

# Special Meeting

of the

## Thames-Coromandel District Council

---

Date	13-15 May 2015
Time	To follow Council workshop on 13 May 2015
Venue	Council Chamber 515 Mackay Street Thames

---

### Members


Mayor	GF Leach JP	
Members	HD Bartley DR Connors PL French MK McLean JP	PA Brijevich LA Fox SA Goudie JT Wells

### In Attendance


Community Board	P Kelly JP	K Johnston
Chairpersons	S Peters J Walker QSM	B Renton

David Hammond  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

# Members of Council

	<p><b>His Worship the Mayor Glenn Leach JP</b> 027 498 5122 <a href="mailto:glenn.leach@tcdc.govt.nz">glenn.leach@tcdc.govt.nz</a></p>		<p><b>Deputy Mayor Peter French Thames Ward</b> 07 868 6649 027 681 8783 <a href="mailto:frog03@xtra.co.nz">frog03@xtra.co.nz</a></p>
---	--	--	---



## Coromandel-Colville Ward

	<p><b>Tony Brljevic</b> 75 Kauri Grove, Coromandel 3506 07 866 7731 021 126 4202 <a href="mailto:billies@slingshot.co.nz">billies@slingshot.co.nz</a></p>
---	---



## Mercury Bay Ward

	<p><b>Tony Fox</b> 07 866 4836 027 497 0705 <a href="mailto:tonytcdc@hotmail.com">tonytcdc@hotmail.com</a></p>		<p><b>Murray McLean JP</b> 182 Buffao Beach Road, Whitianga 3510 07 866 4158 027 457 0855 <a href="mailto:mmcl@xtra.co.nz">mmcl@xtra.co.nz</a></p>
--	--	--	--

## Thames Ward

	<p><b>Sandra Goudie</b> 027 431 2442 <a href="mailto:bsgoudie@xtra.co.nz">bsgoudie@xtra.co.nz</a></p>		<p><b>Diane Connors</b> 07 868 9292 <a href="mailto:sar@slingshot.co.nz">sar@slingshot.co.nz</a></p>
---	---	---	--

## South Eastern Ward

	<p><b>Jack Wells</b> 116 Hampton Road, Whangamata 3620 <a href="mailto:jack.wells@hotmail.co.nz">jack.wells@hotmail.co.nz</a></p>		<p><b>Jan Bartley</b> PO Box 166, Whangamata 3643 07 865 8832 <a href="mailto:hdb@whangamata.co.nz">hdb@whangamata.co.nz</a></p>
---	---	---	--

Full Council order paper and appendices are available on the TCDC website:  
[www.tcdc.govt.nz/CouncilAgendas](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz/CouncilAgendas)

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Item Business</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1 Meeting Conduct</b>	4
1.1 Apologies	4
1.3 Items not on the Agenda	4
1.4 Conflict of Interest	4
1.5 Minutes for confirmation	5
<b>2 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Deliberations</b>	21
2.1 Long Term Plan and associated policies deliberations	21
2.2 Development Contributions Policy deliberations	319
<b>3 Hearing Commissioners for a Joint Hearing</b>	387
<b>4 Public excluded</b>	
4.1 LTP deliberations - Mercury Bay land purchase and lease for utility easement	399
For a fuller table of contents refer to the LTP report table of contents on page	22

# 1. Meeting Conduct

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968, members are reminded to declare an interest in items in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest. In such circumstances, members are required to abstain from discussion and voting and ensure that the declaration is recorded in the Minutes of the meeting.

## 1.1 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of:

1. Leave of absence for future meetings of the Thames-Coromandel District Council; or
2. Apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

## 1.2 Public Forum

A period of up to 30 minutes is set aside for the public to raise matters falling within the terms of reference of the meeting. Each speaker may speak for three minutes but time extensions may be allowed on a vote of not less than 75% of members present at the meeting. Questions from members for information or clarification may be permitted by the Chairperson (Standing Orders Appendix F).

## 1.3 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows:

### ***Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Thames-Coromandel District Council***

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

### ***Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Thames-Coromandel District Council***

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of the Thames-Coromandel District Council for further discussion.

## 1.4 Conflict of Interest

The Chairperson invites notice from members of:

1. Any interests that may create a conflict with their role as an elected member relating to the agenda item(s) for the meeting; and
2. Any interests in items in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest as provided for in the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968.

## **1.5 Minutes for confirmation**

### **1 Purpose of report**

As per Council's Standing Orders, the Thames-Coromandel District Council must confirm the minutes of its previous meeting.

### **2 Suggested resolution(s)**

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Confirms the minutes of the Thames-Coromandel District Council hearing 28-30 April 2015

### **References- Attachments**

***Attachment A - Unconfirmed 28- 30 April 2015 - Council hearing minutes***



**UNCONFIRMED minutes**  
of the  
Thames-Coromandel District Council  
**2015-2015 draft Long Term Plan and  
associated policies hearing**

**Date**  
Venue

**Tuesday 28 April 2015**  
Mercury Bay Boating Club  
93A Buffalo Beach Road  
Whitianga

**Present**

GF Leach JP (Mayor)

HD Bartley  
DR Connors  
MK McLean JP  
T Fox

S Goudie  
PL French  
JT Wells

**In attendance**

**Community Board Chairs**

B McLean (Deputy Board Chair), K Johnston.

**Staff**

David Hammond, Steve Baker, Marion Smith, Scott Summerfield, Graham McDermott, Michelle Baker

**Meeting commenced** 09:00am

**Adjournment**

His Worship  
His Worship

<b>Start</b>	<b>Finish</b>	<b>Reason</b>
10:35	10:45	Morning Tea
12:55	13:20	Lunch

**Date**  
Venue

**Wednesday 29 April 2015**  
Council Chambers  
515 Mackay Street  
Thames

**Present**

GF Leach JP (Mayor)

HD Bartley  
DR Connors  
PL French  
JT Wells

PA Brijevich  
LA Fox  
SA Goudie

**In attendance**

**Community Board Chairs**

P Kelly JP, K Johnson, S Peters, B Renton.

**Staff**

David Hammond, Steve Baker, Marion Smith, Christine Tye, Graham McDermott, Ariana Wickliffe

**Meeting commenced** 09:01am

**Adjournment**

His Worship

His Worship

**Start**

10:31

12:55

**Finish**

10:41

13:34

**Reason**

Morning Tea

Lunch

**Date**  
Venue

**Thursday 30 April 2015**  
Council Chambers  
515 Mackay Street  
Thames

**Present**

GF Leach JP (Mayor)

HD Bartley  
DR Connors  
PL French  
JT Wells

PA Brijevich  
LA Fox  
SA Goudie

**In attendance**

**Community Board Chairs**

P Kelly JP and K Johnson.

**Staff**

David Hammond, Steve Baker, Marion Smith, Scott Summerfield, Graham McDermott, Ariana Wickliffe.

**Meeting commenced** 09:03am

## 1 Meeting conduct

### 1.1 Apologies

#### Resolved

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council receives the apologies from the following elected members for Tuesday 28 April 2015:

Name	Reason	From	To	
Councillor Connors	Lateness		09:00	10:29
Councillor Brijevich	Non-attendance		09:00	15:16
Board Chair Peters	Non-attendance		09:00	15:16
Board Chair Walker	Non-attendance		09:00	15:16
Board Chair Renton	Non-attendance		09:00	15:16
Board Chair Kelly	Non-attendance		09:00	15:16

Moved/seconded by: Fox/McLean

#### Resolved

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council receives the apologies from the following elected members for Wednesday 29 April 2015:

Name	Reason	From	To	
Councillor McLean	Non-attendance		09:01	16:06
Board Chair Walker	Non-attendance		09:01	16:06

Moved/seconded by: Fox/French

#### Resolved

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council receives the apologies from the following elected members for Wednesday 29 April 2015:

Name	Reason	From	To	
Councillor McLean	Non-attendance		09:01	16:06
Board Chair Walker	Non-attendance		09:01	16:06

#### Resolved

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council receives the apologies from the following elected members for Thursday 30 April 2015:

Name	Reason	From	To	
Councillor McLean	Non-attendance		09:03	10:24
Board Chair Peters	Non-attendance		09:03	10:24
Board Chair Renton	Non-attendance		09:03	10:24
Board Chair Walker	Non-attendance		09:03	10:24

### 1.2 Conflict of interest

No conflicts of interest were received.



## **2 Long Term Plan and associated policies hearing submissions**

### **2.1 Anna Horne**

Ms Horne spoke to her submissions (LTP15\_310, RFIN\_165, DC\_5) specifically on the Arts Strategy, the need for a climate change budget and strategy, and tourism event ideas.

Councillor Goudie requested clarification to Ms Horne's statement on the district losing habitat due to climate change. Ms Horne advised she referred to coastal sections/settlements impacted by sea level rise and storm events.

### **2.2 John Wright - Mercury Bay Area School**

Mr Wright spoke to his submission for Mercury Bay Area School (LTP15\_110) specifically on requesting support for the provision of community facilities within the Mercury Bay Area School, support towards the school's gymnasium as a community facility and joint venture developments.

Deputy Mayor French queried whether the utilisation of school facilities and it becoming a community environment was supported at central government level. Mr Wright responded that government policy had set a precedent around public private partnerships (PPP) and the process of joint ventures. The Ministry of Education was very supportive of community involvement with schools.

Councillor Goudie sought clarification on his use of the phrase 'paying it forward' to which he clarified that it was not necessarily relating to financial contributions but investing in our young people and setting the example to them of paying it forward.

### **2.3 Evans Young - Hopper Developments Ltd**

Mr Young spoke to his tabled item and Hopper Developments Ltd submission (DC\_1, RFIN\_45) to reinforce Hopper Development Ltd's requests made in relation to the Revenue and Finance Policy and the Development Contributions Policy.

Councillor Goudie queried Hopper Development Ltd's position on pre-existing arrangements made to which Mr Young replied they were already legally set and had no intention to challenge these.

### **2.4 Stella Pennell**

Ms Pennell spoke to her submission (LTP15\_73) relating to the development of a district-wide Arts Strategy.

Mayor Leach asked how Ms Pennell thought we could tap into the \$400,000 allocated from central government to Creative Waikato. Ms Pennell responded that an arts coordinator and arts strategy would allow the district to seek other funding sources.

Ms Pennell responded to Deputy Mayor French's query whether she has looked at other council's art strategies and if they had achieved what they had sought to by advising this was not an area she had done any research in however it would seem important to utilise the best of what other council's had achieved to create our own district strategy.

Community Board Chair Johnston posited whether an arts strategy could be modelled against the way sports trusts are run and funded by central government to which Ms Pennell responded that this was a very different set up which had been running for a significant length of time.

## **2.5 John Rich - Department of Conservation**

Mr Rich spoke to the Department of Conservation's (DOC) submission (LTP15\_93) to reinforce the request made from DOC to Council for the financial contribution to complete the Kauaeranga Valley Road seal.

Mr Rich responded that DOC had not approached Waikato Regional Council as a funding source for the seal of Kauaeranga Valley Road in response to Councillor Goudie's query.

Deputy Mayor French asked what importance DOC has placed on the maintenance for the rest of the DOC road from the centre to the top of the hill to which Mr Rich advised that DOC had been seeking advice from the Council's Roading Manager as to a proactive regime for maintenance. Mr Rich also advised that DOC had recently been made an authority to manage roads by New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) conditionally. On the completion of roading management plans DOC would be able to apply for the NZTA subsidies.

## **2.6 John Duthie - Burfoot Ltd**

Mr Duthie spoke to his tabled item and Burfoot Ltd's submission (LTP15\_146) specifically relating to areas which impacted Burfoot Ltd's development in Matarangi.

## **2.7 Jillian Kaeppli**

Ms Kaeppli spoke to her submission (LTP15\_114) on the topic of the proposal for an annual fixed rate for short term accommodation providers.

## **2.8 Jan Wright**

Ms Wright spoke from her tabled items on behalf of Deborah Hide-Bayne's submission (LTP15\_39), Creative Mercury Bay's submission (LTP15\_74) and her own submission (LTP15\_42).

## **2.9 Lesley McCormick**

Ms McCormick spoke to her tabled item and submission (LTP15\_135) and to a tabled item and the submission (LTP15\_138) on behalf of Robinson Road Harbour Foreshore Group.

In response to Mayor Leach's query Ms McCormick advised she was supportive of the use of targeted rates where it was to improve infrastructure.

Peter French posited that with increased economic development activity across the district and with greater promotion it would result in a positive impact to those renting bachs. Ms McCormick advised that Council at this point had been successful in the area of tourism and that it would be premature to keep putting more money into this area. Ms McCormick raised that Council is creating a disincentive for owning a bach on the peninsula where you could not offset the cost with occasional renting of your property.

Mayor Leach queried whether Ms McCormick would favour a bed tax (paying only for how many nights were sold) as an alternative to which Ms McCormick responded that as they are not approaching this as a commercial venture bach owners should not be penalised.

Community Board Chair Johnson queried her stance on the local empowerment model and Ms McCormick advised it was a noble philosophy however expressed efficiency and economy of scale were better managed operationally at a district level and could not see the benefit of public conveniences going back to a local level.

## **2.10 Lizzy Leckie**

Ms Leckie spoke in support of her submission (LTP15\_212) on the topic of the Arts Strategy adding additional reasoning that an Arts Strategy would enhance the environment, enrich the community, add mana and promote the peninsula's heritage creating something distinctive.

She also provided comment that the Coromandel is built on tourism and we would not cope with it as a revenue source, the arts create a beacon which attracts and catches the eye allowing for word of mouth extending far beyond the Coromandel.

She noted that an Arts Strategy would allow Council to maximise existing potential of other projects such as the Great Walks and cycle trails.

Councillor Connors queried if Ms Leckie considered an Arts Strategy would make it easier to get funding to which she responded that it would open us up to larger funding sources.

## **2.11 Mervyn Trebes**

Mr Trebes spoke to his submission (LTP15\_264) on the topic of the proposal for an annual fixed rate for short term accommodation providers.

Mr Trebes responded to Deputy Mayor French's query on the view some people have that short term accommodation providers are not competing with motels as they have different clientele than those who use the short term accommodation. Tenants may have gone to motels previously and were now aware of different options available. He had no issue with competition of those renting but they needed to contribute evenly to make it a fair playing field.

Councillor Goudie posited if it was a desire for a different experience that they used alternate accommodation to which he responded that there definitely should be a variety of venues but those gaining need to be treated equally.

## **2.12 Jenny Wolf - Aged Concern**

Ms Wolf spoke to her tabled item and Aged Concern's submission (LTP15\_271) and their request for \$13,315 per annum over 3 years.

Deputy Mayor French questioned if Aged Concern received any central government funding to which Ms Wolf 's response was that no direct funding was received from central government. Aged Concern Thames was given support from the local District Health Board in helping with health promotion classes.

Councillor Wells sought clarification on what was meant by elder abuse and Ms Wolf was able to explain in most cases it would be seen in the form of financial abuse where by the person's children would financially cripple them or it was also seen in the forms of physical or emotional abuse.

## **2.13 Alison Smith - Coromandel Dieback Forum**

Ms Smith spoke as the coordinator for the Coromandel Dieback Forum to their submission (LTP15\_325) and requests.

Deputy Mayor French asked since there was no known cure for Kauri dieback disease whether we should continue to fight a losing battle or focus on another species to which Ms Smith responded that it was debatable whether it was a losing battle as breeding was building up forests and as the Council had Kauri on its track they held a responsibility to do their bit.

Mayor Leach queried what role Waikato Regional Council (WRC) was playing with Kauri dieback disease and management to which Ms Smith was able to advise that WRC were contributing \$80,000 through a service level agreement. Their role had been previously very hands-on but they were now moving towards contributing to a national programme however was still looking to upskill their staff to better manage this issue.

Councillor Connors queried how many Kauri are on Council land and Ms Smith's response was that it was known there were Kauri on Council land but until an audit was complete they could not estimate how many or in what condition.

#### **2.14 Barb Richie - Kauri Trust 2000**

Ms Richie spoke to the Kauri Trust 2000 submission (LTP15\_352) on the topics of biodiversity and the use of more funds towards environmental protection for the district.

#### **2.15 Bill Hewitt - EECA**

Mr Hewitt spoke to a tabled item and the EECA submission (LTP15\_82) on their suggestion for the adoption of a targeted rate for those wanting to install water and energy systems.

Councillor McLean queried by EECA had not looked into promoting solar power to which he responded that the costs did not yet provide enough payback.

Deputy Mayor French questioned whether WRC had adopted the target rate for this and Mr Hewitt advised that they were assisting in other areas however they were not on the list of those using the targeted rate for ratepayers.

#### **2.16 Wallace Leighton**

Mr Leighton spoke to his tabled item and submission (LTP15\_342) on the topic of the proposal for an annual fixed rate for short term accommodation providers and reclassification to a commercial rate for larger B&Bs.

#### **2.17 Dal Minogue - Mercury Bay South Residents & Ratepayers Association**

Mr Minogue spoke to his submission (LTP15\_260) regarding Eastern Seaboard wastewater debt and the proposal to charge a new annual fixed rate for all short term accommodation providers.

#### **2.18 Robin Munch**

Ms Murch spoke to her submission (RFIN\_43) discussing the topic of reclassification to a commercial rate for larger B&Bs.

#### **2.19 Sharyn Morcom**

Ms Morcom spoke to her tabled item and submission (LTP15\_35) regarding the Whitianga Town Hall.

Councillor Goudie queried whether they could work with the Community Board to work with the hall to which Ms Morcom advised that for the hall to meet the needs of the performing arts and community needs it would need a n extension like the one done for the Whangamata Community Hall. Ms Morcom also confirmed the Mercury Bay performing arts would still expect to pay a fee to use it and they want to work with Council to shape it to meet community needs.

### **2.20 Richard Northey**

Mr Northey spoke to his tabled item and submission (LTP15\_50) regarding the proposal for an annual fixed rate for short term accommodation providers.

### **2.21 Gian McGregor**

Ms McGregor spoke to her and Mr Smither's submission (LTP15\_217) regarding the district-wide arts strategy, Council owned land being used for motor-camps as an iconic New Zealand holiday which is being lost, Council designated marine reserves, and keeping New Chums untouched from development.

### **2.22 Alistair Brickell**

Mr Brickell spoke to his submission (LTP15\_345) specifically on the topics of mining tourism and the summertime magazine produced by Council.

Mayor Leach suggested Mr Brickell provide some more detail work on the area of mining tourism and present this back to Council for them to more clearly consider his ideas and what they would entail and the potential costs.

### **2.23 Des Ratima - Creative Waikato**

Ms Ratima spoke to her tabled presentation and Creative Waikato's submission (LTP15\_81) requesting support for a regional art strategy and for them to create one for the Coromandel region.

Deputy Mayor French asked her opinion on the expectations people have that once there is a strategy that Council will fund what comes out of it. Ms Ratima advised that Council is not necessarily a sole funder but a key stakeholder.

Councillor Connors queried how the government funding received by Creative Waikato would benefit this region however Ms Ratima could not provide specifics as to how the funds were being spent.

### **2.24 John North**

Mr North spoke to his tabled item and submission (LTP15\_219) on the topic of parking in Hahei.

### **2.25 Maggie Johnson**

Ms Johnson spoke to her tabled item and submissions (LTP15\_311, DC\_4) with her key focus being on Eastern Seaboard Wastewater debt and development contributions.

**Meeting adjourned: 15:16**

**Meeting reconvened: 29 April 2015 at 9:01am**

### **2.26 Glenn Horsley and Matt Juby (Thames Squash Club)**

Mr Horsley and Mr Dubie spoke to the Thames Squash Club submissions (REM\_41 and RFIN\_179). The points raised were the council rate charges specifically the part tax component. Mr Horsley described the historical events that had taken place addressing this issue and noted that no follow up by council staff had occurred. His Worship noted the lack of communication and requested that staff responses be made back to the club. Councillor

Goudie queried the Squash Club's position to discretionary conditions for those non-profit organisations that do not fit into the policy. Mr Horsley and Mr Juby supported this and would like their club to be considered under a discretionary basis.

#### **2.27 Elizabeth Jones (Tararu Resident Committee)**

Ms Jones spoke to her submission (RREM\_1) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Ms Jones thanked the Council for considering the rate remission proposal in the Long Term Plan consultation document. She noted that the proposal was welcomed and supported by her and fellow retirement village residents. Councillor Goudie queried Ms Jones comments in her submission to fairness and equity and asked whether or not Ms Jones felt it was fair that elderly residents that rented be considered. Ms Jones answered that it was not fair but could only speak to her situation.

#### **2.28 Ronald Ladd**

Mr Ladd spoke to his submission (RREM\_38) on the rates remission. He noted his support for the rates relief for those living in retirement villages.

#### **2.29 Gavin McIntosh**

Mr McIntosh spoke to his submission (LTP15\_1) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Mr McIntosh requested that Council considered funding an upgrade to the Booms Reserve in Thames. He further explained that revitalising the area would be a great community initiative and noted the area was worthy of development. Deputy Mayor French asked Mr McIntosh if he would support more resources implemented in the local school in an effort to providing a community environment. Mr McIntosh said that he would support this idea but still wished for planting and general maintenance to take place at the reserve.

#### **2.30 Katherine Sangster**

Ms Sangster spoke to her submission (LTP15\_251). Ms Sangster addressed concerns to the Thames War Memorial Civic/Centre and i-site project in particular to pedestrian safety issues.

#### **2.31 Lyndon Suckling**

Mr Suckling spoke to his submission (LTP15\_34). Mr Suckling requested that Council considered development to Totara Valley Road in Thames. He noted there were very few sections of new housing available and advised that further development was critical to attract more residents to the area. Mr Suckling commented that he would like to see a focus to increase the Thames population and suggested that Council take the lead on this by way of enabling future housing.

#### **2.32 John Leenman**

Mr Leenman spoke to his submission (LTP15\_103) and presented a Powerpoint on electric vehicles. Mr Leenman advocated that as part of Council's development to the Kopu business area, part funding should be implemented into an electric vehicle charge station. Deputy Mayor French asked Mr Leenman what costs were involved with charging electric vehicles, Mr Leenman answered that the cost equated to a cup of coffee. In addition Deputy Mayor French asked how many kilometres it took before charging the vehicle. Mr Leenman advised that the maximum distant was 150 kilometres before charging was required. His Worship suggested Mr Leenman makes contact with the Economic Development Committee to consider his proposal.

### 2.33 Peter Wood

Mr Wood spoke to his submission (LTP15\_257) and highlighted his concerns to wharf upgrades specifically the Shortland Wharf in Thames. Mr Woods noted that he did not support the proposed budget allocated for this project.

### 2.34 Simon Wathen

Mr Wathen spoke to his submission (RFIN\_69) relating to the short term accommodation proposal. Mr Wathen did not support the introduction of the new rate. Furthermore he stated that bach owners made a significant contribution to providing accommodation.

### 2.35 Peter McKenzie

Mr McKenzie spoke his submission (RFIN\_164) and on behalf of Beverley Mayhead (RFIN\_178). Both submissions did not support the proposed fee for short term accommodation. Mr McKenzie advised that more emphasis was required in the Long Term Plan to address global warming. Mr McKenzie suggested that funds be put aside for this and that Council be actively involved in acknowledging this issue.

<b>Adjournment</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>Finish</b>	<b>Reason</b>
His Worship	10:31am	10:41am	Morning Tea

### 2.36 Aroha Waetford (Community Waikato)

Ms Waetford spoke to the Community Waikato organisation's submission (LTP15\_343). Ms Waetford identified the importance of Council's involvement in community needs. Ms Waetford thanked Council for their assistance and noted that their contribution had supported the ongoing services in the Thames-Coromandel area. Deputy Mayor French asked Ms Waetford who mainly funded their organisation. Ms Waetford responded that Trust Waikato was the lead contributor. Deputy Mayor French also queried what type of support the organisation offered to the Thames-Coromandel District Council. Ms Waetford noted that Community Waikato largely assisted in financial advocacy and budgeting training. Moreover Ms Waetford said the funds were used to support grants and scholarships.

### 2.37 Moira Cursey (Waikato Biodiversity Forum)

Ms Cursey spoke to the Waikato Biodiversity Forum submission (LTP15\_323) and presented a Powerpoint on the organisation's activities. Ms Cursey acknowledged and thanked the Council for the \$3,000 annual contribution. Deputy Mayor French asked Ms Cursey if the workshops provided by the organisation was a free service to which Ms Cursey answered yes.

### 2.38 Neville Williams (Waikato Regional Council)

Mr Williams spoke to the Waikato Regional Council submission (LTP15\_288). The significant points raised were that the Long Term Plan considered adequate funds for the rural community water supply systems upgrades. In addition he advised that Waikato Regional Council would like to see the inclusion of the Regional Coastal Policy Statement in the Long Term Plan. Mr Williams noted Waikato Regional Council's commitment to continuing the on-going partnership with Council. Board Chair Johnson asked Mr Williams if the Regional Coastal Policy was different to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Mr Williams advised this was a separate document. His Worship noted the constructive partnership between the council's and anticipated this would continue to secure consents for water supply upgrades and renewals in the future.

### **2.39 Morrie Dunwoodie (Heritage Hauraki Coromandel) and (The Coromandel Heritage Trust)**

Morrie Dunwoodie spoke to the submissions LTP15\_113 and LTP15\_130. Mr Dunwoodie requested that Council include the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity and budget in the Long Term Plan. Mr Dunwoodie mentioned there was no suggestion of this in the plan. Furthermore he requested that a heritage role be established in Council and wished for continual commitment to heritage in the area.

Councillor Goudie sought clarification and stated she understood there was a point of reference to heritage. She asked Mr Dunwoodie did it matter that the role did not specifically say Heritage, to which Mr Dunwoodie responded it did not matter.

### **2.40 Roger Loveless (CCS Disability Action Group)**

Roger Loveless spoke to the submission LTP15\_280. Mr Loveless requested that Council continue to work with the CCS organisation to provide accessibility to persons with disabilities. Mr Loveless acknowledged and thanked the staff for their work to date.

### **2.41 Matthew Cooper (Sport Waikato)**

Mr Cooper spoke to Sport Waikato's submission (LTP15\_336) and presented a Powerpoint. Mr Cooper acknowledged and supported key projects listed in the Long Term Plan including the Great Walks and Hauraki Rail Trail. He commented that the investigations of a regional aquatic centre and costing put aside for a multi sports indoor facility as signalled in the Plan, fitted nicely with the organisation's Regional Sport Facilities Plan. Mr Cooper also requested that the Council continue to fund the salary for the District Coordinator in the area.

### **2.42 Chris Emmett (Surf Lifesaving)**

Mr Emmett spoke to the submission LTP15\_129 and presented a Powerpoint. Mr Emmett requested that Council continue to support the surf lifesaving organisation. He asked that a three year service delivery contract be implemented. Mr Emmett commented that the patrol season had been extended due to climate changes and asked that Council consider funding for the longer periods.

### **2.43 Leslie Preston (Bachcare Limited)**

Ms Preston spoke to Bachcare Limited's submission (RFIN\_70) and presented a Powerpoint. Ms Preston represented Bachcare and 91 bach owners. Ms Preston confirmed that she and the owners did not support the proposed short term accommodation rate and urged Council to withdraw the proposal.

### **2.44 Vaughn Austen**

Mr Austen spoke to his submission (LTP15\_128) and the Kopu Development Group submission (LTP15\_357). Mr Austen requested that Council consider a commercial wharf in Kopu and noted the benefit it would bring to the area. Mr Austen stated that he was encouraged by the Kopu Business Concept Plan and agreed with the proposal.

### **2.45 John Rennie**

Mr Rennie spoke to his submission (LTP15\_269) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Mr Rennie requested that Council consider installing public conveniences and a flood pump station at Kopu.

<b>Adjournment</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>Finish</b>	<b>Reason</b>
His Worship	1:15pm	1:34pm	Lunch
Special meeting commenced	1.35pm		



### 3 Governance Planning and Strategy

#### 3.1 Thames Community Board recommendation -Thames War Memorial Civic Centre – I-site project

Council was asked to approve the recommendation from the Thames Community Board on the Thames War Memorial Civic Centre – I-site project. Staff tabled a memo that included new estimated costs for roading works, the increase amounted to \$54,500.

##### **Resolved:**

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Receives the 'Thames Community Board recommendation - Thames War Memorial Civic Centre/i-SITE project' report, dated 22 April 2015.
2. Approves a capital budget of \$264,250 excluding GST in the 2014/15 financial year for the building alterations and bus/car parking provisions required for the i-site and Destination Coromandel relocation into the Thames Civic Centre to be funded from the Thames Local Consolidated Depreciation Reserves conditional upon the execution of the tenancy agreement(s) with Destination Coromandel.
3. Delegates the Thames Community Board Chair and Area Manager authority to execute the tenancy agreement for the i-SITE and Destination Coromandel premises at the Thames Civic Centre.
4. Delegates the Thames Community Board Chair and Chief Executive authority to award and execute the Thames Civic Centre alterations contract within a total budget of \$155,250.
5. Delegates the Thames Community Board Chair and Area Manager authority to award and execute the Thames Civic Centre roading works contract within a total budget of \$109,000 excluding GST.
6. Instructs the Area Manager to work with Board Member Cassidy and Councillor Connors to confirm the Civic Centre plaza streetscape plan and costs at its next meeting.

Moved/seconded by: Leach/Goudie

#### 3.2 Thames Community Board recommendation -Thames public conveniences budgets

Council was asked to approve the recommendation from the Thames Community Board to increase the capital project budget for public conveniences at Porritt Park and the Thames Civic Centre.

Councillor Brljevič asked why the Civic Centre toilets required upgrading as he considered the toilets were in reasonable condition. Councillor Connors clarified that the upgrade was for the external public toilets not the toilets within the Civic Centre.

##### **Resolved:**

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Receives the 'Thames Community Board recommendation - Thames public conveniences capital budgets' report, dated 22 April 2015.
2. Approves the budget increase of \$20,000 for the Porritt Park Toilet replacement to be loan funded in the 2014/2015 year.
3. Approves the \$18,000 upgrade to the Civic Centre public toilets to be loan funded in the 2014/2015 financial year.

Moved/seconded by: Goudie/Wells

Special meeting closed 1.47pm

Hearing reconvened 1.48pm

**2.46 John Sandford (Hauraki-Coromandel Federated Farmers)**

Mr Sandford spoke to his organisation's submission (LTP15\_328). Mr Sandford noted the organisation's support to the Financial Strategy and Revenue and Financing Policy and commented that the rating system would be transparent and balanced.

**2.47 Craig Cassidy (Sunkist Stay Bike n Hike)**

Mr Cassidy spoke to his submission (LTP15\_353) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Mr Cassidy agreed with the proposed short term accommodation rate, and noted that this was fair and equitable. He mentioned that bach owners did not pay for a number of things that commercial operators did including pan tax charges and building warrant of fitness.

**2.48 David Rushforth**

Mr Rushforth spoke to his submission (LTP15\_239) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Mr Rushforth highlighted that he did not support the proposal of Tairua information centre moving to local funding. He commented that Tairua was the primary stop point for those visiting the Cathedral Cove and Hot Water Beach and that the centre provided visitors with district wide information.

**2.49 Keith Trembath and Bruce Smith (Waikato East Life Education Trust)**

Mr Trembath and Mr Smith spoke to the organisation's submission (LTP15\_363) and presented a PowerPoint. Mr Trembath highlighted the purpose of their organisation and the support they offer and provide to children. Mr Trembath acknowledged the support of the Council and took the opportunity to thank them.

**2.50 Bob Renton on behalf of Tairua-Pauanui Community Board**

Board Chair Renton spoke to the Community Board's submission (LTP15\_339). Board Chair Renton specifically raised points on the funding proposal for information centres and noted the Board did not support the move from district to local. Board Chair Renton further commented on the Park and Reserve – Tairua Pauanui trail and Pepe Walkway Bridge project signalled in the consultation document to reflect the outcomes of previous workshops.

**2.51 Rowena Brown (Tairua Information Centre)**

Ms Brown spoke to her organisation's submission (LTP15\_290) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Ms Brown stated that she did not support the proposal to move Tairua information centre's funding from district to local. Ms Brown further noted that a large percentage of the information centre's work involved promoting the entire district.

**2.52 Jewel Hughes (Pauanui Information Centre)**

Ms Hughes spoke to her organisation's submission (LTP15\_286). Ms Hughes supported the proposal for the funding change and the three year phased in period. Ms Hughes emphasised however that she did not support district-wide funding of the i-sites.

His Worship asked Ms Brown if the information centre was identified under quality mark standards to which Ms Brown answered no.

#### **2.53 Kim Coppersmith (Hikuai District Trust)**

Ms Coppersmith spoke to her organisation's submission (LTP15\_330). Ms Coppersmith requested that Council consider bringing forward the funds allocated for the Pauanui trail to 2015/2016.

#### **2.54 Rosalind Handy**

Ms Handy spoke to her submission (LTP15\_327). Ms Handy supported the proposed construction of the Wentworth Valley Walkway and cycleway. Ms Handy requested that the investigations into the project be brought forward one year. Ms Handy noted that as a frequent user of the road there were a number of safety issues.

Deputy Mayor French asked Ms Handy of all the health and safety issues accompanied with the road what would be the worst. Ms Handy responded that the dust would be identified as the most hazardous.

#### **2.55 Sarah Campbell (Pauanui Ratepayers and Residents Association)**

Ms Campbell spoke to her organisation's submission (LTP15\_329). Ms Campbell requested that the Coastal and Harbour Erosion activity funding be included in the Long Term Plan. Ms noted past events of erosion and commented there was no indication of prevention, and management to the issues in the Plan. Ms Campbell also requested that more priority be given to the drinking water supply upgrades in the Pauanui area.

#### **2.56 Christian McDean (Hot Water Beach Holiday Park)**

Mr McDean spoke on behalf of the Hot Water Beach Holiday Park submission (LTP15\_351). Mr McDean addressed the Development Contribution Policy and requested that the Council consider not charging the community infrastructure component to camp grounds

**Meeting adjourned: 4:00pm**

**Meeting reconvened: 30 April 2015 at 9:03am**

#### **2.57 Ken Coulam**

Mr Coulam spoke to his submission (LTP15\_124). Mr Coulam does not support the short term accommodation proposal. He commented that many of the rented baches pick up the overflow for some of the district events. He further noted that the target group for the rates would be hard to identify. Mr Coulam requested that Council explore the option of establishing campgrounds and noted that this was a lost opportunity.

Councillor Goudie asked Mr Coulam that given Council provided infrastructure, does he think it was Council's responsibility to be involved with campgrounds. Mr Coulam agreed that it was.

#### **2.58 Tony Jacobs (Tairua Residents and Ratepayers Association)**

Mr Jacobs spoke to his submission (LTP15\_140) and on behalf of the association (LTP15\_318). Mr Jacobs acknowledged the simplified version of the consultation document. Mr Jacobs highlighted that all information centres be district funded as they all provided a district benefit. Mr Jacobs discussed Tairua Water supply and suggested that the restrictions be assessed. Furthermore Mr Jacobs noted that he did support the short term accommodation charge. Deputy Mayor French asked Mr Jacobs what type of water restrictions would be acceptable. Mr Jacobs advised that restrictions were fair but not for

the whole summer period.

#### **2.59 Brett Wilson**

Mr Wilson spoke to his submission (LTP15\_145). Mr Wilson supported the proposal to move the funding of debt on the Eastern Seaboard wastewater plants from development to rates. Mr Wilson suggested that the payments be over longer period to ease the rate burden to ratepayers. Councillor Wells asked Mr Wilson what would be the time period he would suggest for repayment. Mr Wilson answered that a twenty period would be more sufficient.

#### **2.60 John Rive (Whangamata Ratepayers Association)**

Mr Rive spoke to the association's submission (LTP15\_125) and further information that was tabled and circulated to the elected members. Mr Rive emphasised that he did not support the funding of debt on the Eastern Seaboard wastewater plants from development to rates. He included costing and calculations that identified different options to repayments. Deputy Mayor French asked Mr Rive if he supported the Wentworth Valley Road dust sealing. Mr Rive answered that he was against it. Councillor Wells asked Mr Rive if he understood an upgrade to the motor camp was taking place at Wentworth Valley road and that there would likely be an increase to traffic flow. Mr Rive was not aware of this.

#### **2.61 Keith Procter**

Mr Procter spoke to his submission (LTP15\_144). Mr Procter expressed that he did not support the short term accommodation charges that was proposed. He stated that he found the approach to be opposite to driving Economic Development. Councillor Goudie asked Mr Procter if he thought the free enterprise added to the flavour of the Coromandel. Mr Procter agreed with this. Deputy Mayor French asked Mr Procter how many days out of the year would he rent his bach out. Mr Procter answered that over the year he would only rent out over the Christmas and Beach Hop period about ten days in total.

**Meeting closed at 10:24am on Thursday 30 April 2015**

The foregoing minutes were certified as being a true and correct record of the meeting of the Thames-Coromandel District Council Long Term Plan hearings and special meeting held between 28 - 30 April 2015.

**Chairperson** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

# 2015-2025 Long Term Plan and associated policies deliberations

---

TO	Council
FROM	Angela Jane, Governance Strategy Manager and Steve Baker, Chief Financial Officer
DATE	28 April 2015
SUBJECT	<b>2015-2025 Long Term Plan and associated policies deliberations</b>

---

## **1 Purpose of report**

This deliberations report contains information on the Council's consultation proposals and the other submission topics raised by submitters in order for Council to make decisions to finalise the 2015-25 Long Term Plan and Revenue and Financing Policy. Similar reports are included in the agenda for the Development Contributions Policy and the Rates Remission Policy. The deliberations report includes:

### **Section 2**

a summary of the consultation and hearings process for the Long Term Plan, association policies and next steps

### **Section 3**

Corrections and changes requested by staff, as a result of updated information and subsequent checks

### **Section 4**

- deliberations information for each of the district-funded Council's proposals contained in the Long Term Plan, Rates Remission Policy and the Revenue and Financing Policy.
  - including statistics on the submissions received
  - a summary of the submission points,
  - staff advice
  - any additional information that has become available and
  - Community Board recommendation where available
  - staff recommendation.

### **Section 5**

Deliberations on the remainder of the Revenue and Financing Policy

### **Section 6**

Deliberations information on district-funded funding requests received through submissions

### **Section 7**

Information for confirmation on other Long Term Plan content

### **Section 8**

Deliberations information on topics raised by submitters for district-funded activities

### **Section 9**

deliberations information for each of the local-funded proposals contained in the Long Term Plan

### **Section 10**

Deliberations information on locally-funded funding requests received through submissions

### **Section 11**

Deliberations information on topics raised by submitters for locally-funded activities

## Table of Contents

1	Purpose of report.....	21
2	Background .....	24
2.1	Long Term Plan development.....	24
2.2	Consultation .....	24
2.3	Submissions and hearing process .....	25
2.4	Deliberations .....	25
2.5	Next steps .....	26
3	Corrections and change requests from staff .....	26
3.1	Financial information to be noted.....	26
3.2	Changes to the financial supporting information .....	27
3.3	Changes from 2014/15 financial year .....	28
3.4	FIS changes .....	29
3.5	Rating base information.....	29
3.6	Changes to supporting policy information .....	29
3.7	Changes to financial budget information.....	30
3.8	Performance measure targets .....	35
4	Consultation Document Proposals affecting district-funded activities.....	36
4.1	Eastern seaboard wastewater plants.....	36
4.2	Stormwater - local to district funding.....	39
4.3	Change in UAGC as funding source.....	42
4.4	Rates Remission Policy Proposal - Minor dwellings.....	43
4.5	Rates Remission Policy Proposal - retirement villages .....	45
4.6	District activity changes to fees and charges.....	46
4.7	World War 1 Memorial Forests - Te Wao Whakamaumaharatanga .....	46
4.8	Short-term accommodation proposed rate.....	47
4.9	Reclassify Bed and Breakfast businesses with four or more bedrooms for hire as commercial properties.....	53
5	Revenue and Financing Policy .....	54
6	Funding requests for district funded activities .....	56
6.1	Age Concern Thames.....	57
6.2	Enviroschools budget .....	58
6.3	Natural and cultural heritage activity and Biodiversity Forum.....	59
6.4	Biodiversity Strategy.....	60
6.5	Other former grants .....	60
6.6	Kauri Protection from Kauri dieback .....	61
6.7	Eco-design advisor .....	62
7	Information for confirmation of other Long Term Plan content .....	63
7.1	Council-controlled organisations.....	63
7.2	Contribution to Decision Making by Māori.....	64

8	Deliberations information on topics raised by submitters for district-funded activities	64
8.1	Rates/debt comments .....	65
8.2	Revenue and Financing Policy .....	74
8.3	Activity: Representation.....	75
8.4	Activity: Strategic Planning .....	80
8.5	Activity: District Plan.....	89
8.6	Activity: Community Health and Safety.....	95
8.7	Activity: Emergency Management .....	103
8.8	Activity: Economic Development .....	104
8.9	Activity: Coastal and Hazard Management.....	146
8.10	Activity: Grants and Remissions .....	152
8.11	Activity: Water supply .....	168
8.12	Activity: Stormwater .....	174
8.13	Activity: Solid Waste.....	177
8.14	All other submissions .....	180
9	Consultation Document proposals for local funded activities .....	192
9.1	Funding change from district to local .....	192
9.2	Local activity changes to fees and charges .....	197
9.3	Thames Community Board area - Local Economic Development.....	199
9.4	Whangamata Community Board area - Local roads and footpaths.....	201
9.5	Whangamata Community Board area - Wentworth Valley Seal extension and walkway/cycleway.....	203
10	Funding requests for local funded activities .....	205
10.1	Thames Flag Budget.....	205
10.2	Thames Brown Street Public Conveniences.....	206
10.3	Landscaping for relocated Cook's Landing Monument .....	206
10.4	Tapu Reserve .....	207
10.5	Thames CBD Specimen Trees.....	207
10.6	Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping .....	207
10.7	Mackay Street carpark .....	208
10.8	Youth participation in Thames Community Board local governance .....	209
10.9	Coromandel Wharf .....	209
10.10	Coromandel Library service level agreement and funding .....	210
10.2	Signage for toilet facilities - Tokatea.....	211
10.3	Coromandel Heritage Trust .....	211
10.4	Whitianga Youth Centre/Space .....	211
11	Deliberations information on topics raised by submitters for local-funded activities	208
11.1	Activity: Roads and Footpaths.....	212
11.2	Activity: Community Spaces - Coromandel-Colville .....	236
11.3	Activity: Community Spaces - Mercury Bay .....	248

11.4	Activity: Community Spaces - Tairua-Pauanui .....	258
11.5	Activity: Community Spaces - Thames .....	267
11.6	Activity: Community Spaces - Whangamata .....	291

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Long Term Plan development

Every three years all councils across the country develop, consult on and adopt a long term plan. This year the legal requirements, under an amended Local Government Act 2002, are different from previous years. The major difference to date has been consulting on a new style of Consultation Document, with supporting information available, rather than a draft Long Term Plan.

The Consultation Document and most of the supporting information was audited by Audit New Zealand prior to consultation to check that the Consultation Document provided an effective basis for public participation in the Council's decisions about the proposed content of its Long Term Plan.

### 2.2 Consultation

The Council consulted on the Long Term Plan Consultation Document, a revised Revenue and Financing Policy, revised Rates Remission Policy and revised Development Contributions Policy for a month from 9 March to 9 April.

Promotion of the consultations utilised the following mechanisms:

- a rates insert that was distributed in February with the rates instalment notices. Ratepayers who pay by direct debit or who had already paid their rates in full did not receive this mailout.
- Radio advertising campaign (Coromandel FM, Breeze, Nga Iwi FM) throughout the month of consultation - including promotion of the public meeting dates and venues and close of submissions date.
- Printed advertising in the district's newspapers - Informer, Tairua Local Advertiser, Coastal News, Matarangi Beach Paper, Coromandel Town Chronicle, Pauanui Post
- Online advertising on NZHerald.com, Waikato Times, Stuff.co.nz, metservice, Sun Media and Bookabach.
- Council's website, facebook page and twitter

#### Social media feedback

There were 10 posts to the Council Facebook page relating to the Long Term Plan over the consultation period and the week leading up to consultation. From the 10 posts:

- 267 people engaged in the posts by either, liking, commenting or sharing
- 5,318 people saw the posts
- 12,485 views by the people seeing the posts

The post to get the most views was the B&B proposal. The post stating "What a good turnout" (related to submission numbers) was viewed the least, only 228 times.

The 10 posts related to:

- Awareness raising of consultation open
- B&B and short term accommodation proposal (2 posts)
- Awareness raising of public meetings (6 posts)
- Encouragement to make a submission (and reminder of submissions closing)
- Thank you for participating and submissions closed

Public meetings were held in Thames, Tairua, Coromandel, Whitianga, Pauanui and Whangamata. These meetings were an opportunity for residents and ratepayers to convey their thoughts and give their feedback, in place of only using the formal hearings.



Summaries of the public meetings are included as Attachment A. Approximately 100 people attended the meetings.

### 2.3 Submissions and hearing process

Council received 567 submissions from all the consultations with the following breakdown:

Long Term Plan	347
Development Contributions Policy	5
Rates Remission Policy	41
Revenue and Financing Policy	174

Hearings were held in Whitianga and Thames over three days - 28-30 April 2015. Twenty-five submitters presented in Whitianga and 36 submitters presented in Thames.

#### Types of submissions received

The Council provided a submission form for each of the documents open for consultation. All the forms with the exception of the Development Contribution Policy included targeted questions for the specific proposals within the documents and a general space for any other comments. Due to the large number of proposals with the Development Contributions Policy in its form we requested submitters note which proposal or part of the policy they were commenting on an open commentary field for their comment.

Submissions were received via the web through the new consultation portal, via email and through the mail as hard copy (which included any faxed submissions).

Submission type	Submitters	
Web	132	23%
Email	189	33%
Hardcopy (posted/dropped off/faxed)	246	44%
<b>Total</b>	<b>567</b>	

The submission form asked submitters (known as consultee in the software) for the following demographic information:

Demographic question	Submitters
Question not answered by consultee	194
Visitor to Thames-Coromandel	5
On behalf of an organisation based in the Thames-Coromandel district	38
On behalf of an organisation not based in the Thames-Coromandel district	9
Live in Thames-Coromandel district	227
Owns a property in Thames-Coromandel but lives elsewhere in NZ	80
Owns a property in Thames-Coromandel but lives internationally	9
None of these options	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>567</b>

#### Submission responses

For many of the proposals we only received feedback by a tick to the question we asked on the form with no additional comment noting the submitter's reasons. Where the proportions of just ticks versus ticks with commentary are quite different we have noted these numbers to help in the deliberations.

### 2.4 Deliberations

In addition to the Council deliberation meetings a round of Community Board meetings has taken place over 1 and 4 May to share the summary of the submissions and a draft of the staff report for the local funded activities and for the proposals that involve a change in funding. The Community Boards were invited to make recommendations on the proposals

and provide local input on the submission points relating to local issues. On some matters the Community Boards wished to remain neutral and for the information centre proposal recommendations were only sought from the affected Community Boards.

## **2.5 Next steps**

Following the deliberations meetings staff will update the financial model, the supporting information and associated policies to incorporate the Council decisions on all the proposals, the submission points received and other matters included in the agenda reports that are needed to produce the final Long Term Plan. Media releases will be distributed on the major decisions.

Audit New Zealand auditors are scheduled to commence their audit of the final Long Term Plan on 2 June 2015. If a major matter is identified then the Office of the Auditor General may also review the final plan. Any significant changes required by the auditors will be communicated to councillors at the earliest opportunity for direction and if necessary an additional council meeting will be scheduled. Small changes, usually of a technical nature will be incorporated and noted to Council in the adoption meeting agenda.

The final Long Term Plan is scheduled to be adopted by Council on 24 June 2015 (in Whitianga) at its Ordinary Council meeting. A communications plan for the wide dissemination of the council decisions will be presented at this meeting.

Responses to submitters will be distributed in early July.

Project debriefs to record the lessons learned and future actions will be scheduled for July and August and will include staff, management, councillor and Community Board sessions.

## **3 Corrections and change requests from staff**

The budget information and supporting information for the draft Long Term Plan was finalised in late January 2015 in order to be audited before the release of the consultation document in early March. Since then further investigations and checks of the information has occurred which has uncovered a number of corrections and recommended changes. There has also been a change in some of the base information due to circumstances which require changes to be made. All of these changes and corrections are described below.

### **3.1 Financial information to be noted**

#### **NZTA subsidy**

Council's draft 2015-25 Long Term Plan identifies the following work programmes which are part funded through NZTA's minor improvement work category (where NZTA investment criteria is met):

- Minor Improvements (district funded)
- Footpath construction budgets for all wards (locally funded).
- Street light improvement budgets for all wards (locally funded).

NZTA's investment cycle is the same as that for Council's LTP. Council's application for NZTA investment through the 2015-45 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) process uses the draft LTP budgets for the work programmes above. Once NZTA's level of investment is approved, the maximum value is essentially locked down for the minor improvement activity (as with most other NZTA work categories) for the 2015-18 period.

If Council approves increases to the LTP work programme budgets (which are funded from NZTA's minor improvement work category), it is unlikely that there will be any additional

NZTA subsidy to part fund these projects (i.e. these project will need to be 100% TCDC funded).

## **3.2 Changes to the financial supporting information**

### **3.2.1 Borrowing requirements and interest**

Council's forecast borrowing requirements over the ten years will change as a result of the March Budget revision as well as decisions made in the LTP deliberations. The interest rate curve forecast over the next ten years will have moved since the budgets for Council's Consultation Document were constructed. This will impact on the interest rates forecast in each of the following ten years covered by the Ten Year Plan. This will also impact the book value of the Council's interest rate swap portfolio. However any changes to the valuation of its Interest rate swaps will not impact rates. It is a book entry.

#### **Recommendation:**

7. That the Council updates the financial information to reflect changes in the interest rate curve, interest rate swaps and Council's borrowing requirements.

### **3.2.2 Cemetery fees**

The following changes to the cemetery fees schedule are suggested by the Cemeteries Working Group:

- Removal of child and stillborn plot fees for all cemeteries as child and stillborn plots are no longer available.
- Redefining the fees "ashes" to "ashes - lawn" and redefining "family ashes" to "family ashes and memorial gardens" for all cemeteries to define the types of plots to better reflect the need for higher costs.
- Reduce the "Columbarium Wall interment fee" for all cemeteries from \$180 to \$55 given there is no physical requirement on Council for the interment of ashes in the Columbarium Walls.
- Increase the "extra fee Sunday/public holiday" for all cemeteries from \$290 per service to \$480 to match actual contractor costs.
- Removal of the "stillborn memorial plaques" fee from Coromandel, Mercury Bay, Tairua-Pauanui and Whangamata cemetery schedules as these cemeteries do not have stillborn memorial walls.
- Include a new disinterment fee for all cemeteries to provide clarity for customer service staff upon enquiry. The text under the 2015/16 column for the charge to read "Quote to be obtained, with all costs being passed back to the applicant".

#### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board
- Whangamata Community Board
- Mercury Bay Community Board
- Thames Community Board

#### **Recommendation:**

8. That the Council adopts the proposed changes to the Cemeteries fees and charges schedule.

### **3.2.3 Destination Coromandel Funding Contract**

An error was made in the budget line for the Destination Coromandel Funding Contract. Year One (2015/16) should read \$375,000 (not \$350,000) with \$25,000 increases each year until \$450,000 is reached in Year 4. The increase in year 1 is \$16,075 which equates to a rating impact in year 1 of \$0.57 per UAGC.

Destination Coromandel has been paying back an historic debt at \$25,000 per annum, reducing their funding from \$375,000 to \$350,000 per annum for the previous three financial years. This debt is now repaid.

#### **Recommendation:**

9. That the Council approves the correction to the budget for the Destination Coromandel contract in year 1 to be \$375,000.

### **3.2.4 Regional Sports Facilities Plan**

Sport Waikato request that the Thames-Coromandel District Council support a proportional contribution for the delivery of the Regional Sports Facilities Plan - shared across district councils throughout the region. With a total annual value of \$100K plus GST the proportional contribution for Thames-Coromandel District Council equates to \$9,570 plus GST per year for three years. The Chief Executive advised the Council at the LTP hearings that with the support of the Mayor the Council had already confirmed this funding contribution.

#### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Tairua-Pauanui
- Whangamata
- Mercury Bay Community Board
- Thames Community Board

#### **Recommendation**

10. That Council approves a grant for Sport Waikato of \$9,570 plus GST annually for the first three years of the Long Term Plan within the Grants and Remissions budget to fund TCDC's contribution to the Regional Sports Facilities Plan.

## **3.3 Changes from 2014/15 financial year**

### **Opening balance**

Since the draft Ten Year Plan budgets were compiled, staff will have undertaken a further review of the current 2014/2015 financial year budgets. This review will affect 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.

#### **Recommendation:**

11. That the Council updates the financial information to reflect opening balances and revised estimates as a result of the March 2015 current year budget revisions.

### **Carry forward projects**

Since the draft Ten Year Plan budgets were compiled, management will have undertaken a

further review of the current 2014/2015 financial year budgets which may result in some capital projects being carried forward into the next financial year. Unless this information is updated there is a danger of double counting projects.

At the completion of the March 2015 budget revision process staff will construct a list of those carry forward requests by individual capital project.

**Recommendation:**

12. That the Council updates the capital programme for 2015/16 to reflect the approved carry forward projects.

**3.4 FIS changes**

As part of the Ten Year Plan process Simpson Grierson were engaged to review Council's Funding Impact Statement to ensure legislative compliance. Changes of a technical nature have been identified and corrections by staff will be made for the final LTP. The changes do not have an impact on budget amounts, borrowing amounts or rates.

**3.5 Rating base information**

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.

**Recommendation**

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

**3.6 Changes to supporting policy information**

**3.6.1 Rates Remission Policy delegations**

A general rating delegation to verify rate rebate applications that was in the previous policy was accidentally omitted when the policy revisions occurred. This inclusion has no impact on Council budgets but provides certainty around whom, as an authorised Council officer can verify rate rebate applications.

**Recommendation**

14. That the Council adds the following delegation to the Rates Remission Policy:

Delegation	Delegate
Verify rate rebate applications	Credit Controller, Senior Rates Officer, Rates Officer, Customer Services Representative, Customer Services Administrator, Area Office Team Leader

### 3.6.2 Rates Remission - Community sporting and other non-profit organisations

Staff were advised by the CEO on behalf of the Council to amend the Community sporting and other non-profit organisations remission policy whereby the requirement for annual application is replaced with the provision for applications to be made on a triennial basis.

Current policy statement wording: *In written application of a ratepayer or lessee annually and provided that...*

Suggested amendment: *On written application of a ratepayer or lessee every three years, and provided that...*

Community sporting and other non-profit groups are unlikely to change structure and triennial application will reduce the amount of resource required internally for reminders to be sent and to process/check the information annually once it is received. This change will not have any effect on the social development budget.

#### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

#### Recommendation

15. That the Council amends the policy statement for the Rates Remission policy for Community sporting and other non-profit groups to:

*"On written application of a ratepayer or lessee every three years, and provided that..."*

### 3.7 Changes to financial budget information

#### 3.7.1 Great Walks Anchor Project

Negotiations with Department of Conservation (DOC) have confirmed that TCDC will have the services of Project Manager John Gaukrodger from 1 July 2015. This activity was not budgeted for as it was anticipated that DOC would continue covering John's costs as part of their contribution to the Great Walks project. DOC have since had changes to their work programme and can only continue this support until 30 June 2015.

<b>Breakdown of costs</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Project management, administration and travel expenses	\$110,000
Legal establishment of the Trust (one-off)	\$7,500
Iwi consultation (Ngati hei on specific sites i.e. Hereheretaura Pa, Hot Water Beach dunes- urupa, specific funding applications for Iwi/ tribal projects)	\$15,000
Giblin Group (further funding applications, implementing the revenue generation strategy, community consultation)	\$35,000
Hahei Stakeholders Group (admin support, hall hire, catering etc new stakeholder groups will need to be formed and supported as the Walks develop x2 and x3)	\$2,500
Community Groups north and south (admin and consultancy expenses, hall hire, catering etc) - wider community engagement Whitianga north, Hot Water Beach south	\$5,000

At the Thames Community Board meeting clarification was requested of the total funding contribution from DOC towards the Great Walks project, and where responsibility lies for track maintenance going forwards.

Staff can clarify the following:

- \$220,000 in year 1 (2015/16) to contribute to Council's budget for construction of the Pa Road carpark in Hahei.
- \$250,000 (estimate) in year 1 (2015/16) to upgrade the Cathedral Cove track, which is an integral link with the Coromandel Great Walks Cathedral Cove track.
- Maintenance - When the Great Walks Trust is formed in 2015/16 management of the maintenance programme will become the responsibility of the Trust. Funding will primarily come from carpark fees.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board
- Whangamata Community Board
- Thames Community Board - Support in principle, subject to greater detail on financial implications for ratepayers.

### **Recommendation**

16. That an additional annual \$175,000 be added to the Great Walks Anchor Project for years 1-3 to provide for project management fees, including transport and on-going consultation with iwi; consultancy with Giblin Group, consultation with Hahei Stakeholders Group and other community interest groups in Whitianga and north, Tairua and south.

### **3.7.2 AA service**

Council will consider a proposal to deliver the AA service from the Council's customer services area from 1 July 2015 once the I-Site under Destination Coromandel's management and moves to the Civic Centre. The proposal notes that the service will be delivered with a small cost to council in the first year.

### **Recommendation**

17. That the Council, subject to its decision on 13 May 2015, amends the customer services income and expenditure budgets to reflect the delivery of the AA service from the Council's customer services area.

### **3.7.3 Cemetery masterplan budget**

The Cemeteries Business Improvement project has identified a need for a master planning exercise to provide better future interment plot planning for all active cemeteries. The plans will also address current on-going problems with unauthorised tree and shrub planting within lawn cemeteries.

The cemetery masterplans will be in the form of computer-drafted spatial plans for each active cemetery showing overall plot layout and provision for various memorialisation types.

The plans will provide for better forward planning and allow staff to plan for interment plot construction requirements with more certainty and direction. The planning will also address a current unmet customer need to provide an option for the ability for grieving families to include tree and shrub planting within a new memorialisation option. This has been an on-going problem within lawn cemeteries.

GL	Cemetery Activity	Draft 2015/16	LTP	Change proposed	Revised 2015/16
231.20105	Thames Contract - Other	\$10,305		Add \$9,600*	\$19,905
232.20105	Coromandel Contract - Other	\$5,153		Add \$6,400*	\$11,553

\*The change proposal budget is based on planning and draughting costs of \$80 per hour utilising a locally sourced external landscape architect.

### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board
- Thames Community Board

### Recommendation

18. That the Council increases the Thames Cemetery Contract - other budget by \$9,600 and the Coromandel Cemetery Contract - other budget by \$6,400 for 2015/16 to develop a cemetery master plan for each cemetery.

### 3.7.4 Thames Civic Centre revenue

A report on relocating the Thames I-site and Destination Coromandel into the Thames Civic Centre was considered by the Council at its Special Council meeting on 29 April 2015. The relocation budget was approved. The additional income for the Destination Coromandel lease needs to be reflected in the revenue budget for the Thames Civic Centre which will increase from \$10,800 to \$18,800.

### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### Recommendation

19. That the Council increases the Thames Hall annual revenue budget from \$10,800 to \$18,800 to reflect the lease income from Destination Coromandel relocating into the Civic Centre.

### 3.7.5 Representation non-staff meeting budget

The budget for non-staff meetings under the Representation budget funds the payment of the Committee's external appointments. The 2015/16 budget of \$23,997 was based on 6 meetings of the Economic Development Committee and 4 meetings of the Audit Committee. The total meeting fees, estimated at current rates, with all members attending every meeting totals \$28,398. The lower budget amount reflected an attendance rate of 85% which was a typical trend.

Since budgeting for the 2015/16 two events have occurred.

1. The Economic Development Committee has decided to meet every six weeks increasing their potential meetings to seven.
2. The Economic Development Committee Chairperson has been invited to attend Council meetings.

These combined events increases the expenditure to \$27,299 with an 85% attendance rate (\$32,117 with 100% attendance).

A budget increase for GL 248.20272 of \$3,300 is requested for 2015/16 with this increase flowing across the 10 years of the LTP. This amount is not a significant change nor of a



significant amount that would trigger any further consultation.

### Recommendation

20. That the Council increases the Representation activity non-staff meeting budget by \$3,300 from 2015/16.

### 3.7.6 Civil Defence Emergency Management budget

Council has recently been advised of the allocations for the Thames Valley Civil Defence Emergency Management activity. The allocation for Thames-Coromandel District Council increases by \$15,000 in year 1. The increase would be greater if it was not for a surplus carry forward being distributed across the first three years.

The table shows the relative contributions across all three partners.

<b>Council contributions</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>	<b>2024/25</b>
Hauraki (26%)	66,564	66,564	66,564	69,605	69,771	69,872	69,585	68,479	69,356	68,965
Matamata-Piako (28%)	85,868	85,868	85,868	91,021	91,239	91,372	90,996	89,549	90,697	90,185
<b>Thames-Coromandel (46%)</b>	<b>116,174</b>	<b>116,174</b>	<b>116,174</b>	<b>123,147</b>	<b>123,441</b>	<b>123,620</b>	<b>123,112</b>	<b>121,155</b>	<b>122,707</b>	<b>122,015</b>
Carry forward prior years surplus	22,147	21,937	16,687							
<b>Total</b>	<b>274,700</b>	<b>274,490</b>	<b>269,240</b>	<b>267,710</b>	<b>268,350</b>	<b>268,740</b>	<b>267,635</b>	<b>263,380</b>	<b>266,755</b>	<b>265,250</b>

Note 1: No annual cost adjustment

There has been no allowance made to the annual figures for an inflation cost adjustment

Note 2: Income

A distribution of the prior year's surplus across 2015-2018 to reduce any increase in levy

### Recommendation

21. That the Council approves the Thames-Coromandel contribution to the Thames Valley contribution for the next ten years.

### 3.4.6 Central Government urban and rural broadband fund

The Government has a new \$350 million contestable fund for urban and rural broadband upgrades, along with additional funding to remove cell-phone blackspots. The towns that will be eligible to receive this funding (and the order of the roll-out) will be determined through a competitive bid process, which will take into account the cost of deployment, strength of consumer demand, and regulatory and other assistance from local authorities.

Based on the methodology used for the original roll-out, the Government has identified two TCDC towns - Thames and Whitianga - as potential candidates to receive this funding. However this is not guaranteed and depends on the strength of the case presented to the Government.

The Government is operating on a two-pronged process for determining which towns and rural areas will be given priority for broadband upgrades.

- On the one hand they will be asking the service providers (such as Chorus and Vodafone) which areas they believe they can deliver in the most cost-effective manner.

- On the other hand, the Government is asking local authorities to indicate which areas they believe should have priority, and why. But rather than just seek the opinion of local government, MBIE is now requiring councils to demonstrate that they are willing to support broadband rollouts in their areas.

This will require TCDC to demonstrate that its District Plan and consenting processes are aligned and supportive for broadband upgrades. In addition councils are required to develop a Digital Enablement Plan to show how the upgrades will work with the community. And the Government is also providing the option for councils to co-invest with the Crown in order to secure upgrades within the territorial authorities' district.

Indicative bids from local authorities are required by 3 July 2015. Once these have been received, the information is shared with the suppliers of infrastructure, who are then asked for RFPs by mid-August. By 18 September, the council's Digital Enablement Plan must be submitted to the Ministry MBIE will evaluate the bids in October-November for selection of towns, with decisions confirmed in December 2015.

On 24 April 2015 the Economic Development Committee allocated \$15,000 to provide a consultant to assist with the preparation of this funding bid, along with help towards the Digital Enablement Strategy. This means that TCDC will be able to make a well-researched bid for funding.

However providing a competitive tender may not be sufficient (in itself) to advance the TCDC projects up the priority queue. The criteria which is likely to sway priority allocation of funds is potentially the Government's desire for co-investment, either with the Crown Fibre Holdings or directly to a service provider (much as TCDC has recently done with Chorus to advance the broadband upgrade at Kopu).

It is worth noting that the Matamata-Piako District Council has recently been in the news with its commitment of \$50,000 towards the broadband upgrade bidding process. In addition, during the Northland by-election the Government issued a media statement indicating that four Northland towns are already strong contenders, thanks to a concerted effort by the Far North District Council which is working with Northpower (who won the Government contract to deliver fibre into the Whangarei district) and Top Energy

Therefore in order to give TCDC a competitive advantage in tendering for this broadband upgrade, it is proposed that \$125,000 be set aside in the LTP for 2015/16 for co-investment with broadband service providers or the Crown as part of the tender process. It is proposed that \$50,000 would be utilised towards co-investment in ultrafast broadband for towns such as Whitianga and Thames, with an additional \$50,000 towards rural broadband for more remote areas, and \$25,000 towards improving cellphone blackspots (such as the Kopu-Hikuai Road).

It is recommended that this \$125,000 should be funded on a loan basis, so that it is only drawn down if the tender bid is successful. It is noted that even if the bid is successful, the Crown does not intend to make its preferred bidders known until December 2015. This loan funding would therefore have no direct impact on the 2015/16 year's rates - but may provide a crucial negotiating chip for securing TCDC's fair share of the \$350 million funding.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Mercury Bay Community Board
- Thames Community Board
- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board
- Whangamata Community Board

Clarification is sought from both the Tairua-Pauanui and Whangamata Community Boards on what the Crown's criteria is, and whether it is feasible for the bid to be extended to a wider coverage. In the case of Whangamata, it is the only one of the three hubs not covered.

#### **Recommendation**

22. That the Council approves the allocation of \$125,000 on a loan-funded basis to be repaid over three years from the Economic Development rate for use as co-funding with either the Crown or broadband service providers as part of a bid to secure the district's portion of the Government's \$350 million urban and rural broadband investment.

### **3.4.7 Mercury Bay footpath construction project**

The Mercury Bay Footpath Construction project is a local transportation budget with the Community /Board determining the level of funding for each year of the Long Term Plan. The figures provided to Finance for this project for the 10 years were incorrect. As a result they have been overinflated. The over-all effect is an error of \$694k over the 10 years.

The change sought is not significant (in terms of Council's policy), however we believe it is material as it shows incorrect funding for this project.

#### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Mercury Bay Community Board

#### **Recommendation**

23. That the Council corrects the Mercury Bay Footpath Construction project budget to the following amounts across the ten year:

2015/16	\$256,289
2016/17	\$262,704
2017/18	\$270,326
2018/19	\$278,847
2019/20	\$288,333
2020/21	\$298,718
2021/22	\$310,074
2022/23	\$322,641
2023/24	\$336,521
2024/25	\$351,328

### **3.8 Performance measure targets**

The draft performance measure and targets for each group of activities that are required to be included in the Long Term Plan were included in the consultation supporting information. The Council did not receive any comment in the submissions on the proposed performance measures and targets.

Several of the performance measures require targets to be finalised which are noted below. The Strategic Planning, District Plan and Economic Development activities have a measure that references work programmes. These work programmes will be ratified formally by either Council or a committee of Council before the new financial year commences.

### 3.8.1 Local Roads and Footpaths

The target for the following performance measure is required to be finalised before the adoption of the Long Term Plan:

- Percentage of footpaths meeting level of service conditions

This is one of the mandatory performance measures decided by the Department of Internal Affairs. The measure has been reliant on the conditions stated within the new Operations and Maintenance contract which is programmed for implementation from 1 July 2015. The contract includes footpath levels of service for maintenance and renewals as trip hazards and depressions to be remedied within a prescribed timeframe. Given this is the first year for this measure to be included and historic data is not available a target of 85% is proposed by staff.

#### Recommendation

24. That the Council includes the following performance measure for footpaths in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan:

85% of the following footpath defects will be remedied within the stated timeframes:

Defect	Remedied within
Trip hazard greater than 30mm	48 hours
Trip hazard 10 to 30mm	1 month
Depression greater than 30mm	48 hours
Depression 10 to 30mm	1 month

### 3.8.2 Mercury Bay - Community spaces and development

A performance measure and target for the Mercury Bay sports facility for inclusion in the Mercury Bay Community Spaces activity was initially recommended by the Mercury Bay Community Board with the measure to be drafted prior to the final LTP being adopted. Given that development of the grounds over several years is still required before the facility will be operating to its specifications the Community Board recommends that the performance measure wait for the next Long Term Plan.

#### Recommendation

25. The Mercury Bay Community Board recommends that the Council supports excluding a performance measure for the Mercury Bay sports facility in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan.

## 4 Consultation Document Proposals affecting district-funded activities

### 4.1 Eastern seaboard wastewater plants

#### Precis of proposal

Following a review of the capacity of the three eastern seaboard wastewater plants and the outstanding debt associated with future development the Council proposed in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan to move \$46.6 million of the future development related debt to be repaid by rates. This is because the capacity associated with this debt is no longer available for new development and the slow growth projections mean that it is not financially prudent to expect all of this debt to be repaid by future development prior to the retirement of those assets.

In 2014 the Council recognised that the interest accumulating on debt to be repaid by future development contributions was not sustainable and funded the interest on that debt in part

through wastewater retained earnings (rates collected in previous years). It also advised that a detailed review of this issue would be undertaken in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Due to the impact of this unexpected cost to ratepayers, this proposal includes a transition period over the first three years of the 2015 Long Term Plan by using wastewater retained earnings to fund some of these costs. After applying retained earnings the wastewater rate, which was \$674 (+ GST) in 2014/15, increases in each of the first three years of the Plan to \$761 (+GST), \$762 (+ GST) and \$765 (+GST) respectively and to \$773 (+GST) in year 4. This is the major driver of the 3.67% rate rise in the 2015/16 year.

Capital projects to increase the plants' capacity over the next 10 years have been aligned with the new slow growth scenario within the 2015 Long Term Plan, which has been factored into the future development contribution rates. Approximately \$8.8 million of the eastern seaboard wastewater plants' construction cost remains a debt associated with future development contributions.

### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	165	
Total in favour	70	(61 (87%) without any reason)
Total opposed	95	(73 (77%) without any reason)

### Summary of submission points

In favour of the proposal

- Three submitters stated that Council has no choice but to move the repayment of the debt to rates.
- One submitter noted that this decision demonstrated financial prudence to ensure the debt is paid off properly.
- One submitter agreed that there had been slow growth in some areas.
- One submitter noted that increased visitor numbers over the summer have also played a part in the need for more capacity, so it is appropriate for local residents to pay for the infrastructure upgrade.
- One submitter stated that it was appropriate to scale back the amount to be collected from development as increased capacity was not the only reason for the upgrade.

While in favour of the proposal, submitters noted the following concerns

- Two submitters requested that the rate be reviewed annually based on the level of development contributions being received, which may offset future rate increases.
- One submitter noted that while it was clear that a lack of development has forced the use of rates to pay back the loan, the rate should not be levied on ratepayers who provide their own wastewater systems.
- One submitter requested that the external debt be transitioned over a longer period of time to ease the rate burden.

Opposed to the proposal

- Six submitters noted that not all residents benefited from the eastern seaboard wastewater infrastructure and that only those who directly benefit should pay.
- Four submitters raised the issue of intergenerational equity and stated that this proposal did not comply with this principle.
- One submitter stated that developers should still pay the majority of the cost of the plants.
- Three submitters stated that the proposal was a result of poor financial planning.
- One submitter noted that it would be unfair if the wastewater rate was based on land value.
- One submitter stated that ratepayers should not have to subsidise developers.

- One submitter suggested that more effort is needed to promote the development, and that help at a national level would be more appropriate.
- One submitter stated that the consultation document did not provide enough information on the proposal.
- One submitter commented that the lack of capacity seems to contradict the reason for the change in funding.

### **Staff analysis/commentary**

A number of the submitters against the proposal were under the impression that all ratepayers would be paying regardless of whether they were connected to a wastewater network (or in the area of benefit). Staff will ensure that communications on the Council's decision clearly identifies that the wastewater rate is funding the transferred debt.

The alternate option of doing nothing, the status quo, was included in the Consultation Document at the insistence of the Office of the Auditor General review team. Initially the Council considered the only financially prudent action was to move the debt therefore there were no options. But the Long Term Plan legislation requires options to be represented for all significant changes.

If the Development Contribution model is not changed and the debt not moved then the current debt associated with the future development will continue to grow (with interest compounding) as the growth projections do not substantiate that future development will come soon enough to pay this share.

In the Consultation Document we explained that we were transitioning the impact of this unexpected cost by using wastewater retained earnings. To be more accurate the retained earnings softens the impact on the ratepayer in Year 1 (by about \$9.60) with very small increases in the following years. The rate increases after year 1 are relatively small because we are also repaying substantial debt from surplus depreciation reserves (draft LTP - Year 1 - \$3.M; Year 2 - \$3.5M; Year 3 - \$1.9M) which reduces the interest and offsets the need to increase the rate more.

### **Additional information**

The upgrades of the Eastern Seaboard Wastewater Plants at Whitianga, Tairua/Pauanui, and Whangamata contained a significant portion of additional capacity requirements. As such, from 2009 Council determined that it would not require the current ratepayers to fund the depreciation on the additional capacity proportion until that capacity is taken up. Council reviewed this approach as part of the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan and determined that it would continue this approach for at least the next three years. It is prudent for this proposal to be reviewed in the 2018-2028 Ten Year Plan.

### **Recommendation**

26. That the Council adopts the proposal within the Consultation Document to transfer \$46.6 million of the future development related debt to be repaid by the wastewater rate and depreciation reserves.

## 4.2 Stormwater - local to district funding

### Precis of proposal

The stormwater activity is the last of the five core services to be moved from local funding to district funding. These five services are considered essential to the functioning of our district and are water supply, wastewater, stormwater, roads and footpaths and rubbish and recycling.

In the Long Term Plan Consultation Document it was noted that Council has taken the view that those who create the need for these services, and those who benefit from the provision of these services are one and the same. It is considered that everybody in our community, regardless of where they live, over time, should have equitable access to these services based on need.

