next Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- Not currently well acknowledged in the Ten Year Plan. Text could be changed.

Community Centres and Halls Activity

205. Coromandel-Colville Community Board Area - Coromandel Citizen's Hall

Two submissions were received requesting funds for restoration works on the Coromandel Citizen's Hall.

Submitter #225 requests:

- That \$50,000 be provided in the 2012/2013 financial year to allow for the completion of stage 2 of the restoration of the Coromandel Citizen's Hall, and
- That \$50,000 be provided for in the 2014/2015 financial year to allow for the completion of stage 3 of the restoration of the Coromandel Citizen's Hall.
- That should the restoration be delayed, urgent work be undertaken to prevent further damage from ground flooding and broken spouting etc.

The submitter suggests that the project could be funded by the district rate.

The submitter notes that regardless of what happens to the hall, the Council is obliged by an agreement made in 1965 to provide the RSA (currently located on the premises) with premises.

The reasons provided for the request include:

- The hall is an iconic heritage building and an integral part of the heritage fabric of the town
- It is the only community owned, non secular, building available for hire
- Parts of the hall are in extremely poor condition
- The hall restoration has been underway for approximately 9 years, with charitable funding granted

Submitter #191, requests:

- That the Council carry over the \$92,000 in the 2011/2012 year to the 2012/2013 year to undertake work on the south/western wall of the Coromandel Hall.
- The submitter is currently reviewing the scope of the work and preliminary costs indicate the work will cost approximately \$125,000. NB: at the hearing, the submitter may request an increase to this budget by \$33,000.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will allocate funds to the restoration of the Coromandel Citizens Hall.

Staff recommendation

That the Council include a Coromandel Hall upgrade project in the 2012/2013 year of \$42,000.

Staff reason for recommendation

This is made up of carryover from 2011/2012 year of \$42,000.

The Board will consider a report at their 30 April meeting which will clarify the extent of the works required on the building to make it water tight. If the budget is required to be increased this will be provided at the Hearing.

Council resolution

That the Council include a Coromandel Hall upgrade project in the 2012/2013 year of \$92,000 plus inflation. (Notes that \$42,000 is a carry over and \$50,000 new).

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

This is made up of carryover from 2011/2012 year of \$42,000. The Board considered a report at their 30 April meeting which clarified the extent of the works required on the building to make it water tight. An increase is required to this budget.

Discussion

- Would like to do drainage and make building water tight.
- Original consent has lapsed.
- Coromandel-Colville Community Board wants \$125,000 to spend in total.
- 2011/2012 Annual Plan had \$90,000 in it. At the March budget review 2011/2012 was dropped to \$45,000 and balance carried over.

Harbour Facilities Activity

206. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area - Services

Submitter #472, Destination Coromandel, requests that the Ten Year Plan recognise the strategic priority of urgently developing an all-tide all weather wharf at Coromandel and make provision for an immediate term build.

The reason outlined for this refers to Barry Brickell's suggestion that a long wharf that is serviced by a railway transfer service is the sort of artisan and boutique solution that fits so well with the Coromandel township area.

Submitter #619 requests that the Council improve ferry facilities in Coromandel Harbour and consider the submitter's proposal for an extension of the present Coromandel Harbour wharf in the form of a railway trestle as a means to achieve this (see submission 619 for further details on the proposal).

The reason outlined for this includes:

- Improvements are needed to benefit tourism.
- The proposed extension would enable both recreational fishers and tourists to use the facility.

Submitter #679 requests that the Coromandel Wharf be upgraded and extended by building the wharf into deep water as it was in 1886 towards Ruffins Rocks with minimal dredging.

The reasons for this include:

- The work is vital to the town's economic growth and will open up one of the main and viable links (water access from Auckland)
- Hannaford's wharf is too congested
- Benefits will be widespread including to a range of industries

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the scope of its wharf services and projects in Coromandel.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and an intent to work with the Community Board on future wharfing options and associated channel work at Coromandel Town.

Staff reason for recommendation

Extending the small railway to the wharf, and providing a facility to allow the ferry to come in to Coromandel Wharf all-tide is an excellent idea. It will likely be done in partnership and Council would be eager to support a partnership.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions and an intent to work with the Community Board on future wharfing options and associated channel work at Coromandel Town
2. allocates \$15,000 to local strategic planning for a feasibility study in 2012/2013
3. allocates \$5,000 from economic development activity (district) for a feasibility study 2012/2013.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Extending the small railway to the wharf, and providing a facility to allow the ferry to come in to Coromandel Wharf all-tide is an excellent idea. It will likely be done in partnership and Council would be eager to support a partnership.

Discussion

- Coromandel wharf not currently provided for in the Ten Year Plan.
- Chief Executive feels the main money will be for consents and dredging.
- Would benefit from a feasibility study.
- \$5,000 in Economic Development budget. Community Board would like to put in \$15,000 from community plans for this work in 2012/2013.
- There is some investigative work already done which should be brought together with some figures.

Harbour Facilities Activity

207. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area- Hannafords Jetty Modifications

Seven submitters made comments in relation to the Hannaford's Jetty modifications project.

Four submitters requested that the \$275,000 allocated for the upgrade of the Hannaford's Wharf in 2013-2015 be retained.

Submitter numbers include 191, 203, 252 and 612.

Reasons in support of their request were:

- *As aquaculture uses of the Sugarloaf Wharf, the submitter is generally in favour of the separation of the ferry access from the Sugarloaf Wharf in order to avoid additional congestion.*
- *One submitter notes that the wharf needs to be done ASAP as it is a major tourism gateway and it's dangerous and dark.*

Two submitters (241 and 612) requested that the upgrade be funded by commercial users.

The reasons for this request were:

- *that the Jetty was never intended to accommodate commercial users but is now the case*
- *to offset the use of some of the rates.*

Submitter # 679 views that short-term development and upgrade of Hannaford's wharf is a waste of time and money and considers that there is no foresight being given to this.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider its approach the proposal, and in particular to funding the Hannaford's Jetty Modifications, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Whilst the money is committed to the strengthening and stabilising of Hannafords Jetty to make the ferry berth safer and more flexible for use, the ferry company has not yet been approached to provide financial input. This needs to be done concurrent with the proposed enhancement of Hannafords Jetty.

The other matter to be explored is the viability of the use of Coromandel Town's wharf in future as the location for the ferry, and what this may mean for Council's financial investment into Hannaford's Jetty.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Brljevič

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Whilst the money is committed to the strengthening and stabilising of Hannafords Jetty to make the ferry berth safer and more flexible for use, the ferry company has not yet been approached to provide financial input. This needs to be done concurrent with the proposed enhancement of Hannafords Jetty.

The other matter to be explored is the viability of the use of Coromandel Town's wharf in future as the location for the ferry, and what this may mean for Council's financial investment into Hannaford's Jetty.

Discussion

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board would like to be able to use the money at another wharf if desired.

Harbour Facilities Activity

208. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area -Fees and Charges

Two submissions were received regarding fees and charges specifically for Coromandel commercial wharfage fees.

The Coromandel/Colville Community Board (#191) requests:

- *that the fees for commercial wharfage at the Coromandel harbours be \$75.00/meter/pa + GST*
- *that these charges be enforced, and*
- *that all boats be charged the advertised amount.*

The reasons outlined for this request is that:

- *the collection of fees and charge from wharf users has been of concern to the submitter for some time.*

Submitter number 250 requests that the proposed commercial wharfage fees for Coromandel (per metre per annum) are reduced. The submitter suggests \$300 per metre per annum.

The reason outlined for this request is:

- *the submitter notes that while an increase is justified, the increase proposed would be a considerable cost for fishing charter operators.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the Coromandel commercial wharfage fees and also its approach to enforcement.

Staff recommendation

That the Council apply the fees of \$75 per metre per annum as suggested by the Coromandel-Colville Community Board.

Staff reason for recommendation

Community Board request.

There will be minimum impact as staff have been unable to find any per metre charges for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012. If we were to start collecting the fee then this would reduce the local rate requirement.

Council resolution

That the Council apply the fees of \$75 per metre per annum as suggested by the Coromandel-Colville Community Board.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

- Community Board request.
- There will be minimum impact as staff have been unable to find any per metre charges for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012.
- If Council were to start collecting the fee then this would reduce the local rate requirement.

Libraries Activity

209. Services - Coromandel Library

Nine submissions were received regarding the Coromandel library, in support of library services in Coromandel.

The submissions request:

- *That the Council/Community Board continues to support the Library financially by way of a grant.*
- *Some submitters request that the Service Agreement drawn up between the Coromandel Library Management Committee be extended to a three year period as would be outlined in the three year Service Agreement, rather than annually as it is at present (6 submissions in total)*
- *That the Council let the staff continue running this community service to its current outstanding standards.*

Submission number include: 54, 62, 77, 83, 95, 96, 101, 304 and 416

Reasons provided include:

- *The Library is immaculately presented, efficiently run, with high calibre and current books.*
- *The service provided is excellent.*
- *To provide for continuity and assured stability.*
- *To assist in keeping subscriptions and book purchase affordable.*

One submitter (#416) requests that the Ten Year Plan includes a commitment to work in partnership with the Coromandel library to improve the provision and make it more accessible and attractive to young people.

The reason provide is that high membership costs, a limited selection of appealing books and limited internet access mean that young people are not frequent users of the facility. Only 10.9% of youth surveyed said they used the library compared to 46.9% in Mercury Bay.

Council Decision Required

Whether the reconsiders its current approach to the Coromandel Library service.

Staff recommendation

That the Council commit to working in partnership with Coromandel Library while still retaining the community library model.

Staff reason for recommendation

Increased cooperation between community and Council Libraries has benefits for customers and staff of all libraries. Whilst still recognising the strong community support for Coromandel Library, working alongside Council Library staff would enhance the services currently provided, especially with regard to technology and by sharing the benefits currently enjoyed by Council libraries, through national and regional partnerships.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. commit to working in partnership with Coromandel Library while still retaining the community library model.
2. continue to provide annual service level agreement for the library until the community empowerment model is further implemented.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - French

Reason for resolution

Increased cooperation between community and Council Libraries has benefits for customers and staff of all libraries. Whilst still recognising the strong community support for Coromandel Library, working alongside Council Library staff would enhance the services currently provided, especially with regard to technology and by sharing the benefits currently enjoyed by Council libraries, through national and regional partnerships.

Discussion

- Year by year Service Level Agreement seems appropriate.

Libraries Activity

210. Services - Coromandel Library

Whilst outside the scope of the Ten Year Plan, nine submissions were received requesting that the Coromandel Library remains in its present building on its present site 140 Kapanga Road, Coromandel.

Reasons for the request include:

- *The location is central to the needs of the community and is of historic value.*
- *It has a large parking area.*
- *It is flat and wheelchair and push chair friendly.*
- *The adjacent garden area is used by local and visitors.*
- *Many of the volunteers are no longer young and they would be adversely affected by shifting to a less central site.*
- *Coromandel community has worked hard to construct the building.*
- *The building is light, airy and cool in summer yet small enough to be heated in winter.*
- *The library is appropriate to the size of the book collection.*
- *The building is an adequate size to cater for the community's needs.*

Submitter numbers are: 54, 62, 77, 83, 95, 96, 101, 304 and 612.

Council Decision Required

Outside the scope of the Ten Year Plan. No Council decision is required.

Staff recommendation

That the Community Board considers the issue further.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is no proposal to investigate relocation of the Coromandel Library. The Community Board have indicated a desire to communicate with the Library committee about improving the services provided at the library but this does not include relocation.

Local services have returned to Community Board leadership under the Community Empowerment Model.

Council resolution

That the Community Board considers the issue further, in the context of the community empowerment model.

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

There is no proposal to investigate relocation of the Coromandel Library. The Community Board have indicated a desire to communicate with the Library committee about improving the services provided at the library but this does not include relocation.

Local services have returned to Community Board leadership under the Community Empowerment Model.

Discussion

- *There was some discussion a round moving it to where the i-Site is.*

Parks and Reserves Activity

211. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area - Minor Works Funds

The Coromandel/Colville Community Board (# 191) request that the Council spend the minor works funds (renewals, minor reserve projects and reserve car park seals) on local assets around the area.

In particular, the Board requests that new play equipment for the Hauraki House reserve area be included in this work, and that the Coromandel-Colville Community Board be kept informed about these projects.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council can confirm it will spend the minor works funds (renewals, minor reserve projects and reserve car park seals) on local assets around the area, and keep the Community Board informed about these projects.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The budget for minor works has been set on the basis of completing works in accordance with priorities in reserves management plans. However, with the activity being delegated to Community Boards, the Community Board will be able to re-prioritise the works that make up this project as they see fit.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The budget for minor works has been set on the basis of completing works in accordance with priorities in reserves management plans. However, with the activity being delegated to Community Boards, the Community Board will be able to re-prioritise the works that make up this project as they see fit.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

212. Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area - Sportsville

Coromandel Sportsville project is not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal to not include this project in the Ten Year Plan.

163 submitters responded to this question. Of these, 76 people were in agreement, 28 disagreed and 59 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Coromandel Sportsville include:

- *Three comments were received in favour of this project being included in the draft Ten Year Plan.*

Comments against the Coromandel Sportsville include:

- *One comment was received opposing this project stating that it should not be funded from district rates.*

The Coromandel/Colville Community Board (# 191) request that support be provided to the Board to develop a comprehensive plan for the on-going use and development of the Park in Coromandel. The Board advise that they are not aware of the background to the proposed budget of \$550,000.

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for Coromandel Sportsville.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Providing funding for the development of the Coromandel Sportsville can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan as costs and priorities are established through the Community Board plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. allocates \$20,000 in 2012/2013 from the Parks and Reserve activity to confirm a concept for the Coromandel Sportsville project (capital project)
3. adjusts the Ten Year Plan text to reflect this project.

Moved - Brljevich

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Providing funding for the development of the Coromandel Sportsville can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan as costs and priorities are established through the Community Board plan. Investigation funds are required in the meantime to confirm a concept for the project.

Discussion

- Included on submission form.
- A contract has been signed off in 2008, but it is felt that work has not been done as specified.
- Do we need to look at whether we have any come back on getting the retention money back?
- Need to confirm which concept the Community Board wants to progress.
- Budget of \$20,000 in 2012/2013 from Parks and Reserves as a capital project to get an agreed and locked in concept.
- There is a current potential flood issue for the Fire Station because of the drainage issue on the fields.

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Deliberations - Mercury Bay Community Board Area

Table of Contents	Page No.
District Transportation.....	312
Local Transportation	315
Airfields.....	326
Cemeteries.....	327
Community Centres and Hall	328
Public Conveniences	332
Harbour Facilities	333
Parks and Reserves	336
Social Development	344
Water Supply	347
Wastewater	349
Solid Waste	351
Emergency Management.....	352

District Transportation Activity

1. Comments Regarding Existing Projects - Dalmaneys Corner Flood Mitigation

Dalmaneys Corner Flood Mitigation (Mercury Bay South Area)

One submission was received in support of this project (#213)

The same submitter also requested that a flood detector be installed to activate electronic warning signs.

The reasons outlined by the submitter include:

- *That this project is urgently needed as the road is currently impassable during intense rain.*
- *Flooding can occur rapidly and there are no alternative routes or public warning system.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the scope of the Dalmaneys Corner Flood Mitigation project so that it takes into account electronic warning signs.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This project is scheduled to be completed over the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 years. The project phases provided for in the draft Ten Year Plan are design (including resource consents) in 2012/2013 and physical works in 2013/2014.

There will be an opportunity to include some method of flood detection in the scope of the project, although staff note that the ability to traverse the area is dependent on vehicle type and driver ability and any warning system (electronic or other) would need to provide motorists of crossing risk information, depending on flood levels.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

This project is scheduled to be completed over the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 years. The project phases provided for in the draft Ten Year Plan are design (including resource consents) in 2012/2013 and physical works in 2013/2014.

There will be an opportunity to include some method of flood detection in the scope of the project, although staff note that the ability to traverse the area is dependent on vehicle type and driver ability and any warning system (electronic or other) would need to provide motorists of crossing risk information, depending on flood levels.

Discussion

- Possible that NZTA funding will not be available.

District Transportation Activity

214. New Project Request - Flaxmill Bay Culvert

Flaxmill Bay Culvert

Submitter number 49 requested that the Council increase the diameter of the culvert under the ford at Flaxmill Bay to at least 1.5m. The submitter also offers to assist in the cost of this project.

Reason for request as outlined by the submitter:

- The small size of the culvert causes water to back up then flood.
- It subsequently damages bank stability and native plantings, and proposes a serious danger to life.
- The submitter notes that they have spoken to staff who say this proposal is possible.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider a project to increase the diameter of the culvert under the ford at Flaxmill Bay.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Provision for road drainage improvements such as that requested for the Flaxmill Bay ford culvert are included in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Road drainage improvements are prioritised across the district, using a risk-based approach. Culvert upgrading at the Flaxmill Bay ford has a low ranking due to the relatively infrequent flooding and the area of benefit if the culvert capacity was increased. Project priority could be re-evaluated given the offer to contribute toward project costs.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Leach

Seconded Fox

Reason for resolution

Provision for road drainage improvements such as that requested for the Flaxmill Bay ford culvert are included in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Road drainage improvements are prioritised across the district, using a risk-based approach. Culvert upgrading at the Flaxmill Bay ford has a low ranking due to the relatively infrequent flooding and the area of benefit if the culvert capacity was increased. Project priority could be re-evaluated given the offer to contribute toward project costs.