The movement of funding of core services from local to district-wide began with wastewater in 2003, and over time each of the services have been transitioned. The stormwater transition proposal, while consulted upon, was not implemented in the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan in order to moderate what would otherwise have been substantial rate movements for some members of the community. Instead, the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan signalled to the community that the stormwater activity would be moved in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

The proposal in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan means that, in general, all those who benefit from these services should be paying the same amounts for these services, irrespective of the underlying costs of service delivery. The district wide rate is forecast to be \$88.01 on an average value property in year one. If funding remained local then the following differences in this amount would apply:

Thames	an additional	\$100.01
Coromandel-Colville	a reduction of	\$4.87
Mercury Bay	a reduction of	\$12.72
Tairua-Pauanui	a reduction of	\$34.68
Whangamata	a reduction of	\$42.64

After year one, the stormwater rate is forecast to go up 2.3% per year over the remaining nine years of the plan.

### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	201	
Total in favour	156	132 (85%) without any reason
Total opposed	45	28 (62%) without any reason

### Summary of submission points

In favour of the proposal

- Seven submitters state that stormwater is a basic, core council service and a common good, and therefore it is appropriate for it to be funded through a district-wide approach.
- Five submitters consider stormwater to be a district-wide issue that everyone benefits from and therefore it is appropriate that everyone pays for it.
- Six submitters note that district-wide funding of stormwater is a fairer way of distributing costs.
- Two submitters noted that anyone who uses the roads in the district also benefits from stormwater, infrastructure therefore it is appropriate that everyone pays.
- One submitter stated that a purely user pays system is discriminatory against those in lower deciles, therefore district-wide funding is more appropriate due to the disparate socio-economic spread of residents in the district.
- One submitter stated that stormwater board areas should not be charged more just

because they are susceptible to or sustain more major flooding and storm damage.

While in favour of the proposal, submitters noted the following concerns:

- Two submitters expressed concern about the retrospective transition from local to district, namely with regard to projects already in place before the transition, and raised questions as to what would happen with the retained earnings raised previously through the local funding model.
- One submitter requested that the planned work programme for stormwater projects be made available to communities, and that the decision making process includes community boards.
- One submitter suggested that the change in funding be transitioned because Whangamata does not have stormwater services, and that the proposed transition of funding should be used to give priority to increase the provision of stormwater services.
- One submitter sought assurance that Whangamata and Thames will have a similar level of service to reflect the district-wide funding model.
- One submitter sought assurance that the rate increase as a result of the proposed change in funding would be monitored and not rise exponentially.
- One submitter requested confirmation that existing stormwater differentials, specifically on properties in Puriri Road, Kowhia Drive and Te Kouma Road in Te Kouma, would remain after the change in funding.

Opposed to the proposal

- Six submitters consider that those in the district who do not benefit from having stormwater infrastructure on their properties should not have to pay for it.
- Three submitters consider stormwater to be a local responsibility and that decision making should sit locally, so communities can determine their own level of service.
- Three submitters stated that if there were higher costs or needs in a particular area; that the people benefiting from the infrastructure should pay for it and to not do so would be inequitable.
- Two submitters considered that the proposal is unfair to those who own high value rural properties as they pay for something that they do not have access to, and that only those who benefit from the infrastructure should pay for it.
- Two submitters suggested that if there was to be a district rate it should be reviewed and take into account local, community board decisions.
- One submitter noted that removing local responsibility may have a flow-on effect of reducing the district's high quality coastal water.
- One submitter, while acknowledging the benefit they received through visiting towns such as Thames and Whitianga which have stormwater infrastructure, could not support the proposal whilst there are large disparities in the provision of stormwater infrastructure between communities.
- One submitter stated that there should be consistency in Council funding sources and allocations for spending therefore funding arrangements should remain constant.

### **Staff analysis/commentary**

Submitters both for and against the proposal mentioned the principles of fairness, equity, and uniformity. Submitters against the proposal suggested that 'user-pays' would be a better model, that costs should fall where they lie, and to not do so would be unfair. In developing the Consultation Document proposals Council considered that the move of stormwater to district-wide funding not only underpins the essential service philosophy; it demonstrates fairness and equity across the district. It is important to not merely look at stormwater in isolation - it must be part of the bigger picture of the five core services, which have already transitioned from locally funded to a district-wide funding model. When the proposal is examined in the context of the bigger picture, the uniformity and equity of the district-wide approach is clear.



In the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan the water supply activity was moved from local scheme based funding to district-wide funding, which had a reasonably large financial impact on some members of the community. It was noted that while stormwater was one of the essential activities to the district, it was not moved to district-wide funding in the 2012 year in an attempt to moderate this financial impact.

The reasons behind the district-wide funding approach have been consistent through Long Term Plans since the transition of core services started in 2003 - that there are district-wide benefits from the provision of the five core services and therefore it is appropriate that the district contributed to the funding of these services. Over the years, these transitions have affected different communities in different ways, as each community have different needs for their water supply, wastewater, stormwater, roads and footpaths, and rubbish and recycling. Stormwater is the last of these to be transferred, and like the core services which were transferred before it, has different financial impacts across the district. However, with all core services funded the district level, there will be notable parity in rates across the different local areas and similar levels of service can be maintained across the district. The district-wide funding approach recognises that local factors of geography and weather are outside of a community's control; whereas the user-pays model does not.

As one submitter noted, our stormwater infrastructure helps increase our district's resilience to extreme weather events. The change in the way the stormwater activity is funded will not change Council's ability to maintain current service levels in each community.

Several submitters address the perceived disparity between those who do not have stormwater in their properties and therefore who do not receive the same level of benefit as other ratepayers. Approximately 30% of the funding for stormwater is obtained through the general rate on the basis that all ratepayers benefit from the management of stormwater to prevent ponding of rainwater and landslips, maintaining accessibility and protecting property and public safety. Without appropriate stormwater management, people would not be able to move freely around the community to go about their normal business.

The majority of stormwater rates is targeted to urban ratepayers as these ratepayers are considered to receive greater benefits in terms of property protection and access.

Submitters to the proposal had queries about the current rating differentials. The proposal maintains the status quo with regards to the 0.6 differential on the properties noted below on the basis that these properties are within settlements that receive a significantly lower level of stormwater infrastructure.

Properties rated 0.6 differential targeted stormwater rate:

Hikutaia, Kennedy Bay, Tuatawa and Te Kouma (this excludes properties 399, 401, 403, 405 and 407 Te Kouma Road), Kuaotunu West and Wharekaho, and Opoutere.

Submitters both for and against the proposal raised concerns with regards to the erosion of community decision making through moving the funding of stormwater from local to district-wide. As with the operation of other core services, community boards continue to have an advocacy role and are able to input into the decision making process, and the district-wide approach enables an economy of scale which is vital to ensuring Council is delivering its core services in the most efficient and effective way.

Several submissions questioned the use of the current depreciation reserves built up from local funds and any retained earnings. As with other district-wide services when they moved from locally funded to district funded the depreciation reserves will be consolidated and used across the stormwater activity for renewals of the stormwater infrastructure network. It is proposed that the stormwater renewals programme is shared with Community Boards on an annual basis to assist in determining priorities. It is recommended that any retained earnings are consolidated and used in the first instance to address stormwater issues that

have been identified for attention and then to reduce future rating impacts.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- All five Community Boards

### **Recommendation**

27. That the Council adopts its proposal to change the targeted funding of the stormwater activity from a scheme basis to a district-wide basis, in line with Council's essential services philosophy.

## **4.3 Change in UAGC as funding source**

### **Precis of proposal**

Council proposed that the district component of the Grants and Remissions activity and the District Plan activity be funded through a uniform annual general charge rather than the general rate.

The Council had reconsidered the beneficiaries and exacerbators of all its activities through the review of the Revenue and Financing Policy and identified more activities that the ratepayers of properties all benefit equally. In these cases the Council considers that it is fairer to distribute the costs uniformly over the affected properties. That means all ratepayers pay the same amount regardless of the property value.

### **Submission statistics - District Plan activity**

Total submissions on this proposal	14
Total in favour	10
Total opposed	3
Neutral	1

### **Submission statistics - Grants and remission activity**

Total submissions on this proposal	12
Total in favour	5
Total opposed	6
Neutral	1

### **Summary of submission points**

Support

One submitter noted support for keeping rates down, another submitter noted consistency in Council funding sources and allocation of spending.

Opposed

One submitter noted their concern that it looked like people on fixed incomes are being asked to carry an unreasonable proportion of the costs.

One submitter noted that all rates should be based on the value of the property - a property of less value, should pay less.

### **Staff analysis/commentary**

Submission numbers were much lower on these proposals than other funding changes. The proposals were included in the Revenue and Financing Policy statement of proposal. They were not included in the Long Term Plan Consultation Document as they were not considered to be a major matter for the Long Term Plan and had a lower impact on ratepayers than the other proposals.

District Plan

The District Plan activity provides guidelines and regulation of the use and development of

land. The funding analysis provided as supporting information to the Consultation Document and Revenue and Financing Policy Council notes the activity benefits the district community as a whole by ensuring environmental and community standards are maintained. Council costs involved with privately initiated changes to the District Plan (e.g. cost of advertising, cost for preparing a Planner's Report, cost for a hearing, etc) are recovered through 'actual and reasonable' costs from the applicant.

Funding the activity through the UAGC reflects that there is District-wide benefit and that all properties benefit equally from the protection of their assets. Previously the general rate (district) was used on the basis that those with high value properties benefit more from the protection of their assets via this activity, however the Council is of the view that this is not the case and that all ratepayers benefit equally from this component of the activity and therefore should be charged on that basis.

#### District Grants and remissions

Grants and remissions provided under the district component are not intended to provide benefits to individual geographical communities (e.g. an community board area), however may target an individual community of interest (e.g. young people across the district). It is not considered practicable to always define these communities of interest for the purposes of charging.

Funding the activity through the UAGC recognises the broader benefits to the District and all rateable properties. Previously the general rate (district) was used to help address the affordability issues for some sectors of the District, however the Council is of the view that all ratepayers benefit equally from this component of the activity and therefore should be charged on that basis.

#### **Additional information**

No additional information has come to hand or been requested on this topic since the Consultation Document was released.

#### **Recommendation**

28. That the Council confirms its intention to fund the district component of the Grants and Remissions activity and the District Plan activity through a uniform annual general charge.

### **4.4 Rates Remission Policy Proposal - Minor dwellings**

#### **Precis of proposal**

An automatic remission of 50% of the fixed charges applicable to owners with one additional unit used as accommodation where these units are 50m<sup>2</sup> or less in size (as these are intended to be permitted to be built on a property as of right in the Proposed District Plan). The proposal was intended to provide greater certainty and require less administration for the relevant property owners.

#### **Submission statistics**

Total submissions on this proposal	199	
Total in favour	155	(143 without any reason)
Total opposed	44	(35 without any reason)

#### **Summary of submission points**

##### In favour

- Three submitters noted that support for elderly is important.
- Two submitters noted the proposal would be more equitable, avoids policing.
- Two submitters noted that often the second dwelling was integral to the main home by

housing family or supplementing livelihoods through low rent.

- Two submitters stated they only agree with the remission if second dwelling is not rented permanently.
- One submitter agreed if it was only occupied by family members.
- Two submitters considered the current arrangement represented double dipping.

#### Opposed

- Six submitters suggested that every dwelling connected to the Council's services should be charged.
- One submitter noted that all properties should be rated on their value.
- One submitter suggested the current 100% remission for property owners that do not rent the second dwelling is sufficient.
- Two submitters considered the status quo was more equitable, and the proposal too hard to police by Council.
- One submitter suggested this proposal seems to contradict the plan to charge the short term accommodation rate.

#### Staff analysis/commentary

The proposal has a high level of support from the submitters. There was a low level of commentary accompanying the responses for this proposal. The issues raised were identified during the council workshops to consider the Rates Remission Policy.

The Proposed District Plan also allows 60m<sup>2</sup> if the building is certified as functional for elderly and disabled residents.

The Proposed District Plan defines a minor unit as:

*"A separate building or part of a building that:*

- *is accessory to a dwelling on the same site; and*
- *has only one kitchen and one bathroom, and at least one habitable room; and*
- *has a gross floor area (excluding a garage) no greater than 60m<sup>2</sup> if it is Lifemark™ Design certified or has another certification that it is functional for elderly and disabled residents; otherwise its gross floor area (excluding a garage) is no greater than 50m<sup>2</sup>; and*
- *there is only one minor unit on a site. Any subsequent buildings that meets the above criteria is a dwelling.*

As the definition of minor units extends the gross floor area excluding garage from 50m<sup>2</sup> to 60m<sup>2</sup> in the event that it holds certification for functionality for elderly and disabled residents, it is recommended that the 50% rates remission also be applied to these properties. This is consistent with the intention of the proposal, which was to provide greater certainty and require less administration for the relevant property owners, and will have the additional benefit of providing an incentive to increase the number of properties which are functional for elderly and disabled residents in the district.

The definition of minor units has been the subject of submissions in the Proposed District Plan so there is a potential that the specifics of the definition will change. It is recommended that for the purposes of the 50% rates remission proposal, the Long Term Plan is consistent with the definition of minor unit in the Proposed District Plan as above.

#### Recommendation

29. That the Council proceeds with the proposal to apply an automatic remission of 50% of the fixed charges applicable to owners with one additional minor unit used as accommodation as per the definition of a minor unit in the Proposed District Plan, where these units have a gross floor area excluding a garage no greater 50m<sup>2</sup>, or 60m<sup>2</sup> if it is Lifemark™ Design certified or has another certification that it is functional for elderly and disabled residents. .

## 4.5 Rates Remission Policy Proposal - retirement villages

### Precis of proposal

The proposal is to remit rates for owners of 'licence to occupy' units in retirement villages to an amount equal to that which they would receive from central government, as they would have under the rates rebate scheme should they have been eligible as a home owner.

The remission of rates will only be given where the retirement village can prove that the remission goes back to the 'licence to occupy' owner.

### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	219	
Total in favour	194	(171 without any reason)
Total opposed	22	(16 without any reason)
Neutral	3	

### Summary of submission points

#### Support

- Seven submitters noted it was fair and equitable to recognise.
- Three submitters noted that these residents were entitled through having paid taxes their whole lives.
- Two submitters noted that retired people often struggle with ever increasing rates.
- Two submitters requested that Council lobby government to revise the rules.
- Rates rebate are due as residents pay for lawn mowing outside village.
- Make sure remission goes back to licence to occupy resident.
- Service use for these residents likely to be below the norm.

#### Opposed

- Three submitters suggested the Council put the case to government, as a national issue rather than a local issue.
- Three submitters noted the proposal was unfair on all ratepayers who have to share the cost of the rebates.
- Don't agree with distinguishing from elderly tenants and lessees who cannot qualify for rebates
- One submitter noted that there is a remission available to retirement village residents - they just need to be aware of it and ask the village management. Below is a statement copied and pasted from the Internal Affairs website:

**"Retirement village residents** – residents of retirement villages who have a licence to occupy are not eligible for a rates rebate, but may be eligible for the retirement village remission."

### Staff analysis/commentary

Staff accessed the Department of Internal Affairs website and found the following wording on the rebate scheme form:

#### **"Can people living in retirement villages apply?"**

In general, holders of a licence to occupy agreement are not eligible for a rebate. They do not meet the Scheme's requirements as they are not directly liable to pay rates, and their residential units cannot be rated separately. However, retirement villages operate under a variety of tenure arrangements. Please check with your local council to determine if you are eligible to apply."

Three councils have been identified as offering a rates remission for retirement village licence to occupy residents. Auckland Council offers a remission to a similar value as the government's rates rebate scheme. Kapiti Coast District Council offers a remission for financial hardship to the value of up to \$150.00 per licence to occupy. New Plymouth

District Council offers a remission equal to the Council's UAGC with various conditions for eligibility.

### **Recommendation**

30. That the Council proceeds with the proposal to remit rates for owners of 'licence to occupy' units in retirement villages to an amount equal to that which they would receive from central government where the retirement village can prove that the remission is received by the licence to occupy owner.

### **4.6 District activity changes to fees and charges**

The Consultation Document noted that there were no significant changes to the policies setting fees and charges but there were some key changes to the following charges:

- Building control and monitoring recalculations have led to both increases and decreases but no change to the overall fee structure.
- Rubbish and recycling have some small increases.

These proposed changes did not receive any comment in submissions.

### **Recommendation**

31. That the Council adopts the proposed changes to the fees and charges for district-funded activities.

### **4.7 World War 1 Memorial Forests - Te Wao Whakamaumaharatanga**

#### **Precis of proposal**

The project is to establish a series of memorial native forests around the Coromandel Peninsula in order to commemorate the New Zealand soldiers who died in World War 1. In total it is proposed that 18,166 trees will be planted at a series of five (or more) different sites around the Peninsula. The trees are designed to become national Memorial Forests which will enhance the environmental values of the Peninsula, and also act as a place for people to walk and remember New Zealand history.

The estimated cost of the project is \$453,000 which will be spread over 10 years. Council proposes to fund the initial purchase of the trees, and help to coordinate volunteers and school groups to undertake the first year's planting, while long-term maintenance will be undertaken by contractors and suitably qualified volunteers. The \$453,000 estimated cost of the project will be offset by grants received by external agencies and also by funds received from members of the public purchasing trees to commemorate their relatives who died in World War 1.

The planting of the Memorial Forests is proposed to commence in 2015 and conclude by Armistice Day 2018. While the project is now underway, the main costs will be spread over the ten years of the Plan with funding provided through to 2025 for long-term maintenance of the trees.

A range of other options have been considered which involved greater the use of volunteers to maintain the trees. These options had slightly lower costs and therefore rates impacts but the proposed contractor/volunteer mix was considered the option most likely to ensure the safe development and long-term sustainability of the forests.

#### **Submission statistics**

Total submissions on this proposal	198	
Total in favour	137	(116 (85%) without any reason)
Total opposed	56	(39 (70%) without any reason)

## Summary of submission points

### In favour of proposal

- Eight submitters were supportive of the forest as a memorial, three submitters considered it should be for soldiers from all wars.
- Four submitters were supportive of planting trees mostly for the environmental benefits (carbon dioxide, prevention of erosion, protecting waterways) but also for more walking places.
- Three submitters noted the carbon credits to be generated to offset costs.

### Opposed to proposal

- Seven submitters suggested this was not a core service of Council and the money would be better spent on other council services e.g. infrastructure, maintaining existing memorials.
- Five submitters suggesting using existing bush/forests on the Coromandel.
- Five submitters suggested there were already enough war memorials around the peninsula.
- Two submitters noted that if the project had already commenced was the Council really consulting.
- Two submitters noted that the volunteers interested in this type of activity were already fully committed e.g. Kauri 2000 and Bruce Smith Rings Beach walk.

## Staff analysis/commentary

The submission responses show there is broad community support for the proposal.

Project planning since consultation began has continued with the first events held over Anzac Day and more events scheduled for Arbor Day. External funds of \$39,987.50 has been secured from Waikato Regional Council's Environmental Initiatives Fund. Application will also be made later in the year (once the grant round opens) to the Lotteries Board WW1 fund, with an application likely to be in the order of \$250,000.

Staff suggest that instead of providing a budget for the first three years that the Council underwrites the funding required in these early years for establishing the forests in case external funding and purchase of trees needs supplementing. The maintenance in the latter years will be retained and revisited in future budgeting/planning.

## Recommendation

32. That the Council proceeds with the proposal to establish the WW1 memorial forests, underwriting the first three years of funding required and providing the maintenance budgets in years 4-10.

## 4.8 Short-term accommodation proposed rate

### Precis of proposal

In order to reduce the inequities in the current funding structure between moteliere and other providers in the short term accommodation sector the Council proposed a new short-term accommodation rate of \$200 to fund economic development for small bed and breakfast operators and those letting their residences on a short term basis such as through an online booking agency. Council's Economic Development activity is strongly oriented to supporting the tourism sector and short stay accommodation providers are considered to be direct beneficiaries of tourism, marketing, events and other activities. The Revenue and Financing Policy activity analysis for Economic Development noted "An increased portion of

this activity is proposed to be funded by all ratepayers. Short-term accommodation has been recognised as a beneficiary of this activity and is also proposed to contribute funding to this activity".

In response to submissions to the 2012/2022 Long Term Plan regarding a proposal to classify all bed and breakfast operations as "commercial" for rating purposes, Council resolved to "signal in the Ten Year Plan the Council intent to reconsider its approach to Bed and Breakfast and Homestay and other commercial enterprises". In the 2014/2015 Annual Plan, Council considered this matter again and included an option of a fixed targeted charge for short-stay accommodation but ultimately decided to leave final consideration of this matter to this Long Term Plan process.

### **Consultation process**

In developing this proposal, Council identified approximately 1,440 properties advertising their residences for short stay accommodation. Those identified were written to advising them of the proposals and of the opportunity to submit. Additionally, this matter has been the subject of local and national media interest, ensuring that there is a relatively high level of awareness.

### **Submission statistics**

Total submissions on this proposal	391	
Total in favour	75	(66 without any reason)
Total opposed	309	(58 without any reason)
Neutral	7	

This has been the proposal about which we have received the most feedback.

### **Summary of submissions:**

#### **In favour of the proposal**

- One submitter compared this charge to the tourist tax for use of infrastructure and facilities charged in some overseas destinations.
- Three submitters considered the levy fair for people earning revenue from their properties.
- One submitter questioned the costs in monitoring and collecting the rate.
- One submitter suggested the fee be higher
- One submitter agreed on the basis there was an additional extra load on local facilities.

#### **Opposed to the proposal**

- 112 submitters considered the proposal would discourage a needed service for the peninsula (provision of residential-style accommodation for a niche sector of the visitor market) that is being encouraged by other economic development strategies. These submitters noted the benefits to the whole of the Coromandel through the multiplier effect for visitors spending in area. Some baches were only rented for 1-2 times for major events or over New Year to alleviate accommodation problems eg Beach Hop. Many noted they would withdraw their advertising which would reduce accommodation available and therefore work against the efforts to promote the district's attractions.
- 105 submitters questioned the legality of the proposed rate.
- 90 submitters supported Bachcare's challenge of the reported inequity of motel's rates over short term accommodation residences (rates paid per person accommodated).
- 77 submitters noted that they paid enough rates already with the residence empty for most of the year and therefore not consuming council services like permanent residences. Many mentioned that bach owners are subsidising permanent residences already and this rate is a double tax (others noted that bach owners should receive a rates rebate for using less services and providing a necessary service to the district).
- 57 submitters noted that they rented to help pay their rates and other holiday home expenses - it was not a money making exercise or enough to support an income.



- 29 submitters considered that bachs serviced different customers than motels, offering a different service so not competing - if this type of accommodation is not available tenants/visitors will travel to another region, won't use motels instead.
- 21 submitters were concerned at the cost involved in administering the new rate, many considered it would be more than the rates collected.
- 19 submitters noted that taking the interests of one sector, the moteliers, over another is not being fair or impartial.
- 14 submitters noted that inequities would still exist with other businesses operating from their homes and those renting to friends/family without advertising - these should have to pay too to make it a level playing field.
- 13 submitters suggested a differential for the new rate to be based on rental income received with a threshold similar to IRD - quoted as \$4,000 per annum.
- 12 submitters questioned the benefit of the economic development programme including events programme to the short term accommodation providers - most tenants not here for events; proposal not justified.
- Ten submitters said that rent will have to increase with the new charge, reducing the appeal to tenants and reducing the number of visitors.
- Nine submitters considered the new fee would damage the reputation/image of the Coromandel - put off visitors, future home owners and developers.
- Seven submitters noted their outrage with the proposal suggesting that the current councillors would be voted out at the next election.
- Six submitters were concerned the proposed rate will increase every year under the pressure of the motels and make renting for short periods unfeasible.
- A small number of submitters (four or less) noted the following:
  - a. considered economic development is outside of Council's remit, not a core service.
  - b. the new rate would cause a divide between bach owners and other accommodation providers with policing issues.
  - c. the funds collected should only be used in the area collected eg visitor information centres and local walkways
  - d. freedom campers are using the district's services and not paying a thing.
  - e. suggested reducing rates for moteliers and imposing the economic development rate across all properties.
  - f. suggested a better use of the new rate would be to fund infrastructure services.
  - g. no one gains from the proposal, no new revenue, motels no better off, less accommodation available to support the economic development programme.
- Many of the submitters suggested the status quo remain, that the \$250,000 to be raised comes from the UAGC with all ratepayers contributing.

### **Analysis**

The majority of the submitters opposed to the proposal (79%) are absentee ratepayers and the most common reason given is that the rental from these properties offsets costs rather than provides income, coupled with a view that it is an unfair additional cost when they pay full rates already for an under-utilised property, meaning they are already subsidising permanent residents. Many also express the view that their accommodation is necessary to the economic development of the area and that imposition of this extra cost may lead to many withdrawing their properties from the short stay accommodation pool.

While there has been some confusion about the details of this proposal apparent in some of the submissions, there is a consistent theme that this proposal is considered unfair as it is an extra charge to those who are already paying without making full use of what is being paid for. This view goes to the heart of what the Council needs to weigh up when it sets its funding approach for each activity. The matters to be considered under section 101 (3) of the LGA 2002 are:

- the distribution of benefits between the community as a whole, identifiable parts of the community and individuals; and
- the overall impact of liability for revenue needs on the community.

There was a judgement made which resulted in the proposal to impose a fixed targeted rate on the short term accommodation providers to contribute to the costs of the promotion and events activities within the economic development activity. This was, broadly, that short term accommodation providers are an identifiable group that benefit more from the promotion activities within the economic development activity than the community as a whole and therefore they should make a larger contribution than the general ratepayer to these costs. The overall impact on the community as a whole of the proposal is that rates for the general ratepayer were reduced. To put this another way, if the proposal were to be removed, the overall impact on the community as a whole would be an increase in the UAGC of \$8 for all residential ratepayers.

The other issue to be weighed up is the potential for a negative impact on economic development suggested by some of the submitters. If, as a number of submitters suggested, a number of property owners were to withdraw their properties from the short stay rental market as a result of this proposal, it may impact on the ability to stage major events on the Coromandel and reduce the number of visitors within the region at any one time affecting businesses from a reduced local spend by visitors.

The \$200 annual fee was not considered a large amount by the Council compared to the average rent charged per night; it was considered a reasonable contribution towards the promotion and events budget at a level that was cost effective given the administration costs involved. The contribution towards the promotion and events activities reflects the consideration that these identified ratepayers receive an additional benefit through their rental activity over and above other residential ratepayers from the promotion and events activities. Lowering the fee would increase the proportion used for the administration costs - in identifying the properties, managing the annual changes, answering queries and making changes where appropriate - which would reduce the overall contribution to a level considered unpractical.

There is a wide spectrum of renting practices - with many submitters noting that they rent for the occasional weekend (some for a big event, others just over the busy holiday season), many renting just over the summer and some renting as much as possible. For those renting for a very short period the new rate may result in these ratepayers withdrawing their property from the rental market. Alternatively some of these ratepayers may decide to rent their property for a longer period in order to recover the cost of the new rate which would increase the rental market available.

The inequity of moteliers paying commercial rates when short term accommodation providers only pay residential rates has been challenged through the submissions. Our ratepayers' knowledge of our rating system and the lack of this kind of detail in the Consultation Document likely contributed to this stance being taken. There is a wide range of what is included in commercial rates across New Zealand. For TCDC the commercial rate has only two components - a higher pan tax than the residential rate (residences are protected to a single pan tax in legislation regardless of number of the number of pans in the residence) and the specific rate for economic development based on the property's improvement value. The pan tax only applies to properties connected or able to be connected by a Council wastewater system and for this proposal is a moot point. The contribution to economic development particularly the promotion and events activities undertaken to attract visitors to the Coromandel as a destination is the activity in question for which a contribution is being requested.

Inequities will still exist with the proposed rate as some residents manage to rent without advertising; there is wide variety in the range of income received by residents renting but all STA providers will pay a uniform proposed rate; and there are residences used for a business that are not identifiable for commercial rates to be applied or to attract the proposed rate.

In some other parts of the world the equivalent of local authorities also hold powers to collect revenue taxes including income tax, sales tax and room occupancy taxes. Collectively these taxes with property taxes are used to fund particular services. The rating tools and fees/charges available to New Zealand local government are not as extensive and will not provide for the perfect match between beneficiaries and costs. For every rate applied there will be circumstances that exist that will make the rate seem unfair. Fairness and equity principles need to be considered and applied for the majority of instances; attempting to apply it for all circumstances would likely cost more than can be justified. For some foreseen instances of unfairness the Council's Rates Remissions Policy has provisions available.

We identified approximately 1,440 properties that were providing advertised short term accommodation. That makes up 5% of the district's current rating units. Staff have researched statistics available on trends of accommodation types in overseas markets including Europe, North America and Australia. The statistics available were limited and not completely conclusive. Australia does not breakdown their accommodation types to include short term accommodation providers; the European statistics are only available for 3 years with no compelling trend. The North American research included looking at the Town of Breckenridge Colorado which described the suite of taxes and charges able to be applied by North American agencies.

There are wide ranging occupancy rates amongst the different accommodation providers and wide ranging costs associated with each. Some operators will be more efficient than others, more innovative in ensuring high occupancy rates and therefore more profitable. New Zealand local authorities' charging regimes cannot be linked to income/profit (have not been given those tools by central government) and for the most part we do not interfere with market forces.

The legality of the proposed rate was questioned. At least two other district councils in New Zealand are charging a similar rate. A legal review of our funding impact statement and has not raised any issues with the proposed new rate.

Some of the other proposals for funding changes within this deliberations report have followed after two or more consultation processes with each consultation process either refining the proposal or providing a transition of a rating impact. Any change requires dissemination of good quality information, an opportunity to clarify aspects and understanding of all parties, opportunity to explore other options and time to allow acceptance of new information/ideas. The special consultative procedure, being one month in length with limited opportunity this year for pre-consultation, is far from ideal for managing a change process. The Council may wish to postpone its decision to a future annual plan or long term plan in order to give comments within submissions and alternative options put forward further consideration.

### **Additional information**

Staff have sourced information on the tourism type rates charged by three other New Zealand local authorities. Two of the council's rates are of a similar value, in Queenstown the tourism rate is approximately three times the value. A precis of each council's rate is below.

### **Marlborough District Council tourism charge**

Marlborough DC has had their current tourism charge since approximately 2006. The charge is increased by CPI each year and for 2014/15 was set at \$199 inclusive of GST. Destination Marlborough find the baches through advertising - the more they find (and can prove) the more funding Destination Marlborough gains. For 2014/15 the rate was projected to raised \$215,725 (inclusive of GST). The rate is calculated on the basis of a fixed amount on every separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit set differentially

- *residential baches or other dwelling units that are advertised for short term rental*

*accommodation and properties used for commercial rental accommodation where less than 30 people can be accommodated- \$199 GST incl*

- *Properties used for commercial rental accommodation where 30 or more people can be accommodated - \$307 GST incl.*
- *Properties used for tourism activities (excluding the two groups above) - \$223 GST incl*

Charges are only made if it can be proven that the property is being advertised. The Council sends the advice letter of the charge and information on what the funding is being used for to new properties identified by Destination Marlborough.

### **Rotorua District Council business and economic development rate**

A targeted business and economic development rate is in force at Rotorua District Council for the purposes of contributing to the cost of:

- Economic Projects
- Destination Rotorua Marketing
- Tourism Rotorua Travel and Information Centre

The rate is a mix of a targeted fixed rate and a rate in the dollar based on capital value. The business category funds 80% of the total costs. The business category includes properties providing short-term accommodation which for the purposes of this rate includes the provision of accommodation such as a B&B, lodge, retreat, farm stay or homestay or the provision of other similar short-term accommodation. Where the secondary use of the rating unit is for short term accommodation the property only pays the fixed targeted rate which for 2014/15 was \$183.11 plus GST.

### **Queenstown Lakes District Council**

The revenue from the Queenstown Lakes District Council's tourism promotion rate is used to help fund the activities of Lake Wanaka Tourism, Destination Queenstown and the Arrowtown Promotion Association. Only Wanaka property owners will pay a tourism promotion rate towards Lake Wanaka Tourism and Wakatipu / Arrowtown property owners towards Destination Queenstown and the Arrowtown Promotion Association.

If a property is rented on a residential lease or for accommodation purposes for a single period of up to 28 days per year, then it is not affected by this rate. If the property is rented on a nightly, weekly or monthly basis for accommodation purposes then the tourism promotion rate is applied. The Council seeks owners to register as either a homestay, holiday home or advises that a resource consent may be required.

A holiday home is categorised by the following:

- Not a multi-unit building
- Has a minimum stay of 3 nights
- No more than two people in the same bedroom
- No letting site over 90 days throughout the whole year (multiple visits totalling 90 days)

The tourism promotion rate for 2014/15 that applied to the short term accommodation category is a rate in the dollar based on capital value and ranged from \$551 to \$656 across the three wards.

### **Range of options for Council's consideration:**

- proceed with the proposal - reason: consider that this group does benefit more from the economic development activity than residential ratepayers in general so should pay a greater share of the costs; or
- not proceed with the proposal - reason: accept that these ratepayers already pay for more than they are utilising so it would be unreasonable to impose an extra cost

- and/or the proposal may result in the withdrawal of accommodation needed to support economic development; or
- not proceed with the proposal for 2015/16 and review the issue more thoroughly in light of the information provided through the submission process.

#### **4.9 Reclassify Bed and Breakfast businesses with four or more bedrooms for hire as commercial properties**

##### **Precis of proposal**

In order to reduce the inequities in the current funding structure between moteliers and other providers in the short term accommodation sector the Council proposed to reclassify Bed and Breakfast businesses with four or more bedrooms for hire as commercial properties. This means that these businesses would pay commercial rates, similarly to motels, which in addition to their current rates includes:

- the pan tax if connected to a council wastewater scheme
  - 0.5 times the wastewater rate (proposed wastewater rate = \$761.40) for each additional pan - for a B&B with two bathrooms the additional commercial rate = \$380.70; with four bathrooms the additional commercial rate = \$1,522.80.
- the economic development rate
  - rate in the dollar based on the value of improvements for each property - \$0.000888 in the proposed LTP which means for a property with \$1million of improvements the economic development rate = \$888.

##### **Consultation process**

In developing this proposal, Council identified 27 bed and breakfast operators with 4 or more bedrooms available from advertisements. All 27 ratepayers were written to advising them of the proposal and of the opportunity to submit.

##### **Submission statistics**

Total submissions on this proposal	198	
Total in favour	117	(105 without any reason)
Total opposed	81	(47 without any reason)

##### **Summary of submission points**

In favour of the proposal

- Eleven submitters noted that B&Bs of more than four bedrooms are accepted as a commercial business.
- Two submitters noted there was a risk that the B&B operators would reduce the number of rooms available as a result of a change in rating.
- One submitter considered that B&Bs needed to be considered a commercial business to ensure oversight for health and safety requirements.

Opposed to the proposal

- Ten submitters noted that the proposal seems to discourage the provision of quality accommodation which was in opposition to the economic development strategic direction of encouraging accommodation providers to increase patronage.
- Nine submitters considered B&Bs offer a niche accommodation option (more personalised service in often non-commercial and rural environments) that has an increasing demand by visitors/travellers - providing a service to the Coromandel.
- Nine submitters suggested that the proposal will result in B&Bs closing or reducing the number of rooms available to three and below which reduces the amount of quality accommodation available.
- Eight submitters noted that B&Bs were seasonal businesses with low returns that did not justify full commercial rating. The residence was still using less council services than if fully occupied as a family residence all year round and freedom campers were

getting similar services for free.

- Five submitters considered that bed and breakfast operators are not significant businesses to be considered commercial in nature; many noted that the threshold should be more than six bedrooms.
- Four submitters noted that B&Bs limited occupancy was also limited to two people per room, much lower than motel unit occupancy. Rented bachs could accommodate more people and make more income. Most B&Bs had a maximum of two bathrooms compared to every motel unit having a bathroom.
- Three submitters noted that as businesses using their homes this was reflected in their tax relief, why should they pay full commercial rates when the property was still being used primarily as a residence.
- Three submitters noted their concern with the cost of the monitoring and enforcement and the inequities that will result eg B&B advertising three rooms but rent further rooms on request.
- Two submitters noted the Council had not provided evidence to show that B&Bs received benefits of council services worthy of commercial rates, in particular that they did not benefit from the economic development events programme as B&B visitors were drawn to the district for other reasons.
- Two submitters noted that there are other businesses on the Coromandel using their residence as their place of business that are not penalised with commercial rates - where is the equity with these businesses?
- One submitter noted that reclassifying a residence as commercial for rating purposes opens up opportunity for property to be redeveloped under commercial provisions of District Plan without the scrutiny of the Plan Change process.

### **Staff analysis/commentary**

While the numbers alone show approximately 60% in support of the proposal, nearly 90% of the supporters did not provide any reasoning or supporting information. Most of the submitters identified as B&B operators noted they would either reduce the number of rooms available to three or would seriously consider closing down or selling.

If we assume that all 27 B&Bs reduced their available rooms to three, with maximum occupancy over three months of the year there would be potentially 1,134 fewer visitors on the peninsula or that many visitors looking for alternative accommodation. Over the peak period the motels have full occupancy therefore many of these visitors would likely choose a different destination than the Coromandel.

### **Additional information**

Marlborough District Council charge B&Bs with occupancy of 6 plus persons the commercial rate - their commercial rate is a differential of the general rate (paying a significant share of regional development, roading, stormwater, CBD works) so much greater than TCDC's.

### **Recommendation**

33. That the Council decide to either;
- proceed with the proposal - reason: consider that this is operating a business that should be on a commercial basis for rating; or
  - not proceed with the proposal - reason: accept that the proposal may result in the withdrawal of accommodation needed to support economic development; or
  - accept the points made in the submissions opposing the proposal in part, while maintaining that it is appropriate to classify this sector as commercial and modify the proposal to a differentiated rate of a lesser amount.

## **5 Revenue and Financing Policy**

In the Statement of Proposal for the revised Revenue and Financing Policy we noted the following key changes to the policy:

- Changing the funding of the Stormwater activity from a local-funded activity to a district-funded activity.
- Changing the funding of Public conveniences and Cemeteries from district-funded activities to local-funded activities.
- Introducing a targeted fixed rate of \$200 per property for those who make their homes available on a short term basis for holiday rentals.
- Classifying Bed and Breakfast businesses who have 4 or more bedrooms available for short term accommodation as Commercial rather than Residential ratepayers.
- Changing the funding of the Tairua, Pauanui, Whangamata and Coromandel Information Centres from district-funded to local funding over the next three years.

These key changes were also included as proposals within the Long Term Plan Consultation Document and submission form. Each of these proposals is summarised and analysed as a separate item within this deliberations report.

Other changes to the policy noted in the Statement of Proposal were:

- A number of the Council's activities have been restructured from the 2012 Long Term Plan. For the most part, the funding of the affected services has not changed, where funding has changed it is included in the key changes highlighted above or in the list that follows.
- The district component of the **Grants and Remissions** activity is proposed to be funded through a uniform annual general charge rather than the general rate.
- The **District Plan** activity is proposed to be funded through a uniform annual general charge (UAGC) rather than the current combined funding from the general rate and uniform annual general charge (UAGC).
- The **Economic Development** activity includes provision for capital expenditure to be funded by grants and subsidies.
- The funding split for the **Community Spaces and Development** activity group changes to a medium portion from land value based rates, a medium portion from a fixed charge rate and a low portion from user fees and charges.

The two activities proposed to be fully funded by the uniform annual general charge are summarised and analysed as a separate item within this deliberations report. The Council only received one general submission on the Revenue and Financing Policy which is included under the submissions by activity in Section 8.2.

In line with recommendations of a review of the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy (RFP) appropriate paragraphs will be inserted into this policy to address the following issues:

- The Section 101(3)(a) or (3)(b) funding considerations are not directly referenced in the RFP.
- There is little guidance for the DC Policy itself referenced in the RFP.
- The modified unit of demand cost allocation methodology that was maintained throughout the DC Policies from 2006 to 2012 is primarily based on cost causation and incorporates the primary principle that existing ratepayers when entering into a combined project should pay no more than the replacement cost to service standard. The draft DC Policy 2015 represents a fundamental shift in funding principals. The cost allocation to developers is based on share of capacity of total capacity (restricted to 40 years) rather than prior policy that restricted costs to existing ratepayers to the replacement cost to service standard of existing assets with the balance allocated to development. The changed cost allocation methodology and funding principles proposed in the draft DC Policy 2015 has meant a significant portion of capital costs have been transferred from AC to ILOS/ERP.
- In effect the liability for the cost of the ES3 project costs have been also transferred from the catchments that receive the benefits (through DC charges) to the district at large

(One District targeted rates).

The appropriate wording is under development in conjunction with Council's advisors and will be presented as part of the deliberations process.

### Recommendation

34. That the Council adopts the proposed Revenue and Financing Policy, with changes that may be necessary to match with Long Term Plan decisions and tabled advice.

## 6 Funding requests for district funded activities

Many of the funding requests listed in this section are also noted in the Grants and Remission activity report and Economic Development activity report with fuller summaries of the submission points.

Organisation/ Activity	Request	Included in budgets prior to deliberations	Variance unbudgeted expenditure	2012-2022 Funding 2014-2015
Sport Waikato	\$82,633 annually for 3 yrs (plus CPI in years 2 and 3)	\$105,000	Balance of \$22,367 remaining if Sport Waikato is awarded full request.	\$82,000
Community Waikato	Not specified			\$15,000
Life Education Trust	Not specified			\$8,000
Age Concern Thames	\$13,315 annually for 3 yrs	0 annually for 3 yrs	\$13,315 annually for 3 yrs	0
Regional Sports Facilities Plan	\$9,570 +GST annually for 3 yrs	0	\$9,570 +GST annually for 3 yrs	0
Surf Lifesaving New Zealand (SLSNZ) - Core	2015-16 - \$132,000 2016-17 - \$132,000 2017-18 - \$132,000	\$114,015 \$113,626 \$113,626	\$18,000 \$18,000 \$18,000	\$111,180
Surf Lifesaving New Zealand (SLSNZ) - Additional service	2015-16 - \$26,200 2016-17 - \$20,800 2017-18 - \$20,800	0 0 0	\$26,200 \$20,800 \$20,800	Whangamata \$2,700
Rescue Helicopter	No formal request	\$25,000	0	\$25,000
Enviroschools programme	\$11,000	0	\$11,000	\$11,000
Biodiversity Forum	\$3,000	0	\$3,000	\$3,000
Reinstatement of Natural and Cultural activity budget	\$30,000	0	\$30,000	\$30,000



In the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan the Social Development activity awarded grants for district wide activities to the value of \$105,000 which were awarded as follows in the 2014-2015 year:

- Sport Waikato (\$81,412)
- Community Waikato (\$15,000)
- Life Education Trust (\$8,000)

The current contracts all finish on 30 June 2015.

The budget allocation of \$105,000 has been transferred to the new Grants and Remissions activity and factored into the 2015-2025 budgets. This budget is not currently allocated against specific actions, activities or organisations.

#### Sport Waikato

Sport Waikato has requested continued funding for the salary and overheads of the District Coordinator.

The Regional Sports Facilities Plan funding request was included under Section 8.10 as a change to the financial information.

#### Community Waikato

Community Waikato provides support to social service organisations in the greater Waikato region to help build their capability and capacity.

Their principle source of funding is Trust Waikato. The organisation submitted to the Long Term Plan and presented at the hearings. While they indicated that they would welcome continued funding this was not the purpose of the submission and they did not make a request for a specific amount.

#### Life Education Trust

Life Education Trust presented at the hearings, predominantly to thank Council for its ongoing support for the last 25 years and advise of some changes in the geographic coverage, this was instrumental in enabling the upgrade to the new classroom unit. While they indicated that they would welcome continued funding this was not the purpose of the submission and they did not make a request for a specific amount. They also indicated that regardless of the level of funding the service would continue.

### **6.1 Age Concern Thames**

An additional request was made by Age Concern Thames who have been seeking a three year SLA from council since 2014, and submitted on the 2014/15 Annual Plan to this effect. At that time the council gave an undertaking to work with Age Concern on a closer relationship, though a SLA, no specific funding was agreed to.

Since their 2014 submission they progressed the standalone establishment of Age Concern Thames and have a well-established Accredited Visitor Service in Thames (entirely run on volunteers) and have since started Accredited Visitor Services in Whitianga and are focussing on Coromandel. Their Thames-based services cover the TCDC and HDC areas.

The existing activity with budget for this grant, Social Development, is not included in the proposed 2015-25 Long Term Plan. The general direction of council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model. Budget provision has only been made to accommodate the current district funded grants. Should council wish to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored.

## **Recommendations from Community Boards**

### Support proposal

- Thames Community Board support in principle, subject to the funding amount.

### **Recommendation**

35. That Council determines funding for Age Concern Thames.

The following programmes were funded through the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity which no longer exists.

## **6.2 Enviroschools budget**

Multiple submitters requested that TCDC continue to allocate \$11,000 to the Enviroschools programme. Submitters noted the value they see in the Enviroschool programme for participating students and school communities within the Thames-Coromandel district.

The programme provides professional development for teachers through staff meetings, teacher workshops, networking, bus trips to other Enviroschools and through one to one support with their facilitator. It also provides funding for student workshops, support, and events where students are able to share their learning and action around sustainability in creative ways. Currently there are 14 Enviroschools in the Thames Coromandel District.

Submitters were concerned that the future requirement to apply for funding through individual community boards would divert teacher time from delivering the programme into increased administration and put the long term stability of funding for the programme at an increased risk.

The current activity and budget for this grant, [2012 activity where this funding came from], is not included in the proposed 2015-25 Long Term Plan. The general direction of council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model. While provision has been made to accommodate grants which are currently district funded within Community Board budgets, these have not been factored into 2015/16 budgets and there will likely be a transition period where funding is not available for existing district funded recipients.

The total Waikato Enviroschool programme is in the region of \$270,000 and levers in funding from a number of different sources including Waikato Regional Council who are the biggest single funder. There are another 10 territorial authorities supporting the programme, and their contributions are proportionate to the level of participation e.g. the largest contribution is \$28,000 while some of the smaller authorities contributing \$5,000. Over the last three years the contribution has remained the same but the number of schools in Thames-Coromandel has increased from eleven to fourteen.

Enviroschools has informed Council that at their national hui in February 2015, they were advised that MFE was comfortable with waste levy funding being utilised for District Council Enviroschools funding, and that multiple councils in the wider Waikato region were using this funding in this way. A similar initiative Zero Waste Education is funded from this source and there may potentially be some duplication.

Should council wish to continue supporting the existing district grants, or to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored.

## **Recommendations from Community Boards**

### Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

#### Alternative proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board.  
That Council refer funding of the Enviroschools programme to each Community Board for consideration.
- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board and Whangamata Community Board took neutral stances but recommended that alternative funding through solid waste levies be investigated.

#### Recommendation

36. That Council funds Enviroschools in the 2015-2016 year from the waste levy fund and reviews the Enviroschools and Zero Waste Education for future funding as part of the 2016-2017 Annual Plan.

### 6.3 Natural and cultural heritage activity and Biodiversity Forum

Several submitters request the reinstatement of the budget to support the Biodiversity forum (\$3,000) and several submitters request the reinstatement of the natural and cultural heritage activity. The Thames Community Board suggested the budget could assist with the district Heritage Park concept initiative.

The annual activity budget within the 2012-22 Long Term Plan was \$30,000.

Council's Economic Development Committee has commissioned a Concept Study to investigate what a Heritage Region could mean. The scope is to research, review and present the opportunity and impact of a Coromandel Heritage Region and is much wider than image and marketing. This work has been funded by 2014/15 budget and no further project costs are required at this conceptual stage excluding existing staff resource. If the Coromandel Heritage Region project proceeds from the conceptual stage any further funding requirements will be proposed as part of 2016/17 Annual Plan processes.

Council's current Natural and Cultural Heritage activity and associated budget was not proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. The general direction of Council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model. Costs of running the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity have been proposed within the Economic Development activity.

While provision has been made to accommodate grants which are currently district funded within community board budgets, these have not been factored into 2015/16 budgets and there will likely be a transition period where funding is not available for existing district funded grants.

Should Council wish to continue supporting the existing district grants/funding, or to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored.

One such interim measure could be to allocate interim budget for Year 1 for some natural cultural and heritage funding to continue while the Coromandel Heritage Region Concept Study is being undertaken and any local funding sources are established, and revisit the decision during the 2016/17 Annual Plan planning process.

Current budget (under the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity) that has not been re-allocated under the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan are set out below.

Heritage building maintenance: 15,000

Heritage promotion: \$30,000

Subscriptions (Biodiversity Forum and Heritage NZ): \$4,500

Enviroschools Programme: \$11,500

#### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board
- Coromandel-Colville Community Board
- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board

### **Recommendation**

37. That Council determines funding for the Biodiversity Forum and the former activities within the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity.

## **6.4 Biodiversity Strategy**

Kauri Trust 2000 support the review of the TCDC Biodiversity Strategy to be undertaken. Waikato Regional Council requests that council allocate \$50,000 in the 2018/19 year to support a local indigenous biodiversity strategy for the Thames-Coromandel District.

TCDC was closely involved with a number of other territorial authorities in submitting on the Proposed Waikato RPS (via the Joint Working Party on the PRPS) and was supportive of 'Implementation Agreements' as a way to prioritise the efforts and resources of territorial and regional councils across the Waikato Region in achieving the objectives of the RPS.

TCDC is aware that Local Indigenous Biodiversity Strategies have been identified in the RPS as a method to implement the RPS and the TCDC Proposed District Plan has, as a non-regulatory method, that "The Council will review its Biodiversity Strategy." Resources and timing for review of the Biodiversity Strategy are yet to be confirmed but it is useful to know of WRC commitments.

With regard to building regional heritage capacity, through the Long Term Plan the Council is consulting on the potential for the Coromandel to become a 'Heritage Region'. Following consideration of submissions on the Long Term Plan the Council may make resources available to promote a Heritage Region for the Coromandel Peninsula. This may involve the allocation of resources to review the Council's existing Heritage Strategy, and Council involvement in the Regional Heritage Forum to promote positive heritage outcomes (both from a natural and cultural heritage perspective).

Staff are currently in the process of identifying possible priorities for inclusion in the Implementation Agreement between WRC and TCDC - which will also involve Council input. The Council looks forward to working with WRC to achieve the objectives of the Waikato RPS.

### **Recommendation:**

38. That the Council allocates \$50,000 in 2018/19 to support a local indigenous biodiversity strategy.

## **6.5 Other former grants**

The following grants were defined as district wide activities and have also been included in the budgets for this activity, having previously been allocated against the Emergency Management Planning activity:

- Surf Life Saving (\$111,180)
- Rescue Helicopter (25,000)

Surf Lifesaving New Zealand (SLSNZ) has applied for two distinct areas of funding in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan. SLSNZ has requested \$132,000 annually in years 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 for an extension of their existing summer services. This is \$18,000 more than staff have currently budgeted for this service. They have also requested \$26,200

in the 2015/16 year and \$20,800 in the years 2016/17 and 2017/18 to extend existing services in the Whangamata, Mercury Bay and Tairua-Pauanui Community Board areas. These extensions cover busy periods which are not currently covered by the service, and are consistent with the emphasis which both council and Destination Coromandel are placing on extending the shoulder season in their promotion of the Coromandel.

Community Boards have indicated they consider this additional funding should be met by the district, rather than by Community Boards, which is who SLSNZ directed these additional requests for funding to. Council may choose to support both funding applications, only one funding application, or support neither.

**Recommendation:**

39. That Council confirms the budget of \$132,000 per year for three years to Surf Lifesaving New Zealand to fund surf lifesaving services at Hot Water Beach, Tairua, Pauanui, Onemana, and Whangamata over peak summer periods from the grants and remissions budget.

That Council confirms a budget of \$26,200 for 2015/16 and a budget of \$20,800 for years 2016/17 and 2017/18 to Surf Lifesaving New Zealand to fund extended surf lifesaving services at Hot Water Beach, Whangamata Main Beach, Whangamata Wharf and Tairua and Pauanui beaches from the grants and remissions budget.

## **6.6 Kauri Protection from Kauri dieback**

Waikato Regional Council coordinates Kauri Protection work across the region, but does not fund the work on Thames-Coromandel District Council land.

It is suggested that district approach is needed to protect Kauri on Council-owned land across the peninsula. Council staff are investigating the costs of a district-wide approach to this and they will be tabled at this deliberations meeting.

The Coromandel-Colville Community Board received a report on 14 April 2015 which outlined the need to protect Kauri in the Long Bay area. If a district-wide approach is not adopted by Council, the Coromandel-Colville Community Board recommend that measures are put in place to ensure the Long Bay Kauri are protected. What has been suggested is an interim measure to protect specific stands of Kauri in Long Bay and Memorial Reserve which are high risk areas due to high visitor numbers.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board
- Coromandel-Colville Community Board

### **Recommendation**

40. That a new district-wide capital budget is established which is specific to Kauri protection and addresses high risk areas in the district. (Costs and an updated recommendation to be tabled at the meeting.)

That the immediate importance of protection for the Long Bay Walkway Kauri and the Memorial Reserve Kauri is acknowledged and the funding below is allocated for this work to be undertaken in the 2015/16 financial year with some urgency. Budget requirements in the 2015/16 year for Coromandel-Colville area are as follows:

At an additional cost of approximately \$0.86 per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area:

- Relocate and improve the Kauri dieback station at Hannafords Wharf - \$5,000
- Protection and boardwalk around the Kauri at Long Bay - \$11,400
- Interpretation signage (x5) \$2,500 at key Coromandel holiday parks and dump stations

That Council establishes a new Local Kauri Protection operational budget at an additional cost of approximately \$2.64 per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area which includes:

- Establish garden around the Memorial Reserve Kauri \$2,000 (one off)
- An on-going annual parks contract variation of \$200 extra per annum to maintain the new garden around the Memorial Reserve Kauri
- An annual parks contract variation of \$3,600 extra per annum for maintenance of cleaning stations at Long Bay (x2 stations) and Hannafords (x1 station).

That Council staff are instructed to work with Waikato Regional Council to ensure that priority areas for Kauri protection in the Coromandel are included in protection plans to reduce Kauri dieback risk in the district and to investigate possible funding options from the Waikato Regional Council and the Kauri Forum.

## 6.7 Eco-design advisor

Claire Benge (LTP15\_314) urges the Council to budget for the provision of an Eco Design Advisor.

Precis of Claire's submission follows:

"Coromandel has a warmer climate than Wellington but its climate, especially the high humidity, creates its own problems that the national building code does not cover adequately, what I have seen and read there are still many people living in houses with dampness, ventilation, heating and cooling problems. I feel that an Eco Design Advisor in the TCDC area could do a lot to lift the quality of living for them. At the recent public discussion in Coromandel Town about the Long Term Plan, the CEO noted the difficulty with the district because of its wide spread population and the fluctuations because of the tourism. The long term plan proposes to build up the strengths of each community in order to overcome problems from this, which I endorsed to him as being an excellent idea. This could be helped enormously by having an EDA working through the communities with Thames as a base.

Each EDA around New Zealand has different experience and qualifications behind them but that is one of their strengths because they share their knowledge and experience between them. It is an extremely good service and the TCDC would only benefit from it.

The Eco Design Advisor Network is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Thames Coromandel District Council Long Term Plan and submits:

**We urge the Council to budget for the provision of an Eco Design Advisor.** Eco Design Advisors undertake free or low cost in-home consultations with homeowners, provide free phone advice on new home or renovation plans, or on upgrading existing homes, and increase the understanding of sustainable building in the local Council area.

Seven councils already provide this service, including Hamilton City Council.

- Demonstrated success – the 2013 national customer survey (see Supporting Information) indicates high satisfaction and high rates of improvements as a result of the advice.

- Positive feedback indicates this is appreciated by participants as a constructive service provided by Council.

- Contributes to upgrading the condition of the District's housing stock, reducing household running costs (energy/water) and improving residents' health.

There are numerous benefits to Thames Coromandel District Council. These include:

- raising the condition of the housing stock in the District to World Health Organisation standards and improving the energy and water efficiency of all houses, delivering an improved health and quality of life to current and future residents
- meeting the Council's vision that "Coromandel will be New Zealand's most desirable place to live, work and visit."
- encouraging and educating about water conservation as part of the Council's water demand strategy
- promoting sustainable building in design and construction, as required under the Building Act 2004 (sections 3, 4 and 172)
- being a key mechanism for championing sustainable design within the Council and feeding back into the development of council policy
- generating positive feedback by offering free, impartial advice and assistance to residents, designers and the building trade – the EDA service is one of the few "carrots" Council can offer in the building compliance area
- showing the Council as proactive and leading in sustainability issues.

### **Recommendation**

41. That Council determines funding for an Eco Design Advisor.

## **7 Information for confirmation of other Long Term Plan content**

The Long Term Plan content is regulated by the Local Government Act 2002. The recent legislative amendments have changed the mandatory content of the plan; still to be included that has not yet been considered by the Council is the documented steps to foster Maori capacity to contribute to decision-making processes and the information on our council-controlled organisations.

### **7.1 Council-controlled organisations**

A long term plan must name the council-controlled organisations (CCO) and any subsidiaries and for each:

- a) identify the local authority's significant policies and objectives in relation to ownership and control of the organisation
- b) nature and scope of the activities to be provided by the council-controlled organisations
- c) key performance targets and other measures by which performance is to be judged.

LASS (Local Authority Shared Services Limited) is the only CCO that this information is required for as Destination Coromandel and the Thames Valley Rural Fire Authority have exemptions.

The council's significant policies and objectives in relation to ownership and control of the organisation and the nature and scope of the activities to be provided by the council-controlled organisations have not changed since the 2012-22 Long Term Plan was adopted.

The key performance targets for 2015/16 have been received in the CCO's draft Statement of Intent (attached as Attachment C).

### **Recommendation**

42. That Council includes the 2012-22 Long Term Plan CCO information for the significant policies and objectives in relation to ownership and control of the organisation and the nature and scope of the activities and the 2015/16 Statement of Intent performance measures targets in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan.

## **7.2 Contribution to Decision Making by Māori**

The Council's current approach was included in the 2012-22 Long Term Plan. In the latter half of 2014 during the development phase of the Long Term Plan staff discussed the current approach with Councillor Goudie as Chairperson of the Policy Committee. At that time no changes were identified as being necessary to the current statement as the Treaty settlements have not been finalised. The Council still intends to review this statement once the Treaty settlement outcomes are known.

Current approach to "Contribution to Decision Making by Māori" is in Attachment B.

### **Recommendation**

43. That Council confirms the inclusion of the 2012-22 version of the Council's approach to development of Maori capacity to contribute to decision-making processes with the following change:
- removal of the last sentence "The revised Statement is intended to be included in the Council's draft 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan".

## **8 Deliberations information on topics raised by submitters for district-funded activities**

The submission points raised by submitters outside of the proposals within the Consultation Document and statement of proposals for the Revenue and Financing Policy and Rates Remission policy have been categorised to the Council's activity structure with the overflow categorised by topic. These submission points are captured in the following tables and include staff advice and recommendations.



## 8.1 Rates/debt comments

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_15 Mr Andrew Harnos	I am very concerned that the Council is over-reaching at the expense of rate payers. Council needs to be clear on its core functions and responsibilities and should not borrow or rate for functions, no matter how laudable, are outside its remit. Where in doubt, a narrow approach should be taken to defining remit and responsibilities.	Advice from ratepayer is noted; no specific projects or services were identified for further consideration.	No action required.
LTP15_33 David Iles	Please - stop trying to fleece the ratepayers. Maybe its time to look to look in-house at the ever increasing costs at the council offices.	Reducing in-house costs was a focus for staff during the Long Term Plan budgeting process and achieving efficiencies will continue to be focus for operations.	No action required.
LTP15_69 Mrs Elizabeth Anne Stewart Ball	We would like to add that TCDC should follow its own policy and use depreciation to replace existing assets and not spend depreciation on new assets. Regardless of what may be the current thinking fashion for Councils it is not good business practice using depreciation towards new assets and runs the risk of more debt and even perhaps bankruptcy. We do not believe that debt should be borrowed on or funded by further debt. It is not good practice and history including that of Councils, record major problems.	The Council borrows against its depreciation reserves rather than using external sources to achieve savings in costs and limit exposure to adverse interest rate movements. When the depreciation reserves are needed for replacement of existing assets the internal debt is replaced with external debt.	No action required.
LTP15_70 Mr. Christopher Raymond Ball	We would like to add that TCDC should follow its own policy and use depreciation to replace existing assets and not spend depreciation on new assets. Regardless of what may be the current thinking fashion for Councils it is not good business practice using depreciation towards new assets and runs the risk of more debt and even perhaps bankruptcy. We do not believe that debt should be borrowed on or funded by further debt. It is not good practice and history including that of Councils, record major problems.		
LTP15_125 Mr John Rive Whangamata Ratepayers Association	<b>1) Rates and Debt Levels</b> We believe that driving the External Debt down by \$55.5M (\$5.55M per year) to almost zero over the 10 years runs counter the notion of "Intergenerational Equity" as espoused by Local Government. The poor old Ratepayer is meeting the total cost of the Eastern Seaboard	External debt is one part of the Council's debt profile. As our reserves grow, mostly the depreciation reserves, then a greater share of the Council's	No action required.

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Wastewater Plants to the tune of \$93M (repayment of the loan, interest on the loan, and depreciation), and now we are expected to pay off the external debt portion of this in a mere ten years when the plants probably have a life of 40 years.</p> <p>We have done some calculations (attached) which show that by delaying \$10M of Capital Expenditure from the first 5 years to the second 5 years, and reducing the loan repayments to \$27.6M instead of \$54.5M, after allowing additional interest of \$3.9M, a rate reduction of \$23M would be achieved.</p> <p>This would reduce the rates increase from a planned 28.1% to 23.7%.</p> <p>This would still leave \$75M of possible additional external debt before the ceiling of \$105M is reached. This ceiling was calculated on our proposed rates for 2024/25 of \$70M (10 Year Plan \$72.4M).</p> <p>Loans on Wastewater Plants can be likened to a mortgage on the family home which are generally set up for a 20 to 30 year term. Very few home owners have the ability to pay off a mortgage in 10 years.</p> <p>The 10 Year Plan also shows that over the 10 years, residential rates (Land Value \$400k will increase by between 16% in Coromandel (lowest) and 23% in Whangamata (highest) while business rates are reduced by 9% in Thames and remain the same in Whangamata and Mercury Bay. There may be good and valid reasons for doing this, but nobody has explained to the residential ratepayers why businesses are paying less or the same while they are paying up to 23% more.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that the Council accepts our plan, any reduction should be applied only to residential rates as business rates have already been treated leniently, when compared with the residential.</p> <p><b>2) Accounting Practices</b></p> <p>Under the guise of "Intergenerational Equity" TCDC and Councils up and down the country routinely revalue their assets and thus inflate the depreciation which is then charged as part of the rates.</p> <p>To illustrate the difference that this makes; the Revaluation Reserve is projected to be \$800M at 30 June 2015 and increase to \$1167M at 30 June 2025. This is an increase of \$367M in 10 years, and is more than the either the projected depreciation or capital expenditure, and not much less than both of these added together.</p> <p>This pernicious practice allows Councils access to ever increasing reserves so they can also increase internal debt while all the time telling the ratepayer they are reducing external debt.</p> <p>The effect of this practice on a large asset with a long life such as the Wastewater</p>	<p>debt will be funded from internal debt (by borrowing from the reserves). To this end the Council is still funding new assets with debt which achieves inter-generational equity and the replacement of existing assets will be funded from the depreciation reserves which is built up over time and therefore funded by more than one generation.</p> <p>The repayment of the eastern seaboard wastewater plant debt is proposed to take 40 years to pay back. Some of the residual debt after ten years will be funded by internal debt. This means we will still be paying back the wastewater debt after ten years and savings in rates to extend the payback period are not available.</p> <p>Residential rates are increasing more than commercial rates because the higher property values benefit from the proposed greater use of the UAGC to fund services.</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Plants is very significant. At an inflation rate of 1% for 40 years, additional depreciation of \$44M would be charged to ratepayers, while if the rate was 3% a truly eye-watering \$202M would be charged.</p> <p>The interest paid on internal debt is currently hidden and should be disclosed by way of a note in the TCDC Accounts.</p> <p>[Submitter has attached a spreadsheet with financial information in reference to reducing debt.]</p> <p>1) Capital expenditure in my version is the same in total but for each of the first 5 years \$2M is transferred into year 6, then 7 etc. 2) Debt remains the same and Rates are reduced by the cap exp reduction of \$2m for each of the first 5 years. 3) In the second 5 years; year 6, 7, &amp; 8 Rates are reduced by \$3M, &amp; year 9 &amp; 10 are reduced by \$4M. This is the "Adjusted Rates Line". 4) Then the interest is recalculated on the increased debt and the "Additional Interest" is deducted from the "Adjusted Rates". 5) This creates the "Proposed Rates" line. 6) The last line shows the "Pro Forma Rates Decrease" reduced by the additional Interest on the increased Debt. 7) The small decrease in Depreciation is ignored. 8) In summary the Loan Repayment is reduced from \$54.5M to \$29.6M &amp; the Rates are reduced by \$23.1M or \$2.31M per year; while interest increase by \$3.9M.</p>		
<p>LTP15_218 Darlan Lunjevich- West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submitter addressed submission to the Thames Community Board] Create more opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce costs.</li> </ul>	<p>The submitter's advice is noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>LTP15_226 Darlan Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[The submitter addressed submission to the Tairua-Pauanui-Hikuai Community Board] Create more opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce costs such as tax, power, and water rates.</li> </ul>	<p>The submitter's advice is noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>LTP15_255 Mr Evan Penny</p>	<p><b>Financial Prudence:</b> I question whether it is sustainable to cap average cumulative district rate increases to no more than CPI. Council costs are comprised of internal administrative costs and contracted service costs. Capping these latter costs would be a good principle if council services remained constant over time, and no additional new facilities or services were provided in the District. Some increases in council budgets could be funded from an increase in development in the district and increases in the rating base, and these costs might be managed under the CPI cap, but the assumption would be that the levels of service pro rata would have to be frozen in time at the current levels.</p> <p>The other component of costs used to be described as the council up factor. This factor used to be used to represented the costs of any service over the actual externally contracted costs. A public work might cost say \$1.00 but the final cost to ratepayers had to include all the internal council costs to administer the work. Up factors of in excess of 2.5 used to be common, meaning that the \$1.00 project cost would cost ratepayers \$2.50. Reducing the up factor is obviously where savings would have to be found. 91</p> <p>I am certain that council does everything reasonably possible to get the best value for money out of its external contractors, but the real opportunity to get more for less is to reduce the up factor. With my background in local government I am well aware of the constraints and requirements placed on local government by law, and that this environment creates costs for the ratepayer that private individuals and normal commercial concern do not face, but if there is to be any way to squeeze more goods and services from local government it will have to come from reducing the internal democratic and accountability costs?</p> <p>So what can council do? One thing that commends itself to me is that council could press Local Government NZ to lobby the Minister Of Local Government to reduce the bureaucracy involved in territorial government. The Government seem well aware of the problem with bureaucracy with the Resource management Act, but the point needs to be made that the tortuous processes within the Local Government Act and the Local Bodies Rating Powers Act might also be worthy of his attention.</p> <p>The third issue I raise is that with the best of intentions to hold rates you will come under pressure to agree to one additional project after another. With this pressure on one side and your aim of holding rates increases on the other side you will inevitably be tempted to fund vote winning projects by delaying infrastructure maintenance. You may get to do the small projects by deferring infrastructure</p>	<p>The submitter requests Council lobby the Minister of Local Government and LGNZ to reduce the bureaucracy involved in territorial government to enable the Council to reduce overall costs and rates.</p> <p>Central government is currently undertaking its Rules Reduction initiative, opening the way for people to submit examples of property regulations and local rules that don't make sense. This is one of the initiatives from the Productivity Commission's review to identify opportunities to improve the regulatory performance of local government which was one part of the government's Better Local Government programme.</p> <p>Submitter requests Council not defer infrastructure maintenance in order to fund additional "vote winning" projects and remain within the CPI cap for rates.</p> <p>The maintenance of infrastructure assets is contained within separate</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>maintenance, but future ratepayers will not thank you. In summary, my submission concerning financial prudence is that council should work with Local Government NZ to reduce the complexity and cost of local governance, adopt a CPI objective for all existing projects without compromising infrastructure maintenance, but not tie council's hands where new project opportunities present or commend themselves.</p>	<p>budgets to additional projects and is not within the same prioritising decision-making processes.</p>	
<p>LTP15_260 Dal Minoque</p>	<p>correct use of local government debt to create 'intergenerational equity'. This approach does not appear to be well understood by the TCDC as evidenced by their attempt to transfer all future capacity debt for their Eastern Seaboard wastewater plants from future users to current ratepayers.. Extract: Local government debt - why do councils borrow? There is nothing like the issue of debt to create interest in local government, yet without debt many communities would simply not have the infrastructure that enables them to exist and grow. The real question is not whether councils should have debt or not, but what should debt be used for and how do we determine when debt is too high? Debt and assets: how do councils determine the right level of debt? One of the major questions all councils grapple with is how to pay for capital expenditure - what proportion should be paid by operational income and what proportion should be paid for by debt, whether by bank loan or bond. In answering such questions councils apply the principle of inter-generational equity, which requires that each generation that benefits from an investment, such as an investment in a waste water plant that is expected to serve a community for at least 50 years, should contribute to the cost of that service. One way of doing this is to borrow the cost of the construction of the plant and pay it off during its operational life time, ensuring that each generation which benefits also contributes.</p> <p>But how much debt can a council afford? Councils employ a range of quantifiable thresholds so as to ensure debt levels remain sustainable. The Local Government Act 2002 requires councils to set, in consultation with citizens, financial strategies which include a statement of the local authority's quantified limits on rates, rate increases and borrowing. Financial strategies also outline expected capital expenditure on network infrastructure. In addition they must also adopt 'revenue and financing' policies which dictate how capital expenditure will be funded and 'liability management' policies, which set interest rate exposure, liquidity, credit exposure and debt repayment approaches. Councils must also balance their</p>	<p>The eastern seaboard wastewater plant debt is being transferred from future developers to current and future ratepayers. Rather than fund a large portion of the debt from development contributions that are not likely to come forth, the debt will be paid by current and future ratepayers which means inter-generational equity will be maintained.</p> <p>Up until last year the current debt assigned to future development has been increasing due to interest incurred on the debt. Last year the Council funded the interest component to halt the debt growing while a longer term decision could be formulated.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	<p>budgets on an accrual basis unless it is prudent not to. In order to assess whether councils are managing their debt levels LGNZ asked NZIER to look into the question of whether local government was fiscally responsible or not, with particular emphasis on debt. NZIER commented: Local government is generally obliged to balance their budget so debt is not used to fund operational expenditure. This is underpinned by the 'Golden Rule' of fiscal policy. The Golden Rule suggests that Government should only borrow to invest (in relation to local government this refers to investment in infrastructure, such as waste water schemes. rather than stocks and shares and not to fund current spending. This is consistent with intergenerational equity in that any debt inherited by future generations is matched by assets passed on. Debt can be used by local government to spread the cost of long lived assets across generations. As a result of the sharp increase in capital spending since the mid-2000s, the sector is making more use of debt. The level of debt is not the problem though. The problem is whether or not the local government sector can deal with the amount of debt it has. To get an understanding for that. two measures can be used; the Gearing ratio - comparing debt to total assets (and) the Interest Cover ratio - comparing the interest being paid on debt with the revenue stream.(See <a href="http://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/LJp1oads/NZIER-Is-local-government-fiscally-responsible.pdf">http://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/LJp1oads/NZIER-Is-local-government-fiscally-responsible.pdf</a>)</p> <p>NZIER note that while the gearing ratio has been trending slowly upwards since 2000. As of 2010, the gearing ratio sat at 6.8 per cent, which compared with 30 per cent for central government (see figure 1). (The gearing ratio for 1992 stood at 8 per cent.) NZIER concluded that the level of local government expenditure financed by debt does not appear worryingly high. Figure 1: Gearing ratio: debt to assets (Source NZIER 2012) 70 6c,-, - 501-11- 40, 0:,5040 ILC - Local Goernrn.et Cerra Government 2000 2002 2004 2006 200S 2010 In relation to the interest cover ratio, NZIER found that councils were consistent with the Golden Rule, with the ratio of revenue being spent on debt servicing in 2011 sitting at 6.4 per cent, see figure 4 (provisional figures for 2013 put the figure closer to 8 per cent). Coincidentally, the Local Government Funding Authority, when assessing funding applications from councils, sets its maximum benchmark for debt servicing at 20% of total revenue. Figure 2: Interest cover ratio Total interest expenditure as a % of total operating</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>revenue 10 9 S 6 4 ) 1 0 1q93 iJ4 l )20i0 1 Year (endediune)</p> <p>Why do councils use debt? In their report on local government funding in 2007 the Local Government Rates Inquiry recommended that "local government look favourably on making more use of debt to finance long- term assets" (Inquiry 2007 P. 21). International research backed the Inquiry's recommendations by showing that councils in both NZ and Australia had comparatively low levels of debt when compared to councils in the rest of the world (UCLG 2011). Councils primarily borrow to fund capital investments, such as the building of infrastructure and amenities that benefit current and future generations. Debt is one way of smoothing the cost of construction over the generations that make use of, or benefit from, the service. It is a way of meeting the principle of 'inter-generational equity.' Inter-generational equity occurs when the costs of an asset are spread over the life-time of that asset and paid for by the generations that benefit from, or consume, that asset. Not only would it be unfair if today's generation paid the full cost of building assets that last for 50 to 100 years, but such investments also tend to be well beyond the capacity of councils to fund out of their operational income alone.</p>		
<p>LTP15_320 Moana Hale T Roopu Tautoko O Harataunga</p>	<p>TRT has not had the opportunity to discuss issues raised by LTP in full but we vehemently oppose any and all changes that will increase the rates in Maori ancestral land.</p>	<p>Rates increases have been minimised wherever possible while continuing with well-documented anchor projects and maintaining current services.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>LTP15_328 John Sanford Hauraki- Coromandel Federated Farmers</p>	<p>2. FINANCIAL STRATEGY Council's emphasis on maintenance and maintaining current service levels is supported. The constraint on rates increases in recent years has been valuable to the rural community. We appreciate the extensive challenges faced by Council in the area of core infrastructure, and believe that Council is doing a good job of managing the situation pragmatically. The revenue shortfall in development contributions to fund the debt on the Eastern Seaboard wastewater plants is acknowledged, and it is positive that Council has directly addressed the problem in this LTP. Development contribution shortfalls are affecting a number of councils and can potentially drive up debt. Federated Farmers totally supports council's target of future average cumulative rate increases of no more than CPI. While this is not achieved across the life of this LTP</p>	<p>The submitter's advice is noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>it is important that the affordability of council services is not out of line with the cost of living, and council should continue to strive toward this objective. The forecast decline in external debt from 2016/17, shown on page 9 of the Consultation Document is encouraging. 3. CHANGES TO THE RATING SYSTEM TCDC makes extensive use of the rating mechanisms available in the Local Government (Rating) Act, producing what we believe to be a reasonably balanced and equitable rating system. The combination of a general rate, uniform annual general charge, local rates and other targeted rates reflects TCDC's philosophy of spreading the rates burden fairly and equitably "... ensuring that those who cause the need for the service are, as far as possible, contributing to those costs" (p.8 consultation document). This approach contributes a lot to the sustainability of what council is doing – as everyone in the community experiences the real cost of maintaining local and general services.</p>		
<p>RFIN_33 Mr Stephen Enger</p>	<p>Just a thought rates have to come down. Question how do you pay for the new infrastructure that you have promised? I know put up rates and this is what the problem is in the first place. Council do not understand the market. Don't take this personal. If you do, you have helped create another problem. What is this again you may ask, you are becoming political. Rates can not to be determined by a group of people lobbying Councillor's.</p>	<p>The submitter's advice is noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>RFIN_57 Joycelyn Ollington</p>	<p>I pay less rates in New Plymouth but get more value for my money.</p>	<p>The submitter's advice is noted.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>LTP15_82 Ms Alison Johnson EECA</p>	<p>The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) wishes to propose that the Thames-Coromandel District Council support greater water and energy efficiency initiatives in Council operations and in the wider community. EECA proposes a Voluntary Targeted Rate (VTR) mechanism to support the community to install water and energy efficiency measures in the home, as a cost neutral initiative to Council. This would provide your ratepayers with another method of funding their water tank or insulation requirements by paying off the balance on their rates over a nine to ten year period. The VTR mechanism is important as cash is not always available for some ratepayers to meet the upfront costs of insulating their homes. Given that some ratepayers either do not have a</p>	<p>Council is a member of the rates postponement consortium which has tried to advance this cause. It received a grant of \$50,000 from EECA in 2008 however to date there has been little progress. The Rates Postponement consortium felt that the initiative should be</p>	<p>In order to reduce duplication advocate that the scheme is driven at a regional Council level.</p>



<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	<p>mortgage (such as the elderly who are often asset rich and cash poor), or do not want to take out a personal loan. From a council point of view the VTR debt is secured against the ratepayer's home and so provides first call for repayment. Insulating homes can provide multiple benefits to your community. These benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Job creation/economic growth: This is because insulation is a labour intensive process, and companies tend to employ and up skill local labour to meet demand.</li> <li>• Warmer, drier, healthier homes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cold, damp homes mean more problems like asthma in children and adults, and so resolving the causes of this problem through insulation and improved heating creates positive health outcomes.</li> <li>o Warmer, drier homes can result in fewer hospital admissions.</li> <li>o Warmer drier homes can also improve productivity through reduced days off work, and reduced days off school.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Insulation helps to reduce energy bills A well-insulated house requires less heating. This can reduce energy costs for householders.</li> <li>• Increased potential for older people to "age in place" A well-insulated and heated house can allow for older people to live in their homes for longer, and with better health. This reduces hospital and rest homes costs, and also builds more resilient communities.</li> <li>• Improved health for homeowners: An independent survey (Motu Report 2011) has demonstrated that the insulation programme shows a cost-benefit ratio of 5:1 – with the majority of the benefits coming from improvements in health and wellbeing.</li> </ul>	<p>driven at a regional Council level to reduce the amount of duplication between territorial authorities. I have been advised by Waikato Regional Council that the proposed targeted rate is not currently applied by them.</p>	

## 8.2 Revenue and Financing Policy

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
LTP15_328 John Sanford Hauraki-Coromandel Federated Farmers	4. REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY Overall we support the mix of changes to the funding of stormwater, information centres, cemeteries, and economic development. These changes, including the proposed short term accommodation charge of \$200, fall within the rating philosophy mentioned above. Federated Farmers supports the extensive use of targeted rates and uniform charges within the rating system. This ensures that the rating system is transparent and balanced between the communities making up the district.	Advice is noted.	No action required.

### 8.3 Activity: Representation

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_233 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	[Submission summarised to remove duplication between the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network submissions] When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Thames / Coromandel area it is suggested that consideration be made towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring consideration is given to young people, particularly Maori, who may be hard to reach, may be isolated, may be impacted by unpredictable environments, and/or may be disengaged from marae/iwi.</li> </ul>	Submitters have sought opportunities for the youth voice to be taken seriously, opportunities for respectful engagement between council and youth, and engagement by councillors and community board members on youth issues.  Council adopted a Youth Strategy in 2014 after consultation with young people in the district and youth agencies. One element of the strategy relates to the youth voice, and a desire by young people for council to provide opportunities for their participation in decision making that affects them.	
LTP15_226 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	[Submission summarised to remove duplication between the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network submissions] Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give young people had a voice that is taken seriously.</li> <li>• Youth and adults have the same rights.</li> </ul> Ensure there's more support for youth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discrimination particularly around age and race.</li> </ul>	Different councils around the country provide opportunities to youth involvement in local government, including youth councils, youth councillors and youth advisory groups. Should council direct staff to do so, these are options which could be explored alongside an implementation plan for the youth strategy.	
LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network	[Submission summarised to remove duplication between the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network submissions] Ensure there's more support for youth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respectful interactions with youth without discrimination.</li> </ul> The Whangamata Youth Forum would strongly like to advocate for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Youth / Council Partnership programme to be supported by a Council representative from Whangamata.</li> </ul>	While young people are able to attend all public sessions of council meetings and to participate in all special consultative procedures under the Local Government Act, a specific invitation from councillors to young people to participate in these processes may encourage more engagement by youth in council processes and therefore better enable them to have a voice in influencing decision making which affects them.	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_218 Darian Lunjevich- West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submission summarised to remove duplication between the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network submissions] Over half of the respondents [to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013 and in the Thames area] feel that it is important for young people to be involved in decision making. A quarter of the respondents don't know whether they should be involved or not, and only a very small percentage feel youth do not need to be involved in decision making. Create more opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give youth a voice and identity.</li> </ul> <p>Ensure there's more support for youth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respectful interactions with youth without discrimination.</li> </ul> <p>When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Thames area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring consideration is given to young people, particularly Maori, who may be hard to reach, may be isolated, may be impacted by unpredictable environments, and/or may be disengaged from marae/iwi.</li> </ul>		
<p>LTP15_229 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submission summarised to remove duplication between the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network submissions] Create more opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give youth a voice and take their ideas seriously.</li> </ul>		
<p>LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich- West</p>	<p>[Submission summarised to remove duplication between the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network submissions]</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	<p>When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Coromandel-Colville area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring consideration is given to young people, particularly Maori, who may be hard to reach, may be isolated, may be impacted by unpredictable environments, and/or may be disengaged from marae/iwi.</li> </ul>		
LTP15_292 Albert Marshall	<p>Re. funding to develop a post-Treaty development and planning strategy with Hauraki iwi. Waikato Regional Council are now charging us ratepayers a tax to engage with Hauraki iwi, and another tax for integrating Maori into WRC's planning and review process [see WRC proposal for integration of matauranga Maori into WRC processes]. Why do both Councils have to charge ratepayers for all this? Let Hauraki iwi fund their own Maori interests like any other business or culture, not subsidised by ratepayers.</p>	<p>Five of the twelve Hauraki Treaty settlement negotiations are currently on hold while those iwi are in litigation. Negotiations with the other Hauraki iwi are continuing. Only once these Treaty Settlements are final will each Council know the financial support that is provided by central government for co-governance arrangements.</p>	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_150</a> Mark Skelding	<p>Extending a clear place in local governance conversation to tangata whenua, and showing how this is happening as part of its communication policy.</p>		
<a href="#">LTP15_331</a> Deborah Brown	<p><b>Continue to invest in your voluntary community</b> Strengthen your community empowerment model. Invest more resources in your Community Boards – the contestable funds are always oversubscribed. I believe your return on investment is approx. 20:1. Because there are different expectations of the position, you need to ensure that you set clear goals, clear boundaries and that the outcomes expected are do-able – and there is a reasonable operating budget and a clear reporting path. I believe many of the issues/opportunities are entrenched in the town's psyche and culture and it would be worthwhile to ask some searching questions. ie Why is there no business association, why is there no coordinated marketing effort etc. Why do volunteer groups not coordinate more closely?</p>	<p>The Council has invested more in the Community Boards and delegated more responsibilities than previous councils.</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">LTP15 69</a> Mrs Elizabeth Anne Stewart Ball <a href="#">LTP15 70</a> Mr. Christopher Raymond Ball</p>	<p><b>Tairua/Pauanui/ Whangamata Economic Development Committee</b> We believe the makeup of this committee needs reviewing as there is no Councillor or Community Board Representation from this Ward - One from Thames, Coromandel and two from Mercury Bay. On this side of the Peninsula (Eastern Seaboard) there are four major draw card events which bring income to tourism, accommodation and business. Two events operate out of Whangamata and need representation from Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beach Hop</li> <li>• Brits at the Beach</li> <li>• Scallop Festival</li> <li>• Car Rally</li> </ul> <p>There are three significant maritime events coming up over the next four years marking years that have the potential to bring Ancestry Tourism [and] need input from Council in Tairua/Pauanui/ Whangamata Ward.</p>	<p>Submitters noted that the Economic Development Committee may not have sufficient representation from the Tairua/Pauanui and Whangamata wards to advocate for economic development opportunities in those wards or reflect the significance economic development events in these wards (Beach Hop and Brits at the Beach).</p> <p>Council may want to consider whether appointments of elected members to the Economic Development Committee offer satisfactory representation of the electorate and provide for engagement with community boards and the public on economic development in the district.</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15 280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>While access to new public buildings must meet current standards, there are many older buildings with significant barriers to access, sometimes to the point of them being completely inaccessible. Older shops with steps at their entrances are still being used. Councils can encourage removal of these barriers by providing suitable advice, perhaps unsolicited, to building owners on ways to remove barriers. We recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that a percentage of staff involved with compliance issues have Barrier Free Trust certification.</li> <li>• Council buildings be upgraded to modern access standards as exemplars to the wider community.</li> <li>• Consultation channels with the disability sector be developed that allow access concerns to be identified and appropriate action taken. CCS Disability Action"s</li> </ul>	<p>Submitter requests that council undertake a number of initiatives to remove barriers to accessibility to building access in the district and to enhance the communication channels between the disability sector and council on this issue.</p> <p>A recent accessibility audit is being considered by Community Boards as they develop their footpath and local roading programme.</p> <p>Following the adoption of the Disability Strategy in 2012 there has not been a clear position from council on how this strategy is to be implemented or which department of council is responsible for its implementation and engaging the disability sector in council business.</p>	<p>No recommendation.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>experience is that many access issues are resolved quickly once brought to the attention of building owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an opportunity to improve access by stricter enforcement of emergency evacuation provisions for places of public assembly.</li> </ul> <p>CCS Disability Action believes that all people benefit from improved accessibility not just those living with permanent disability.</p>	<p>In 2015/16 Strategic Planning will undertake an assessment on the role council may wish to play in social development in the district, including the role it can play in supporting the disability sector, which will provide advice to council on how the disability strategy may be implemented and identify which part of council is best equipped to coordinate and lead council engagement with the disability sector.</p>	

## 8.4 Activity: Strategic Planning

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">LTP15_343</a> Ms Aroha Waetford Community Waikato</p>	<p>12. We further encourage the Council to reflect on the overarching benefits of supporting community organisations that provide social and leisure services within each of its wards, and the district overall. [Submitter requests council provide support to social services organisations in the district in recognition of the value of social and community development]</p>	<p>Council has three existing social development strategies: youth, positive ageing and disability.</p> <p>Implementation of the three council social development strategies (Disability, Positive Aging and Youth) has been unresolved since the strategies were adopted by council. Advocacy groups and the respective communities for each of the strategies have sought council input in how those strategies will be implemented and how the relationship can be advanced in recent months. The strategies themselves do not set out how council will approach implementation.</p> <p>Strategic Planning has a number of activities on its work programme which provide support to this, including a social development role assessment which will identify what the social development 'gaps' are in the Thames-Coromandel District which council may seek to fill, and a retrofitting of the social development strategies to an in-house set of strategy guidelines which will provide clarity around implementation of and responsibility for the social development strategies.</p> <p>Council is currently considering the best way in which the business can engage with the social and community development sectors. Once a clear path forward has been identified, council staff should communicate this to the social and community development sector. Staff will provide advice to Council on this later in the 2015/16 year.</p>	<p>No recommendation</p> <p>Considered under District Funding Requests</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_141</a> Mr Stuart Christie Mercury Bay Art Escape Trust</p>	<p>MBAET proposes and supports the development of an Arts Strategy by the TCDC as part of the Long Term Plan(LTP) in 2015, to recognise the strong community support for such an initiative as seen for example in the TCDC Thames Art Strategy Workshop held with Creative Waikato in March this</p>	<p>Staff have begun working on the development of an Arts Strategy for TCDC and the Coromandel arts community. A public meeting was held in March, facilitated by Creative Waikato, at which a number of aspirations for arts in the Coromandel and how a strategy could support this were discussed. Consultation is underway.</p>	<p>Note that the Economic Development committee has allocated \$12,000 in the 2014/15 year to fund the development of a district arts strategy</p>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	year.		
<a href="#">LTP15_81</a> Mrs Sarah Nathan Creative Waikato	Creative Waikato supports the development of an Arts Strategy for the Thames Coromandel Area	The development of this strategy is being led by the Economic Development team and supported by the Strategic Planning team. A project initiation document is in the process of being written by the Economic Development team.	with any additional funding required to be provided by external sources.
<a href="#">LTP15_275</a> Edward and Betty Collings	<b>THE ARTS:</b> The 2015-2025 plan does not mention the Arts which are proving to be an important draw for visitors to the region. We note that many organizations, individual artists, restaurants and other venues already present an attractive variety of events.	The Economic Development Committee has agreed to fund the development of the Arts Strategy with \$12,000 from the Economic Development budget, with additional funding for the strategy to be sought from Creative New Zealand and Creative Waikato to support the strategy.]  42 submitters requested TCDC develop and adopt an arts strategy, with many of those submitters requesting funding from council to advance the strategy, including to support community consultation on the strategy and for its implementation.	
<a href="#">LTP15_331</a> Deborah Brown	<b>Support the Arts.</b> Decide to develop an arts strategy and employ a local professional artist to do the work.		
<a href="#">LTP15_209</a> Ian Webster <a href="#">LTP15_201</a> Gail Taylor <a href="#">LTP15_197</a> Dhyana Muir <a href="#">LTP15_206</a> Mr Ian Calloway <a href="#">LTP15_196</a> Ginney Deavoll <a href="#">LTP15_40</a> Mrs Marion Manson <a href="#">LTP15_53</a> Mrs Jane Parson <a href="#">LTP15_32</a> Dr Kay Palmano <a href="#">LTP15_192</a> Gary Nevin <a href="#">LTP15_35</a>	I request that TCDC to develop and adopt an arts strategy to encourage and promote all arts and creativity in our district.	Council staff will note the recommendations made by submitters on what the arts strategy should include as part of their consultation for a draft strategy.	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Mrs Sharyn Morcom			
<a href="#">LTP15 332</a> Susan Speerstra	[submitter notes the benefits of the arts to the district and growth of sales in the Coromandel arts market]		
<a href="#">LTP15 73</a> Ms Stella Pennell	TCDC should adopt a comprehensive Arts strategy to support and facilitate the Arts within the district.		
<a href="#">LTP15 39</a> Deborah Hide-Bayne	I would like an arts co-ordinator employed by TCDC, and an arts policy in place to support the arts.		
<a href="#">LTP15 217</a> Michael Smither and Gillian McGregor	Full support for District wide arts strategy and creation of full time job consulting and developing the strategy.		
<a href="#">LTP15 74</a> Ms Jan Wright Creative Mercury Bay	The Creative Mercury Bay Trust requests that council develops and adopts an arts strategy		
<a href="#">LTP15 334</a> David Pannett Creative New Zealand	We note that local authorities are also required under the [LGA 2002] to take into account the 'cultural interests of people and communities' (section 14(1)(h)(i), Local Government Act 2002). This provides a legislative basis for supporting local arts and culture. There is also a growing body of research relating to the contribution of the arts to a community's social cohesion as well as to an area's economic prosperity. [submitter requests support from TCDC for the district arts community]		
<a href="#">LTP15 54</a> Ms Joan Delellis <a href="#">LTP15 208</a>	[I support the development of an arts strategy for the Coromandel District to encourage and promote all of the arts with funding being allocated to		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>Raewyn Helms <a href="#">LTP15_205</a> Ms Margherita Giampietri <a href="#">LTP15_194</a> Colin Verner <a href="#">LTP15_310</a> Anna Horne <a href="#">LTP15_55</a> Annemieke Kregting <a href="#">LTP15_199</a> Margaret Ivory <a href="#">LTP15_198</a> Natasha Courtney <a href="#">LTP15_212</a> Lizzy Leckie <a href="#">LTP15_182</a> Eric and Sue Wight <a href="#">LTP15_110</a> Mr John Wright Mercury Bay Area School <a href="#">LTP15_132</a> Thames Community Board Thames Community Board <a href="#">LTP15_126</a> Mr David Crocker <a href="#">LTP15_117</a> Ms Andrea Por <a href="#">LTP15_45</a> Ms Andrea Gill</p>	<p>implement the strategy]</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_274</a> Diane Morcom</p>	<p>I fully support the development of a district wide arts strategy, with funding being allocated to</p>		

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_42</a> Ms Jan Wright <a href="#">LTP15_270</a> Sue Withy <a href="#">LTP15_56</a> Kate Nielsen <a href="#">LTP15_57</a> Belinda May Clapperton <a href="#">LTP15_59</a> Jessica Bradley <a href="#">LTP15_204</a> Judith Foster <a href="#">LTP15_31</a> Ms Hilary Falconer</p>	<p>consultation and development of the strategy.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>To maintain momentum [on disabled people's issues including accessibility] we recommend Council also appoint a staff member with specific responsibility for consideration of disabled peoples issues within the wider context of Councils responsibility to its community. This would show meaningful commitment to TCDC's core values of empathy, compassion, and fairness when making decisions about how activities should be funded.</p>	<p>Submitter seeks appointment of a dedicated staff member within council with responsibility for liaison with the disabled community, advocacy groups and for advancing the council's disability strategy.</p> <p>Implementation of the three council social development strategies (Disability, Positive Aging and Youth) has been unresolved since the strategies were adopted by council. Advocacy groups and the respective communities for each of the strategies have sought council input in how those strategies will be implemented and how the relationship can be advanced in recent months. The strategies themselves do not set out how council will approach implementation.</p> <p>Strategic Planning has a number of activities on its work programme which provide support to this, including a social development role assessment which will identify what the social development 'gaps' are in the Thames-Coromandel District which council may seek to fill, and a retrofitting of the social development strategies to an in-house set of strategy</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>guidelines which will provide clarity around implementation of and responsibility for the social development strategies.</p> <p>While this exercise may not lead to a dedicated position to support the disability strategy it will identify which department within council is responsible for these strategies and set out the social development priorities for the council in the next three to five years.</p>	
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	<p>[Submitter requests] controls on dogs near bush areas to protect wildlife.</p>	<p>Strategic Planning will undertake a review of the Dog Control Bylaw in the 2015/16 year. Feedback from this submitter will be incorporated into the review.</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>
<a href="#">LTP15_19</a> Mr David Mallowes	<p>[Submitter requests council review freedom camping bylaw with regard to areas where camping may be permitted in residential areas or near public conveniences.]</p>	<p>TCDC has recently undertaken a review of the Freedom Camping Bylaw and staff worked with Community Boards on appropriate areas for prohibition, restriction and designation of suitable freedom camping area.</p> <p>This bylaw will not require review under the Freedom Camping Act 2011 until 2024, within five years of the current bylaw's adoption.</p> <p>However Strategic Planning are working with the regulatory and enforcement teams as well as community boards to monitor issues with the existing bylaw and those which may not be addressed by the community board changing their designated area for freedom campers within restricted areas may provoke an early review of this bylaw.</p> <p>Strategic Planning are maintaining an issues register for freedom camping to inform future changes to the bylaw, either within the existing bylaw or requiring a review of the bylaw before 2019. The submitter's submission will be recorded on this register.</p>	<p>No recommendation.</p>
<a href="#">LTP15_321</a> Roy Carter	<p>Submitter requests that consideration and indication be given in the Long Term Plan relating to the impact of freedom camping on services including public conveniences, reserves, and the need for services provided for free with costs.</p>		
<a href="#">LTP15_7</a> Jean Anderson Physicians and Scientists for Global	<p>[Submitter requests] that Council put in place a precautionary approach on genetic engineering [with particular application to resource consents, district planning, bylaws and community health and</p>	<p>Council does not currently have an organisation wide policy that provides a coordinated approach to the treatment of genetically modified organisms within the district. The approach to genetically modified organisms requested by the</p>	<p>No recommendation.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Responsibility	safety.]	submitter suggests a cross-departmental approach is required. No immediate action is proposed on this submission. Strategic Planning will await Council direction before undertaking further action.	
<a href="#">LTP15_346</a> Ms Kay Kristensen Population Health, Waikato District Health Board	Population Health advocates council include in its final document a section that aligns the health and social wellbeing of its community to its strategic outcomes i.e. a prosperous district, a liveable district, and a clean and green district, to demonstrate its engagement with and commitment to individuals and communities.	Noted, for consideration in preparing final 2015-2025 Long Term Plan document.	No recommendation.
<a href="#">LTP15_345</a> Alastair Brickell	Does the 10 year plan really have to be updated every 3 years. Is this a central government requirement? If so, TCDC should make submissions to central government to have the frequency reduced to every 5 or maybe 10 years.	Triennial Long Term Plans are a requirement for local government under the Local Government Act 2002.	No recommendation.
<a href="#">LTP15_87</a> Mr John Haycock	[submitter considers] The 10 Year Plan exercises are a futile waste of time and money given the lack of implementation of the previous ones.		
<a href="#">LTP15_141</a> Mr Stuart Christie Mercury Bay Art Escape Trust <a href="#">LTP15_81</a> Mrs Sarah Nathan Creative Waikato	[Submitters request council provide support for a Waikato Region Arts strategy in order to support regional coordination in the arts sector and to support council's proposed arts strategy]	<p>A Waikato regional arts strategy has been proposed by Creative Waikato, and is nominally supported by Creative New Zealand as part of their regional arts pilot, with other community arts organisations likely to support the proposition.</p> <p>It is unclear how this strategy would impact on the proposed arts strategy for TCDC and what the funding implications of the regional arts pilot may be, with both TCDC and Creative Waikato seeking funds from Creative New Zealand to support their art strategies under this pilot.</p> <p>Staff will continue to work with Creative Waikato on the proposed regional arts strategy and on the proposed TCDC arts strategy and provide advice to council in due course.</p>	Recommend that Council note staff will provide an update on the proposed Waikato Regional Arts Strategy alongside proposals for a Thames-Coromandel Art Strategy later in the 2015/16 year.

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p><a href="#">LTP15 233</a> Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p> <p><a href="#">LTP15 226</a> Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p> <p><a href="#">LTP15 225</a> Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network</p> <p><a href="#">LTP15 218</a> Darian Lunjevich- West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p> <p><a href="#">LTP15 229</a> Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and</p>	<p>Submitters request council progress implementation of the youth strategy</p>	<p>Implementation of the three council social development strategies (Disability, Positive Aging and Youth) has been unresolved since the strategies were adopted by council. Advocacy groups and the respective communities for each of the strategies have sought council input in how those strategies will be implemented and how the relationship can be advanced in recent months. The strategies themselves do not set out how council will approach implementation.</p> <p>Strategic Planning has a number of activities on its work programme which provide support to this, including a social development role assessment which will identify what the social development 'gaps' are in the Thames-Coromandel District which council may seek to fill, and a retrofitting of the social development strategies to an in-house set of strategy guidelines which will provide clarity around implementation of and responsibility for the social development strategies. This is planned for the 2015/16 year.</p> <p>This exercise will lead to council being better equipped to implement the existing youth strategy and engage with the district's youth.</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network <a href="#">LTP15 231</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network			



## 8.5 Activity: District Plan

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Comments on the District Plan activity	Staff advice to council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_288 Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council</p>	<p>Submitter requests that council allocate \$50,000 in the 2018/19 year to support a local indigenous biodiversity strategy for the Thames-Coromandel District.</p> <p>Submitter requests greater financial contribution to the on-going enhancement, development and maintenance of the Hikuai Te Kouka forest.</p> <p>Submitter notes their support for the allocation of resources in the TCDC LTP which are supportive of building regional heritage capacity.</p>	<p>TCDC was closely involved with a number of other territorial authorities in submitting on the Proposed Waikato RPS (via the Joint Working Party on the PRPS) and was supportive of 'Implementation Agreements' as a way to prioritise the efforts and resources of territorial and regional councils across the Waikato Region in achieving the objectives of the RPS.</p> <p>TCDC is aware that Local Indigenous Biodiversity Strategies have been identified in the RPS as a method to implement the RPS and the TCDC Proposed District Plan has, as a non-regulatory method, that "The Council will review its Biodiversity Strategy." Resources and timing for review of the Biodiversity Strategy are yet to be confirmed but it is useful to know of WRC commitments.</p> <p>With regard to building regional heritage capacity, through the Long Term Plan the Council is consulting on the potential for the Coromandel to become a 'Heritage Region'. Following consideration of submissions on the Long Term Plan the Council may make resources available to promote a Heritage Region for the Coromandel Peninsula. This may involve the allocation of resources to review the Council's existing Heritage Strategy, and Council involvement in the Regional Heritage Forum to promote positive heritage outcomes (both from a natural and cultural heritage perspective).</p>	<p>Recommend that council allocate \$50,000 in 2018/19 to support a local indigenous biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>Recommend staff meet with Waikato Regional Council to discuss the requirements for the Hikuai Te Kouka forest.</p>
<p><u>LTP15_352</u> Alison Henry Kauri Trust 2000</p>	<p><b>We support</b> the review of the TCDC Biodiversity Strategy to be undertaken (there is no reference to this strategy in the LTP document)</p>	<p>Staff are currently in the process of identifying possible priorities for inclusion in the Implementation Agreement between WRC and TCDC - which will also involve Council input. The Council looks forward to working with WRC to achieve the objectives of the Waikato RPS.</p>	
<p>LTP15_279 Arthur Hinds <a href="#">LTP15_323</a> Moria Cursey Waikato Biodiversity Forum</p>	<p>Submitters request that TCDC develop a local indigenous biodiversity strategy.</p>	<p>TCDC is aware that Local Indigenous Biodiversity Strategies have been identified in the RPS as a method to implement the RPS and the TCDC Proposed District Plan has, as a non-regulatory method, that "The Council will review its Biodiversity Strategy." Staff note that although resources and timing for review of the Biodiversity Strategy are yet to be confirmed, that WRC has requested funds be set aside in the 2018/19</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Comments on the District Plan activity	Staff advice to council	Recommendation
		year to enable development of a local indigenous biodiversity strategy for the Thames-Coromandel District.	
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	<p>Submitter requests council establish planning processes that encourage the construction of accessible homes and tourist accommodation in all categories of housing and accommodation.</p> <p>Submitter recommends Council research the current availability of accessible homes and tourist accommodation, likely increase in such accommodation under the current District Plan, likely demand for such accommodation and consider how best to amend the district plan to address any shortfall that may be identified.</p>	<p>The Council supports accommodation for disabled people and disabled visitors. The Council has a disability strategy. Data on disabled-capable accommodation in the district was not easily available, but details about disabled people's living situation is within the strategy. Council's actions are detailed in the Disability Strategy Supporting Information document.</p> <p>In addition to the Supporting Information actions, the Proposed District Plan includes two incentives to build houses suitable for disabled people and the elderly: Minor units (i.e. granny flats) can be an extra 10 m<sup>2</sup> in size if the minor unit is certified by Lifemark™ (or equivalent certification for elderly/disabled people). Houses in residential areas can have an additional 5% site coverage (35% to 40%) if the house is certified by Lifemark™ (or equivalent certification for elderly/disabled people).</p> <p>Motels, hotels and other larger-scale visitor accommodation have disabled access standards they must meet through the Council's building consent process.</p> <p>Council staff will be monitoring the effectiveness of these incentives in providing disabled-suitable accommodation, probably at the same time as the triennial review of the Disability Strategy.</p>	No recommendation
LTP15_233 LTP15_226 LTP15_225 LTP15_229 LTP15_231 LTP15_218 Youth networks	Submitter requests council focus on creating a lush and healthy environment that young people are proud to call their own, and that focuses upon sustaining natural resources into the future.	Sustainable management, the purpose of the RMA, encompasses future generations ensuring that they have the natural and physical resources necessary to meet their needs. The RMA requires the Council to manage the use, development and protection of these resources. These requirements are given effect to through the Council's District Plan. The Proposed District Plan identifies areas of special value including outstanding natural features and landscapes and historic heritage resources. It also has provisions addressing the management of indigenous vegetation within the District.	No recommendation

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Comments on the District Plan activity</b>	<b>Staff advice to council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
LTP15_151 Miss Jo Stone NZTA	Submitter requests that they are engaged in any development decisions involving future release of land and significant changes to related land use.	The Council supports collaboration with external agencies and actively involves the Transport Agency in strategic land use planning processes, such as when greenfield development opportunities are proposed. Most recently this has involved NZTA involvement in the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint Project and the Kopu-Thames Structure Plan. The Transport Agency's involvement with land uses on individual sites requiring resource consent is prescribed in the RMA. The Transport Agency also has its own powers under the Government Rooding Powers Act 1989.	No recommendation
LTP15_13 Mr Paul Couper	Submitter raises concerns regarding the densities of subdivisions as a rate-gathering exercise, and notes that if the Council does not want higher densities and the higher infrastructure needs they bring, subdivisions should not be approved.	The Council does not approve subdivisions so that it can get more rates. As part of the District Plan process Council identifies areas of land that may be suitable for residential development and expansion - with close reference to Council's settlement strategy and existing or planned infrastructure capacities (i.e. roads, wastewater, water, parks and reserves, etc.). The Council does not rezone land where it will not easily be able to service that land. For land outside existing serviced areas, people are able to apply for subdivision consent to create additional development. Subdivision applications are assessed by Council staff on their merits and in accordance with the provisions of the District Plan. Arrangements for servicing new development are matters that Council staff consider when assessing subdivision applications.	No recommendation
LTP15_150 Mark Skelding	Submitter notes support for TCDC climate change planning and requests as part of its communication strategy council identify minimum and maximum impacts of climate change on the district over 15, 30, 50 and 100 years.	TCDC incorporates adaptation to climate change into its land use planning and infrastructure works. For flood projections and modelling, maximum rainfall is increased by about 20% to account for increased heavy rainfall events. Stormwater networks and flood hazard controls take this into account.  New development near the coast must take into account future coastal inundation risk projected from sea level rise of 1 m from the 1990s baseline, plus 0.1 m for subsequent decades. This is required by the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. The Waikato Regional Council is currently working on detailed maps to identify future coastal inundation risk areas around the district.	No recommendation

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Comments on the District Plan activity	Staff advice to council	Recommendation
		<p>The Proposed District Plan identifies areas within existing settlements that could be subject to future coastal processes, particularly erosion, from climate change and sea level rise.</p> <p>New buildings located in areas that could be subject to sea level rise or coastal erosion over the next 50 years must be designed to be relocatable in the future. Increased flood risk from climate change is taken into account when setting minimum floor levels, particularly for new dwellings.</p> <p>The future coastal process lines, and flood hazard areas for west coast communities, Cooks Beach and Tairua, are available on the Council's intramaps website. These will be updated and expanded over time. Future coastal inundation maps are being developed by the Waikato Regional Council, and are regularly requested as part of LIM reports.</p>	
<p>LTP15_218 Darian Lunjevich- West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network Network LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Submitter opposes mining in the Thames-Coromandel District</p>	<p>The District Plan manages a full range of mining activities, including quarrying, exploration, surface and underground mining. Mining is a legitimate activity in our District but the Plan is careful to manage where and how these activities can occur. Generally speaking these activities are not provided for in residential, recreation or commercial areas of the District area.</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>
<p>LTP15_229</p>	<p>Submitter requests council</p>	<p>In the District Plan policy and provisions are included to enable the</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Comments on the District Plan activity	Staff advice to council	Recommendation
Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	provide a healthier environment by allocating more beach/land reserves.	setting aside or creation of esplanade reserve/strips when a lot is created (through the subdivision process) along the mark of mean high water springs of the sea and along the bank of any river to enable public access.	
LTP15_217 Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	Submitter requests council ensure New Chum/Wainuiototo remains development free, and fund other bays into the public experience.	The District Plan does not prohibit subdivision, use or development at New Chum/ Wainuiototo Beach. However levels of control apply to certain types of activity where special values are identified.  In the District Plan policy and provisions are included to enable the setting aside or creation of esplanade reserve/strips when a lot is created (through the subdivision process) along the mark of mean high water springs of the sea and along the bank of any river to enable public access.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	Submitter requests council adopt an activity focussed on the protection of biodiversity.	Council decided in 2014 to change its activity groups and activities under the Long Term Plan, and the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity which included biodiversity was removed. This activity is now covered by grants and remissions, and economic development. Council may need to consider which activity the protection of biodiversity at an operational level of council will come under should this appear to be a gap.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	Submitter requests council recognise the need for land use to be designed to protect remaining native ecosystem and threatened species.	Sustainable management, the purpose of the RMA, encompasses future generations ensuring that they have the natural and physical resources necessary to meet their needs. The RMA requires the Council to manage the use, development and protection of these resources. These requirements are given effect to through the Council's District Plan. The Proposed District Plan identifies areas of special value including outstanding natural features and landscapes and historic heritage resources. It also has provisions addressing the management of indigenous vegetation within the District.	No recommendation



## 8.6 Activity: Community Health and Safety

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_233; LTP15_226; LTP15_229; LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network LTP15_218 Darian Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>In order to improve the district to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing incidences of crime, violence, and intimidation towards youth.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Reducing incidents of crime, violence and intimidation towards youth</u> Police and other government agencies including education institutions take the lead role in crime prevention and education. Council has a youth strategy that includes supporting young people who are victims of crime or abuse and reducing offending by young people. In addition Council contributes by providing parks and recreation facilities or opportunities for various clubs and provides grants for events and activities targeted at youth and the community generally as well as supporting opportunities for recreational entertainment.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_233; LTP15_226; LTP15_229; LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network LTP15_218 Darian Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Thames / Coromandel area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing the prevalence and impact of legal and illegal drug use.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Reducing the prevalence and impact of legal and illegal drug use.</u> Police and other government agencies including District Health Boards are heavily involved with drug education and reduction of harm. Council's contribution to harm reduction is via the Psychoactive Substances Act and the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act whereby, working within the constraints of the legislation, it is able to contribute to harm minimisation through a combination of licensing and policy controls. Policies relating to Psychoactive Substances Act and the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act have already been consulted on and will be reviewed in the future when the public and stakeholders will have a further opportunity to put forwarded their concerns and ideas for reducing the prevalence and impact of legal and illegal drug use.</p> <p>Further, every alcohol licence application for the sale or supply of alcohol is-reported on by Police, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief Licensing Inspector. It is also public advertised before</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
		being deliberated on by an independent Licensing Committee who must take into consideration all reporting agency reports and give effect to the minimisation of harm objective of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act and Council's alcohol policy.	
<p>LTP15_233; LTP15_226; LTP15_229; LTP15_231            Darian Lunjevich-West            Coromandel Peninsula            Youth Collective and            Coromandel Peninsula            Youth Supporters Network            LTP15_225            Hannah Palmer            Whangamata Youth Forum            and Whangamata Youth            Supporters Network            LTP15_218            Darian Lunjevich-West            Thames Youth Forum and            Thames Youth Supporters            Network</p>	<p>When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Thames / Coromandel developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop plans to maintain and improve established facilities that young people use on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• Offer activities and events targeted towards areas that interest youth and create safe areas for young people to socialize.</li> <li>• Create healthy public policies that challenge the factors identified by young people as making them feel unsafe and vulnerable, and ensure more action is taken to challenge unreasonable and unlawful behaviours.</li> <li>• Ensure young people have access to robust support and education around the aspects of youth health that are impacting their ability to prosper.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Develop plans to maintain and improve established facilities that young people use on an ongoing basis.</u>  <b>AND</b>  <u>Offer activities and events targeted towards areas that interest youth and create safe areas for young people to socialize.</u></p> <p>Council contributes by providing parks and recreation facilities or opportunities for various clubs and provides grants for events and activities targeted at youth and the community generally as well as supporting opportunities for recreational entertainment aimed a youth.            Council has an overarching youth strategy that amongst other things focuses on health and wellbeing, and leisure and social activities for young people. However in various communities there are local issues affecting youth that Community Boards can prioritise resources or work with support services and local youth groups to address concerns.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_226            Darian Lunjevich-West            Coromandel Peninsula            Youth Collective and            Coromandel Peninsula            Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[The submitter addressed submission to the Tairua-Pauanui-Hikuai Community Board]            Provide a healthier environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ban 1080.</li> </ul> <p>Provide a healthier environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No marinas.</li> </ul> <p>When striving to include youth priorities in</p>	<p><b><u>Ban 1080</u></b>            The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment evaluated the use of 1080 and presented a report in 2011. The risks of the use 1080 were acknowledged but the Commissioner concluded that the risks needed to kept in perspective and that the use of 1080 should not only continue but be expanded.</p> <p>Council does not use 1080 but it is used on Department of Conversation land throughout the Coromandel.</p>	<p>No change</p>



Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>planning for future Tairua Hikuai Pauanui developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create healthy public policies that challenge the factors identified by young people as making them feel unsafe and vulnerable, and ensure more action is taken to challenge unreasonable and unlawful behaviours.</li> <li>• Ensure young people have access to robust support and education around the aspects of youth health that are impacting their ability to prosper.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>No marinas</u></b> Marinas contribute to economic development and offer employment opportunities for youth through support services that boat owners and marina operators require and employment opportunities for youth and others would be lost if marinas were banned.</p> <p>The development of marinas is generally subject to a resource consent process whereby the affected parties have the opportunity to submit on any proposal. Also the banning of marinas would entail making marinas a prohibited activity in both the regional and district plans and any person can make submissions to the Regional and District Council when the respective resource management plans are next reviewed.</p> <p><u>Create healthy public policies for youth</u> <b>AND</b> <u>Providing robust support and education around the aspects of youth health</u> Council has an overarching youth strategy that amongst other things focuses on education, youth training and employment, health and wellbeing, justice and crime and leisure and social activities for young people. However in various communities there are local issues affecting youth that Community Boards can prioritise resources or work with support services and youth groups to address local concerns.</p>	
<p>LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submitter addressed submission to the Whangamata Community Board] Improve safety and security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expect better role modelling and behaviour by adults.</li> <li>• Keep troublesome youth occupied.</li> <li>• Eliminate discrimination and bullying.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Expect better role modelling and behaviour by adults</u> There already exist examples of adult role models through prominent community groups, clubs, educational institutions and enforcement personnel such as Police. There is no recommended action to achieve the submitter's objective other than to continue to support youth policies and other opportunities for youth.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Whangamata developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create healthy public policies that challenge the factors identified by young people as making them feel unsafe and vulnerable, and ensure more action is taken to challenge unreasonable and unlawful behaviours.</li> <li>• Ensure young people have access to robust support and education around the aspects of youth health that are impacting their ability to prosper.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Keep troublesome youth occupied</u> Council contributes by providing parks and recreation facilities or opportunities for various club and provides grants for events and activities targeted at youth and the community generally as well as supporting opportunities for recreational entertainment.</p> <p>Council has an overarching youth strategy that amongst other things focuses on health and wellbeing, and leisure and social activities for young people. However in various communities there are local issues affecting youth that Community Boards can prioritise resources or work with support services and local youth groups to address concerns.</p> <p><u>Eliminate discrimination and bullying</u> This is part of the youth strategy policy but early childhood centres and educational institutions have lead role in the elimination of discrimination and bullying as do sports clubs.</p> <p><u>Create healthy public policies that challenge the factors identified by young people as making them feel unsafe and vulnerable, and ensure more action is taken to challenge unreasonable and unlawful behaviours.</u> <b>and</b> <u>Ensure young people have access to robust support and education around the aspects of youth health that are impacting their ability to prosper.</u></p> <p>Council has an overarching youth strategy that amongst other things focuses on education, youth training and employment, health and wellbeing, justice and crime and leisure and social activities for young people. However in various communities there are local issues affecting youth that Community Boards can prioritise resources or work with support services and youth groups to address local concerns.</p>	

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_218 Darlan Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submitter addressed submission to the Thames Community Board] One of the three most cited things [from responses to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013 in the Thames area] that impact youth in the Thames area are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legal and illegal use of drugs.</li> </ul> <p>Improve safety and security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate violence, aggression, bullying, tagging, crime, drugs, smoking, and gangs.</li> <li>• Add more streetlights, police on duty, and security cameras.</li> <li>• A curfew to keep troublesome youth off the streets.</li> <li>• Alcohol made less available to youth.</li> <li>• More consequences around drug and alcohol use by youth.</li> <li>• Reduce the amount of liquor stores and improve regulations around sale and supply.</li> <li>• Improve road safety by installing traffic lights, and challenging bad driving.</li> <li>• Expect better behaviour and role modelling by adults.</li> </ul> <p>In order to improve Thames to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing incidences of crime, violence, and intimidation towards youth.</li> </ul> <p>When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Thames area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing the prevalence and impact of legal and illegal drug use.</li> </ul> <p>When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Thames developments it</p>	<p><u>The legal and illegal use of drugs</u> Police and other government agencies including District Health Boards are heavily involved with drug education and reduction of harm. Council's contribution to harm reduction is via the Psychoactive Substances Act and the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act whereby, working within the constraints of the legislation, it is able to contribute to harm minimisation through a combination of licensing and policy controls. Policies relating to Psychoactive Substances Act and the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act have already been consulted on and will be reviewed in the future when the public and stakeholders will have a further opportunity to put forwarded their concerns and ideas for reducing the prevalence and impact of legal and illegal drug use.</p> <p>Further, every alcohol licence application for the sale or supply of alcohol is-reported on by Police, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief Licensing Inspector. It is also public advertised before being deliberated on by an independent Licensing Committee who must take into consideration all reporting agency reports and give effect to the minimisation of harm objective of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act and Council's alcohol policy.</p> <p><u>Eliminate violence, aggression, bullying, tagging, crime, drugs, smoking, and gangs.</u> Council is active in removing tagging and the Police and other government agencies take the lead role in crime prevention and education and anti-bullying. Council has a youth strategy that includes supporting young people who are victims of crime or abuse and reducing offending by young people. In addition Council contributes by providing parks and recreation facilities or opportunities for various club and provides grants for events and activities targeted at youth and the community generally as well as supporting opportunities for recreational entertainment.</p> <p><u>More street lights, Police and security cameras</u> The installation of additional street lights and security cameras is dependent on various factors plus there is a capital cost and ongoing operating and maintenance costs. The submitter has not identified any specific street or streets for additional lights or for security cameras but such matters can be considered by individual boards on the recommendation of our engineers and subject to budget constraints and funding arrangements.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p style="text-align: right;">13-15 May 2015</p>

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_229 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submitter addressed submission to the Mercury Bay Community Board.] Create more opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relax certain laws such as fires and vehicles on the beach.</li> </ul> <p>Ensure there's more support for youth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More education around drugs, alcohol, sex, and sexually transmitted infections.</li> <li>• Free condoms that are easily accessible.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Relax certain laws such as fires and vehicles on the beach.</u> There are certain restrictions on fires in the open that apply to open fires whereby permits may be required but in general Council does not allow open fires on its reserves. The lighting of fires in public places is not supported because of the public risk and danger that may exist from fires that are not properly controlled or extinguished. Also the litter that remains after a fire often is visually unacceptable to the public.</p> <p>The use of vehicles on beaches is generally limited to boat launching and retrieval purposes from designated tracks controlled by Council and it would be the individual boards to allow access full access the beach via Council controlled reserves.</p> <p><u>More education around drugs, alcohol, sex, and sexually transmitted infections</u> <u>AND.</u> <u>Free condoms that are easily accessible</u> The Ministry of Health, District Health Boards and other social agencies and institutions including medical practitioner, are already actively involved with education concerning drugs, alcohol, sex, and sexually transmitted infections. Council is not the jurisdiction that could provide funding or be involved with the promotion of free condoms. There would need to be central government initiated programme involving the District Health Board and other agencies.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submitter addressed submission to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board] Improve safety and security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate violence, abuse, bullying, theft, tagging, drugs, and smoking.</li> <li>• More police on duty, and security cameras.</li> <li>• Alcohol made less available to youth.</li> <li>• More consequences around drug and</li> </ul>	<p><u>Eliminate violence, aggression, bullying, tagging, crime, drugs, smoking, and gangs.</u> Council is active in removing tagging and the Police and other government agencies take the lead role in crime prevention and education and anti-bullying. Council has a youth strategy that includes supporting young people who are victims of crime or abuse and reducing offending by young people. In addition Council contributes by providing parks and recreation facilities or opportunities for various club and provides grants for events and</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>alcohol use by youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the amount of liquor stores and improve regulations around sale and supply.</li> <li>• A curfew to keep troublesome youth off the streets.</li> <li>• Improve policies to make schools safer, drug free places.</li> <li>• Expect better behaviour and role modelling by adults.</li> </ul>	<p>activities targeted at youth and the community generally as well as supporting opportunities for recreational entertainment.</p> <p><u>More Police and security cameras</u> The allocation of additional police resources is outside Council's jurisdiction and is largely dependent on Police enforcement and funding priorities.</p> <p>The installation of security cameras is dependent on various factors plus there is a capital cost and ongoing operating and maintenance costs. The submitter has not identified any specific street or streets for security cameras but such matters can be considered by individual boards on the recommendation of our engineers and subject to budget constraints and funding arrangements.</p> <p><u>Alcohol made less available to youth</u> <u>AND</u> <u>consequences around drug and alcohol use by youth</u> <u>AND</u> <u>Reduce the amount of liquor stores and improve regulations around sale and supply.</u> Council's new alcohol policy restricts the hours when alcohol can be sold and the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act has new controls on the exposure and advertising of alcohol. There are also a range of enforcement options and penalties available to enforcement agencies where alcohol is sold or illegally supplied to underage persons.</p> <p>The siting of liquor stores in relation to schools and other community amenities is a matter that can now be reported on and considered. Licence applications (and renewals thereof) are reported on by Police, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief Licensing Inspector. It is also public advertised before being deliberated on by an independent Licensing Committee who must take into consideration all reporting agency reports and give effect to the minimisation of harm objective of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act and Council's alcohol policy.</p>	

Submitter	Comments on the Community Health and Safety activity	Staff Advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p><u>A curfew to keep troublesome youth off the streets.</u> Council has no ability to implement such a curfew.</p> <p><b><u>Improve policies to make schools safer, drug free places</u></b> Council has no ability to create policies for schools and this rests with individual school boards.</p> <p><u>Expect better role modelling and behaviour by adults</u> There already exist examples of adult role models through prominent community groups, clubs, educational institutions and enforcement personnel such as Police. There is no recommended action to achieve the submitter's objective other than to continue to support youth policies and other opportunities for youth.</p>	

## 8.7 Activity: Emergency Management

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_355 Mark Skelding Transition Town Thames</p>	<p>LTP 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy March 2015 consultation version – page 17 “Focus on building resilient communities that are prepared for and able to manage during service interruptions. This approach is supported by our Civil Defence and Emergency Management group who assist with building resilient, prepared communities.” Whilst Transition Town Thames (T)3 fully supports this objective and the attendant concern regarding potential increased disruptions due to climate change, global economic disruptions, and possible refugee and population displacement, we would suggest that resilience is also about making the very best of what we already have, and this is not restricted to the very vital concerns and particular skills of Civil Defence and Emergency Services, but a matter of ongoing participation and civic engagement.</p>	<p>Staff agree that the format used in the developing of the community response plans could be applied in other Council/Community programmes that makes the best of what we have already while planning for our next generation.</p> <p>Staff can identify a number of initiatives across the organisation to demonstrate Council's ongoing commitment to civic engagement and ongoing participation through engaging with a wide range of partners to deliver practical opportunities and services for the local community.</p> <p>This is most evident through the Community Governance model and the appointment of positions like Community Development Officers.</p>	<p>No change</p>

## 8.8 Activity: Economic Development

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15 288</a> Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council	Anchor projects Submitter [Waikato Regional Council] supports Council's anchor projects and requests that they be retained [Coromandel Harbour, Great Walks, Hauraki Rail Trail].	This submitter is supporting Council's proposed Anchor Projects and there is no change requested. At appropriate times Council makes requests to Waikato Regional Council to contribute financially to the implementation of key projects where the business case demonstrates regional economic benefit. Currently the Regional Economic Development Strategy is relatively silent on tourism. Council has submitted a recommendation to Waikato Regional Council that tourism be included in the scope for future reviews of the regional strategy.	No change. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter is supporting Council's proposed Anchor Projects.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15 355</a> Mark Skelding, Transition Town Thames	Approach to Economic Development Submitter suggests encouraging and facilitating community resilience and positive re-localisation projects to build economic resilience and community cohesion across district. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These would develop trans-sectorial, social, environmental and arts/cultural co-operation to raise awareness and achieve outcomes.</li> </ul>	Council's Economic Development Strategy sets out the Council's approach to economic development and areas of contribution to economic growth in the district. The strategy sets the framework for the Economic Development work programme, which includes social, environments and cultural aspects. Council's community boards are able to progress local initiatives, such as related to encouraging and facilitating community resilience and positive re-localisation projects to build economic resilience and community cohesion. Additional investment in Thames local economic development was proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.	No change. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council's Economic Development Strategy sets out the Council's approach to economic development, which includes social, environmental and cultural aspects.</li> <li>Council's community boards are able to progress local initiatives that are consistent with the strategy.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15 136</a> Mr Kerry Bingham	Approach to Economic Development - Support for growth and development Submitter comments that Tairua requires adequate support for growth and development; encourage	Council's Economic Development Strategy supports growth and development, and identifies local-based initiatives. No change is required.	No change. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council's Economic Development Strategy supports</li> </ul>



ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	permanent residents.		local growth and development.
<p><a href="#">LTP15 255</a> Mr Evan Penny</p>	<p>Broadband Submitter supports Council's involvement in improving internet services and would like the efforts to be appropriately supported, including Council being in a position to implement local funding initiatives such as targeted rates with a minimum of bureaucracy. However, submitter comments that Council's Economic Development Strategy seems not to include broadband development. Provision of functional broadband service to all parts of the district seems to be the single most pressing and important development to allow residents and small businesses to drive their own economic development. Increasingly these days businesses cannot hope to survive without this, in part because of the enthusiasm with which people worldwide have embraced the internet as their preferred means of searching for goods and services and for buying or booking them. The international accommodation sector is largely internet based now, with no other means of access! Internet access these days is in the nature of a strategic infrastructural resource, every bit as essential to small businesses as roads, water supplies etc. In recent years there has been a boom in small rurally based businesses bringing visitors and money into the district - all at no direct cost to the community. Servicing the large and growing number of grass roots businesses is one of the most important activities council can undertake to directly foster business growth. This growth is directly threatened wherever the Chorus system is unable to cope with the volume of business, and this is very</p>	<p>Council has recognised that good broadband speeds are an important part of the Coromandel's infrastructure. Council is working with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, and internet service providers, to upgrade broadband speeds as quickly as possible as part of the Governments new funding initiative for rural broadband upgrades. This includes continuing to identify Broadband 'black spots' on the Coromandel and to work with agencies and retailers to address infrastructure deficits. Kopu has already received investment to improve Broadband infrastructure because of Council intervention. Future funding has been established for further upgrades around the Coromandel. The Government has increased funding for its Rural Broadband Initiative. Staff are currently working on developing an application to apply for the Government funding mid this year (2015). Customers with limited access to fast broadband are able to investigate options such as satellite broadband. In response to the submitters comment relating to use of targeted rates, the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 sets out how new rates, such as a targeted rate, must be introduced and involves inclusion in Council's Revenue and Financing Policy and Financial Strategy, and must be consulted on as part of the draft Long Term Plan Consultation document (or in later years through annual plan or future long term plan planning processes). No such targeted rate has been proposed and</p>	<p>No change. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is currently working to improve internet Broadband infrastructure in the district.</li> <li>• No targeted rate relating to funding internet improvements has been proposed.</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>directly hindering small rural business growth. I am aware of the efforts council is now making to address this issue, but for some of us as we are not even on any kind of Chorus priority list we cannot even get in line! Council must take another look at this issue if rural development initiatives are not to wither away through simply lack of ability to get to the business start line.</p> <p>Submitter supports the efforts being made by Council to facilitate internet improvements, and wishes to see those efforts appropriately supported. As part of that support Council should ensure that it is in a position to implement local funding initiatives such as targeted rates, with a minimum of bureaucracy. To that end submitter asks that the Long Term Plan specifically include this activity area as a key part of its economic development plan, and foreshadow the use of targeted rates to speed up internet improvements outside of built up areas.</p>	<p>therefore it would not be legal.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15_355</a> Mark Skelding, Transition Town Thames</p>	<p>Buys Local Policy Submitter requests that Council develop and promote a TCDC Buys Local Policy. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investment in locally sourced services and goods keeps TCDC money circulating within the community.</li> <li>• There are multiplier effect benefit calculations for the expense of paying (initially) slightly more for local contractors to fulfil contracts, rather than bringing services from elsewhere. This is one way that TCDC can easily invest in local businesses and skills.</li> </ul>	<p>Council does not currently have a Buys Local Policy (or similar) and staff would need direction from Council if it wanted one. This is not strictly an Economic Development matter, but rather has across-Council relevance.</p> <p>The Council does invest in locally sourced services and goods where it is considered feasible to do so, and there may be some minor downstream effect for the local economy. Council could choose to review its Procurement Policy to include a specified buys local policy direction.</p>	<p>No change. Council to provide direction to staff if it wants a Buys Local policy direction, and allocate budget if necessary for work to be undertaken. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council does not currently have a Buys Local Policy (or similar).</li> <li>• This not strictly an Economic Development matter, but rather has across-Council relevance.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_354</a></p>	<p>Combined Impact of ED Proposals</p>	<p>The combined effect of the Economic</p>	<p>No change.</p>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Keith Johnston, Whangamata Community Board	<p>Submitter [Whangamata Community Board] requests that Council consider the combined impact of the Economic Development proposals (such as i-SITE funding, Holiday Home Levy, Bed and Breakfast rate) on the local Whangamata community. Further, that Council ensures that these effects are collectively considered when implementing Council's Economic Development Strategy.</p> <p>Submitter considers that all the aspects need to be considered in more detail to understand the potential benefits to Council relative to the corresponding impact on the community.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decisions such as relating to i-Site funding, Holiday Home Levy, and Bed and Breakfast rate including assessment of maximum guest numbers are considered to have been made with positive intent, the cumulative 'local' effect and impact upon the "psyche" of the Whangamata community, could prove to be quite detrimental.</li> <li>• Regrettably, they are all 'individually' perceived to have a potentially negative impact on the Whangamata community and need to be re- examined collectively.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to full submission for further detail].</p>	<p>Development proposals has been considered in development of the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan and will be further considered before adoption (through deliberations and finalising processes).</p> <p>The end impact will be dependent on Council's decisions for relevant Economic Development proposals.</p> <p>Council's Economic Development work programme is progressed under the umbrella of the Economic Development Strategy and action plan, with impacts across activities. Council could choose to review its Economic Development Strategy earlier than currently planned (being 2018) if it considers this necessary to reflect adopted proposals.</p>	<p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The combined effect of the Economic Development proposals has been considered in development of the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</li> <li>• The end effect will be dependent on Council's decisions for the relevant proposals, determined through the deliberations and finalising processes.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_214</a> John McGregor	<p>Council role in Economic Development Submitter considers that Economic Development should be funded by Central Government.</p>	<p>Council does consider that local government has a role to play in economic development, particularly given the impact its day-to-day business operations have on a district and region, and Council adopted its Economic Development Strategy in December 2013.</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has determined that it does have a role to play in economic development, as set out in its Economic Development Strategy,</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_255</a> <a href="#">Mr Evan Penny</a>	<p>Council role in Economic Development Managing infrastructure so as to facilitate use and enjoyment of the district is the baseline of economic development, and should be seen as part of</p>	<p>The strategy and associated action plan does</p>	

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>council's contribution, rather than actively getting into the business of creating attractions. Councils cannot expect to do this well, and should stay right away from it. Council already does a great many things to stimulate use and enjoyment of the district. Paying attention to the attractiveness of such as footpaths and wharves, attractive public open spaces generally, the provision of convenient parking, the provision of litter and toilet facilities and dog bag dispensers in open spaces are just some of the many ways that ratepayers money benefits residents as well as commercial businesses dependent on visitor activities. The maintenance of our local roads need to be mentioned here as well, and with my approval - it wasn't always so. [Comment also made to Roads and Footpaths]</p>	<p>recognise and reflect that delivery of core services and infrastructure is a way that Council contributes to economic growth, as well as through Council expenditure and employment; Business facilitation/attraction/retention; regulation; and delivering community outcomes and amenities.</p>	<p>including the delivery of core services and infrastructure.</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15 324</a> Gloria Rennie</p>	<p>Council role in Economic Development Should not be looking at funding luxuries i.e. cycle/walking tracks, forest planting when don't have basic infrastructure in place. i.e. water drainage, footpaths, industrial areas etc.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 347</a> Sid and Vicki Ovesen</p>	<p>Council role in Economic Development Submitter considers that the area of Economic Development is outside Council's mandated activities, and considers that the economic development funds could be targeted in providing well maintained and right-sized infrastructure. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What pays the Council's bills are the landowner's rates, not how much business is carried out on the peninsula.</li> <li>• Trying to pick or decide what type of businesses is the future of the Coromandel is high risk and detrimental to existing</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	business and industry (e.g. everybody's rates being used to support competing businesses).		
<a href="#">LTP15_217</a> Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	Camping Grounds Need to plan for ensuring sufficient motor camps remain, providing the iconic NZ holiday family experience.	It is agreed that camping grounds are an important part of the Coromandel; however it is not core Council business to provide camping grounds.	No change. Reason:
<a href="#">LTP15_310</a> Anna Horne	Camping Grounds Submitter comments that "we still need" camping grounds.	Council does have a Property Strategy and if Council considers that the purchase of land for a camping ground would be a strategic asset then it can consider this on a case by case basis, if and when appropriate land becomes available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not Council's core business to provide camping grounds.</li> <li>Council has a Property Strategy and can consider the purchase of land as a strategic asset on a case by case basis.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_255</a> Mr Evan Penny	Coromandel Harbours Submitter supports the project to create all tide access into Coromandel township, although comments about who should pay. Submitter advocates for a partnership approach to funding due to the benefit received by Coromandel, Thames Coast, Mercury Bay, the aquaculture industry, the ferry service and fishing tourism operators.	Maintaining existing Council infrastructure is recognised as important, as is planning for current and future growth. A draft Coromandel Harbours Strategy is being drafted to determine the direction to be taken. It is envisaged that this would include engagement with stakeholders, including the Highway Network Organisation. Staff aim to complete economic (benefit/cost) project analysis prior to 2016/17 Annual Plan development, to confirm whether the required project profile will be achieved and therefore eligibility for NZTA subsidy for the State Highway intersection improvement works.	No change. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project is still at concept stage and the submissions are within the project scope proposed.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_255</a> Mr Evan Penny	Coromandel Harbours Submitter supports the Coromandel Harbour Facilities project and its objectives. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The harbour has suffered perhaps more than most from the ravages of early European era land clearance and mining.</li> <li>Notwithstanding the above, the harbour supports an important range of activities and is the natural sea link with Auckland.</li> </ul>	A Coromandel Harbours business case is being developed which includes investigating funding options and funding partners. No related project will proceed without funding and support from multiple stakeholders. The business case and strategy will include all aspects of Coromandel harbours, including Sugarloaf Wharf, Hannafords Wharf, Furey's	
<a href="#">LTP15_292</a> Albert Marshall	Coromandel Harbours Submitter comments on the cost of the Coromandel		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Harbour project and its development (\$850,000 for resource consent, \$3.6 million for supporting aquaculture and its associated industries, and fast ferry services). Submitter states that this funding should be sought from those who will benefit, not the ratepayer.</p>	<p>Creek, fast ferry (Blue Highway) initiative and related facilities.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15 317</a> Chris Lux</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours Submitter supports Council's efforts to bring the 'blue highway' into Coromandel Town, the dredging of Fury's Creek and a business case looking at both bringing the Ferry into Coromandel Town and the reclamation of land between Fury's Creek and the Coromandel Wharf. Submitter considers that this project is all about developing a vision with effective leadership from Council, and without this the status quo "of putting it into the too hard basket" will prevail. Submitter considers that the project is too big for the Coromandel-Colville Community Board; and that it has to continue be driven, resourced and project managed at a district Level.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 347</a> Sid and Vicki Ovesen</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours Submitter considers that the infrastructure of the Coromandel Harbour project is core Council business.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 356</a> Margaret Harrison, Coromandel-Colville Community Board</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours Submitter [Coromandel-Colville Community Board] supports the Coromandel Harbour Development Project remaining one of Council's three anchor projects. Submitter [Coromandel-Colville Community Board] supports retention of the aquaculture industry through provision of appropriate harbour facilities for</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>this industry. Reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harbour development is a priority for the Coromandel-Colville Community Board to reduce congestion at the Sugarloaf and Hannafords Jetty sites.</li> <li>• Coromandel is reliant on visitors drawn in by recreational use of the Hauraki Gulf and the Auckland Ferry service to drive its economy and the current capacity restraints at key harbour access ways is a major limiting factor in the economic future for Coromandel.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_358</a> Colin Pepper</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours Submitter supports Council's proposal for increased Coromandel Harbour facilities and states that the only real long term option is a facility incorporating a marina from the wharf to Jacks Point. Also, that focus must be given to all water access for the recreational user with a large parking facility. Submitter states that he is totally opposed to the solution of a light railway and light wharf extension to provide all water access for the ferry, and questions under this solution "who is going to operate the train at 5 in the morning for a fishing charter, let alone transport all their [fishing charter] gear out there". Submitter comments that "in my lifetime this is one project in Coromandel I would like to see done properly and not hijacked by self-motivated interest groups". Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Recreational users] are being pushed out of the Sugarloaf facility and this is getting taken over by Coromandel users.</li> <li>• The economic development from the</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Auckland to Coromandel ferry should be seen as a peninsula wide benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The solution of a light railway and wharf extension to provide all water access for the ferry, as it does nothing to address the other users of the town's facilities and will not address refuelling for the mussel barges, all water rec users, or even charter operations.</li> <li>• Submitter comments that "in my lifetime this is one project in Coromandel I would like to see done properly and not hijacked by self-motivated interest groups".</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 183</a> Donald Hughes</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours - Blue Highway Submitter queries the specifics of the Blue Highway project and the Coromandel Harbour upgrade project and states that he cannot support the proposals. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals are tourism focused and only incidentally and indirectly benefit the bulk of local people.</li> <li>• The proposals make very sweeping assumptions on the margin of benefits over costs and the consequent flow on effects of that margin.</li> <li>• There is no mention of the externalities that exist because of the difficulty of measuring them.</li> <li>• The proposals lack detail and full accounting information.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 356</a> Margaret Harrison, Coromandel- Colville Community</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours - Coromandel Wharf budget Submitter (Coromandel-Colville Community Board) requests that Council include a budget of \$1.7m in the 2022/2023 financial year towards the</p>		



ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Board	<p>Coromandel Harbour. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Coromandel Wharf head and retaining structures will need to be removed and replaced.</li> <li>• The Coromandel-Colville Community Board notes that if the Wharf continues to be used in the current manner it is likely that this work will need to be brought forward or the Wharf will become unusable within the next ten years timeframe.</li> </ul> <p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board notes that the need for these repairs could change based on decisions yet to be made in relation to the Coromandel Harbour Development Project.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_151</a> Miss Jo Stone, NZTA</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours - Engagement with Highway Network Operations Submitter notes that the Transport Agency is currently working with the Council on funding applications related to the Te Kouma road/intersection improvements. If funding is secured for this project, early engagement between Council and Highway Network Operations is required to ensure Transport Agency requirements are met. Submitter notes that they are aware that the anchor projects related to the improvement will support the economic development associated with the Coromandel Harbours project.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_255</a> Mr Evan Penny</p>	<p>Coromandel Harbours - Furey's Creek Submitter supports all tide access into Furey's Creek, however notes that it is an issue which will divide the town. Reason:</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With appropriate on shore separation and disposal there is no compelling reason to hold back.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15_183</a> Donald Hughes	Coromandel Harbours - Sugarloaf Submitter opposes the inclusion of even a 'guess-timate' of costs for the Coromandel Harbour Sugar Loaf development. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an absence of information on how the costs are made up and estimates of the possible rate of return on what is a considerable investment.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15_307</a> Anthony Fabricius	Coromandel Harbours - Sugarloaf Submitter states that Council should not lose overall control of the Sugarloaf Wharf even if Coromandel Marine Farms contribute to the upgrade.		
<a href="#">LTP15_231</a> Darian Lunjevich-West, Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Coromandel Harbours - Wharfs Submitter requests that the Coromandel Wharf offers more docks for boats. This request is based on the findings of the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013.		
<a href="#">LTP15_113</a> The Coromandel Heritage Trust	Coromandel Heritage The submitter requests that Council reinstate the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity with an accompanying budget to continue the co-ordination of heritage groups, initiatives and activities between the Council and community across the district. Submitter comments that there is no reference to the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity in the Ten	Council's Economic Development Committee has commissioned a Concept Study to investigate what a Heritage Region could mean. The scope is to research, review and present the opportunity and impact of a Coromandel Heritage Region and is much wider than image and marketing. This work has been funded by 2014/15 budget and no further project costs are required at this	That Council consider whether it wants to approve interim Year 1 budget to continue natural and cultural heritage funding (for heritage buildings maintenance, heritage promotion, subscriptions), and if so what funding amount. Reasons:

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Year Plan and there is no recognition of the importance of our heritage and the economic benefit it brings to the district in terms of the many tourist attractions that educate and inform about the historical activities that were so prevalent in our past and formed a vital part in the settlement of the area. The Coromandel Heritage Trust requests that the Council demonstrates support for the importance of the district's heritage by making the commitment to continue the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity. This will encourage ongoing preservation of heritage values in the community and align with Council outcomes for the District such as achieving a prosperous economy and a being a place where people want to visit and enjoy living and working in.</p>	<p>conceptual stage excluding existing staff resource. If the Coromandel Heritage Region project proceeds from the conceptual stage any further funding requirements will be proposed as part of 2016/17 Annual Plan processes. Several submitters request that Council reinstate the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity including district grant budget for support to the Biodiversity Forum, and other heritage -related activity such as maintenance of heritage buildings and relevant promotions. Council's current Natural and Cultural Heritage activity and associated budget was not proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. The general direction of Council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model. Costs of running the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity have been proposed within the Economic Development activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Coromandel Heritage Region project is in its conceptual stage and no budget has been allocated in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</li> <li>• Council's current Natural and Cultural Heritage activity was not proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. Continuation of some funding would be consistent with the Coromandel Heritage concept, at least until further assessment can be made.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">LTP15 130</a> Morrie Dunwoodie, Heritage Hauraki Coromandel</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter comments that as a regular attendee at the Heritage Hauraki Coromandel meetings over the last five years, convened by Council's Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity Manager, they were nominated to make a submission requesting to reinstate the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity with an accompanying budget, to continue the co-ordination of heritage groups, initiatives and activities between the Council and community across the District. Submitter comments that there is no reference to the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity in the Ten Year Plan and there is no recognition of the importance of our heritage and the economic benefit it brings to the District in terms of the many tourist attractions that educate and inform about the historical activities that were so prevalent in our past and formed a vital part in the settlement of the area. There needs to be support for the proposed</p>	<p>While provision has been made to accommodate grants which are currently district funded within community board budgets, these have not been factored into 2015/16 budgets and there will likely be a transition period where funding is not available for existing district funded grants. Should Council wish to continue supporting the existing district grants/funding, or to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored. One such interim measure could be to allocate interim budget for Year 1 for some natural cultural and heritage funding to continue while the Coromandel Heritage Region Concept Study</p>	

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Coromandel Heritage Region which I understand is a 20-50 year vision and retaining Council's Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity Manager is extremely important to continue coordinating the heritage groups across the district. The Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity was insignificant/miniscule in terms of Council budget and it served the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provided a single 'district level' contact point within TCDC for matters relating to heritage (i.e. to help coordinate initiatives and activities e.g. heritage content on the Destination Coromandel website, Heritage Hauraki Coromandel Forum, etc).</li> <li>• It signalled that TCDC put at least some priority on the preservation of heritage values (even if the budget was not sufficient).</li> <li>• It was a way to coordinate heritage matters across TCDC and was a way to avoid duplication across Council.</li> </ul> <p>The members of Heritage Hauraki Coromandel request that Council make a commitment to continue the Natural and Cultural Heritage Activity and also make provision to update the Council's 'Heritage Strategy' which was last reviewed in 2008. Not a lot of financial commitment is required, but coordination and commitment is necessary. Heritage should be recognised as an important economic development driver in the TCDC area and heritage should be recognised as important in terms of the following Council outcomes: "A prosperous district - the Coromandel Peninsula has a prosperous economy" "A liveable district - the Coromandel Peninsula is a</p>	<p>is being undertaken and any local funding sources are established, and revisit the decision during the 2016/17 Annual Plan planning process.</p> <p>Current budget (under the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity) that has not been re-allocated under the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan are set out below.</p> <p>Heritage building maintenance: 15,000 Heritage promotion: \$30,000 Subscriptions (Biodiversity Forum and Heritage NZ): \$4,500 Enviroschools Programme: \$11,500 [Enviroschools funding is addressed under district-funded funding requests]</p>	

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>preferred area of New Zealand in which to live, work and raise a family and have a safe and satisfying life".</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 150</a> Mark Skelding</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter requests that Council commit to Heritage as being about how we attend to our past AND future, and refers to page 22 [of the Consultation Document] where it says: "Another initiative being pursued as part of the Economic Development package is the potential for the Coromandel to become a Heritage Region. There are no project costs associated with this project as, in its conceptual stage, it will only require staff resource." Submitter comments that this seems unlikely; noting the recent loss of Council paid and financed district heritage provision. Further, that this needs to be reinstated if we are to fulfil the promise of truly being "a heritage district".</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 217</a> Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage [On the idea of] Coromandel as a heritage region, start planning now to ensure integrity behind the claim.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 249</a> Susan Wright</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter notes: Natural + Cultural Heritage relates to Economic Development Tourism. I would like to support the proposed Coromandel Heritage Region as a 20-50 year vision but with emphasis on having a specific natural and cultural heritage activity that will support this vision within the LTP. To define Heritage: it is anything that someone wishes to conserve or collect to pass on to future generations.</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Heritage Tourism: is defined as visits from persons outside the host community that motivated by the opportunity to enjoy the special values of the natural and cultural heritage activities. Tourism is a major economic contributor.</p> <p>It is therefore disturbing that no reference to the continuation of the natural and cultural heritage activity is in the LTP, or the need to up the Council's Heritage Strategy (last reviewed in 2008) is included.</p> <p>With the initiative for the Coromandel to become a heritage region is is disconcerting to read on page 22 that there are no project costs associated with this as it will only require staff resources. Not only should there be come financial commitment, but co-ordination and leadership is necessary. Heritage should be recognised as important in terms of Council's outcomes, "A prosperous district: The peninsula has a prosperous economy" and "A liveable district: is a preferred area of NZ in which to live, work, raise a family and have a safe and satisfying lifestyle."</p> <p>I ask that Council enable the existing strengths and heritage opportunities be given a high priority in determining our future economic development while retaining our unique character both historically and culturally. Build on what we have.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_281</a> Mr John Isdale</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Historic Heritage; with the recognition in the draft plan of the importance of heritage assets and the proposal for the whole district to become a Historic Heritage area, submitter requests that funding for historic heritage must be included in our 10 year plan.</p> <p>As a founder member of Council supported,</p>		