Discussion

None

District Transportation Activity

215. Pedestrian Crossing near Mercury Bay Area School

Submitter #626 requests that an additional pedestrian crossing be installed opposite the Cook Drive/Heritage Close pedestrian walkway.

The reasons provided include:

- *Would provide a vital pedestrian link to ease congestion and provide easier access to Mercury Bay Area School.*
- *It would enable parents to be confident that their children are able to cross Cook Drive*
- *Better pedestrian linkages may reduce the number of vehicles to the school and promote a healthy lifestyle by enabling children to walk/bike safely*
- *The School has agreed to provide staff supervision of the crossing.*

Council Decision Required

Whether a pedestrian crossing near the Mercury Bay Area School be provided for in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan, and that the Community Board consider the matter further in the 2012/2013 year.

Staff reason for recommendation

Road safety improvement projects are funded from the district minor improvement budget in the draft Ten Year Plan. As part of the 2010/2011 minor improvement programme a crossing point to the Heritage Close walkway was formed and a school threshold treatment was installed north of this crossing point on Cook Drive to raise motorist's awareness that they were entering a school zone.

Staff will investigate the possibility of upgrading the crossing point on Cook Drive to a Kea crossing, which are operated by students and supervised by teachers. Kea crossings operate at the start and end of the school day allowing alternating pedestrian / motorist priority during periods of high pedestrian flows on Cook Drive enabling school children to cross the road safely. If a Kea crossing meets the necessary criteria, it will be prioritised against other minor improvement projects across the district.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan
3. refer to the Community Board to consider the matter further in the 2012/2013 year.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Road safety improvement projects are funded from the district minor improvement budget in the draft Ten Year Plan. As part of the 2010/2011 minor improvement programme a crossing point to the Heritage Close walkway was formed and a school threshold treatment was installed north of this crossing point on Cook Drive to raise motorist's awareness that they were entering a school zone.

Staff will investigate the possibility of upgrading the crossing point on Cook Drive to a Kea crossing, which are operated by students and supervised by teachers. Kea crossings operate at the start and end of the school day allowing alternating pedestrian / motorist priority during periods of high pedestrian flows on Cook Drive enabling school children to cross the road safely. If a Kea crossing meets the necessary criteria, it will be prioritised against other minor improvement projects across the district.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

216. Mercury Bay Community Board Area – Lee Street Car Parking

The draft Ten Year Plan outlined that for the Lee St car parking in Whitianga the Council considers a joint venture arrangement will occur and is looking to facilitate way to make this project happen so that the cost does not rest with the Council and its ratepayers.

As such, not budget was allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan for this project.

The submission form specifically asked submitters whether they agreed with the Council not providing funding for this project. 164 submitters responded to this question. Of those, 84 of agreed with the proposal, 15 disagreed and 65 had no preference.

Comments to this question included:

- This is not a core Council responsibility.
- This project should not be funded by district rates.
- User pays parking is a good concept.

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) request that the Council note the submitter's acknowledgement that the proposal to upgrade the Lee St carpark has been removed from the plan and their wish that this not be 'lost'. They further note that the proposal is to provide for growth and for an emergency evacuation point.

Council Decision Required

Whether the proposal to not allocate funds for Lee Street Car Parking in Whitianga, as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan be adopted.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Mercury Bay Community Boards' comments regarding not losing the proposal to upgrade the Lee Street car park are noted. This project remains outside the draft Ten Year Plan programme, but is retained on the longer term capex programme, as the project will ultimately be driven by growth in Whitianga, and an anchor funding partner.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded- McLean

Reason for resolution

Mercury Bay Community Boards' comments regarding not losing the proposal to upgrade the Lee Street car park are noted. This project remains outside the draft Ten Year Plan programme, but is retained on the longer term capex programme, as the project will ultimately be driven by growth in Whitianga, and an anchor funding partner.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

217. Mercury Bay Community Board Area – Lee Road, Hahei

A late submission was received (#736) requesting that the draft Ten Year Plan be amended to incorporate an undertaking to seal Lees Road in conjunction with the appropriate contribution from the property owners that use the road and to facilitate this at the earliest possible opportunity.

Refer to the submission for further details regarding the costs and offer from property owners in the area.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider including the Lees Road seal extension project in the 2012-22 Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council include the Lees Road seal extension project at a cost of \$650,000 in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan (\$50,000 in 2013/2014 and \$600,000 in 2014/2015) subject to:

- *support from the Mercury Bay Community Board that the project be joint funded by adjoining landowners and from Mercury Bay Local Transportation, and if so*
- *Board recommendation on their share of project costs.*

Staff reason for recommendation

The traction seal project referred to is programmed for completion in 2014/5. Any further seal extension project should be completed in conjunction with this project to minimise establishment costs and disruption to road users. In order for any work (including investigation/design) to proceed, the adjoining owners contribution toward costs should be held by Council by 30 June of the preceding financial year from the year in which the particular phase of work is programmed.

Staff do not support sealing the remaining unsealed sections of Lees Road to a dust seal standard, as this involves sealing the existing road with minimal improvements to road width and drainage. Dust sealing the full length would cause vehicle speeds to increase, without improvements such as widening and geometric improvements necessary to ensure the road would remain safe (as required as part of a seal extension project). An economic evaluation is yet to be completed.

Council resolution

That the Council include the Lees Road seal extension project at a cost of \$680,000 in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan (\$30,000 in 2012/2013 and \$650,000 in 2013/14) subject to:

- *support from the Mercury Bay Community Board that the project be joint funded by adjoining landowners and from Mercury Bay Local Transportation, and if so*
- *Board recommendation on their share of project costs.*
- *agreement on scope of the project by the TCDC Roading Manager and Mercury Bay Community Board.*

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The traction seal project referred to is programmed for completion in 2014/15. Any further seal extension project should be completed in conjunction with this project to minimise establishment costs and disruption to road users. In order for any work (including investigation/design) to proceed, the adjoining owners contribution toward costs should be held by Council by 30 June of the preceding financial year from the year in which the particular phase of work is programmed. Staff do not support sealing the remaining unsealed sections of Lees Road to a dust seal standard, as this involves sealing the existing road with minimal improvements to road width and drainage. Dust sealing the full length would cause vehicle speeds to increase, without improvements such as widening and geometric improvements necessary to ensure the road would remain safe (as required as part of a seal extension project). An economic evaluation is yet to be completed.

Discussion

- There is a difference between the standard that the submitter is proposing and what Council would do.
- If the standard is not high enough will cause Council to incur maintenance charges.
- There is budget for investigation design in year one and work in year 2, a total of \$680,000.

Local Transportation Activity

218. Mercury Bay Community Board Area – Kuaotunu Footpath Services

Three submitters request footpath works in Kuaotunu, as follows:

- The footpath on State Highway 25 project be included in the Ten Year Plan (submitter #210)
- That a footpath be provided from Bluff Road to the Town Centre at Kuaotunu (submitter #272)
- A submitter further notes that Kuaotunu is in desperate need of footpaths from the Waitaia Road right through to Kuaotunu West.

The reasons provided by all submitters are all similar, and include:

- The footpaths are required for safety reasons
- Walking on the road is dangerous in areas of Kuaotunu

Council Decision Required

Whether specific footpath works in Kuaotunu should be provided for in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

1. That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.
2. That the Community Board consider the matter further under the Community Empowerment Model.

Staff reason for recommendation

All new footpath construction projects in each Community Board Area are prioritised based on pedestrian safety benefits and include factors such as pedestrian volumes, traffic volumes and available berm width and consulted with Board members. The sections of footpaths requested within Kuaotunu are included within the Mercury Bay footpath construction programme used to develop the draft Ten Year Plan. However as a local activity, the Community Board may reconsider the matter further.

Council resolution

1. That the Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.
2. That the Community Board consider the matter further under the Community Empowerment Model.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Staff reason for recommendation

All new footpath construction projects in each Community Board Area are prioritised based on pedestrian safety benefits and include factors such as pedestrian volumes, traffic volumes and available berm width and consulted with Board members. The sections of footpaths requested within Kuaotunu are included within the Mercury Bay footpath construction programme used to develop the draft Ten Year Plan. However as a local activity, the Community Board may reconsider the matter further.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

219. Mercury Bay Community Board Area –Footpaths around Mercury Bay Area School

Submitter #626 requests that footpaths within a 200m radius of Mercury Bay Area School be widened and improved to allow adequate drainage.

The reasons provided include:

- *The current paths are over-congested and do not allow for safe pedestrian flow.*
- *The current paths do not drain properly and have no grass edging which results in children having wet and dirty feet*

Note the submitter has attached photos illustrating the problem areas. Please refer to the submission.

Council Decision Required

Whether specific footpath works around the Mercury Bay Area School be provided for in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

1. *That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.*
2. *That the Community Board consider the matter further under the Community Empowerment Model.*

Staff reason for recommendation

Sections of the existing footpath around the Mercury Bay Area school are old and under the current minimum footpath width of 1.5 metres. There is currently no budget in the draft Ten Year Plan to widen existing old and under width footpaths near the Mercury Bay Area School. Widening the existing footpath does not qualify for NZTA subsidy on safety grounds and therefore could not be completed as a footpath construction project using Council's new level of service for footpath construction proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Whilst the requested scope of the works is unclear staff estimate of the cost of the request is approximately \$180,000.

Staff note that under Council's community empowerment model the Community Board will in the future consider requests such as this.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- *Unclear as to whether there would be an additional capacity portion to this project. The increased levels of service portion would be funded by Depreciation Reserves and the additional capacity portion by either Contribution Reserves or Additional Capacity Loan*
- *No indication of what year to take place so have worked on project being completed in 2012/2013*
- *Depreciation and interest cost per property = \$1.97*

Council resolution

1. *That the Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.*
2. *That the Community Board consider the matter further under the Community Empowerment Model.*

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Sections of the existing footpath around the Mercury Bay Area school are old and under the current minimum footpath width of 1.5 metres. There is currently no budget in the draft Ten Year Plan to widen existing old and under width footpaths near the Mercury Bay Area School. Widening the existing footpath does not qualify for NZTA subsidy on safety grounds and therefore could not be completed as a footpath construction project using Council's new level of service for

footpath construction proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan. Whilst the requested scope of the works is unclear staff estimate of the cost of the request is approximately \$180,000.

Under Council's community empowerment model the Community Board will in the future consider requests such as this.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

221. Mercury Bay Community Board Area – Whitianga Town Entrance Project

- Two submitters requests that the Council does not make the Whitianga Town Entrance project a priority
- Submitter numbers are 287 and 252
- The reasons provided note concern regarding the cost of the project.
- One submitter suggests instead that the work could be done by the Lions.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the Whitianga Town Entrance Project in 2017/2018 year, or amend the timeframe.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This project is for the formation of a lay-by area and Whitianga information sign adjacent SH25, near Golf Road at the southern entrance to Whitianga during 2017/2018 of the Ten Year Plan. Alternate options available to complete this project include using input from community groups, Iwi, local designers and contractors to assist with development and completion of this project. The project scope can be completed and amendment made as part of the 2015 - 2025 Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

This project is for the formation of a lay-by area and Whitianga information sign adjacent SH25, near Golf Road at the southern entrance to Whitianga during 2017/2018 of the Ten Year Plan. Alternate options available to complete this project include using input from community groups, Iwi, local designers and contractors to assist with development and completion of this project. The project scope can be completed and amendment made as part of the 2015 - 2025 Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

222. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Summer Shuttle Service

One submitter, the Waikato Regional Council (#280), requested that the Council consider permanently funding the Mercury Bay Summer Shuttle, and note the Waikato Regional Council's invitation to work with the Council to determine the future of the services.

The reason for this request outlined by the submitter is that the summer shuttle has demonstrated great value to the communities. Over 34,500 passenger trips have been made, reducing local road congestion over the busy summer period.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain or increase its level of service regarding public transport in peak summer holiday periods.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Budgets provided in the draft Ten Year Plan are indicative of those required, noting that a review undertaken following completion of the 2011/2012 summer shuttle and park and ride services has identified a number of factors to consider in order to maximise value from these services in going forward. These include:

- More focused promotion and marketing of the summer shuttle service to improve patronage
- Working closer with the service provider (Murphy Buses) to improve marketing for the summer shuttle service
- Opportunity to utilise summer shuttle service for access to events such as Coro Gold
- Extend the duration of the Hahei Park and Ride service to Auckland Anniversary weekend to align with the summer shuttle service and reduce congestion on Grange Road and ensure visitors to Cathedral Cove are provided with an acceptable service during the peak visitor season
- Review the need for the Park and Ride service following the Department of Conservation's planned Cathedral Cove car park development in 2013/2014.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Budgets provided in the draft Ten Year Plan are indicative of those required, noting that a review undertaken following completion of the 2011/2012 summer shuttle and park and ride services has identified a number of factors to consider in order to maximise value from these services in going forward. These include:

- More focused promotion and marketing of the summer shuttle service to improve patronage
- Working closer with the service provider (Murphy Buses) to improve marketing for the summer shuttle service
- Opportunity to utilise summer shuttle service for access to events such as Coro Gold
- Extend the duration of the Hahei Park and Ride service to Auckland Anniversary weekend to align with the summer shuttle service and reduce congestion on Grange Road and ensure visitors to Cathedral Cove are provided with an acceptable service during the peak visitor season
- Review the need for the Park and Ride service following the Department of Conservation's planned Cathedral Cove car park development in 2013/2014.

Discussion

- Now that it is up and running should it go to commercial now?

Local Transportation Activity

223. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Black Jack Road

Two submitters (#507 and #508) request that the sealing of Black Jack Road to Opito Bay be completed within the ten years, including safety improvements.

The reasons outlined include:

- The settlements of Otama, Opito and Matapaua are the biggest group of settlements that still have metal roads.
- The number of heavy trucks, especially logging, is increasing.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider a road sealing project for Black Jack Road within the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Seal extension projects are completed in line with Council's Land Transport Strategy. Seal extension is only undertaken where necessary to improve vehicle traction on steep gradients, on high maintenance sites such as unsealed bridge approaches and where road dust is causing a nuisance to adjoining properties.

Over the past four years approximately 3.5km of seal extension has been completed on Black Jack Road and with the except of a portion of the Opito hill there are no further sections that meet Council's seal extension criteria.

If the Council want to seal the balance of Black Jack Road sealed a locally funded seal extension project will need to be included in the next Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded -Fox

Reason for resolution

Seal extension projects are completed in line with Council's Land Transport Strategy. Seal extension is only undertaken where necessary to improve vehicle traction on steep gradients, on high maintenance sites such as unsealed bridge approaches and where road dust is causing a nuisance to adjoining properties.

Over the past four years approximately 3.5km of seal extension has been completed on Black Jack Road and with the except of a portion of the Opito hill there are no further sections that meet Council's seal extension criteria.

Discussion

- Not all the road qualifies for subsidy.

Local Transportation Activity

224. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Skipper Road

Two submissions (#596 and #512) request that the sealing of Skippers Road be completed within the ten years.

The reasons outlined include:

- The submitters consider Skippers Road to possibly be the last urban road of that calibre that is not sealed.
- The submitters query what will happen if the developer does not proceed with the proposed subdivision

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a project for sealing Skippers Road.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan

Staff reason for recommendation

It remains a condition of the developer's resource consent that they upgrade and seal Skippers Road as this work was to be completed in lieu of paying local transportation development contributions.

The project is therefore not included on any of Council's sealing programmes.

Should the developer not proceed with their subdivision within the period of the resource consent (due to expire in 2015), the consent will lapse and Council could then consider the priority for Skippers Road to be sealed.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. make no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

It remains a condition of the developer's resource consent that they upgrade and seal Skippers Road as this work was to be completed in lieu of paying local transportation development contributions.

The project is therefore not included on any of Council's sealing programmes.

Should the developer not proceed with their subdivision within the period of the resource consent (due to expire in 2015), the consent will lapse and Council could then consider the priority for Skippers Road to be sealed.

Discussion

- Not in Ten Year Plan yet.

Airfields Activity

225. Services - Mercury Bay

Submitter #472 requests that the Ten Year Plan make provision for Council to liaise with air transport providers in order to immediately advance the development of a cost proposal and feasibility for an upgraded airport at Whitianga, to include an all-weather tarmac runway with such facilities as are necessary to enable night landings, with a view to such an upgrade being completed by 2015.

The reason provided is to make the Coromandel more attractive to new residents, visitors and new investment.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers provision of an upgraded airfield in Whitianga.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the Ten Year Plan pending further investigation through the Board.

Staff reason for recommendation

Whilst the Whitianga Aero Club is a privately owned and operated facility, and Council's policy is to not increase its involvement in such activities, Council also recognises the connection between enhanced airfield facilities and economic opportunities. For this reason it is suggested that the Community Development Officer explore the concept further in partnership with the Aero Club.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan pending further investigation through the Board.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Whilst the Whitianga Aero Club is a privately owned and operated facility, and Council's policy is to not increase its involvement in such activities, Council also recognises the connection between enhanced airfield facilities and economic opportunities. For this reason it is suggested that the Community Development Officer explore the concept further in partnership with the Aero Club.