<b>ID Full Name Company/ Organisation</b>	<b>Submitter comment</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	<p>Heritage Hauraki Coromandel, member of the Australasia Mining history Association and the international Mineralogical Museum Professionals association, local historian who has contributed to visitor oriented interpretation such as the Farmers and Saxon mine signage in Thames and activist for Historic Heritage, the submitter considers that they can offer Council a well-informed view of how we can improve our district through its historic heritage. Further, that they have been fortunate to be able to see first-hand the benefits of preserving historic heritage has and is giving in places as diverse as Beechworth in Australia, Freiberg in Germany or Sapporo in Japan. All of these places derive not only economic benefits but also cultural and social ones from the preservation and promotion of their Historic Heritage.</p> <p>Defined adequate funding should support the heritage policy areas already established in Coromandel town and the Grahamstown area of Thames as well as other aspects of our historic heritage. As with boat ramps, adventure playgrounds and swimming pools the funding of historic heritage supports economic development/tourism and community development. Council has been supporting historic heritage in recognition of its benefits, this needs to continue with funding budgeted in the LTP specifically for Historic Heritage. There is also I believe a need for support of councils historic heritage policies with the establishment from the historic heritage community of formal advisory groups and the allocation of formal responsibility for historic heritage to council staff. All of this needs to be supported by the allocation of specific sufficient funding in the LTP.</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15 310</a> Anna Horne	Coromandel Heritage The Heritage Region concept is great - however, our environment underpins that concept.		
<a href="#">LTP15 323</a> Moria Cursey, Waikato Biodiversity Forum	Coromandel Heritage The Forum supports the concept of investigating a future Coromandel as a heritage region that “celebrates and cherishes its rich heritage and unique geography” including the regions natural heritage. Reviewing the Councils Biodiversity Strategy would act as a starting point to reach this vision.		
<a href="#">LTP15 331</a> Deborah Brown	Coromandel Heritage Support Heritage. Heritage like the arts is one of the foundations of our sense of identity and one of the main reasons why people come to visit the Coromandel. I support your vision of Coromandel Heritage Region – but much work needs to be done in improving the relationship between council and the heritage sector. The perception by the heritage community is one of many years of Council neglect and threat. This area needs substantial and sustained action. You will need to create a dedicated position within TCDC to tackle the issues and opportunities within heritage and help with resourcing the many changes that will be needed. You already have a strong voluntary community involved who are passionate about protecting our heritage but you will have to show positive change. Consider moving the band rotunda in Thames from tapu ground so that we can use it as a resource.		
<a href="#">LTP15 331</a> Deborah Brown	Coromandel Heritage Submitter requests that as part of a heritage strategy, there should be a comprehensive collection		



ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	of local publications and ephemera conserved for future generations.		
<a href="#">LTP15 345</a> Alastair Brickell	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter refers to page 10-11 [of the Consultation Document] and asks why is there no mention of our mining history under the “proud history” headline? Decades ago the PATA report highlighted the unique mining heritage that Coromandel has and how this could be developed as a major and unusual tourist attraction throughout the peninsula. Developing this history would be much more useful than further spending on Great Walkways which only benefit small areas of the peninsula and those visitors fit and interested enough to be able to do the walks. Mining heritage sights are distributed throughout much of the Coromandel and could provide jobs and development opportunities for many small communities that currently miss out on the big high profile items.</p> <p>Developing our mining heritage could be one way to do this. New tracks or improvements to existing tracks on the Thames coast would appeal to many of those who might otherwise use the Great Walks. Many sites in less busy areas of the peninsula could give tours through old mine tunnels much as done already at the Thames Stamper Complex. The old Blondin tower and cableway system at Paritu could be re-erected over the coastal road and would be a great tourist attraction. This would help to draw visitors to the NW of the peninsula and reduce the pressure on the western side.</p> <p>Overseas mining heritage has huge tourist potential and generates impressive sums of money for many</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>communities that would otherwise be struggling to survive and thrive. There is no reason why we cannot do the same on the Coromandel.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 347</a> Sid and Vicki Ovesen</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter states that they do not support the Coromandel becoming a Heritage Region. What does the term "Heritage Region" actually mean? Will we become a backwater with no vision for the future, only resting on the laurels of the past when times were better?</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 69</a> Mrs Elizabeth Anne Stewart Ball</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter considers that this initiative needs further definition (explanation to what the term 'Coromandel heritage' means), and notes that it should mean the whole peninsula and include logging, environmental and writing heritage. Submitter considers that Coromandel Heritage should have more than just a 'token budget' and that there should be a TCDC staff member (paid position) facilitating Heritage and a Heritage Organisation such as the Hauraki Heritage Forum. Submitter considers that there should be adequate and robust research done on Ancestry Tourism for this region given that in the past there have been a large number of people to this area for gum digging, timber logging and gold mining. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage should be treasured for its inherent values, cultural importance and sense of identity.</li> <li>• Coromandel heritage is not an add on but an integral part of past, present and future.</li> <li>• This initiative needs to be a person already experienced in Heritage and District planning as</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>TCDC already has an extensive Register of Heritage Items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a large untapped, un-coordinated potential to grow this ancestry tourism on this peninsula which should increase usage of accommodation, meals, etc.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 70</a> Mr. Christopher Raymond Ball</p>	<p>Coromandel Heritage Submitter considers that this initiative needs further definition (explanation to what the term 'Coromandel heritage' means), and notes that it should mean the whole peninsula and include logging, environmental and writing heritage. Submitter considers that Coromandel Heritage should have more than just a 'token budget' and that there should be a TCDC staff member (paid position) facilitating Heritage and a Heritage Organisation such as the Hauraki Heritage Forum. Submitter considers that there should be adequate and robust research done on Ancestry Tourism for this region given that in the past there have been a large number of people to this area for gum digging, timber logging and gold mining. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage should be treasured for its inherent values, cultural importance and sense of identity.</li> <li>• Coromandel heritage is not an add on but an integral part of past, present and future.</li> <li>• This initiative needs to be a person already experienced in Heritage and District planning as TCDC already has an extensive Register of Heritage Items.</li> </ul> <p>There is a large untapped, un-coordinated potential to grow this ancestry tourism on this peninsula which should increase usage of accommodation, meals,</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	etc.		
<a href="#">LTP15 255</a> Mr Evan Penny	Coromandel Heritage Region Submitter comments they feel that technology has rendered this sort of image boosting and branding obsolete. Local government history is littered with attempts to create a point of difference, a unique marketing advantage, a memorable slogan, whatever. The internet has largely removed any benefits such branding ever had. Visitors do not visit an area of New Zealand because the local council calls its area this or that. The only value council can make in this area is to provide whatever support it wishes to give to individuals and organizations developing their own attractions.		
<a href="#">LTP15 331</a> Deborah Brown	Destination Coromandel mandate Submitter comments that the current role of Destination Coromandel is to attract visitors to the Kopu Bridge but not to ensure they are entertained once they get here (except with large events). Community events and our artisan businesses may not attract visitors from overseas but they do enhance the visitor experience once they are here because they show off the richness of our arts, heritage and culture. With the move to bring the I-SITE under Destination Coromandel's wing, surely this is the time to change Destination Coromandel's mandate so they can take on both aspects of marketing The Coromandel on their database. Submitter suggests "check out Shopikon New York".	Destination Coromandel is heavily involved in the promotion and support of major events on the Coromandel under their current directive (Business Plan). The Destination Coromandel Business Plan is aligned to the national i-SITE strategy (i-SITE New Zealand Corporate Profile and Strategic Plan 2013 - 2016) which favours i-SITES to be run by Regional Tourism Operators (RTOs). Destination Coromandel therefore has a strategy for operation of the i-SITES on the Coromandel, and also has working relationships with the information centres such as for co-ordination of marketing. The district's i-SITES and information centres will continue to be heavily involved in connecting visitors with tourism product at all levels on the Coromandel. Council proposed in its draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan to increase funding to Destination Coromandel (and has increased service level	No change. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destination Coromandel is heavily involved in the promotion and support of major events on the C leoromandel under their current directive.</li> <li>• Destination Coromandel has a strategy for operation of the i-SITES on the Coromandel.</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		expectations) and its major events sponsorship fund, to ensure visitors to the Coromandel connect with the full range of events here.	
<a href="#">LTP15_310</a> Anna Horne	<p>Events Submitter comments that these [events] can be overdone and have a negative impact on residents (e.g. road closures impact on travel to Saturday sports; we have to put up with drunks at the scallop festival). Submitter comments that it was totally wrong to give \$40,000 to a private Hahei Raceway event and to fund The Guy Fawkes, the only for locals event. Submitter considers that all events should incur a small levy per participant that can go to a fund to help look after our environment. Further, that events need to move away from high-carbon use activities as quickly as possible if we are to honour our commitment to being a sustainable district.</p>	<p>It is recognised that events do need to be carefully managed and any negative impacts mitigated. This is reflected in Council's Economic Development Strategy and Events Strategy which explain that Council's desire is not to chase economic growth at the expense of the environment or community amenity. Environmental issues and the effect on the community are considerations given to event funding decisions.</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council's Economic Development Strategy and Events Strategy reflect that events must be carefully managed and any negative impacts mitigated to an acceptable degree.</li> <li>• Environmental issues and the effect on the community are considerations given to event funding decisions.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_275</a> <a href="#">Edward and Betty Collings</a>	<p>Events calendar Submitter comments that they have noted through the annual Mercury Bay Art Escape tours that many folk plan their visit to the area to coincide with specific events, and think that many of these events and exhibitions would draw in more people if there was a continually updated Coromandel wide 'event calendar' published each week in the weekly papers and available on line. Submitter makes suggestions, commenting that the most useful event calendar, including all events sports as well as arts, could be managed digitally. People could submit an online form including name of event, brief description, location, hours, open and closing dates, and that this would be free. Adding additional promo material such as photographs and</p>	<p>Events calendars are currently managed by the i-SITEs and information centres in the district, and are published on their websites and in the local newspapers. It is preferred that online marketing of events should be through Destination Coromandel's visitor website (<a href="http://www.thecoromandel.com">www.thecoromandel.com</a>). This submitter's feedback can be referred to Destination Coromandel to consider how the events calendars could potentially be better managed and promoted.</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events calendars are already being managed and promoted by Destination Coromandel, i-SITEs and information centres.</li> <li>• The submitter's feedback will be referred to Destination Coromandel.</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	extended text would be charged. Council funding could be directed to the establishment of the system with the additional promo material providing ongoing costs.		
<a href="#">LTP15_255</a> Mr Evan Penny	Great Walks Submitter notes that the Great Walks project is an example they can agree with. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is Council assisting communities.</li> <li>• It is assisting with management of access to the natural features that already exist.</li> </ul>	The Great Walks project is reliant on Government funding, DOC support and in kind support from community groups. It is recognised that Council cannot undertake this project alone. A business case has been developed for the Great Walks project and further planning will be undertaken if government funding is secured in mid-2015.	No change. Refer the matter of participation from the Waikato Biodiversity Forum in the Coromandel Great Walks Working (Governance) Group to Council's Economic Development Committee for further consideration.
<a href="#">LTP15_310</a> Anna Horne	Great Walks Submitter considers that the Great Walk is "silly" and that it should be made a bike path as well if Council "is really serious to keep overloading this area with more people, pollution and traffic". Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's a 'stroll' and of course it would be nice to walk from Hot Water Beach to Cathedral Cove, but why bring even more people to an area which is already overloaded.</li> </ul>	In response to the Waikato Biodiversity Forum submission, community groups who are involved with managing biodiversity adjacent to any Great Walk tracks on the peninsula could have opportunity to contribute to the project. The Coromandel Great Walks Working/Governance Group (for the proposed Cathedral Coast Walkway) currently includes DOC, Coastal Walkways Trust, and Ngati Hei. Participation from the Waikato Biodiversity Forum could be referred to Council's Economic Development Committee to consider.	Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submissions are within the project scope proposed for the Great Walks project.</li> <li>• Representation on the Coromandel Great Walks Working (Governance) Group is not a Long Term Plan matter.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_323</a> Moria Cursey, Waikato Biodiversity Forum	Great Walks Submitter notes the development of the Great Walk to attract tourism to the peninsula and requests that the community groups who work to improve the biodiversity adjacent to the Great Walk be recognised as contributing to this tourism project.	In response to submitter concerns relating to demand, managing demand is a key requirement of the Great Walks project, such as by offering more off-peak tourism product throughout the year rather than only during the peak summer period.	
<a href="#">LTP15_336</a> Vikki Bertram, Sport Waikato	Great Walks Submitter supports investment in anchor projects related to sport, and the proposed Great Walks total budget of \$2.527M. Reasons:	If determined feasible in future, additional walks to that proposed (being Hot Water Beach to Cathedral Cove) may also be connected over time to the peninsula, which could contribute to	

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sporting and community infrastructure are a vital part of the broader local authority asset portfolio.</li> <li>• At a community level, assets offer valuable social outcomes for the health and wellbeing of communities.</li> <li>• Appropriate, well designed and well managed assets offer the opportunity for economic development and growth. Thames-Coromandel District Council has a history of sound investment for the enhancement of outdoor sport, recreation and physical activity pursuits.</li> <li>• Strategic and long-term investment is supported by Sport Waikato, especially given trends towards outdoor freedom pursuits such as walking and cycling.</li> </ul>	mitigating demand during peak times and associated impacts for popular areas.	
<a href="#">LTP15_345</a> Alastair Brickell	<p>Great Walks Submitter considers that the Great Walks project will only serve to concentrate more visitors into an area that is already struggling to cope with current visitor numbers, and at the very least it will require further infrastructure to accommodate the increased visitors probably at a cost, at least in part, by the ratepayers. Submitter comments that it would be better to encourage new visitors in the future to explore other parts of the Coromandel thus spreading out the costs and also the benefits.</p>		
<a href="#">LTP15_347</a> Sid and Vicki Ovesen	<p>Great Walks Submitter considers that the Great Walks is a luxury project and using ratepayer funding should be questioned in light of tight economic times. Reason:</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due diligence needs to be done first then consultation with communities, before decisions are made. This will ensure that ratepayers will trust the Council is listening to them and using their money wisely.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15 255</a> Mr Evan Penny	Hauraki Rail Trail Submitter supports the Hauraki Rail Trail project. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hauraki Rail Trail is a somewhat different issue where the demise of rail transport along the route has given rise to a unique and never to be repeated opportunity to retain a dedicated land access route in public ownership, and capitalize on a recreational trip experience of regional significance.</li> <li>Without local body involvement the trail would not get off the ground. On that basis the submitter supports it.</li> </ul>	Council has committed further funding to the Hauraki Rail Trail project, and planning is well underway for the Hauraki Rail Trail section from Kopu to Kaiaua. The Rail Trail project is reliant on Government funding and Council will know later this year if it has been successful in its application for further government funding support for the extension. The economic impact of the current Rail Trail has already surpassed expectations. There is confidence that the Rail Trail extension to Kaiaua will dramatically increase the number of people using the trail; it is up to the visitor industry across the peninsula to extract more yield from them.	No change. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submissions are within the Hauraki Rail Trail project as proposed.</li> <li>Local cycling initiatives are able to be progressed by Council's community boards as part of urban planning projects.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15 310</a> Anna Horne	Hauraki Rail Trail Submitter considers that the trail from Thames to Paeroa "is pleasant but boring", and needs to be enhanced with planting, restoration of drains and interpretation. Further, that an extension to Kaiaua is an admirable idea, but as for Thames to Paeroa [it is "pleasant but boring"].	More work is planned along the Rail Trail to enrich the visitor experience, and the Hauraki Rail Trail Charitable Trust is charged with this work. Note that the Hauraki Rail Trail is part of the Roads and Footpaths activity, not Economic Development given that it supports alternative transportation modes.	
<a href="#">LTP15 336</a> Vikki Bertram, Sport Waikato	Hauraki Rail Trail Submitter investment in anchor projects related to sport, and the \$1.26M for the Hauraki Rail Trail. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sporting and community infrastructure are a vital part of the broader local authority asset</li> </ul>	There may be considered a need for a broader cycling strategy for the Coromandel, however local cycling initiatives could be progressed by Council's community boards as part of their urban planning projects.	



ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>portfolio.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At a community level, assets offer valuable social outcomes for the health and wellbeing of communities.</li> <li>Appropriate, well designed and well managed assets offer the opportunity for economic development and growth. Thames-Coromandel District Council has a history of sound investment for the enhancement of outdoor sport, recreation and physical activity pursuits. Strategic and long-term investment is supported by Sport Waikato, especially given trends towards outdoor freedom pursuits such as walking and cycling.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_345</a> Alastair Brickell</p>	<p>Hauraki Rail Trail Submitter questions the cost to extend the Hauraki Rail Trail and considers that the money should be spent developing other tourism areas of the Coromandel. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extension to the Hauraki Rail Trail will likely bring very few visitors to the overall area and this would be concentrated in a very small part of the peninsula.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_346</a> Ms Kay Kristensen, Population Health, Waikato District Heath Board</p>	<p>Hauraki Rail Trail Submitter [Population Health, WDHB] supports Council's ongoing commitment to the development of the Hauraki Rail Trail in partnership with Hauraki District Council. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant economic impact from the trail is already evident and realised in sustainable job growth and other opportunities such as</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>physical activity, improved health and wellbeing, and social cohesion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived danger from collisions with motor vehicles is one of the greatest barriers to active transport and physical activity. Off road cycling opportunities overcome this.</li> <li>• Physical inactivity is a key public health issue and a global public health priority. Nearly 50% of the New Zealand adult population are physically inactive. New Zealand rates 27th out of 122 most inactive countries. Australia is rated 52nd with 38% of its population inactive. The cost of physical inactivity for the Waikato region in 2010 was \$106 million.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_347</a> Sid and Vicki Ovesen</p>	<p>Hauraki Rail Trail Submitter considers that the Hauraki Rail Trail (and Great Walks) is a luxury project and using ratepayer funding should be questioned in light of tight economic times. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due diligence needs to be done first then consultation with communities, before decisions are made. This will ensure that ratepayers will trust the Council is listening to them and using their money wisely.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_150</a> Mark Skelding</p>	<p>Hauraki Rail Trail and cycling Submitter considers that cycling requires a higher profile in Thames and across the district, and that TCDC (with Hauraki District Council) should encourage and facilitate land owners and land managers to work with interest groups, industry, and volunteers to develop a network of cross country cycle tracks to connect the Hauraki Rail Trail heads</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>(Thames and Waihi) with the other five main centres on the peninsula. Submitter considers that better cyclist provision (such as bike racks, cycle paths, and cycle ways marked on roads) around the peninsula would add to the success of the District as a destination, and to the Rail Trail as a visitor experience.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_355</a> Mark Skelding, Transition Town Thames</p>	<p>Hauraki Rail Trail and cycling T3 supports raising cycling profile and provision in Thames (and across the District) Provide better cyclist provision (bike racks, cycle paths, cycle ways marked on roads etc) in Thames (and around the peninsula) will add to the success of the District as a tourist destination, and to the RailTrail as a visitor experience. Encourage and facilitate (with Hauraki District Council) land-owners and land-managers to work with interest groups, industry, and volunteers to develop a network of cross country cycle friendly tracks (based on current and historic tracks) to connect the Hauraki RailTrailheads (Thames and Waihi) with the other five main centres on the peninsula. (eg: Karaka/Waiotahi – Crosbies Clearing – Tapu crossing; Crosbies-Tairua; Tapu-Crossing-Castle Rock – Whitianga etc.)</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_310</a> Anna Horne</p>	<p>Information Centres and Destination Coromandel Submitter considers that the continued reduction of spending on visitor information centres while also hugely increasing destination Coromandel's budget is bizarre, and comments that it's like the impact on small communities of post office closures. Submitter considers that Destination Coromandel needs even better infrastructure than now exists to service all the visitors once they get here, and that</p>	<p>Destination Coromandel funding was proposed to increase under the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan, and Council is expecting higher levels of service from Destination Coromandel including more marketing for key tourism products, such as the Hauraki Rail Trail, and in order for i-SITES to gather more revenue from selling tourism products. The proposed funding is considered appropriate for the services that Destination</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed funding to Destination Coromandel, the i-SITES and information centres is consistent with the direction indicated in Council's Economic Development Strategy.</li> <li>• Funding of information centres</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>the level of service within many tourism operations is very poor. Local operators should be actively involved in Kiwi host (or today's equivalent), giving real accurate interpretation and working towards truly sustainable activities.</p>	<p>Coromandel is required to deliver. Funding to the Whitianga i-SITE has been increased and Council is investing heavily in the relocation and fit out for the Thames i-SITE move into the Thames Civic Centre. This is in-line with the direction for Thames and Whitianga to provide the main i-SITE services for the district. Funding for the information centres is discussed as a separate decision matter, as specifically presented in the Consultation Document.</p>	<p>is to be dealt with as separate decision matter.</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_150</a> Mark Skelding</p>	<p>Sustainability Submitter comments that Council should promote local energy efficiency and generation (suggests local and district linked business association commitment), encourage local food production, raise a "Taste Coromandel" profile (or similar), and show how this is happening as part of a communication policy.</p>	<p>In the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Consultation Document Council proposed a Joint Venture Investment Marketing initiative that would involve Council working in partnership with other key economic development agencies such as Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) to increase our reach and product offering, including related to local food and beverage industries.</p>	<p>No change. Refer the matter of sustainability to Council's Economic Development Committee for further consideration. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is currently working with Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) on initiatives to promote the local food and beverage industries.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_355</a> Mark Skelding, Transition Town Thames</p>	<p>Sustainability Submitter requests that Council consider how local energy efficiency and solar generation, EV [Electric Vehicle] provision, local food production, a "Taste Coromandel" profile (or similar) and waste reduction measures will impact our national and international profile and enhance our attraction for visitors and businesses. Submitter further requests that Council demonstrate how this is happening as part of a communication policy. Reason:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To show how community development and economic resilience can be achieved as a means towards fulfilling obligations to have clear and visible climate change planning in</li> </ul> </p>	<p>Successful waste reduction measures have been progressed under Council's Solid Waste activity. There is currently no significant resource to explore opportunities within sustainability initiatives (such as local energy efficiency, support to the Governments EECA scheme, solar generation, and Electric Vehicle projects) however some work could be managed within existing resources through the Economic Development activity. Council has undertaken work in the past related to sustainability. Council could approve budget to undertake further investigations and/or pursue a particular direction, if considered necessary above existing resource availability. However, it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration could be given to sustainability initiatives raised to Council's attention.</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15 150</a> Mark Skelding	<p>place.</p> <p>Sustainability - Electric Vehicle charge points Submitter supports the provision of electric vehicle [EV] charge points in Thames and surrounds, noting that at present, this major tourism destination has no provision for travellers in EVs. [Submitter references support to the submission from Transition Towns and supports the points made in this submission.] Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A focus on renewable and clean energy would be in line with the Urban Vision for Thames (2013) and provide opportunities for local employment, and to build energy resilience.</li> </ul>	<p>could be considered that sustainability related initiatives and services are more appropriately driven by the private sector and Council has more of an enabling role, which is relatively reflected under its Economic Development Strategy. Council could choose to review its Economic Development Strategy earlier than planned (being 2018) if it considers it appropriate in order to incorporate any specific 'energy efficiency' direction. Council uses various mediums for communications, and communications plans are developed for specific projects as needed.</p>	
<a href="#">LTP15 103</a> Mr John Leenman	<p>Sustainability - Electric Vehicle charge station at Kopu Submitter requests that as part of the Council's development of the Kopu Business Park, the Council part-fund an Electric Vehicle (EV) charge station at Kopu. Submitter comments that they are 'EV enthusiasts' and would commit \$500 towards the cost, and have a registered electrician willing to complete the electrical work free of charge. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council wishes to attract more visitors from Auckland and that a growing number of Aucklanders are now opting for electric vehicles. There are currently 20 public charging stations from Pukekohe to Wellsford Library, but none in the Coromandel Peninsula.</li> <li>• Electric vehicles cannot access the Coromandel Peninsula effectively unless</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>they can recharge on their journey. Kopu would be an ideal site for the first recharging station. It would be at a low cost (approximately \$1300 to \$1700 plus installation-per unit). It could be sited near the café which would stimulate business in the area as well as provide a food and resting stop for travellers heading north or east i.e. Whangamata, Tairua, Whitianga, or Coromandel town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An EV charge station would provide a unique brand to the Kopu Business Park and as pure electric vehicles have zero emissions, bring us into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century low-carbon economy.</li> <li>• The Minister of Transport, Simon Bridges, who spoke recently at an industry level meeting (March 2015), has officials investigating ways to accelerate uptake of electric vehicles. The Electricity Networks Association (ENA) has initiated a “Renewables Highway” project and is currently scoping the establishment of charging stations along State Highway 1. The ENA Chief Executive, Graeme Peters, has stated that New Zealand is EV ready. This is an opportunity for the Coromandel Peninsula to take the lead in opening up the district for EV drivers.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_331</a> Deborah Brown</p>	<p>Youth focus - Sharing of generational skills Submitter comments that we need to conserve and strengthen our knowledge base and train our young people in artisan “real world” traditional skills, as we need to capitalise on the fact that we have a community of older people and we do not want to</p>	<p>There are multiple stakeholders involved in youth development in the district. Council adopted a Youth Strategy in 2013 that provides overarching direction and work is continuing under this umbrella at the district and local levels. There is relevance across multiple Council</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council adopted a Youth Strategy in 2013 that provides overarching direction and work</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>lose their skills. Submitter comments that we need to place a high priority in transferring the knowledge and wisdom within our older community to our young people, and requests that Council set up basic community education, commenting that Tim Shadbolt attracted people to Invercargill with free education. These kinds of apprentice skills (building, welding, plumbing, horticulture, etc.) should help our community and young people become more self-reliant and self-sufficient. There will be future work opportunities in rescue and rebuilding.</p>	<p>activities, and the Economic Development Committee has recently committed resources to fund a youth employment initiative that involves transferring of knowledge and skills. Further projects have wider relevance, such as working to improve broadband access across the Coromandel. Council's community boards are progressing local initiatives that have benefit to youth, such as sports facilities. Same as YOUTH FOCUS above</p>	<p>is continuing under this umbrella at the district and local levels.</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_233</a> Darian Lunjevich-West, Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus – district [Submitter addressed submission to the Thames-Coromandel District Council] Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the district, informed by responses from youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to improve the district to make it more youth friendly the submitter recommends that efforts are put into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Targeting youth interests when developing new facilities, shops and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Thames / Coromandel area it is suggested that consideration be made towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilising modern marketing systems and youth focused promotion when presenting youth targeted activities.</li> <li>○ Involving youth in the planning and implementation of new developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Thames / Coromandel</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase opportunities for young people to get ahead in life, become more connected, independent and financially sound, and ensure their skills remain in our district.</li> <li>○ Invest in new developments that improve young people's access to activities that excite them and enable them to foster skills in what they are passionate about, and that encourage people to come to the area.</li> <li>○ Advocate that new retail opportunities consider youth as a target market when setting up in the area.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 231</a> Darian Lunjevich-West, Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus - Coromandel-Colville [Submitter addressed submission to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board] Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the Coromandel-Colville area, informed by responses from local youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Invest in new developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Grow the community - more space, people, and employment infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Improve retail options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More youth focused clothing and pet shops.</li> <li>○ Thames Mall - bigger, more exciting, take it off the market, stop shops from leaving, increase opening hours, and lower the rent.</li> <li>○ More food outlets - KFC and lolly shops.</li> <li>○ Build a mall and ensure everything was affordable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Create more opportunities:</li> </ul>		



ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More employment.</li> <li>● In order to improve Coromandel-Colville to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Targeting youth interests when developing new facilities, shops and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Coromandel-Colville area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilising modern marketing systems and youth focused promotion when presenting youth targeted activities.</li> <li>○ Involving youth in the planning and implementation of new developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Coromandel-Colville developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase opportunities for young people to get ahead in life, become more connected, independent and financially sound, and ensure their skills remain in our district.</li> <li>○ Invest in new developments that improve young people's access to activities that excite them and enable them to foster skills in what they are passionate about, and that encourage people to come to the area.</li> <li>○ Advocate that new retail opportunities consider youth as a target market when setting up in the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Submitter noted that the most cited things [from the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013] that youth would change in Coromandel / Colville to better support</p>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	youth was for more youth focused clothing shops.		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 229</a> Darian Lunjevich-West, Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus - Mercury Bay [Submitter addressed submission to the Mercury Bay Community Board.] Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the Mercury Bay area, informed by responses from local youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invest in new developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New outdoor facilities - mountain bike and motocross tracks, camp grounds, a new skate park, and more parks and playgrounds, walkways, and outdoor entertainment areas.</li> <li>○ Expand commercial areas to support new business ventures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Offer more youth focused activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More community events.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Improve retail options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More youth focused clothing shops - skate / surf, menswear, Glassons, Valley Girl, Jay Jays, and Cotton On.</li> <li>○ More food outlets - fast food, cafés, Carls Jnr, Burger King, Kiwi Yo, juice bars, lolly shops, pizza parlours, and Burger Fuel.</li> <li>○ Build a mall or shopping centre which would have included specific interest shops like science, pets, gaming.</li> <li>○ Open a Z gas station.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More employment.</li> <li>○ More free WIFI hotspots and fast broadband.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In order to improve Mercury Bay to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into targeting youth interests when</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>developing new facilities, shops and activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Mercury Bay area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilising modern marketing systems and youth focused promotion when presenting youth targeted activities.</li> <li>○ Involving youth in the planning and implementation of new developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Mercury Bay developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase opportunities for young people to get ahead in life, become more connected, independent and financially sound, and ensure their skills remain in our district.</li> <li>○ Invest in new developments that improve young people's access to activities that excite them and enable them to foster skills in what they are passionate about, and that encourage people to come to the area.</li> <li>○ Advocate that new retail opportunities consider youth as a target market when setting up in the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 226</a> Darian Lunjevich-West, Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus - Tairua-Pauanui [The submitter addressed submission to the Tairua-Pauanui-Hikuai Community Board] Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the Tairua-Pauanu-Hikuai area, informed by responses from local youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invest in new developments:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Grow the community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Encourage innovative new business ventures such as industrial hemp farms, and wind turbines.</li> <li>● Improve retail options:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More youth focused clothing shops available.</li> <li>○ More food outlets - KFC, Pak n Save, healthier options.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Create more opportunities:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Better access to free WIFI hotspots and fast broadband.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Offer more youth focused activities:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More community events.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ensure there's more support for youth:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More whole community fundraising events and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● In order to improve Tairua Hikuai Pauanui to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Targeting youth interests when developing new facilities, shops and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Tairua Hikuai Pauanui area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilising modern marketing systems and youth focused promotion when presenting youth targeted activities.</li> <li>○ Involving youth in the planning and implementation of new developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Tairua Hikuai Pauanui developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase opportunities for young people to get</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>ahead in life, become more connected, independent and financially sound, and ensure their skills remain in our district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Invest in new developments that improve young people's access to activities that excite them and enable them to foster skills in what they are passionate about, and that encourage people to come to the area.</li> <li>○ Advocate that new retail opportunities consider youth as a target market when setting up in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Submitter notes that the most cited things [from responses to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013 in the Tairua Hikuai Paunui area] that youth would change to make the Tairua Pauanui Hikuai area better for youth was 'more youth focused clothing shops'.</p> <p>Submitter acknowledged some of the great things the Council is doing and noted that they would like to see Council continue to support these and other initiatives, including support to local youth centres / spaces.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 218</a> Darian Lunjevich-West, Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus - Thames [Submitter addressed submission to the Thames Community Board] Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the Thames area, informed by responses from local youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The most cited things [from responses to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013 in the Thames area] that impact youth in the Thames area includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not enough youth focused shops, activities,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>and good facilities available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Offer more youth focused activities:</li> <li>○ More community events like other towns had (Paeroa Battle of the Streets, Beach Hop, Coro Gold, and Celtic Fair).</li> <li>● Improve retail options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More youth focused clothing and interest shops - skate/surf, menswear, Glasson's, Valley Girl, Jay Jays, and Cotton On and science shops and Spotlight.</li> <li>○ Thames Mall - bigger, more exciting, take it off the market, stop shops from leaving, increase opening hours, and lower the rent.</li> <li>○ More food outlets - fast food, café's, Carts Jnr, Burger King, Kiwi Yo, juice bars, lolly shops, pizza parlours, and Burger Fuel.</li> <li>○ Open a Z gas station.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More employment.</li> <li>○ More free WIFI hotspots and fast broadband.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● In order to improve Thames to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Targeting youth interests when developing new facilities, shops and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Thames area it is suggested that consideration be made towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilising modern marketing systems and youth focused promotion when presenting youth targeted activities.</li> <li>○ Involving youth in the planning and implementation of new developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Thames developments it is</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase opportunities for young people to get ahead in life, become more connected, independent and financially sound, and ensure their skills remain in our district.</li> <li>○ Invest in new developments that improve young people's access to activities that excite them and enable them to foster skills in what they are passionate about, and that encourage people to come to the area.</li> <li>○ Advocate that new retail opportunities consider youth as a target market when setting up in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Submitter notes that one of the most cited things [in the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013] that youth would change in Thames to better support youth was to have more youth focused clothing shops.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_225</a> Hannah Palmer, Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus - Whangamata [Submitter addressed submission to the Whangamata Community Board] Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the Whangamata area, informed by responses from local youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Offer more youth focused activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More community events.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Better access to free WIFI hotspots and fast broadband.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Improve retail options. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More food outlets - KFC, McDonalds.</li> <li>○ More youth focused shops available.</li> <li>○ Build a mall or shopping centre.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company/ Organisation	Submitter comment	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to improve Whangamata to make it more youth friendly it is recommended that efforts are put into:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Targeting youth interests when developing new facilities, shops and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When putting projects in place to address issues impacting youth in the Whangamata area it is suggested that consideration be made towards:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilising modern marketing systems and youth focused promotion when presenting youth targeted activities.</li> <li>○ Involving youth in the planning and implementation of new developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Whangamata developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase opportunities for young people to get ahead in life, become more connected, independent and financially sound, and ensure their skills remain in our district.</li> <li>○ Invest in new developments that improve young people's access to activities that excite them and enable them to foster skills in what they are passionate about, and that encourage people to come to the area.</li> <li>○ Advocate that new retail opportunities consider youth as a target market when setting up in the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Whangamata Youth Forum would strongly like to advocate for more WIFI hotspots around town. Submitter notes that the most cited things [from the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013] that youth would change in Whangamata to better support youth would be for more new developments.</p>		





## 8.9 Activity: Coastal and Hazard Management

D Full Name Company / Organisation	General Comment: Coastal and Hazard Management - Further comments on the Coastal and Hazard Management activity.	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_017 June Spalding	<p>I have enclosed photos from Rangī Point, Hokianga as an idea which may serve as a temporary barrier for sea erosion at the eastern end of Cooks Beach towards Purangi.</p> <p>The photos were taken up close but from a distance the barrier doesn't look too bad, and could be camouflaged by planting inside the tyres.</p> <p>[Submitter has attached three photos showing the tyre barrier.]</p>	<p>Council is in the process of obtaining a resource consent for remedial works on the Purangi end reserve of Cooks Beach affected by coastal erosion.</p>	<p>That Council thank the submitter and note that it is in the process of obtaining resource consents to address the adverse effects of coastal erosion on the Purangi end reserve of Cooks Beach.</p>
LTP15_138 Lesley McCormick Robinson Road Harbour Foreshore Group	<p><b>Issue:</b> The harbour edge bank that borders the Robinson Road walkway reserve and our properties from Lovers Rock to the Waterways entrance is eroding at an alarming rate, and we want to work with Council to provide a long term sustainable solution to halt the erosion and rebuild the bank.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The canal entrance to the Waterways development runs parallel to the harbour edge and when the canal was first constructed in the early 2000's the canal was as close as 20mtrs from the harbour edge along the estuary reserve. On average the canal is between 50 and 80mtrs max from the edge. With the increasing number of boat movements we have greater harbour/wake wash.</p> <p>Much of the bank has eroded with many trees and jetties undermined. Photographic evidence is available. Several of the residents have raised concerns about the erosion with Council officers but no action has been taken.</p> <p>It is now time for Council to focus on this popular reserve and walkway to take the opportunity to work with the neighbours to come up with a long term solution.</p> <p>The harbour edge erosion cannot continue to be ignored as the number of boats in the Waterways</p>	<p>Solutions for this area can be investigated and potentially actions (subject to funding and Council approval) as part of the wider coastal erosion work underway within the Whitianga Coastal Erosion Action Plan process. It should be noted that higher priority, high erosion 'hotspots' are the current priority for example Brophys Beach, Buffalo Beach, Whangapoua and Cooks Beach</p>	<p>That Council staff continue to investigate and where appropriate implement actions to address coastal erosion in the Robinson Road area and surrounds as per the Whitianga Coastal Erosion Action Plan</p>

D Full Name Company / Organisation	General Comment: Coastal and Hazard Management - Further comments on the Coastal and Hazard Management activity.	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>continue to increase so does the erosion. <b>Decision Sought:</b> There are a number of options that we want Council to action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enforcement of the 5 knot speed limit for all boats in the harbour, with particular emphasis on the canal from "Lovers Rock" to the Waterways entrance. The speed limit drops to 3 knots at the canal.</li> <li>2. Meet with the residents on-site to develop a plan to rebuild the banks. We believe a program of sand replenishment along with compaction, contouring and re-vegetation is required. Sand dredging occurs on a regular basis in Whitianga harbour and we want these dredging's utilised to restore the harbour bank and secure the walkway.</li> <li>3. Apply funding to progress the proposed work.</li> <li>4. Continue to monitor the erosion and remedial work in communication with the working group of residents.</li> </ol> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The erosion of the Robinson Road harbour estuary bank adjacent to the houses has been increasing in recent years as the number of boat movements to and from waterways canals increases. Speed of these vessels as they travel up the harbour to their anchorage is not policed therefore skippers do not stick to the speed limit of 5 knots with the resulting wakes eroding the banks. Residents adjacent to the reserve are seeing plants erode, holes forming in the ground and the bank fall into the harbour. We want to restore the harbour edge, secure the bank, and re-vegetate the area.</p>		
LTP15_203	Why is nothing been done about the continuing loss of	Council is in the process of obtaining a	That Council note the submitter's

<b>D Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>General Comment: Coastal and Hazard Management - Further comments on the Coastal and Hazard Management activity.</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Beverley Ross	beach front at Brophys? It is now extremely difficult to get down on to the sand. I have no interest in paying for special walkways and rail bike trails. It would make more sense to try and stop beach erosion. What we already have with Hot Water Beach, Cathedral Cove and lovely beaches etc. is what people visit for.	resource consent to address the effects of coastal erosion on Brophys Beach	comments and advises that it is in the process of obtaining resource consents to address the effects of coastal erosion on Brophys Beach.
LTP15_217 Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	Initiate and realise more marine reserves, or create local government equivalent marine reserves.	Council does not administer the Marine Reserves Act 1971. This function lies with the Department of Conservation; neither does Council have regulatory functions in the coastal marine area.	That Council note the submitters' request and directs them to discuss the issue with either the Department of Conservation or the Waikato Regional Council.
LTP15_229 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	[Submitter addressed submission to the Mercury Bay Community Board.] Provide a healthier environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stop the erosion of the beach frontage and swimming areas.</li></ul>	The Mercury Bay Community Board has identified coastal hotspots and has adopted a programme to address the effects of coastal erosion including the building, where appropriate, of seawalls to protect public infrastructure and high value amenity areas	That Council note the submitter's request and notes that the Mercury Bay Community Board has adopted a programme to address the effects of coastal erosion at selected hotspots including, where appropriate and after obtaining a resource consent, sea walls.
LTP15_310 Anna Horne	Is there budget for sea level rise mitigation? Should Whangamata be moved? Climate change is costly - need a policy and budget for this.	Council is required by the Resource Management Act and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to address the long-term effects of climate change induced sea level rise. District Plan and infrastructure planning budgets recognise the need to provide for and incorporate climate change mitigation strategies in associated work programmes.	That Council note that it is required by the Resource Management Act and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to address the long-term effects of climate change induced sea level rise. District Plan and infrastructure planning budgets recognise the need to provide for and incorporate climate change mitigation strategies in associated work programmes.
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers and	15. Coastal and Harbour Erosion Funding Our Association requests that funding be included in the LTP Why?	The Eastern Seaboard Coastal Management Plan has been completed and awaits endorsement by	That Council note the submission and makes no changes to the LTP.

D Full Name Company / Organisation	General Comment: Coastal and Hazard Management - Further comments on the Coastal and Hazard Management activity.	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Residents Association	<p>a) Mayor Leach has acknowledged that erosion is one of the biggest issues related to the Peninsula b) Ministers of the Crown have identified during Treaty negotiations, that Pauanui specifically is an erosion zone.</p> <p>c) Health and Safety issues are being ignored as no action is being taken to remedy dangerous 4—5 metre ocean beach dune drop offs (sheer dune faces) that have been created by erosion.</p> <p>d) Health and Safety issues are being ignored as a recent storm driven dune wave breach was very close to inundating a beach front property due to dune erosion.</p> <p>e) Health and Safety issues - Beach Access ways are not being properly maintained to an acceptable standard. Inadequate and short term repair is undertaken by using sand taken directly from the dune adjacent to an access way (thus increasing the dune damage) to make repairs when sand ladders are undermined by wave action. Beach access ways should be constructed at a 45 degree angle from the esplanade down to the beach level and be less than 1m in width. Current perpendicular sand ladders are requiring too much maintenance and many have timber slats that are too widely spaced for safety. Our association believes that with community input a cost effective, lower maintenance design can be achieved.</p> <p>f) Property and amenity values could be jeopardised by no implementation of any erosion control programme.</p> <p>g) Health and Safety issues- Royal Billy Point Boat Ramp Silting. This council maintained facility is constantly rendered unusable due to wind/water borne sand that has been eroded from the Ocean Beach. In the event of an emergency, launching of the Coastguard Boat located there would have been impossible due to sand build up. Concerns from our Association, the Coastguard and Local Harbour Master</p>	<p>the Community Boards (June 2015).</p> <p>Funding of this activity will be managed through local budgets which are reflected in the LTP, this includes storm damage and emergency works associated with weather events. With reference to item e) staff will be addressing the structured access ways to undertake improvements where identified as necessary.</p> <p>Council instruct staff to explore the possibilities of increasing the consent volume of 100m<sup>3</sup> of sand removal at any one time to up to 300m<sup>3</sup> at any one time to ensure that Royal Billy Boat ramp and access to open water does not impede Coast Guard or other emergency services and continues to provide recreational access for Pauanui residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>Staff are also asked to investigate the possibilities of introducing a trailer boat parking fee for Royal Billy Boat Ramp users to ensure sufficient funds are available throughout the year to maintain the required access and sand removal.</p> <p>Staff do not recommend that Council consider Royal Billy Point sand maintenance to be district funded. Note the Community Board approved \$350,000 in the 2017/18 year of the 2015 LTP to upgrade the Royal Billy</p>	<p>That Council endorse the staff recommendations.</p>

D Full Name Company / Organisation	General Comment: Coastal and Hazard Management - Further comments on the Coastal and Hazard Management activity.	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>and accompanying correspondence have been relayed to TCDC. None of the aforementioned parties wish to see a water fatality occurring due to lack of ramp maintenance and request that urgent attention is given to addressing this issue.</p> <p>A working group in Pauanui consisting of TCDC Staff, Coastal Scientist Jim Dahm, Community Board Members and Local Residents has been established to provide a long term erosion strategy for Pauanui. Despite this and the issues listed above, no funding has been allocated in the LTP to prevent, remedy and manage erosion as it occurs.</p>	Boat Ramp area.	
LTP15_331 Deborah Brown	<p><b>Recognise and acknowledge our vulnerabilities</b> and plan how we can ameliorate the impacts. How are you going to deal with properties build on sand and exposed to coastal erosion? High levels of flooding? Who is going to pay?</p>	Council is working with east coast communities to identify hotspot locations and to develop strategies to address the coastal management issues at each location.	That Council note the submitter's concern and notes that the East Coast Coromandel community boards have adopted a programme to address the effects of coastal erosion at selected hotspots. Community consultation will include how preferred options will be paid for.
LTP15_344 Cath Wallace	Please provide for sea level rise planning as well as storm surges and other climate change related issues.	Council is required by the Resource Management Act and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to address the long-term effects of climate change induced sea level rise. District Plan and infrastructure planning budgets recognise the need to provide for and incorporate climate change mitigation strategies in associated work programmes.	That Council note that it is required by the Resource Management Act and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to address the long-term effects of climate change induced sea level rise. District Plan and infrastructure planning budgets recognise the need to provide for and incorporate climate change mitigation strategies in associated work programmes.
LTP15_345 Alastair Brickell	Pg. 16 'Visitors and Growth'. "...coastal settlements are vulnerable to sea level rise...". Where is the evidence for this sea level rise that is supposedly threatening our coastal settlements? If there is no	Council is required by the Resource Management Act and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to address the long-term effects of climate change induced	That Council note that it is required by the Resource Management Act and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement to address the long-term effects of

<b>D Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>General Comment: Coastal and Hazard Management - Further comments on the Coastal and Hazard Management activity.</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	problem why endlessly waste time and effort worrying about it.	sea level rise. District Plan and infrastructure planning budgets recognise the need to provide for and incorporate climate change mitigation strategies in associated work programmes.	climate change induced sea level rise.

## 8.10 Activity: Grants and Remissions

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">LTP15_271</a> Jenny Wolf</p>	<p>At last year's TCDC District Plan submission round Age Concern Thames wrote highlighting the services Age Concern provides, our Thames office establishment and development over the recent two years. Katina Conomos was a key link from TCDC and a keen supporter of what Age Concern Thames provides as a means to implementing aspects of TCDC's Positive Ageing Strategy.</p> <p>As a result of our submission we received a positive letter from TCDC (see enclosed) addressed to the Service Co-ordinator of Age Concern Thames. Since our submission we have further progressed the standalone establishment of Age Concern Thames and have a well-established Accredited Visitor Service in Thames (entirely run on volunteers) and have since started Accredited Visitor Services in Whitianga and are focussing on Coromandel. Our services (based from Thames office) cover the TCDC and Hauraki District Council areas.</p> <p>We write this letter to highlight the valuable service we believe we provide primarily through volunteer co-ordination to far reaching isolated communities across the TCDC area. We continue to develop these support services. We originally wrote in 2014 seeking financial support for our Service Co-ordination function within the community and wrote in our original letter that we propose a 3 year commitment from TCDC to the value of 25% of our operating costs equating to \$13,315 per annum.</p> <p>We understand Community Boards may play a stronger role in funding allocation for local communities however point out that our services cover a number of towns within the TCDC area and respectfully request you give consideration to supporting us through a "top slice" or "across TCDC" fund. It would seem pointless to approach a number of individual Community Boards for services we provide across the entire district.</p>	<p>This is a new funding project.</p> <p>Age Concern has been seeking a three year SLA from council since 2014, and submitted on the 2014/15 Annual Plan to this effect. At that time the council gave an undertaking to work with Age Concern on a closer relationship, though a SLA, no specific funding was agreed to.</p> <p>Since their 2014 submission they progressed the standalone establishment of Age Concern Thames and have a well-established Accredited Visitor Service in Thames (entirely run on volunteers) and have since started Accredited Visitor Services in Whitianga and are focussing on Coromandel. Their Thames-based services cover the TCDC and HDC areas.</p> <p>The existing activity with budget for this grant, Social Development, is not included in the proposed 2015-25 Long Term Plan. The general direction of council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model.</p> <p>Budget provision has only been made to accommodate the current district funded grants.</p> <p>Should council wish to establish a new district</p>	<p>No change</p>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		grant, interim measures may need to be explored.	
<p>LTP15_181 Carlene Carmichael Coromandel Community Library Inc</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the Coromandel-Colville Community Board, via the Council, renews the Coromandel Service Agreement as it ceases on 30 June 2015. The submitter requests that this renewal begins on 1 July 2015 with the same conditions apart from the grant, which should be increased to \$10,000 per annum.</p> <p>Submitter state that they are shocked to learn that it is Council's intention to reduce the library grant to an unworkable amount of \$6,000, and they question whether this severe reduction is intended to penalise them for our successful management as volunteers, or to devalue the library with the intention to downsize.</p> <p>Submitter states that there is no doubt that the library is a success story, and the unique way we operate and manage so effectively and efficiently on a yearly budget of under \$18,000, including the grant, amazes people. The allocated amount documented by Council for the library was \$44,954, a debatable figure given that apart from the grant, rates etc; no maintenance has been carried out on the building in years, nor has it required any. Compare that amount with the \$100,000 plus costs for the District Libraries.</p> <p>Submitter describes various ways in which the budget requirements have been kept costs down despite rising costs due to the importance of a library to a community's well-being.</p> <p>The submitter states that they will continue to provide the service the community deserves, with specific targets in mind to achieve good outcomes. What the submitter will not do is go beyond what they are capable of doing as volunteers and requests that the Council does not take volunteers for granted.</p>	<p>Great work is done by volunteers at the library and the Library is operated in an efficient and successful manner.</p> <p>The decrease of the grant in the service level agreement from \$10,000 to \$6,000 was initially in response to actions being taken by the library board in dropping their subscriptions from \$20 per annum to \$15 per annum, on the basis that the user pays contribution to the activity should be maximised and ratepayer subsidisation through a general rate should be secondary to this user pays contribution.</p> <p>However, on the basis that surpluses are being applied to maintenance and improvements of the service being provided, the grant should remain at \$10,000. This is consistent with the Coromandel-Colville Community Board's recommendations.</p> <p>In the 2014/15 year the grant was \$12,000. The draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan reduced this to \$6,000, so the \$10,000 which is recommended is a reduction in the Library funding of \$2,000 per annum from the 2014/15 year.</p>	<p>That the grant in the Coromandel Library service level agreement be increased from \$6,000 to \$10,000, at an additional cost of approximately \$1.81 per year per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area.</p> <p>[Also noted under Funding Requests in main report]</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_356</a> Margaret</p>	<p>2015/16 (Library) 2017/18 - The Board proposes to increase the Coromandel Library grant to \$10K per year for the next three years. - The Community</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Harrison Coromandel- Colville Community Board	Board acknowledges the benefits received by the community from this fully volunteer run service and does not wish to see this vital community service jeopardised due to a shortfall in funding.		
LTP15_331 Deborah Brown	Submitter requests that measures are taken to strengthen and support our libraries due to the growing trend to rely on the internet as our knowledge base. Submitter states that it is important to recognise that we do not have control over the servers where this information is stored and that the much of this information is not manifest in the real world.	The Coromandel Library, while run independently from Council, receives funding from Council through a service level agreement. The Coromandel Library is currently working on a historic local collection.	No change
<a href="#">LTP15_288</a> Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council	WRC requests that the following proposals within the LTP be further considered as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We note Enviroschools funding has been cut but it is our understanding that funding may be obtained through community boards. We are concerned this may affect the long term stability of funding and the efficiencies of maintaining funding relationships with both your council and schools. WRC has valued and appreciated the positive partnership created by working together to successfully implement the Enviroschools programme for the past six years and acknowledge TCDC's funding contribution of \$11,000 pa.</li> </ul>	Submitters request that TCDC continue to allocate \$11,000 to the Enviroschools programme. Submitters noted the value they see in the Enviroschool programme for participating students and school communities within the Thames-Coromandel district.  The programme provides Professional Development for teachers through staff meetings, teacher workshops, networking, bus trips to other Enviroschools and through one to one support with their facilitator. It also provides funding for student workshops, support, and events where students are able to share their learning and action around sustainability in creative ways. Currently there are 11 Enviroschools in the Thames Coromandel District.	
<a href="#">LTP15_362</a> Anke Nieschmidt The Enviroschools Foundation	The Enviroschools Programme has a proven track record of being an effective approach for engaging schools and communities in environmental and social action. With the backbone support of The Enviroschools Foundation, and a network of councils around the country, the programme catalyses learning and action among thousands of young people, their families and communities from early childhood to secondary school. By connecting and coordinating resources and people, openly building and sharing knowledge across communities, widespread action is enabled on a broad scale. As a funder, the partnership with Enviroschools provides TCDC with multiple points of leverage across the Thames--Coromandel	Submitters were concerned that the future requirement to apply for funding through individual community boards would divert	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>community, extending the possible impact of its funding beyond what might be expected with a more traditional approach. Our requests of the TCDC are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current funding of \$11,000 per annum for the facilitation of your local Enviroschools is maintained in the Long Term Plan 2015--2025.</li> <li>• A staff member is identified to hold the overview of the Enviroschools partnership and liaise with the Enviroschools Regional Coordinator.</li> </ul>	<p>teacher time from delivering the programme into increased administration and put the long term stability of funding for the programme at an increased risk.</p> <p>The existing activity with budget for this grant, [2012 activity where this funding came from], is not included in the proposed 2015-25 Long Term Plan. The general direction of council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15 143</a> Ms Rebecca Dove</p>	<p>I have read through the 2015 - 2025 Long Term Plan for the Thames Coromandel District and have seen no mention of the Enviroschools Programme in it, however I have been informed by Leigh Robcke (my liaison person at TCDC) that it has been proposed that the funding for Enviroschools will move from the central District Council to Community Boards.</p> <p>I believe this will have a detrimental effect on the sustainability of the programme as it means we would have to apply to the separate Community Boards for funding and it would be up to each board whether they deemed it worthy to fund. Through this process I fear that some schools/centres may lose their funding. I also think that being funded by 6 different community boards rather than one central fund will create a lot more admin and thus reducing the hours available for practical work in schools with teachers and students.</p> <p>I feel strongly about sustaining the Enviroschools Programme for the next 10 years in Thames-Coromandel area. As a facilitator I see the huge value of the programme to teachers who need support with delivering environmental education in their schools and for the students who, through the kaupapa/principles of this programme, are empowered to make change, firstly in their own lives and schools and then in the wider community. I am constantly hearing about the ripple effect of the sustainable practices students are developing at school being carried back to their homes.</p> <p>The programme provides Professional Development for teachers through staff meetings, teacher workshops, networking, bus trips to other enviroschools and through one to one support with their facilitator. We also provide student workshops, support, and events where they are able to share their learning and action around sustainability in creative ways.</p> <p>Currently there are 11 Enviroschools in the Thames Coromandel District with</p>	<p>While provision has been made to accommodate grants which are currently district funded within Community Board budgets, these have not been factored into 2015/16 budgets and there will likely be a transition period where funding is not available for existing district funded grants.</p> <p>Should council wish to continue supporting the existing district grants, or to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored.</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>some of them working towards a reflection this year. If there is to be a change of funding bodies then I would ask that there is a transition phase where schools aren't abandoned mid-year. Schools, such as Opoutere school, are working towards reflecting at a Green-Gold level by the end of the year and I would hate to see their support suspended during this time.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 326</a> Shelley Johnson St Francis School</p>	<p>My submission relates to the on-going centralised funding of the EnviroSchools facilitator in this area as the importance and relevance of her work to this district is paramount to our school and other schools and education centres throughout the Peninsula. The facilitator for the last 5 years in this area is Beccy Dove.</p> <p>It is so important that students learn about caring for our planet and know that they can take action that contributes to this. We have been empowered to do this with the support of the facilitator who has worked with the whole staff, led student meetings and been involved with the students on many occasions with hands- on projects in the school and around the community.</p> <p>We have enjoyed over five years of being involved in the Enviro-Schools movement, and have recently been awarded Silver enviro- schools status. From 2011 the students have led a vision for the school that has seen a steady improvement in actions to make our school and town a more sustainable community. We have enhanced and beautified our environment and been involved in wider community projects. As our facilitator's work is also backed by funding and support from the Waikato Regional Council, we have enjoyed the opportunity to be involved with the wider Waikato Enviro-Schools family with days visiting other schools and attending workshops.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 113</a> The Coromandel Heritage Trust The Coromandel Heritage Trust</p>	<p>Request for funding for a proportion of the operational costs of The Treasury and/or for salaries</p> <p>The Coromandel Heritage Trust has established an archive and family research centre which is a key facility in Thames, the Grahamstown Historic Precinct and in the entire Thames Coromandel District. The Centre has been, and is still, currently run by approximately 70 enthusiastic and dedicated volunteers but there is now a pressing need to have a full time qualified archivist and a curator who have the expertise to properly record, preserve and repair the valuable documents and records that have been donated by local families and businesses for safe and secure storage.</p>	<p>Submitter requests funds for proportion of The Treasury's operational costs, including the possibility of funding for a qualified archivist. Submitter discusses the volunteer nature of The Treasury to date and outlines the work of those volunteers.</p> <p>Council has provided periodic funding to the Coromandel Heritage Trust over the last 10 years, to a total of approximately \$143,910.</p>	<p>That staff investigate transferring externally housed Council archives to The Treasury to provide a revenue stream and support a local organisation over</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Many local and international heritage enthusiasts, genealogists and researchers visit The Treasury and The Trust requests that allocation be made in the Ten Year Plan for funding for a proportion of the operational costs of The Treasury and/or for salaries to enable The Trust to employ qualified staff to ensure the continuity and high standards that are required for recognised archival repositories.</p> <p>With an archivist and curator in place The Trust is able to seek national recognition of the Archive and this will have a long term benefit for the District in that it will encourage more visitors and add to the economic opportunities of the area. In this way The Trust believes that the provision of funding will enhance the Council outcomes for a prosperous economy.</p>	<p>This funding excludes the allocation of Council budgets for the purchase of property and contributions for restoration and refurbishment costs. The Thames Community Board granted an initial \$25,000 from its Urban General Purpose Reserves Fund, while subsequent funding has also been from district budgets. Funding of \$100,000 from Lotteries was contributed in 2007, to go to external restoration costs of the Carnegie building. Conditions were attached, including that the Coromandel Heritage Trust raise at least \$200,000 from other non-Council sources (which they did). The Trust was given a 30 year lease in 2007, providing the Trust contributed \$113,000 to the restoration cost of the building and with other conditions attached including that the Trust cover building maintenance costs. Subsequent funding has been less significant, and includes approximately \$20,000 from grants (for example for heritage events advertising, HRV installation), and approximately \$280 for research. Council has also paid for room hire several times.</p>	<p>an out of region business.</p> <p>That the Coromandel Heritage Trust be referred to the Thames Community Board for local grant funding.</p>
<p><a href="#">RFIN_176</a> Chris Stark</p>	<p>I understand heritage funding, is also being shifted over to Community Board's discretion. I would like to be reassured that this funding will still be available to the local community. Our Heritage is a valuable economic and cultural asset to this community in particular, and the peninsula in general. It should be treated as such, and not subject to the personal whims of whoever is making a decision on what or how much this is funded. - I would like to see the reinstatement of the 2008 provision for heritage protection and management.</p>	<p>Submitter requests the reinstatement of the natural and cultural heritage activity.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15_363</a> Keith</p>	<p>Waikato East Life Education Trust would like to make a verbal Submission to Thames Coromandel District Council Long Term Plan, to thank them for</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No recommendation</p>

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission points</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Trembath Waikato East Life Education Trust	their past and future support.		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>Youth Collectives, Youth Forums and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>We would like to acknowledge some of the great things the Council is doing and we would like to see Council continue to support these and other initiatives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Youth Development Partnership Fund administrator.</li> </ul>	<p>Submitters have requested council fund or appoint an administrator for the Ministry of Youth Development (MYD) Partnership Fund. The MYD Partnership Fund provides for MYD, territorial authorities and youth to work together on youth citizenship projects, and may provide between \$10,000.00 and \$70,000.00 to a territorial authority to support these projects. The funding period runs from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016 and the project must be completed in this time.</p> <p>Appointment of an administrator from TCDC for the partnership fund may be either a new position with other responsibilities, or to provide resources for an existing position to manage engagement with MYD and youth on a project on behalf of council.</p> <p>The current review of Community Development Officers may provide an opportunity to provide support for an existing position to be responsible administering this fund, should council and youth from the district put a project forward for funding.</p>	<p>That the Thames-Coromandel District Council investigate appointing a community development officer to administer the Ministry of Youth Development Partnership Fund.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">RREM 41</a> <a href="#">RFIN 179</a> Glenn Horsley</p>	<p><b>Background</b> On 1 August 2011 the Thames Squash Club received a letter (attachment A) from Council advising that an additional \$2,700 per year was required from the Club. The reason, to pay wastewater charges for toilets located within the Squash Club building (4 toilets and 2 urinals). Upon receiving this letter the Club wrote to His Worship the Mayor (attachment B) seeking a waiver for the additional wastewater charges.</p> <p>The Club was advised by Mayor Leach in September 2011 (attachment C) to address this issue to the Thames Community Board as <i>"...I am hopeful that changes to current policy can be made before the next rateable year."</i></p> <p>The Club subsequently wrote to the Thames Community Board (attachment D) and attended the public forum at their 17 October 2011 meeting. At the meeting Squash Club members received a sympathetic hearing from the Board and there was discussion along the lines that the Board would be advocating for some sort of differential to apply to community sport and recreation clubs to help off-set the additional costs of the targeted wastewater charges.</p> <p><b>Reasons for this submission</b> As we noted in the Club's letter to Mayor Leach:  - The Thames Squash Club provides a recreational facility, open to all members/people within the community at reasonable rates. This helps deliver health and community benefits (eg. Vibrancy, robustness, etc) at no cost to the ratepayer. - There are already significant operating, maintenance and compliance costs associated with owning and running community based sport and recreation facility - which are currently funded by Club members, as no cost to the ratepayer. - If there were no community sport and recreation clubs, chances are there would be requests from the community for the Council to provide/contribute to the type of facilities already being provided - again at no cost to the ratepayer. - The majority of our 120 odd members live locally, within Thames, and already pay for District wide wastewater services. - These are very tough economic times and additional costs cannot just be absorbed, or passed on.</p> <p>We submit that having healthy and viable community sport and recreation clubs adds considerably to the strength and viability of communities. Without community sport and recreation clubs it will be even more difficult to attract and retain young people and families within our communities. We submit that community sport and recreation clubs are very important in terms of facilitating/encouraging economic development at the local level.</p> <p>On 5 September 2012 the Squash Club wrote to the Council advising that the</p>	<p>Submitter requests remission for pan tax over the past four years.  Submitter notes that the Thames Squash club has been in operation for over 40 years and is not council funded.  Submitter notes that the Squash Club cannot afford to pay an annual pan tax of \$2,700 and is unable to pay the backdated pan taxes of \$10,000.  Submitter requests that the wastewater charge be waived.</p> <p>The Thames Squash Club is not the only community sporting/not-for-profit organisation that has overdue pan taxes, for example, Thames Rugby Club is in a similar situation. This issue has been ongoing for a number of years and is still unresolved, and in the meantime the overdue pan taxes continue to increase which is a reasonable concern to the organisations concerned.</p> <p>Further investigations are required for Council to review all the relevant issues and determine its policy position. Investigations are suggested to happen in the 2015/16 year.</p>	<p>That Council undertake further investigations in 2015/16 including review and determination of Council's policy position in relation to overdue pan taxes for community sporting / not-for-profit organisations.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p> <p>13-15 May 2015</p>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15 344</a> Cath Wallace	Please pay for [rates remission on covenanted land, such as those covered by QEII covenants] by removing the subsidies to economic activity such as the Coromandel Sugar loaf Development for the aquaculture industry;	Submitter requests rates remissions for land covered by conservation covenants.  Rates remissions are already available for land subject to QEII covenants.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15 231</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund school books and other gear.</li> </ul>	Out of scope for Council funding.	
<a href="#">LTP15 336</a> Vikki Bertram Sport Waikato	District Coordinator Role Sport Waikato requests the Thames-Coromandel District council continue to fund the salary and overheads of the District Coordinator in the Thames-Coromandel District for \$82,633.18 plus CPI per year for three years.	Submitter requests on-going funding for Sport Waikato to fund the district sports coordinator. Council has to date been satisfied with this service and considers its continuation to be valuable.	That Council confirms the budget of \$82,633.18 plus CPI increases per year for three years to Sport Waikato to fund a district coordinator in the Thames-Coromandel District from district-funded grants budget.

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15 254</a> Trust Waikato	<p>The Board also notes its support of the <b>Trust Waikato Hot Water Beach Lifeguard</b> Service and suggests to the Council the need for permanent life saving facilities at the Beach, given the extraordinarily high visitor and rescue numbers. As it has done previously, the Trust Board expresses an interest in collaborating with TCDC to assist in this development.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests permanent lifesaving facilities at Hot Water Beach given high visitor and rescue numbers.</p>	
<a href="#">LTP15 129</a> Mr Chris Emmett SLSNZ	<p>[Submitter requests funding of \$132,000.00 in years 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 for surf lifesaving services at Hot Water Beach, Tairua, Pauanui, Onemana, and Whangamata over peak summer periods.]</p>	<p>Surf Lifesaving New Zealand provides a valuable regional surf lifesaving service at key Coromandel beaches throughout the busy summer period, including at Hot Water Beach, Tairua, Pauanui, Onemana and Whangamata North and South main beaches. This service spans three Community Board areas.</p> <p>Surf Life Saving New Zealand is responsible for and supplies the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recruitment, appointment and human resource management related to this service along with any transportation of personnel and equipment.</li> <li>2. Supply of rescue and first aid equipment, IRB's (inflatable rescue boats), communication equipment at locations where a SLSNZ affiliated Club is located.</li> <li>3. Supply of Clubrooms for administering first aid, storage of all equipment, and staff requirements at locations here where a SLSNZ affiliated Club is located.</li> </ol> <p>They also provide a written report to council following contract completion which includes patrol statistics, rescues performed over the contract period and recommendation to improve the safety of beach goers.</p> <p>The existing activity with budget for this grant, [2012 Activity where this funding came from], is</p>	<p>That Council confirms the budget of \$132,000 per year for three years to Surf Lifesaving New Zealand to fund surf lifesaving services at Hot Water Beach, Tairua, Pauanui, Onemana, and Whangamata over peak summer periods from district-funded grants budget.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>not included in the proposed 2015-25 Long Term Plan. The general direction of council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model.</p> <p>While provision has been made to accommodate grants which are currently district funded within Community Board budgets, these have not been factored into 2015/16 budgets and there will likely be a transition period where funding is not available for existing district funded grants.</p> <p>Should council wish to continue supporting the existing district grants, or to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored.</p>	
<p>LTP15_129 Mr Chris Emmett SLSNZ</p>	<p>Submitter requests \$9,000.00 per year for years 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 to extend surf lifesaving services at Hot Water Beach to cover all of March in each of these years.</p> <p>Submitter requests \$7,800.00 per year for years 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 to extend surf lifesaving services at Whangamata Wharf to cover the three week period from 25 December to 10 January in each of these three years.</p> <p>Submitter requests \$4,000.00 per year for years 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 to extend surf lifesaving services at Whangamata Main Beach to include midweek periods up until Waitangi weekend in each of the three years.</p> <p>Submitter requests \$5,300.00 in 2015/16 to extend surf lifesaving services at both Tairua and Pauanui beaches through cover a later Auckland Anniversary Weekend in 2016, on 30 January - 1 February, and the anticipated extended</p>	<p>Funding for the regional life guard service is district.</p> <p>Staff recommend that Council approve the requested base funding for Surf Life Saving New Zealand, and refer the specific requests for additional life guard services to the relevant Community Boards for consideration via the Community Grants or discretionary funding pool.</p> <p>Surf Lifesaving New Zealand have asked for a total of \$26,200 in the year 2015/16 and \$20,800 in the years 2016/17, and 2017/18 to extend existing services.</p> <p>Surf Lifesaving New Zealand have separately</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>holiday period at the locations.</p>	<p>asked for \$132,000.00 across the years 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18 to cover their current lifesaving service across the district (seven locations on the east coast of the peninsula).</p> <p>Should Community Boards be unwilling or unable to fund these additional services in their areas, council may wish to fund the additional services at a district level alongside the base funding for existing services from the grants and remissions activity.</p> <p>The request for additional funding of services at Hot Water Beach is separately supported by Trust Waikato, who also fund lifesaving services at Hot Water Beach.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15 279</a> Arthur Hinds</p>	<p>We are also concerned that it appears that the TCDC has removed the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity stream as the LTP has been reviewed. This we believe, has serious implications for the funding that was provided for the Biodiversity Forum on an annual basis. This forum plays an essential role in providing information to and linking with community groups through the Waikato region. Without these community groups biodiversity values will decline putting at risk even more of our native species. The Whenuakite Kiwi Care group believes that it is essential that the TCDC continues to support the work of the Biodiversity Forum as we believe its previous record speaks for itself. In our view ratepayers get extremely good value from the \$3000:00 that the TCDC contributes. Bearing in mind that volunteers do the bulk of the conservation work in this area- our group puts in 1800 hours of volunteer time per annum-and as Al Morrison - the previous Director General of DOC stated " for every \$1 put into conservation volunteers add \$4 to \$5 we consider that we get very good value from the Biodiversity Forum. We request that funding for the Biodiversity Forum be continued.</p>	<p>Submitters noted that the Waikato Biodiversity Forum provides important support to their environmental organisations, through providing information, education on biodiversity programmes, pest management advice, technical support and linking with community groups throughout the Waikato.</p> <p>Submitters noted that given the relatively modest amount which council provides to the Waikato Biodiversity Forum - \$3,000.00 per annum - Coromandel based environmental groups receive good value for money in the services which they in turn receive from the Forum.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15 323</a></p>	<p>The Forum submits for the continued financial support of Enviroschools. This</p>	<p>Submitters argue that should this funding to the</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Moria Cursey Waikato Biodiversity Forum	is a positive way of educating young people in environmental and conservation values and providing a link with schools on planting projects that the Council undertakes on its reserves around the Peninsula. The Forum submits to continue the Councils annual \$3,000 plus (GST) contribution so that the ratepayers of the Coromandel have access to support and advice.	Forum not continue, it may compromise their services and by extension volunteer conservation efforts on the peninsula, which submitters note supplement the efforts of government and local government immensely.	
<a href="#">LTP15 325</a> Alison Smith Coromandel Kauri Dieback Forum	Support for Waikato Biodiversity Forum Action sought: The \$3000 per year currently allocated towards the operation of the Waikato Biodiversity Forum on the Coromandel Peninsula should/must be reinstated.	The existing activity with budget for this grant, Natural and Cultural Heritage, is not included in the proposed 2015-25 Long Term Plan. The general direction of council has been to move grant funding from district funding sources to local ones, consistent with the local empowerment model.	
<a href="#">LTP15 289</a> Natalie Collicott Moehau Environment Group	Moehau Environment Group was disappointed to find no mention of the Natural and Cultural Heritage activity stream in the draft Long Term Plan for the Coromandel. Council used to contribute \$3000 annually under this activity towards the Waikato Biodiversity Forum. We want support for the Forum to continue.	While provision has been made to accommodate grants which are currently district funded within Community Board budgets, these have not been factored into 2015/16 budgets and there will likely be a transition period where funding is not available for existing district funded grants.	
<a href="#">LTP15 352</a> Alison Henry Kauri Trust 2000	Kauri 2000 notes that there is no reference to a Natural and Cultural Heritage activity stream, a review of the Biodiversity Strategy, or support for the Waikato Biodiversity Forum in the TCDC review of the Long Term Plan (LTP). 1. <b>We support</b> the need for the Natural and Cultural activity stream to remain (there is no reference to this activity stream in the LTP document) <b>We support</b> the TCDC contribution of \$3000 to the Waikato Biodiversity Forum. <b>Reasons:</b> 1. TCDC has established an economic development committee to focus on the key drivers for economic development of the district. Tourism is one of the major economic drivers. 2. Underpinning all economic and tourism activities lies the landscape and natural values of this Peninsula. A sound and workable biodiversity strategy is key to both protection and the sustainable use of land under TCDC's care. Allocation of funds for a Natural and Cultural activity stream based on the biodiversity strategy is essential if tourism is to remain a key economic driver. It is also the natural values of this Peninsula that would underpin any potential for the Coromandel to become a Heritage Region. Any such moves for this to happen would be futile without	Should council wish to continue supporting the existing district grants, or to establish a new district grant, interim measures may need to be explored.	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>visible support for the natural values of the area. 3. The discovery of the unwanted organism, kauri dieback disease (Phytophthora taxon agathis - PTA) on the Coromandel Peninsula requires management and action by all landowners. TCDC must set aside a budget to instigate a plan for both preventing the spread of the disease and to manage infection of kauri on its land should be identified. 4. Kauri 2000 is one of many conservation groups that rely on the information and support the Waikato Biodiversity Forum provides. We have been extremely well served by this forum and have been particularly grateful for their services since the discovery of Kauri Dieback Disease on the Peninsula. The Forum's reach to an extensive network has been invaluable in the dissemination of information regarding the threat this unwanted organism is to the iconic kauri stands of the Coromandel. The Forum's service also extends to the benefits regulatory bodies (including TCDC) and private individuals. TCDC has provided \$3000 annually as a contribution to this work. The TCDC district is a biodiversity hotspot with the natural values of the peninsula underpinning the tourism industry. A contribution of \$3000 is of great importance to the continuance of the Forum's work. We strongly recommend that the financial support of \$3000 annually to the Waikato Biodiversity Forum continues.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_254</a> Trust Waikato</p>	<p>The Board also asks the Thames Coromandel District Council to consider further the results of the sport and creative facilities infrastructure plans, completed in 2014. The <i>Waikato Regional Sports Facilities Plan</i> and the <i>Waikato Creative Infrastructure Plan</i> represent an opportunity to collaborate, to bring parties together, and to develop and deliver the sports and creative facilities our communities need.</p>	<p>In 2014 Trust Waikato worked with territorial authorities across the Waikato to develop the Waikato Regional Sports Facilities and Waikato Creative Infrastructure plans. These plans set out the state of sports and creative infrastructure in the region and encourage regional collaboration in identifying and developing regional focussed infrastructure to better support sports and creativity within the communities of the region.</p> <p>Implementation of these plans requires further collaboration, including at political level, on how best to develop a regional network of sports and creative infrastructure that provides high</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15_336</a> Vikki Bertram Sport Waikato</p>	<p>Summary: Recommendations and Requests ♣ Regional Sports Facilities Plan Sport Waikato request that the Thames-Coromandel District Council support a proportional contribution for the delivery of the Regional Sports Facilities Plan - shared across district councils throughout the region. With a total annual value of \$100K + GST the proportional contribution for Thames-Coromandel District Council equates to \$9,570+ GST per year for three years.</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>quality services and opportunities across the region while achieving cost efficiencies through strategic placing of this infrastructure.</p> <p>Sport Waikato requests that Council contribute \$9,750+GST each year for three years to support delivery of the Regional Sports Facilities Plan.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Provide financial support to the Whitianga Youth Centre / Space so they can offer a safe place for youth to socialise and access education and support services.</p>	<p>Submitter requests funding to support the Whitianga Youth Centre.</p>	<p>That Council advise the submitter to apply to the Mercury Bay Community Board for funding for a Whitianga Youth Centre.</p>

### 8.11 Activity: Water supply

Submitter	Submission points on the water supply activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_288 Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council	<b>Submitter</b> supports the inclusion of funds to resource water efficiency measures.	Staff support further development of water efficiency measures. Water conservation and demand management is an integral part of water supply management.  The District Water Strategy is due to be completed during the current (2014/15) financial year and will be adopted in the 2015/16 financial year. In the interim, work is continuing to investigate current demand.	That Council instructs staff to continue and finalise the water strategy and undertakes the demand management initiatives in the 2015/16 financial year, which will form part of the strategy.
LTP15_255 Mr Evan Penny	Submitter supports Council's Water Conservation and Demand Management project, and suggests that water metering is an effective way on delivering this and advocates for a user pays system. Submitter notes that those on a lower income could spread the cost of the installation over water rates over a number of years.	Water Conservation and Demand Management is an integral part of water supply management. Council is currently in the process of finalising the District Water Strategy. This strategy will look at all the measures available for demand management and their effectiveness for each township on the district. Some of the initiatives being investigated are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Meters</li> <li>• Different charging structures</li> <li>• Low flow fittings</li> <li>• Incentivising the use of tanks and personal water sources for outdoor use</li> <li>• Individual tanks for new developments</li> <li>• Grey water reuse systems.</li> </ul> <p>Though the implementation of the district water strategy, effective and efficient management of our water supplies is possible.</p>	
LTP15_255 Mr Evan Penny	Submitter suggests that the use of water meters could also be used as a basis to charge for sewage rather than counting pans.	Charging for wastewater though the water supply meter is common practice, however not undertaken currently by TCDC. Charging structure options are being assessed as part of the District Water Strategy.	That staff are instructed to consider the inclusion of charging for wastewater via the property water supply meter as an



Submitter	Submission points on the water supply activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
			initiative in the District Water Strategy.
LTP15_288 Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council	Submitter requests that Council ensures that sufficient funds exist for further investigations into long term and sustainable community water supply systems, particularly for the rural Thames and Matatoki communities.	The investigation phase of the Thames South Water project is completed. The implementation of the preferred option is now underway. This option will take a number of years to implement.	That Council retain the Water Supply Renewals and Thames South Water projects.
LTP15_346 Ms Kay Kristensen Population Health, Waikato District Heath Board	Submitter states that compliance with the DWSNZ05/08 is essential to ensure that consumers are provided with potable drinking-water. This is likely to reduce the prevalence of water borne illnesses. Insufficient information has been provided in the plan to determine whether all TCDC owned drinking-water supplies will be planned for upgrading to meet the DWSNZ05/08. For example it is unclear whether Thames South and Manuka Place water supply cover the registered water area of Thames valley and Matatoki drinking-water supplies and what the upgrades will include. Submitter recommends further consideration is given to ensuring that all TCDC owned drinking-water supplies are planned to comply with the DWSNZ05/08.	All of the Council owned and operated water supplies are programmed for upgrade to meet the DWSNZ05/08, except for the Thames South supplies (Matatoki and Thames Valley). The Thames South supplies are predominately for agricultural use. The townships residents and the Council have determined that to upgrade the supplies to DWSNZ05/08 would not be affordable for the Council or the local ratepayers.  All other supplies upgrades have been prioritised to spread the financial burden over a number of years. The upgrades will ensure that the supplies comply with the DWSNZ05/08 standard.	That Council retain funding to upgrade the district's water treatment plants to comply with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand (2005 Revised 2008) and if deemed affordable, Council reprioritise the upgrades to commence sooner.
LTP15_346 Ms Kay Kristensen Population Health, Waikato District Heath Board	Population Health commends council's actions to take over ownership of private water supplies and connect these supplies to council supplies, to improve security, quality and safety of the drinking-water supply. It is noted in the Mayor's message in the beginning of the Consultation document, that there are no major infrastructure plans for drinking-water plants. This seems to contradict the proposed drinking-water treatment plant upgrades to meet the DWSNZ05/08. TCDC has not provided sufficient information for comment on this matter.	Council does not intend to take ownership for all private water supplies on the district. One of these Area of Benefit extensions has been undertaken in Whitianga due to the close proximity to the Council supply and the willingness for all residents to pay development contributions when connecting.  The upgrade of water treatment plants in the Mayor's message is in relation to capacity upgrades. All water treatment plants have sufficient capacity to meet requirements of projected growth. All supplies (other than Thames South) will need to be upgraded to comply with the DWSNZ05/08.	That Council retain funding to upgrade the district's water treatment plants to comply with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand (2005 Revised 2008) and if deemed affordable, Council reprioritise the upgrades to commence sooner.

Submitter	Submission points on the water supply activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
			<p>That staff are instructed to continue to assess expanding areas of benefit on a case by case basis as per the draft Long Term Plan.</p>
<p>LTP15_346 Ms Kay Kristensen Population Health, Waikato District Heath Board</p>	<p>Submitter strongly supports Council's intention to upgrade its drinking-water supplies to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008) (DWSNZ05/08). Submitter <b>strongly recommends</b> that council reconsider the prioritisation of the drinking-water supplies upgrade to meet compliance with the DWSNZ05/08. For example, the plan proposes to upgrade Thames drinking-water supply in 2016/17. Submitter has information concerning this supply which indicates that the plant has the potential to comply with the DWSNZ05/08, whereas, Whangamata drinking-water treatment systems are inadequate and serve a large resident and even larger transient population, especially during summer months.</p>	<p>All of the Council owned and operated water supplies are programmed for upgrade to meet the DWSNZ05/08, except for the Thames South supplies (Matatoki and Thames Valley). The Thames South supplies are predominately for agricultural use. The townships residents and the Council have determined that to upgrade the supplies to DWSNZ05/08 would not be affordable for the Council or the local ratepayers.</p> <p>All other supplies upgrades have been prioritised to spread the financial burden over a number of years. The upgrades will ensure that the supplies comply with the DWSNZ05/08 standard.</p>	<p>That Council retain funding to upgrade the district's water treatment plants to comply with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand (2005 Revised 2008) and if deemed affordable, Council reprioritise the upgrades to commence sooner.</p>
<p>LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers and Residents Association</p>	<p>Submitter requests that funding be bought forward from the deferred timeframe of 2020/21 as indicated in the draft Long Term Plan to address the drinking water supply upgrade. Submitter states that this issue is of highest significance within both the resident and non-resident community and requests urgent consideration.</p>	<p>All of the Council owned and operated water supplies are programmed for upgrade to meet the DWSNZ05/08, except for the Thames South supplies (Matatoki and Thames Valley).</p> <p>All other supplies upgrades have been prioritised to spread the financial burden over a number of years. The upgrades will ensure that the supplies comply with the DWSNZ05/08 standard.</p>	<p>That Council retain funding to upgrade the district's water treatment plants to comply with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand (2005 Revised 2008) and if deemed affordable, Council reprioritise the upgrades to commence sooner.</p>

Submitter	Submission points on the water supply activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_64 Mrs Stephanie Dodd	Submitter requests that Council construct additional reservoirs/s to deal with the issues during summer with the mains water supply in Tairua.	Water restrictions have been in place in Tairua since late 2014. These restrictions have been in place due to weather affecting the treatment plant's ability to treat water, and also Waikato Regional Council resource consent conditions have reduce the take from what was permitted in previous years.  The treatment plant is unable to treat water from its two sources during and directly after heavy rain events. When these rain events occur, the water in the sources becomes very turbid and the treatment plant throughput is reduced significantly. A number of these events have been observed in Tairua over the past few months.  The Tairua supply is currently going through a re-consenting process with the Waikato Regional Council. This process has met some unexpected delays and has resulted in the supply volumes being temporarily reduced. This reduction in consented supply volume has required Council to implement water restrictions. These restrictions are a means of limiting demand to assist with meeting the requirements in the resource consents.  The renewed resource consents are due to be granted in the coming months. Once the consents are granted construction can commence on a new intake structure (River Bank Filtration) that will be consented for a larger supply volume and will not be as affected by rain events.	No change.
LTP15_87 Mr John Haycock	Submitter queried as to why despite not allowing applications for water collection reservoirs to be installed, heavy water use restrictions are still in place every summer in Tairua.		
LTP15_140 Susan and Anthony Jacobs	Submitter expressed concern that there is no information available on the issues on water supply in Tairua and requests that Council increase storage capacity to prevent lengthy summer water restrictions.		
LTP15_168 Michael Newton	Submitter commented that the water supply is poor. [Submitter is based in Tairua.]		
LTP15_108 Margaret Browne	Submitter queried as to why water restrictions go on for so long. [Submitter is based in Tairua.]		
LTP15_167 Marie Newton	Submitter states that the Tairua water supply is very inadequate and that the ban on hose use this summer is ridiculous considering that it has rained.		
LTP15_318 Tairua Residents and Ratepayers Ass	Submitter expressed concern that there is no information available on the issues on water supply in Tairua and requests that Council increase storage capacity to prevent lengthy summer water restrictions.		
LTP15_324 Gloria Rennie	Submitter requests that Council construct additional reservoirs/s to deal with the issues during summer with the mains water supply in Tairua. Submitter noted that if all ratepayers lived in Pauanui permanently there would be insufficient water supply and that rates are being collected to provide basic services that are not in place. Submitter referenced plans to construct a dam for \$1.1 million which would have solved the issue but that the plan was replaced in favour of a combined system with Pauanui, resulting in rate rises without addressing the problem. Because of the water supply issues, submitter questions what would happen if there was a major fire.		

Submitter	Submission points on the water supply activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_339 Bob Renton Tairua- Pauanui Community Board</p>	<p>Submitter has the following questions about the water supply issues in Tairua and Pauanui and requests that the Council provides the following information to the Tairua-Pauanui Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why has the funding allocated to address water restrictions been removed from the Ten Year Plan, and what are the long term plans to address the supply issue?</li> <li>- Pepe Stream project 2014/2015, - will this project be completed this financial year and what additional capacity will it provide as a % of the current supply levels?</li> <li>- The proposed Water Demand Strategy will take many years to implement and provide any additional supply benefits. How is the current supply shortage issue going to be addressed?</li> <li>- The Long Term Plan Consultation Document states that the Pauanui aquifer reconfiguration will provide additional water supply for Pauanui. What will be the % of increased supply and when will this work commence?</li> </ul>	<p>The long term water supply strategy for Tairua and Pauanui is centred on more efficient use of the resource and also implementing revised consent conditions to allow adequate volumes of water to be supplied during peak times.</p> <p>In Tairua the key change is around the consenting of an additional water take in the river bank filtration in the Pepe Stream. The Pepe Stream project was intended to be completed in the 2014/15 financial year however, due to consenting delays, these works will now be undertaken in the 2015/16 financial year. This project, along with consenting changes, will provide up to an additional 18% to the current supply volumes.</p> <p>The District Water Strategy is due to be completed during the current (2014/15) financial year and will be adopted in the 2015/16 financial year. In the interim, work is continuing to investigate current demand.</p> <p>Work on the Pauanui Aquifer reconfiguration is underway and will be completed during the 2014/15 financial year. This project, along with consenting changes, will allow for an increase in supply of up to 34% and will also provide a number of operational efficiencies.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>LTP15_339 Bob Renton Tairua- Pauanui Community Board</p>	<p>Submitter requests that Council provide the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board the current drinking water test results and proof that this water has been treated to an acceptable standard for the Pauanui and Tairua communities. Submitter notes that the last two Long Term Plans have had millions of dollars allocated for the upgrade of the Tairua water treatment plant a new plant being installed in Pauanui.</p>	<p>This is an operational issue that is currently be addressed by staff directly with the submitter and the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>LTP15_218 Darlan Lunjevich- West</p>	<p>Submitter requests that chlorine not be put in the town water supply.</p>	<p>To maintain public health and ensure that Thames water supply is safe for human consumption, Chlorine treatment is required. Chlorine is used to treat the water at the water treatment plant. A residual amount</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submitter	Submission points on the water supply activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network		of chlorine is required to stay in the water to make sure the water remains safe to drink once it has passed through reservoirs and pipes.	
LTP15_92 Jane Beck	Submitter opposes fluoridation of water in Thames because it is unsafe and not in line with the rest of the district.	In December 2014, Council made a decision to hold a binding referendum in the second half of 2015 to determine whether or not the Thames water supply will continue to have fluoride added. This is outside of the scope of the Long Term Plan.	No change.
LTP15_288 Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council	Submitter requests that Council ensures that sufficient funds exist to ensure that TCDC water treatment plants to comply with consent conditions.	The funding that has been proposed (over multiple operational budgets) in the Long Term Plan is sufficient to operate the district's water treatment plants within consent requirements.	That Council retain all operation budgets to ensure compliant operation of the district's water treatment plants.

## 8.12 Activity: Stormwater

Submitter	Comments on the Stormwater activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_44 Mr Rodd Ganley	Submitter supports the \$739k which has been allocated to remedy the stormwater problems in Sarah Ave, Whitianga in 2016/2017, but requests that it be moved forward to provide protection to the affected properties.	Significant investigation works have been undertaken on this project over the past six months. Staff request that funding is retained in 2016/17 to allow time to develop a business case and final design.	No change.
LTP15_269 John Rennie	<p>Submitter expressed serious doubts about drainage efficacy even without future development due to the ponding area in the surplus land has being destroyed by NZTA. Submitter states that it is certain that the only solution to a drainage problem, made worse by NZTA's works, would be to install a high capacity flood pump fitted into Area A near the Southern floodgate and Area A will need to be dug out to the invert of the main K drain (K8).</p> <p>Submitter estimates that cost as \$3 million dollars which should be paid for by NZTA and not landowners, and it is required NOW, not 2022/23 and asks whether the Thames Community Board been advised of their faults list against NZTA &amp; BECA.</p> <p>Submitter feels that a flood which we have not had up until now, due to low rainfall in the June 2014 storm and the Pam cyclone which did not affect Kopu. The relative rainfall on these dates were: 40mm &amp; 50mm respectively. The latter falling as soft rain over 12 hours and the former over 3 hours with the tide full out over the rainfall of 3 hours. There are already too many properties untenanted and a flood will get Kopu a bad name.</p>	<p>TCDC has included a project in the LTP in 2022/23 for consideration of the installation of a stormwater pump station in Kopu if it is required. Further investigations that include hydraulic modelling are also required. This analysis will help with determining the current stormwater issues and potential solutions such as a stormwater pump station.</p> <p>TCDC has also made a submission to WRC's LTP to request they work with TCDC to continue investigating options around stormwater improvements in the Kopu area to allow future development. This may include retention of an upgraded floodgate or a pump station, or a combination of these.</p> <p>On-going operations and maintenance of the Kopu stormwater network is being proactively undertaken to reduce the likelihood of a flooding event.</p>	No change.
LTP15_269 John Rennie	Submitter agrees with the linking of Kopu to Totara with General Industrial Zonings and states that it is over very suitable land (with a good floodgate existing) but improvements to draining & detention of stormwater is essential together with the need for TCDC to install the road linking Kopu to Totara, otherwise the development will not occur due to the myriad of land ownership over	TCDC has included a project in the LTP for consideration of the installation of a stormwater pump station in Kopu if it is required. Further investigations that include hydraulic modelling are also required. This analysis will help with determining the current stormwater issues and potential solutions such as a stormwater pump station.	No change.

Submitter	Comments on the Stormwater activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>the route. The fast development of Pokeno has stolen a march on Thames. Submitter estimates the cost of drains and roading at \$3 million for the northern section. Roading levies will be pay-back. Submitter states that Council's proposed costs for these developments are insufficient in amounts of money and late in application. Submitter hopes we are proved wrong about floods, that if we cannot, natural rain events will prove us right.</p> <p>Submitter supports the expansion of industrial zoning to the north; as we are for commercial zoning to the south. Submitter states that they have spent the last two years obtaining a written guarantee, from TCDC, that before development is allowed, the drainage is sorted out, due to NZTA's intentions merely to extract money from its surplus land after the new bridge works. This is in writing from the Minister of Transport, he is conveniently overlooking the deception of it on its "as built" plan.</p> <p>Submitter will seek to present its, &amp; TCDC's, sins to the Board at its next meeting in case Council are unaware of them. It is of no use inviting new business into the area if we are presenting them with a guaranteed hazardous situation from stormwater. This is why a flood pump is essential now, because of NZTA's actions which have destroyed our ponding area at Kopu South. Submitter has lent their hydrologist to TCDC but his report is not available to them at this date. Submitter is sure he will confirm their basic knowledge of Kopu's problems and their remedy.</p>	<p>TCDC has also made a submission to WRC's LTP to request they work with TCDC to continue investigating options around stormwater improvements in the Kopu area to allow future development. This may include retention of an upgraded floodgate or a pump station, or a combination of these.</p> <p>On-going operations and maintenance of the Kopu stormwater network is being proactively undertaken to reduce the likelihood of a flooding event.</p>	
<p>LTP15_50 Richard Northey</p>	<p>Submitter requests that there be improved stormwater management at 2550 - 2600 Wyuna Bay Road. The existing holding tank does not have sufficient capacity and frequent major storms fill it, bursts its lid and washes away the submitter's gravel driveway - seven occasions in the last twelve years. Submitter suggests</p>	<p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board has requested that the issue be investigated and reported back to the Board.</p>	<p>That Council instructs staff to investigate the stormwater issue at 2550-2600 Wyuna Bay Road and report back to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board.</p>

Submitter	Comments on the Stormwater activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	that the stormwater holding tank either needs to be replicated on the other side of the road or replaced by one with at least three times its current capacity.		
LTP15_357 Kopu Development Group	Submitter agrees with the proposed plans relating to the Kopu area.	Support is appreciated for the Kopu project.	No change.
LTP15_261 Mark Alloway	Submitter requests that Council put covers in at the water outfall and cover in trench at Buffalo Beach Reserve.	This issue has been assessed previously. Due to consenting conditions and maintenance issues, the status quo has been considered the best option.	No change.



### 8.13 Activity: Solid Waste

Submitter	Submitter Comments on the Solid Waste activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_259 Paul Kelly Mercury Bay Community Board</p>	<p>Whitianga Refuse Transfer Station The Mercury Bay Community Board recognises the need for an upgraded refuse transfer facility within the Mercury Bay Area</p>	<p>The council currently has a project underway for moving the RTS site from its current location on South Highway to Moewai Road. Plans for this site are underway to include 24hr drop off centre where customers can drop off recycling and approved refuse bags. There are also plans to implement a reuse centre to remove items that are salvageable and reusable. The new site will also have its usual disposal facilities for refuse and greenwaste.</p>	<p>That Council direct staff to work with the Mercury Bay Community Board on the design and development of the Whitianga Refuse Transfer Station in the 2015/16 year.</p>
<p>LTP15_9 Jill Barke APL Property Rotorua Ltd</p>	<p>The submitter requests a review of rating policy relating to solid waste disposal as it relates to the Pacific Rise Apartments located at 105 Aickin Road, Whangamata apartments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the service provided by TCDC for the removal of solid waste does not meet the requirements of the Pacific Rise Apartments.</li> <li>• As many of the units are rented out as holiday accommodation, leaving full rubbish bags in the basement until the next available collection by TCDC is unsanitary and attracts pests.</li> <li>• The committee of the Pacific Rise Apartments has approved the installation of secure bins for the disposal of solid waste and this system is working very well in keeping the property clear of rubbish and free of pests. The cost to the Pacific Rise Apartments for the disposal of solid waste is between approximately \$90 and \$500 per month dependant on occupancy at the apartments. We believe it is extremely unfair the unit owners are paying twice for the disposal of solid waste and the service provided</li> </ul>	<p>It is unusual for apartment blocks to have a council collection. Generally body corporates organise private collections as it is unsuitable to have large numbers of wheelie bins crates and refuse bags placed on the kerbside outside apartment blocks.</p> <p>In this case the apartment complex has unit titles (thereby each separate residence is treated as a separate rating unit) the charge is applicable and TCDC do not have provision within the remission policy for the charge to be remitted.</p> <p>The scale and impact of any change requires further analysis.</p>	<p>That Council instructs staff to review the rating policy for solid waste in relation to multi-unit dwellings and bring forward recommendations as part of the 2016-2017 Annual Plan.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Comments on the Solid Waste activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>by TCDC is completely inadequate for their needs. The submitter requests TCDC implement a policy to provide for a rebate on rates paid by ratepayers when the ratepayer arranges for the disposal of their own solid waste.</p> <p>In support of the submission the submitter cites Rotorua Lakes Council which allows for a part rebate of rubbish disposal costs to ratepayers if they ratepayer applies in writing to the Council and requests the service stop. The rebate takes affect from the next round of rates billing.</p>		
<p>LTP15_99 Ms Louise Deane</p>	<p>The submitter requests that the Council promote and provide the facilities for recycling in public spaces and at events. Events provide a great opportunity to educate about recycling. These initiatives would encourage a recycling ethos and result in a reduction in waste to landfill and reduce costs to the ratepayer.</p> <p>The submitter asks that Council continue to give support to community recycling initiatives; to include public space recycling in future town waste collection contracts and support the contractor in meeting these aims; and to use Council media to promote effective recycling in public spaces. This would fit with the public's perception of the "clean green" Coromandel and align with the Council by-line of "the Coromandel being New Zealand's most desirable places to live, work and visit".</p>	<p>This would require monitoring of the recycling bins during the event which would be a significant cost. The most effective way to do this is to place an instruction on Event permits that they must provide recycling facilities and monitoring services to ensure recycling bins are not contaminated. Also, the council already provides recycling services for public areas: Beaches Libraries TCDC Refuse Transfer Stations - Recycling and refuse. TCDC Schools - zero waste. TCDC Schools - Paper 4 Trees.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_179 Beverly Woods</p>	<p>Area concerned: Responsibility for refuse when special events are held in Thames- Coromandel District Council area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On Waitangi Day there are recycling bins for different purposes placed there by the organisers of the event. I have been involved in monitoring of the bins as a member of an NGO.</li> <li>• At the end of the day there was no rubbish to be dealt with.</li> <li>• Point one - does the TCDC have a similar arrangement</li> </ul>	<p>This would require monitoring of the recycling bins during the event which would be a significant cost to the ratepayer.</p> <p>The most effective way to do this is to place an instruction on event permits that the organisers must provide recycling stations and monitoring services to ensure</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submitter	Submitter Comments on the Solid Waste activity	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>with all organisers of special events? i.e. Do the organisers have to take responsibility for the refuse? Is there a bond?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Point two - if there is no specific arrangement this is a submission to ask that TCDC instigate a system whereby organisers of special public events are made responsible for all refuse. I do not wish to be heard on this matter but would like a reply as to the present situation and what might need to be done.</li> </ul>	<p>recycling bins are not contaminated.</p> <p>Also, the Council already provides recycling services for many events such as the following: Peak Period Beach Hop Christmas Parades</p>	
<p>LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network LTP15_218 Darian Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network LTP15_229 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>[Submitter addressed submission to the Whangamata Community Board] Provide a healthier environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove rubbish and pollution from the community. Clean up the beaches. Whangamata submission particularly highlighted swimming areas and reserves.</li> </ul>	<p>Kerbside collections are carried out weekly and fortnightly by Smart Environmental Limited (SEL).</p> <p>Council compliance officers and SEL work hand in hand to ensure illegally dumped rubbish or fly tipping are investigated and collected.</p> <p>Street cleaning is carried out by SEL and Downer, each contractor is responsible for the cleaning of State Highways and Local arterial roads.</p> <p>Beach cleaning is also carried out by SEL parks and from time to time is cleaned by community groups and volunteers as part of the Community cleaning project used to raise the awareness of keeping our most vulnerable places clean and free of litter.</p>	<p>No change</p>

**8.14 All other submissions**

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">LTP15_345</a> Alastair Brickell</p>	<p>Why on earth is TCDC continuing to produce the glossy “Summer Magazine” each year. There are a plethora of similar publications produced every year by commercial operators...there is no need for TCDC to compete with them. As a volunteer in the Coromandel Town Information Centre I know that very, very few visitors are willing to pay \$5 for this when there are several free publications that have the same or better information.</p>	<p>The cost. The total cost to make this magazine was \$35,000, funded from our allocated Communications and Economic Development budget. Breaking that down the cost is roughly \$3 per absentee ratepayer. Graphic Design \$9,000 We used a local graphic designer based in Whangamata Print \$26,000 (17,000 copies) Postage \$9,000 13,000 were wrapped and mailed to our absentee ratepayers. We had to manually go through our rates database, so please excuse us if you got more than one copy in the mail. This will be down to human error. If you did get posted extras please pass one on to the others on your property title. Distribution \$1,500 1500 were sent to hospitality/accommodation providers through Jason's. A further 2500 copies have been distributed out to our Council offices, libraries, i-sites and information centres. If someone can show they are a local ratepayer they can grab a copy free of charge. Otherwise it is a \$5 purchase. Total cost <u>\$45,000</u> This has been offset by \$6,500 advertising. We are also selling the magazine for \$5 a copy at our libraries, i-sites, information</p>	<p>No change</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>centres, council offices and selected retail outlets (petrol stations). Is it worth it? Absolutely! Just to give you an example - if we were to do any messaging/advertising (to encourage people to come to the Coromandel) in a publication the NZ Herald we'd be looking at just \$8,000 for a quarter page ad. Summertimes will be around and relevant from November through to Easter next year so we are getting more value for money and targeting our specific audiences. Also, \$3 per non-resident ratepayer is a pretty cost-effective way to say thank you to those have invested in the Coromandel. We organised a survey both last year and this year to get feedback about Summertimes which was sent out for public feedback. Overwhelmingly in both surveys the comments were people supported the magazine and were happy with the spend/outcomes.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15_233</a> Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>We would like to acknowledge some of the great things the Council is doing and we would like to see Council continue to support these and other initiatives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support to local youth centres / spaces.</li> <li>• Community Development Officers youth focus.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No action required</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_125</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We appreciate that there have been major changes to the</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No action required</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Mr John Rive Whangamata Ratepayers Association	<p>Council, the Council staff, and the way things are now being done compared with the bad old days of the previous regime. However, there are a significant number of major wastewater and water projects in particular across the peninsula.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Eastern Seaboard Wastewater Plants loom large in the ratepayer memory banks and the Mercury Bay Sports Project still has its problems.</li> <li>• We trust that there are no repeats of the past problems.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15_221</a> Gordon Coates	More efficiency - Less bureaucracy - Once democracy- Now dictatorship!	Comments noted	No action required
<a href="#">LTP15_95</a> Mrs Erin Watt	<p>It is interesting to read in the Consultation Document that 55% of property owners reside outside of the TCDC area. However, in no way did the community engagement programme reflect this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The document loaded to the website for viewing was 32MB and not at all suitable for downloading or viewing online, therefore limiting access.</li> <li>2. The community meetings to discuss the proposals were all scheduled in daytime hours (12 noon or 1pm) Monday - Friday. There was no allowance for ratepayers living outside of the district to attend either an evening meeting or a weekend meeting. Given that Easter and the Beach Hop fell in the middle of the submission period these would have been perfect opportunities to capture a target audience.</li> <li>3. As a non residential ratepayer we didn't receive any correspondence, until requested, about the process.</li> </ol>	<p>Non-resident ratepayers were included in the promotion material prior to consultation through our rates insert and local community newspapers over Easter when a large number of our absentee ratepayers were in the District.</p> <p>We also sent out regular updates through our electronic newsletters (5,000 subscribers which has a high number of absentee ratepayers on the list), promotion through bookabach, bachcare, trademe websites to capture ratepayers who advertise their properties as holiday homes and through our twitter feed and Facebook page which has a reach of up to 100,000 views.</p> <p>The rates insert is limited as a communication tool in that ratepayers who have already paid their rates in full or pay via direct debit do not receive the January rates mailout.</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>The initial Consultation Document loaded to the website was a large file. This was rectified within three days of consultation starting and has been noted in the lessons learned from the project.</p> <p>Staff did not receive any requests for more face to face meeting opportunities and the proposed timetable was shared with councillors for feedback.</p> <p>We had regular updates on our website throughout the consultation.</p>	
<p><a href="#">LTP15_288</a> Anthea Sayer Waikato Regional Council</p>	<p>Firstly, WRC would like to acknowledge the overall positive working relationship that exists between our organisations. This relationship is demonstrated by the progress being made over the last few years on key projects such as Grahams Creek, WW1 Memorial Forest and Cook Stream.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No action required</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_255</a> Mr Evan Penny</p>	<p><b>Essential Services:</b> With reservations I support identification of the five essential services, and the principles guiding the 30 year strategy. My reservations concern firstly fair treatment of communities who have recently fully funded their own essential services, and secondly ensuring that moving away from area of benefit funding to general rating is fair to those sectors of the community who are not serviced by all of the essential services. I note in this regard that there has never been any assistance for rural house owner for installation of their stand alone water supplies, storm water disposal or sewage systems. More of that under the funding discussion.</p> <p><b>1. Local government re-organisation.</b> There is already considerable cooperation and resource sharing between regional and territorial government in the Waikato. I support this, and adoption of any new initiatives where the regional council can more rationally and cost effectively do once what currently is done by thirteen separate district and city councils.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that those fully funded their own essential services - own water and wastewater - will be helping pay for the Council services with general rating.</p> <p>Will clarify to the submitter that the proposed change in funding from local to district for stormwater, as per other essential services, will not involve general rates - but funding by only the areas of benefit or those connected.</p> <p>Comments noted on re-organisation.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_347</a></p>	<p>Essential Services (Page 6) Good, and when local economic times are</p>	<p>Maintenance and repairs of our existing</p>	<p>No change</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Sid and Vicki Ovesen	tight, this is exactly what the council must focus on. However, what is missing, is the timely maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure. In the long term this will save the council money and time and build resilience into the council's core business.	infrastructure is budgeted within the long term plan. Further investigations of our underground assets over the next two years is required to confirm the priorities within the replacement programme. The investigations will also determine if the current replacement budget is sufficient.	
<a href="#">LTP15_226</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	[The submitter addressed submission to the Tairua-Pauanui-Hikuaui Community Board] Provide a healthier environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit commercial fishing.</li> </ul>	This is outside of the Council's responsibilities.	No change
<a href="#">LTP15_218</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network	[Submitter addressed submission to the Thames Community Board] Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the driver's license process easier.</li> </ul> Provide a healthier environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Become sustainable and self-reliant.</li> <li>• Protect the wildlife.</li> </ul>	Comments noted	No change
<a href="#">LTP15_217</a> Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provide mechanisms that support the early and significant life style patterns that are part of the District's cultural heritage. Communes, organic agriculture. Foster and promote such structures.</li> <li>- Establish a fundamental of respect for early Māori pre-European lifestyles. All headlands with pa sites be preserved and respected.</li> <li>- as a council policy ensure all properties Council owned are solar powered, to feed excess power generated back into the National grid.</li> <li>- TCDC should lead by example and ensure all land managed by</li> </ul>	Submitters all support greater sustainability initiatives be undertaken by the Council.  Some waste minimisation initiatives are supported through the waste minimisation levy funding and through Enviroschools funding.	No change



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	TCDC, that has waterways flowing through, have riverside planting.	No resources have been allocated to pursue these matters.	
<a href="#">LTP15_86</a> Tomoko Bruce	Ban plastic bags - this movement is already happening all over the world, including Waiheke Island and Waitakare as local example. Plastic bags kill marine life and choke our land, and they are made from fossil fuel. We could take steps, plastic bags swapped to biodegradable bags then promote people carrying own shopping bags. Creating natural material shopping bags are by-product of this movement, promote local economy and businesses.		
<a href="#">LTP15_77</a> Ms Samantha Claire	I believe that one of the most essential elements for long term development in Thames is a food strategy, in order to make locally grown food easily available to all who live here, travel in and through Thames. a just and sustainable food system will help to meet social, environmental, economic and health goals for the residents of this town. i hope that the council will continue to support projects like Thames be fruitful and the bright smile community gardens, and any and all other projects working towards growing fresh produce locally. it would be excellent to have a farmers market or other forum at which local growers can sell any surplus produce, and the councils endorsement of a "locally grown" label of some sort would be an excellent way to promote growing food in the district and keep money spent on food within the local economy.		
<a href="#">LTP15_96</a> Robyn Sinclair	I would like to see the council work towards several environmental initiatives including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a plastic bag ban</li> <li>- recycling in public places</li> <li>- future living skills workshops</li> <li>- better cycling infrastructure</li> <li>- more community gardens</li> <li>- a continuation of the Thames Be Fruitful project</li> </ul> Thames is a fantastic place to live, but we could be a lot more environmentally focussed too.		
<a href="#">LTP15_150</a>	I support greater TCDC assistance for householders to access		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Mark Skelding	<p>insulation and energy savings initiatives. having been involved in such a scheme, I know first-hand the benefits received.</p> <p>I support encouragement and facilitation of climate change resilience and transition positive re-localisation projects to build economic resilience and community across district. These would be trans-sectorial - i.e. social, environmental and art/cultural co-operation to raise awareness and achieve outcomes. For example:</p> <p>A particular focus on food production and supply would reduce food miles and build local industry and local identity. A "home-grown" scheme (on foodstuffs and in restaurants and shops) would cost little and create high visibility and awareness. Encouraging all communities of 750 people or more to establish and maintain community gardens would encourage food awareness, community cohesion, and re-establish vanishing skills. Encouraging retired people to share know-how and skills bridges the generation skills gap, enhances intergenerational understanding, and adds meaning and purpose to people's lives. Advancing community fruit tree and other growing projects (eg: community coppicing for fuel etc) complements community garden projects. maintenance can be achieved through working closely with rehabilitation and probation groups, as well as making use of community recycling programmes (e.g.: for mulch and compost).</p>		
<a href="#">LTP15 117</a> Ms Andrea Por	<p>In order to have a prosperous, clean and green district, Council members should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the districts future vision "Coromandel (green) heritage region" can mention environment and geographic location which are crucial to the overall experience of the Coromandel</li> <li>• a salt water swimming pool</li> <li>• Any future Council funded developments MUST demonstrate waste minimizing plans including recycling facilities: from construction phase all the way through to final use. Ex. Public toilet facilities, multisport facility and library improvement</li> <li>• All Council procurement processes should be based on best value rather than lowest cost (taking into account social, environmental impacts, etc.)</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local economic development projects should have to demonstrate and achieve a commitment towards minimizing waste.</li> <li>• Commit to working together towards a zero waste region:</li> </ul> <p>-To protect our communities, land, water and air from harmful and hazardous waste.</p> <p>-To encourage resource efficiency and beneficial reuse that creates sustainable, economic growth.</p> <p>I also agree with the following statements provided by Mark Skelding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>i support the provision of electric vehicle [EV] charge points in Thames and surrounds. at present, this major tourism destination has no provision for travellers in Evs.</i></li> <li>2. <i>cycling requires a higher profile in Thames and across the District. TCDC (with Hauraki District Council) should encourage and facilitate land-owners and land-managers to work with interest groups, industry, and volunteers to develop a network of cross country cycle tracks to connect the Hauraki RailTrailheads (Thames and Waihi) with the other 5 main centres on the peninsula. better cyclist provision (bike racks, cycle paths, cycle ways marked on roads etc) around the peninsula would add to the success of the District as a destination, and to the RailTrail as a visitor experience.</i></li> <li>3. <i>i support greater TCDC assistance for householders to access insulation and energy savings initiatives, <b>including provision of individual rain water barrels and composting buckets.</b></i></li> <li>4. <i>i support TCDC fulfilling its obligations to have clear and visible climate change planning that detail and acknowledge Government perceived maximum and minimum anticipated impacts over 15, 30, 50 and 100 years. these need to be available on the TCDC site, and to people contemplating developments on marginal or flood prone land, and showing how this is happening as part of a communication policy.</i></li> <li>5. <i>i support encouragement and facilitation of climate change resilience and transition positive relocalisation projects to build economic resilience and community across district. these</i></li> </ol>		

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submissions</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	<p><i>would be trans-sectorial - ie: social, environmental and art/cultural co-operation to raise awareness and achieve outcomes. for example:</i></p> <p><i>a particular focus on food production and supply would reduce food miles and build local industry and local identity. a "homegrown" scheme (eg: promotional label on foodstuffs and in restaurants and shops) would cost little and create high visibility and awareness of local food and specialities. encouraging all communities of 750 people or more to establish and maintain community gardens would encourage food awareness, community cohesion, and re-establish vanishing skills. encouraging retired people to share know-how and skills bridges the generation skills gap, enhances intergenerational understanding, and adds meaning and purpose to people's lives. advancing community fruit tree and other growing projects (eg: community coppicing for fuel etc) complements community garden projects. maintenance can be achieved through working closely with rehabilitation and probation groups, as well as making use of community recycling programs (eg: for mulch and compost). a focus on renewable and clean energy would be in line with the Urban Vision for Thames (2013) and provide opportunities for local employment, and to build energy resilience. encouraging businesses along Pollen Street to lay the foundations for a solar network would be a good start at no financial cost. having key council buildings fitted out with solar panels a focus on waste reduction through zero waste policy, developing recycling activities with local groups and Smart environmental (or similar), raising awareness on food waste, promoting composting programs at dumps and waste collection centres, increasing waste collection costs and using this to subsidise making composting and waste reduction "technology" available to householders.</i></p> <p><i>6. promoting local and district linked business association commitment to promoting local energy efficiency and generation, encouraging local food production, raising a "Taste Coromandel" profile (or similar), and showing how this is happening as part of a communication policy.</i></p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p><i>7. Extending a clear place in local governance conversation to tangata whenua, and showing how this is happening as part of its communication policy.</i></p> <p><i>8. Commit to Heritage as being about how we attend to our past AND future. On page 22, it says: " Another initiative being pursued as part of the Economic Development package is the potential for the Coromandel to become a Heritage Region. There are no project costs associated with this project as, in its conceptual stage, it will only require staff resource." however, this seems unlikely since i note the recent loss of TCDC paid and financed district heritage provision. this needs to be reinstated if we are to fulfill the promise of truly being "a heritage district".</i></p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_99</a> Ms Louise Deane</p>	<p>Please could Council support education for living sustainably in the future. This would cover waste minimisation, reduced consumption of energy and increased uptake of local renewable energy, healthy local food, and supporting the local economy. We would like the Council to support initiatives in this area such as the Future Living Skills programme (currently supported by 13 local councils including Auckland and Wellington), the Seagull Centre expansion proposed education space and workshops, and a possible future Envirocentre. This would involve Council working in partnership with community groups and private companies.</p> <p>We support Council in encouraging its own staff to attend a programme such as the Future Living Skills programme so that staff have more awareness of what needs to be considered in order to plan for the future. This would also support low income households as it has been shown that families where a member attends a programme, such as the Future Living Skills course, save about \$300 per year on their household bills.</p> <p>I support the establishment of an edible landscape around Thames with Council supporting the fruit tree programme and increasing the number of community gardens. This would benefit the health of low income families in the region and also help towards future resilience.</p> <p>I would like Council to support the establishment of a local solar power</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>supply for Thames and the set up of facilities for charging electric cars. I ask Council to support a plastic bag free Thames. Plastic bags are being recognised globally as an environmental hazard. For example Mexico City, Kenya, Rwanda, Italy, Toronto City and more than 100 local territorial authorities in the United States have banned the use of plastic bags altogether. The incorrect disposal of single use plastic bags (such as are provided by the majority of retailers) can lead to the death of sea life when ingested, or become unsightly rubbish along tourist routes. In addition to this, the bags require fossil fuel to produce.</p> <p>The idea of a plastic bag free town has been floated and is being pursued by several organisations in New Zealand (notably in Golden Bay and on Waiheke Island), and there are many opportunities for the Council to take a lead role in the implementation of a plastic bag ban in Thames. For example, helping to advertise a Plastic Bag Free day, promotion of alternatives such as Thames Market/Thames Coast branded canvas bags, and education at many levels as to why plastic bags should ultimately be replaced.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_355</a> Mark Skelding Transition Town Thames</p>	<p><b>Initiate a "Coromandel homegrown" scheme</b> Establishing promotional label on foodstuffs, in restaurant menus and in participating shops) would cost little to add into present foodstuffs health provision and create high visibility and awareness of local food and specialities. This label could be designed via a schools competition and applied for by local business and industry.</p> <p><b>Tangata Whenua:</b> T3 requests that tangata whenua be formally invited to be part of any community building projects along the lines of those described here and that proactive steps be taken to ensure that these initiatives are shared with the local tangata whenua community in ways that community leaders support.</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_355</a> Mark Skelding Transition Town Thames</p>	<p><b>Communication:</b> Expand the coverage given to TCDC activities via Hauraki Herald and online sources.</p> <p><b>T3 asks for the widespread advancement of community fruit tree</b></p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submissions	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p><b>and other growing projects (eg: community coppicing for fuel etc) in tandem with community garden projects.</b></p> <p><b>Promote and facilitate</b> fruit tree and garden maintenance can be achieved through working closely with rehabilitation and probation groups, as well as making use of community recycling programmes (eg: for mulch and compost).</p> <p><b>Assist in and support</b> the design and production of signage to allow residents to better understand care and harvesting needs of fruit trees.</p> <p><b>Encourage any communities of 750 people or more to establish and maintain community gardens and growing “berms” to encourage food awareness, community cohesion, and re-establish vanishing skills.</b></p> <p><b>Encourage</b> retired and non-working people to share know-how and skills. This will bridge the generation skills gap, enhance intergenerational understanding, and add meaning and purpose to people's lives.</p> <p><b>Facilitate community and schools groups to develop food growing, harvesting and processing skills.</b></p> <p><b>Fulfill its obligation to have clear and visible climate change planning in place.</b></p> <p><b>Demonstrate</b> NZ Government perceived maximum and minimum anticipated impacts over 15, 30, 50 and 100 years.</p> <p><b>Commence</b> community conversation about long term response to these issues – on the assumption that many responses can be achieved in ways that would be desirable anyway – eg: community building, etc etc.</p>		

## 9 Consultation Document proposals for local funded activities

### 9.1 Funding change from district to local

Over the last four years, the Council has examined all of its services and more explicitly recognised those that are primarily provided for the benefit of the local community. These services are funded locally which enables the diversity of the District to be provided for in the ways most appropriate to each community. Community Boards feed directly into the Council decision-making process to set local priorities for local services. As part of the broader review of service, public conveniences and cemeteries, two services which have previously been district funded, are now considered to be primarily for the benefit of the local communities. It is proposed that the net costs of these services are funded by each local community (after deducting user fees and charges).

There has also been a small change proposed to the funding of library services so that all of the costs associated with the libraries are now funded locally rather than in part by a charge across the whole District.

#### 4.3.1 Public conveniences funding

##### Precis of proposal

Council proposed to move the net costs of public conveniences from district funding to local funding. Community Boards will decide the priorities for public conveniences in their Community Board areas and, increase or decrease service levels according to the needs of their community and their ability and willingness to pay for these service levels.

If the activity continued to be funded under a district wide rate the rating impact would be \$36.52 through the uniform annual general charge. With funding proposed as local the following impact on each local community would apply:

Thames	a reduction of	\$3.08
Coromandel-Colville	an additional	\$14.14
Mercury Bay	a reduction of	\$8.31
Tairua-Pauanui	an additional	\$9.94
Whangamata	an additional	\$1.91

##### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	206	
Total in favour	57	(10 provided additional comment)
Total opposed	149	(45 provided additional comment)

Further analysis on the location of submitters was undertaken for this proposal.

- 143 submitters reside in the Thames-Coromandel district
- 45 submitters own a property in the Thames-Coromandel District but live elsewhere

Community Board Area	In favour	Opposed	Number with comments	
			In favour	Opposed
Whangamata	7	8	0	3
Tairua-Pauanui	14	76	0	12
Mercury Bay	9	24	4	9
Coromandel-Colville	4	5	1	2
Thames	8	8	2	6
Not stated or known	10	22	3	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>45</b>

Nine submissions were on behalf of an organisation/company which is based in the Thames Coromandel district and nine submissions were a combination of visitors, or did not supply



sufficient information to categorise in any of the above groups.

### **Summary of submission points**

In favour of the proposal (10 submitters provided comments)

- Two submitters suggested that user pays is the most important principle.
- Submitters also highlighted the difference in quantity and standards of facilities across the district, that local decision-making would result in better quality, and there should be consistency of the service.

Opposed to the proposal (45 submitters provided comments)

- Thirty submitters cited that the main reason for providing public conveniences is for visitors/tourists.
- Seven submitters indicated that they felt that the service benefitted everyone so should be shared across the wider rating base.

### **Staff analysis/commentary**

The submissions broadly reflect the issues which were discussed by Council prior to developing the proposal and consulting.

Public conveniences are a necessary facility for the travelling public and the Coromandel Peninsula is certainly known for having a significant number of tourists and visitors. The Council's Revenue and Financing Policy analysis of benefits and costs notes that public conveniences benefit visitors and tourists from outside the district and from other parts of the district, as well as benefitting each community from the environmental protection afforded by proper management of wastes. The analysis also notes that it is not always economic to identify and charge the identified individual users in all cases.

There is no current provision for user pays of public conveniences in the Thames-Coromandel district. The most notable example in New Zealand is the Taupo Superloo. This was one of the first user-pays facilities to be developed specifically for the travelling public. It recently celebrated a milestone anniversary for 20 years of use. Users are charged 50 cents for toilet facilities and \$2 for the showers. The facility also offers showers, lockers, and towels for hire. The Taupo District Council's performance measure target for the Taupo Superloo facility is 165,000 visits per year. This enables the Council to fund the facility 50% from user fees and charges and 50% from general rates - all other public toilets in their district are 100% funded from general rates. The Taupo example is not considered manageable for the Coromandel Peninsula because of our geography and multiple access points for visitors. Taupo is both a destination and on a central travel route that enables a user pays principle to be adopted for the Superloo and even then it only manages to fund half the costs involved.

There is a wide variety in the standard of the public conveniences across the district. With local funding in place each Community Board can address the standards in their own area without undue influence from other areas.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board
- Tairau-Pauanui Community Board
- Whangamata Community Board
- Mercury Bay Community Board

Alternative proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board  
That Council abandons its proposal to change the funding of public conveniences from a district-wide basis to each local Community Board area.

## Recommendation

44. That the Council adopts its proposal to change the funding of public conveniences sub-activity from a district-wide basis to each local Community Board area; and

### 4.3.2 Cemeteries funding

#### Precis of proposal

Council proposed to move the net costs of cemeteries from district funding to local funding. Community Boards will decide the priorities for cemeteries in their Community Board areas (including heritage cemeteries) and increase or decrease service levels according to the needs of their community and their ability and willingness to pay for these service levels.

If the activity continued to be funded under a district wide rate the rating impact would be \$24.35 through the uniform annual general charge. With funding proposed as local the following impact on each local community would apply:

Thames	an additional	\$7.19
Coromandel-Colville	an additional	\$25.18
Mercury Bay	a reduction of	\$5.56
Tairua-Pauanui	a reduction of	\$6.64
Whangamata	a reduction of	\$5.43

#### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	193	
Total in favour	90	(80 (89%) without any reason)
Total opposed	103	(82 (80%) without any reason)

#### Summary of submission points

In favour

- Six submitters noted that cemeteries are local services and should be managed and funded locally.
- The proposal is considered to be consistent with the principles of community empowerment.

Opposed

- Five submitters noted that cemeteries are considered an essential service and should be funded through a district rate to balance costs across the district.
- Seven submitters considered that cemeteries are a district service, with cemeteries in any one area used by people across the district (and outside it).
- If cemeteries do change to locally funded, it should be spread over several years similarly to the information centres funding change.

#### Staff analysis/commentary

User pays was noted by one submitter as a significant funding source for cemeteries where the plot fee is utilised to maintain the cemetery. Unfortunately the revenue generated through this activity through plot fees and interments is not sufficient to fully cover the costs of delivering this activity. Fees and charges raise between approximately 5-29% of the operating costs each year across the cemeteries. Increasing fees and charges to the level where a rates subsidy is not required would raise affordability issues for users of the activity.

All Community Board areas have at least one cemetery so ratepayers across the district will contribute to funding this activity. The number of cemeteries and associated costs vary across the district. The greatest impact from the change in funding is on the Coromandel-Colville area with an additional \$25 on the uniform charges.

Cemeteries, wherever they are, are used by people who live locally, nearby and far away.

Boundaries for Community Board areas and the district cannot manage to reflect where the benefits lie. Aligning the funding to the Community Board area will enable accountability at a local level for determining levels of service. Community Board decision-making for this activity aligns with Council's community empowerment policy.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- All five community boards

### **Recommendation**

45. That the Council adopts its proposal to change the funding of the cemeteries sub-activity from a district-wide basis to each local Community Board area; and

### **4.3.3 Library funding**

The Consultation Document noted a small change in the funding of library services so that all costs associated with libraries are now funded locally. In 2014/15 20% of the library activity was still being funded through district rates. Council did not receive any submissions specifically on the change in library funding.

The impact on each Community Board area is:

Coromandel-Colville	a reduction of	\$8.19
Mercury Bay	a reduction of	\$2.02
Tairua-Pauanui	an additional	\$1.18
Thames	an additional	\$11.25
Whangamata	a reduction of	\$4.26

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- All five community boards

### **Recommendation**

46. That the Council adopts its proposal to change the funding of the libraries sub-activity from a district-wide basis to each local Community Board area.

### **4.3.4 Information Centres funding**

#### **Precis of proposal**

Council has taken account of a national i-SITES review that concluded there should be only two sub-regional i-SITES in our district, at Thames and Whitianga. Council came to the conclusion that the information centres at Tairua, Pauanui, Whangamata and Coromandel were primarily for the benefit of the local community.

While expressing a firm view that these information centres should as a result be locally funded, council noted that moving the costs to local rates would cause substantial rate movements to some members of the community so proposed that the change in funding be phased in over the next three years.

If the three information centres continued to be funded under a district wide rate the rating impact with no transition would be an additional \$8.91 through the uniform annual general charge. The impact on each local community with and without the transition is below:

	No transition	Year 1 with transition	Year 2 with transition	Year 3 with transition
Coromandel-Colville	\$32	\$16	\$23	\$26
Tairua-Pauanui	\$22	\$11	\$16	\$19
Whangamata	\$17	\$9	\$12	\$14

With the proposed transition the full impact of local funding would be in place for Year 4 (2018/19).

### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	226	
Total in favour of the proposal	49	(10 with comments)
Total opposed to the proposal	160	(7 with comments)
Neutral submissions	17	

### Summary of submission points

#### In favour of the proposal

- One submitter, with 234 signatures attached, noted partial agreement with the proposal and support for TCDC providing funding for the sustainability and growth of InfoPlus and Whangamata.nz.com
- A large number of submitters in favour of the proposal have proposed that the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board fund the Tairua Information Centre for the next three years. The majority of these were a pre-populated submission and it was not entirely clear whether they supported the proposal or not as some submitters selected to retain district funding while including the proposal for funding from the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board.

#### Opposed to the proposal

- Most submitters opposed to the proposal commented that all the information centres provide district-wide benefit promoting all parts of the district and their primary focus was on providing a service to tourists and visitors not locals.
- Many submitters noted that Tairua was the only information centre visited by domestic and international visitors driving to Hot Water Beach and Cathedral Cove via the Kopu-Hikuai Road.
- A number of submitters recommended a sub-regional information centre at Kopu instead of in Thames and Whitianga.

### Staff analysis/commentary

In its consultation, council showed three options - retain district funding for the information centres, move the funding of the three information centres to local funding over three years or move funding of the three information centres to local funding in Year One of the Long Term Plan (no transition). The submission form asked if submitters agreed or disagreed with the following statement - *We are proposing over the next three years that the funding for the Tairua, Pauanui, Whangamata and Coromandel information centres be funded locally by ratepayers in those community board areas and that the Thames and Whitianga information centres remain funded at a district-wide level as they are key visitor information locations for the whole of the Coromandel Peninsula.*

The majority of submissions were against the proposal to locally fund the four stated information centres. Most of the submitters in favour of the proposal were only in part as they preferred local funding over withdrawing the information centres. This included the submission with 234 signatures.

The Council did not consult on closing the information centres but did indicate in the Consultation Document that a national review concluded there should be only two sub-regional i-SITES in the district at Thames and Whitianga. Submitters seem to prefer local funding over

losing their information centres.

The community empowerment model adopted by council allows communities to decide which services are important to them and a priority for funding from their rates. This can apply to the funding of information centres if the Council adopts the consultation proposal.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Oppose proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board  
The Coromandel Information Centre runs the risk of closing if it cannot afford to fund locally. The information centre is a vital part of the Coromandel community.
- Whangamata Community Board  
Whangamata ratepayers will make a double contribution under the proposal  
Disagree with the hybrid approach with the exception of a district-wide facility at Kopu
- Tairua-Pauanui Community Board  
Disagree with the hybrid approach with the exception of a district-wide facility at Kopu

Alternative proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board  
That the Council decide not to proceed to move funding of Tairua, Pauanui, Whangamata and Coromandel information centres from district to local Community Board area funding, or, if the funding changes to local that it be phased in over three years.
- Tairua-Pauanui and Whangamata Community Boards  
That the Council funds all information centres locally, with the exception of a district-wide funded facility at Kopu, or  
That the Council avoid a hybrid local-district funding model and either fund information centres completely district-wide, or completely locally.

### **Recommendation**

47. That the Council decide proceed with the proposal to move the funding of the Coromandel, Pauanui, Tairua and Whangamata information centres to local funding by each Community Board area over the next three years.

## **9.2 Local activity changes to fees and charges**

### **Precis of proposal**

The Consultation Document noted that there were no significant changes to the policies setting fees and charges but there were some key changes to the following charges:

- New fee of \$2 per hour or \$15 daily charge for use of the Hahei Pay and Display (with exemption upon application for Hahei residents and ratepayers).
- New boat launching/trailer parking permits for harbour facilities at Purangi boat ramp, Ferry Landing, Whitianga Wharf and Kuaotuna boat ramp following upgrades of these facilities.
- Future investigations into new fees for Marys Beach reserve wharf and boat ramp and Billy Point boat ramp following upgrades of these facilities.

The proposed Hahei Pay and Display fees and the Mercury Bay boat ramp fees were both specifically included on the submission form.

Where possible, Council charges fees and charges for its activities in order to have who pays for the activity reflected in its use. In most cases, these fees do not fully pay for the activity so the public element is covered by rates.

The new fee proposed of \$2 per hour or \$15 per day for use of the Hahei Pay and Display is intended to move much of the burden of paying for the service from ratepayers to visitors, in an area characterised by its high visitor numbers and low resident population. An exemption to this

fee is available on application for residents and ratepayers in the Hahei Village Area.

The new fee, payable annually or on a daily basis, for recreational boat launching/trailer parking permits at the Purangi Boat Ramp, Ferry Landing, Whitianga Wharf and Kuaotunu Boat Ramp will be implemented once these harbour facilities have been upgraded. Following upgrades at the Robinsons Road and Dundas Street boat ramps in the coming year, Council will also look to introduce the fees at these boat ramps. This new fee is intended to help the Community Board recoup the necessary costs in providing a higher level of service at these facilities, which have high use from both residents and visitors.

### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	142	
Total in favour of the Hahei Pay and Display fee	100	(7 with comments)
Total opposed to Hahei Pay and Display fee	42	(9 with comments)
Total in favour of boat ramp fees	89	(9 with comments)
Total opposed to boat ramp fees	53	(7 with comments)

### Summary of submission points

In favour of both proposed fees

- Six submitters noted their support for the fees as they reflect a user pays system, which they support

In favour of the Hahei Pay and Display fee, but in opposition to the boat ramp fees

- One submitter noted that the Pay and Display fee was acceptable as this was a service used predominantly by visitors, but that the boat ramps are actively used by locals and so should not need to pay additional fees beyond what they pay in rates for these facilities.

In favour of the boat ramp fees, but in opposition to the Hahei Pay and Display fee

- One submitter considered that the Hahei Pay and Display fee was excessive, and suggested a flat \$5 fee for the service instead.
- One submitter noted that locals should be exempt from paying the boat ramp fees, but supported fees for visitors.
- One submitter considered upgrades to the boat ramps may prevent or rectify foreshore degradation, and supported the fees as revenue to fund these upgrades.

Opposed to both proposed fees

- Four submitters viewed the proposed fees as an unnecessary revenue gathering exercise by council, not related to the need to pay for upgrades or extension of these services.
- One submitter noted they did not support the proposal as they considered this a question for the Community Boards rather than for the general community (note this is not specifically opposition to the proposal and more to the way the consultation was undertaken).
- One submitter noted that the proposal may disincentivise visitors to the area.
- One submitter opposed the proposals as they considered the fees were not related to each other.

### Staff analysis/commentary

With 89 total submitters in favour of the boat ramp and trailer parking fees and 53 against, and 100 in total in favour of the Hahei Pay and Display fee with 42 against, the Community Board can consider that the proposed fees have broad support from submitters.

Should the Mercury Bay Community Board only wish to implement one of the fees, the fee for the Hahei Pay and Display has greater support than the fee for the Mercury Bay boat ramps and trailer parking.

### Additional information

Boat ramp fees are levied by a number of other councils including Queenstown Lakes District

Council. Fees are also levied on boat ramps operated by the Department of Internal Affairs on Lake Taupo through a permit system. For the avoidance of doubt, the introduction of fees at boat ramps would occur after upgrade works are completed at the respective ramps and/or adjoining facilities.

### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Mercury Bay Community Board

### Recommendation

48. That the Council adopts the proposed fees for Mercury Bay boat ramps (subject to the completion of upgrade works being completed at the respective boat ramp facilities within Mercury Bay) and trailer parking and for the Hahei Pay and Display; and

That the Council adopts the proposed schedule of fees and charges as included in the supporting information, incorporating the changes to the cemetery fees from the previous resolution; and

That Council notes the Mercury Bay Community Board will investigate the Hot Water Beach car parking fees in the development of the 2016/17 Annual Plan

## 9.3 Thames Community Board area - Local Economic Development

### Precis of proposal

The proposal as stated in the Consultation Document is to provide additional funding to market and promote Thames through a new position at a cost of \$90,000 per annum alongside an additional \$50,000 per year, for the first three years of the Long Term Plan, to facilitate economic development in the Thames Community Board area. The additional funding was proposed to be funded from a targeted local rate. The options presented included:

- the combined funding of \$140,000 (average rate impact of \$24.18 per annum)
- only the funding of \$90,000 for the promotion and marketing activity (average rate impact of \$15.55 per annum)
- only the \$50,000 to support external groups to deliver local economic development projects (average rate impact of \$8.64 per annum).

### Submission statistics

	No. of submissions	Proportion of submissions
Support combined funding of \$140K	39	26%
Only support additional \$90K	2	1%
Only support additional \$50K	26	17%
Opposed to any funding	70	47%
Comment only	12	8%
<b>Total submissions</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100%</b>

Submission statistics for Thames submitters only:	No. of submissions	Proportion of Thames submissions
Total Thames submitters*	20	100%
Support combined funding of \$140K	17	85%
Only support additional \$90K	0	0%
Only support additional \$50K	2	10%
Opposed to any funding	0	0%
Comment only	1	5%

\*From submitters that provided an address.

## Summary of submission points

### In support

- Two submitters considered there should be an even greater investment in promoting Thames
- Two submitters considered that a co-ordinated approach was essential
- One submitter noted that if external groups were not supported then the town promoter won't have a portfolio of events and activities to promote.
- One submitter noted that visitors need to stop in Thames (throughout the year) and not use it as the "Gateway to the Coromandel".

### Opposed

- Four submitters noted that promoting economic development is not a Council function
- One submitter is concerned that this funding will be at the expense of other areas
- Council should have been promoting economic development already from the revenue you have been gathering
- Seems to conflict with the proposed short term accommodation rate - robbing Peter to pay Paul

## Staff analysis/commentary

The Thames local economic development additional investment fund proposal:

- has been developed in response to initiatives generated from both community groups and the Thames Community Board
- is in alignment with the objectives of the Thames Urban Development Strategy
- is supported by the majority of Thames submissions to the LTP and;
- can be viewed as a positive outcome of community empowerment philosophy of Council.

## Additional information

The Consultation Document provided a very brief description of the Thames local economic development investment proposal and accordingly the responses from some submitters is limited.

- 1) The Thames Promotions and Marketing allocation for \$90k per year provides for investment that may include a position and operating expenses to better promote, market and coordinate Thames, the Thames Visitor Attraction Strategy\* and Thames events. The position may be part time or full time depending on the final job description and KPI's developed by the Community Board. The position may also be sourced in a number of ways - a TCDC employee or outsourced to an appropriate organisation such as Destination Coromandel or a specialist contractor through a Service Level Agreement. For example; if outsourced to Destination Coromandel who will be operating the Thames i-SITE as of 1 July 2015, it could be a shared position. The position is proposed for three years to allow a proofing period prior to review at the end of Year 3.
- 2) The \$50k budget is proposed to support external and community groups to deliver economic development projects in alignment with the Thames Visitor Strategy. Several groups are already undertaking projects in alignment with the Board's strategy but will require on-going financial support to assist them in achieving projects that will run over multiple years and result in substantial visitor attraction assets such as mountain bike trails and "Coromandel Great Walks" linkages. The funding will be managed as a provisional fund contestable through a grant application process with criteria aligned with the Thames Visitor Attraction Strategy\*. The external and community groups will be able to utilise the funding as seed funding for leverage to seek further external funds through grants from Lotteries and other public and private funders.

\*The Thames Visitor Attraction Strategy: 5 reasons to visit and "stay another day"

1. Our Heritage is Gold  
Discover the living museum of Thames from yesteryear to yesterday including the gold



- rush, Kupe to Cook and early pioneering families.
2. Homegrown  
Ignite the senses with local arts, crafts and cuisine at our innovative cafes, restaurants, galleries and markets.
  3. Kauaeranga Valley Rainforest  
Our natural hidden gem contains the world famous Pinnacles, extreme canyoning, mountain biking, swimming holes, ancient kauris and well provisioned campgrounds.
  4. Pohutukawa Coast  
New Zealand's most scenic pohutukawa lined coast boasts forty kilometres of stunning spots to swim, fish, picnic, boat and watch the sun set.
  5. Thames Trails  
Explore our diverse range of walking/cycling tracks from easy trails to more challenging and spectacular adventures.

### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### Recommendation

That the Council:

49. That Council adopts the Thames local economic development proposal for annual funding for both the Thames marketing and promotion (\$90,000) and the grant funding (\$50,000) for external and community group projects for three years.

## 9.4 Whangamata Community Board area - Local roads and footpaths

The Whangamata Community Board is proposing that it accelerates its long-standing gradual programme of footpath construction and kerbing and channel to key roads so that the footpath on Bellona Road is completed in 2016 and all priority roads have kerb and channel by the end of 2017. From that point, Council will simply maintain the wide road berms and tidy road edges rather than constructing new footpaths or more kerb and channelling. This proposal is consistent with feedback over several years that the Whangamata community prefers a less urban, more holiday style environment and, therefore, footpaths are not desired on every road in the township.

The proposal represents a different level of service than in previous years where a small amount of kerb and channelling and footpaths were constructed each year. The cost of this programme is \$1.271 million, which accounts for \$13.87 of the average local rate in 2016/17 and \$18.55 in 2017/18.

### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	129	
Total in favour	84	(75 without any reason 9 with)
Total opposed	45	(38 without any reason 7 with)

Of the 129 submissions, 87 submitters noted they live in the Thames Coromandel District and 31 submitters own a property in the Thames-Coromandel District but live elsewhere. Since the proposal was for a locally funded project the analysis below of the submissions by the known resident addresses has been undertaken.

Community Board Area	Yes	No	Comments
Whangamata	10	3	4 of these submitters provided additional supporting comments, all of them in favour of the proposal, with the remainder providing a tick to indicate their position.

Tairua-Pauanui	31	21	2 submitters opposing the proposal provided additional comments with the remaining 46 providing a tick to indicate their position.
Mercury Bay	10	2	1 submitter supporting the proposal provided additional comment with the remaining 11 providing a tick to indicate their position.
Coromandel-Colville	1	1	
Thames	6	2	1 submitter supporting the proposal provided additional comment with the remaining 7 providing a tick to indicate their position.
Not stated or known	18	15	
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>43</b>	11 indicated this was a local matter and did not state a preference.

Whangamata Ratepayers Association was the only organisation who submitted on the proposal and they were in favour with some caveats.

### Summary of submissions

#### Opposed

- Two submitters noted they were happy with current set up
- One submitter noted there were more urgent projects than foot paths.
- One submitter considered there is already too much concrete on Whangamata verges, an area with excellent natural drainage and grass verges was perfect for walking on. Beverley Terrace in particular should never have a footpath in the vicinity of Williamson Park.
- One submitter noted that Whangamata footpaths are not too bad compared to Hamilton.

#### Support

- Three submitters noted their support as a safety issue.
- Two submitters noted that efficient kerb and channel was required to control flooding.
- One submitter requested a walking and biking path on SH25, Old Tairua Road as a safety issue because of the logging trucks.
- One submitter supports the kerb and channelling if it is merely a neat edge to the road. Proper kerb and channel is an unnecessary expense that creates stormwater problems.

NZTA requests that Council's approach for the Whangamata footpath and kerbing programme needs to ensure that the integrity of the roading asset is not compromised.

#### Staff analysis/commentary

Through the design and scope of the construction works the project engineers will be charged with mitigating all relating stormwater issues.

The Community Board has not allocated budget for a walking cycling path on SH25 Old Tairua Road in the 2015-2025 LTP. However the Board are investigating a walkway that would link Harry Watt Drive to SH25. This investigative work programme is set down for 2015/2016.

The Community Board has not programmed Beverly Terrace into the work programme. The road reserves on both sides of Beverly Terrace are considered more than adequate and safe to accommodate pedestrian traffic and vehicle and boat parking without the necessity of a formalised footpath. This is in line with the Community Board's desire to retain the beach character of Whangamata without compromising health and safety.

#### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Whangamata Community Board

## Recommendation

50. That the Council adopts the proposal to complete priority footpath programme in the 2015/16 year and priority kerb and channel programme in the years 2015/16 and 2016/17 at a combined cost of \$1.271 million then maintain the wide road berms and keep road edges tidy over the balance of the Long Term Plan.

### 9.5 Whangamata Community Board area - Wentworth Valley Seal extension and walkway/cycleway

In the 2012-2022 Long Term Plan, there was a budget for a \$1million project to extend the seal on Wentworth Valley Road. The Whangamata Community Board has considered the options for access to Wentworth Valley and wishes to improve the access for both walking and cycling for the economic potential that this project has for the area and District. The Community Board is proposing to spend \$70,000 to develop the business case for this project in the 2017/18 year and, if the concept is economically beneficial, to extend the seal and construct a walkway/cycleway in the following year. The capital cost of this project is estimated at \$2.4million. The options for this project will be developed and further put to the community through the next Long Term Plan process. In the Consultation Document the Community Board advised it was keen to receive feedback on this potential project.

The proposal focussed on

- Access to Wentworth Valley for walking and cycling
- Business Case and economic benefits
- Extend the seal and construct the walkway/cycleway

#### Submission statistics

Total submissions on this proposal	109	
Total in favour	84	(67 without any reason)
Total opposed	25	(16 without any reason)

As the proposal anticipated that the project would be funded by the Whangamata Community Board ratepayers more detailed analysis was carried out. The overall response from Whangamata ratepayers as a proportion of the total submitters was very low, therefore the analysis has focussed on actual numbers rather than percentages. There were a total of 12 known submitters from the Whangamata Community Board area. Nine of these live in the Whangamata Community Board area and a further three could be easily identified as owning a property in the Community Board area but living elsewhere.

The submissions from Whangamata residents were split relatively evenly with 7 in favour and 5 opposed. Both positions contained submissions which were on behalf of a number of people. In support there was a submission which was endorsed by 59 signatories mostly living in Wentworth Valley. The Whangamata Ratepayers Association was opposed to the proposal - its membership numbers are not known, nor is it clear that the total membership is opposed to the project.

Community Board Area of submitter (residents and ratepayers)	Support	Opposed
Whangamata	7	5
Tairua-Pauanui	39	14
Mercury Bay	10	2
Coromandel-Colville	1	1
Thames	10	0
Not stated or known	17	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>25</b>

## Summary of submission points

### In favour of the proposal

- Four submitters noted that cycleways and walkways with great scenery are important for drawing tourists and good for locals and local economy.
- Support for providing activities that are healthy and fun for locals and tourists too.
- Three submitters support the project if it is district funded; should count as economic development project.
- Three submitters noted that sealing of the road will be even more important if proposal of cycleway/ walkway proceeds.

### Opposed to the proposal

- Three submitters noted they opposed the project only on the basis of local funding and suggested that central government should be contributing.
- Two submitters noted their preference for the money to be spent on footpaths and kerbing and channel in the urban area first.
- One submitter prefers that the original project of sealing Wentworth Valley Road continue without delay.
- One submitter considered the district had enough cycleways/walkways.
- One submitter suggested it should be funded through user pays.

## Staff analysis/commentary

The proposal was included in the Consultation Document to seek feedback on the project at an early stage on the knowledge that better information would be available for public consultation after a business case was completed. The feedback received shows there is interest in the project; the level of opposition is relatively low and not enough to suggest that the project be stopped at this time.

Whangamata Community Board requests that Council consider this project as part of the Economic Development/Coromandel Great Walks Strategy noting it includes a new cycleway/walkway to link the Wentworth Valley across to the Hauraki Rail Trail and Wires/Maratoto Valley. The Community Board would like to bring forward \$5,000 of operational expenditure (local roading) from the third year (2017/2018) of the Long Term Plan and move it to the first year (2015/16). This small adjustment would ensure momentum for the project and would allow for the completion of a business case. The business case would provide a cost/benefit analysis for the project which would assist the Community Board and residents to come to a final decision.

The Community Board supports the proposed funding for this project as set out in the Draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan with the above amendments. Upon reviewing the business case, the Community Board would like to focus on the short term goal of progressing dust sealing of the road as far as practical and they will submit to the 2016/2017 Annual Plan on progressing this from 1 July 2016 onwards.

## Additional information

The Department of Conservation, in their submission, requests that its staff are involved very early in the project. DOC supports the principle of the proposed Wentworth Valley Road seal extension in 2018 /19 and the construction of a walkway/cycleway in the same year. The project is in accordance with one of DOC's intermediate outcomes which is "New Zealanders are enriched by outdoor experiences".

The Department notes it may find it necessary to make capital and operational investment to provide for an expanded campground to accommodate extra visitors, and to do so requires appropriate lead-in time to scope requirements (ideally with TCDC), present a business case, and go through the internal investment approval process. Such investment is not guaranteed, particularly as DOC's current priorities lie with required upgrades of infrastructure at Waikawau Campground and infrastructure in the Kauaeranga Valley. It should be particularly noted that an

increase to a capacity of over 500 persons will require significant investment to the water supply to provide for appropriate and legal drinking water standards. Toilets will also have to be increased in numbers to comply with Campground Regulations when and if the site numbers are increased.

### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Whangamata Community Board

The Whangamata Community Board will meet costs associated with preparing more detailed options for consideration as part of the 2016/17 Annual Plan (\$5,000).

### Recommendation

51. That the Council make no changes to the LTP but, in conjunction with the establishment of the Great Walks Trust and the 2018-2028 LTP review, re-evaluate how the project is to be funded (local or District, commencing July 2017) in light of the significance of the project and what contribution it may make to the overall Great Walks programme.

## 10 Funding requests for local funded activities

Many of the funding requests listed in this section are also in the Grants and Remission activity report. Refer to the activity report for further information.

### Summary of requests

Request for	Request from	Additional amount requested	Year
Thames flag budget	Thames Community Board	Annual \$15,000	Years 1-3 only
Thames Brown St toilets	Thames Community Board	Capital \$172,000	Year 1 and 4
Cook's Landing Monument landscaping	Thames Community Board	One-off \$15,000	2015/16
Tapu reserve landscaping	Thames Community Board	One-off \$20,000	2015/16
Thames CBD specimen trees	Thames Community Board	One-off \$12,000	2015/16
Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping	Thames Community Board	One-off \$20,000	2015/16
Thames Mackay Street carpark	Thames Community Board	Capital \$261,563	2015/16
Youth participation Thames	Thames Community Board	One-off \$2,000	2015/16
Coromandel Wharf	Coromandel-Colville Community Board	Capital \$1.7 million	2022/23
Coromandel library service	Coromandel-Colville Community Board	Annual \$4,000	
Kauri dieback protection	Coromandel-Colville Community Board	One-off \$24,700 Annual \$TBA	2015/16
Coromandel Heritage Trust grant	Submitter	One-off \$5,000	2015/16

### 10.1 Thames Flag Budget

Thames Community Board requests that if the proposed funding of \$90K per annum for promotion and marketing activity is not approved by Council then a budget of \$15K for three years be provided for the replacement of the town centre flags. The Community Board intends to use some of the \$90K to replace the flags as the current set of 'Happy Holidays' flags are at the end of their useful life. The Community Board is often approached by the public asking why flags aren't flown more throughout the year.

### Recommendations from Community Boards

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### **10.2 Thames Brown Street Public Conveniences**

Thames Community Board requests additional budget for Brown Street toilets upgrade, as follows:

Year 1: \$22,000 - minor upgrade.

Year 4: \$150,000 - replacement.

Reasons:

The Brown Street toilets are considered below standard. Minor upgrade work in Year 1 would bring the toilets up to a reasonable standard for the short term, until a full replacement can take place in year four as part of a future Victoria Park upgrade. Minor upgrade work in Year 1 would include painting and terraflaking, new signs, taps, LED lighting and door furniture.

A minor upgrade then replacement of the Brown Street toilets in Thames is in alignment with the asset condition report.

The local rating impact of this decision would be:

- \$0.47 per ratepayer per year (minor upgrade).
- \$3.21 per ratepayer per year (replacement).

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### **Recommendation**

52. That Council approves additional budget for Brown Street toilets upgrades, as follows:

Year 1: \$22,000 - minor upgrade.

Year 4: \$150,000 - replacement.