Discussion

- The Community Board is developing a relationship with them.

Cemeteries Activity

226. Services - Mercury Bay Cemetery

Three submissions concerning the Mercury Bay cemetery development were received.

Two in support (#287 and #193, the Mercury Bay Community Board), requesting that the proposal to develop a new cemetery be retained.

One submitter (#287) in support of the proposal requested that no additional funds should be spent on this land until it is required.

Another submitter queried whether a hillside is really the best location for a cemetery development, but did note that the development was needed.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the Mercury Bay Cemetery Development (stage one) as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012 - 2022 Ten Year Plan

Staff reason for recommendation

There is budget in 2012/13 to develop Stage One of the cemetery, which will include the new road entrance (required by NZTA as a mitigation of effects under the resource consent), refinement of the landscape concept plan, some boundary planting, and introduction of the first section of plots. There is no intention to develop the whole cemetery at one time, as it is a large area and development of the whole cemetery is unnecessary at present. However, some capacity will need to be created immediately to ease concerns regarding capacity at Ferry Landing. The cemetery topography is too hilly for graves around the edge, but includes substantial areas of flat to slightly hilly terrain, which is entirely suitable for plots. Geotechnical studies have already been completed to confirm suitability.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012- 2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

There is budget in 2012/13 to develop Stage One of the cemetery, which will include the new road entrance (required by NZTA as a mitigation of effects under the resource consent), refinement of the landscape concept plan, some boundary planting, and introduction of the first section of plots. There is no intention to develop the whole cemetery at one time, as it is a large area and development of the whole cemetery is unnecessary at present. However, some capacity will need to be created immediately to ease concerns regarding capacity at Ferry Landing. The cemetery topography is too hilly for graves around the edge, but includes substantial areas of flat to slightly hilly terrain, which is entirely suitable for plots. Geotechnical studies have already been completed to confirm suitability.

Discussion

- Currently a District project.
- Sitting in year one of the Ten Year Plan.
- Funding will be reviewed in year two.

Community Centres and Halls Activity

227. Services - Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Whitianga Hall

Submitter #193, the Mercury Bay Community Board, requests that \$100,000 be provided for scoping and researching options for upgrading the Whitianga hall into a combined community Civic Centre in the year 2021/2022, including a complete review of how the relevant Council services will be delivered.

The reason provided is that the submitter considers the combined centre to be a key strategic development and that planning should commence in years 9 or 10 of the Ten Year Plan.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council allocate funds for scoping and researching options for upgrading the Whitianga Hall.

Staff recommendation

That the Council support the provision in 2021/2022 year (year ten) of \$100,000 as research/scoping into a proposed upgrade of the existing Whitianga town hall to a combined Civic centre.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Whitianga town hall is a tier one facility. It will be maintained in the interim. However in ten year's time the Board will be required to undertake more substantial repairs on the building and this is the opportune time to research and scope the future requirements and the option of an expanded Civic Centre.

Council resolution

That the Council support the provision in 2021/2022 year (year ten) of \$100,000 as research/scoping into a proposed upgrade of the existing Whitianga town hall to a combined Civic centre.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Whitianga town hall is a tier one facility. It will be maintained in the interim. However in ten year's time the Board will be required to undertake more substantial repairs on the building and this is the opportune time to research and scope the future requirements and the option of an expanded Civic Centre.

Discussion

None

Community Centres and Halls Activity

228. Services - Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Hahei Hall

Two submissions were received regarding the Hahei Hall requesting funds for upgrade works.

Submitter #482 requests:

- That \$55,000 be allocated from the 2012/2013 Reserves Depreciation Account to supplement the Hahei Community Centre upgrade (additional to the \$11,000 previously approved for the kitchen upgrade), and that all associated building consent costs associated with the centre be waived

The reasons for this request include:

- The Hahei Community Centre is the hub and heart of the community and is frequently used for a variety of purposes by a range of organisations in the community.
- The upgrade of the Community Centre will cost \$195,000 plus the associated TCDC Building Consent fees.
- The building does not comply with current regulations pertaining to the egress and toilet facilities.
- The submitter considers it would be neither equitable nor realistic for local ratepayers to fund the upgrades, many of whom have already paid rates to cover halls, libraries and reserves and who have paid development contributions.
- The UAGC allocated for Halls and Libraries from the Hahei rates far exceed any finance that has been allocated locally, and for many years Hahei has not had any specific projects carried out that have been drawn from the retained earnings.
- The submitter considers that some of today's challenges have been brought about by poor decision making.
- The Council owns the building and has been remiss in not having an on-going capital works programme to ensure buildings are maintained and upgraded.
- The Hahei Community Centre will undertake the responsibility to raise the additional \$129,000 and to implement the project.
- The Hahei Community Centre Depreciation Account has a reserve account of \$494,317 as at 30 June 2012 and is the appropriate account to draw these funds from.

Submitter #193, the Mercury Bay Community Board, requests that the \$11,000 contribution to the Hahei Community Centre's interior and kitchen upgrade be re-budgeted in the 2012/2013 year.

The reason provided is that the upgrade plans are progressing but additional funding required has not yet been secured.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council allocate funds for upgrades to the Hahei Community Hall.

Staff recommendation

That the Council roll over the Hahei hall upgrade budget from the 2011/2012 year to the 2012/2013 year, but there be no further increase in the budget.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Board have committed to contributing to the refurbishment of the Hahei hall Kitchen and ablution areas. The Hahei Community Centre Incorporated has undertaken a much wider needs assessment for the facility and has designed an expanded and upgraded building. The Board applaud the society for this work but in line with Council's policy are not prepared to increase their contribution to the upgrade from the \$11,000 proposed.

Due to the delay in the Society preceding with their upgrade the budget allocation for the 2011/2012 year has not been required and the Board want it carried over so it is available when the Society is able to proceed.

That the Council roll over the Hahei hall upgrade budget from the 2011/2012 year to the 2012/2013 year, and refer the matter back to the Mercury Bay Community Board for further consideration.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. roll over the Hahei hall upgrade budget from the 2011/2012 year to the 2012/2013 year
2. refer the matter back to the Mercury Bay Community Board for further consideration.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Board have committed to contributing to the refurbishment of the Hahei hall Kitchen and ablution areas. The Hahei Community Centre Incorporated has undertaken a much wider needs assessment for the facility and has designed an expanded and upgraded building. The Board applaud the society for this work but in line with Council's policy are not prepared to increase their contribution to the upgrade from the \$11,000 proposed.

Due to the delay in the Society preceding with their upgrade the budget allocation for the 2011/2012 year has not been required and the Board requested the funds be carried over so it is available when the Society is able to proceed.

Discussion

None

Community Centres and Halls

229. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Te Rerenga Hall

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council removes reference to Te Rerenga hall from the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That reference to Te Rerenga hall be removed from the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The plan refers to removing funding from community owned and managed halls which includes Te Rerenga, however this hall has been sold and is now a private residence. The budget for this hall had already been removed from the Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council remove reference to Te Rerenga hall from the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The plan refers to removing funding from community owned and managed halls which includes Te Rerenga, however this hall has been sold and is now a private residence. The budget for this hall had already been removed from the Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

None

Public Conveniences Activity

230. Projects - Hot Water Beach Superloo

The Mercury Bay Community Board, submission #193, requests that a review of the need to upgrade the Hot Water Beach public toilets be undertaken.

The reason outlined for the request is that the submitter considers there are options to assist improvements and management of this area and facilities.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the Hot Water Beach Superloo project in the Ten Year Plan as proposed (2017/2018 - 2018/2019), or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The project is planned for the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 years. The project can be reviewed by the Community Board and any changes proposed as part of the 2015 - 2025 Ten Year Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The project is planned for the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 years. The project can be reviewed by the Community Board and any changes proposed as part of the 2015 - 2025 Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- Funding may change from district to local.

Harbour Facilities Activity

231. Mercury Bay Community Board Area -Fees and Charges

One submission was received specifically regarding fees and charges for Mercury Bay Harbour Facilities activity.

Submitter #29 requests that the Council charge fees for the Kuaotunu Boat ramp to non-locals.

The reasons outlined for this request is that:

- *the boat ramp is used by boat owners from Matarangi, Whitianga, Coromandel Town and beyond and the locals complain that they cannot use their own boat ramp.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider boat ramp fees and charges for non-locals.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan. It is noted that this function returns to the Community Board for decision-making under the community empowerment model along with costs of the boat ramps needing to be met by Boards.

Staff reason for recommendation

This would be difficult to enforce and is also acknowledged that many non-residents are ratepayer of the District and account for 55% of total ratepayers. The harbour activity is being delegated by Council back to Community Boards. The Mercury Bay Community Board have submitted that they wish to review wharf management in the area and could extend the review to include launching fees at Kuaotunu if considered appropriate.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
3. notes that this function returns to the Community Board for decision-making under the community empowerment model along with costs of the boat ramps needing to be met by Boards.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

This would be difficult to enforce and is also acknowledged that many non-residents are ratepayer of the District and account for 55% of total ratepayers. The harbour activity is being delegated by Council back to Community Boards. The Mercury Bay Community Board have submitted that they wish to review wharf management in the area and could extend the review to include launching fees at Kuaotunu if considered appropriate. This matter can be further considered by the Mercury Bay Community Board.

Discussion

None

Harbour Facilities Activity

232. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Services - Destination Boat Ramp

Submitter #636 requests that the Council note the submitter's view that the main boat ramp at Whitianga is of an inferior quality. No specific reasons for were provided for this.

The same submitter also requests that the Council:

- *Make no expenditure be made for the Mercury Bay Destination Boat Ramp until the real issues around it have been explored*
- *Note the submitter's question as to where the proposals for this expenditure are and whether there has been public input.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the Mercury Bay destination boat ramp as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council:

1. *notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan*
2. *returns the matter to the Community Board for further consideration under the Community Empowerment model.*

Staff reason for recommendation

There are no plans to undertake capital expenditure on the current Whitianga Destination boat ramp, but maintenance will continue until a new boat ramp site is decided upon. The Board will be working through site options for provision of a new ramp in due course.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. *notes the submissions*
2. *makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan*
3. *returns the matter to the Community Board for further consideration under the Community Empowerment model.*

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

There are no plans to undertake capital expenditure on the current Whitianga Destination boat ramp, but maintenance will continue until a new boat ramp site is decided upon. The Board will be working through site options for provision of a new ramp in due course.

Discussion

None

Harbour Facilities Activity

233. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Services - Interpretive Signage

Two submissions were received noting objection to the interpretive signage project.

Submitter #636 requests that the Council notes the submitters objection to the proposed interpretive signage at Mercury Bay wharf budgeted for \$22,000.

The reasons for this include:

- *The submitter considers the price outrageous and suggests plainer signs.*
- *The submitter considers people more likely to disobey as signage increases*
- *The Harbour Master cannot control the area with current signage.*

Submitter #252, requests that the Council justify why \$22,000 should be spent on interpretive signage in Mercury Bay, and notes this to be gold plated.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retain the interpretive signage for Mercury Bay wharf as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The signage is for both Whitianga Wharf and Ferry Landing Wharf. This is continuation of a total historical interpretation series already commenced. Scoping will continue with the Board and signage will be installed accordingly once the proofs are approved.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The signage is for both Whitianga Wharf and Ferry Landing Wharf. This is continuation of a total historical interpretation series already commenced. Scoping will continue with the Board and signage will be installed accordingly once the proofs are approved.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

234. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - New Project

Submitter #404 requests that the Ten Year Plan includes a clear commitment to maintaining the current skate/scooter park facility in Whitianga and support a user campaign to upgrade the area.

The reason provided is that there are more young people enjoying this facility. The users are keen to see the space develop and grow.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council confirm a commitment to maintaining the current skate/scooter park facility in Whitianga and support a user campaign to upgrade the area

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Staff reason for recommendation

Providing funding for the development of the skate facility can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. If the Community Groups wish to expand the site they can seek external funding with the support of Area Office staff. The existing facilities were extensively refurbished and expanded four years ago. There is no agreement yet from the board that the skatepark will remain on this site long term.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Providing funding for the development of the skate facility can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. If the Community Groups wish to expand the site they can seek external funding with the support of Area Office staff. The existing facilities were extensively refurbished and expanded four years ago. There is no agreement yet from the board that the skatepark will remain on this site long term.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

235. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Buffalo Beach Foreshore Walkway - larger scale improvements

Larger scale improvement works for the Buffalo Beach Foreshore Walkway were not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included in the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal.

164 submitters responded to this question. Of those, 77 people were in agreement, 26 disagreed and 61 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Council allocating funds to the Buffalo Beach foreshore walkway include:

- Buffalo Beach should be returned to as natural an amenity as possible
- The rocks on the beach (that protect the land) need to be reviewed as they are considered unsafe for walkers and swimmers and are unappealing to look at, thus have a negative affect from a tourism and economic perspective
- There should be a walkway from the wharf to at least the toilet block on Buffalo Beach and that this should be done immediately
- Improvements are improving tourism.

Comments in support of the Council's proposal to not allocate funds include:

- One comment was received stating no preference, but that it should not be funded from district rates
- Another stating that this is not a core Council responsibility.

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for Buffalo Beach foreshore walkway, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Providing funding for the development of the foreshore walkway can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. Council would welcome a community partner to take a lead in this project.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
3. refers back to the Mercury Bay Community Board for further consideration.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Providing funding for the development of the foreshore walkway can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan. Council would welcome a community partner to take a lead in this project.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

236. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Whitianga Taylor's Mistake and esplanade - larger scale improvements

Larger scale improvements for Whitianga Taylor's Mistake and esplanade were not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with this. 165 submitters responded to the question. 78 people were in agreement, 26 disagreed and 61 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Council allocating funds for this project include:

- This is a high profile location and popular area for tourists
- Natural features attract visitors and therefore the natural outlook and open area should be maximised to promote and continue the appeal of the town and the Coromandel in general
- Not in favour of 'an open ground' for this location
- Improvements would improve tourism.

Comments in support of the Council's proposal to not allocate funds for this project include:

- One comment was received stating that it should not be funded from district rates.
- Another stating that it's not core Council responsibility.

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that the Council notes the Mercury Bay Community Boards intention to review the timing of the Taylors Mistake upgrade project in accordance with the CBD upgrade.

The reason outlined by the Boards is that this project is linked to the Whitianga CBD upgrade as the reserve links the main street with the harbour.

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for Whitianga Taylor's Mistake and esplanade, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Providing funding for the development of Taylors Mistake improvement can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan, or in conjunction with the main street upgrade. However, community groups willing to take a lead would be welcomed to partner with council in these areas.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Providing funding for the development of Taylors Mistake improvement can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan, or in conjunction with the main street upgrade. However, community groups willing to take a lead would be welcomed to partner with Council in these areas.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

237. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Mercury Bay Indoor Sports Facility

The draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan included a proposal for a contribution of \$1m from the Council to an indoor sports facility in Mercury Bay.

The submission form specifically asked submitters whether they agreed with this proposal. 283 submitters responded to the question. 202 people in agreement, 33 disagreed and 48 had no preference.

NB: the limitation of this question is that the feedback question asked whether submitters agreed with Council's proposal to build new sports facilities in Thames and Mercury Bay, in the same question.

Comments in support of the Mercury Bay indoor sports facility include:

- Support for these projects being funded locally
- Great way to bring communities together
- Support for youth facilities in the community
- Support for the use of innovative technologies and design
- The Mercury Bay Youth Forum (#404) considers (after surveying youth) that this would help make their community more youth friendly.

Comments against the Mercury Bay indoor sports facility include:

- One submitter provided comment against this facility that they thought that there is a high elderly population in this area and the facility would not be very well utilised. They also commented that the cost was hard to justify.

The Mercury Bay Community Board, #193, requests that the Council ensure that all relevant staff will be allocated to support the establishment of the Mercury Bay multi-sport complex as a priority on the Mercury Bay Community Board's work programme.

The Board has applied to Sport NZ on behalf of Council for funding for an operational manager, and is relying on the operational budgets provided in the first three years of the plan.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintain its contribution of \$1m (2021/2022) for the Mercury Bay Indoor Sports Facility as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Operational staff, as required, will be allocated once the contract for the fields is completed. Council is committed to working with the facility manager to ensure the complex meets the needs of the community of Mercury Bay. The fields are under maintenance as part of the construction contract until late 2012, so input from Council is overseeing only at this time. There are resources in the budgets to maintain the fields and facilities into the future. The operations of the facility and booking systems are yet to be set up and will be done by the facility manager.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. withdraws the Mercury Bay Indoor Sports Facility project from the 2012-2012 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Further work is needed to be undertaken to ascertain how best to make this contribution - whether this expense will be a capex expense or a grant provided to a Trust. Until then, it has been removed from the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan and will be further considered as part of the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.

Discussion

- If funded through a contribution to a trust then it should not be in a capex line.

Parks and Reserves Activity

238. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Buffalo Beach Groynes

Three submissions were received concerning the Buffalo Beach Groynes project.