### **10.3 Landscaping for relocated Cook's Landing Monument**

Thames Community Board requests an additional budget be included in Year 1 of \$15,000 for landscaping when the Cooks Landing Monument is relocated.

Reasons:

- The monument is currently in storage and the Kopu community has requested that a new site be established as soon as possible.
- The monument is the property of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage and they will cover the cost of relocating it to its new site in Kopu.

The monument is to be sited so that it becomes an attraction for users of the Hauraki Rail Trail and it will be a focal point for the anniversary of Cook's landing in 2019. The Thames Community Board plans to re-locate the Cooks Landing Monument in 2015/16 prior to the 150 year anniversary in 2019 of Cooks Landing at Kopu.

The monument is currently in storage in Whangamata as the previous location (Kopu Hall site) was sold without the monument being sub-divided off the main parcel. Therefore a new location needs to be found. The funding requested is for landscaping only as the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, being the owner of the monument, will cover the costs of relocation.

The local rating impact of this decision would be:

Year 1: \$3.21 per ratepayer as a one-off cost.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### **Recommendation**

53. That Council approves an additional one-off budget of \$15,000 in Year 1 for landscaping when the Cook's Landing Monument is relocated in 2015/16.

### **10.4 Tapu Reserve**

The Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plan 2006 identifies the need for landscaping of the Tapu Reserve to improve the amenity of the area, including hard features such as seats and picnic tables. Over time demand has risen for the services of the Tapu Reserves and facilities have declined due to lack of funding.

Four submitters supported landscaping the areas Tapu Domain is a popular place for locals and tourists because it has such easy access for pulling completely off the road, and it a good resting place while driving the very busy narrow winding road. Tapu has a wonderful beach, a very good and well used dairy, and the ancient pohutukawa tree is a main attraction.

Improvement work is estimated to cost \$20,000 which could include planting, placement of rocks or bollards to control vehicles, signage, seats and picnic tables. The local rating impact of this decision would be \$0.43 per ratepayer per year.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### **Recommendation**

54. That Council approves funding of \$20,000 in Year 1 for the provision of landscaping of Tapu Reserves, including hard features such as seats and picnic tables.

Reasons:

To improve the amenity of Tapu Reserves, consistent with the Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plan 2006.

### **10.5 Thames CBD Specimen Trees**

Thames Community Board requests that an additional budget of \$12,000 be provided for the replacement of specimen trees in Pollen Street, Thames. The 15 existing Melia trees in Pollen Street in Thames have outgrown their in-ground containers and are structurally unsound, and will continue to decline in health.

The existing Melia trees in Pollen Street, Thames, are declining in health and should be replaced. The works should be prioritised in Year 1 (2015/16) as the trees are rapidly becoming a hazard. The local rating impact of this decision would be in Year 1: \$2.56 per ratepayer as a one-off cost.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### **Recommendation**

55. That Council approves additional funding of \$12,000 in Year 1 for the replacement of specimen trees in Pollen Street, Thames.

### **10.6 Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping**

Thames Community Board requests that the current budget for the Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping be increased in Year 1 from \$15,000 to \$35,000.

Reasons:

- An application for funding for a Monument Restoration Plan [Conservation Management Plan] has been lodged with Lotteries Heritage Fund.
- It is the intention of the Thames Community Board that once the Monument Restoration Plan [Conservation Management Plan] is completed, that the Board would apply for Lotteries funding to undertake restoration and landscaping works to upgrade the monument for the on-going WW100 commemorations.
- The Lotteries application will expect Council to provide one third of the total estimated cost of \$105,000.

The Thames Monument, located at Monument Road overlooking the township, has deteriorated over time and needs restoration.

A Conservation Management Plan for restoring the monument needs to be prepared by a conservation architect, and forms a Monument Restoration Plan that guides how to restore the monument and how to maintain it into the future. The Thames Community Board should know by May 2015 whether the funding application has been successful to have the Conservation Management Plan prepared.

The Thames Community Board would like to align the process for a Conservation Management Plan with a second funding application in around September 2015 to restore the monument itself, according to the Conservation Management Plan. The restoration work would ideally extend beyond the monument to create authentic landscape surrounds, and includes the area from the associated carpark to the monument. The local rating impact of this decision would be \$0.43 per ratepayer per year.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board

### **Recommendation**

56. That Council approve to increase the proposed budget in Year 1 for Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping from \$15,000 to \$35,000.

### **10.7 Mackay Street carpark**

Thames Community Board has requested that the Mackay Street carpark be included in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan period in year 1. Staff have subsequently investigated surfacing options to determine cost, with cost estimates as follows:

Option 1 (chipseal): \$189,491.50

Option 2 (ashaltic concrete): \$261,563.50

The local rating impact of option 2 would be \$5.73 per Thames ratepayer per year.

Council's Roading staff recommend Option 2 for an asphalt surface. Due to the turning stresses from vehicles that would be present in this carpark, asphalt would hold up a lot better than chipseal meaning that less surfacing repairs are required in the long run.

Prioritising this project is considered appropriate due to limited existing parking in the Mackay Street area. There will likely be increased demand for parking with the relocation of the AA service to the Council building from 1 July this year. Council's Area Manager for Thames notes that it would be appropriate to prioritise the parking spaces closest to the Council building for customers, and the rear section of the Mackay Street carpark for Council staff.

Thames Community Board supports the inclusion of the Mackay Street carpark in year 1 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. Feedback has not been gained relating to surface option/cost from the Board.



## **Recommendation**

57. That Council approve a local roading budget in year 1 for \$261,563.50 for the Mackay Street carpark project in Thames.

### **10.8 Youth participation in Thames Community Board local governance**

The submission from the Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network covers a wide range of matters and, as acknowledged by the submitter, some are outside Council's core activities. There are multiple stakeholders involved in youth development in the district, with support and provision of services provided by the private sector and other public organisations, such as Population Health of Waikato District Health Board and the Ministry of Social Development.

Council has a Youth Strategy for overarching direction, and relevant local initiatives are being progressed such as sporting facility projects that impact on youth wellbeing.

This submission from Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network does highlight an opportunity for more effective engagement with youth, which could raise awareness and understanding with both Council and youth and enable joint progression of initiatives within agreed scope and the business of Council. Funding could be allocated in Year 1 to work with local youth and develop an agreed approach for youth participation in appropriate Thames Community Board local governance processes. The local rating impact of this decision would be Year 1: \$0.043 per ratepayer as a one-off cost.

The Council's Thames Community Development Officer (CDO) has applied for funding from the Ministry of Youth Development for a range of youth initiatives including investigating Youth Council models and best practice around New Zealand. If the application is successful it is envisaged that a proposal would be formulated for presentation to Council in the second half of 2015. An additional budget may be required to deliver a well-considered proposal.

A decision matter relating to district-wide approach to youth development is presented under the Economic Development activity.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support request

- Thames Community Board

### **Recommendation**

58. That Council approve funding of \$2,000 in Year 1 to work with local youth and develop an agreed approach for youth participation in Thames Community Board local governance processes for more effective engagement with youth.

### **10.9 Coromandel Wharf**

Coromandel-Colville Community Board proposes to include \$1.7m in the 2022/2023 financial year towards the Coromandel Harbour, due to the following:

- The Coromandel Wharf head and retaining structures will need to be removed and replaced.
- The Community Board notes that if the Wharf continues to be used in the current manner it is likely that this work will need to be brought forward or the Wharf will become unusable within the next ten years timeframe.

The Community Board notes that the need for these repairs could change based on decisions yet to be made in relation to the Coromandel Harbour Development Project.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board  
This will allow time to prepare for costs budgeted in 2022/2023. Other projects are already using the depreciation funding.

### **Recommendation**

59. That the Council add \$1.7 million to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Coromandel Harbour renewals budget in the 2022/2023 financial year (impact to Coromandel-Colville area ratepayer - \$76.97 annually from 2022/23).

### **10.10 Coromandel Library service level agreement and funding**

Coromandel Community Library Inc requests that the Coromandel-Colville Community Board, via the Council, renews the Coromandel Service Agreement (as it ceases on 30 June 2015) and sets the funding at \$10,000 per annum. The Community Board had set the 2015/16 budget for the library grant at \$6,000 down from \$12,000 in 2014/15.

The decrease of the grant in the service level agreement from \$10,000 to \$6,000 was initially in response to actions being taken by the Library Board in dropping their subscriptions from \$20 per annum to \$15 per annum, on the basis that the user pays contribution to the activity should be maximised and ratepayer subsidisation through a general rate should be secondary to this user pays contribution. However, on the basis that surpluses are being applied to maintenance and improvements of the service being provided, the Coromandel-Colville Community Board recommends the grant be set at \$10,000.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board

### **Recommendation**

60. That the Council approve the grant budget for the Coromandel Library service level agreement be increased from \$6,000 to \$10,000, at an additional cost of approximately \$1.81 per year per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area.

### **10.11 Wyuna Road stormwater and roading issues move**

Roading staff estimated \$30K was required to construct a turning area at the end of Wyuna Bay Road. The Community Board endorses the project to be funded from local transportation in the 2015/16 financial year (recommendation to the 13 May 2015 Council meeting). The local rating impact of this decision would be \$1.81 per ratepayer per year.

Council's Roading staff support this request as the identified work will resolve a local issue for property owners, boaties and road users at the end of Wyuna Bay road.

### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board

### **Recommendation**

61. That Council approve an additional \$30,000 to the Coromandel-Colville Local Roading budget to address stormwater and roading issues at the end of Wyuna Bay road.

### **10.12 Signage for toilet facilities - Tokatea**

Submitter expresses concerns that the sacred maunga of Tokatea is desecrated by human defecation due to the increased numbers of tourists. Submitter requests that Council takes the lead in discussions with **DOC** and other relevant agencies to get a toilet built immediately as a priority for our community.

The Coromandel-Colville Community Board is aware of this concerning issue and has raised this issue with the land owner, the Department of Conservation, and is engaged in discussion to resolve this.

#### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Coromandel-Colville Community Board

#### **Recommendation**

62. That Council refer the matter of public defecation at Tokatea to the Department of Conservation for consideration.

### **10.13 Coromandel Heritage Trust**

Submitter requests funds for proportion of The Treasury's operational costs, including the possibility of funding for a qualified archivist. Submitter discusses the volunteer nature of The Treasury to date and outlines the work of those volunteers.

#### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Thames Community Board  
Support in principle of local level funding of \$5,000, subject to information on funding from Hauraki District Council.  
Support for review of archivist in next annual plan, to be district funded.  
Support for Council to consider using the Coromandel Heritage Trust archiving service (to support local and instead of paying out of district costs).

#### **Recommendation**

63. That Council determines funding for Coromandel Heritage Trust.

### **10.14 Whitianga Youth Centre/Space**

Submitter requests funding to support the Whitianga Youth Centre Space so they can offer a safe place for youth to socialise and access education and support services.

The Mercury Bay Community Board recommended that the youth group be directed to the Board's local grants process.

#### **Recommendations from Community Boards**

Support proposal

- Mercury Bay Community Board

#### **Recommendation**

64. That Council advise the submitter to apply to the Mercury Bay Community Board for funding for a Whitianga Youth Centre.

## 11 Deliberations information on topics raised by submitters for local-funded activities

### 11.1 Activity: Roads and Footpaths

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><u>LTP15_346</u> Ms Kay Kristensen Population Health, Waikato District Heath Board</p>	<p>Footpath construction and maintenance - district</p> <p>Submitter [Population Health, WDHB] advocates for continued construction and maintenance of footpaths as an identified essential service, and supports Council in its intention to continue footpath rehabilitation and construction district wide, particularly in line with recommendations resulting from the accessibility audits started in 2013.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpaths that are maintained and well lit are a key part of universal access principles.</li> <li>• Footpaths contribute to personal safety and security, accessibility and community cohesion.</li> <li>• Footpaths support alternative transportation modes particularly for vulnerable population groups such as children, the disabled and the elderly. Of TCDC's population, 27% are 65 years or older, almost double the national average. Conversely, a lack of adequate footpaths will have a disproportionate effect on vulnerable population groups.</li> </ul>	<p>This submitter supports Council's proposed approach to its Footpath Construction and Maintenance programme.</p> <p>No change is necessary.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>LTP15_261 Mark Alloway</p>	<p>Submitter requests that Blackjack Road be tar sealed all the way to Opito Bay.</p>	<p>The Council has sealed a significant length of Blackjack Road over the last 5 years, and has programmed to complete a traction seal on the Opito Bay hill (approx. 1km length) in the 2015/16 year for safety reasons.</p> <p>The extent of this recent and programmed future work is considered appropriate for Blackjack Road and no change is necessary.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><u>LTP15_120</u> Mr Ross Edens MJ &amp; SA Edens</p>	<p>Blackjack road sealing</p> <p>Submitter considers that roads funding for the Mercury Bay ward needs to have moneys set aside specifically for upgrading, widening and sealing of the road between Otama and Opito Bay [Blackjack road].</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The gravel road is dangerous.</li> <li>• There seems to be a lot of money designated to upgrade Whitianga that will ultimately promote more tourism and more permanent residents</li> <li>• Sections of the road between Otama and Opito have been in a similar gravel condition for over 20 years with hair-pin corners and lack of vision.</li> <li>• Opito Bay is been increasingly used by day-trippers from all over the Coromandel Peninsula, especially since the completion of the sealing of State Highway 25 between Whitianga and Coromandel. A major goal of the LTP is to promote tourism, and sealing of this road would realise the full potential for Opito Bay as a destination.</li> <li>• Most road users who now use these roads are inexperienced on gravel roads, and broken glass on the road from headlights is a common sight on most of the hairpins during peak times. Historically the gravel sections of State Highway 25 prepared these drivers for the road but now, persons are driving from an urban centre such as Auckland, or are overseas drivers, to this narrow dangerous road with little experience on gravel roads. .</li> </ul>		
<p>LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>Collect information to inform accessibility improvements</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council collect quality information relating to the movement of persons with disabilities in the community including the elderly, and to whether they can safely leave their places of residence as pedestrians to participate in society as they wish without encountering barriers.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the quality of information collected may be excellent, it may not always cover everything that is important to the</li> </ul>	<p>Council has collected a reasonable amount of information under the Disability Strategy and Positive Ageing Strategy related to accessibility of Council's roads and footpaths, and these work areas are continuing albeit to a limited extent recently due to resourcing and prioritisation of work. However, communication lines remain open for issue awareness.</p> <p>Engagement with stakeholders was undertaken to inform Council's 2013/14 Accessibility Audits, including gathering information to better understand existing</p>	<p>No change.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	community.	<p>access issues in the local community.</p> <p>Council holds Transportation Forums twice per year that enable people to raise issues.</p> <p>Members of the public can raise a Request for Service with Council, which would be assessed and responded to as appropriate to the situation.</p>	
<p><u>LTP15_356</u> Margaret Harrison Coromandel- Colville Community Board</p>	<p>Coromandel-Colville Community Board requests that the 2015/16 local roading budget increase by \$30K to address stormwater and roading issues at the end of Wyuna Bay Road.</p>	<p>To increase the Coromandel-Colville Local Roading budget is a community board decision.</p> <p>Council's Roading staff provided a report to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board at its 14 April 2015 meeting. The report included a budget estimate of \$30,000 to construct a turning area at the end of Wyuna Bay Road.</p> <p>The Community Board approved the formation of a turning head at the end of Wyuna Bay Road up to the value of \$30,000 to be funded from local transportation in the 2015/16 financial year.</p> <p>Council's Roading staff support this request as the identified work will resolve a local issue for property owners, boaties and road users at the end of Wyuna Bay road.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1.81 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul>	<p>That Council approve an additional \$30,000 to the Coromandel-Colville Local Roading budget.</p>
<p>LTP15_229 Darlan</p>	<p>Cycle lanes in Mercury Bay</p>	<p>To establish cycle lanes in the Mercury Bay area would require further investigations, such as better</p>	<p>No change.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	<p>Submitter requests allocating cycle lanes in the Mercury Bay Community Board area.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve safety and security.</li> </ul>	<p>understanding the reason for this submitter's request, to determine key cycle routes and potential cost. The Mercury Bay Community Board would need to prioritise this work against other footpath improvements, or increase the budget.</p> <p>If the key cycle routes are determined to be to and from the Mercury Bay Area School, Council could investigate widening the footpaths for shared use at a lesser cost as opposed to establishing cycle lanes as part of the road carriageway, which could result in loss of carparks.</p> <p>Council Roding staff are aware of limited evidence of serious safety issues in the Mercury Bay Area School vicinity at present. Cycle lanes or shared use footpaths may result in reduced peak traffic volumes at school start and finish times.</p>	<p>Refer the matter of cycle lanes or shared use footpaths in the Mercury Bay area to the Mercury Bay Community Board for further consideration.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further investigations are required.</li> </ul>
LTP15_265 Heather Prescott	<p>Duck Creek Bridge, Pauanui.</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council bring forward work for Duck Creek Bridge, Pauanui.</p>	<p>Duck Creek Bridge (on Hikuai Settlement road in Pauanui) is currently a 1 lane bridge with safety issues due to poor visibility at both approaches.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
LTP15_69 Mrs Elizabeth Anne Stewart Ball	<p>Duck Creek Bridge Upgrade, Pauanui</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council review the time span before it is completed.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By then hopefully the cycleway is completed, new Motor Camp is completed, more housing in the waterway - all contributing to probable higher traffic levels.</li> </ul>	<p>2024/25 budget is already in the Tairua-Pauanui Local Transportation activity as proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for bridge widening (2 lanes). The Tairua-Pauanui Community Board could consider bringing this work forwards.</p> <p>The Duck Creek Bridge wouldn't normally be widened until the bridge is due for replacement or it is considered necessary for safety reasons, which may be triggered by increased traffic volumes associated with development east of the bridge.</p>	<p>Refer the matter of bringing forward already programmed work for 2024/25 widening of Duck Creek Bridge to the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board for further consideration.</p>
LTP15_329	<p>Hikuai Settlement Road has an extremely high recreational use and</p>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers and Residents Association	as the only feeder road into and out of Pauanui, also has a very high traffic usage, particularly in the peak period. It is currently non-compliant with the TCDC district plan for numerous reasons including non-compliance for inadequate width in some areas. Safety improvements must be a priority and carried out sooner than 2024/25 to ensure that this road remains free of fatalities. This funding must not be purely dependent on future development at the township end, as this affects a very small proportion of this 11.5 km stretch of road. Our Association requests that the widening of the one lane bridge is an improvement that should be undertaken sooner than 2024/25.	Other safety improvement options include increasing visibility from both directions or improving advance warning signage.  This matter should be referred to the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board for further consideration. Council's Roding staff could assist in investigation of appropriate options for improving safety.	Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Widening the bridge is currently programmed for 2024/25.</li> <li>There are other safety improvement options available, such as increasing visibility from both directions or improving advance warning signage.</li> </ul>
<u>LTP15 70</u> Mr. Christopher Raymond Ball	Duck Creek Bridge Upgrade, Pauanui  Submitter requests that Council review the time span before it is completed.  Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By then hopefully the cycleway is completed, new Motor Camp is completed, more housing in the waterway - all contributing to probable higher traffic levels.</li> </ul>		
<u>LTP15 320</u> Moana Hale Te Roopu Tautoko O Harataunga	Footpaths in Kennedy Bay Submitter requests that Council invest in footpaths throughout Kennedy Bay. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For safety of residents' babies, families and future generations.</li> <li>The roads are increasingly dangerous for walkers and cyclists, but that is how people in the community get around and what they do in their spare time.</li> <li>Changes in traffic volumes and types of vehicles have brought new hazards, such as speeding cars, large vehicles,</li> </ul>	It is ultimately the responsibility of the Coromandel-Colville Community Board to prioritise its various footpath construction projects.  There may be a reasonable need for further footpaths in Kennedy Bay, but this needs to be prioritised against available budget.  Further investigations could be undertaken to determine and consider other potential options to address issues such as raised by the submitter.	That Council instruct staff to investigate footpath options in Kennedy Bay for consideration in the 2016/17 Annual Plan.  [Coromandel-Colville



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>and tourists.</p> <p>[Submitter notes that the submissions is on behalf of an ahi kaa roa (long time established/tangata whenua/Maori) group in Harataunga (Kennedy Bay) called Te Roopu Tautoko o Harataunga (TRT)].</p>	<p>No footpaths are currently included on the Coromandel-Colville Footpath Construction programme for Kennedy Bay.</p> <p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board will need to decide whether it wants to include a form of footpath at Kennedy Bay and what the priority of this would be.</p> <p>The main foot traffic is likely to be from Moana Avenue up to the Kura. The length of a footpath over this section would be 2.6kms. This length of concrete footpath is estimated to cost \$550,000 (excluding footbridge adjacent to Potaes Bridge).</p>	<p>Community Board supported this recommendation.]</p>
<p>LTP15_282 Kepa Maika Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga</p>	<p>Harataunga River bridge (Potae Bridge), Kennedy Bay</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council undertake improvement work on the Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga bridge between the Harataunga Marae and Te Paea Marae, Kennedy Bay</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing bridge is on a Council road.</li> <li>• The bridge needs improvements for safety reasons (pedestrians and car drivers, both locals and tourists), including to cater for heavy traffic use particularly in summer.</li> </ul> <p>[Submitter provided pictures drawn by the tamariki of Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga of the proposed bridge improvements. On 17 March 2015 the tamariki of Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga, led by their principal Kepa Maika, presented an oral submission to the Coromandel Community Board.</p>	<p>This submission relates to Potae Bridge, Kennedy Bay.</p> <p>Deck maintenance work on Potae Bridge has been completed in 2014/15. Further maintenance work on the bridge structure is planned for 2015/16 through the road maintenance contract.</p> <p>Sealing of this bridge deck is also planned as part of the 2015/16 road resurfacing contract.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	A submission was made on this matter to Council's draft 2014/15 Annual Plan.]		
LTP15_282 Kepa Maika Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga	<p>Harataunga River footbridge (at Potae Bridge), Kennedy Bay</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council add a footbridge or walkway.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A footbridge or walkway would improve safety around the bridge, which is a very popular area for activities such as swimming and fishing.</li> </ul> <p>[Submitter provided pictures drawn by the tamariki of Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga of the proposed bridge improvements. On 17 March 2015 the tamariki of Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga, led by their principal Kepa Maika, presented an oral submission to the Coromandel Community Board. A submission was made on this matter to Council's draft 2014 Annual Plan.]</p>	<p>This submission relates to Potae Bridge, Kennedy Bay.</p> <p>There is currently an item on the Coromandel footpath construction programme for a footbridge at this location, however it is yet to be prioritised and there is currently no budget provided specifically for a footbridge at Potae Bridge in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</p> <p>There is an annual footpath construction budget for the Coromandel-Colville ward of approx. \$50,000 which could be used towards construction of a footbridge, along with a decision from the Coromandel-Colville Community Board to increase the budget to fund the footbridge construction.</p>	<p>That Council instruct staff to investigate footbridge options in Kennedy Bay for the Potae stream for consideration in the 2016/17 Annual Plan.</p> <p>[Coromandel-Colville Community Board supported this recommendation.]</p>
LTP15_320 Moana Hale Te Roopu Tautoko O Harataunga	<p>Harataunga River footbridge, Kennedy Bay</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council build a footbridge over the Harataunga river in Kennedy Bay next to the bridge, and that this be included in the Coromandel-Colville Footpath Programme for priority funding.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A footbridge or walkway would improve safety around the bridge, which is a very popular area for activities such as swimming.</li> <li>The bridge has been a central meeting place for the local tamariki [children] and whānau for many decades but it is becoming increasingly dangerous.</li> </ul>	<p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board will need to consider the priority of this footbridge against other footpath construction projects.</p> <p>The estimated cost of a footpath bridge at Potae Bridge is \$220,000. (Based on \$3,500/m for a 57m bridge. Rate/m based on costings done by Opus for Manaia footbridge. \$22,000 has been allowed for design; consents; and management, supervision and quality assurance (MSQA).</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tarsealing the roads, sub-division and housing development in the community has contributed to the problem, with more traffic and people in the area.</li> </ul> <p>[Submitter notes that the submissions is on behalf of an ahi kaa roa (long time established/tangata whenua/Maori) group in Harataunga (Kennedy Bay) called Te Roopu Tautoko o Harataunga (TRT). Submitter also notes support to submissions that have previously been made by Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Harataunga and other members of our community.]</p>		
<p><u>LTP15_263</u> William Prescott</p>	<p>Puketui Road, Hikuai The submitter requests that Council upgrade Puketui road in Hikuai.</p>	<p>Council currently maintains 6.065km of Puketui Valley road (accessed off Morrison Road) and 3.665kms of Puketui Road (accessed off Kopu-Hikuai SH25).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>LTP15_265 Heather Prescott</p>	<p>Puketui Road, Hikuai Submitter requests that Council upgrade Puketui Road in Hikuai.</p>	<p>There is a gap of approximately 1km between the ends of these two roads. Further clarification with the submitter indicates that the submitter is asking for Council to re-open the intermediate section of road (which is currently used as a walking track), as it used to be open until a large slip occurred and resulted in it being closed.</p> <p>It is likely that the existing track/ old road is located or partially located on DOC land, therefore to open this track/ old road as a road may mean that land purchase or legal agreement from DOC would be required.</p> <p>Opening up this road would provide an alternate route for part of Hikuai to Kopu (SH25) which is not prone to closure resulting from weather events. However, it would be costly with considered limited benefit.</p> <p>There is no project to open this road proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</p>	<p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dust sealing work is already programmed for Puketui Valley road.</li> <li>Further investigations are required to if the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board wants to consider upgrading Puketui road.</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p><u>Puketui Valley Road:</u> Dust sealing work of approximately 1km of Puketui Valley road is to be completed in May 2015. No further upgrades are planned at this stage as the standard of this road is not dissimilar to other roads of similar use across the district.</p> <p>Council is working towards aligning the level of service for roads across the district with NZTA One Network Road Classification (relating to having consistent levels of service use across New Zealand).</p>	
<p>RFIN_57 Joycelyn Ollington</p>	<p>Improvements for Tui road, Whangamata - kerbs, paths, driveways</p> <p>Submitter requests that improvements be made in Tui road, Whangamata, for kerbs, footpaths, driveways and street lights.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is a resident of Tui road and notes that there are still no kerbs, paths or driveways.</li> <li>• The street lighting is a "disaster" with one light at each end of Tui Road and one in the middle for over 100 houses.</li> <li>• The submitter notes that they have paid rates for their property in Tui road since 1976 and during this period little improvement. It is a health and safety issue.</li> <li>• There are more costs for the ratepayers of Whangamata with no evidence for improvements for the residents.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a local transportation matter for the Whangamata Community Board.</p> <p>Driveways installation, improvements and maintenance are private owner responsibility.</p> <p>Streetlights for Tui road are not currently on the Whangamata Streetlight programme. These can be added and prioritised against other areas if the Whangamata Community Board consider there is a need.</p> <p>Funding for new street lighting is available from the existing Whangamata Streetlight improvement budget of approximately \$19,000 per year.</p> <p>NZTA subsidy may not be available for this project.</p> <p>Whangamata Community Board has previously decided that its priority for footpaths in Whangamata is to complete the key routes through town and then to focus</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer the matter to the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board to consider adding Tui road to the kerb installation programme which is budgeted in the draft Long Term Plan for completion in 2015/16 and 2016/17.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for new street</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>on tidying up road berms and kerbs, rather than additional new footpaths so as to retain the beach character of Whangamata. The priority for the 2015/16 year is providing a footpath on Bellona road, which the Community Board considers to be the last main connecting road where a footpath is required.</p> <p>The Whangamata Local Roads and Footpaths programme has a project in 2015/16 and 2016/17 to complete flush kerbs on various streets. Tui Road is not currently on this programme, therefore the Community Board will need to decide if they want to add Tui road to the kerb programme.</p> <p>To respond to the submitter comment that they have been paying rates since 1976 and there has been little improvement in the area - rates are used for work according to highest priority, not necessarily for work to balance direct benefit to residents and ratepayers nearby.</p> <p>Improvements need to be prioritised, rates also cover ongoing maintenance.</p>	<p>lighting is available from the existing Whangamata Streetlight improvement budget, and streetlights for Tui road are can be added and prioritised against other areas if the Whangamata Community Board consider there is a need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tui road is not currently on the Whangamata Local Roads and Footpaths programme.</li> </ul>
<p>LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability</p>	<p>Infrastructure Strategy - amendment Submitter requests that the Council's draft 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy document be amended to add a further bullet point in section 6.4 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persons with disabilities, including the elderly, will represent an</li> </ul>	<p>Consideration to future demographic change is reflected in Council's draft Infrastructure Strategy, (section 3.3 Demographic Context). The draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan assumptions also reflect consideration to the district's demographics and catering for changing needs</p>	<p>No Change.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The content of Council's draft</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Action	<p>increasing proportion of our population. This will require additional expenditure to upgrade pedestrian infrastructure to ensure it remains fit for purpose as the needs of the population change.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district has a reported 27% of residents aged over 65.</li> <li>• TCDC's recognition of roads and footpaths as one of five essential services is important.</li> <li>• Council's public consultation documents should include more meaningful commitment to persons with disabilities and the elderly.</li> </ul>	<p>over time.</p> <p>The draft Infrastructure Strategy could be amended (in section 6.4 Transport and Footpath Infrastructure Expenditure) to more explicitly reference expectations related to projected demographic change and likely impacts, however this is not considered necessary. The submitter's suggested wording is not considered appropriate as this situation may not transpire (for example, Council may not require additional expenditure).</p> <p>There is need to consider investment in Level of Service improvements that will have a relatively short period of benefit. Staff expect the issue of changing accessibility expectations and the need for improvements to be managed within long term plan and annual plan programme cycles or dealt with on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>Infrastructure Strategy and draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan as related to projected demographics and catering for changing needs is appropriate as proposed.</p>
<p><u>LTP15_86</u> Tomoko Bruce</p>	<p>Kauaeranga Valley road - footpath Submitter requests a cycle/walking path from Parawai to Kauaeranga Valley.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For safety - every summer local people walk Kauaeranga Valley road to get to swimming holes, especially to the Swing Bridge spot and this is dangerous due to "hidden spots" for drivers.</li> <li>• Water Race Lane has been added and more new residence are living in this area, it is worth to have a proper walking path for health and safety.</li> </ul>	<p>A footpath on Kauaeranga Valley road, from Parawai road to Water Race Lane, is on the Thames footpath construction programme for completion in approximately year 2034 based on the current footpath priorities and budgets.</p> <p>The estimated cost to form a concrete footpath is \$500,000. (Based on length of footpath being 2000m at a rate of \$250/m2). The current budget for Thames footpath construction in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan is approximately \$80,000 per year.</p> <p>The Thames Community Board needs to consider the priority of this footpath and, if it decides to raise this</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Refer the matter of a footpath on Kauaeranga Valley road to the Thames Community Board for further consideration.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Thames Community</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>project priority in the programme. approve additional funding or advise on staging of the footpath construction</p> <p>NZTA subsidy may not be available for this project.</p>	<p>Board needs to better consider the priority of this potential footpath.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<p><u>LTP15_93</u> Department of Conservation Gemma White Department of Conservation</p>	<p>Kauaeranga Valley road - partial sealing Submitter (Department of Conservation (DOC)) requests to partner with Council to seal the Kauaeranga Valley road from the current end of the seal to the Kauaeranga Visitor Centre (a distance of 2.24km, of which 1.6km is road managed by the Council and 640 metres is managed by the DOC). Submitter notes that the total cost has been estimated by TCDC's roading engineers at \$740,000, and proposes that that the funding be allocated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCDC: \$30,000 for 2016/17, then \$495,000 for 2017/18</li> <li>• DOC: \$10,000 for 2016/17, then \$205,000 for 2017/18 (Subject to Business Case Approval and internal process completion).</li> </ul> <p>Submitter suggests that the Council portion is funded from Economic Development and/or from District / Local Roding funds. [Submitter provided a letter of support from the Thames Community Board Chairperson to DOC on the work to the road between the DOC Visitors Centre and the Pinnacles carpark.] Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Kauaeranga Valley road managed part by TCDC and part by DOC.</li> <li>• Sealing the road would improve accessibility and safety.</li> <li>• The road provides the only vehicular access to the</li> </ul>	<p>Partial sealing of Kauaeranga Valley road is a local transport decision for the Thames Community Board.</p> <p>Council's Roding staff have put a 'place holder' in NZTAs subsidised programme, however both Council and NZTA funding should still be subject to demonstrating that the project will deliver a return on investment (mainly associated with economic development).</p> <p>The Council would need to meet NZTA's funding criteria (including satisfactory project profile).</p> <p>Council does not yet have a business case for this project.</p> <p>If the project is approved, Council net cost estimate would be \$15,900 in 2016/17 and \$257,400 in 2017/18. (to align with NZTA conditional budget).</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2016/17: \$0.34 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul>	<p>That Council approve a 'place holder' budget for partial sealing of Kauaeranga Valley road of \$30,000 in the 2016/17 year and \$495,000 in the 2017/18 year.</p> <p>That Council allow the project to proceed subject to Council completing a business case and NZTA investment approved.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Kauaeranga Valley. For decades the Kauaeranga Valley has been a valuable recreation resource for locals and visitors to the Coromandel Peninsula, including to the Pinnacles Hut, and education camps. Popularity of the area is increasing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is possible to walk to the eastern sea board via the Kauaeranga Valley, which provides for possible future links with the proposed Coromandel Coastal Walkway and the Tairua Harbour walk.</li> <li>• DOC is developing Kauaeranga Valley initiatives, such as</li> <li>• Upgrades to huts and to give the Kauaeranga “Iconic” status within the organisation for both recreation and historic purposes. However, such initiatives are hampered by access issues.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to full submission for further background information provided, including correspondence details, statistics, and progress to date).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2017/18: \$5.50 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul>	<p>investigation work has already been undertaken, including costings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of place holder funding would allow the project to be progressed on approval.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<p>LTP15_180 Thomson Mary</p>	<p>Kopu footpath connection</p> <p>Submitter requests that footpath connection work be undertaken on Kopu Road to connect the footpath from Kopu Hotel to the roundabout on the State Highway.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kopu is a business hub.</li> <li>• There is a footpath from Kopu Hotel to Queen Street, and also from Placemakers to the roundabout, but nothing along Kopu Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Thames Community Board would need to consider and confirm priority for any Kopu footpath connection project.</p> <p>Kopu footpath is on the Thames Footpath Construction programme, being the area from Queen Street to Pakura Close (old SH25 to old Kopu bridge cul-de-sac). This work is programmed for completion in approximately 31 years from 2015/16, based on existing budgets in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan of \$80,000 per year.</p> <p>Estimated cost of this footpath is \$107,000., therefore if the Thames Community Board decide to bring this project forward into this 2015-2025 Long Term Plan period then additional budget will need to be approved.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Thames Community Board needs to consider and confirm project priority.</li> <li>• Work is currently programmed for future years and could be</li> </ul>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		NZTA subsidy may not be available for this project.	brought forward as part of future annual plan and long term plan planning process. [Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].
<p><u>LTP15_357</u> Kopu Development Group</p>	<p>Kopu footpaths Submitter requests that a new footpath is needed along the Kopu Road from 'On all Floors' back to Wharf road. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpaths are used often.</li> </ul>	<p>Local roading</p> <p>This footpath is on the Thames footpath construction programme from Queen St to Pakura Close (old SH25 to old Kopu bridge cul-de-sac) for completion in approximately 31 years from 2015/16 based on existing budgets in draft LTP of \$80,000 per year.</p> <p>Thames Community Board needs to confirm priority for this work. Estimated cost of this footpath is \$107,000 therefore if the Thames Community Board decides to bring this project forward to this 2015-2025 Long Term Plan period then additional budget would need to be requested by the Thames Community Board.</p> <p>Staff note that NZTA subsidy may not be available for this project.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of priority is required by the Thames Community Board and approval of any additional footpath construction budget for the year that the footpath is to be constructed.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_217 Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	<p>Maintenance of gravel roads Submitter requests that Council not seal all roadways, but keep well maintained gravel roads. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognises that roading planning takes account of significant differences created by our geography.</li> </ul>	<p>Council currently only seals unsealed roads where there are dust issues to properties adjoining the road and also steep sections of unsealed roads which compromise safety and where the whole of life cost is less to seal the section of road compared with maintaining it as an unsealed surface.</p> <p>There is no plan at this stage to seal all unsealed roads in the district.</p>	No change.
LTP15_255 Mr Evan Penny	<p>Maintenance of local roads and footpaths Submitter comments that the maintenance of our local roads is among "a great many things" Council already does to stimulate use and enjoyment of the district (further noting that it wasn't always so).</p>	<p>This submitter supports what is proposed in relation to maintenance of local roads and footpaths. No change in necessary.</p>	No change.
LTP15_359 Maria Ling	<p>Matarangi road condition between Greys beach and Rings beach Submitter comments that half the road between Greys beach and Rings beach is not tarsealed and is not in good condition, and asks why this is. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road between Rings beach and Matarangi has been closed, which only leaves the road between Greys beach and Rings beach open.</li> <li>Only half the road is in tarseal and this is a big problem.</li> </ul>	<p>There is one more section of Bluff Rd on Council's dust sealing programme to be dust sealed. This section will be from the start of the seal at the eastern end of Rings Beach for approximately 200m back towards Grays Beach.</p> <p>This work is currently in the dust seal programme for completion in 2015/16 and will be funded from the existing dust seal budget of \$150,000 per year proposed in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</p>	No change.
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	<p>Monitor shared use of footpaths with pedestrians and motorised traffic Submitter requests that Council monitor shared use of footpaths with pedestrians and motorised traffic. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although pedestrians and motorized traffic currently share the roadway with no apparent problems, this situation should be monitored particularly if the number of elderly permanent</li> </ul>	<p>Council completed accessibility audits for main CDB areas in the district during 2013/14.</p> <p>Some work has been completed in the CBD areas to implement recommendations related mainly to serious safety issues as identified in the accessibility particularly for disabled people and the elderly.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Community Board input is required on priority of accessibility</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>residents was to increase and they found the lack of suitable footpaths a barrier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TCDC is not unusual in facing the dilemma that although new infrastructure is being built to modern access standards, it is difficult to find funds to upgrade legacy infrastructure to these standards. This is evidenced by, for example, narrow footpaths, the condition of kerb cuts, the lack of tactile pavers, and infrequency of level crossing opportunities with refuges. [The submitter references design details provided in previous submissions made.]</li> </ul>	<p>All community boards (with input from Council's Roading team) need to prioritise the accessibility audit recommendations within their current footpath construction and footpath rehabilitation budgets.</p>	<p>audit findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Related work is able to be done under existing work programmes.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation]</p>
<p>LTP15_218 Darian Lunjevich- West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Parking in Thames Community Board area Submitter requests that Council invest in improving / upgrading current facilities with a specific focus on a lot more parking in the Thames Community Board area.</p>	<p>The Thames Community Board could consider options which maximise the use of existing parking facilities, such as education campaigns and/or further parking restrictions.</p> <p>Thames Community Board has requested that the Mackay Street carpark be included in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan period in year 1. Staff have subsequently investigated surfacing options to determine cost, with cost estimates as follows: Option 1 (chipseal): \$189,491.50 Option 2 (ashaltic concrete): \$261,563.50</p> <p>The local rating impact of option 2 would be \$5.73 per Thames ratepayer per year.</p> <p>Council's Roading staff recommend Option 2 for an asphalt surface. Due to the turning stresses from vehicles that would be present in this carpark, asphalt would hold up a lot better than chipseal meaning that less surfacing repairs are required in the long run.</p>	<p>That Council approve budget in year 1 of \$261,563.50 for the Mackay Street carpark project in Thames.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports the inclusion of the Mackay Street carpark in year 1 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. Feedback has not been gained relating to surface option/cost from the Board.]</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>Prioritising this project is considered appropriate due to limited existing parking in the Mackay Street area. There will likely be increased demand for parking with the relocation of the AA service to the Council building from 1 July this year. Council's Area Manager for Thames notes that it would be appropriate to prioritise the parking spaces closest to the Council building for customers, and the rear section of the Mackay Street carpark for Council staff.</p>	
<p>LTP15_284 Samantha Lee Supported Life Style Hauraki Trust</p>	<p>Pedestrian crossing in Thames</p> <p>Submitter requests a pedestrian crossing in Thames, at the Grahamstown end of Queen Street either outside 900 Queen Street or Carnegie Hall.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of a safe crossing at this end of town for service users of the Supported Life Style Hauraki Trust and also other members of the community.</li> <li>• On a daily basis there are up to 30 Life Stylers crossing the main road and currently the staff need to escort Life Stylers, some with significant mobility issues, across the road quickly between rushes of cars. This situation is not a safe one and may eventually lead to someone, be it staff or Life Styler, getting seriously hurt.</li> <li>• A crossing in either of the suggested locations would benefit the community as a whole given the location is near the brick flats where many aged residents reside.</li> </ul>	<p>NZTA have stated that they intend to install a pedestrian crossing facility i.e. refuge island on the State Highway through Thames. However, Council needs to advise NZTA on the preferred location.</p> <p>Traffic design work is currently being undertaken for improving pedestrian access across Queen Street, as recommended in the Thames Urban Development Strategy.</p> <p>The Thames Accessibility Audit report (2013) includes a recommendation that Council 'Perform a detailed traffic and pedestrian analysis to determine the best location for pedestrian crossing facilities of the State Highway.' Such analysis could assess issues and appropriate options, and potentially could take a wider scope to assess Council managed roads also as several requests from the community have been made previously for crossings in various locations in Thames. The assessment could inform future work relating to pedestrian crossings including location, type and priority, and should consider related work to date.</p>	<p>That Council approve \$5,000 Opex funding to undertake a pedestrian needs assessment for Thames.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thames Community Board needs to prioritise any further work to assess appropriate locations for new pedestrian crossings in Thames.</li> <li>• Several requests from the community</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		Thames Community Board could consider requesting Opex budget to undertake a pedestrian crossing needs assessment for Thames. Estimated cost is \$5,000. This has been subsequently discussed with the Thames Community Board and the Board supports requesting the additional \$5,000 for a pedestrian needs assessment.	<p>have been made previously for crossings in various locations in Thames.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
LTP15_217 Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	<p>Provision of pull-over areas</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council provide more pull-over areas.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For visitors to enjoy the spectacular of our everyday.</li> </ul>	<p>There are currently many safe places to pull over around the district's roads.</p> <p>There is currently no project in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan to create further pull-over areas.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are currently many safe places to pull over around the district's roads.</li> </ul>
LTP15_218 Darlan Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum	<p>Public transport</p> <p>Submitter requests that there be free public transport for youth in the Thames Community Board area.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To create more opportunities.</li> </ul>	<p>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).</p> <p>A number of public and community transport service</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation]</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
and Thames Youth Supporters Network		currently operate within the TCDC area. More detail is requested from the submitter regarding the opportunities being sought to establish whether a community funded public transport service is the most effective way of addressing this request.	
LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network	Public transport Submitter requests that there be free public transport for youth in the Whangamata Community Board area. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To create more opportunities.</li> </ul>		
LTP15_229 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Public transport Submitter requests that there be free public transport, with particular reference to ferry and buses, for youth in the Mercury Bay Community Board area. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To create more opportunities.</li> </ul>		
LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich-	Public transport Submitter requests that there be free public transport for youth in the Coromandel-Colville Community Board area.		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To create more opportunities.</li> </ul>		
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	Public transport Submitter requests that Council work with the community, including persons with disabilities, to ascertain whether at least a limited accessible public transport service could be provided between key locations. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district has a reported 27% of residents aged over 65.</li> <li>• At a local level there are very limited options for persons who do not hold a driver's licence.</li> <li>• It is vital that people who do not have independent access to a private vehicle, including disabled people, are provided for in community and public transport services.</li> </ul>	Council's Roding staff and Deputy Mayor French were part of a sub-regional working party which determined that the current community transport services being operated were meeting community transport needs, and that any addition to these services should be community driven.	No change.  Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current community transport services have been determined to meet community transport needs, and that any addition to these services should be community driven.</li> </ul> [Thames Community Board

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
			supports this recommendation]
LTP15_110 Mr John Wright Mercury Bay Area School	<p>South Highway (Albert Street), Whitianga Submitter requests that research, and works, be undertaken to address safety concerns on the South Highway west of Albert Street to Cook Drive (Whitianga) around Mercury Bay Area School. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• controlling traffic flow to flow west only</li> <li>• speed humps</li> <li>• changing current parallel parking on the north side of the road to angle parking</li> <li>• Consideration of a name change to 'Albert Street' of South Highway west of Albert street to the waterways canal, and sequential numbering commencing from the east end of south highway.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For significant improvement in safety in and around Mercury Bay Area School.</li> <li>• The road is the width of a state highway and would be well wide enough to allow for all the improvements.</li> <li>• A street name change would make a lot of sense and remove confusion that persists for people wishing to get to our school, frequently new comers to our school and community, and visitors to the school (e.g. Ministry of Education).</li> </ul>	<p>No budget has been included in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for the improvements to the South Highway (Albert Street) road layout in Whitianga.</p> <p>Investigations would need to be completed to consider options to address the issues raised and determine whether the submitter's requests would provide the best transport outcomes for this section of road.</p> <p>Naming of roads is delegated to the Mercury Bay Community Board and is not a long term plan matter.</p> <p>The suggested name change for the road could be referred to the Mercury Bay Community Board for consideration.</p> <p>Mercury Bay Community Board could consider requesting Opex budget to undertake further investigations. Estimated cost is \$5,000.</p>	<p>That Council allocate a budget of \$5,000 and direct staff to investigate altering the direction of traffic on South Highway outside the Mercury Bay Area School and the renaming of this section of road; and</p> <p>That Council consider the outcome of this investigation in the 2016/17 Annual Plan.</p>
LTP15_229 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth	<p>Speed limits in Mercury Bay Submitter requests lowering speed limits in the Mercury Bay Community Board area. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To improve safety and security.</li> </ul>	<p>Speed limit bylaw review (for speed limits on Council roads, excluding state highways) was completed in 2010/11 with several speed limit changes on roads in the Mercury Bay. At this stage there is no further speed limit review planned for Council roads until the national review of the speed limit rule which will have an impact on</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed limit rules are currently under review</li> </ul>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network		management (including what speed limits are suitable and consistent for different road types/hierarchy linked to the one network road classification). Council staff plan to apply the new speed limit rule once these have been confirmed nationally.	therefore no speed limit changes should be made until the outcome from the speed limit rule is confirmed.
LTP15_251 Katherine Sangster	<p>Thames War Memorial Civic Centre - pedestrian safety</p> <p>Submitter expresses concern for pedestrian safety in relation to the proposed Thames War Memorial Civic Centre/i-Site project, and upgrades may be needed.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern for the need for pedestrian safety upgrades in view of the anticipated increase of foot traffic and heavy traffic use, such as Intercity buses travelling along Mary Street.</li> <li>Current pedestrian refuges/crossings will not be sufficient.</li> <li>Clarification is requested as to where this is listed in the Consultation Document March 2015-2025 as an item for Budgetary funding approval, with reference to the chart on page 40-41 of the Consultation Document.</li> </ul>	<p>There is a current i-site project and related bus terminal project in 2014/15 and therefore not included in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</p> <p>Pedestrian safety is being considered as part of the bus terminal design.</p> <p>However, there is already a crossing facility with refuge island on Mary Street at the SH25 roundabout and there are no additional crossing facilities on Mary Street proposed as part of the design.</p> <p>The current parking and entranceway layout does not allow for another crossing facility without loss of carparking.</p> <p>The section of Mary Street proposed for use by buses is between the service lane and the SH25 roundabout.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason: Council has a current 2014/15 project that considers pedestrian safety at Thames War Memorial Civic Centre.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation]</p>
LTP15_34 Mr Lyndon Suckling	<p>Totara Valley Road, Thames</p> <p>Submitter requests that Totara Valley road in Thames be widened and sealed, and services taken to the end of the existing metalled section of the road. Submitter requests that this be done "in the near</p>	<p>Dustseal site on Totara Valley Rd from end of seal to end of maintained road (length = 709m) is programmed for completion in year 2018/19. Dust sealing is for sealing existing roads at their current widths to reduce dust</p>	<p>That Council approve additional budget in the 2015/16 to</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>future". Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will make way for developers to easily provide more sections in the zones marked residential and future residential.</li> <li>• As there are very few sections available for new housing in Thames, and failure to provide for areas of newer housing will result in less people moving in and more people moving out.</li> </ul>	<p>nuisance only. Road widening is not usually completed as part of a dust seal and this would normally be a condition of development, if the current road width was inadequate for the resulting use. The existing road width of Totara Valley is 3m wide.</p> <p>Water services advise that they have a project in the draft LTP to extend the water main up to Sawmill Road only. There is also currently no planned extension of waste water up Totara Valley Rd.</p> <p>Thames Community Board has indicated that it would like to request additional budget in the 2015/16 to investigate water, wastewater and stormwater issues on Totara Valley Road.</p>	<p>investigate water, wastewater and stormwater issues on Totara Valley Road.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation.]</p>
<p>LTP15_105 Mrs Tracey Lamason</p>	<p>Whitianga Town Upgrade Submitter notes support for the proposed spending on the Whitianga Town Upgrade. This is long overdue.</p>	<p>A section of the road on Albert St is overdue for replacement as this has been deferred until after the Whitianga town upgrade has been completed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>LTP15_259 Paul Kelly Mercury Bay Community Board</p>	<p>Whitianga Town Upgrade Mercury Bay Community Board notes that the Board has discussed the extent of the town upgrade looking at the area between The Esplanade and Campbell Street with utilising a navigational theme concentrating on the foreshore and the pedestrian connectivity of the two areas. Submitter notes that consideration will be given to a possible reclamation wall that could allow either reserve extension or aquatic activity.</p>		
<p>LTP15_359 Maria Ling</p>	<p>Drainage infrastructure - Kuaotunu West Submitter comments that they have laid complaints with Council about inadequate drainage infrastructure in Kuaotunu West - that they go to the Council at Whitianga every year to complain about the</p>	<p>This is a road maintenance issue and has been investigated several times in the past.</p> <p>The road side drain on the property side of the road has</p>	<p>That Council direct staff to respond to the submitter's concerns over</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submitter comments	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>contractors who clear the Council drains.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the contractors clear the drains from the sea side of the road but ignore the submitter's side which is Council owned. The drain comes under the road at 183 [Bluff Road Kuaotunu West] and goes down through the property to the back and out to the stream. Flooding happens after heavy rain.</p>	<p>been inspected when raised by the submitter previously and has been found to be within the contract requirements.</p>	<p>road side drainage in Kuaotunu West.</p>
<p><u>LTP15 317</u> Chris Lux</p>	<p>Culvert at Rabarts Road, Tuatēawa</p> <p>Submitter requests funding to be budgeted for a new stream culvert on Rabarts Road at Tuatēawa.</p> <p>Submitter states that the current culvert does not have sufficient capacity resulting in overflow in heavy rain. Further, that fixing the culvert would also allow greater turning space for vehicles as the road is increasingly being used to access the sea.</p> <p>Submitter notes that this funding is requested in every annual plan consultation.</p>	<p>Provision exists within Council's District Transportation activity with budgets to upgrade culverts where insufficient capacity exists.</p> <p>Culvert replacement projects are prioritised using a risk-based approach, with projects completed in order of their district priority.</p> <p>This culvert (at Rabarts Road) is on the drainage renewals programme. Priority for increasing culvert capacity is based on traffic volume and use of the road; in this case access to two properties and the quarry.</p> <p>The frequency and duration of flooding, and also the effects of the flooding caused by the undersized culvert, is considered in prioritisation.</p> <p>Based on the above noted factors the upgrade of the culvert on Rabarts Rd is a low priority.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

## 11.2 Activity: Community Spaces - Coromandel-Colville

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>RFIN_176 Chris Stark</p>	<p>Submitter expresses concern that the Coromandel-Colville Community Board area will become the 'Poor Cousin' of the peninsula that it used to be, in an attempt on the Community Board's part to keep rates at a level it thinks is reasonable and to the detriment of service levels.</p> <p>Submitter requests that Council has a 'bottom line' service level for local activities, and all other activities where the level of service, or funding, is set by the Board.</p> <p>Submitter states that while they are a great supporter of Community Boards, it is recognised that all Boards are different, only ever as effective or proactive as the people that are not on it, and all have different interests and priorities.</p>	<p>Levels of Service are considered by the Coromandel-Colville Community Board during the Long Term Plan process.</p> <p>This process includes a balancing act between affordability and desirable higher levels of service that cannot be avoided. The Board sets its priorities based on their best endeavours to achieve this balance.</p> <p>This approach of allowing Community Boards to set their own levels of service is consistent with Council's community empowerment model.</p> <p>Should specific activities be raised in relation to a desired increase in the level of service, the Board can review their position.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Submitter makes the following requests regarding youth in the Coromandel-Colville Community Board area, based on the findings of the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the local high school by upgrading the classrooms, and funding more education opportunities.</li> <li>• Beautify the area through art, including graffiti art.</li> <li>• More youth focused activities and sports.</li> <li>• More cool and safe places to hang out.</li> <li>• More youth entertainment.</li> <li>• More community events.</li> <li>• More affordable indoor facilities to house sports, a</li> </ul>	<p>Staff agree with and support everything said in this submission, but do note that some of the suggestions are outside of core council activities and are either in the hands of the private sector or public organisations outside of Council's sphere of influence, such as provision of cinemas, ice skating rinks, dance studios and go-kart tracks.</p> <p>There is a need to focus on core</p>	<p>That staff be instructed to encourage the submitter to engage with the Coromandel-Colville Community Board on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a bike tracks (more likely to be pump track)</li> <li>• Arts strategy</li> <li>• Design suite for Coromandel</li> <li>• Youth events.</li> </ul> <p>That the Coromandel-Colville Community Board provides</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>professional dance studio, a cinema, bowling and ice skating rinks, and go karts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build a huge BMX I Skate Park in Coromandel Town.</li> <li>• Build a new, bigger skate park with a bowl.</li> <li>• Eliminate tagging.</li> <li>• Develop plans to maintain and improve established facilities that young people use on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• Offer activities and events targeted towards areas that interest youth and create safe areas for young people to socialize.</li> </ul> <p>The survey shows that although three youth opted not to respond to the question, the majority or just under two-thirds of the youth that participated felt that the Coromandel/Colville area was youth friendly, compared with just over one-third that felt the area was not youth friendly.</p> <p>Submitter acknowledged the work that Council does to support to local youth centres/spaces and would like to see Council continue to support these and other initiatives.</p>	<p>Council activities and prioritise improvements in levels of service based on the greater community needs.</p> <p>Coromandel-Colville Community Board has prioritised harbour facility development and maintenance ahead of higher levels of service with regard to skate parks, BMX tracks, increased pool size and pool heating.</p> <p>The Board has prioritised further work on the achievability of a Coromandel Sportsville, lighting for the Coromandel skate ramp and basketball court and has set aside economic development funding of \$20,000 per annum for improving activities available in Coromandel including development of bike tracks and a pump track at the recently capped Coromandel Landfill.</p> <p>Council is developing an arts strategy which could lead to community board specific action plans. Within this, public art including murals can be addressed. There will be opportunities for the submitter to be involved in the development of both the strategy and the action plan. The action plans may be able to incorporate beautification of the Coromandel</p>	<p>assistance to the Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable them to submit to the Ministry of Education on educational improvements in the Community Board area</li> <li>• Encourage them to engage with the Spirit of the Coromandel in regard to their investigations into provision of outdoor pursuit education being proposed on the Thames-Coromandel District Council reserve at Tucks Bay.</li> </ul> <p>[The Coromandel-Colville Community Board supports these recommendations.]</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>town.</p> <p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board is also about to consider the development of a design suite for the town.</p>	
<p>LTP15_356 Margaret Harrison Coromandel-Colville Community Board</p>	<p>Submitter proposes that Boat Launching Permits should only apply to the ward the permit is purchased in, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The activity is funded locally.</li> <li>• Users should be contributing to the facilities they are using, the fundamental premise of user pays.</li> </ul>	<p>One of the major issues facing maintenance and renewal of existing harbour infrastructure in Coromandel is the lack of reserves and income available to undertake this capital and operational intensive activity.</p> <p>In a user pays environment it is necessary that the user pays contribution is directed toward the budget used to maintain and renew the facilities being "consumed".</p> <p>The 2014/15 fees and charges for boat launching permits throughout the district are as follows: Coromandel-Colville recreational boat launching/trailer parking annual permit = \$90 (daily permit \$10) Whangamata recreational boat launching/trailer parking annual permit = \$65 (daily permit \$6) Whitianga recreational boat launching/trailer parking annual permit = \$70 (daily permit \$8)</p> <p>There are no changes proposed to the boat launching permits throughout the district in 2015/16.</p>	<p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board recommends that Council adopt the approach that recreational boat launching/trailer parking permits are only able to be used in the Community Board area in which the permit has been purchased.</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_356 Margaret Harrison Coromandel-Colville Community Board</p>	<p>Submitter proposes to include \$1.7m in the 2022/2023 financial year towards the Coromandel Harbour, due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Coromandel Wharf head and retaining structures will need to be removed and replaced.</li> <li>• The Community Board notes that if the Wharf continues to be used in the current manner it is likely that this work will need to be brought forward or the Wharf will become unusable within the next ten years timeframe.</li> </ul> <p>The Community Board notes that the need for these repairs could change based on decisions yet to be made in relation to the Coromandel Harbour Development Project.</p>	<p>The true costs of maintaining the current level of service for Coromandel Harbour Activity is reflected in the LTP. The wharf will require significant investment in maintenance to sustain a workable wharf as identified in the condition assessment report completed in 2014.</p> <p>Deferring maintenance until decisions are made on the Coromandel Harbour Development project may negate the need to undertake this maintenance.</p>	<p>The Coromandel Colville Community Board recommends that Council add \$1.7 million to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Coromandel Harbour renewals budget in the 2022/2023 financial year (impact to Coromandel-Colville area ratepayer - \$76.97 annually from 2022/23).</p> <p>[Also noted under Funding Requests in main report]</p>
<p>LTP15_356 Margaret Harrison Coromandel-Colville Community Board</p>	<p>Submitter supports the Coromandel Harbour Development Project remaining one of Council's three anchor projects, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harbour development is a priority for the Board to reduce congestion at the Sugarloaf and Hannafords Jetty sites.</li> <li>• Coromandel is reliant on visitors drawn in by recreational use of the Hauraki Gulf and the Auckland Ferry service to drive its economy and the current capacity restraints at key harbour access ways is a major limiting factor in the economic future for Coromandel.</li> </ul> <p>The Board also supports retention of the aquaculture industry through provision of appropriate harbour facilities for this industry.</p>	<p>There are significant capacity restraints related to car parking at both The Sugarloaf and Hannafords Wharf sites and this has led to many complaints and intermittently created a significant risk in the event there is an emergency further up Te Kouma Rd.</p> <p>Coromandel-Colville community board area staff are currently developing interim solutions to the existing issues in the form of bylaw amendments and signage however this will only be a short term solution and there is a dire need for longer term solutions to be developed. With Harbour development currently under investigation development of long term solutions at these sites</p>	<p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board recommends that alternate sites for charter and recreation boating capacity at all tide facilities be developed as identified in the Coromandel Harbour Development strategy reference document.</p> <p>[Coromandel-Colville Community Board supported this recommendation.]</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		have not been investigated.	
<p>LTP15_149 Mr Darryl O'Keeffe</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the fees and charges for Coromandel/Colville Harbour Facilities regarding the slipway grid at Sugarloaf Landing (the grid) be reviewed. Submitter believes that this particular charge (\$65 per berth per day) is now out dated. Submitter notes that the response from a community board member on the matter was "these charges have always been there".</p> <p>Submitter notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mussel Barge Snapper Safaris 2008 Ltd (MBSS) have been using this grid for more than 15 years and that they pay Berthage fees for the use of Coromandel Harbour facilities (including the grid) at \$75 per meter of vessel per annum which equates to approximately \$2250.</li> <li>• In the last approximate 2 years another fee has been introduced - the passenger fee- at \$1pp. This equates to another approximately \$9-10k a year from MBSS which apparently goes toward these exact same facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Submitter asks why then do MBSS have to pay a 3rd time to use this harbour facility? Charges have increased over 500% in the last 2.5 years yet the "always been there" grid charge does not seem to have been looked at or considered.</p> <p>Submitter would like the issue to be discussed; a decision made and then be notified of the decision and the process undertaken to arrive at the decision.</p>	<p>There is a need to review harbour charges through the 2015/2016 financial year and make further recommendations to the Community Board especially in light of proposed development activity in the near future.</p> <p>Under the present system, the berthage fees are the contribution commercial users make to the maintenance of the various harbour facilities. In addition to the maintenance fees there was a development cost for development of Hannafords wharf to increase its capacity to manage increasing operator and passenger numbers using the facility (passenger fee).</p> <p>In regard to the maintenance grid fees, this is another user pays system to allow the Council to start to maintain these facilities to a higher standard.</p> <p>Maintenance and development of facilities has been impacted by the lack of revenue being generated from users as the general rate has not been applied to the required level of maintenance to sustain facilities in a fit for purpose condition.</p>	<p>That an operational budget of \$10,000 is established to undertake investigations into the fees and charges model for Coromandel-Colville harbour facilities to be completed by Coromandel-Colville area staff in the 2015/2016 year. The impact of additional budget is approximately \$3.94 per ratepayer in the Coromandel-Colville area.</p> <p>That a review of harbour facilities and asset management strategy is undertaken in 2015/16 financial year with recommendations to be brought back to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board and Thames Community Board for inclusion in the 2016/17 Annual Plan.</p> <p>[Coromandel-Colville Community Board supported this recommendation.]</p>



Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>It is expected that the review will identify better and more efficient ways of collecting user pays revenue to improve management and development of harbour facilities to provide an overall higher level of service over time. This is likely to include a greater user pays contribution to an activity that is currently subsidised through the general rate.</p> <p>Wharf infrastructure in the Coromandel-Colville ward requires significant investment and a catch-up in deferred maintenance.</p>	
<p>LTP15_356 Margaret Harrison Coromandel-Colville Community Board</p>	<p>Community Board proposes to remove \$152K from 2016/2017 (year two) identified for Hannafords carpark extension as the resulting benefits (two additional carparks) does not justify the expense and will not resolve the current parking issues at the site.</p> <p>Instead, the Community Board proposes to include \$10K in 2015/2016 (year one) for Hannafords Parking Improvements, because as a result of removing the carpark extension plans there is a need to undertake work to improve the parking situation at Hannafords Jetty. This should include amended parking bylaw and signage/bollards to prevent disruptive parking behaviours.</p>	<p>The proposed spend of \$152,000 was only going to result in benefit of two additional car parks and staff do not consider this creates sufficient benefit to justify the spend.</p> <p>The \$10,000 will ensure development of fit for purpose facilities with sufficient car parking capacity which is not possible at the current Sugarloaf or Hannafords Wharf sites.</p>	<p>The Coromandel-Colville Community Board recommends that Council remove the Hannafords Carpark improvements project and budget of \$152,000 from the 2016/2017 year of the Long Term Plan and replace it with a separate budget of \$10,000 for the 2015/16 year for establishment and implementation of proposed changes to the parking bylaw to be reviewed in June 2015, at a saving of approximately \$6.91 per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area.</p> <p>[Coromandel-Colville Community Board supported this recommendation.]</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	Submitter notes that there may be opportunities for establishing all weather footpaths or boardwalks for those who cannot access the beaches.	There are many beach areas in the Coromandel-Colville ward, and reserve management plans enable the community board to consider specific areas for improvement according to levels of demand for disabled access.	That staff are instructed to consider improving disability access to beaches when reserve management plans are reviewed.  [Coromandel-Colville Community Board supported this recommendation.]
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	Submitter recommends that signage and other information be made available in various formats so that people with vision impairment, and others, have equal access to the information. [Submitter suggests QR codes that can be read by smartphones and provide spoken commentary, and hazardous vehicle crossings can be defined by tactile pavers in the same way as used for normal roads.]	Council is considering use of QR codes for signage on a case by case basis.  Coromandel-Colville area staff are currently scoping work on transportation issues and recommend inclusion of high volume pedestrian areas across vehicle access ways (Wharf and Kapanga Roads in particular) for consideration within these investigations.	No change.
LTP15_356 Margaret Harrison Coromandel-Colville Community Board	Submitter requests that Council include sufficient budget to meet Kauri Protection requirements resulting from Kauri Dieback risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocate and improve the Kauri Dieback station at Hannafords Jetty.</li> <li>• Protection in the form of physical separation of the Memorial Reserve Kauri</li> <li>• Protection and boardwalk around the Kauri at the Long Bay Kauri Track.</li> </ul>	The Coromandel-Colville Community Board received a report on 14 April 2015 which outlined the need to protect Kauri in the Long Bay area. Waikato Regional Council coordinates Kauri Protection work but does not fund the work on Council land.	That a new local capital budget is established which is specific to Kauri Protection and addresses high risk areas in the district.  Budget requirements in the 2015/16 year for Coromandel-Colville area are as follows at an additional cost of approximately \$0.86 per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area:
LTP15_325 Alison Smith Coromandel Kauri Dieback Forum	Submitter requests council allocate a budget to support its existing efforts to prevent kauri die back and to support those of its partners.	What has been suggested is an interim measure to protect specific stands of Kauri in Long Bay and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocate and improve the Kauri</li> </ul>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">LTP15 344</a> Cath Wallace</p>	<p>Submitter requests controls on movement of people, animals and vehicles to prevent the spread of kauri die back.</p>	<p>Memorial Reserve which are high risk areas due to high visitor numbers.</p>	<p>dieback station at Hannafords Wharf - \$5,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection and boardwalk around the Kauri at Long Bay - \$11,400</li> <li>• Interpretation signage (x5) \$2,500 at key Coromandel holiday parks and dump stations</li> </ul> <p>That Council establishes a new Local Kauri Protection operational budget at an additional cost of approximately \$2.64 per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish garden around the Memorial Reserve Kauri \$2,000 (one off)</li> <li>• An on-going annual parks contract variation of \$200 extra per annum to maintain the new garden around the Memorial Reserve Kauri</li> <li>• An annual parks contract variation of \$3,600 extra per annum for maintenance of cleaning stations at Long Bay (x2 stations) and Hannafords (x1 station).</li> </ul> <p>That Council staff are instructed to work with Waikato Regional Council to ensure that priority areas for Kauri protection in the Coromandel are included in protection plans to reduce Kauri dieback risk in the</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
			<p>district.</p> <p>[Also noted under Funding Requests in main report]</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_50</a> Richard Northey</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the cliff track to Back Beach at Wyuna Bay be constructed and restored, because the track is so slippery and degraded that frail residents can no longer use it and are thereby denied access to the back beach and to the northern side of the Wyuna Peninsula.</p>	<p>Council has not had an opportunity to investigate this non-Council track or assess the cost of Council provided track infrastructure. This work could be included in the next reserve management plan review in 2015/16 and could be budgeted for in a future Annual Plan.</p>	<p>That staff be instructed to erect a sign to advise that the cliff track to Back Beach at Wyuna Bay is not a Council maintained track.</p>
<p>LTP15_344 Cath Wallace</p>	<p>Submitter requests that there be biodiversity health and biosecurity performance measures for the Parks and Reserves Activity</p>	<p>Biodiversity health and biosecurity performance is not considered a level of service requirement, but it is legislated for under the Resource Management and Biosecurity Acts.</p> <p>The core purpose of Council reserves is the provision of recreation opportunities and has a secondary purpose of promoting biodiversity. Because of this, it is not appropriate for Council to include performance measures for biodiversity health and biosecurity. Establishment of these measures would require significant investment in benchmarking and annual stocktake which is already undertaken by the Waikato Regional Council as per the Regional Pest Management Plan and Regional Pest Management Strategy.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Submitter requests that regarding youth in the Coromandel-Colville Community Board area that playgrounds are expanded, and bark is removed in favour for softer material. This request is based on the findings of the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013.	Council playgrounds are managed in best attempt to comply with NZ Playground standards which allow for loose safety surface material. Alternate safety surface material can cost significantly more than the current standard and would increase the level of service currently provided by the Coromandel-Colville Community Board.	That staff be instructed to investigate providing a higher level of service through replacing loose safety materials in high demand playground assets through the reserve management plan review.  [Coromandel-Colville Community Board supported this recommendation.]
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	Submitter recommends that the use of loose fill surfaces for children's playgrounds be discontinued [Submitter notes they have been in contact with Standards NZ who allow the use of loose fill surface material, and that Standards NZ are not able to make the requested changes to the handbook without additional funding], in favour of the other surface alternatives and that where loose fill material has been used, a programme be instituted to replace it with a universally accessible safety surface.		
LTP15_336 Vikki Bertram Sport Waikato	Submitter supports the funding of \$473,000 in 2016/17 for the Coromandel Sportville project as it represents a partnership between the MoE, council and sporting organisations and will enable the sharing of facilities – ultimately reducing costs and potentially increasing participation	The business case for this project is under development and is expected to recommend to the Coromandel-Colville Community Board the way forward for this project in 2015. Council's contribution to this project is set at \$315,000 un-escalated. The escalated funding of \$473,000 in the draft Long Term Plan demonstrates the full costs, which includes expected external funding requirements.	No change.
LTP15_231 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel	Submitter requests that regarding youth in the Coromandel-Colville Community Board area that the community pool is made bigger and is heated. This request is based on the findings of the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013.	The Coromandel community pool, while run independently from Council, receives funding from Council through a service level	No change.

Submitter	Submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network		agreement. At this stage the current length and level of solar heating is fit for purpose for the community given the expense of an all year heated pool of greater than 25m.	
LTP15_320 Moana Hale T Ropu Tautoko O Harataunga	Submitter expresses concerns that the sacred maunga of Tokatea is desecrated by human defecation due to the increased numbers of tourists. Submitter requests that Council takes the lead in discussions with <b>DOC</b> and other relevant agencies to get a toilet built immediately as a priority for our community.	The Coromandel-Colville Community Board is aware of this concerning issue and has raised this issue with the land owner, the Department of Conservation, and is engaged in discussion to resolve this.	That staff are instructed to assist the Department of Conservation to resolve this issue of public defecation on Department of Conservation land at Tokatea mountain through provision of signage on the adjacent TCDC road reserve at a cost of \$1,000 at an additional cost of approximately \$0.45 per rate payer in the Coromandel-Colville area.  [Also noted under Funding Requests in main report]
LTP15_356 Margaret Harrison Coromandel-Colville Community Board	Submitter requests that the 2015/16 local car park maintenance budget be increased to include maintenance sealing of the Hauraki House car park. Submitter notes that this would be contingent on completion of property transfers between MoE/TCDC currently under negotiation.	The poor condition of the car park is acknowledged but this area remains under Ministry of Education's ownership. Once property negotiations are complete and the area becomes part of the Hauraki House Reserve a project will need to be established to seal the carpark and make it fit for purpose.  Area staff are preparing a costing for the sealing and will be prepared, on conclusion of negotiations, to include a project in the following 2016/17 Annual Plan.	No change.

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Submission points</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
		This negotiation has been on-going since 2001, so committing to a spend now is not advisable and Council would be better to wait until negotiations are complete.	

### 11.3 Activity: Community Spaces - Mercury Bay

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_275</a> Edward and Betty Collings	[Submitter requests that the access road to the Cathedral Cove carpark be moved from Grange Road to Lees Road.]	These issues are being considered as part of the Great Walks Project and the Hahei Community Plan Review.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_135</a> Ms Lesley McCormick	Submitter requests: 1. Enforcement of the 5knot speed limit of all boats. 2. A replenishment, compaction, contouring and re-vegetation plan along the harbour edge, utilising the dredging's that currently undertaken in the harbour. 3. Communication and monitoring of the erosion with the local adjacent residents.	Solutions for this area can be investigated and potentially actions (subject to funding and Council approval) as part of the wider coastal erosion work underway within the Whitianga Coastal Erosion Action Plan process. It should be noted that higher priority, high erosion 'hotspots' are the current priority for example Brophys Beach, Buffalo Beach, Whangapoua and Cooks Beach.  [Issue also included in Coastal and Hazard Management activity]	That the request for enforcement of a five knot speed limit be forwarded to the Harbour Master.  That Council staff continue to investigate and where appropriate implement actions to address coastal erosion in the Robinson Road area and surrounds as per the Whitianga Coastal Erosion Action Plan.
<a href="#">LTP15_138</a> Lesley McCormick Robinson Road Harbour Foreshore Group	[Submitter requests coastal management work at Robinson Road]	[Issue also included in Coastal and Hazard Management activity]	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_203</a> Beverley Ross	[Submitter expresses preference for funds to be spent on preventing coastal erosion]	With the completion of the Whitianga Coastal Erosion Action plan in 2013, A number of actions are underway to address the most significant coastal erosion 'hotspots' in Mercury Bay. This includes Brophys Beach backstop wall, Buffalo Beach Wall extension, Buffalo Beach Dune Rehabilitation and the potential extension of the	No recommendation



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		Cooks Beach wall. A programme of regular sand push ups in key risk areas has also been implemented and will continue.	
<a href="#">LTP15 310</a> Anna Horne	[Submitter requests greater and more transparent communication from the Mercury Bay Community Board]	Staff to note this.	<p>That Council notes the Mercury Bay Community Board will have a renewed focus on communicating its agendas and decisions to the public; and</p> <p>That Council notes the Mercury Bay Community Board will increase the business conducted at its public meetings in favour of community board workshops.</p>
<a href="#">LTP15 110</a> Mr John Wright Mercury Bay Area School	[Submitter requests an opportunity to meet with council to discuss support for the school's infrastructure and to commit to a community: school partnership.]	<p>Submitter sets out that a number of Mercury Bay Area School facilities have significant value to the wider community.</p> <p>The request for Council funding should be discussed with the Community Board and Council in more detail prior to any funding commitments being made. The community board and MBAS are working productively together currently.</p>	Recommend the Mercury Bay Community Board continue to meet with Mercury Bay Area School staff to discuss the possibility of shared maintenance for community assets.
<a href="#">LTP15 255</a> Mr Evan Penny	[Submitter requests council take greater consideration of enhancing accessibility and aesthetic values when undertaking coastal works projects.]	Staff note that the current works to extend the ex-NZTA rip rap wall at Kuaotunu are to address high erosion risk areas only and rip	No recommendation

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		rap/rock is not a preferred option. The majority of Buffalo Beach is being managed through the recreation of natural dune systems and sand push ups. The Brophys Beach solution is a geotextile bag wall rather than rock.	
<a href="#">LTP15_310</a> Anna Horne <a href="#">LTP15_335</a> Ash Strachan	[submitters seek clarity on what the \$615,000 allocated for the destination boat ramp will cover and why the district needs this development]	The destination boat ramp funding is to improve the facilities in Whitianga associated with recreational boating. This includes improvements to both parking and launching facilities and the possible introduction of new infrastructure such as boat wash down systems. The exact details of the project are being developed currently.	Direct staff to work with the local boat users and ratepayers association to discuss the detail of intended facility improvements for the destination boat ramp.
<a href="#">LTP15_259</a> Paul Kelly Mercury Bay Community Board	<b>Destination Boatramp</b> The Mercury Bay Community Board recognises the need for an all tide, multi-purpose, well facilitated boat ramp within the Mercury Bay Area.		No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_345</a> Alastair Brickell	Submitter queries why council is operating the Hahei shuttle service and notes that this should be a commercially operated service	The Council and Mercury Bay Community Board have previously noted their intention to move out of the direct operation of the shuttle service.	Recommend That Council withdraw from the management of the Hahei/Ferry Landing Shuttle Service at the completion of the current contractual arrangements and that Council advise the Waikato Regional Council, the operator and key stakeholders of this direction.
<a href="#">LTP15_210</a>	Submitter requests building of short term docking spaces at	Submitter requests short term	Direct staff to advise the submitter

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Mr David Hough	Whitianga, to allow boating visitors to disembark and visit the town.	docking spaces in the Whitianga marina/harbour. Staff recently made improvements to the Whitianga Wharf to allow for limited visitor berthing.	of the area on the seaward side of the Whitianga Wharf that is available for visitor berthing.
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darlan Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Upgrade current facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the wharf.</li> </ul>	Council has been making ongoing improvements to the Whitianga Wharf.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_335</a> Ash Strachan	Likewise, the Kuaotunu Ramp Improvements \$95,000. What will be done for that \$95,000?	Council will work with local boat users and the ratepayers association on the final detail however the majority of the funding is intended for the breakwater and potential extension of the ramp.	Direct staff to work with the local boat users and ratepayers association to discuss the detail of intended extensions to the Kuaotunu boat ramp.
<a href="#">LTP15_280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	There may be opportunities for establishing all weather footpaths or boardwalks for those who cannot access the beaches.	Such access ways are being created in Mercury Bay on the foreshore particularly where there is a coastal protection structure between the access way and foreshore for example the Buffalo Beach footpath constructed in 2014. Further extensions to this will be completed in 2015.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a>	Upgrade current facilities:	Submitter requests repairs to	No recommendation

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repair important facilities such as footpaths.</li> </ul>	existing local footpaths. Council operates a system of continually inspecting and repairing footpaths.	
<a href="#">LTP15_85</a> Mrs Fiona Coulam	Council should take some action to ensure camping facilities are still available in Whangamata and Hahei if the existing grounds close. This could involve providing facilities for camping on Council land.	Council has released a public statement stating that it is not in the position or in the market to purchase the Hahei Camp and Beach Resort. However the Mayor has noted that if there were significant support from the community then the council could look at levying a targeted rate in the Hahei/Mercury Bay area to pay for the facility. While there is no recommendation that council purchase the site, staff should monitor the situation and bring to council's attention if this level of support does occur.	No recommendation
LTP15_332 Susan Speerstra	[Submitter requests council purchase the Hahei Camp and Beach Resort as a local economic development matter]		
<a href="#">LTP15_331</a> Deborah Brown	Submitter requests that measures are taken to strengthen and support our libraries due to the growing trend to rely on the internet as our knowledge base. Submitter states that it is important to recognise that we do not have control over the servers where this information is stored and that the much of this information is not manifest in the real world.	The Mercury Bay Community Board has included some additional funding in the 2015/16 year to provide support to the volunteer managed community libraries in the Mercury Bay area.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darian Lunjevich-	Submitter requests that regarding youth in the Coromandel-Colville Community Board area that playgrounds are expanded,	Council playgrounds are managed in best attempt to comply with NZ	That staff be instructed to investigate providing a higher level

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	and bark is removed in favour for softer material.	Playground standards which allow for loose safety surface material. Alternate safety surface material can cost significantly more than the current standard and would increase the level of service currently provided by the Coromandel-Colville Community Board.	of service through replacing loose safety materials in high demand playground assets through the reserve management plan review.
<a href="#">LTP15_280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	Submitter recommends that the use of loose fill surfaces for children's playgrounds be discontinued [Submitter notes they have been in contact with Standards NZ who allow the use of loose fill surface material, and that Standards NZ are not able to make the requested changes to the handbook without additional funding], in favour of the other surface alternatives and that where loose fill material has been used, a programme be instituted to replace it with a universally accessible safety surface.		
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	Please add biodiversity health and biosecurity for the Parks and Reserves performance measures.	Biodiversity health and biosecurity performance is not considered a level of service requirement, but it is legislated for under the Resource Management and Biosecurity Acts.  The core purpose of Council reserves is the provision of recreation opportunities and has a secondary purpose of promoting biodiversity. Because of this, it is not appropriate for Council to include performance measures for biodiversity health and biosecurity. Establishment of these measures would require significant investment in benchmarking and annual	No recommendation

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		stocktake which is already undertaken by the Waikato Regional Council as per the Regional Pest Management Plan and Regional Pest Management Strategy.	
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Upgrade current facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the bike park.</li> </ul>	Submitter requests upgrades to existing parks facilities.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Upgrade current facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Playgrounds - expand them and add more gear.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15_261</a> Mark Alloway	Submitter requests a toilet block on Buffalo Beach Reserve west end near the barbeque and picnic tables along the reserve.	The Mercury Bay Community Board and Council have allocated funding for a new toilet facility in the area in the 2016/17 year.	That the funding of \$168,000 in the 2016/17 year for the toilet block on Buffalo Beach be confirmed and the submitter advised of the outcome.
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darian Lunjevich-West	Submitter request repairs to important facilities such as public toilets.	Council inspects and repairs its public conveniences.	No recommendation

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network			
<a href="#">LTP15_217</a> Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	Consider planning for Whitianga to become the Venice of the South to meet rising sea levels and treat the fact as a platform for creative and exciting responses.	Interesting idea however it is not currently recommended as an approach for Whitianga. Alternative methods of improving the town centres connection with the water will be investigated in the Whitianga Town Centre Project.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_217</a> Michael Smither Gilliam McGregor	Whitianga medical centre, consider instead a wider concept, a health complex that provides on the Eastern side of the peninsula, a 50m swimming pool. A community pool.	Planning is underway for future medical facility needs.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	Whitianga Passenger Ferry. By working with the operator it may be possible to allow for those dependent on wheelchairs, especially heavy motorized wheelchairs to use this ferry.	Submitter requests council work with Whitianga passenger ferry operator to enhance accessibility for the disabled community. This request will be discussed with the Whitianga Ferry Operator.	That staff work with the Whitianga Ferry operator to investigate practical options to improve wheelchair access.
<a href="#">LTP15_105</a> Mrs Tracey Lamason	I support the spending proposed on the Whitianga Sports Ground Development and would like to see funding provided for a new clubroom/netball tower as proposed by the Trust.	Submitter notes support for Whitianga Sports Ground Development.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_335</a> Ash Strachan	Submitter requests clarification on proposal to spend \$1.72m on Whitianga Sports Ground Development.	Staff are able to liaise directly with the submitter on what the costs from	Staff are instructed to provide further information on costs of the

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Summary of submission points	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		the project will go towards.	Mercury Bay Multi Sports Centre to the submitter.
<a href="#">LTP15_105</a> Mrs Tracey Lamason	Submitter requests a covered swimming pool for Mercury Bay.	Submitters request improvements to the Whitianga swimming pool. Council has previously provided a grant of \$100,000 for the upgrading the Whitianga community pool and annually grants approximately \$40,000 toward the operation and maintenance of the facility.	That the request for covering the Whitianga community pool be forwarded to the Whitianga swimming pool trust who manage the Whitianga community pool.  That Council notes that it has previously provided a grant of \$100,000 for the upgrading the Whitianga community pool and annually grants approximately \$40,000 toward the operation and maintenance of the facility.
<a href="#">LTP15_229</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network	Submitter requests that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community pools - deeper, heated all year, with hydro slides and wave and lap pools.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15_74</a> Ms Jan Wright Creative Mercury Bay	Creative Mercury Bay requests that consideration is given by TCDC for TCDC funds to be set aside to support the development of the Whitianga Town Hall, in its current building, into a flexible centre suited for the multiple community uses, but better enabling use of the space as a performance centre.	The Whitianga Hall redevelopment project has \$164,000 allocated in the 2020/21 year within the draft LTP.	That the Community Board considers the request for enhanced use of the Whitianga Hall as a performance centre when the Whitianga Hall Upgrade project is planned.
<a href="#">LTP15_259</a> Paul Kelly Mercury Bay Community Board	<b>Civic Centre Upgrade</b> The Mercury Bay Community Board recognises the Civic Centre will require upgrade this is in consideration within year 6.	The Whitianga Hall redevelopment project has \$164,000 allocated in the 2020/21 year within the draft LTP.	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_345</a> Alastair Brickell	Submitter seeks justification of the proposed \$3.14 million Whitianga Town upgrade.	The Whitianga Town Centre is the key service centre for the Mercury Bay area and beyond. The town centre could be upgraded within the constraints of what is generally	No recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_310</a>	Submitter notes concerns with the Whitianga Town Centre		



<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of submission points</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Anna Horne	upgrade proposal and suggests fund could be better spent elsewhere. Also requests that if the upgrade goes ahead that town centre landlords be asked to contribute.	affordable for ratepayers.	
<a href="#">LTP15_268</a> Florian Geiger	Submitter requests that a double walkway be built in Matarangi to get to the Harbour head, and notes previous council commitments to do this.	Some areas of the harbour are subject to significant coastal erosion and Council does not own all coastal land in the areas.	That the Mercury Bay Community Board investigates walkway options within the limitations of affordability and coastal erosion.
<a href="#">LTP15_325</a> Alison Smith Coromandel Kauri Dieback Forum	Submitter requests that Council allocate a budget to support its existing efforts to prevent kauri die back and to support those of its partners.	Mercury Bay Community Board may want to consider implementing measures, and if required, requesting budget to minimise the risk Kauri Dieback presents.	Refer the matter of considering measures to mitigate Kauri Dieback risks in the Mercury Bay Community Board area to the Mercury Bay Community Board for further consideration.
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	Submitter requests controls on movement of people, animals and vehicles to prevent the spread of kauri die back.	Further investigation could be undertaken to determine an appropriate approach to minimise Kauri Dieback risks in the Mercury Bay Community Board area.	

#### 11.4 Activity: Community Spaces - Tairua-Pauanui

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
LTP15_137 Mr Barrie Bayers	There are two one lane bridges which in the event of tsunami could cause fatalities. Submitter acknowledges that they are not the council's responsibilities but council support could help.	With regard to the one lane bridges, Council is working with NZTA on the future upgrades. At the time of writing both bridges on either side of Tairua are on the NZTA low priority list.	No change.
LTP15_137 Mr Barrie Bayers	We have huge problems with our industrial area at Red Bridge Road that can only be fixed by Council. Maybe Council should stop building cycle tracks and wasting money on sporting facilities (Whitianga) and get their priorities sorted out for the benefit of the ratepayers	For the part of the Red Bridge Road industrial estate which is reclaimed land (i.e. Council's transfer station and the land between it and the state highway) and for which Council has yet to secure an interest, Council is advancing an application for a certificate of title pursuant to the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. Several iwi groups have expressed an interest in this land and with whom Council is consulting as part of the application process.  Until the above issues are resolved Council cannot progress further development, however budget has been allocated in 2017/18 to upgrade the industrial site.	No change.
<a href="#">LTP15_224</a> Jill Abbott	Red Bridge Road Industrial area, Tairua Red Bridge Road Industrial area must be sorted out now. 30 years is too long to wait - economic development essential. Tairua can't wait.		
LTP15_324 Gloria Rennie	Redbridge Road Industrial Area Over 20 years and still not titles for the tenants of the TCDC owned industrial area. There is no sewage or water and the road access is an embarrassment. Tairua is the only town without a proper industrial area. Real estate agents advise that they are constantly receiving enquiries from people requiring industrial sites. Tairua is losing out on much needed economic development and employment. Money and resources are URGENTLY required to enable this area to become a viable and vibrant much needed industrial are NOW!!!!		
LTP15_324 Gloria Rennie	Tairua Wharf Replacement: Safe all tide boat launching facility: Provision of trailer boat parking and upgrade of Mary Beach Reserve More funding needs to be allocated for this long outstanding and URGENTLY needed project. The funding of \$1.2 million planned and costed for in 1998 and approved by Council in 2002 cannot	The Tairua Paunui Community Board in 2013/14 reconfirmed the budget of \$1.2m be the maximum funds available for this Tairua Mary Beach Project. This project is progressing and new design scope	That Council endorse the Tairua Pauanui Community Board decision of 2013/14 regarding the maximum budget available for the Tairua Wharf Replacement project.

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>be expected to complete this long delayed project in 2015. Unlike other towns, Tairua a seaside town, does not have a safe all tide boat launching ramp. The wharf is a TCDC asset depreciated over many years and should be replaced from the Council depreciation fund account. <u>Not included in this budget.</u></p>	<p>and budgets will be presented to the Community Board in May/June 2015.</p>	
<p>LTP15_324 Gloria Rennie</p>	<p>Indoor Recreation Centre Funding needs to be reinstated for this much needed facility in Tairua. Our Community Hall is used to capacity. Tairua is a town. Our population is increasing. The primary school roll now stands at 136 with more children to enrol during the year. The kindergarten roll is closed because it is at capacity and there is a waiting list. Tairua does not require a \$3 million grandiose facility. A concrete block building attached to the fabulous Hornsea Road Bowling Club facility on recreation reserve land would be cost effective.</p>	<p>The Tairua Pauanui Community Board has extended this project outside the 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan period. The Tairua Paunui Community Board has, through the 2015 Tairua Community Plan, requested a community group be established to further develop the concept of an indoor recreation centre</p>	<p>The Council support the Community Boards decision to progress this project through the new Tairua Community Plan, and make no changes to the LTP.</p>
<p>LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>With respect to parks and reserves we recommend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the use of loose fill surfaces for children's playgrounds be discontinued, in favour of the other surface alternatives and that where loose fill material has been used, a programme be instituted to replace it with a universally accessible safety surface.</li> <li>• that signage and other information be made available in various formats so that people with vision impairment, and others, have equal access to the information.</li> </ul>	<p>The Parks department uses loose fill as a means to comply with safety standards from NZ Playground which cover fall heights of 3 metres.</p> <p>The use of fixed safety surfacing has been considered, however this material is expensive and does not provide Council with the best cost benefit solution as it also tends to be more costly for maintenance as they need replacing on an annual basis.</p> <p>Council's Parks department has been working on a number of projects to include accessible park equipment and are currently looking at a basket swing for children with disabilities and is looking at level access to the playground as well.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		There is also a buddy swing in Coromandel and Pepe playground in Tairua.	
LTP15_347 Sid and Vicki Ovesen	Why is Hikuai, the largest physical area in this ward, completely neglected? Please refer to the Hikuai Community Plan 2015 to understand where improvements in infrastructure are required.	Staff are unable to answer specific questions due to the unspecified issues presented by the submitter. The Hikuai Community Plan will be endorsed by the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board in May/June, and a work programme will be developed from this plan.	No change
LTP15_168 Michael Newton	Stone/tar from Chestnut Grove continues to plague our garage floor, carpets and driveway.	This matter is an RFS that was loaded on 21 April 2015 for action. Staff will be following up the RFS.	No change.
LTP15_339 Bob Renton Tairua-Pauanui Community Board	Parks and Reserves - Tairua Pauanui trail and Pepe Walkway Bridge Decision sought: That Council amend the budgets to reflect the outcome of the December Workshops which reflected in error within the LTP Consultation Document to the following: - Tairua Pauanui trail - Opex Council/Board Grants from retained earnings \$50,000 in year 2015/2016. - Pepe Bridge walkway/cycleway - Opex Council/Board Grants \$37,254 for year 2015/2016 and \$50,000 in year 2016/2017.	The Tairua-Pauanui Community Board has proposed via its submission to bring forward the requested \$50,000 for this project to 2015/16 from 2016/17. The Community Board supports this initiative as it will maintain momentum on what is regarded as an excellent Council/public funded project.	That Council amends the LTP as requested by the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board by confirming \$50,000 (Council/Board Grants funded from retained earnings OPEX) for the Pauanui Trail in 2015/16 and remove the opex project identified in the draft LTP in the 2016/2017 year.
LTP15_330 Gary Fowler Hikuai District Trust	PAUANUI TRAIL FUNDING This project will be of major economic and recreational benefit to the community by providing an invaluable recreational resource at minimal cost to TCDC. The working group is currently very close to having the second stage of the trail completed, however the project is currently unable to be finished due to lack of financial resources. The \$50,000 of funding allocated in the Long Term Plan in 2016/17 needs to be brought forward by one year to 2015/16 to enable the stage of the trail currently under construction to be completed. Additionally any further stages of the proposed trail should be district funded		

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	as it is in complete alignment with the Council's current Economic Development Strategy to encourage tourism. It is also within the same scope as the Coromandel Great Walks - one of TCDC's three anchor projects.		
LTP15_69 Mrs Elizabeth Anne Stewart Ball LTP15_70 Mr. Christopher Raymond Ball	Cycleway / Walkway - move the \$50,000 budget from 2016/ 2017 to 2015/2016 - to help completion		
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers and Residents Association	Pauanui Trail We agree with conditions This is an invaluable amenity for the community that has seen a successful trail be constructed at minimal cost. The allocated funding of \$50000 needs to be brought forward by one year from 2016/17 to 2015/16 to ensure that the stage of the trail currently under construction can be completed. Additionally any further stages of the proposed trail should be district funded as part of the Coromandel Great Walks project, as is the case in other areas such as Hahei.		
LTP15_263 William Prescott	Nil in LTP for Hikuai.	Submission noted - staff unable to comment as no specifics provided. The Hikuai Community Plan will be endorsed by the Tairua-Pauanui Community Board in May/June, and a work programme will be developed from this plan.	No change.
LTP15_265 Heather Prescott	Hikuai = nothing in LTP for Hikuai		
LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action	There may be opportunities for establishing all weather footpaths or boardwalks for those who cannot access the beaches.	Staff note this submission and will continue to identify suitable points for disabled access. One completed access point is located at Royal Billy Point.	Council instruct staff to work with CCS and the suggestions as part of the accessibility audits to identify suitable points for disabled access.
LTP15_329 Ken Bush	Disabled Beach Access Our association requests that funding be allocated to implement		

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Pauanui Ratepayers and Residents Association	disabled beach access in alignment with the current TCDC Disability Strategy		
LTP15_140 Susan and Anthony Jacobs	Mary Bay Wharf We require TCDC to guarantee that Mary Bay Wharf is either replaced or upgraded to ensure it its safe and in keeping with its beautiful location.	Staff assume the submitter is referring to the Tairua Mary Beach Wharf redevelopment project. The project is continuing with the expectation that physical works could begin late 2015 or early 2016 this work will address safety and visual enhancement of the Wharf	No change.
LTP15_339 Bob Renton Tairua-Pauanui Community Board	Funding Marys Beach Project - The Board supports this project, however challenges the funding option developed by staff. It believes the use of depreciation reserves to fund the total cost of the project is a breach of policy. - Funding should be 35% depreciation 35% DC for reserve development, 35% loan funded. - The use of 100% of the Wards depreciation reserves will provide no funding over a three year period for the replacement of the assets that the funding was accumulated from. Decision Sought: That Council retain the proposed budget for funding the Mary Beach project but that Council review how this funding is allocated so that it is funded 35% depreciation 35% DC for reserve development, 35% loan funded.	Under the changes to the LGA in 2014 we can no longer charge or use DC's for any Harbour Activity projects that haven't been significantly commenced. Also, in the RFP we state that borrowing will only be used when other funding sources have been exhausted. This is in the best interest of ratepayers as it is cheaper to use reserves than raise a loan. Therefore the staff recommendation is to make no changes to how the project is funded in the draft LTP.	No change
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers and Residents Association	Boat ramp maintenance and beach erosion Our Association also requests that more effective boat ramp management be implemented, namely an increase to the current sand removal consent that only allows for 100m3 per day to be removed. This volume should be increased to allow for effective and economic removal and transfer of sand from this high use recreational and operational facility and back to the beach front erosion zones. A levy should be applied across the district to	Council instruct staff to explore the possibilities of increasing the consent volume of 100m3 of sand removal at any one time to up to 300m3 at any one time to ensure that Royal Billy Boat ramp and access to open water does not impede coast guard or other	Council instruct staff to explore the possibilities of increasing the consent volume of 100m3 of sand removal at any one time to up to 300m3 at any one time to ensure that Royal Billy Boat ramp and access to open water does not impede coast guard or other

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	address this very serious Peninsula wide issue.	<p>emergency services and continues to provide recreational access for Pauanui residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>Council also request Staff to investigate the possibilities of introducing a trailer boat parking fee for Royal Billy Boat Ramp users to ensure sufficient funds are available throughout the year to maintain the required access and sand removal. Staff do not recommend that Council consider Royal Billy Point sand maintenance to be district funded. Note the Community Board approved \$350,000 in the 2017/18 year of the 2015 LTP to upgrade the Royal Billy Boat Ramp area.</p>	<p>emergency services and continues to provide recreational access for Pauanui residents and ratepayers. Council also request Staff to investigate the possibilities of introducing a trailer boat parking fee for Royal Billy Boat Ramp users to ensure sufficient funds are available throughout the year to maintain the required access and sand removal. That Council instruct staff to continue to monitor the outcomes of pest control and plan accordingly for future controls.</p>
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers Residents Association	Rabbit Control Our Association requests that funding be allocated from local budgets to facilitate an effective ongoing eradication programme.	Since the receipt of this submission Council have expedited a one off rabbit control programme in Pauanui, together with a joint funded WRC/TCDC bait station control. Staff will monitor the outcomes and plan accordingly for future controls. Note in 2013/14 WRC withdrew its contract for pest control on the Peninsula. The result of that has led to noticeable increases in pest populations which now have to be addressed primarily at a local level with community board funding.	
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui	Drinking Water Supply Upgrade - volume and quality funding allocated to address this high profile issue has been deferred until 2020/21 and reduced to \$559,000 in the current LIP. This		

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Ratepayers and Residents Association	issue is of highest significance within both our resident and non-resident community. Our Association is currently working with TCDC staff to establish facts and clarify Issues and we request that urgent consideration is given to this issue and adequate funding applied earlier than 2020.		
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers Residents Association	Funding Allocated for Royal Billy Point Ramp and Pontoon Improvements 2017/18 \$370 000 -we agree	Staff note submission	No change
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers Residents Association	Pauanui Wharf Pontoon Replacement 2018/19 \$112 000 We agree	Staff note submission	No change
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers Residents Association	Pauanui Waterway Tennis Courts Upgrade We agree It is imperative this amenity is maintained to ensure maximum longevity of this highly utilised Council asset	Staff note submission	No change
LTP15_329 Ken Bush Pauanui Ratepayers Residents Association	Minor Reserves Projects Power Supply and BBQ at Pleasant Point This highly utilised small vessel launching area would very much benefit from lighting for the toilets that could be motion controlled in order to be energy efficient. Additionally it would also be of great benefit to the recreational users to install a BBQ on the reserve. In alignment with the Community Empowerment Model adopted by TCDC and using local resources and input, our association requests funding to install both a power supply and BBQ. Our association has costed the power supply installation and advise that it could	The issue of lighting has been discussed by previous Community Boards and discounted due to high costs of instillation. The installation of a B BQ is a c ommunity board decision, the Community Board will give consideration to this during the deliberation process. Note the current reserve management plan makes no allowance for a BBQ and	



Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		lighting instillation in this area.	
<p>LTP15_226 Darian Lunjevich- West Coromandel Peninsula Youth Collective and Coromandel Peninsula Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Invest in new developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A skate park in Tairua.</li> <li>• Build more outdoor facilities such as a rugby field in Pauanui.</li> <li>• New playgrounds, parks, outdoor entertainment areas, and walkways.</li> <li>• Upgrade the Pauanui skate park to include lighting, water, and seating.</li> <li>• Improve campgrounds.</li> <li>• Improve the BMX tracks.</li> </ul> <p>Provide a healthier environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No marinas.</li> </ul> <p>When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Tairua Hikuai Pauanui developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop plans to maintain and improve established facilities that young people use on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• Offer activities and events targeted towards areas that interest youth and create safe areas for young people to socialize.</li> </ul> <p>We sit in support of all of the young people and adults that have campaigned to the Tairua Hikuai Pauanui Community Board year after year for a skate park in Tairua. Here, yet again they have indicated through the survey results, that this is still one of, if not the biggest priority for youth in the area. Skate parks appear in all of the survey results for Thames-Coromandel communities indicating that they are important for a large number of youth.</p> <p>Skate parks are great for skill development, physical activity, and coordination for all young people involved but particularly young males. They can create an opportunity for controlled risk taking and can also be a safe place to socialise.</p>	<p>Staff note the submission. A substantial amount of work has been undertaken with the youth sector in Tairua and Pauanui for example, the construction for the youth zone and Cory Wright Park, the Construction of the Pepe Playground, Construction of a half court at Cory Wright park, the provision and establishment a community fitness facility at the old St Johns building adjacent to the Rugby club. Staff note that a strong and well supported youth group has been established in Tairua and staff are exploring possible locations for the construction of a pump track to accommodate skateboarding, scooters and cycle/bmx.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Another priority identified in Tairua Hikuai Pauanui was giving young people a voice and taking it seriously. Youth in this area have been knocked back time and time again with regards to their request for a skate park. This has resulted in them feeling unvalued by their community, particularly the community board, and especially when the people whose views are supported are not usual residents. Youth have every right to advocate for what is important to them just as anyone else in the community can. They may not be rate payers but many of their parents are and given opportunity to make change, they may even continue to reside in the area and raise their families. We ask the Tairua Hikuai Pauanui Community Board to reconsider the young people's request for a skate park in Tairua.</p>		

### 11.5 Activity: Community Spaces - Thames

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_280</a> CCS Disability Action (Roger Loveless) CCS Disability Action	Submitter considers that there may be an opportunity to work with other interested parties to develop one or more short wheelchair friendly tracks in the historic areas such as Kauaeranga Valley, and include interpretive panels for visitors.	Council has few reserves in the Kauaeranga Valley, with the majority being DOC sites.  Council's Parks and Reserves staff are able to work with interested parties to scope potential wheelchair friendly walks, and this could be incorporated in future reviews of the Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plans.	No change.  [Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].
<a href="#">LTP15_280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action (Roger Loveless) CCS Disability Action	Submitter recommends the use of loose fill surfaces for children's playgrounds should be discontinued in favour of the other surface alternatives; and that where loose fill material has been used, a programme be instituted to replace it with a universally accessible safety surface.	Council playgrounds are managed in compliance with NZ Playground standards which allow for loose safety surface material. Safety surfaces such as requested by the submitter are estimated to cost 3-4 times the current loose fill cost.  Playground surfaces are planned on a case by case basis in consideration to location, demand and affordability.  The Council could investigate the feasibility of providing at least one playground in Thames with a universally accessible safety surface and if feasible propose any funding requirements through the 2016/17 Annual Plan process.	No Change.  Instruct staff to investigate the feasibility of providing at least one playground in Thames with a universally accessible safety surface, and if feasible propose any funding requirements through the 2016/17 Annual Plan process.  [Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].
<a href="#">LTP15_280</a> Roger Loveless CCS Disability	Submitter recommends that signage and other information be made available in various formats, and specifically suggests	The Council does provide parks and reserves signage and information in various formats, such as physical signs and related	No change.  Refer the matter of accessibility of Thames

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>Action (Roger Loveless) CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>QR codes that can be read by smartphones and provide spoken commentary; and defining hazardous vehicle crossings by tactile pavers in the same way as used for normal roads. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good signage can significantly enhance the experience of users, especially visitors from other areas.</li> <li>• So that people with vision impairment, and others, have equal access to the information.</li> </ul>	<p>information in printed and electronic forms. The use of QR codes is considered on a case by case basis and is currently being used on Council's freedom camping signs. Wider application would need investigating and an approach determined, such as what information to link to via a QR code.</p> <p>Hazardous vehicle crossings in Council's parks and reserves have not been specifically identified and assessed. Guidance could be sought from the submitter or similar disability stakeholder to clarify what makes for hazardous vehicle crossings in relation to parks and reserves.</p> <p>A Thames CBD Accessibility Audit was completed in 2013 which included identifying and assessing hazardous vehicle crossings and advice for tactiles.</p> <p>Council could commission an accessibility audit process for its Thames and Thames Coast parks and reserves, or use internal resource to apply the recommendations from the Thames CBD Accessibility Audit to assess accessibility in these parks and reserves and guide improvement work. Any minor improvements considered necessary such as related to tactiles could be planned for in future planning processes as appropriate to significance. Progressing such work would need to be prioritised by the</p>	<p>and Thames Coast parks and reserves to the Thames Community Board for further consideration. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wider application of QR codes would need to be investigated.</li> <li>• Assessment of accessibility at Thames and Thames Coast parks and reserves needs further investigation to determine approach and any related budget requirements.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		Thames Community Board.	
<a href="#">LTP15_76</a> Mr Graeme Colman	<p>All tide boat ramp Submitter considers that an all tide boat ramp is needed in or near Thames township, and that Council needs to focus attention on serving its Thames boat owners and visitors. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an economic opportunity lost in the spectacle of more than 200 boats trying to use Waikawau 20 minutes north of town and thousands of boat owners trekking north with nowhere handy to launch.</li> <li>• To better serve and support the lifestyles of residents in the district.</li> <li>• An all tide boat ramp would attract greater visitor numbers to the Thames area from the Hauraki, Waikato and other districts.</li> </ul>	<p>An all tide boat ramp close to Thames would be a valuable asset; however the cost of development and on-going dredging maintenance would be cost prohibitive.</p> <p>There are eight existing boat ramps in the Thames and Thames Coast area with 5 of those being Council registered assets. Only Waikawau boat ramp (25km from Thames township) can be considered an all tide access facility. These existing facilities are considered adequate for current demand.</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing boat ramp facilities in the Thames and Thames Coast area are considered adequate for current demand.</li> <li>• An all tide boat ramp close to Thames township is considered cost prohibitive.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	<p>Biodiversity - Parks and Reserves Submitter requests that Council add biodiversity health and biosecurity for the Parks and Reserves performance measures.</p>	<p>Biodiversity health and biosecurity performance is not considered a Council level of service requirement, but it is legislated for under the Resource Management Act and Biosecurity Act.</p> <p>The core purpose of Council parks and reserves is for the provision of recreation opportunities and has a secondary purpose of promoting biodiversity, which can be managed under Reserve Management Plans.</p>	<p>No change. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity health and biosecurity performance is not considered a Council level of service requirement.</li> <li>• The Waikato Regional Council undertakes monitoring under the Waikato Regional Pest Management Plan and Waikato Regional Pest Management Strategy.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		<p>Establishment of biodiversity health and biosecurity measures would require significant investment in benchmarking and annual stocktaking, which is already undertaken by the Waikato Regional Council according to the Waikato Regional Pest Management Plan and Waikato Regional Pest Management Strategy.</p> <p>As such, to have Council performance measures related to biodiversity health and biosecurity is not considered appropriate.</p>	<p>recommendation].</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_1</a> Mr Gavin McIntosh Friends of the Booms Reserve</p>	<p>Booms Reserve Submitter makes several requests relating to Booms Reserve in Parawai, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for the Friends of the Booms Reserve to develop the area for recreational use in the form of mulching, planting, and general maintenance of the Booms Reserve.</li> <li>• Provision for a playground in that reserve as there is none in the actual area of Parawai.</li> <li>• That drainage be put in to make the reserve more user friendly during the whole year rather than part of the year.</li> </ul>	<p>Booms reserve in Thames is currently an undeveloped reserve with no regular maintenance occurring, other than pest plant management.</p> <p>The group referred to as 'Friends of the Booms Reserve' is currently being formed.</p> <p>Further investigations, including engaging with the Friends of the Booms Reserve group, should be undertaken to better understand the request and to consider what opportunities may be available within allocated operating budgets.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to undertake this work as part of the next Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plan review process.</p>	<p>No change. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further investigation is required and can be incorporated in the next review of the Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plan review process.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation, noting that in the meantime the Board are happy to work with the Friends of the Booms Reserve group within existing budgets].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p><a href="#">LTP15_132</a> Thames Community Board Thames Community Board</p>	<p><b>Brown Street toilets budget</b> <b>Thames Community Board requests additional budget for Brown Street toilets upgrade</b>, as follows: Year 1: \$22,000 - minor upgrade. Year 4: \$150,000 - replacement. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Brown Street toilets are considered below standard. Minor upgrade work in Year 1 would bring the toilets up to a reasonable standard for the short term, until a full replacement can take place in year four as part of a future Victoria Park upgrade.</li> <li>Minor upgrade work in Year 1 would include painting and terraflaking, new signs, taps, LED lighting and door furniture.</li> </ul>	<p>A minor upgrade then replacement of the Brown Street toilets in Thames is in alignment with the asset condition report.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$0.47 per ratepayer per year (minor upgrade).</li> <li>\$3.21 per ratepayer per year (replacement).</li> </ul> <p>[Also included in the Funding requests section of the main report.]</p>	<p><b>That Council approves additional budget for Brown Street toilets upgrades</b>, as follows: Year 1: \$22,000 - minor upgrade. Year 4: \$150,000 - replacement.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Brown Street toilets are below standard. Minor upgrade work in Year 1 would bring the toilets up to a reasonable standard for the short term, until a full replacement can take place in year four as part of a future Victoria Park upgrade.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_331</a> Deborah Brown</p>	<p>Community noticeboards Submitter considers that there is a need for a large community noticeboard outside the Civic Centre managed by the i-Site in order to keep it current; and a noticeboard at the Kopu bridge where the Rail Trail divides, purpose being to invite people to visit Thames with what's on offer in the area.</p>	<p>A community noticeboard at the Thames Civic Centre (new location for the Thames i-Site) could help promote the area to visitors and provide information to locals. However, it could be more appropriate that this be managed by the Thames i-SITE and/or Destination Coromandel under their service level agreements with Council, and work in this area is underway currently.</p> <p>In response to the submitter's comment for a noticeboard at Kopu, a community notice board at Kopu is better considered following</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
		development of Kopu amenity areas and other future initiatives for the area.	
<a href="#">LTP15_126</a> Mr David Crocker	<p>Submitter considers that there should be a serious push to pedestrianise Grahamstown by closing the road, especially on market days. Further, that this is one initiative that the 'Thames Promoter' could take on board as soon as possible.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grahamstown Saturday market already draws people to Thames, but due to the lack of space it is now at full capacity for the number of stalls.</li> <li>• More space needs to be made for more stalls by closing the road.</li> <li>• Stopping cars going through will make the whole 'market experience' more enjoyable.</li> <li>• A bigger market means more customers (from outside of Thames), and more money for our people [the stall holders].</li> </ul>	<p>Closing Pollen Street in Grahamstown, Thames, on market days is currently being considered by the Thames Community Board through its work programme.</p> <p>The idea has been raised with the Thames community previously and had limited support.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<a href="#">LTP15_132</a> Thames Community Board Thames Community Board	<p><b>Landscaping for relocated Cooks Landing Monument</b></p> <p>Submitter requests that additional budget be included in Year 1 of \$15,000 for landscaping when the Cooks Landing Monument is relocated.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Monument is currently in storage and the Kopu community</li> </ul>	<p>The Thames Community Board plans to re-locate the Cooks Landing Monument in 2015/16 prior to the 150 year anniversary in 2019 of Cooks Landing at Kopu.</p> <p>The monument is currently in storage in Whangamata as the previous location (Kopu Hall site) was sold without the monument being sub-divided off the main parcel.</p>	<p>That Council approves an additional budget of \$15,000 in Year 1 for landscaping when the Cooks Landing Monument is relocated in 2015/16.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monument is currently in storage and needs re-locating at Kopu prior to the 150 year anniversary in 2019 of</li> </ul>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>has requested that a new site be established as soon as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Monument is the property of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage and they will cover the cost of relocating it to its new site in Kopu.</li> <li>• The Monument is to be sited so that it becomes an attraction for users of the Hauraki Rail Trail and it will be a focal point for the anniversary of Cooks Landing in 2019.</li> </ul>	<p>Therefore a new location needs to be found.</p> <p>The funding requested is for landscaping only as the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, being the owner of the monument, will cover the costs of relocation.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 1: \$3.21 per ratepayer as a one-off cost.</li> </ul> <p>[Also included under Funding Requests of main report]</p>	<p>Cooks Landing at Kopu.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ministry of Culture and Heritage, being the owners of the monument, will cover the costs of relocation but not all landscaping costs.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_180</a> Thomson Mary</p>	<p>Kopu - Amenity area Submitter comments that if the Cook's Landing Memorial is going to be re-instated in the Kopu area (at the end of the bridges), then this would be an ideal place for a playground, picnic tables, and trees planted for shade (not necessarily natives).</p>	<p>The site at Kopu currently proposed for the relocation of Cooks Memorial does not have sufficient space for a playground or other community amenity facilities.</p> <p>The Kopu Development Concept Plan proposes the development of community recreation facilities at the area identified as the Kaiwhenua Lot areas (surplus NZTA land at Kopu on the eastern approach to the bridges). Council has approved budget for land purchase of the Kaiwhenua Lots for stormwater management purposes. Additional community amenity potential will be considered once stormwater management designs are confirmed.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_357</a> Kopu Development Group</p>	<p>Kopu - Amenity area Submitter considers that there should be a picnic area in Kopu, located at the turning area between the two bridges (by On All Floors and Carswell Construction business). The picnic area should include tables, rubbish bins, public toilets, and perhaps a playground.</p> <p>Reason:</p>	<p>Future opportunity for amenity developments</p>	

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would be a great asset to Kopu area.</li> <li>Having a picnic area at this location would be especially relevant if it were the site for the Cooks Monument.</li> </ul>	will be considered if and when land becomes available.	
<a href="#">LTP15 180</a> Thomson Mary	Kopu - Public toilets Submitter considers that toilets need to be situated in the Kopu business hub, at the turning area between the two bridges. Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The toilets would accommodate visitors to the area and the Rail Trail users.</li> </ul>	A new public toilet facility at Kopu is proposed in Year 1 of the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.  The location for the public toilet is yet to be determined, and further engagement with the Kopu Development Group (of which the submitter is a member) will occur prior to finalising.	That Council approve additional funding of \$5,000 per year for Kopu toilet operation and maintenance costs. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the ongoing operation and maintenance of the new public toilet to be located at Kopu.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15 269</a> John Rennie	Kopu - Public toilets Submitter considers that there is an immediate requirement for public toilets at Kopu, and that they should be located on the land between the Kopu Access Road and State Highway 25 to the Bridge (surplus land area 3 (or C)), as this area is already in the travelling public's eye and nothing else is available. Further, that NZTA should be prepared to part with the required land as it has diverted State Highway 25 to create the situation which has arisen.  Submitter considers that an adequate capital sum for building costs and an annual allowance for cleaning and administration must be allowed for in annual budgets.	Toilet operation and maintenance costs of \$5,000 annually are required for the new toilet and were not included in the draft LTP. The local rating impact of this decision for would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.07 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul>	[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The demands on the new retail development (<i>i.e. Bendon, Kopu Cafe, and Hunting &amp; Fishing</i>) are intolerable for these business owners.</li> <li>• Travellers demand the use of public toilet facilities without feeling any obligation to purchase anything from the shops at Kopu, and become abusive at the retailers' refusal. On two days, between Christmas and New Year 2014, the Kopu Cafe spent \$96.00 replacing toilet paper.</li> <li>• Area 3 should be used [as the location for the public toilet] as it appears that the southern side of the Kopu Access Road will have further commercial development, or at least Tourism and Conservation Department information buildings. Therefore if placed within that precinct [the public toilet facilities] would be less liable to vandalism.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 357</a> Kopu Development Group</p>	<p>Kopu - Public toilets Submitter considers that there needs to be a public toilet block at the turning area between the two bridges (by On All Floors and Carswell Construction business). Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having the public toilet in this location would be visible to traffic coming off the bridge into Kopu, and visitors using the Rail Trail.</li> </ul>		

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_128</a> Vaughan Austen	<p>Kopu - Wharf Submitter requests a commercial wharf at Kopu and notes that they would be happy to support financially to some degree. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be many benefits, including: supporting and bringing work to the area of Kopu; fishing charter possibilities; ferry service to Coromandel, Auckland, etc.; river cruises to Paeroa and back from Kaiaua (after bikers have used the new Kopu-Kaiaua rail trail); boat repairs at Kopu; an entry point to the new Kopu-Kaiaua Rail Trail.</li> </ul>	<p>The scale of a commercial wharf as requested by one submitter (Vaughan Austen) would require substantial dredging. This has previously been investigated for aquaculture and was not considered feasible due to capital and on-going operating costs.</p> <p>Staff have scoped improvements to the Kopu boat ramp including the addition of a floating pontoon and jetty to improve safety and usability of the facility, estimated at a cost of \$387,279.</p> <p>Further investigations are required and the Thames Community Board may want to commission a business case.</p>	<p>That the matter of improvements to Kopu Wharf / boat ramp be referred to the Thames Community Board to consider requesting budget approval for a business case. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further investigation is required.</li> <li>Thames Community Board may want to progress work on a business case earlier than the 2016/17 Annual Plan process.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation, noting that it will consider the matter for the 2016/17 Annual Plan planning process].</p>
<a href="#">LTP15_180</a> Thomson Mary	<p>Kopu - Wharf Submitter considers that the Kopu Wharf should be upgraded and some of the mangroves removed to enhance the area. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To entice river users to Kopu - business, pleasure, fishing, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>The local rating impact of a decision to carry out work to improve usability of the Kopu Wharf (estimated at \$387,279) would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$8.28 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul> <p>Mangrove control and other site improvements are not included in this costing.</p>	
<a href="#">LTP15_357</a> Kopu Development Group	<p>Kopu - Wharf Wharf area - This needs attention, if upgraded would attract more use, boating and business for the area.</p>		
<a href="#">LTP15_357</a> Kopu Development Group	<p>Kopu Business Park Concept Plan Submitter notes agreement with the proposed Kopu Business Park Concept Plan.</p>	<p>A number of initiatives set out in the Kopu Development Concept Plan were proposed as projects in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. Others have not been proposed at this stage due to further investigations required.</p>	<p>No change. [Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<a href="#">LTP15_331</a> Deborah Brown	<p>Library material Submitter requests that measures are taken to strengthen and support our libraries due to the growing trend to rely on the internet as our knowledge base. Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important to recognise that we do not have control over the servers where this information is stored and that the much of this information is not manifest in the real world. Submitter suggests "check out the Carrington Event". [Solar storm of 1859. Wikipedia explains that studies have shown that a solar storm of the same magnitude occurring today would likely cause widespread problems for modern civilisation.]</li> </ul>	<p>The Thames Library is Council managed with appropriate levels of service associated with provision of material, which are reviewed and set through Council's planning processes.</p> <p>The Council has a Business Continuity Plan to ensure essential Council services can continue in the event of a civil defence emergency.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<a href="#">LTP15_180</a> Thomson Mary	<p>Multisport Indoor Sports Facility and Rhodes Park Facilities</p> <p>Submitter comments would it not be logical to amalgamate the two projects of a Multisport Facility at the Thames High School (4.15M) and Rhodes Park (2.90M).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is not enough parking at the High School.</li> </ul>	<p>The amalgamation of the proposed new sports facilities at Thames High School and the facilities at Rhodes Park was considered in the initial feasibility study for the project.</p> <p>Recommendations to locate the facilities at separate sites has been endorsed by the Thames Community Board.</p> <p>Additional parking is planned at Thames High School to cater for users of the new</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amalgamation of the proposed new sports facilities at Thames High School and the facilities at Rhodes Park was considered in the initial feasibility study for the project.</li> <li>Recommendations to locate the facilities at separate sites has been endorsed by</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The facility at the High School wouldn't be able to be used during school hours by outside groups that are not connected to the school.</li> <li>There is ample parking at Rhodes Park, with plenty of outdoor area for outdoor sports all happening together.</li> </ul> <p>Submitter questions whether there would be a flooding problem at Rhodes Park if the Kauaeranga River was dredged and the entrance of the harbour freed of mangroves, which would allow the river to flow its natural course.</p>	<p>facility, and the new facility will be able to be booked by the general public during school hours.</p> <p>Rhodes Park is the accepted flood protection spillway that protects Thames township from serious flooding. There are no known plans for mangrove removal at the harbour entrance; however, this is a matter more appropriate for Waikato Regional Council.</p>	<p>the Thames Community Board.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_336</a> Vikki Bertram Sport Waikato</p>	<p>Multisport Indoor Facility Submitter supports the proposal for a Multisport Indoor Facility with budget of \$4.15M in 2015/2016, and comments that "we support progress with this development and offer peer support services as deemed necessary by Council".</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_11</a> Vaughan de Groen Thames Rugby &amp; Sports Club</p>	<p>Rhodes Park Grandstand Upgrade - project timeframes Submitter requests that the development of Rhodes Park Sports facilities be left at the original timeline dates and not delayed any further. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Users, community supporters,</li> </ul>	<p>Rhodes Park Grandstand upgrade was proposed in the draft 2015-2025 draft Long Term Plan to occur in the 2018/2019 year.</p> <p>Potentially bringing forward all or part of the project can be reviewed as part of future annual plan planning processes, after necessary funding determinations have been</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially bringing forward all or part of the Rhodes Park Grandstand upgrade project can be reviewed as part of future annual plan planning processes, after necessary funding determinations have</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>funding committees and Active Thames 2018 have already proved the need for these upgrades and the community funding had pledged 3/4 of the required funds in a short period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop procrastinating over already agreed decisions and do what your rate payers want!</li> </ul>	<p>made.</p> <p>A staged approach to the project could ensure that construction commences as early as possible but does not cause clashes in funding applications between community projects.</p>	<p>been made.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation, and has noted that it would consider contributing to maintenance costs of the existing grandstand under existing budgets to assist in keeping the current grandstand operational in the interim].</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_132</a> Thames Community Board Thames Community Board</p>	<p><b>Skate Park</b> Thames Community Board requests that the current capital contribution of \$80,000 in 2014/2015 year be increased by \$50,000 in Year 1, with expenditure being subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional \$50,000 community and/or corporate contribution to the project</li> <li>• Public grants being confirmed at \$100,000</li> <li>• Expression of interest process confirming a deliverable skate park within the amended budget.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The costs for the provision of the skate park have come back higher than was expected.</li> <li>• As a result of the increased costs the Thames Community Board resolved [at its 13 April 2015 meeting] to continue with the project with an increased</li> </ul>	<p>Thames Community Board remains committed to delivering the Thames Skate Park project.</p> <p>The costs for the Thames Skate Park have come back higher than expected and additional funding is required to deliver the project.</p> <p>As a result of the increased costs the Thames Community Board resolved at its 13 April 2015 meeting to continue with the project with an increased budget, subject to conditions being met for continued feasibility.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1.07 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul>	<p>That Council approve an additional \$50,000 in Year 1 for the Thames Skate Park project with the following conditions for the project funding: with expenditure being subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional \$50,000 community and/or corporate contribution to the project</li> <li>• Public grants being confirmed at \$100,000</li> <li>• Expression of interest process confirming a deliverable skate park within the amended budget.</li> </ul>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	budget, subject to the conditions [noted above].		
<a href="#">LTP15_218</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network	Skate Park Submitter expressed extreme disappointment with the continual lack of progress with regard to the Thames Skate Park project, and requests immediate action. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of funds this project has used in further feasibility studies and new plans is remarkable and to be told again and again that there have been hold ups due to "not realising there were drains" beneath a community park that has already been built on, is astounding.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">LTP15_325</a> Alison Smith Coromandel Kauri Dieback Forum	Submitter requests that Council allocate a budget to support its existing efforts to prevent kauri die back and to support those of its partners.	Thames Community Board may want to consider implementing measures, and if required, requesting budget to minimise the risk of Kauri Dieback.	That a new local capital budget is established which is specific to Kauri protection and addresses high risk areas in the district.
<a href="#">LTP15_344</a> Cath Wallace	Submitter requests controls on movement of people, animals and vehicles to prevent the spread of kauri die back.	Further investigation could be undertaken to determine an appropriate approach to minimise Kauri Dieback risks in the Thames Community Board area, that should include working with the Waikato Regional Council.	That a new local capital budget is established which is specific to Kauri protection and addresses high risk areas in the district.  [Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].
<a href="#">LTP15_255</a> Mr Evan Penny	Sub-Regional Aquatic Centre Submitter supports the sub-regional aquatic	Funding of \$53,000 for the preparation of a business case for a sub-regional aquatic	No change.



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>centre project, however cautions Council concerning a long running series of investigations and design studies, commenting "for my money simply decide whether to do it or not, and just get on with it".</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thames is the logical place for a sub-regional facility.</li> </ul>	<p>facility was proposed in Year 3 of the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</p> <p>The business case will inform decision-making on whether or not to proceed with a sub-regional aquatic facility.</p>	<p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_336</a> Vikki Bertram Sport Waikato</p>	<p>Sub-Regional Aquatic Centre Submitter supports the proposal to investigate the development of a sub-regional aquatics facility 2017/2018 with a budget \$53,000, commenting that "Sport Waikato, as part of the implementation of the Regional Sports Facilities plan, will support Thames-Coromandel to investigate the concept of a sub-regional aquatics facility".</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal to upgrade the existing Thames Swimming Pool in 2020/2021 including the budget of \$175,000.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sports Waikato's intention is to work with councils across the region to look at aquatics assets and develop a region wide context for future developments and decision making.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_8</a> Rodney and</p>	<p>Tapu Domain Submitter comments that it would be good to</p>	<p>The Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plan 2006 identifies the need</p>	<p>That Council approves funding of \$20,000 in Year 1 for the provision of landscaping of</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Suzanne Albertson	<p>include more seats, picnic tables and trash containers at Tapu Domain.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is one table at the far end near the old tree and not one other thing to sit on.</li> <li>• One of three trash cans was removed last year for some unknown reason. Most people are quite good about packing up their trash from picnics but many times the receptacles are overflowing and the trash just blows across the road to our homes.</li> <li>• Tapu Domain is a popular place for locals and tourists because it has such easy access for pulling completely off the road, and it a good resting place while driving the very busy narrow winding road.</li> <li>• Tapu has a wonderful beach, a very good and well used dairy, and the ancient pohutukawa tree is a main attraction.</li> <li>• The domain is a busy place, with some self-contained campers which is lovely, and fishing boats are using the south end for launching.</li> <li>• The Coromandel is widely promoted as a tourist destination and thus is visited by thousands in cars and campers. Accommodations are needed for all, including visitors and local ratepayers.</li> </ul> <p>[Submission has the signatures of three</p>	<p>for landscaping of the Tapu Reserves to improve the amenity of the area, including hard features such as seats and picnic tables.</p> <p>Over time demand has risen for the services of the Tapu Reserves and facilities have declined due to lack of funding.</p> <p>Improvement work is estimated to cost \$20,000 which could include planting, placement of rocks or bollards to control vehicles, signage, seats and picnic tables.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$0.43 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul>	<p>Tapu Reserves, including hard features such as seats and picnic tables.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To improve the amenity of Tapu Reserves, consistent with the Thames and Thames Coast Reserve Management Plan 2006.</li> </ul> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	neighbours who support the request.]		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 348</a> Elizabeth Jones Tararu Residents Committee</p>	<p>Tararu Village walkway Submitter requests that safety improvements be made to the existing beach access at the end of Wilson Road in Tararu, similar to the well-constructed wooden accessway at the end of Robert Street which is safe and secure.</p> <p>Submitter notes that villagers at Tararu Village have recently raised the issue with local councillors and Council staff. Further, that residents of the area are being canvassed for support and letters and signatures will be coming to the Council.</p> <p>Submitter notes that if Council agreed to construct a simple access structure as requested, and if this was done in 2015, the Tararu Village Residents Committee would like to donate a plaque to commemorate those who died in the two World Wars and have it attached to the structure, with an opening ceremony and possibly plant a pohutukawa tree (although noting that many Wilson Street homeowners could object because they prefer an unobstructed view of the Firth). Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current "concrete mess" sort of access is not safe for most people and is a hazard.</li> </ul>	<p>It would benefit locals and visitors to the Tararu area for improvement work to be undertaken on the walkway near Tararu Village, particularly for safety reasons.</p> <p>Council (Thames area staff and Thames Community Board) has engaged the Tararu Residents Committee to better understand the matter and a budget for improvement work to the Tararu Walkway has been provided for in the draft 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People currently think that private driveways are the beach access.</li> <li>• An safe and secure accessway as requested would have advantages, including no more falls by people trying to get on to the beach, and a safe route for the public who enjoy the walkway daily from Rennie Street to get to the beach and walk along the coast.</li> </ul> <p>[Submitter provided further information relating to the situation - refer to full submission].</p>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15_132</a> Thames Community Board Thames Community Board</p>	<p><b>Thames CBD Specimen Trees</b> Thames Community Board requests that an additional budget of \$12,000 be provided for the replacement of specimen trees in Pollen Street, Thames.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 15 existing Melia trees in Pollen Street in Thames have outgrown their in-ground containers and are structurally unsound, and will continue to decline in health.</li> </ul>	<p>The existing Melia trees in Pollen Street, Thames, are declining in health and should be replaced. The works should be prioritised in Year 1 (2015/16) as the trees are rapidly becoming a hazard.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 1: \$2.56 per ratepayer as a one-off cost.</li> </ul> <p>[Also included under Funding Requests in main report]</p>	<p>That Council approves additional funding of \$12,000 in Year 1 for the replacement of specimen trees in Pollen Street, Thames.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 15 existing Melia trees in Pollen Street in Thames have outgrown their in-ground containers and are structurally unsound.</li> <li>• The existing trees will continue to decline in health and are rapidly becoming a hazard.</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_132</a> Thames Community Board Thames</p>	<p><b>Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping</b> Thames Community Board requests that the current budget for the Thames Monument</p>	<p>The Thames Monument, located at Monument Road overlooking the township, has deteriorated over time and needs restoration.</p>	<p>That Council approve to increase the proposed budget in Year 1 for Thames Monument Restoration and Reserve Landscaping from \$15,000 to \$35,000.</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
Community Board	<p>Restoration and Reserve Landscaping be increased in Year 1 from \$15,000 to \$35,000.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An application for funding for a Monument Restoration Plan [Conservation Management Plan] has been lodged with Lotteries Heritage Fund.</li> <li>• It is the intention of the Thames Community Board that once the Monument Restoration Plan [Conservation Management Plan] is completed, that the Board would apply for Lotteries funding to undertake restoration and landscaping works to upgrade the monument for the on-going WW100 commemorations.</li> <li>• The Lotteries application will expect Council to provide one third of the total estimated cost of \$105,000.</li> </ul>	<p>A Conservation Management Plan for restoring the monument needs to be prepared by a conservation architect, and forms a Monument Restoration Plan that guides how to restore the monument and how to maintain it into the future. The Thames Community Board should know by May 2015 whether the funding application has been successful to have the Conservation Management Plan prepared.</p> <p>The Thames Community Board would like to align the process for a Conservation Management Plan with a second funding application in around September 2015 to restore the monument itself, according to the Conservation Management Plan. The restoration work would ideally extend beyond the monument to create authentic landscape surrounds, and includes the area from the associated carpark to the monument.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$0.43 per ratepayer per year.</li> </ul> <p>[Also included under Funding Requests in main report]</p>	<p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Thames Monument has deteriorated over time and needs restoration.</li> <li>• Thames Community Board would</li> <li>• The Thames Community Board would like to align the process for a Monument Restoration Plan with a second Lotteries funding application in 2015 to restore the monument itself, according to the Monument Restoration Plan.</li> <li>• The funding criteria will expect Council to provide one third of the total estimated cost of \$105,000 (being \$35,000).</li> </ul>
<a href="#">LTP15_126</a> Mr David Crocker	Tidy up Thames Submitter requests that public areas of Thames be made attractive for locals and	Town maintenance service levels are managed under the operations and maintenance contracts, with audits carried	No change.  [Thames Community Board supports this

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>visitors, with reference to grass verges, berms, weeds, etc. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of Thames looks untidy and although a Request for Service means the job is done, it would be better if it was kept tidy all the time.</li> <li>• Once places start to look untidy, vandalism and tagging often follows.</li> </ul>	<p>out monthly to ensure required standards are being maintained.</p> <p>Levels of Service are set by the community boards and the most recent Customer Satisfaction Survey indicated a high level of satisfaction with related services generally.</p>	<p>recommendation].</p>
<p><a href="#">LTP15_257</a> Peter Wood</p>	<p>Wharf renewals - Thames Shortland Wharf Submitter considers that the Thames Wharf (Shortland) is no longer fit for purpose and that \$1.77M should not be spent on this facility. Submitter questions where the overview is by the Harbour Committee. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wharf channel is the Kauaeranga river which consistently brings sediment from forestry disturbance in its headwaters, thus raising the river bed and also mangroves encroachment. In the 1980's the mangrove thickets to the east were an open beach.</li> <li>• The long channel to the Firth of Thames is extremely shallow like the extensive and growing mudflats that surround it. This area is only usable at high tides by shallow draft.</li> <li>• Previous Council community boards wanted depreciation costs to cease after the concrete extension had extra costs. Ratepayers have continually subsidised.</li> </ul>	<p>The Thames Community Board Harbour Committee assessed the 2014 asset condition assessments including for Thames Shortland Wharf prior to prioritising the proposed budgets and projects within the draft 2015-25 Long Term Plan.</p> <p>Commercial tenancies on the wharf are evaluated by a registered valuer.</p> <p>The Shortland Wharf Marina and lease are not controlled by Council.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wharf area has become a commercial area with the two businesses utilising the extra space for customer parking. Submitter questions whether they paying an appropriate rent which should cover maintenance costs.</li> <li>• The haul-out facility for boats crosses a reserve to service the hard-stand, which appears to have extended its area beyond the area leased from Waikato Regional Council by the Yacht Club.</li> <li>• The rents for the up-stream marina and storage on the hard-stand area should cover any costs for dredging the channel, as ratepayers should not subsidise private recreation.</li> <li>• The wharf has minor use (see revenue from harbour master) and would be superseded by up-grading the all tide boat ramp at Wharf Road, Kopu.</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">LTP15 218</a> Darian Lunjevich-West Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>Youth focus Submitter considers that Council should be able to influence and support the following activities relating to youth in the Thames Community Board area, informed by responses from Thames-based youth to the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer more youth focused activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have more cool, safe places to hang out.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Invest in new developments, particularly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More entertainment - a bowling alley,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The submission from the Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network covers a wide range of matters and, as acknowledged by the submitter, some are outside Council's core activities. There are multiple stakeholders involved in youth development in the district, with support and provision of services provided by the private sector and other public organisations, such as Population Health of Waikato District Health Board and the Ministry of Social Development.</p>	<p>That Council approve funding of \$2,000 in Year 1 to work with local youth and develop an agreed approach for youth participation in Thames Community Board local governance processes.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For more effective engagement with youth.</li> </ul> <p>[Also included under Funding Requests in main report]</p>

ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>a water park, an ice skating rink, a paintball field, a go-kart track, a youth zone, more youth centres, and a mini putt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o More indoor facilities - more sport, rock climbing walls, tennis, a skate/sport/pool with hydro slides complex, and dance studios.</li> <li>o New outdoor facilities - a new skate park, a grand stand, more parks and playgrounds, a mountain bike track/park, and shelters for when it rains.</li> <li>o More attractions such as zoo, more hotels, a nightclub, and a sky city complex.</li> <li>o All facilities to be affordable for young people to use.</li> <li>o Improve access to Thames beach.</li> <li>• Upgrade current facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Invest in improving / upgrading current facilities with a specific focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The skate park - flatter concrete and more gear. [To be addressed as separate decision matter.]</li> <li>o Community pools - deepen and heat, include hydro slides and wave pools.</li> <li>o Playgrounds - remove the bark and add softer material, remove the swings, add more gear.</li> <li>o Improve the Rhodes Parks drainage system. [To be addressed as separately decision matter under</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Council has a Youth Strategy for overarching direction, and relevant local initiatives are being progressed such as sporting facility projects that impact on youth wellbeing.</p> <p>This submission from Thames Youth Forum and Thames Youth Supporters Network does highlight an opportunity for more effective engagement with youth, which could raise awareness and understanding with both Council and youth and enable joint progression of initiatives within agreed scope and the business of Council. Funding could be allocated in Year 1 to work with local youth and develop an agreed approach for youth participation in appropriate Thames Community Board local governance processes.</p> <p>The local rating impact of this decision would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 1: \$0.43 per ratepayer as a one-off cost.</li> </ul> <p>The Council's Thames Community Development Officer (CDO) has applied for funding from the Ministry of Youth Development for a range of youth initiatives including investigating Youth Council models and best practice around New Zealand. If the application is successful it is envisaged that a proposal would be formulated for</p>	<p>[Thames Community Board supports this recommendation].</p>



ID Full Name Company / Organisation	Submission topic	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>Stormwater activity.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Make the movie theatres bigger.</li> <li>○ Improve the Civic Centre.</li> <li>○ Repair important facilities such as the public toilets and the wharf.</li> <li>● Create more opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fund youth facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Provide a healthier environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Beautify the area through colour, art, flowers and gardens.</li> <li>○ Eradicate gorse.</li> <li>○ Tidy up the mudflats, mangroves, and the muddy river.</li> <li>○ Up keep bush tracks.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ensure there's more support for youth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure a great youth / family environment with good community spirit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Develop plans to maintain and improve established facilities that young people use on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>● Offer activities and events targeted towards areas that interest youth and create safe areas for young people to socialise.</li> </ul> <p>Submitter noted that the findings [of the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013] showed that of the youth who responded to the survey question, slightly more felt that the Thames area is youth friendly, than those that did not.</p> <p>Submitter acknowledged the work that</p>	<p>presentation to Council in the second half of 2015. An additional budget may be required to deliver a well-considered proposal.</p> <p>A decision matter relating to district-wide approach to youth development is presented under the Economic Development activity.</p>	

<b>ID Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Submission topic</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	Council does to support to local youth centres/spaces and would like to see Council continue to support these and other initiatives.		

### 11.6 Activity: Community Spaces - Whangamata

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
<p>LTP15_069 Mrs Elizabeth Anne Stewart Ball LTP15_070 Mr. Christopher Raymond Ball</p>	<p>The submitter states that the <b>Whangamata Williamson Park Reserve</b> was gifted in perpetuity with a clear written document and terms. The document must be consulted with initially to ensure meeting requirements and terms.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a written redevelopment plan however there is a figure of \$294,000 Is this a progress budget or a final figure?</p> <p>The submitter enquires which reserves are under consideration as part of the drive to pursue the sale of surplus assets in order to reinvest funds into key community projects - on Whangamata Community Board Survey</p>	<p>Staff are well aware of the documentation relating to Williamson Park and will ensure the conditions set out are adhered to in the redevelopment of the park.</p> <p>A concept plan is currently being prepared for consultation in July/August 2015. The budget figure was derived from advice given by park development specialists.</p> <p>The Whangamata Community Board are actively working on a property strategy which has identified surplus land parcels to be considered for disposal. No reserves are included for disposal.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_124 Mr Ken Coulam LTP15_85 Mrs Fiona Coulam</p>	<p>The submitter suggested that Council should take some action to ensure camping facilities are still available in Whangamata and Hahei if the existing grounds close. This could involve providing facilities for camping on Council land. Park Avenue is cited as an example.</p>	<p>The Whangamata Community Board under the property strategy work programme are currently investigating all possibilities with regard to ensuring a camp ground facility is available.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_225 Hannah Palmer Whangamata Youth Forum and Whangamata Youth Supporters Network</p>	<p>The findings [of the Coromandel Youth Survey 2013] have shown the majority of the youth feel that the Whangamata area is youth friendly.</p> <p>Offer more youth focused activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More places to hang out.</li> <li>• Invest in new developments:</li> <li>• An amusement park.</li> <li>• A new multi-purpose indoor facility.</li> <li>• A new community pool.</li> <li>• A new park.</li> </ul>	<p>Staff note the submission. Whangamata has a very active youth community. There are three very active youth groups undertaking a variety of social. Cultural and physical activities. The town provides three substantial playgrounds catering for all age groups and a substantial skate park and BMX track, as well an international standard Mt Bike park on the outskirts of town caters for a large number of residents and visitors.</p> <p>The Community Board are supportive of the district wide youth initiative which is co-ordinated in Whangamata through Helen McCabe and includes Youth Awards, Youth</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a space for a youth centre.</li> <li>• All facilities to be affordable for young people to use.</li> </ul> <p>Upgrade current facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The skate park - bigger and include lighting, water, more gear, and flatter concrete.</li> <li>• Improve the sports facilities.</li> <li>• Make the cinema bigger.</li> </ul> <p>When striving to include youth priorities in planning for future Whangamata developments it is recommended that consideration be made towards developing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop plans to maintain and improve established facilities that young people use on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• Offer activities and events targeted towards areas that interest youth and create safe areas for young people to socialize.</li> </ul> <p>We would like to acknowledge some of the great things the Council is doing and we would like to see Council continue to support these and other initiatives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support to local youth centres / spaces.</li> </ul> <p>The Whangamata Youth Forum would strongly like to advocate for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Youth Centre.</li> </ul>	<p>employment, youth Emergency, youth volunteer and youth projects ) and area office staff are available to support this initiative on the eastern seaboard ward.</p>	
<p>LTP15_280 Roger Loveless CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>There may be an opportunity to work with other interested parties to develop one or more short wheelchair friendly tracks in these historic areas [Wentworth Valley], and include interpretive panels for visitors.</p> <p>There may be opportunities for establishing all weather footpaths or boardwalks for those who cannot access the beaches.</p> <p>With respect to parks and reserves the submitter</p>	<p>The Parks department uses loose fill as a means to comply with safety standards from NZ Playground which cover fall heights of 3 metres.</p> <p>The use of fixed safety surfacing has been considered, however this material is expensive and does not provide Council with the best cost benefit solution as it also tends to be more costly for maintenance as they need replacing on</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submitter	Submission summary	Staff advice to Council	Recommendation
	<p>recommends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the use of loose fill surfaces for children's playgrounds be discontinued, in favour of the other surface alternatives and that where loose fill material has been used, a programme be instituted to replace it with a universally accessible safety surface.</li> <li>• that signage and other information be made available in various formats so that people with vision impairment, and others, have equal access to the information.</li> </ul>	<p>an annual basis.</p> <p>Council's Parks department has been working on a number of projects to include accessible park equipment and are currently looking at a basket swing for children with disabilities and is looking at level access to the playground as well. There is also a buddy swing in Coromandel and Pepe playground in Tairua.</p>	
<p>LTP15_331 Deborah Brown</p>	<p>Submitter requests that measures are taken to strengthen and support our libraries due to the growing trend to rely on the internet as our knowledge base. Submitter states that it is important to recognise that we do not have control over the servers where this information is stored and that the much of this information is not manifest in the real world.</p>	<p>Staff note the submission and will discuss this further with library staff.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>LTP15_344 Cath Wallace</p>	<p>Submitter requests biodiversity health and biosecurity for the Parks and Reserves performance measures.</p>	<p>Biodiversity health and biosecurity performance is not considered a level of service requirement, but it is legislated for under the Resource Management and Biosecurity Acts.</p> <p>The core purpose of Council reserves is the provision of recreation opportunities and has a secondary purpose of promoting biodiversity. Because of this, it is not appropriate for Council to include performance measures for biodiversity health and biosecurity. Establishment of these measures would require significant investment in benchmarking and annual stocktake which is already undertaken by the Waikato Regional Council as per the Regional Pest Management Plan and Regional Pest Management Strategy.</p>	<p>No change</p>

## Attachment A

### Summary of public meetings

#### 1.1 Thames Public Meeting

**Meeting notes:** 2015-2025 Long Term Plan, Thames Public Meeting  
16 March 2015 8.30 - 11.10am Council Chamber

#### Attendees

- Members of the public (approximately 9)
- Elected members and staff (approximately 11 in total for the duration of the meeting):
  - *Councillors: Deputy Mayor Peter French, Diane Connors, Sandra Goudie (arrived and left before the start of the meeting)*
  - *Thames Community Board members: Craig Cassidy*
  - *Staff: David Hammond, Steve Baker, Angela Jane, Greg Hampton, Larissa Doherty, Christine Tye, Graham McDermott, Andrew Mehrtens*

#### Discussion outline

Chief Executive David Hammond presented the proposals within the Consultation Document and responded to questions from the public as they were raised. Staff and elected members contributed to the discussion where it was relevant.

#### Questions/comments and answers

##### *Rates/Debt*

#### 1) What is the difference between internal and external debt?

- DH - The Council builds up internal reserves and can borrow against this, which is better as have lower interest rates than borrowing from the bank.

#### 2) Why have reserves so high?

- DH - The Council has some big projects that will draw on reserves.
- SB - An example of a big cost project is with wastewater where Council has built up reserves to use for the renewals of the assets. Where an activity has not enough reserves we internally borrow from another reserve and keep a record of it (like in a 'jam jar') so the reserve can be repaid.

#### 3) Why can't external debt be smoothed out to a greater extent? (by increasing external and decreasing internal debt)

- SB - [Explained about internal and external debt].
- DH - [Referred to the trend of smoothing out, as shown in the presentation graph 'Forecasted debt and debt levels']. It is not prudent yet to make decisions until we know more about the future big projects.

##### *Information Centres*

#### 4) Have we measured the value of the I-Sites?

- DH - We don't really know [the value of the I-Sites].

#### 5) The rates increases for the transition are over what timeframe?

- SB - Rates indicated are average per year. It is a targeted rate, uniform (flat) charge.
- DH - It is complex and there is different funding involved.

##### *\$200 new rate for advertised holiday homes*

#### 6) How many motel beds in the district compared to B&B beds? Aren't we short of beds? B&B hosts spend a lot of time promoting the district to their guests so contribute that way.

- DH - We don't know bed number comparisons. We are short on some types of accommodation. Council is proposing that large B&Bs pay commercial rates.

#### 7) How are the baches being captured that will need to pay the \$200 rate?

- DH - If your place is rented via marketing then it would be captured, such as advertised on TradeMe. The Council sent out letters to those bach owners identified in an initial capture.

- 8) **Would the impact be the same if you only rent your place once compared to more often?**
- DH - Yes, we won't know how often the place is rented out.
- 9) **This will fall over on administration. It will change behaviour, such as where and how people advertise their holiday homes.**
- DH - That may be right. Council will have to weigh up options.
- 10) **Why not encourage [people to rent out their holiday homes] as it brings tourists in?**
- DH - Council acknowledges that there is an inequity at the moment. Funds brought in will go to economic development.
- 11) **Would it dis-incentivise developers? [people buying holiday homes]**
- DH - Development contributions [payable] are going down.
  - SB - [For clarification] the \$200 represents a redistribution of rates, not a new tax.
- 12) **People may just decide to live in their bach instead of renting it out, which would increase the load on services.**
- DH - This would be great. We have capacity for this already.
- 13) **Would it cost more to collect [the \$200 rate] than charge? Why not have a uniform charge for everyone?**
- DH - Yes, using UAGC would be easier, but it still wouldn't address the inequity.
- 14) **Is this user pays and what can we expect in times to come?**
- DH - User pays will probably not happen in economic development.
- 15) **Are commercial businesses contributing? This could be increased.**
- DH - The commercial sector is already contributing.
- 16) **The level of service varies, e.g. B&B hosts dedicate time [to their guests]. Was this raised by moteliers? Have you looked at other areas [in NZ]?**
- DH - Agree that B&B guests get more of a personalised service. Marlborough has had a \$200 charge for some time.
- 17) **If this is to raise funds for economic development, why not just do that instead of penalising the bach owners?**
- DH - That is a good submission point. Council needs feedback on this.
- 18) **How would this affect a ratepayer who lives in their bach most of the time, then rents it out for a small period of time?**
- DH - They would still need to pay.
  - CC - They could include a charge in their rental cost to cover it.
  - DC- For context it is beneficial to see where this is driven from. It is Council's philosophy to use user pays where possible, and to keep rates affordable for all ratepayers, contributing costs back to those who most benefit. It is a balancing act.
- 19) **What is the cost to administer?**
- SB - It has been costed at approximately \$6,000 - \$7,000. To respond to the question of why not use the UAGC - it would increase the UAGC by approximately \$10 or more, including for those who don't benefit. Further assessments may be needed and we want feedback on this, e.g. is \$200 too high?

*New Project - WWI Memorial Forests*

- 20) **Are the memorial forests to be all on Council land?**

- DH - No, some may be on DOC land.

- 21) **Can Council apply for carbon credits?**

- DH - Maybe.

*Thames - Local Economic Development*

- 22) **Can Council look at a targeted rate?**

- DH, PF - Yes.

- 23) **Is the funding indicated annual or over a number of years?**

- DH - Annually over three years.