The Mercury Bay Community Board (# 193) request that the Council notes that the Mercury Bay Community Board has yet to complete a scope and full cost for the Buffalo Beach Groynes project but considers the costs will fall within the \$53,000 provided.

Two submissions were received requesting that groynes should not be built on Buffalo Beach (#69 and #252).

The reasons for this request include:

- *Currently the beach is in the best condition it has been for years.*
- *The beach would benefit from dune planting and attention.*
- *The submitter notes that 'we went through all this at the time they were on the community board in 1999 - 2001.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopt the Buffalo Beach Groynes project as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

1. *That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the budget included in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan, but investigates alternatives to groynes when the scoping is completed.*
2. *That the Council include a strategic intent to develop options for foreshore protection District wide.*

Staff reason for recommendation

Groynes do an outstanding job at controlling sand movement. However the District needs an agreed foreshore protection approach for short, medium and long term solutions.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the budget included in the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
3. investigates alternatives to groynes when the scoping is completed.
4. include a strategic intent to develop options for foreshore protection District wide.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Groynes do an outstanding job at controlling sand movement. However the District needs an agreed foreshore protection approach for short, medium and long term solutions.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

239. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Purangi Reserve

One submitter, #207 requested that the \$200,000 budgeted for the Purangi Reserve in 2017-2019 be removed.

The reasons outlined by the submitter are that:

- The expenditure is unwarranted as current facilities are adequate and appropriate for the level of use.*
- The expenditure is unreasonable.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the Purangi Reserve project as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but make no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The improvements were signalled and adopted in the 2007 Reserve Management Plan, and relate to landscape improvements to manage increasing numbers of boat/trailer combinations and casual visitors to the area. Some improvements (eg. barbecues and shade structures) have been installed, but there is much still to do. The Council, however, could choose to defer this project or reduce the budget if the Board sees reason to.

Removal of this project would result in a reduction of approximately \$2.40 per ratepayer in the Mercury Bay Community Board area.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. removes the Purangi Reserve project from the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

This project is no longer required.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

240. Mercury Bay Community Board Area - Whitianga Foreshore Upgrade

One submitter, #655, requests that the Whitianga foreshore from Albert Street to the wharf be upgraded, including topsoiling, levelling and regrassing.

The submitter suggests that this would cost less than \$50,000 and would give best value for Whitianga.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a project to upgrade the Whitianga foreshore.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission but make no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This project is currently not signalled as a priority for the Mercury Bay Community Board area. Some landscape works towards the wharf have recently been completed in this location. Council would welcome a community partner to take a lead in this project.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submissions
2. make no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

This project is currently not signalled as a priority for the Mercury Bay Community Board area. Some landscape works towards the wharf have recently been completed in this location. Council would welcome a community partner to take a lead in this project.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

241. Mercury Bay Community Board - Grants - Mercury Bay Community Pool

185 submissions were received requesting that the Council provide for a replacement swimming pool filter and pump at the Mercury Bay community pool.

The reasons outlined for this request include:

- *A recent report on the condition of the pool states a new filter, motor and pump is required.*
- *Urgent temporary repairs have already been undertaken to the existing filter*
- *The draft Plan states that swimming and other water skills are important, and that swimming pools provide for learning and training*
- *This will enable the Council to meet its swimming pool performance standard in Mercury Bay*
- *The draft Plan indicates a growing population, and the swimming club has also seen increased membership*
- *The Mercury Bay Area School as managers of the pool do not have the funds for new equipment*
- *The Council wouldn't need to build a new pool as the existing pool itself is in good condition*
- *The submitter currently has to travel to Thames to use its pool because of the lack of suitable year round facility*
- *A trust has been set up to seek funding to bring the pool up to a standard that it can operate year round, however funding is required for a replacement pool filter and pump for this to happen.*
- *It is good to utilise what we already have.*
- *Swimming pools provide the most complete form of exercise for the elderly.*
- *Every person should be able to learn to swim in a suitable pool.*
- *This is a cost effective option for the ratepayer.*

The cost of a replacement filter and pump is estimated to be \$100,000.

Submitter #404 requested that the Council proceed with the proposed upgrade of the Mercury Bay Area School Pool. The reason provided is that this is the submitter's only easily accessible community pool and they would like it to be heated to enable greater year-round access.

[NB: An 'upgrade' isn't proposed in the draft ten year plan, and given the reason noted for the request it is assumed submitter #404 is referring to this same matter above as noted by the other 185 submitters].

Submitter numbers include:

19, 131, 244, 270, 382, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 486, 492, 494, 496, 497, 499, 501, 502, 505, 509, 510, 511, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 519, 521, 522, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 549, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 556, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 570, 571, 572, 574, 575, 576, 578, 580, 582, 583, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 594, 595, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 611, 613, 614, 616, 618, 620, 621, 622, 623, 625, 627, 629, 631, 633, 634, 635, 637, 638, 639, 641, 656, 658, 659, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 673, 674, 684, 685, 686, 688, 691.

(ALL ON SAME SUBMISSION FORM)

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will consider funding a replacement swimming pool filter and pump at the Mercury Bay community pool.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and makes no change to the Ten Year Plan. The Community Board may wish to explore options further with the pool.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Mercury Bay Community Board have identified the need to resource a new structure to operate and manage the Mercury Bay Area School pool on behalf of the Community. They have provided additional funding over and above the normal Contract to support the establishment of this new management structure.

The Community Board have supported the School pool being available to the community over the summer period by the provision of a Contract for service, so they have shown a commitment to the provision of this service. They do not intend to provide a separate swimming pool in the near future.

If the Plan is approved then the Board will be able to assist the Swimming Pool trust and the Area School enter into a new agreement. This will enable that structure to access funding from outside organisations for upgrading the existing pumps and other capital development works.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. allocates \$100,000 in 2012/2013 year as a grant funded through local social development (100% rates funded).

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

In response to feedback received through the submissions process, the Council notes that its support of this project is essential to the on-going viability of the Pool and it will enable the Mercury Bay Pool to access further funding from outside organisations. It is also understood that this will be a one-off contribution by the Council towards this upgrade.

Discussion

- The Community Board would very much like this to go ahead.
- The committee has a number of grant providers coming on.
- Amounts to \$11 on the rates for one year.

Social Development Activity (Local)

242. Mercury Bay Community Board - Grants - Mercury Bay Community Pool

Submitter #626 requests that the Council contribute to new changing rooms for the Mercury Bay Community Pool (in addition to the annual grant of \$35,000).

The reasons outlined include:

- *The Mercury Bay Area School Board of Trustees has consulted with the Community Board and Area Manager and has spent a reasonable amount of time and money designing the replacement changing rooms with the expectation of a contribution from the Council*
- *The Board believes this matter will not progress without provision in the Ten Year Plan*
- *The pool provides a number of benefits to the community*

NB: The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that all grants proposed in this activity be retained.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council will retain the \$35,000 grant to the Mercury Bay Community Pool, or amend (increase).

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Board has provided for a new management structure to be established for the operation of the Mercury bay Area School pool to become a community pool.

The School approached the Mayor who gave support in principle to assisting the school in the development of its new gymnasium project which meant the ablution block at the school pool was being demolished. The school sought funding from Council to replace this ablution block, as part of the pool being available to the community.

Subsequent meetings with to School have seen such support discussed, but no detailed cost analysis is yet been completed.

Should the Community Board want to consider the provision of funding for the construction of the replacement ablution block to serve the swimming pool area separately then a specific proposal with detailed funding would be required to be presented to the Board and Council for approval, outside this Ten Year Plan process.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Council could not support this project at this time given other priorities.

Discussion

None

Water Supply Activity

243. Services - Hahei Water Supply

With regards to Hahei water supply specifically, the Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that resources be provided to work with the Hahei community to hand over operations and maintenance of the scheme to the Area of Benefit.

The reason provided is that the submitter supports the opportunity to progress meaningful consultation with the community to hand over operation and maintenance.

Further, the submitter requests the Council note the submitter's concern at the high cost of consent renewal proposed at \$87,000.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the Water Supply programme in Hahei as per the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains the current budgets as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan and continues investigating the potential for handing back supplies, including Hahei.

Staff reason for recommendation

Provision of Supply:

Staff are currently investigating supply options for Hahei along with other townships. These investigations include looking at Councils obligations under the Local Government Act in relation to the provision of existing supplies and also the requirements to meet standards for water quality under the Health Amendment Act.

Until these investigations are completed it is recommended that budgets remain as allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Consent Costs:

The costs that have been allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan are considered suitable by staff. These costs do not allow for any potential hearing expenses or large scale legal involvement as staff believe that this consent should be able to be progressed without this being required. It should also be noted that the budget is not a target and every effort will be made to come in under the allocated amount.

Staff are very comfortable with explaining the return of the supply to the Hahei community.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. retains the current budgets as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan
2. continues investigating the potential for handing back the Hahei water supplies for a community managed/owned approach .

Moved - Brljevic

Seconded - Mclean

Reason for resolution

Provision of Supply:

Staff are currently investigating supply options for Hahei along with other townships. These investigations include looking at Councils obligations under the Local Government Act in relation to the provision of existing supplies and also the requirements to meet standards for water quality under the Health Amendment Act.

Until these investigations are completed it is recommended that budgets remain as allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Consent Costs:

The costs that have been allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan are considered suitable by staff. These costs do not allow for any potential hearing expenses or large scale legal involvement as staff believe that this consent should be able to be progressed without this being required. It should also be noted that the budget is not a target and every effort will be made to come in under the allocated amount.

Discussion

None

Wastewater Activity (Services)

244. Whitianga Treatment Plant Extension

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that the Council clarify the growth projections that identify the Whitianga Treatment Plant extension to occur in year ten; and that the extension be reviewed taking into account infiltration.

The submitter considers that a focus on good operational management through best practice which highlights and addresses infiltration in times of severe rain this will extend the capacity of the plant and delay the need for an upgrade.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the timing of the Whitianga Treatment Plant, or retains as proposed.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission and no change is requested to the Ten Year Plan. However this project could be, if required, planned outside the Ten Year Plan period.

Staff reason for recommendation

While the growth projections have some level of uncertainty around them, the main driver for the extension to the wastewater treatment plant is the loading being experienced at the plant more than the flows. Discussions are continuing with trade waster producers looking at ways to reduce loading at the plant.

Stormwater inflow and infiltration volumes have been reduced over recent years and will continue to be an ongoing operation focus. Maintaining sound operational management is a key priority for the Water Services team and their contractors.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submissions
2. make no change to the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

While the growth projections have some level of uncertainty around them, the main driver for the extension to the wastewater treatment plant is the loading being experienced at the plant more than the flows. Discussions are continuing with trade waster producers looking at ways to reduce loading at the plant.

Stormwater inflow and infiltration volumes have been reduced over recent years and will continue to be an ongoing operation focus. Maintaining sound operational management is a key priority for the Water Services team and their contractors.

Discussion

- Dependant on growth and infiltration.

Wastewater Activity (Services)

245. Cooks Beach Treatment and Disposal

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that

- *the private property connections to the Cooks Beach wastewater scheme be completed*
- *Cooks Beach additional capacity loan be integrated into the District wide wastewater charge*
- *the Council focus on ensuring that every property in the area of benefit that can connect is connected*

The submitter notes their reason as being that Cooks Beach is the only community singled out to pay for the additional capacity separately. They pay a separate additional wastewater loan charge.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its current approach to Cooks Beach wastewater.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and does not change to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Cooks Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant has sufficient capacity to accept the additional flows and loads if connections are made. Staff currently has no project to motivate or actively promote connecting to the Councils wastewater network.

The Cooks Beach Wastewater scheme was built prior to wastewater becoming a district activity.

It was built to service:

- a) *existing properties and*
- b) *future development.*

The existing properties were invited to pay a lump sum towards their cost or if they chose not to they could repay their share of the loan via annual rates. In subsequent years we have reoffered the lump sum option several times and more and more have chosen to pay it. The future development costs were amalgamated into the District Wastewater activity. It would be unfair to those who chose to pay a lump sum if we now absorbed the existing properties loan into the District Wastewater activity.

Similar funding exists for Moanataiari Flood Protection, Coromandel Water Supply, Whangapoua Wastewater Extension - some have chosen to pay a lump sum and some have chosen to pay their share via annual rates.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions and does not change to the Ten Year Plan
2. instruct staff work with the Mercury Bay Community Board to clarify and resolve the issues associated with the Cooks Beach wastewater scheme.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

To ensure a fair and equitable funding approach for those in the Cooks Beach wastewater scheme, staff will continue to work with the Mercury Bay Community Board to clarify and resolve issues surrounding this scheme.

Discussion

None

Solid Waste Activity

246. Services - Mercury Bay Refuse Transfer Station and Greenwaste Dump

The Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requests that a greenwaste facility be provided in Mercury Bay South as part of the proposed capital works for the refuse transfer station.

The reason provided is that there is insufficient detail in the Plan to identify if the greenwaste facility is part of the proposed work.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the scope of the Mercury Bay Refuse Transfer Station and Greenwaste Dump.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the terminology of project name and associated references to provide consistent wording and clearly define the location and scope of the facility as follows:

Project Name: "Mercury Bay South Refuse Transfer Station and Greenwaste Facility."

Staff reason for recommendation

The current terminology is inconsistent and does not define the location as Mercury Bay South.

Council resolution

That the Council amends the terminology of project name and associated references to provide consistent wording and clearly define the location and scope of the facility as follows:

Project Name: "Mercury Bay South Refuse Transfer Station and Greenwaste Facility."

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

The current terminology is inconsistent and does not define the location as Mercury Bay South.

Discussion

None

Emergency Management Activity

247. Emergency Warning Systems

A submission was received from the Mercury Bay Community Board (#193) requesting that funds be allocated to Whitianga for Tsunami warning systems.

The reason provided is: the Whitianga Community has completed a risk management plan that includes more sirens for the growing community.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers allocating funds to Whitianga for Tsunami warning systems.

Staff recommendation

That the Council provides funding for the Whitianga tsunami warning system, including signage, from within the allocated budget provision of \$51,949 (2012/2013) and \$53,224 (2013/2014).

Staff reason for recommendation

Budget provision was made in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 for a warning system in Whitianga on the basis that the Whitianga Tsunami Risk Management Plan identified this community as a priority area for the District. The budget was based on warning systems installed in Whangamata, Tairua and Pauanui.

Council resolution

That the Council provides funding for the Whitianga tsunami warning system, including signage, from within the allocated budget provision of \$51,949 (2012/2013) and \$53,224 (2013/2014).

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

Budget provision was made in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 for a warning system in Whitianga on the basis that the Whitianga Tsunami Risk Management Plan identified this community as a priority area for the District. The budget was based on warning systems installed in Whangamata, Tairua and Pauanui.

Discussion

- In the past it has been brought forward by staff to fund by District but then Council has decided to fund locally.
- Tairua-Pauanui and Whangamata have been community driven.
- Whitianga is the first time a process has been worked through with Council. It is a joint WRC and Council project.
- There is a paper being developed for CDEM on tsunami sirens.

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan Deliberations - Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area

Table of Contents	Page No.
Economic Development.....	354
District Transportation.....	355
Local Transportation	361
Airfields.....	365
Community Centres and Hall.....	368
Harbour Facilities	370
Parks and Reserves	374
Stormwater	380
Water Supply	381
Wastewater	386
Emergency Management.....	388

Economic Development Activity

1. Services - Red Bridge Road

Four submissions refer to the Red Bridge Road industrial area in Tairua.

Two submitters (#27 and #28) request that the Council retain the proposal for Red Bridge Road area investigations.

- *The reasons outlined include:*
 - *To meet basic requirements including sanitation and clean water.*
 - *The proposal will result in an increase in companies willing to lease new lots.*

Submitter #76 notes concern that nothing has been done in the Red Bridge Road area in the past 30 years.

- *For example, the road is unsealed and there is no water and sewerage.*
- *This submitter outlines that 30 years is long enough to wait, and*
- *That there is a need to create more employment opportunities as the population is declining.*

Submitter number 335 requests that the vacant council land in Red Bridge Road be made available for long term tenancy for business. No reason was provided for this.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the Red Bridge Road investigations project as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council should include Red Bridge Road in its property strategy to determine the land's use and to proceed with the investigations project.

Staff reason for recommendation

The property strategy should include this land and the Community Board should decide its purpose or overall land-use.

Council resolution

That the Council retain the Red Bridge Road investigations project as outlined in the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The purpose of this project is to consider the options and confirm a way forward for the Red Bridge Road industrial area.

Discussion

- **Board would like some investigation works - \$20,000 (funds in economic development in TYP).**
- **Might end up being a joint venture.**
- **The community could get together and put in a package unit themselves.**

District Transportation Activity

249. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - Dust Seal

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) requests that a budget for 400 metres of dust seal for Puketui Valley Road, Hikua be included in the Dust Seal programme for year 2014/2015.

The reason provided is:

- The Hikua Community Plan 2006 identified the sealing of this road as a 'priority for action'
- The road is narrow and dusty and has a high traffic volume

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders dust seal for Puketui Valley Road in the 2014/2015 year.

Staff recommendation

That the Council complete dust sealing of unsealed roads as per the dust seal policy and programme.

Staff reason for recommendation

Dust sealing is done on sections of unsealed roads where dust affects houses/businesses adjacent to the road. All sections of unsealed road that have houses/businesses adjacent to them are prioritised based on: number of houses, distance of houses from road, traffic volume and type, impact on crops, prevailing wind. Sections of unsealed road that have a priority score higher than 5 are added to the dust seal programme and ordered based on their priority score.

The dust seal programme does not include sections of unsealed where there are no houses or businesses affected.

Provision exists within the dust sealing policy to advance (buy) priority for any treatment length in the dust seal programme through a local contribution of a minimum of 50% of the dust sealing cost.

There is a 713 metre section of Puketui Valley Road commencing at 3.5 kilometres that has a priority score of greater than 5 and is on the dust seal programme for completion in 2020/2021. Should the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board support advancing dust sealing this section of Puketui Valley Road, a local budget for 50% (approximately \$11,000) of the dust sealing cost will be required in accordance with Council's dust seal policy.

Indicate rating impact would be:

- Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves
- Local rates - Depreciation and interest cost per property - \$0.26
- This assumes that the District rate will remain the same as others works will be done with in the Dust Seal budget

Council resolution

That the Council make provision for a dust seal on Puketui Valley Rd in 2014/2015 funded 50% local and 50% district.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

This project has been determined a priority by the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board.

Discussion

- Community looking at doing 50/50 funding.
- Concern raised that less affluent communities get pushed to the bottom as projects buy their priority on the list.

District Transportation Activity

250. Comments Regarding Existing Projects - Tairua / Manaia Road Causeway Improvements

Tairua / Manaia Road Causeway Improvements

- Seven separate submissions received requested that this project be retained by the Council and also stressed the importance of this project.
- Submitters to this category include numbers: 28, 27, 226, 640, 676, 657, and 724

The reasons for the importance of the project outlined by the submitters include:

- The project will hopefully halt further flooding.
- The Waikato Regional Council notes that it will enable it to undertake supporting stopbank and floodway works, providing a long term solution to reduce the flood hazard to the Graham's Creek community.

Submitter number 226

- Submitter number 226 notes that flooding has dramatically increased, and their property being flooded twice as much in the last four years.
- The submitter requests to see this project funded **by residents from Paku Hill**, and notes that residents on Paku and the new marina use the causeway road the most - not residents of Ocean Beach Road and should therefore contribute to the funding of this project.
- This same submitter also makes suggestions for how this project be undertaken, requesting that the causeway bridge needs extending or pipes inserted to take the water away.

Another submitter (#657) adds that TCDC should establish a memorandum of understanding with Waikato Regional Council to establish timeframes for the work.

Submitter #577 requests that Waikato Regional Council must be made to undertake remedial work and provide guarantees to continue maintenance in the whole of Grahams Creek before the work is carried out. The present inadequate structure is the cause of the flooding/silting problems and potentially most of Tairua could be adversely affected if the issue is not resolved.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council consider alternative funding arrangements for the Tairua / Manaia Road Causeway Improvements.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Bridge improvements necessary to ensure an effective transport network have historically been a district funded activity due the larger area of benefit or use of these transport assets. The driver for this project however is to mitigate a local flooding issue rather than for transport purposes and for this reason the project does not meet NZTA subsidy criteria.

Staff agrees that a memorandum of understanding with Waikato Regional Council is required to ensure the mitigation of flood risk on Ocean Beach Road is maximised through complimentary works proposed by Waikato Regional Council being completed.

The project concept is to extend the existing causeway bridge northwards by 32m.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Bridge improvements necessary to ensure an effective transport network have historically been a district funded activity due the larger area of benefit or use of these transport assets. The driver for this project however is to mitigate a local flooding issue rather than for transport purposes and for this reason the project does not meet NZTA subsidy criteria.

Staff agrees that a memorandum of understanding with Waikato Regional Council is required to ensure the mitigation of flood risk on Ocean Beach Road is maximised through complimentary works proposed by Waikato Regional Council being completed.

The project concept is to extend the existing causeway bridge northwards by 32m.

Discussion

None

District Transportation Activity

251. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - Road Seal Extensions

Four submitters made comments to road seal works in Tairua/Pauanui, as follows:

Red Bridge Road

- That Red Bridge Road should be sealed (#335)
- That a budget of \$121,000 for the Tairua Red Bridge Road seal extension be brought back into year 2013/2014 (#657)

The reasons outlined include:

- The development of Red Bridge Rd industrial area is a means to help achieve economic development for Tairua.
- The dust is a health risk to workers there and spoils the air quality.

Unsealed road off Bayview Road

- Submitters 27 & 28 have concern that the unsealed road off Bayview Road is long overdue for sealing

The reasons provided by the submitters is that the loose chip is dangerous and causes dust

Council Decision Required (Red Bridge Road)

Whether the Council reconsiders and adjusts its road seal extension programme, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Red Bridge Road seal extension is currently on the local transportation capex programme, but remains outside the draft Ten Year Plan.

Any decision to advance the timing of the Redbridge Road seal extension project needs to give consideration to the future land tenure, development and other infrastructure improvement requirements for the Redbridge Road industrial area.

The cost of a seal extension for Red Bridge Road would be approximately \$135,000.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- It is unclear as to whether there would be an additional capacity portion to this project. The increased level of service portion would be funded by Depreciation Reserves and the additional capacity portion by either Contribution Reserves or Additional Capacity Loan
- Depreciation and interest cost per property = \$3.22

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the Ten Year Plan
3. refer also to decision number 248 regarding the Red Bridge Road investigation project.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Red Bridge Road seal extension is currently on the local transportation capex programme, but remains outside the draft Ten Year Plan.

Any decision to advance the timing of the Redbridge Road seal extension project needs to give consideration to the future land tenure, development and other infrastructure improvement requirements for the Redbridge Road industrial area.

The cost of a seal extension for Red Bridge Road would be approximately \$135,000.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- It is unclear as to whether there would be an additional capacity portion to this project. The increased level of service portion would be funded by Depreciation Reserves and the additional capacity portion by either Contribution Reserves or Additional Capacity Loan
- Depreciation and interest cost per property = \$3.22

Council Decision Required (Bay View Terrace)

Whether the Council reconsiders and adjusts its road seal extension programme, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Dust sealing is done on sections of unsealed roads where dust affects houses/businesses adjacent to the road. All sections of unsealed road that have houses/businesses adjacent to them are prioritised based on: number of houses, distance of houses from road, traffic volume and type, impact on crops, prevailing wind. Sections of unsealed road that have a priority score higher than 5 are added to the dust seal programme and ordered based on their priority score.

The dust seal programme does not include sections of unsealed where there are no houses or businesses affected.

Bay View Terrace is on the dust seal programme currently for completion in the 2013/2014 financial year.

Provision exists within the dust sealing policy to advance (buy) priority for any treatment length in the dust seal programme through a local contribution of a minimum of 50% of the dust sealing cost.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Dust sealing is done on sections of unsealed roads where dust affects houses/businesses adjacent to the road. All sections of unsealed road that have houses/businesses adjacent to them are prioritised based on: number of houses, distance of houses from road, traffic volume and type, impact on crops, prevailing wind. Sections of unsealed road that have a priority score higher than 5 are added to the dust seal programme and ordered based on their priority score.

The dust seal programme does not include sections of unsealed where there are no houses or businesses affected.

Bay View Terrace is on the dust seal programme currently for completion in the 2013/2014 financial year.

Provision exists within the dust sealing policy to advance (buy) priority for any treatment length in the dust seal programme through a local contribution of a minimum of 50% of the dust sealing cost.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

252. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area – Tairua Hornsea Road Kerb and Channel Project

Five submitters made submissions in support of retaining the proposal for the Hornsea Road new kerbing and channelling.

One submitter supports the proposal if it is at the southern end by the new St Johns Ambulance station.

One submitter assumes this is the section adjoining the football field and supports the proposal so as to reduce ponding and flooding issues with Cory Park Domain.

Submitter numbers are: 28, 27, 640, 676 and 657.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the Hornsea Road kerb and channel project as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Hornsea Road kerb and channel project is in the first year of the draft Ten Year Plan. This project starts at Tokoroa Road and joins the existing kerb and channel on Hornsea Road at the northern end of Cory Wright Domain. This project will address stormwater issues on this section of Hornsea Road and formalise the edge of the seal.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded-Wells

Reason for resolution

The Hornsea Road kerb and channel project is in the first year of the draft Ten Year Plan. This project starts at Tokoroa Road and joins the existing kerb and channel on Hornsea Road at the northern end of Cory Wright Domain. This project will address stormwater issues on this section of Hornsea Road and formalise the edge of the seal.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

253. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area – Tairua Cory park Domain Car Park Improvements

Three submitters(#27, #28 and #657) made submissions in support of retaining the proposal for the Tairua Cory Wright Domain carpark improvements.

One submitter (#657) noted that this is a continuation of the town centre car parking requirements partially addressed with the service land and car park improvements undertaken in 2010/2011.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the Tairua Cory Park Domain car park improvement project as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Cory Wright Domain carpark improvement project is in the second year of the draft Ten Year Plan. This project is to create formal car parking along Manaia Road in front of the Cory Wright Domain along with completing kerb and channel from Tokoroa Road north to meet existing kerb and channel on Manaia Road. This project will address car parking and stormwater water ponding issues on this section of Manaia Rd and is a continuation of the work completed previously on Manaia Road as part of the service lane and car park construction project.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The Cory Wright Domain carpark improvement project is in the second year of the draft Ten Year Plan. This project is to create formal car parking along Manaia Road in front of the Cory Wright Domain along with completing kerb and channel from Tokoroa Road north to meet existing kerb and channel on Manaia Road. This project will address car parking and stormwater water ponding issues on this section of Manaia Rd and is a continuation of the work completed previously on Manaia Road as part of the service lane and car park construction project.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

254. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area – Footpath Rehabilitation and Construction

Submitter #657 requests that the proposed footpath rehabilitation and construction for Tairua and Pauanui be retained.

The reason provide is so as to provide safe pedestrian access within these communities.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains footpath rehabilitation and construction for Tairua and Pauanui.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Construction of new footpaths that qualify for subsidy and rehabilitation of existing footpaths is vital to provide safe pedestrian access in areas where no footpath exists and to ensure existing footpaths are safe for all users.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

Construction of new footpaths that qualify for subsidy and rehabilitation of existing footpaths is vital to provide safe pedestrian access in areas where no footpath exists and to ensure existing footpaths are safe for all users.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

255. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area – Pauanui-Hikua Settlement Road Improvements

Two submissions were received concerning the Pauanui-Hikua Settlement Road Improvements project.

Submitter #217 noted their support for the allocation of \$1.6m in 2021/2022 for the upgrade of the Pauanui-Hikua Settlement Road, however, requested that the Council consider the following:

- *That the project be funded from the District Transportation budget*
- *That the "Opus Hikua Settlement Road Pauanui Traffic Assessment Report" dated January 2011 be used as reference during the upgrade process.*
- *That the timing of the funding be constantly reviewed and possibly brought forward to ensure that the required upgrade work is completed as soon as is practical one proposed development in the area is completed.*

Concerning their request that this project be funded from the District Transportation budget, the submitter refers to the definition of page 122 of volume one of the draft Ten Year Plan as their reason, where it states that District Transportation includes maintaining roads, including sealed and unsealed roads, bridges and street light maintenance, minor safety projects.

Submitter #657 requests that

- *the proposed Pauanui-Hikua Settlement Road improvements be retained*
- *that some of the budget be brought forward as future development occurs along Hikua Settlement Rd*
- *that the Council clarify whether this project should be District funded*
- *a comprehensive plan showing all proposed developments be prepared.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the timing of and funding of the Pauanui-Hikua Settlement Road project, or adopt as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council retains the timing of this project as provided in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Project timing provided in the draft Ten Year Plan aligns with the possible completion of development on the western fringe of Pauanui.

Council resolution

That the Council retains the timing of this project as provided in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

Project timing provided in the draft Ten Year Plan aligns with the possible completion of development on the western fringe of Pauanui.

Discussion

None

Airfields Activity

256. Services - Pauanui Airfield

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) requests that the maintenance budgets and the budget for the Pauanui boundary fence renewal in 2016/17 be confirmed.

The reason provided is:

- *To maintain the Pauanui airfield as a safe airfield for small aircraft and compliance with the Civil Aviation Authority safety requirements.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council maintains the maintenance budget for the Pauanui boundary fence, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council maintains the maintenance budget for the Pauanui boundary fence as proposed in the draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The existing boundary fence has been programmed for replacement in 2016/17 due to the condition of the fence and anticipated maintenance costs for repairs increasing. Landing fees would contribute to the replacement cost of the fence.

Council resolution

That the Council maintains the maintenance budget for the Pauanui boundary fence as proposed in the draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The existing boundary fence has been programmed for replacement in 2016/17 due to the condition of the fence and anticipated maintenance costs for repairs increasing. Landing fees would contribute to the replacement cost of the fence.

Discussion

None

Airfields Activity

257. Funding - Pauanui Airfield

The draft Ten Year Plan contained a proposal for the Council to collect fees and charges at the Pauanui airfield, which were previously payable to a third party.

Submitters #64 and #340 request that the proposal for fees and charges to be introduced at the Pauanui Airfield be retained.

The reasons provided include:

- The charges were introduced without adequate user consultation and a violation of assurances issued to flying club personal for many years.
- It is reasonable to retain charges.

One submitter (#64) specifically requests that the Council:

- maintain fees and no higher than the present level;
- publish clear management information;
- communicate properly with all Pauanui users who are ratepayers.

One submitter (#204) suggests that if the Pauanui airfield is coming under Council administration (because the previous operator could not make it pay) then perhaps it should be kept as a paddock that is mowed.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the funding policy to enable the collection of fees and charges at Pauanui airfield, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council adopt the funding policy to enable the collection of fees and charges at Pauanui airfield.

Staff reason for recommendation

Fees and charges were introduced at Pauanui airfield thereby treating it the same as Thames airfield. This enabled Council to ensure that fees and charges collected in Pauanui were offsetting the rates component of this activity. Fees and charges are collected where feasible. The remainder is funded by targeted rate to the local communities of Pauanui and Tairua.

Council resolution

That the Council adopt the funding policy to enable the collection of fees and charges at Pauanui airfield.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Fees and charges were introduced at Pauanui airfield thereby treating it the same as Thames airfield. This enabled Council to ensure that fees and charges collected in Pauanui were offsetting the rates component of this activity. Fees and charges are collected where feasible. The remainder is funded by targeted rate to the local communities of Pauanui and Tairua.

Discussion

None

Airfields Activity

258. Funding - Pauanui Airfield

Submitter #657, the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board, requests that the invoicing administration fee for both private and commercial aircraft be \$25.00 charged per invoice. The reason provided is to be consistent with the fee charged at Thames airfield.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council adopts the fees and charges schedule as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the invoicing administration fee for both private and commercial aircraft in the fees and charges schedule from \$30.00 charged per invoice to \$25.00 charged per invoice in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

To maintain consistency the invoicing administration fee charged per invoice at Pauanui airfield should be the same as it is for the Thames airfield.

Council resolution

That the Council amends the invoicing administration fee for both private and commercial aircraft in the fees and charges schedule from \$30.00 charged per invoice to \$25.00 charged per invoice in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved -Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

To maintain consistency the invoicing administration fee charged per invoice at Pauanui airfield should be the same as it is for the Thames airfield.

Discussion

None

Community Centres and Halls Activity

259. Services - Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - Pauanui Community Centre

The draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan proposed an increase in levels of service with this activity, by including the Pauanui Community Centre project in the 2013/2014 year.

The submission form specifically asked submitters whether they agreed with this proposal. 167 submitters responded to this question. Of those, 40 agreed, 65 disagreed and 62 had no preference.

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) requests that:

- The Pauanui Community Centre in Year 2013/2014 be brought forward to Year 2012/2013 and the balance of \$571,000 remain in Year 2013/2014.
- The reason for this request is this allows the Community Board opportunity to consult with relevant community groups prior to construction.

Comments in support of the proposal include:

- the project is considered long overdue
- current facilities have served Pauanui well to a point, but it is now time for the Pauanui community to have the security of a council owned facility
- Submitter (#217) considers that the Pauanui Community Plan document "Vision Pauanui" was endorsed by Council and was identified in this document that a multi-functional community amenity building was an urgent priority, and that a recent email survey produced an high than 80% of ratepayers in favour of this multi-functional community amenity building.
- Submitter #696 request that young people are involved in the development of the centre and notes that there are few other initiatives in Tairua/Pauanui that will contribute to the social development and wellbeing of youth.

Several submitters in support of the proposal made reference to how the project should be funded:

- Three submitted agreed to the project provided it was funded locally.
- The submitter (#152) notes agreement with this proposal, only if funded locally by the Subdivision Reserve account and not by district rates.
- The submitter (#113) suggest development contribution funding for this project

Pauanui Information Centre / Location

- With regards to location, submitter (#127), on behalf of the Pauanui Information Centre would like to relocate closer to retail premises and the proposed Community Centre will increase Information Centre visitor numbers with flow-on effects.
- Similarly, another submitter considers that the location of the current information centre and potential for further growth and sustainability is limited and if located centrally it would be of greater tourism benefit to the local community, businesses and visitors to the town.
- Submitter #161 requests that the Council provide a community amenity in Pauanui that is centrally located. The submitter notes that Pauanui does not require a community centre (with additional facilities), but rather a community amenity which will contain the library, information centre, community office, meeting room and space to display heritage items. The reason provided is that:
 - The facility has been identified as a long-standing need
 - There is no council-funded public facility in the Pauanui Town Centre
 - There is a need for a town centre focal point for cohesion, economic survival, tourism and avoid future town centre amenity division.

Comments against the proposal include:

- *There should be better co-ordination with facilities already in Pauanui*
- *That the Pauanui Centre should be based on the existing facilities at the club, which are considered to be underutilised.*
- *Building a new community centre is an unnecessary expense as such facilities already exist in Pauanui that can accommodate the need, with assistance from the Council (#118)*
- *There needs to be collaboration between the Council and the Pauanui Sports and Recreation Club, rather than causing division by creating another separate entity. It is thought that the Club is open to this idea and has approached the Council in the past for support without success. (#118)*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceed with the Pauanui Community Centre as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council proceed with the Pauanui Community centre bringing forward \$25,000 to year 2012/2013 with the balance of \$571,000 remaining in Year 2013/2014 as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

A multi-purpose community facility has been identified as a key priority by the Pauanui community and the project was widely consulted on through the Pauanui Community Plan - Vision Pauanui. This plan was endorsed by Council in December 2005. This project is consistent with the objective of integrating community facilities together. Bringing forward \$25,000 of the total budget into Year 2012/2013 will enable community consultation; detailed design plans to be developed and consents to be initiated for full construction in 2013/2014.

Council resolution

That the Council proceed with the Pauanui Community centre bringing forward \$25,000 to year 2012/2013 with the balance of \$571,000 remaining in Year 2013/2014 as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

A multi-purpose community facility has been identified as a key priority by the Pauanui community and the project was widely consulted on through the Pauanui Community Plan - Vision Pauanui. This plan was endorsed by Council in December 2005. This project is consistent with the objective of integrating community facilities together. Bringing forward \$25,000 of the total budget into Year 2012/2013 will enable community consultation; detailed design plans to be developed and consents to be initiated for full construction in 2013/2014.

Discussion

- Adjustment to timing of budget - bring forward \$25,000 into first year.

Harbour Facilities Activity

260. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area -Tairua Boat Ramp Complex

Ten submissions were **received in support** of the Tairua Boat Ramp Complex project in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Submission numbers include: 27, 28, 205, 220, 251, 269, 577, 630, 657 and 724.

Reasons for support of the project include:

- Opportunity to provide further tourist picnic area for visitors, decent parking area for boat trailers, safe entry and exit.
- The locals have been asking for these facilities and are happy to pay for them.
- The concept plan was drawn up in 1995 after much consultation.
- Boating enthusiasts will not be able to launch their boats after the marina is developed later this year.
- Adequate launching facilities are essential to the enjoyment of residents, holiday makers and the domestic tourist market.
- Without a well-managed harbour and support facilities Tairua will never progress.
- The development of the Paku marina will put pressure on the existing trailer boat parking with the loss of some parking areas.

Three of the submitters (201, 205 and 657) noted that the **project is not described correctly**. They state that the project is far more than a boat ramp and involves the reconstruction of the whole wharf area: Mary's Bay and a new wharf for Tairua. They note that the current description does not convey to ratepayers the extent of the project.

One submitter (205) also suggests that the **Council start on the engineering and final design and costing immediately to finalise preparations for the resource consent**.

Submitter #630 requests that the Council **reinstate the foreshore development proposal developed by Mr Roy McNabb and the (then) Tairua Harbour Committee in 1993/94 into the Ten Year Plan and implement as a priority**.

- The plan addresses many of Tairua's problems.
- It provides a range of facilities, including trailer boat launch ramp, parking, recreation area, skateboard park, launch berthage facilities and an all-weather pontoon.
- The cost of the project should not be substantial.
- There is much support for the project amongst the ratepayer community.

In addition to the above, one further submission was received (#335), and while not specifically mentioning the Tairua Boat Ramp complex, they did note **concern that a boat ramp is needed in Tairua more than ever**.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council rename the project to better reflect the extent of the project.

Staff recommendation

That the Council changes the name of the project to Tairua Mary's Bay Wharf and Boat Ramp Enhancement.

Staff reason for recommendation

This provides for clearer explanation of the project for residents and ratepayers.

Council resolution

That the Council changes the name of the project to Tairua Mary's Bay Wharf and Boat Ramp Enhancement.

Moved - French

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

This provides for clearer explanation of the project for residents and ratepayers.

Discussion

None

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsider the timing of the Tairua Boat Ramp complex project and allocate budget so as to commence the engineering and design immediately.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Council and Board has already spent some time moving the project around years, and where it sits now has the least impact on rates overall.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. adjust the budget for the Tairua Boat Complex project as follows.
 - a. 2012/2013 \$17,000 for investigations
 - b. 2012/2013 \$35,000 for Tairua Boat Ramp improvements
 - c. 2013/2014 \$130,000
 - d. 2014/2015 \$1.17m
2. note that the figures will be adjusted for inflation
3. requests that the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board works in the communities regarding user pays options for a contribution to offsetting the costs of the project over time.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

In response to feedback from the community and the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board, the timing of this project has been reconsidered.

Discussion

- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board would like it bought forward
- Allows the boat ramp to be made all tide and away from the marina.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reinstate the foreshore development proposal developed by Mr Roy McNabb and the (then) Tairua Harbour Committee in 1993/94.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The budget is set using the figures (inflation adjusted) and plan developed by the Tairua Harbour Committee. However, this plan will be reviewed for appropriateness prior to a business case being prepared for approval.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. considers this plan as part of confirming the detailed design for this project.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

This plan will be reviewed for appropriateness and will be considered prior to a business case being prepared for approval.

Discussion

None

Harbour Facilities Activity

261. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - New Project

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) submit that a budget of \$35,000 for improvements to the existing Tairua wharf boat ramp in Year 2012/2013.

The reasons for this request include:

- The existing boat ramp can only be used at high or low tides.
- The proposed improvements would allow boat owners to use this ramp rather than travel to the Paku boat ramp via a congested one lane bridge.
- Additional trailer boat parking can be made available near Tairua wharf with some layout changes.
- The development of the Paku marina will result in loss of some parking areas.
- Improvements to the wharf and boat ramps were identified in the Tairua Community Plan.
- The plan also identified a shortfall of boat ramps at peak times.
- The development of additional boating facilities through the Tairua wharf/launching facility is six years old.

Council Decision Required

Whether Council consider a budget of \$35,000 for improvements to the existing Tairua wharf boat ramp in 2012/2013.

Staff recommendation

That the Council introduce a budget of \$35,000 to improve the boat ramp at Tairua but notes that the figure may not be one fully scoped yet.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves
- Depreciation and interest cost per property is estimated to be an additional \$0.53 per ratepayer in the Tairua/Pauanui community board area.

Council resolution (as per decision #260)

That the Council:

1. adjust the budget for the Tairua Boat Complex project as follows.
 - a. 2012/2013 \$17,000 for investigations
 - b. 2012/2013 \$35,000 for Tairua Boat Ramp improvements
 - c. 2013/2014 \$130,000
 - d. 2014/2015 \$1.17m
2. note that the figures will be adjusted for inflation
3. requests that the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board works in the communities regarding user pays options for a contribution to offsetting the costs of the project over time.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

In response to feedback from the community and the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board, the timing of this project has been reconsidered.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

262. Tairua-Pauanui Community Board Area - new Tairua Sports Complex

The Tairua sports complex project was not budgeted for in the draft Ten Year Plan. A specific question was included on the feedback form to gauge whether the community agreed with the Council's proposal.

227 submitters responded to the question. Of those, 79 were in agreement, 96 disagreed and 52 had no preference.

Comments in support of the Council allocating funds for the Tairua sports complex include:

- It was previously in the Ten Year Plan, so it should be reinstated
- There is a lot of support through the Tairua community plan
- Involvement of young people will make them feel their views are important, that their community is youth friendly and that they can make positive contributions
- Tairua has a large permanent population including approximately 500 permanent youth
- There are only two tennis courts, 1 rugby field and 2 small children's playgrounds
- There is no bus service to enable youth to access facilities in other centres
- This facility is urgently needed.

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that the budget of \$800,000 for the Tairua Indoor Sports Facility is brought back into year 2021/2022.

The reasons provided by the Board include:

- The Tairua-Pauanui Community Board supports the partnership approach the Council is moving toward. For the community to be able to seek funding from outside sources, some level of funding must be provided in the Ten Year Plan.
- A budget of \$800,000 is proposed rather than the \$3.4m in earlier plans.
- The project has been consulted on and members of the community are expecting this facility to be provided.

Comments in support of the Council not allocating funds include:

- The Blueprint mentions only three main centres of which Tairua is not one of them
- Existing facilities should be more widely utilised rather than building new ones
- District funding should not be used for such facilities as the cost is too high and we have ample outdoor space to enjoy.

Council Decision Required

That the Council confirm whether it wishes to maintain its position and not include budget in the Ten Year Plan for Tairua sports complex.

Staff recommendation

That Council signal intent for a budget of \$800,000 for the Tairua Indoor Sports Facility in year 2021/2022, but subject to the community confirming the priority, and taking a lead in fundraising.

Staff reason for recommendation

This is a Community Board request which can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan process and reprioritised if appropriate. The community would need to cross a threshold of fundraising prior to the Council providing funding.

Council resolution

That Council signal intent for a budget of \$800,000 for the Tairua Indoor Sports Facility in year 2021/2022, but subject to the community confirming the priority, and taking a lead in fundraising.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

This is a Community Board request which can be reviewed during the next Ten Year Plan process and reprioritised if appropriate. The community would need to cross a threshold of fundraising prior to the Council providing funding.

Discussion

- Will be a multi-use facility.
- Stage one has happened with the building of the new St John building.

Parks and Reserves Activity

263. Tairua-Pauanui Community Board Area - Tairua Youth Zone

Forty-two (42) submissions were received requesting that funding for the **Tairua Youth Zone** project be carried over to 2012/2013 (if it is not completed this year).

The reasons provided for this request include:

- The project needs to be completed for youth
- The youth in Tairua need physical exercise facilities to keep them occupied, not computer/console gaming.
- Tairua youth need something to do.
- The whole town will use it, not just youth.
- It could be used for a range of things including school shows, meetings, emergency accommodation, we weather venues for events such as the Tairua Food and Wine Festival.

NB: there are some inconsistencies in the way in which this project has been referred to. One submission refers to the 'Tairua Youth Zone (Tairua Sports Complex)'.

22 of the submitters have ticked the feedback form question in support of the Council funding a Tairua Sports Complex, and have then included the request for the Tairua Youth Zone. As such, we would assume that these submitters are making submissions to both projects, but this is not entirely clear.

Submitters include: 265, 267, 274, 275, 277, 278, 279, 281, 285, 286, 289, 295, 296, 298, 301, 302, 303, 305, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 316, 318, 319, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, and 334.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers carrying over funds from the 2011/2012 year to the 2012/2013 year for the Tairua Youth Zone project if the project is not completed in the 2011/2012 year.

Staff recommendation

That the Council carry over funds from the 2011/2012 year to 2012/2013 for the Tairua Youth Zone project, if the project is not completed in the 2011/2012 year.

Staff reason for recommendation

A Community Board request.

Council resolution

That the Council carry over funds from the 2011/2012 year to 2012/2013 for the Tairua Youth Zone project, if the project is not completed in the 2011/2012 year.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

In response to the submissions received and as requested by the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

264. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - New Project

Submitter #229 requests that the Patrick Heath Memorial Reserve Walkway be provided for in the Ten Year Plan.

The submitter estimates the likely cost of construction of a bridge over Pepe Stream to be \$80,000 to \$100,000 depending on the length of the walkway.

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that a budget of \$90,000 be included in year 2013/2014 for the Patrick Heath Memorial Reserve walkway and bridge.

The reasons provided by the submitters include:

- *The submitter is confident that the walkway is being looked forward to by the Tairua population*
- *The concept provides an opportunity for walkers, riders, people with pushchairs who can enjoy a variety of views.*
- *This project was consulted on through the Reserve Management plan as part of a wider walkway around the estuary and to link up with other walkways.*
- *The Tairua Parks and Reserves Committee sought Community Board support for funding for this project which has been confirmed and discussed with staff for the project to be included in the Ten Year Plan.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a Patrick Heath Memorial Reserve Walkway project in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

On the request of the Community Board, Council include a budget of \$90,000 in year 2013/2014 for the Patrick Heath Memorial Reserve walkway and bridge.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Community Board have requested the project which has been flagged for a long period of time.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- *Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves*
- *Depreciation and interest cost per property = \$1.93*

Council resolution

That the Council, on the request of the Community Board, include a budget of \$90,000 in year 2013/2014 for the development of coastal walkways in the Tairua/Pauanui area.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

This may link with the Coromandel Great Walk concept and as such is included as a generic coastal walkway project in the ten year plan rather than specifically for a Patrick Heath Memorial Reserve walkway and bridge at this stage.

Discussion

- Not provided for in the Ten Year Plan.
- Links with Coromandel Great Walk concept.
- Suggested it be renamed as a generic walkway for the communities.

Parks and Reserves Activity

265. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - New Project

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that at a budget of \$5,000 be provided in each year of the Ten Year Plan (inflated over the ten years) for tree planting.

The reason provided is that the tree planting budget needs to be reinstated to enable planting to be undertaken in Tairua/Pauanui.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers the inclusion of a tree planting budget in Tairua/Pauanui.

Staff recommendation

That the Council provides an operations budget of \$5,000 in each year of the Ten Year Plan (inflated over the ten years) for tree planting.

Staff reason for recommendation

A Community Board request.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- *Cost per property in the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board area = \$1.14*

Council resolution

That the Council provides an operations budget of \$5,000 in each year of the Ten Year Plan (inflated over the ten years) for tree planting.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board have indicated this is a priority.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

266. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - New Project

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that the budget for new playground equipment in years 2012/2013 and 2015/2016 be confirmed.

The reason provided is that the playground equipment at Pepe Reserve is near the end of its life and is beginning to fail.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council confirms a budget for new playground equipment in years 2012/2013 and 2015/16 in Tairua/Pauanui.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission but makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

There is budget in 2012/2013 for additional playground provision at Pepe Reserve, which can be augmented with renewals budget if the playground equipment is failing. The budget for 2015/2016 is targeted at sunshades for Given Grove playground in accordance with reserve management plans, however, the Board may elect to redefine this budget into another playground at a later time.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. makes no change to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

There is budget in 2012/2013 for additional playground provision at Pepe Reserve, which can be augmented with renewals budget if the playground equipment is failing. The budget for 2015/2016 is targeted at sunshades for Given Grove playground in accordance with reserve management plans, however, the Board may elect to redefine this budget into another playground at a later time.

Discussion

None

Stormwater Activity (Services)

267. Services - Tairua/Pauanui

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) requests that the budget for the stormwater outfall upgrades in Years 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 be confirmed in the Ten Year Plan.

The reasons provided include:

- *The work is being done in conjunction with the beach replenishment with the material dredged from the Tairua Marina.*
- *To reduce flooding in Manaia Rd.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council confirm the stormwater outfall upgrades in years 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council continue the stormwater outfall upgrades as per the draft Ten Year Plan and retain associated budgets.

Staff reason for recommendation

The stormwater outfalls are key infrastructure assets and their continued operation is required to adequately cope with stormwater in this area of Tairua. Due to the fact that the outfalls are the final piece of infrastructure before the stormwater reaches the receiving environment, a restriction at this point can have major implications on upstream infrastructure and its capacity.

Council resolution

That the Council continue the stormwater outfall upgrades as per the draft Ten Year Plan and retain associated budgets.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The stormwater outfalls are key infrastructure assets and their continued operation is required to adequately cope with stormwater in this area of Tairua. Due to the fact that the outfalls are the final piece of infrastructure before the stormwater reaches the receiving environment, a restriction at this point can have major implications on upstream infrastructure and its capacity.

Discussion

None

Water Supply Activity

268. Services - Tairua Water Meters Investigation Project

Eight submissions were received regarding the water meters investigation project.

Responses include one in support of and five opposing to the proposal for the project in Tairua be retained.

Some submitter's note that the amount budgeted seems very high for the benefit.

Some submitters suggest the money would be better spent elsewhere, e.g. on emergency storage capacity

Comments specifically in support include:

- *This could reduce cost recovery for the Council because there are so many absentee owners.*
- *Currently everyone connected shares the cost of water despite some only using it for short periods.*
- *Submitter #291*

Comments specifically in opposition to the project include:

- *The cost far exceeds any benefit and there is no sense in monitoring selected sites.*
- *This is a scam to collect extra rates for water from already over rated ratepayers.*
- *Meters will not cut water consumption*
- *Meters will not benefit ratepayers*
- *Permanent residents are well aware of the need to conserve water*
- *Absentee owners feel they are entitled to use as much water as they need and are not concerned with the cost.*
- *Submitter 335, 577, 632, 640, 647, 662 and 676*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the water meters investigation project in Tairua as per the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions and retains the project as per the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

An accurate understanding of use of the water is essential for future planning and consenting. Some new water consents require metering at the property, particularly where source water is scarce. This is one part of the wider water conservation and demand management measures that are required under the Regional Plan Variation 6. The Tairua metering project was designed to be a lower cost option (than metering all properties) of gaining valuable information for the long term consent applications. This information can also be useful for consent applications in other townships.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. retains the project as per the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

An accurate understanding of use of the water is essential for future planning and consenting. Some new water consents require metering at the property, particularly where source water is scarce. This is one part of the wider water conservation and demand management measures that are required under the Regional Plan Variation 6.

The Tairua metering project was designed to be a lower cost option (than metering all properties) of gaining valuable information for the long term consent applications. This information can also be useful for consent applications in other townships.

Discussion

- Information gathering only at this stage.
- One quarter of the properties (400) intended to be metered using smart meters.
- Water meters are one of the best ways to get people to conserve water.

Water Supply Activity

269. Services - Tairua & Pauanui

Three submitters specifically have made comments to the water supply activity in Tairua and Pauanui.

One submitter (#205) requests that the Council responds to the submitter's question as to why the water reticulation in Tairua has not yet been completed.

The submitter considers that:

- this project has been continually deferred.
- all that is needed is more reservoir capacity for collection in the off season.
- the deferral an easy solution to finance problems, that does not take into account the public, community board, ratepayers association and councillor's support.

Two submitters (#267 and #724) request that the Council retain the proposal for improving the Tairua and Pauanui water supplies provided this work is necessary to improve the quality of drinking water.

- The reason outlined is that an increased capacity is only required for a very short period each year.
- They suggest that if it is a quantity issue, then public education and encouraging (possibly by way of subsidy) use of tanks would be a better option.

Another submitter (#647) requests that the Council:

- progress the supply of water to Tairua
- reconsider and action the original plan for a dam above Ailsa Crescent

The reasons for the requests include:

- The supply from the Pepe is inadequate over peak times and can result in water cuts It has been 22 years since the water deficiency was announced but this has not been resolved
- The submitter provides background on a proposed dam above Ailsa Crescent and surveying work (refer to the submission for further details)
- The proposed dam would ensure water supply and remove the need for water meters.

The Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) request that the Council review the timing and \$7.4m budget for the Pauanui treatment plant expansion in year 2021/2022. The reason outlined is that the project is linked to growth and with the current economic climate the expenditure is hard to justify based on forecasted growth.

Council Decision Required

That the Council notes the staff submission to review the timing of the water supply projects for Tairua and Pauanui to avoid unnecessary costs to these communities.

Staff recommendation

The Council note that staff are committed to looking at the timing of the water supply projects for Tairua and Pauanui noted on page 218 of Volume 1 of the draft Ten Year Plan (with the exception of the water metres investigation project), with a view to ensuring a just-in-time approach to the provision of this infrastructure so as to not bring unnecessary cost to these communities.

Staff reason for recommendation

- The Council has indicated to staff that the current costs of the water supply projects in Tairua and Pauanui are costly and that the timing and necessity of these projects be reviewed more closely.

- Further details will be presented to the Council as part of the hearings and deliberations process.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council proceeds with the Water Supply programme in Tairua and Pauanui as per the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission points and adjust the budgets allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan once further investigations are undertaken and presented to Council as part of the Ten Year Plan deliberations.

Staff reason for recommendation

Further work is currently underway to investigate the following:

- Remain operative under the 2000 Drinking Water Standards for a defined period to allow further investigation with regard to the requirement for upgrading the existing plant.
- Investigate further the new groundwater test bore to ascertain the Drinking Water Requirements for the Pauanui groundwater, this may reduce the amount of work required to upgrade the plant at this stage.
- Reuse and demand management measures in conjunction with staging of works to allow maximum benefit to be obtained.

Council resolution (one resolution to cover both decisions requested in 269)

That the Council

1. notes the submission points
2. adjust the budgets allocated in the draft Ten Year Plan as follows:
 - a. Pauanui Treatment Plant 2013/2014 \$190,000, 2016/2017 \$3.14m and 2017/2018 \$3.453m
 - b. Tairua Treatment Plant 2012/2013 \$150,000, 2015/2016 \$544,000 and 2016/2017 \$1.11m
 - c. Remove Pauanui additional storage project from 2021/2022
3. notes the Councils increased focus on considering a range of demand management approaches for water supply, including on-site storage
4. remove Grahams Stream project and Pauanui Tangiatori Aquifer project from the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

For reasons of affordability the large capital works have been reviewed.

Discussion

Staff have amended figures as per below.

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018
Pauanui -current		\$3.3m	\$3.45m			
Pauanui - new		\$190k			\$3.14m	\$3.45m
Tairua - current	\$693k	\$1.10m				
Tairua - new	\$150k			\$544k	\$1.11m	
Graham Stream - current		\$646k	\$1.49m			
Graham Street - new		0	0			

Water Supply Activity

270. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - Red Bridge Road

Submitter #657, Tairua/Pauanui Community Board requests that the budget for the Tairua Area of Benefit extension that includes the Red Bridge Road industrial area be brought back into the Ten year Plan as follows:

Year 2014/2015 - \$65,662

Year 2015/2016 - \$592,246

Year 2016/2017 - \$613,565

The reasons provided are:

- To align with the budget for wastewater extension to Red Bridge Road
- Development of the industrial area will help economic development for Tairua
- This is the only industrial land in Tairua
- It will be more costly if the wastewater and water projects are not done together.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council includes the budgets and project for the Red Bridge Road industrial area in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the Tairua-Pauanui Community Boards submission and brings forward the funding of this project. Also for 272

Staff reason for recommendation

Tairua-Pauanui Community Board request.

Indicative rating impact would be:

Water	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018
Per UAGC	\$0.01	\$0.08	\$0.21	\$0.30
Metered charge	\$0.08	\$0.95	\$3.79	\$3.63
Unmetered charge	\$0.08	\$0.94	\$3.79	\$3.63
Serviceable charge	\$0.07	\$0.71	\$2.85	\$2.72

Council resolution (also for decision 272)

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions and makes no change to the Ten Year Plan
2. refer also to decision number 248 regarding the Red Bridge Road investigation project.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The purpose of the investigation project is to consider the options and confirm a way forward for the Red Bridge Road industrial area.

Discussion

None

Wastewater Activity (Services)

271. Tairua and Pauanui Wastewater Disposal

Submitter #17 requests that the Council withdraws its plan to dump Pauanui and Tairua sewerage into the ground around Pauanui

The reason outlined is that Pauanui residents draw drinking water from the water table and the proposed dispersal of treated sewerage could pose a serious contamination problem leading to sickness.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders it's disposal of sewerage at Pauanui and Tairua.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and no change is made to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

Extensive work has been undertaken over many years by Council staff to investigate the viability of disposing treated wastewater to the ground at Pauanui. This work has included intensive modelling to assess any impact on the drinking water supply for Pauanui. Council staff are confident that there will be no negative impact on the municipal water supply for Pauanui. As part of the resource consenting phase, the Regional Council has required Council to present an assessment of environmental effects. This assessment covers the environmental risk and also any implications associated with public health. This work gives staff confidence in the recommendation above.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submission and no change is made to the 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan
2. notes that the CEO acknowledges that this matter was not handled well and undertakes to raise this with the Regional Council.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

Extensive work has been undertaken over many years by Council staff to investigate the viability of disposing treated wastewater to the ground at Pauanui. This work has included intensive modelling to assess any impact on the drinking water supply for Pauanui. Council staff are confident that there will be no negative impact on the municipal water supply for Pauanui. As part of the resource consenting phase, the Regional Council has required Council to present an assessment of environmental effects. This assessment covers the environmental risk and also any implications associated with public health. This work gives staff confidence in the recommendation above.

Discussion

- Part of resource consent of Waikato Regional Council.

Wastewater Activity (Services)

272. Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area - Red Bridge Road

Submitter #657, Tairua/Pauanui Community Board requests that the budget for the Tairua Area of Benefit extension that includes the Red Bridge Road industrial area be brought back into the Ten year Plan as follows:

Year 2014/2015 - \$57,600

Year 2015/2016 - \$981,100

Year 2016/2017 - \$759,700

The reasons provided are:

- To align with the budget for water extension to Red Bridge Road
- Development of the industrial area will help economic development for Tairua
- This is the only industrial land in Tairua Harbour Committee It will be more costly if the wastewater and water projects are not done together.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council includes the budgets and project for the Red Bridge Road industrial area in the Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the Tairua-Pauanui Community Boards submission and brings forward the funding of this project.

Staff reason for recommendation

Tairua/Pauanui Community Board request.

Indicative rating impact would be:

Wastewater	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Per UAGC	\$0.01	\$0.22	\$0.58	\$0.77
Per Wastewater charge	\$0.12	\$2.42	\$6.49	\$8.59

Council resolution (also for decision 270)

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions and makes no change to the Ten Year Plan
2. refer also to decision number 248 regarding the Red Bridge Road investigation project.

Moved -Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The purpose of the investigation project is to consider the options and confirm a way forward for the Red Bridge Road industrial area.

Discussion

None

Emergency Management Activity

273. Emergency Warning Systems

A submission was received from the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board (#657) requesting that \$4,600 for tsunami testing and maintenance be included in the Ten Year Plan.

The reason provided is the tsunami systems installed in Whangamata, Tairua, Pauanui and Thames are links and tested bi-annually. Budget is required for testing and maintenance.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers allocating funds to testing and maintenance of Tsunami systems.

Staff recommendation

That the Council approves an increase of \$5,000 per annum to the Emergency Management operating expenditure budget to provide for the testing and maintenance programme for tsunami sirens.

Staff reason for recommendation

A tsunami siren has also been recently installed at Port Charles and should be included in the testing programme. Public notices will also be required for the testing programme. Note: maintenance costs in the longer term may be substantial because of the impact of the coastal environment.

Council resolution

That the Council approves an increase of \$5,000 per annum to the Emergency Management operating expenditure budget to provide for the testing and maintenance programme for tsunami sirens.

Moved - McLean

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

A tsunami siren has also been recently installed at Port Charles and should be included in the testing programme. Public notices will also be required for the testing programme. Note: maintenance costs in the longer term may be substantial because of the impact of the coastal environment.

Discussion

- District funding.
- Funding not provided for significant maintenance.

Draft 2012-2022 Ten Year Plan

Deliberations - Whangamata Community Board Area

Table of Contents	Page No.
Economic Development.....	390
Local Transportation	391
Community Centres and Hall	399
Harbour Facilities	400
Parks and Reserves	403
Social Development	407

Economic Development Activity

1. New Project - Whangamata Council Facilities

Submitter #518, the Whangamata Community Board requests a budget of \$300,000 be provided for in 2017/18 for the development of a community hub building in Whangamata, which would include the library, TCDC office extension and potentially i-Site and additional services the item of Whangamata Library Extension in the Ten Year Plan with no amount allocated be renamed the Whangamata Community Hub.

The reason provided is so to support a greater focus on area offices in keeping with the community governance model and the organisational restructure.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders its approach to consultation based on the feedback received.

Staff recommendation

Staff are presently gathering further information on this project and will present a recommendation at the Deliberations meeting.

Council resolution

That the Council signal a Whangamata Community Hub project in the Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Brljevic

Reason for resolution

This has been indicated as a priority by the Whangamata Community Board.

Discussion

- 30% AC/70% ILOS split.
- The administration building is currently District funded.
- Suggested that half could be split half District for the administration office and half be funded through library budget.

Local Transportation Activity

275. Whangamata Community Board Area - Car Park Seal Programme

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that the following car park seal works be included in the Ten Year Plan:

- Mum's Corner Pull Off 2012/2013 \$100,000 (\$50,000 funded from retained earnings, \$50,000 from the Whangamata off-street parking budget)
- Otahu Road Carpark seal 2013/2014 \$15,000
- Pipi Road Carpark seal 2013/2014 \$15,000
- Esplanade Carpark 2014/2015 - \$29,000 moved from 2013/2014

The reason outlined is that these carpark seals were priorities set by the Whangamata Community board during the development of the Ten Year Plan but were not included in the draft.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers projects for sealing carparks in Whangamata.

Staff recommendation

That the Council includes budgets in the Ten Year Plan for sealing the on street car parks identified in the Whangamata Community Boards submission and that the off-street parking budget is not used to fund any component of these projects.

Staff reason for recommendation

Sealing the car parks identified in the Whangamata Community Boards submission will improve these car parks whilst reducing dust nuisance and maintenance costs on these high use car parks within the Whangamata township.

Staff note that the off-street parking budget should not be used to partially fund the Mum's Corner car park project, as outlined in the submission. This budget is made up of car parking contributions received from developers in the town centre zone in lieu of providing the required number of off-street car parks and therefore should only be used by Council to provide car parking in the town centre zone.

Indicative Rating impact would be:

- Retained earnings are not a funding option for Capex projects, except in exceptional circumstances
- Otahu Road (funded Depreciation Reserves) - Depreciation and interest cost per property = \$0.29
- Pipi Road (funded Depreciation Reserves) - Depreciation and interest cost per property = \$0.29
- Esplanade Car Park - by moving the project back a year, there would a saving of \$0.56 per property in 2013/2014 but the cost per property in 2014/2015 would be \$0.57

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. includes in the Ten Year Plan the following car park seal programmes:
 - Mum's Corner Pull Off 2012/2013 \$100,000
 - Otahu Road Carpark seal 2013/2014 \$15,000
 - Pipi Road Carpark seal 2013/2014 \$15,000
2. moves the Esplanade Carpark project from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015
3. notes that projects be funded through depreciation reserves and loans
4. instructs staff to work with the Community Board to determine the AC/ILOS split.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

These projects are determined priority projects by the Whangamata Community Board.

Discussion

- Finance staff advise against using retained earnings for this.

Local Transportation Activity

276. Whangamata Community Board Area - Services

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that:

- an annual operating budget of \$10,000 be created to cover installation and maintenance of the Surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations
- an additional capital budget of \$2,000 in years 2012/2013, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 be created for the purchase of three new sets of Surfing Santa lights and decorations.

The reasons outlined:

- The Whangamata Surfing Santa installation and maintenance is currently funded from the Whangamata Streetlight budget each year, leaving little to install new streetlights.
- The proposal will clarify what the budgets are for and ensure budget for streetlights as intended.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers projects for the installation, maintenance and purchase of surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations in Whangamata.

Staff recommendation

That the Council includes budgets in the Ten Year Plan for installation, maintenance and purchase of surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations as detailed in the Whangamata Community Board submission.

Staff reason for recommendation

Previously the installation, maintenance and purchase of surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations has been funded from the Whangamata street light maintenance budget, leaving less budget for maintenance and improvement of street lighting in the Whangamata ward.

Inclusion of specific Christmas lighting budgets in the Ten Year Plan will ensure the costs associated with Christmas lighting and decorations is more transparent and street lighting budgets are not used for other purposes.

Indicative Rating impact would be:

- The additional \$10,000 operating budget would cost per property = \$1.81
- The Santa light budgets would cost per property = \$0.04

Council resolution

That the Council includes budgets in the Ten Year Plan for installation, maintenance and purchase of surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations as per the following:

- a. an annual operating budget of \$10,000 be created to cover installation and maintenance of the Surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations
- b. an additional capital budget of \$2,000 in years 2012/2013, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 be created for the purchase of three new sets of Surfing Santa lights and decorations.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Previously the installation, maintenance and purchase of surfing Santa Christmas lights and decorations has been funded from the Whangamata street light maintenance budget, leaving less budget for maintenance and improvement of street lighting in the Whangamata ward.

Inclusion of specific Christmas lighting budgets in the Ten Year Plan will ensure the costs associated with Christmas lighting and decorations is more transparent and street lighting budgets are not used for other purposes.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

277. Whangamata Community Board Area - Services

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that:

- Cost analyses be carried out for dust seal versus full seal of Wentworth Valley Road, including maintenance costs for the past five years
- That the budget for the seal of Wentworth Valley Road be moved forward to 2014/2015.

The reasons outlined is that the sealing of Wentworth Valley Road has been an on-going priority for Whangamata for nearly two decades for safety and practicality reasons.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council decides to bring forward funding for Wentworth Valley Road seal extension in the draft Ten Year Plan to 2014/2015.

Staff recommendation

That the Council bring forward the \$1,000,000 of funding for the Wentworth Valley Road seal extension from 2019/2020 to 2014/2015 as requested by the Community Board, and that \$70,000 of the project budget be advanced to 2013/2014 to allow lead works to be done.

Staff reason for recommendation

Staff do not support sealing the remaining unsealed sections of Wentworth Valley Road to a dust seal standard, as dust sealing involves sealing the existing road with minimal improvements to road width and drainage. Dust sealing the full length of Wentworth Valley Road will cause vehicle speeds to increase, without improvements such as widening and geometric improvements necessary to ensure the road would remain safe (as required as part of a seal extension project).

The NZTA economic evaluation completed by staff indicates this project has a benefit/cost ratio of approximately 2.0 (over a 30 year period) based on rough order costs.

Staff support the Whangamata Community Boards request to bring the Wentworth Valley road seal extension project forward to 2014/2015 and recommend that \$70,000 of the project budget is bought forward to 2013/2014 to ensure all lead-in works are completed and that the physical works project can proceed in the following year.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- This project currently has an increased level of service/additional capacity split of 81%/19%. The increased levels of service portion would be funded by Depreciation Reserves and the additional capacity portion by Additional Capacity Loan
- Fund \$70,000 in 2013/2014 - Cost per property = \$1.37
- Fund \$930,000 in 2014/2015 onwards - Cost per property = \$10.78

Council resolution

That the Council bring forward the \$1,000,000 of funding for the Wentworth Valley Road seal extension from 2019/2020 to 2014/2015 as requested by the Community Board, and that \$70,000 of the project budget be advanced to 2013/2014 to allow lead works to be done.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

This project is a priority of the Whangamata Community Board.

Discussion

- Project will require intense scrutiny by the Area Manager.
- Will be all loan funded.
- NZTA will not put any funds towards it.

Local Transportation Activity

278. Whangamata Community Board Area - Services

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that the current 2011/2012 budget for footpath construction be carried over into the 2012/2013 year.

The reason outlined is that the path may not be able to be finalised in 2011/2012 and by carrying the budget over it will enable the combined 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 amount to cover the completion of the project.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers carrying over the remaining 2011/2012 Footpath construction budget to 2012/2013.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

This submission refers to the footpath from Mums Corner to Wentworth Valley Road along state highway 25.

Design of this footpath construction project will be finalised in 2011/2012, with construction of the footpath programmed for completion prior to Christmas 2012. Footpath construction budgets are often used to fund more than one project in each Community Board area per year. The budget remaining from 2011/2012 will not be known until June, following construction of the Harry Watt Drive footpath outside Moana House and design of the SH25 project will be carried over to 2012/2013 as a work in progress.

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. make no change to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

This submission refers to the footpath from Mums Corner to Wentworth Valley Road along state highway 25.

Design of this footpath construction project will be finalised in 2011/2012, with construction of the footpath programmed for completion prior to Christmas 2012. Footpath construction budgets are often used to fund more than one project in each Community Board area per year. The budget remaining from 2011/2012 will not be known until June, following construction of the Harry Watt Drive footpath outside Moana House and design of the SH25 project will be carried over to 2012/2013 as a work in progress.

Discussion

None

Local Transportation Activity

279. Whangamata Community Board Area - Services

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that a general Whangamata Town Centre Service Lane/Road Legalisation budget be set up combining the amounts for legalisation.

The reasons outlined are:

- *To ensure that all areas in town that require this budget are included*
- *To enable all of the legalisation issues in the town centre to be resolved.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a project for Whangamata town centre service lane legalisation in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submissions and that no change be made to the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff reason for recommendation

The draft Ten Year Plan includes two specific service lane legalisation projects within the Whangamata Township, namely:

- *Aicken to Lincoln - 2013/2014 (\$129,000)*
- *Casement to Aicken - 2014/2015 (\$106,000)*

It is recommended that each of the service lane legalisation proposal be considered on its own merits to ensure project value prior to committing budget, rather than the more generic approach requested in the Board submission.

Council resolution

That the Council amends the draft Ten Year Plan to combine the budgets and re-label the 'Aicken to Lincoln' and 'Casement to Aicken' service lane legalisation projects to 'Whangamata Service Lane legalisation projects'.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - McLean

Reason for resolution

At the request of the Whangamata Community Board these project budgets are being combined to provide for a more generic road legalisation budget, which will provide greater flexibility.

Discussion

None

Community Centres and Halls Activity

280. Services - Whangamata Community Board Area - Fees and Charges

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) requests the following adjustments to the fees and charges schedule for the Whangamata Hall.

	<i>Change requested</i>	<i>Reason provided</i>
1.	<i>That a Combined Auditorium and Little Theatre fee of \$75 for community groups and \$500 for commercial groups be added to the schedule of fees and charges.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Auditorium and Little Theatre are often hired out together and this would make the fees consistent with other combined hire amounts in the fees and charges.</i>
2.	<i>That the charges for Old Hall - Under Stage Bays be reduced to \$50 per bay per financial year.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The fees and charges are too high and discourage users</i>
3.	<i>That Fire Brigade, security and excessive noise callouts be removed from the schedule of fees and a note applicable to all hires be added stating that invoices received from call outs from external agencies (for example, but not limited to, New Zealand Fire Service, security, excessive noise and electrical) will be on-charged to the hirer.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To ensure accuracy with the on-charging of call out fees received from external agencies.</i>
4.	<i>That a note be added to the Commercial Use section of the schedule of fees and Charges noting that wedding receptions will be charged at 50% of the commercial rates.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To eliminate the need to list all the facilities again for a wedding rate.</i>

Council Decision Required

Whether Council adopts the fees and charges schedule for the Whangamata Hall as proposed or amends.

Staff recommendation

That the Council amends the fees and charges schedule for the Whangamata War Memorial Hall as proposed by the submission above.

Staff reason for recommendation

The proposed suggestions help to clarify the fees and charges for the Whangamata Hall, making them more accurate and user friendly for users of the hall. Staff have received comments regarding some charges being too high for community groups and this will assist them in continuing to use the facility at a reasonable rate.

By on-charging invoices received it ensures a fair, accurate and transparent way of charging call out fees. The current Fees and Charges set a call out fee rate, estimating what the fees may be from external agencies, however this is not always what we will be charged, thereby some fees set in the Ten Year Plan may be too high or low.

Wedding receptions are currently charged at a Commercial rate, however it has been noted that this rate is excessive for those in the community seeking a reasonably priced venue. By introducing a wedding rate it will enable the community to continue to hire the facility for weddings at a reasonable price.

Council resolution

That the Council amends the fees and charges schedule for the Whangamata War Memorial Hall as proposed by the submission above.

Moved - Fox

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The proposed suggestions help to clarify the fees and charges for the Whangamata Hall, making them more accurate and user friendly for users of the hall. Staff have received comments regarding some charges being too high for community groups and this will assist them in continuing to use the facility at a reasonable rate.

By on-charging invoices received it ensures a fair, accurate and transparent way of charging call out fees. The current Fees and Charges set a call out fee rate, estimating what the fees may be from external agencies, however this is not always what we will be charged, thereby some fees set in the Ten Year Plan may be too high or low.

Wedding receptions are currently charged at a Commercial rate, however it has been noted that this rate is excessive for those in the community seeking a reasonably priced venue. By introducing a wedding rate it will enable the community to continue to hire the facility for weddings at a reasonable price.

Discussion

None

Harbour Facilities Activity

281. Whangamata Community Board Area - Services - Wash Down Facility

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that

- \$160,000 being included in 2012/2013 for a Whangamata Boat Wash Down Facility using recycled water
- Staff investigate options for this facility

The reasons for this request include:

- A wash-down facility close to the Whangamata Boat Launch was supported through the Marine Precinct consultation and concept adoption. It is also supported by the Whangamata Harbour Committee and Whangamata Trailer Boat Association.
- Leasing may be a cheaper option.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a project for provision of a wash down facility in Whangamata.

Staff recommendation

On advice of the Whangamata Community Board, the Council approves a budget of \$160,000 for the 2012/2013 financial year for the construction of a wash down facility, but that spend be subject to further staff investigation of funding options and confirmation of funding source not impacting on ratepayers generally.

Staff reason for recommendation

The Community Board has requested this item and made its assessment that it is a community priority for ratepayers locally.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves
- Depreciation (based on 20 year life) and interest cost per property is an additional \$3.35 if rates are funded from the Whangamata ratepayers.

It has been noted that there have been companies who have approached Council in the past willing to place "user pays" boat wash down facilities District Wide near to relevant boat ramps. This option would come at no cost to Council, other than a possible lease at reduced rate. Issues such as limited water supply in some locations, compatibility with Reserves Act, and resource consent issues would need to be considered. The project may be subject to resource consent depending on the scale.

Council resolution

That the Council, on advice of the Whangamata Community Board, approves a budget of \$160,000 for the 2012/2013 financial year for the construction of a wash down facility, but that spend be subject to further staff investigation of funding options and confirmation of funding source not impacting on ratepayers generally.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Wells

Reason for resolution

The Community Board has requested this item and made its assessment that it is a community priority for ratepayers locally.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves

- Depreciation (based on 20 year life) and interest cost per property is an additional \$3.35 if rates are funded from the Whangamata ratepayers.

Discussion

- Not currently in the Ten Year Plan.
- The intention is that this will be self-funding.

Harbour Facilities Activity

282. Whangamata Community Board Area - Services - Wharekawa Boat Ramp

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that budget for \$70,000 be included in 2012/2013 for Wharekawa Boat Ramp improvements.

The reasons for this request include:

- *People launching boats at the ramp currently must encroach on the road which presents safety issues.*
- *Earth moving and layout investigations are needed to resolve the issue.*

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers a project for the provision of boat ramp improvements in Whangamata.

Staff recommendation

On the advice of the Board, that the Council includes a budget of \$70,000 for the 2013/2014 financial year for improvement to the Wharekawa Boat ramp, subject to confirmation of funding source and the impact on rates.

Staff reason for recommendation

Community Board request.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- *Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves*
- *Depreciation & interest cost per property = \$1.06*

Council resolution

That the Council, on the advice of the Board, includes a budget of \$70,000 for the 2013/2014 financial year for improvement to the Wharekawa Boat ramp, subject to confirmation of funding source and the impact on rates.

Moved - Connors

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Community Board has requested this item and made its assessment that it is a community priority for ratepayers locally.

Discussion

- Not currently provided for in the Ten Year Plan.

Parks and Reserves Activity

283. Whangamata Community Board Area - Island View Reserve Development

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) request that:

- *a separate budget be created for the Island View Reserve Development - \$38,000 in the 2012/2013 year and \$85,000 in 2013/2014*
- *the amounts be moved out of the Minor Reserves Projects*

The reason outlined is that the amounts currently included in the Minor Reserves Projects budget will not cover the work required for Island View Reserve in line with the concept plans developed.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers additional funds for Island View Reserve Development.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission and create a separate budget for the Island View Reserve Development - \$38,000 in the 2012/2013 year and \$85,000 in 2013/2014 and reduce the Minor Reserves budget accordingly for those years.

Staff reason for recommendation

Community Board request.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- *An additional \$16,000 would be required in 2012/2013 as the Minor Reserves budget of \$22,000 is insufficient.*
- *Assuming 100% increased levels of service, the project would be funded from Depreciation Reserves*
- *Depreciation and interest cost per property for additional \$16,000 = \$0.45*

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submissions
2. create a separate budget for the Island View Reserve Development of \$38,000 in the 2012/2013 year and \$85,000 in 2013/2014 funded from the Whangamata land subdivision reserve.

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Connors

Reason for resolution

The Community Board has requested this item and made its assessment that it is a community priority for ratepayers locally.

Discussion

- High priority in Whangamata.

Parks and Reserves Activity

284. Whangamata Community Board Area - Trees

With respect to the levels of service for trees in the Ten Year Plan, the Whangamata Community Board (#581) request two adjustments.

1) That a budget of \$5,000 be provided in each year of the Ten Year Plan (inflated over the ten years) for tree planting.

The reason provided is that the tree planting budget needs to be reinstated to enable planting to be undertaken in the Whangamata area.

2) That \$5,000 of the Urban Tree Maintenance budget be dedicated to resolve the Williamson Park tree issues.

The reason provided is that there are a number of large hazardous trees that need maintenance.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers increasing the levels of service associated with trees in Whangamata, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council notes the submission and reinstate a budget of \$5,000 in each year of the Ten Year Plan (inflated over the ten years) for tree planting and also that \$5,000 of the Urban Tree Maintenance budget be dedicated to resolve the Williamson Park tree issues.

Staff reason for recommendation

Community Board request.

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Cost per property = \$0.91

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. notes the submissions
2. reinstate a budget of \$5,000 in each year of the Ten Year Plan (inflated over the ten years) for tree planting
3. dedicate \$5,000 of the Urban Tree Maintenance budget to resolving the Williamson Park tree issues.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

The Community Board has requested this item and made its assessment that it is a community priority for ratepayers locally.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

285. Whangamata Community Board Area - Park Avenue Reserve

The Whangamata Community Board (#581) requests that the following amounts for the Park Avenue Reserve development each be moved forward a year as follows:

\$89,000 to 2013/2014

\$139,000 to 2014/2015

\$178,000 to 2015/2016

The reason provided is that the development of Park Avenue Reserve has been anticipated for many years and is a priority of the Whangamata Community Board.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers increasing the levels of service associated with trees in Whangamata, or adopts as proposed in the draft Ten Year Plan.

Staff recommendation

That the Council note the submission and, noting possible impact on local rates, move the following amounts for the Park Avenue Reserve development forward a year as follows:

\$89,000 to 2013/2014

\$139,000 to 2014/2015

\$178,000 to 2015/2016

Staff reason for recommendation

Community Board Request

Indicative rating impact would be:

- Depreciation and interest cost per property 2013/2014 = \$2.44
- Additional depreciation and interest cost per property 2014/2015 = \$1.38
- Additional depreciation and interest cost per property 2015/2016 = \$1.08

Council resolution

That the Council:

1. note the submissions
2. noting possible impact on local rates, move the following amounts for the Park Avenue Reserve development forward a year as follows:
 - \$89,000 to 2013/2014
 - \$139,000 to 2014/2015
 - \$178,000 to 2015/2016

Moved - Fox

Seconded -Bartley

Reason for resolution

The Community Board has requested this item and made its assessment that it is a community priority for ratepayers locally.

Discussion

None

Parks and Reserves Activity

286. Whangamata Community Board Area - Moana Anu Anu Development

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council considers changing the name of the Moana Anu Anu Development throughout the Ten Year Plan document.

Staff recommendation

That the Council changes the name of Moana Anu Anu Development throughout the document and that it be presented as Whangamata Harbour Walkway (Moana Anu Anu Development).

Staff reason for recommendation

This offers more clarity to the community and those reading the documents as to what the development is. We have experienced in the past that people are not sure what you are talking about when calling it the Moana Anu Anu and there has recently been agreement with Iwi that it will be called something different, so for clarity it should be referred to as the Whangamata Harbour Walkway Plan.

Council resolution

That the Council changes the name of Moana Anu Anu Development throughout the document and that it be presented as "Whangamata Harbour Walkway (Moana Anu Anu Development)".

Moved - Bartley

Seconded - Fox

Reason for resolution

This offers more clarity to the community and those reading the documents as to what the development is. We have experienced in the past that people are not sure what you are talking about when calling it the Moana Anu Anu and there has recently been agreement with Iwi that it will be called something different, so for clarity it should be referred to as the Whangamata Harbour Walkway Plan.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

287. Whangamata Community Board - Grants - Beach Hop

Submitter #267 requests that the Council does not continue to provide funding to the Whangamata Beach Hop. No specific reason was provided.

Submitter #581 (the Whangamata Community Board) requests that the grant for Beach Hop of \$10,000 be renamed to "events". The reason provided is to enable the Community Board to assist any events that add economic and social development to the area with funding.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council retains a grant for Beach Hop as outlined in the draft Ten Year Plan, or amend.

Staff recommendation

That the Council changes the name of this grant to Events to enable the Community Board to allocate the funds to any community event organiser seeking financial assistance in the area. Although it is recommended that the grant name be changed, the primary intent of the funding will still be for Beach Hop; however the name change allows flexibility to fund other events in the future.

Staff reason for recommendation

Community events in the Whangamata area stimulate economic and social development throughout the town. By retaining this grant funding it enables the Board to support any events trying to establish or continue in the area. Changing it from a Beach Hop specific grant to an Events grant it encompasses all community events that may seek funding assistance.

Council resolution

That the Council

1. changes the name of this grant to Events to enable the Community Board to allocate the funds to any community event organiser seeking financial assistance in the area.
2. notes that although the grant name is being changed, the primary intent of the funding will still be for Beach Hop; however the name change allows flexibility to fund other events in the future.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

Community events in the Whangamata area stimulate economic and social development throughout the town. By retaining this grant funding it enables the Board to support any events trying to establish or continue in the area. Changing it from a Beach Hop specific grant to an Events grant it encompasses all community events that may seek funding assistance.

Discussion

None

Social Development Activity

288. Whangamata Community Board - Grants - Other

Submitter #581, the Whangamata Community Board request that the \$500 miscellaneous grant and \$30,000 Community Grant be combined to make a \$30,500 Community Grant.

The reason provided is that it is uncertain what the miscellaneous grant would be used for.

Council Decision Required

Whether the Council reconsiders the Whangamata miscellaneous grant.

Staff recommendation

That the Council incorporate the \$500 miscellaneous grant into the Community Grant fund making a total pool of \$30,500.

Staff reason for recommendation

The \$500 miscellaneous grant category is considered to be an error.

Council resolution

That the Council incorporate the \$500 miscellaneous grant into the Community Grant fund making a total pool of \$30,500.

Moved - Wells

Seconded - Bartley

Reason for resolution

The \$500 miscellaneous grant category is considered to be an error.

Discussion

None