*District projects over next 3 years*

- 24) What is the cost to respond to increased water standards over 10 years?**
- DH, AJ - Approximately \$3 million over the ten year period with works across the district.
- 25) What is the cost for the airfield?**
- GH - The project costs are related to drainage. Current issues restrict the available timeframes for landing. The Community Board needs to do a business case to assess demand.
- 26) Are airfield costs covered by usage returns? Ratepayers in general do benefit.**
- GH - No, there is a cost to the ratepayer. Staff are looking at options including residential hangers such as in Tauranga. However this would need private investment to happen.
  - **Comment - seems a shame that the airfield is so close to town and it can't be used at times.**
- 27) The economic projections and assumptions don't match the plan [referenced assumptions relating to birth and death rates].**
- DH - The growth projections were developed by Rationale. We have changing demographics, and there are a number of factors contributing to population change including births, deaths and migration. The projections show net change. [Offered further discussion on the projections after the meeting].
- 28) What is the Council doing to attract businesses in Thames?**
- DH - Council is picking up and advancing the Kopu plan. This involves going around businesses to get feedback on what needs improving. Looking at Kopu infrastructure (e.g. broadband) and investing in stormwater. Is in competition with nearby areas.
- 29) It [Kopu] lends towards being an industrial park for nearby Auckland.**
- DH - I agree.
- 30) Where are Kopu sub-division plans at?**
- DH - Land is opening up, including for example in Hauraki which we benefit from.
  - CC - Nearby residents come in and spend money. We still benefit.
  - GH - A big focus for Council is providing / making available more land. We're working hard to remove obstructions, e.g. broadband, stormwater.
- 31) Will this make us a fibre town?**
- GH - No, but ADSL is on the cards, for Kopu and the Civic Centre. Council is partnering with Wintec relating to training. Momentum is growing.
- 32) Why rule out fibre? Schools have it but not businesses.**
- GH - We are not on Central Government's fibre plan.
  - DH - New money is being made available from Central Government and we're getting ready to make an application.
- 33) We need it [fast broadband]. Thames is basically last.**
- DH - Yes, we're working on it.
  - PF - [outlined Council's relationship with ATEED and it being a good strategic partner in future], food trails, 'blue highway', events support, etc. Auckland should be where the focus is, but to what degree do we want to turn Coromandel into the "playground" for Auckland? We need to think on it. But we need to get Thames / Kopu ready.
- 34) How long until it [Kopu] is ready?**
- PF - We're hoping that this Kopu plan will fix a number of issues, but it won't be overnight. It's a chicken and egg situation.
  - DH - [Referenced the Infrastructure Strategy].
- 35) Thames is a good place to raise children, but there are no jobs for young people. We need jobs for them to come back to.**
- 36) Auckland's problems are our benefit. We have a service need - where is that reflected in the plan?**
- DH - Council's big projects aren't just about tourism - it's about 'live and play'. Our big sectors include tourism, retirement (and the services needed within this sector).
- 37) The memorial forests and walks are about tourism?**



- DH - With Council's anchor projects we do talk about tourism. I am putting priorities on staff including broadband, Kopu, the retirement sector.

**38) For low income households it is important to develop industries.**

- DC - [Referenced Rationale projections report]. The projections project what will happen. It is up to Council to decide what to do about it.
- CC - The Thames Community Board is working with youth and employers. The LTP is about major projects - there are lots of other things on.
- DH - [Referenced the Economic Development Strategy].

**39) Are we looking at attracting tertiary education providers?**

- DC - Yes, we're working with Wintec. We're looking at industry needs - what skills do young people need to be employable.

**40) Could look at the Invercargill model (no fees).**

- DC - Someone is still paying. We need to make sure the training is relevant.

**41) The plan includes water upgrades and metering. Is this for Thames South? Why not for Thames - is it considered not worth it?**

- DH - Water is already metered in Thames.
- DC - The water metering project is for Thames South.

**42) Where is the boundary for Thames South?**

- PF / AJ - Thames South is south of Kopu.

Meeting closed at 11.10am.

## 1.1 Coromandel Public Meeting

Record of questions from the **Long Term Plan Public Meeting** at the **Coromandel-Colville Area Office** on **Tuesday 17 March 2015, 9am - 12pm**

### Attendees

- 13 members of the public
- 12 staff/community board members/councillors
  - *David, Angela, Steve, Greg, Emma, Margaret, Lorna*
  - *Jane Warren, Kim Brett, John Walker, Tony Brljevic*
  - *Peter French*

### Questions/comments and answers

#### *Rates/Debt*

- **Do the rates cover inflation?**  
Yes, but we only rate for what we need.
- **Does this mean that if you have an increase which is lower than inflation, you do less?**  
No, it's about the way we work and the decisions we make - we make better decisions so we can rate less. We're always learning. The new 30 year infrastructure strategy has helped us understand what's happening a lot more.
- **Does this rate increase allow for contingencies? (i.e. do we have room to respond to unknown costs?)**  
Yes, we have room to move in this budget.
- **Please explain the internal debt.**  
Steve explained internal debt and how it interacts with external debt.

#### *Local services*

- **Will there be an overarching level of service decided by the Council for these local services which community boards have to maintain as a minimum?**  
No. All decisions will be made by the community board. This means that if they decide they want to reduce a level of service to save money, they can.
- **I've seen a reduction in the level of service in mowing and dealing with pest plants on the roadsides near where I live. Please explain.**  
Greg explained the huge potential expense that dealing with pest plants can be, so Council needs to be pragmatic and set a reasonable budget, because you can always spend more on dealing with pest plants.  
Greg advised that if people have concerns about pest plants in their area that they can call in and report it using a request for service (RFS).
- **Surely because we have less rate payers, we have less mortalities, so it shouldn't cost that much? [Addressing the larger increase for Coromandel-Colville in localising cemeteries.]**  
Greg explained that the biggest cost is in the maintenance of the cemeteries. Coromandel-Colville has two cemeteries, one of which is the second largest in the district, therefore it is expensive to maintain.  
This is an opportunity for communities to find local solutions to how to pay for cemetery maintenance.
- **If Coromandel-Colville doesn't want to change from district to local but the rest of the community board areas do, what happens?**  
Peter and Tony explained how the decision making process works, didn't answer question outright.
- **How will these changes affect Maori land?**  
Steve explained that it will have an impact, but decisions may be made by Community Boards as to what the impact could be.
- **Does the differential for stormwater change?**  
No
- **Support stated for local empowerment model - this underlines the community identity; beneficial for Coromandel-Colville as a whole. Will mean the Coromandel-Colville community will understand itself and run itself a lot better**  
Localism is important, thank you for your support.

- **I remember Coromandel County Council's amalgamation into Thames. This was sold to the community through the idea that shared costs = cheaper.**  
This model is a hybrid idea, somewhere in the middle. Some costs will remain district (i.e. essential services), but some will stay local.
- **Is there a threat on the horizon for further amalgamation into Waikato?**  
David explained - not really, the process will be massive. TCDC and WRC have a better working relationship now so that will help maintain status quo. Mentioned process currently happening in Wellington, etc.
- **Further endorsement of the local model to ensure local empowerment is there to protect communities from future amalgamations. Empowered communities = resilient communities.**  
Thank you for your comments.

*Other issues*

- **Bach charge - didn't understand before now the reasons behind the charge. Cautioned that Council need to market this properly because it seems like an intrusion before you hear the details.**
- **Wastewater - there is a case for user pays.**  
David said there are huge lessons for this Council out of this.
- **Has there been a projection on the number of developers coming in, and have future developers been factored in?**  
Yes, and we have found there isn't enough of them to cover the whole 66%.
- **What's the new percentage on Wastewater DC's?**  
Depends on which plant, Steve thought between 12-16%.
- **Is 12-16% fair? Ratepayers have already paid for it.**  
David said it's justifiable. We can't leave it to grow.
- **How can we make developers include riparian strips in their developments?**  
We are limited in what we can make them do, it's largely based on goodwill but we need to buy at market rate. Greg said - we look at it from a need basis (i.e. if the neighbourhood needs it, like a local neighbourhood reserve.)
- **Water quality standards - what is our standard like in the district?**  
The requirements keep changing. [Explained new water standards and how it doesn't mean that we have sub-quality water, just that there are now additional standards to meet.]
- **Is there a push to get people to use rain water tanks for the gardens?**  
David explained that our water strategy's next step is implementation - we need to do analysis area by area. Our actions must affect supply and demand.
- **Granny flats proposal - does this mean that the memos of encumbrment will be annulled?**  
Steve explained the process. This needs to get signed every year to confirm you're not renting it out. An automatic 50% remission is applied, but you need to apply for the 100% remission.

*Greg took the group through the Coromandel - Colville slide*

- No funding for the Coromandel Harbour project in LTP yet - it still needs to go to Council.
- *(Hannafords shouldn't be there - \$152K project)*
- Sugarloaf - aligned to Council decision, district funded
- Coromandel wharf renewal - Council backing renewal of harbour facilities
- Around \$9M spend over ten years on harbour/boat ramp facilities
- Sportsville - new netball courts and alterations to club rooms

*David talked about the Coromandel Harbour facilities project as one of the Council's three anchor projects.*

He said that the decision on the business case for the project is still to be made. Explained Opotoki District Council's way of obtaining money from Treasury for their harbour upgrade as a potential funding model that Council could follow.

Coromandel township roading improvements - still to be investigated.

- **Funding from Treasury - what's the major impediment to access this for Coromandel harbour?**

*David explained that:*

- Aquaculture not strong enough in our proposal
  - Hope that tourism and 'clean up harbour' aspects attract national and regional funding
  - Tourism could be pushed as a tag for Treasury.
- **As a Council, have you got to the point yet where you can accept that we aren't going to grow largely and are thinking about how we cope with that? (referenced wastewater plants as example)**  
David responded - we need to still compete with other districts so as soon as we accept no growth, we miss out. We need to be active in promoting what we've got, we will loose and go backwards and loose growth etc if we don't.  
We don't accept growth at any cost - growth needs to be in serviced areas to save on the need for new infrastructure.
  - **Today we have talked about big projects. What about the smaller projects? Do community boards have room in their budgets for smaller projects?**  
The LTP's new format only shows big projects. Just because it isn't in the LTP Consultation Document, it doesn't necessarily mean it isn't in the budget. Community boards have the ability to complete minor projects through their discretionary funds. Partnerships are encouraged.
  - **Comment on heritage -we have a unique ability and opportunity to promote the heritage of the Coromandel. There should be much more given to this heritage aspect. Tourism is important and we need to maintain this opportunity and maintain the uniqueness that tourists look for.**

#### **Submission from Te Kura Kaupapa Maori o Harataunga (Kennedy Bay School)**

The school children, led by their principle Kepa Maika, presented an oral submission to the council. They referenced their last year's submission to the 2014/15 Annual Plan and again asked Council to consider putting a footbridge on their bridge for the safety of pedestrians and car drivers, both locals and tourists. This bridge is on a council road.

## 1.2 Whitianga Public Meeting

Record of questions from the **Long Term Plan Public Meeting** at the **Mercury Bay Area Office** on **Tuesday 17 March 2015, 1pm**

### Attendees

- 19 members of the public
- Staff including area office and district office, Community Board members, Councillors and Mayor

### Summary of questions and comments

#### *Rates/Debt*

- **Are the rates increases GST exclusive or inclusive?**  
GST exclusive.
- **How have the major toilet facility upgrades in the next three years been factored into the discussed reduction in the Mercury Bay rate for toilets?**  
The reduction in the rate for toilets is only in year one (2015-16). This may change where there are significant capital projects for toilets in later years.
- **What type of efficiencies will you seek in order to meet the growing gap between council costs, and the consumer price index and rates income?**  
The council has increased its scrutiny on where the spend of ratepayer money occurs and is moving towards systems which enhance this scrutiny further, for example in tying each project to a comprehensive project definition from the outset the council can better monitor spending across that project and question it where necessary.
- **It was remarked that the rating model used by TCDC is inequitable and the council should undertake a holistic review of the way in which it levies rates to reduce the burden on ratepayers, particularly those on low incomes, and have commercial operators pay a higher rate. There was also concern in this comment that the proposed \$200 fee on bookabach will punish those who casually rent out a portion of their property on an irregular basis and do not make profit from this.**

#### *Local services*

- **What will the proposed sealing of Lees Road include?**  
The Mayor briefly outlined how far Lees Road will be sealed under the proposed \$1.05m extension in year two, including sealing Lees Road as far as the carpark and the car park itself.
- **Why is the regional aquatic centre proposed to be based in Thames when Whitianga doesn't currently have a pool with year round access?**  
The upgrade to the Thames Centennial Pool is seen to make it a sub-regional facility in the assessment of Sports Waikato, which opens up other avenues of funding including from regional sources and from neighbouring district which would likely use the facility, for example Hauraki District. If there are upgrades sought to the Mercury Bay complex then you can submit on this to the 2015 Long Term Plan.
- **When are the Mercury Bay reserve management plans to be reviewed, and will the review pick up illegal activities that are currently occurring on those reserves?**  
The review of these is currently underway.
- **Was it considered that the Hot Water Beach toilet facility be a user-pays service?**  
Yes, this was considered alongside a number of other options for funding the facility.

#### *Other issues*

- **There was a large level of interest in the proposed \$200 fee for property owners renting their property through services like bookabach and the classification of Bed and Breakfasts with more than four bedrooms as commercial accommodation providers. In particular it was expressed that this proposal doesn't reflect that these accommodation options are not competition for hotels and other established commercial providers but instead tailor to a different market.**
- **There was also a view expressed that council was becoming overly reliant on Cathedral Cove and Hot Water Beach as tourism attractions in an unsustainable way, particularly without supporting local infrastructure to cope with the influx in peak periods. Was recommended more be done to spread visitors throughout the district.**

The Mayor provided a response to this saying that this is a view held by some members of the community however sustainability plays a key role in how council works with the Department of Conservation, iwi and business in promoting these attractions and the region more generally. The Mayor also noted that sustainability has been at the heart of council and community planning for tourism on the peninsula since the early 1990s.

- **Why doesn't the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) pay the licence to occupy remission (with regard to proposal from council to provide a rates remission to those with a licence to occupy in retirement village) as they do the rates rebate, and has council lobbied them to do so?**

Council has been lobbying DIA for some time for an extension of the rates rebate to those with a licence to occupy but has been unsuccessful. It is unlikely that DIA will move on this policy in the near future and so as a matter of equity council is proposing to provide a remission to those who have a licence to occupy their property.

### **1.3 Pauanui Public Meeting**

2015-2025 Long Term Plan Consultation Document Information Session  
Notes from meeting held in Fire Station, Pauanui, Wednesday 18 March 2015 1-3pm

#### **Attendees**

Members of the public: 27

Staff: David Hammond, Steve Baker, Angela Jane, Garry Towler, Lorna Price, Ross Ashby, Graham McDermott, Laurina White.

Elected members: Glenn Leach, Bob Renton, Peter French, Jack Wells, Jan Bartley, Donna Brooke, Kim Coppersmith

#### **Presentation**

The format was explained. The Chief Executive would go through the presentation and asked that questions are saved to the end.

#### **Debt**

##### ***What is the difference between external and internal debt?***

Steve Baker explained that internal debt is where Council uses reserves instead of using an external source like banks to borrow money. The advantage to Council is that it saves the ratepayer money.

Interest is charged on the money being borrowed at a higher rate than we get from the bank for our reserves and is borrowed at a lower rate than we would pay if we were borrowing from a bank.

#### **Stormwater**

##### ***Tairua-Pauanui Stormwater which is currently locally funded carries significant reserves, what will happen with these reserves if the proposed move of Stormwater from local to District funding proceeds. Will the current reserves be ring-fenced for Tairua-Pauanui.***

David Hammond confirmed at the meeting that the reserves currently in Stormwater would be earmarked for Tairua-Pauanui projects. This was immediately corrected at the end of the meeting to the Board Chair. As advised on the day retained earnings and depreciation reserves are to be consolidated across the district into one stormwater retained earnings reserve and one stormwater depreciation reserve. This follows the same process as for water and wastewater going district previously.

Further discussions have taken place with the Community Board Chair to provide reassurance that a general principle of fairness and equity would be at the forefront of project prioritisation. Projects programmed for Tairua-Pauanui in the early years of the Long Term Plan will be completed, the two priority projects are Holland Close and Ajax Head.

#### **Economic Development**

##### ***Are we being bold enough with a projected growth of 0.1%? Are we being aggressive enough? Questions were raised about the visibility of initiatives to market the area?***

See our future more aligned with Auckland than Waikato making reference to the developing relationship with Auckland Tourism Economic Development (ATEED).

Land zoning and availability of land for development is a difficult balancing act in a place like the Coromandel.

The immediate priority for Council at the beginning of its first term was to put the brakes on spending and bring external debt down.

#### **Local Government Re-organisation and wider strategic relationships**

##### ***Are there any indications that there are likely to be further amalgamations?***

There are no obvious indicators that there is likely to be amalgamation proposals triggered, however council is never complacent on this issue because timeframe are very tight if another party triggers the process.

***What about strategic relationships with iwi?***

Council continues to work closely with Hauraki iwi on areas of shared interest consistent with our legislative and Treaty of Waitangi obligations. Treaty Settlement issues continue to be a core focus for the iwi of the Hauraki Collective. Council has no control over this process and it requires these negotiations to be concluded to enable meaningful dialogue on areas like natural resource co-governance. Outside of settlement negotiations Council continues to engage with all Hauraki iwi on a day to day basis.

***Relationship with Waikato Regional Council***

There are many shared interests and Council is working to develop positive working relationships around areas of common interest, particularly focussed on practical, pragmatic, timely and cost effective solutions. Areas like coastal erosion is one obvious area of shared interest.

***Short-term accommodation - \$200 charge***

***Issue about why this charge is only being restricted to the tourism sector and why not other businesses which operate from home. This was seen as inequitable.***

Steve Baker responded that where we know there is a commercial enterprise operating from a private address we are pro-active in applying the appropriate rates, however we do not always have the appropriate information.

***Being positive, where is the \$200 going?***

Going to Economic Development initiatives which includes activities like Events, Destination Coromandel, Broadband initiative at Kopu.

Fairness and equity is a key driver for the proposal. It isn't an attempt to bring in additional revenue it is an attempt to redistribute the costs.

Priority has been bringing external debt down.

***Information Centres***

***The importance of local information services was highlighted and in particular there were concerns that local residents were being asked to contribute to both the local and district services.***

David Hammond stressed that the proposal is not to reduce funding and that the proposed funding change will be phased over a three year period to allow a smoother transition.

While there has been muted discussion about the potential for a discovery type centre/l site at Kopu and the strategic role that a facility at Kopu could perform, this remains speculative and has not been budgeted for.

***Heritage***

***What is being done around Captain Cook and is there a cost implication?***

Council has developed and invested in the events strategy and the links to the developing heritage park concept.

In the past there has been limited investment in Economic Development and Council is keen to see the development of ambitious, cost effective projects delivered through partnerships which share the costs.

***Water***

***Concern about water quality and the testing.***

Staff are aware of the concerns and operational investigations are underway.

***New/Local projects***

***There was general support for the local projects in particular bringing forward the Pauanui trail and there was widespread support of what has already been achieved. Keen to see other projects in the Long Term Plan being delivered.***



## 1.4 Tairua Public Meeting

**Notes from 2015-2025 Long Term Plan information session held in Tairua Library - 16 March 2015 from 1 to 3pm.**

### **Attendees**

**Members of the public:** 13

**Staff:** David Hammond, Steve Baker, Angela Jane, Garry Towler, Lorna, Ross Ashby, Graham McDermott

**Elected members:** Bob Renton, Glenn Leach, Jack Wells, Jan Bartley (arrived 1.30pm); Donna Brooke (arrived 1.35pm), Kim Coppersmith, Gloria Giles

### **Presentation**

The format was that ratepayers were invited to make comment, ask questions seek clarification at any point.

### **Activities**

General nods of agreement about the importance of Civil Defence as the activities were covered in the presentation.

### **Rates**

***Challenge on the figures relating to rates increase where one ratepayer claimed that her rates had doubled. Mayor was surprised by this as it contradicts his experience and asked staff to follow-up.***

Steve Baker followed this individual case up and the doubling was a combination of Land Value/ Improvement Value. The doubling went back to 2002 and not 2011 as claimed, the increase also included the EW3 costs (\$600).

### **Bach owner \$200 charge**

***Why does short-term accommodation need to pay for Economic Development? There are plenty of other businesses who benefit from tourism activity. Many of these operate from homes and are therefore not always visible.***

Steve Baker responded that where we know there is a commercial enterprise operating from a private address we are pro-active in applying the appropriate rates, however we do not always have the appropriate information.

***Will we not simply trip up on the administration? How do we know there are 1400 properties that will be affected?***

Steve Baker described the methodology used to arrive at the number of properties affected.

### **B&B proposal**

***How many B&B will be affected by the proposal?***

***How does this proposal fit with the Economic Development initiatives to grow the Coromandel. It seems a backward step.***

***Is this being driven by the motelliers?***

Steve Baker explained that the short-term sector is not currently making a contribution but enjoying the benefits of increased promotion and visitors. This is not an attempt to bring in new revenue, it is about redistributing the costs.

### **Stormwater**

***Issues raised about work not being completed and that the Stormwater outflows were silting up at the marina. Residents are frustrated that the job has not been completed.***

Council acknowledged that there had been a number of issues around the consenting process which was outside Council's direct control. This was having an impact on completing the job. Staff undertook to alert the appropriate activity manager to the issues

and advise of the solutions offered at the meeting.

### **Public Toilets**

***If the area is serious about promoting the area and attracting visitors then they need to be catered for and it is an essential service. Toilets are mainly used by visitors and other resident from across the Coromandel therefore being funded on a district basis is more equitable.***

These issues have been debated extensively within Council so there is an understanding from Council. There has been serious discussion around the issue of funding toilets that are built to service district assets e.g. the Great Walks - is it more appropriate to fund them district wide?

### **Information Centres**

***There were a number of attendees who are involved in Tairua information centre and had strong views on the proposal to change the funding arrangements and in particular the move from district to local funding. Issues included:***

- ***Role of Destination Coromandel was questioned and there was a belief that Tairua will not be well served by services in Thames and Whitianga.***
- ***That the Tairua Information Centre acts as a gateway in particular for the two major attractions Cathedral Cove and Hot Water beach.***
- ***Many visitors particularly international visitors make their way straight to the Coromandel and their first stopping point is Tairua bypassing all facilities.***
- ***The benefits of providing the service are enjoyed far more by businesses operating in the Mercury Bay community board area than locally.***
- ***The proposal was perceived to undermine the Tairua Information Centre***
- ***The cost of running the service from commercial premises is prohibitive but location and being on the main street is seen as a very important factor.***
- ***That Tairua/Pauanui residents are paying twice in that they are making a contribution to the district wide services in Thames and Whitianga but still having to fund a local service.***

***The consultation document states that it is a service that only benefits local residents and this is not true. If anything there is more benefit to the district.***

David Hammond stressed that the proposal is not to reduce funding and that the proposed funding change will be phased over a three year period to allow a smoother transition.

While there has been muted discussion about the potential for a discovery type centre/l site at Kopu and the strategic role that a facility at Kopu could perform, this remains a speculative proposal and has not been budgeted for in the Long Term Plan.

The Mayor stressed that there still continues to be an important role for local information centres and that should be focussed on maximising local benefits from the wider district efforts to attract visitors to the Coromandel.

The Community Board chair also commented that the package had to be viewed in its entirety and that it was a case of swings and roundabouts. The assumptions about the benefits that areas were receiving compared to others were often inaccurate or did not take account of the additional rates costs incurred to achieve these benefits.

### **Economic Development**

***What about the plight of businesses who invested heavily but continue to struggle? What role and priority will these businesses receive from Economic Development initiatives?***

Issues covered were generally a repeat of the wider discussion around B&B and short-term accommodation proposals. The relationship between the increased focus on Economic Development and the increased activity around activities like events was acknowledged.

***What other initiatives are we undertaking to attract and retain people? Why don't we try to attract tertiary education initiatives like those in Invercargill/Southland?***

A number of examples of initiatives were described including broadband, Blue Highway, Thames Urban Development Strategy, developing formal and informal links with Auckland which are seen as more significant to Thames Coromandel than many of the Waikato based initiatives.

**Water**

***Comparisons to Pauanui were made about differences in terms of hose bans still being operational in Tairua but not Pauanui. The main issue was perceived not to be a lack of water but lack of storage.***

The longer term driver of Council is water demand strategy and the use of tanks was one example. Water is a resource which needs to be managed effectively and will be a major focus for Council. The priority is to get better quality information about the condition of our assets.

**Wastewater**

***How long will it take to pay off the wastewater debt?***

Presenters returned to the chart in the presentation and explained the role that debt plays in addressing inter-generational equity.

**District Projects**

***Why is the war memorial forest just WWI and not for all wars?***

The initiative is prompted by the 100th anniversary.

**Local projects**

***What happened to the Tairua Sports Complex?***

The Community Plan provides an opportunity to get more feedback on local priorities and will be used to inform future Annual Plans and Long Term Plans.

## 1.5 Whangamata Public Meeting

2015-2025 Long Term Plan  
Consultation Document Information Session  
Notes from meeting held in Whangamata Area Centre -  
Thursday 19 March 2015 from 1 to 3pm.

### Attendees

**Members of the public:** 25

**Staff:** David Hammond, Steve Baker, Angela Jane, Garry Towler, Jennifer Mahon, Ross Ashby, Graham McDermott, Michael Dobie

**Elected members:** Peter French, Jack Wells, Jan Bartley; Keith Johnston, Terry Walker

### Presentation

The format for the session was a presentation by the Chief Executive with three breaks for questions.

### Part One - Services, Rates and debt

#### ***What is the average rate in Whangamata?***

The figures are simply provided as an indicator and it was acknowledged that very few people fall into the average threshold. If ratepayers wanted to work out their own personal rates they are directed to the Council website which has a rates calculator.

#### ***Internal/External debt was perceived to be smoke and mirrors. Debt is debt.***

Steve Baker responded that the approach does produce real savings for ratepayers. Inter-generational equity is an important consideration for Council. One of the tools for achieving this is the use of debt to spread the share over a number of generations taking account of the expected life cycle of assets.

#### ***Is too much debt being paid off too quickly?***

Steve Baker provided an explanation about the relationship between inter-generational equity and the life span of the asset.

### Public Conveniences

***This should be a district funded facility because visitors are mostly used by visitors and tourists.***

There followed some discussion about the community empowerment model and local control and prioritisation of services.

### Information Centres

***Information centre is a double whammy for everyone except Thames and Whitianga as they have to pay for both the district and local service.***

***Ratepayers in Whangamata are expected to fund both a local service and the district wide service and there are a number of questions about***

***Believe there is a performance issue with Destination Coromandel and that Whangamata does not receive good value***

This is a perception from a number of quarters that this is the case. We will discuss this with the organisation. There are many things carried out by the organisation which may not be appreciated because of a lack of awareness and communication.

### Economic Development Targeted Rate

***Why single out one sector there are plenty of businesses who benefit from tourism and visitors?***

Steve Baker responded that where we know there is a commercial enterprise operating from a private address we are pro-active in applying the appropriate rates, however we do

not always have the appropriate information.

***For events like the beach hop the event relies on the occasional renter otherwise there would be a shortfall of accommodation.***

This is not an attempt to raise additional revenue, simply an attempt to redistribute the expenses more appropriately to those who benefit from the support of Council through the funding of events like the Beach Hop.

***Bach owners who overbook or turn a blind eye to over occupancy including camping on lawns are a bigger concern and it feels as if we are picking on the wrong people. Where is the incentive for people who manage their bach responsibly and who make a positive contribution to the quality of the accommodation mix in Whangamata.***

***Many people rent in response to requests from visitors who have exhausted all other options to find suitable accommodation.***

***Are we not going to spend more trying to identify people and just drive them underground?***

Steve Baker described how they had identified properties and provided indicative costs associated with this exercise.

#### **B&B proposal to**

***Why 4+ bedrooms and is the proposal inconsistent with the District Plan?***

***Similar issues were raised about the potential negative impact of these proposals when we should be encouraging visitor and tourism development.***

***Encourage as many submissions as there have been many excellent points raised.***

#### **New Local projects**

Garry took the group through the proposed major projects.

#### **Wentworth Valley**

There are mixed views about this project which has dragged on for many years. The purpose of the proposal is to assess what the level of interest and support/opposition is and if there is sufficient interest to move on to the next stage to define accurately what the options and costs are to deliver the project.

There was a general level of support for projects and the feedback was that residents were keen to see some of these plans turned into reality.

## **Attachment B**

### **Steps to Foster the Development of Māori Capacity to Contribute to Decision-Making**

The Thames-Coromandel District Council is obliged to ensure that Māori have the opportunity to participate in Council decision-making processes. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out a clear purpose for local government – to promote social, economic, cultural and environmental well-being through local decision-making and action. Every day Iwi, Hapu, Whanau and Māori communities are affected by decisions made by the Council. Much of what Council does is directly relevant to Māori and requires good relationships at a local level.

The Council is required by the Act to:

- establish and maintain opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision-making processes (particularly in relation to land and water bodies)
- ensure processes are in place for consulting with Māori
- consider ways in which they can foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to decision-making processes
- provide relevant information to Māori.

The Council intends to undertake the following steps, to foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to its decision-making processes:

1. the Council will compile a database of those who wish to be considered Māori for the purposes of the Local Government Act 2002. The council will maintain a process to ensure this database is current and up to date.
2. those persons who have identified themselves as Māori will be specifically targeted for consultation when the Council decides that it wishes to consult. Where specific legislation requires specific consultation with Māori or Tangata Whenua, then the requirements of that specific legislation will override this step.
3. the Council will identify key issues of particular interest to Māori.
4. the Council will gather information on Māori perspectives about Council activities.
5. the Council will consciously build on the good quality relationships that have already been established. Examples include the development of further Memorandums of Understanding and relationships developed through other processes such as the Resource Management Act, Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint project and the Council's strategic work programme.
6. the Council will identify a work programme to progress items 1-5 above.
7. the Council will progress the above work programme as staff time and funding allows.

#### **Hauraki Treaty Settlement**

As part of their Treaty of Waitangi settlement process, the Hauraki Collective<sup>1</sup> (the Collective) and the Crown signed a Framework Agreement (Agreement) at Wharekawa Marae, Kaiaua on 1 October 2010.

Post-Treaty settlement arrangements within Hauraki have the potential to bring new challenges and opportunities to local government: opportunities to build and foster more enduring relationships with a better resourced and focussed Hauraki tribal collective; challenges in terms of new co-governance/co-management frameworks and strategies arising from post settlement legislation that will most likely draw on existing models and experience.

Such arrangements will have a significant impact on Iwi contribution to the Council's decision-making. The Council regards it as important that the Treaty settlement

arrangements, once known, be acknowledged and reflected in its intended approach to fostering Māori capacity to contribute to its decision-making processes.

The Council intends to review this Statement once the Treaty settlement outcomes are known. ~~The revised Statement is intended to be included in the Council's draft 2015-2025 Ten Year Plan.~~

<sup>1</sup> The Hauraki Collective comprises the following iwi: Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki; Ngāti Hako; Ngāti Hei; Ngāti Maru; Ngāti Pāoa; Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki; Ngāti Pūkenga; Ngāti Rahiri Tumutumu; Ngāti Tamaterā; Ngāti Tara Tokanui; Ngāti Whanaunga; and Te Patukirikiri.



*value beyond boundaries™*

**DRAFT  
STATEMENT OF INTENT  
FOR 2015/16**

**30 June 2015**



## Local Authority Shared Services Limited

---

### Introduction

This Statement of Intent is a public declaration of the activities and intentions of the Waikato Council Controlled Organisation, Local Authority Shared Services Limited (LASS). The statement outlines the Directors' accountabilities to the shareholders for corporate performance, as is intended by Schedule 8 of the Local Government Act 2002.

### Objectives of LASS

During the early 2000s, the relationship between the local authorities within the Waikato Region continued to strengthen. As a result of this, it was considered desirable to set up a structure under which shared services could operate to provide strategic or other advantages to the local authorities involved. Of the structures considered, the Local Authority Shared Services Limited (LASS) was chosen, as it was considered the most appropriate mechanism to provide the Councils in the Waikato Region with a vehicle to operate shared services.

LASS provides a mechanism to develop and procure services which are available to be joined by any shareholder that chooses to do so. It also provides a company structure for any Council that wishes to develop new services, under which they can develop and promote services to other local authorities and external parties.

As part of providing a mechanism for supporting shared services and collaborative opportunities within the region, LASS also provides support to the Waikato Mayoral Forum and the working parties established by.

### Nature and Scope of Current Activities

There are currently four major initiatives operating under the LASS umbrella, plus a support role for the collaborative workstreams of the Waikato Mayoral Forum.

1. **Shared Valuation Data Service (SVDS).** This operational system is providing timely and accurate valuation data to member Councils and shareholders. The SVDS has become the accepted valuation database for the region. The revenue shown in the financial statements is based on the assumption that there will continue to be external commercial sales of the SVDS data. However, central government or council decisions on open data provision could reduce or eliminate the commercial sale of SVDS data in the future.
2. **Waikato Regional Transportation Model (WRTM).** This model became fully operational in February 2010. This model provides accurate information to Councils and external users (for a charge) for their transport modelling requirements. The WRTM is the only recognised strategic transport modelling resource in the Waikato Region, and is jointly funded by the NZ Transport Agency.
3. **Joint Procurement Initiatives.** LASS is a party to a number of joint procurement contracts between the company, shareholding Councils and suppliers. Some contracts (e.g. insurance brokerage services; various collective insurance policies; courier and postal services; historic aerial photography) involve all of the

shareholding councils. Other joint procurement contracts have been negotiated, involving only some of the shareholding councils (e.g. the Professional Services Panel; computer-generated print, mailhouse and e-services). Further procurement opportunities are continually being identified, and a number are currently under active investigation (e.g. asset valuation services; pipe procurement).

4. The **Waikato Regional Aerial Photography Service (WRAPS)**. WRAPS was set up in the 1990s for the supply of colour, digital, ortho-rectified, aerial photography for the Waikato Region. So far, there have been three WRAPS contracts – 2002, 2007 and 2012. In 2012, the WRAPS members were the councils of the Waikato Region, plus the Department of Conservation and Waikato University. The next contract is due in 2016/17. Discussions are currently being held with other parties to assess their willingness to join the syndicate. Both Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) and the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) have indicated potential interest, which would reduce the cost to the participating councils. WRAPS became a LASS-managed project in December 2014.

The establishment of the **Waikato Mayoral Forum** in 2012 resulted in the creation of five working parties to investigate collaborative opportunities in the areas of governance, spatial planning, two waters, roading, and economic development. An additional work stream for bylaws and policies was created in 2013. (Note: The governance workstream is currently in abeyance, and the two waters project is now being run by a consortium comprising Hamilton City, Waikato and Waipa District Councils.) Each working party is led by a Council CEO in conjunction with a group of Mayors/Chairperson from the Waikato Mayoral Forum. LASS provides administrative and financial support to both the Forum and the working parties. The LASS CEO is a member of the roading governance group (RATA).

Over the period that the company has been operating benefits have been delivered in the form of:

- Improved level and quality of service
- Co-ordinated approach to the provision of services
- Reductions in the cost of services
- Development of new initiatives
- Opportunities for all Councils (irrespective of their location or size) to benefit from joint initiatives
- Leverage provided from economy of scales resulting from a single entity representing all Councils and leveraging procurement opportunities.

Based on feedback from the shareholding Councils and the CEO Forum, the LASS Directors will continue to discuss their role in the development of business cases for shared services at Board meetings. The Directors are mindful of the political environment, and see the investigation of possible future shared services as a key focus of their role.

### **Process for Future Developments**

All new proposed shared services involving LASS will have a business case developed for consideration by the Directors. New services will only be adopted where the business case shows that they provide sufficient benefit to the shareholders, that the benefits exceed any benefits associated with other proposals, and where there are sufficient resources available to progress the initiative. (If there are insufficient resources, the initiative may be deferred and reconsidered at such time that resources can be made available.)

Benefits may include, but are not limited to, greater strategic capacity, mitigation of risk, development of intellectual property, protection of Council data, improved levels of service, efficiencies and/or reduced cost. All proposals shall be presented to the shareholding councils for approval prior to implementation. Further approvals may be required at various phases during the development of a shared service or if material changes to the original proposal are thought desirable as the initiative is developed.

## Governance

LASS has twelve Directors, with each Director representing a shareholder Council.

Unless otherwise agreed by the appointing Councils, each Director shall be the Chief Executive of a local authority. In addition, the Board may appoint up to three professional directors to supplement the Directors' expertise. At this time, no independent directors have been appointed to the Board.

LASS conducts itself in accordance with its constitution, its annual Statement of Intent as agreed with shareholders, the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, and LASS policies.

## Directors

The current Directors of LASS are:

<b>Director</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Director Appointed By</b>
Gavin Ion (Chair)	Chief Executive, Waikato District Council	Waikato District Council
Geoffrey Williams	Chief Executive, Rotorua District Council	Rotorua District Council
Chris Ryan	Chief Executive Officer, Waitomo District Council	Waitomo District Council
Vaughan Payne	Chief Executive, Waikato Regional Council	Waikato Regional Council
Langley Cavers	Chief Executive, Hauraki District Council	Hauraki District Council
Richard Briggs	Chief Executive, Hamilton City Council	Hamilton City Council
David Hammond	Chief Executive, Thames-Coromandel District Council	Thames-Coromandel District Council
Garry Dyet	Chief Executive, Waipa District Council	Waipa District Council
Don McLeod	Chief Executive Officer, Matamata-Piako District Council	Matamata-Piako District Council
Rob Williams	Chief Executive Officer, Taupo District Council	Taupo District Council
Craig Hobbs	Chief Executive Officer, South Waikato District Council	South Waikato District Council
Dave Clibbery	Chief Executive Officer, Otorohanga District Council	Otorohanga District Council

## Activities for which the Board seeks Compensation

Additional shared services may be developed during the year that this Statement of Intent is current. Any such services will only be delivered by LASS after the Directors have considered a business case, including the proposed budget, and agreed that the proposed new service meets the objectives of LASS.

Any ongoing activities to identify, develop and procure shared services will be budgeted for in advance, subject to a business case, and either funded and/or staffed by individual Councils without LASS involvement, or agreed by the Directors to be funded by the LASS and/or utilising LASS resources with consequent recovery from participating Councils.

Shareholders will continue to contribute to the operational costs of the LASS on an annual basis.

## Performance Targets

To ensure that the Company continues to operate effectively and efficiently, the performance targets for 2015/16 are as follows:

TARGET	METHOD	MEASURE
<p><b>Procurement</b> Joint procurement initiatives for goods and services for LASS councils will be investigated and implemented.</p>	<p>Procurement is from sources offering best value, service, continuity of supply, and/or opportunities for integration.</p>	<p>A minimum of three new procurement initiatives investigated per annum and business cases developed if considered appropriate.</p> <p>Initiatives which are implemented shall provide financial savings and/or improved service levels to the participating councils.</p> <p>New suppliers are awarded contracts according to the LASS Financial Delegations Policy.</p>
<p><b>Collaborative Projects</b> Priorities for collaboration are identified, business cases are developed for the highest priority projects, and the projects are implemented.</p>	<p>The focus is on shared services which will benefit all councils.</p>	<p>A minimum of three priority projects for collaboration are identified per annum.</p> <p>If considered of value, business cases are developed for approval by the Board, and the projects are implemented.</p>
<p><b>Existing LASS Contracts</b> Existing contracts are managed and renegotiated as required.</p>	<p>Appointed vendors deliver on the terms of their contracts and deliver value to the shareholders.</p>	<p>The LASS Contracts Register is maintained and managed.</p> <p>Contracts which are due for renewal are tested for competitiveness and either renegotiated or tendered through a competitive process.</p>

TARGET	METHOD	MEASURE
<p><b>Cashflow</b> The company shall maintain a positive cashflow position.</p>	<p>The Financial Accountant reviews cashflow monthly.</p> <p>The LASS Board reviews the financial statements quarterly.</p>	<p>Monthly financial statements show a positive cashflow position.</p>
<p><b>Cost Control</b> Administration expenditure shall be managed and monitored.</p>	<p>The Financial Accountant and Chief Executive review expenditure monthly.</p> <p>The LASS Board reviews financial statements quarterly.</p>	<p>Administration expenditure shall not exceed budget by more than 5%, unless prior approval is obtained from the Board.</p>
<p><b>Reporting</b> Six monthly reports provided to Shareholders.</p>	<p>The Chief Executive prepares a written report for the LASS Board every meeting.</p> <p>One 6-monthly and one Annual Report are prepared for shareholders.</p>	<p>The Board shall provide a written report on the business operations and financial position of the LASS to the Shareholders every six months.</p> <p>Note that every second report shall be the Annual Report, which includes a report that all of the statutory requirements of the LASS are being adhered to.</p>
<p><b>Waikato Mayoral Forum</b> The company shall provide administrative support and updates on Mayoral Forum workstreams to the Mayoral Forum.</p>	<p>Mayoral Forum projects shall be managed financially through the LASS.</p> <p>Updates on Mayoral Forum projects shall be co-ordinated by the LASS Chief Executive.</p> <p>Note: The current approved workstreams are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roothing (RATA)</li> <li>• Economic Development</li> <li>• Regulatory Bylaws and Policies</li> <li>• Waters</li> <li>• Waikato Spatial Plan</li> </ul>	<p>The Mayoral Forum is regularly updated on the progress of each approved workstream.</p> <p>Approved invoices for Mayoral Forum projects are paid by the 20<sup>th</sup> of the month following their receipt.</p>
<p><b>Shared Valuation Data Services (SVDS)</b> The SVDS is reliable, well maintained and available to all users.</p>	<p>A Contract Manager is appointed for SVDS.</p> <p>Contract Manager monitors performance of contractor and reports quarterly to the SVDS Advisory Group.</p>	<p>The SVDS is available to users at least 99% of normal working hours.</p> <p>All capital enhancement work is supported by a business case and approved by the SVDS Advisory Group.</p> <p>The SVDS Advisory Group meets at least 6-monthly.</p>

TARGET	METHOD	MEASURE
<p><b>Waikato Regional Transport Model (WRTM)</b> The WRTM is reliable, well maintained and available to all users.</p>	<p>A Contract Manager is appointed for WRTM.</p> <p>Contract Manager monitors performance of the model supplier (currently Traffic Design Group) and reports quarterly to the WRTM Project Advisory Group.</p>	<p>All modelling reports requested from the model supplier are actioned within the agreed timeframe, scope and budget.</p> <p>A report by the Contract Manager on any new developments and on the status of the model is provided to the LASS Board at least every six months.</p> <p>The quality of the base model complies with NZTA guidelines (as set out in the NZTA's Economic Evaluation Manual), and is independently peer reviewed each time the model is updated.</p>
<p><b>Shareholder Survey</b> Shareholders are satisfied with the performance of LASS.</p>	<p>An annual survey of shareholders is undertaken to assess satisfaction levels with LASS.</p>	<p>A survey of shareholders is undertaken each year, and the results are reported to all shareholders.</p>
<p><b>Review of Benefits</b> Shareholders are informed of the benefits being provided to shareholding councils by LASS.</p>	<p>The benefits of LASS (including financial and non-financial achievements) are regularly analysed and reported to shareholders.</p>	<p>Information on the financial and non-financial benefits being achieved by LASS are included in the 6-monthly and Annual Report to shareholders.</p>

## **2.2 Deliberations for Development Contributions Policy**

---

**TO** Thames-Coromandel District Council  
**FROM** Steve Baker - Chief Financial Officer  
**DATE** 8 May 2015  
**SUBJECT** **Deliberations for Development Contributions Policy**

---

### **1 Purpose of report**

The purpose of the report is to present the submissions with staff advice on the proposed Development Contributions Policy and a revised Development Contributions Policy that encompasses advice from a legal review.

### **2 Background**

A revised Development Contributions Policy was developed in 2014 in response to changes in the legislative requirements from the 2012 amendment of the Local Government Act 2002 and in response to our three yearly review of the policy for adoption with the new Long Term Plan.

The revised policy was the subject of a special consultative procedure run in parallel with the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan over March/April 2015. Council received five submissions on the revised policy and statement of proposal. Hearings for submitters wishing to speak to their submission were held over 28-30 April 2015.

### **3 Issue**

The summary of the five submissions with staff advice is in Attachment A. Staff have updated the proposed Development Contributions Policy with tracked changes to reflect the further staff reviews undertaken since January 2015 when the policy was finalised for public consultation. The tracked change version is in Attachment B.

### **4 Suggested Resolution(s)**

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Receives the 'Deliberations for Development Contributions Policy' report, dated 9 May 2015.
2. Approves the changes proposed by staff to revise the 2015 Development Contributions Policy.

### **References-Tabled/Agenda Attachments**

**Attachment A** *Summary of submissions and staff advice*  
**Attachment B** *Revised Development Contributions Policy*

**Attachment A**

**Submissions on Development Contributions Policy and statement of proposal**

<b>Full Name Company / Organisation</b>	<b>General Comment: Development Contributions Policy - Further comments on the Development Contributions Policy.</b>	<b>Staff advice to Council</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Evans Young Hopper Development Limited</p>	<p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Amendment to private development agreement provision <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to amend the private development agreement provision.</b> There is a need to preserve the integrity and value of existing Developer Agreements. Developers should be encouraged to commit to providing improved facilities as part of any development. <b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Change to method of calculating reserve contributions <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to change the method of calculating reserve contributions.</b> Council needs to have a clear Reserves and Open Space policy that can be applied consistently and equitably across the District. Council needs to establish and maintain a register of Reserves and Open Space as an extension to it's Asset Register, recording how the Reserve was acquired (Crown grant, resident gifting, purchased, source of funds [developer contributions, ratepayer contributions] etc), the use (active sports, open space, conservation, local purpose, etc). Expenditure incurred over the preceding 10 years as well as the programed 10 year future expenditure should be included in the formula to calculate Reserve Contributions.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Change to the purpose for which reserve contributions are to be collected and clarification of the purpose of these <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to change the purpose for which reserve contributions are to be collected and clarify the</b></p>	<p>No existing developer agreements will be affected by the change in policy. While developers improving facilities within a development is laudable, to qualify for a developer agreement in must meet the necessary requirements of the community, i.e provide some kind of infrastructure that would otherwise be funded from development contributions. Otherwise Council may be seen as participating in improvement works whose primary purpose is to promote the development that built it.</p> <p>On the Reserves and open space policy - The submitters concerns are noted.</p>	<p>No change to proposed policy</p>



	<p><b>purpose of these.</b> Until Council has a clear policy on Reserves and Open Space, I find it difficult for Council to justify any Contribution regime.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Revised methodology for allocating costs of projects</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to revise the methodology for allocating costs of projects.</b> Any allocation of costs needs to be transparent and contestable - Would require an independent audit of assumptions and allocations.</p>		
<p>Mr Ian McAlley Wharekaho 2013 Limited</p>	<p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Provision for developers to request a reconsideration</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to make provision for developers to request a reconsideration.</b> The provision for developers to request a reconsideration of development contributions is an important addition to the Policy given the potentially long lead times and development timeframes for projects and also the potential for new technologies and/or means by which to provide services to be applied to a development, potentially altering the method of service provision after a development has started.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> <b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Amendment to private development agreement provision</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to amend the private development agreement provision.</b> The ability to enter into private development agreements is a necessary means by which to provide services to developments, particularly where that service provision does not coincide with Council's projected infrastructure expenditure. Further, the timing of payments is critical to the success of a development and also a reduction in the time taken to utilise capacity within newly developed infrastructure and/or reduce the period of time that borrowings are</p>	<p>We acknowledge the submitters support for the Provision for developers to request a reconsideration of development contributions.</p> <p>We acknowledge the submitters support of the private development agreement provision.</p> <p>Changing the method of calculating reserve contributions. Due</p>	<p>No change to proposed policy</p>

	<p>subject to interest, can significantly reduce the quantum of development contributions. Any reduction in the amount of development contributions paid is beneficial to the end user as this should be reflected in lower development/section costs. Having mechanisms by which Council can proactively enter into agreements with developers can significantly assist in progressing a development and reducing the infrastructure and development contributions costs.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Change to method of calculating reserve contributions</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to change the method of calculating reserve contributions.</b> Previously the method for calculating reserve contributions was: <i>The average market land value of 20m<sup>2</sup> of land, determined no more than 90 days prior to the payment of the contribution by a registered land valuer appointed by the Council, for each additional allotment created by subdivision, excluding balance lots on a staged subdivision, provided that the contribution shall not exceed 7.5% of the value of the additional allotments created by subdivision.</i></p> <p>The new policy proposes that reserve contributions be calculated as: <i>The amount of such contributions shall not exceed the greater of 7.5% of the value of additional lots created by subdivision and the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional household unit created by development.</i></p> <p>The new calculation method is lifted from the Local Government Act 2002 and is considered to be ambiguous in its interpretation and application. The previous definition was clear in that the maximum reserve contribution payable was equivalent to 20 m<sup>2</sup> of land and no more than 7.5% of the value of the new lot. The new definition appears to enable a contribution to a maximum of 7.5% of the value of the new lot. In the instance of higher value coastal sections, a reserve</p>	<p>to changes in the Local Government Act 2002 and the amendments made in August 2014, Council was required to align the reserves contribution provisions alongside the spirit of the act.</p> <p>As such, the submitters concerns are noted.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>contribution set at the value of 7.5% of the lot value is considered to be excessive. Furthermore, with reference to Appendix C - Sources of Funding contained within the draft development contributions policy, there appears to be no capital expenditure set aside for reserves. It is therefore impossible at this stage to assess the effect of any contribution payable and also limits and/or negates the ability for Council to reimburse a developer who has included usable recreation reserves within their development and/or committed to making expenditure to upgrade existing reserves proximate to their development. The provision of reserve land needs to be linked to a clear and unambiguous reserves acquisition and development policy and consideration should be given to placing a cap on any reserves contribution payable as a dollar amount, rather than a percentage, as a percentage acts more as a tax, rather than a contribution in recognition of the capital cost per unit of demand associated with the provision of particular infrastructure and/or services. It is proposed that further consultation occur with significant developers in the District to discuss how reserve contributions should be calculated and how and where reserves should be provided as it is recognised that attractive, usable and well-placed reserves are both beneficial to the development within which they are located and to the wider community also. <b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Change to the purpose for which reserve contributions are to be collected and clarification of the purpose of these <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to change the purpose for which reserve contributions are to be collected and clarify the purpose of these.</b> As above.</p>		
Mr John Fryer	<p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Provision for developers to request a reconsideration</p>	We acknowledge the submitters support for the Provision for	

	<p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to make provision for developers to request a reconsideration.</b> It is only fair.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Retention of certificate of acceptance pending payment of development contributions</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to retain the certificate of acceptance pending payment of development contributions.</b> Developers can go broke.</p>	<p>developers to request a reconsideration of development contributions.</p> <p>Retaining certificate of acceptance one of the limited ways that Council can obtain contributions. Without this ability, the risk to council in terms of obtaining payment would be unacceptable. Developers are made aware at the beginning of their development of the requirement to pay a development contribution and therefore as with any cost associated with subdivision, building or connection, it should be considered as a standard cost of development.</p>	<p>No change to proposed policy</p>
<p>Maggie Johnson</p>	<p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Retention of certificate of acceptance pending payment of development contributions</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to retain the certificate of acceptance pending payment of development contributions.</b> I support Council's Option 2, "to ensure developers pay their share towards infrastructure.. etc." and because it "provides an additional level of safeguard for the ratepayer" on whom too much of the burden has already fallen. We need also to have a 'consistent approach" by Council in all things.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Amendment to private development</p>	<p>The submitters concerns are noted (on the assumption that this submission has already been dealt with)</p>	<p>No change to proposed policy</p>

	<p>agreement provision <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to amend the private development agreement provision.</b> I support Option 1 if that is the one which retains the criterion that such agreements can only be entered into where there is "significant public benefit (created towards the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of the District community". This criterion should NOT be removed for ANY reason, including giving "greater flexibility for developers and Council". I object that the consultation document in proposing Amendment of Option 3, identifies "no particular disadvantages", when it is advocating to remove the clause which "protects the community interest" Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 1 (as cited above in Option 2, and at the same time wishing to support 'flexibility to developers' instead. I fail to see how the inclusion of "significant public benefit... would be outside the intentions of the LGA? <b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Change to method of calculating reserve contributions <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to change the method of calculating reserve contributions.</b> I support the retention of current methodology for assessing reserve contributions. It is fair that the people doing the developing and or the people with higher value properties pay more, and pay for their valuations etc. as part of the cost of development rather than to spread the costs across the board to make people who own lower-valued land pay the same. This is in keeping with my central premise that we should have a capital value-based rating system in our district, which would be far more equitable and fairly proportionate in terms of revenue-gathering. I therefore oppose the proposed amendment option #4, which again seems to err on the side of the developers. Also, because historically, we have seen calculations</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>based on 'planned expenditure etc... needed for growth in the catchment' to be misguided.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Revised methodology for allocating costs of projects</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to revise the methodology for allocating costs of projects.</b></p> <p>I support Option 1 to retain the existing policy and methodology in respect of the two limiters, and I oppose Option 2 as Council's proposed amendment. The argument to remove the limiters (RCSS &amp; ODRV) is NOT in the interest of the base community, as stated in the Disadvantages to Option 2. It is unethical to expect ratepayers to bear any more of the additional capital costs when Council has already transferred the interest debt to them in the last AP. In Option 1, you say both the existing ratepayers AND the developers are protected by the limiters in place so this seems the most practicable and equitable solution. I continue to trust Council to make wise, equitable decisions.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Replacement of term ILOS (Improved Level of Service) with ERP (Existing Ratepayer Projects)</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to replace the term ILOS (Improved Level of Service) with ERP (Existing Ratepayer Projects).</b></p> <p>I support retaining the term ILOS as a good one to describe what Council work should be about. Also, there is too much name-changing and shifting the parameters that has already gone on. This can be confusing and is always at administrative cost to Council and indirectly to ratepayers. If capital project</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>costs are not transparent, that needs to be corrected but transparency in general needs addressing by Council. I'd respectfully suggest that streamlining procedures and spending wisely on staff training is a better option than to spend time and money on revising and publishing more and more documents, at ratepayer expense.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Inclusion of minor units into the Policy Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 2</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to include minor units in the Policy.</b></p> <p>I do NOT support the inclusion of minor units in the DC policy or Table 1. NB: I've consistently challenged the adoption of the definition of 'minor unit' etc. into the PDP on the basis of 'self-containment, with own kitchen, etc.' (and the classification by Council of such as "capable of separate inhabitation" in a rating unit (SUIP) when it is a single residence on a COT &amp;/or the Valuation Roll, and intended to be "principally" used as such. (NB: to avoid repetition, refer earlier submissions to PDP &amp; DAP, 2014 &amp; 23/3/2015 letter to Mayor Leach, Councillors and TCDC staff. I will refer to those previous arguments in this submission as needed.)</p> <p>NB: Section 15(1)(b) of the 2002(amended 2014) LGA requires councils to undertake factual enquiries about separate use or separate inhabitation, rather than levy UAGCs based on a property's capacity for separate inhabitation. Councils need to ensure that they are imposing rates on the best available current information and that rates are applied consistently to ensure that like properties are treated in a like manner. Currently, however, there is no effective database or system of identifying 'targeted properties' in a consistent way.</p> <p>I ask again that Council reviews/reconsiders the basis of their whole rating system (i.e. not according to targeted fixed rates per rating unit or SUIP) but to reassess and choose different factors from</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Schedule 3, the LGA, so that rates are more equitable and in proportion to the capital value of properties &amp;/or to their (semi-commercial) use of services (see below). There also needs to be consistency between the factors e.g. 7 &amp; 9 do not gel where a so-called MU does not have a separate "connection to the local authority reticulation system" but may still be charged as 0.5 or as one extra rating unit.</p> <p>Your new proposal also seems proportionately unfair, given the great attention to detail given to charging campgrounds for use of services in Table 1, vis a vis these other perhaps undercharged 'uses'. Refer my email to Mayor Leach of 23/3:</p> <p>"re former campgrounds-now high-density apartment complexes, how two units in one building are rated, and in other non-detached 2 or 3 storey multi-unit blocks, how (particularly wastewater) rates apply, when most of these 'homes' are not lived in but garner good returns year round as Visitor accommodation, and are not caught in any rating net, other than perhaps to pay the \$200 fixed holiday home fee? (and this, in a max. of 12 guests, zone)? A similar imbalance looks to be occurring with Council's suggested 4+ rooms B&amp;B limit before they incur a commercial rating?" People will simply close one room, but what of the 2 and 3 bedroom B&amp;B's, in all fairness, that escape detection and/or payment?</p> <p>Given the def. of 'minor unit' can't be altered, I would support Option 1 on p. 22, DCP to EXEMPT all minor units from DCs, but add the condition, IF they EXISTED prior to the change in the LGA of 2002/03. On this basis, development contributions taken will coincide with the new push towards economic development of our town and region, as seems correct. An already-established 1BR flat or space of under 50sq m. in a residential home (even if SC'd) does not deserve to be charged even a HALF a rating unit, when it is on one system and not using more services than other non-permanent</p>		
--	---	--	--



	<p>arrangements in residential units which are used semi-commercially.</p> <p>I support that any property owner who actively advertises a home for accommodation (with 1-4/5 BRs on more than a casual basis, be targeted for extra rates or fees along the lines of your suggested \$200 annual fixed rate. (#6 on LTP submission form). The rate should though, be proportionate to the size of home or # of bedrooms available to let, and also incorporate Pt.#7 because holiday home rental IS NOT the same thing as A MOTEL, &amp; should not either require to have OSH or other building/resource consent regulations apply.</p> <p>Council has altered several definitions, but the attention to detail and close loopholes seems largely to be in one direction (see 3, 5&amp; 6 below). Examples of new, and I would say 'unfairly' altered or wooly definitions, where further change is needed are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. "activity unit of demand.. for (future) development activity other than subdivision</li><li>2. "development" (at the time of the Draft policy being prepared, is...) The prior emphasis on "new development and growth" on subdivisions is being eroded.</li><li>3. "dwelling unit...solely or principally used for residential purposes" etc.</li><li>4. "legally established for the purposes of this Policy"... Here, I question the choice of date (10 years) and feel it should rather be the date the LGA changed which was 2002, (or 2003, when it came fully Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 3 into effect). This more realistically corresponds to the time when the 'development wave' - including the beginning of the Waterways - began in Whitianga.</li><li>5. "Residential Activity" (as in 3 above) including "permanent or temporary accommodation" and incorporating also "commercial accommodation".</li></ol> <p>Whether Council continues with SUIP rating or not, I would like it to put a limit on this indeterminate phrasing, as Kaipara DC did for a similar situation, as below: i.e. "Each dwelling, flat, or additional</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>rentable unit (attached or not attached) on a residential property which is let for a substantial part of the year to persons other than immediate family members is a separately inhabited part of a property. A substantial part of the year is considered to be 3 months or more (this total period may be fragmented &amp; may occur at any part of the rating yr).”</p> <p>6. “Unit: any independent unit capable of being used separately&amp; independently of any other unit whether or not it is dependent on common or shared facilities of any kind. (This is totally altered from the PDP Hearing Staff report, to confirm Council’s immovable position on its rating policy).</p> <p>7. “Unit of demand: ... measurement by which the relative demand for C. infrastructure, generated by different types of development activity (existing since 2002/3 or proposed) can be assessed”.</p> <p>TCDC must eliminate abuse &amp; inconsistencies in applying rating rules in the current LTP &amp; PDP, where a definite bias exists towards semi-commercial uses of large non-SC’ed residential properties (with 1-4BRms available), OR when the new building of MUs on an existing lot is permitted and will be more beneficial to certain ‘key zones’ allowed to house 6-12 guests without resource consent, and where property owners are able to rent throughout the year, with the only restriction being ‘no one guest able to stay longer than 50 days’.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Inclusion of methodology for assessing campground activities</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to include a methodology for assessing campground activities.</b></p> <p>I support Option 1 rather than C’s proposed amendment, as it sets things less in stone, for campground owners or developers who belong more to the ‘old Coromandel tradition’ which should be preserved and not unfairly lumbered with rate payments when they CHOOSE to live more simply, or only come</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>here at holiday times of the year.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Removal of community infrastructure contribution charges except solid waste from commercial developments</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to remove community infrastructure contribution charges except solid waste from commercial developments.</b></p> <p>I do not understand the implications of these amendment choices and Council did not get back to me with the questions I had. However, if this is due to the legislative changes that the current policy expands on the "exemption", then the best option will be the one that puts LESS burden on the ratepayer, even at the expense of deterring developers, as we have had to bear TOO much of the cost of past errors and slow uptake on Whitianga town centre upgrade, for example, which Council cannot now draw on developers' contributions. If I have misunderstood this, I apologise, but would like to be able to speak to it further if time and information gained, permits.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Exemption for Council developments that provide infrastructure or reserves</p> <p>Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 4</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to exempt Council developments that provide infrastructure or reserves.</b></p> <p>I do not understand the implications of these amendment choices and Council did not get back to me with the questions I had. However, if this is due to the legislative changes that the current policy expands on the "exemption", then the best option will be the one that puts LESS burden on the ratepayer, even at the expense of deterring developers, as we have had to bear TOO much of the cost of past errors and slow uptake on Whitianga town centre upgrade, for example, which Council</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>cannot now draw on developers' contributions. If I have misunderstood this, I apologise, but would like to be able to speak to it further if time and information gained, permits.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Local funding for cemeteries and public toilets</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to locally fund cemeteries and public toilets.</b></p> <p>The provision of public toilets should be consistent throughout our region, where the big push is towards tourism development. Therefore I believe this should remain to be funded by the District. I would support the shift to locally fund cemeteries however.</p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b></p> <p>Review basis on which a unit of demand is determined for commercial activities on water and wastewater services</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to review the basis on which a unit of demand is determined for commercial activities on water and wastewater services.</b></p> <p>I am unsure and out of time to read this proposed amendment but I consider with Council's push for tourism as our main source of economic development in the region, the impact of commercial activities is NOT minor and SHOULD be taken into account as they have access to infrastructure on several other points other than just "solid waste"... i.e. parks and reserves, airfields, harbour facilities and public toilets, which I believe should ALL be District funded and charged to the entire community.</p> <p><b>Have more to tell us? Record it below.</b></p> <p>In the absence of requested clarification from Council. I object (again) to the public consultation documents and process, including the</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>changing definitions in the DCP &amp; LTP, as insufficiently clear and obstructive in terms of manageable access, reading &amp; sufficient understanding for the layman ratepayer. This includes the 'consultation meeting' on 17/3 and often-misleading YES/NO format of the LTP submission form. The bulk of affected people, even if they collect a form from TCDC or do it online, would not find the necessary background to your decision making for amendments (as in the 4 choices about minor unit inclusion instead of an 'either/or' two!)</p>		
<p>Anna Horne</p>	<p><b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Amendment to private development agreement provision <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to amend the private development agreement provision.</b> The emphasis must always be for the benefit of the community at large. Without examples I can't imagine what type of development agreements would require the removal of the public benefit aspect. We must keep the long term impacts at the fore front of our decisions. <b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Local funding for cemeteries and public toilets <b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to locally fund cemeteries and public toilets.</b> Cemeteries: Yes fund locally is OK. Public Toilets: A general public good for tourists and residents alike. In fact most of us see the whole of the District as our place and we all travel extensively throughout the Coromandel to access services and social things. Eg. Thames Hospital, TCDC Hearings, sports events, travelling through other towns to go further afield. So I think public toilets should remain as a cost in the District wide rate. <b>Please select if you would like to submit a comment on our proposal:</b> Change to criteria for waivers or reductions of development contributions for developments providing a public benefit,</p>	<p>The submitters concerns are noted.</p>	<p>No change to proposed policy.</p>

	<p>and clarification as to how these are to be funded</p> <p><b>Please tell us what you think of our proposal to change the criteria for waivers or reductions of development contributions for developments providing a public benefit, and clarification as to how these are to be funded.</b></p> <p>Waiving of reserve contribuion: There can never be enough reserves, playspace. Can the contribution go to a general fund for eg new campsites, planting of streambanks, protecting bush or coast? We must resist the creep of privatising every part of the Coromandel.</p>		
--	---	--	--

**Attachment B**

# **Thames-Coromandel District Council**

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY**

**June 2015**

Page 1 of 52

# Development Contributions Policy

## Contents

- 1.0 Introduction**
  - 1.1 Statutory requirements
  - 1.2 Growth projections
  - 1.3 Policy on growth
  - 1.4 Financial management policies and strategy
- 2.0 Development Contributions Policy**
  - 2.1 Requirement to pay development contributions
  - 2.2 Limitations on contributions
  - 2.3 Limits on costs eligible for inclusion in development contributions
  - 2.4 Subsidies and other sources of funding
  - 2.5 Vested assets
  - 2.6 Surplus capacity
  - 2.7 Service levels
  - 2.8 Cumulative effects
  - 2.9 Appropriate sources of funding
  - 2.10 Principle of project cost allocation
  - 2.11 Areas of service (catchments)
  - 2.12 Reserves
  - 2.13 Significant assumptions as required by the Act
  - 2.14 Development contributions calculation period
  - 2.15 Policy on existing lots or development
  - 2.16 Exemptions on network and community infrastructure
  - 2.17 Best available knowledge
  - 2.18 Financial policy
- 3.0 Practical Application**
  - 3.1 Requirement for development contribution
  - 3.2 Amount of total development contribution
  - 3.3 Determination of Units of Demand
  - 3.4 Information requirements
  - 3.5 Special Assessments
  - 3.6 Private Developer Agreements
  - 3.7 Credits for works done or land vested
  - 3.8 Reconsideration of development contributions assessed
  - 3.9 Review of development contributions payable on a development
  - 3.10 Right to object to independent commissioner
  - 3.11 Refunds of development contributions
  - 3.12 Statement on GST
- 4.0 Audit**
- 5.0 Methodology for Cost Allocation**
  - 5.1 Listing projects and information required
  - 5.2 Cost allocation of combined projects
  - 5.3 AC Cost allocation between new and future rating charges

- 6.0 Growth Projection Methodology**

APPENDIX A - Definitions

APPENDIX B – Schedule of Development Contributions Payable by Area

APPENDIX C – Sources of Funding

APPENDIX D – Demand Factors for Business Development

APPENDIX E - Development Contribution Catchments

APPENDIX F - Assessment of Effects In Relation to Significant Assumptions

APPENDIX G - Assessment of Grouping by Geographic Area - Section 197ab(G) of the Local Government Act 2002



# Overview of the Development Contributions Policy

## What is the Development Contributions Policy?

---

The Development Contributions Policy is a policy adopted by the Council under the Local Government Act 2002. It allows the Council to require contributions of money or land when new development occurs. The Council then uses the funds collected to carry out capital works needed to service that development (alone or together with others), for the following services:

- transportation
- water supply
- wastewater
- stormwater, environmental protection works, flood protection and mitigation works reserves (for residential development only)
- community infrastructure, such as public conveniences, community centres and halls, play equipment on neighbourhood reserves and – for established projects only – parks, libraries, harbours, airfields, swimming pools, strategic land and buildings, cemeteries and solid waste facilities.

## How do you know when a development contribution is payable?

---

In general you will pay a development contribution when you cause any additional demand on Council services by:

- creating additional lots by subdivision, including the subdivision or cross lease of an existing lot
- building additional dwellings on a lot
- providing additional retirement units or units of commercial accommodation
- extending the area of business activity on a lot
- extending the area of any other activity such as kindergartens, churches or clubs
- obtaining a new or additional service connection, or
- converting areas of temporary use to permanent use.

A development contribution will be payable by each additional “unit of demand” created by development activity for the services provided in the area or “catchment” within which it falls.

## What is a “unit of demand”?

---

The Development Contributions Policy considers any new residential or rural lot or any new business lot of 1000m<sup>2</sup> or more created in a subdivision to be one additional “unit of demand” for services.

For residential activities, a new dwelling is also considered to be a unit of demand while some smaller accommodation units or small commercial lots are charged less than this – for example a one-bedroom commercial accommodation unit is assessed at half a unit of demand. For commercial and other activities, the Development Contributions Policy contains formulas that use the “gross business area” (for commercial/industrial developments) or the “gross floor area” (for any other activity such as kindergartens, churches, and clubs) to calculate the units of demand generated.

In requiring a development contribution, the Council will give credits for any unit of demand in existence at the time the development or subdivision takes place because it deems this to have paid its contribution already\*. For example:

- if a dwelling (one new unit of demand) is built on an existing residential lot (one existing Unit of Demand), then no contribution is payable, the residential lot being deemed to have paid a contribution when it was created. (Hence 1 new - 1 paid = 0) \*
- if two dwellings (two new units of demand) are built on an existing lot (one existing Unit of Demand), then one contribution is payable. (2 new - 1 paid = 1)\*

\* with the exception of water and wastewater contributions where only existing lots or developments already connected to water and wastewater networks are deemed to have paid contributions in the past.

## How are development contributions calculated?

---

Development contribution amounts originate from historical capital expenditure made in between 2000-2015 for growth that has not yet been recovered from new developments historical capital costs, and from planned capital expenditure in the Council's Long Term Plan from 2015-2025 that is required to service new developments. The Council then divides this expenditure by the amount of development that is expected to take place.

Development contributions cannot be used to fund the costs of renewing or replacing infrastructure to ensure existing development enjoys the appropriate levels of service.

## Contributions payable will depend on location

---

The contributions payable for any new development or subdivision will depend on where the activity is situated.

The Development Contributions Policy uses a number of service areas or “catchments” to which expenditure is allocated. Only development taking place within a particular catchment will contribute towards its infrastructure.

Catchments range in size depending on the types of service. For example:

- There is a single district-wide transportation catchment. Any new development in the District, wherever it is located, gives rise to the need for capital expenditure on the District transportation network as a whole and should contribute toward it.
- There are a number of community board area catchments. These are used to assign the costs of works undertaken to deal with growth in particular parts of the District such as community transportation works, halls and community centres.
- There are a number of local settlement catchments for services like wastewater, stormwater and water supply. These small catchments are used to assign the costs of works only to those developments that are serviced by or derive benefit from a particular scheme.

In general, a subdivision in a rural area will pay district-wide and community board contributions but will not pay toward water, wastewater or stormwater services which are usually limited to the urban settlements.

## Reserve Contributions

---

Contributions are also payable for neighbourhood reserves in urban settlements in the District.

Reserve contributions are only payable for residential activities occurring in urban residential zones, including the *Coastal Village*, *Coastal Residential* and *Rural Village* zones in the District Plan.

The method of calculating reserve contributions is proposed to change from 1 July 2015 to align with the method for calculating other services. Currently, reserve contributions are based on property values but it is proposed that these will be based on an equal contribution towards the planned expenditure in that catchment per unit of demand.

## What amounts of development contribution are payable?

---

Refer to Appendix B of the attached Development Contribution Policy for the estimated contribution amounts payable for services in each part of the District. Final figures are not available at time of the draft Development Contributions Policy being publicly released as the contributions payable are determined through the Long Term Plan process, which is still in progress and subject to public consultation. This Policy will be updated to include these when they become available.

# Introduction

## Statutory Requirements

---

Local authorities are required, under section 102 of the Local Government Act 2002, (“the Act”) to adopt funding and financial policies as part of their financial management obligations. The Revenue and Financing Policy, required to be adopted under section 102(2)(a) of the Act must state, amongst other things, the Council’s policies in respect of the funding of capital expenditure from sources including development contributions and financial contributions. One such policy is a policy on development contributions or financial contributions. Development contributions may be sought to meet the increased demand for community facilities resulting from growth and new development in a district.

This document contains the Development Contributions Policy accompanying the Thames-Coromandel District Council 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Section 106(6) of the Act requires that a development contributions policy must be reviewed at least once every three years using a consultation process that gives effect to the requirements of section 82 the Act.

In adopting [its first](#) Development Contributions Policy 2004, the Council considered the options available to it and determined that a development contributions policy was the most practical and efficient means of securing sources and levels of funding to meet costs associated with growth and new development. [The Council still considers this to be the case in 2015.](#)

The Council, in addition to determining matters of content of [this](#) policy, has determined:

- that the decision to amend the Development Contributions Policy is a significant decision;
- that it believes it has met the decision-making and consultation requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent required; and
- that the Special Consultative Procedure under section 83 of the Act, provides an appropriate level of consultation for the review of the Development Contributions Policy.

The Act requires a development contributions policy to include a schedule of assets listing assets or programmes of works for which development contributions are to be required. The schedule of assets can be obtained in electronic format from the Council's website [www.tcdc.govt.nz](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz) or in hard copy from the Thames-Coromandel District Council, 515 Mackay Street, Thames 3500.

### Sources of Funding

Section 106(2) of the Act requires a policy on development contributions to summarise and explain the capital expenditure that the Council expects to incur to meet the increased demand for community facilities resulting from growth.

It also requires the Council to state the proportion of capital expenditure that will be funded from other sources and the total amount of funding to be sought by development contributions for each activity or group of activities.

**Appendix C** shows the approximate total amount of funding to be sought by development contributions for each type of Council infrastructure. As above, final figures are not available at the time this draft Policy is required to be publicly released. Updated numbers will be included when these are finalised.

Other sources of funding of capital expenditure may include:

- (a) Outside sources such as New Zealand Transport Authority subsidies, grants, regional council or central government funding;
- (b) Funding from sources such as rates and sale of assets;
- (c) Funding from financial contributions previously made for the same [asset/activity](#), in accordance with section 207 of the Act.

## Growth Projections

---

- 1.2.1 The Council acknowledges that new development is occurring throughout the Thames-Coromandel District. This places demands on the Council to provide a range of new and upgraded infrastructure. This Policy provides the means by which the Council may seek development contributions from new development where the effect of that development requires the Council to incur capital expenditure to provide for reserves and infrastructure.
- 1.2.2 The successful application of this Development Contributions Policy is dependent on reliable estimates of the amount of new development that is expected to occur in the District and different parts of it. Estimates are required:
  - to inform infrastructure planning; and
  - to give the Council some assurance as to the reliability of its predicted reserve and infrastructure requirements, and that development will occur from which the Council can expect to recover growth-related expenditure.
- 1.2.3 This Development Contributions Policy uses the growth projections as set out in the Forecasting Assumptions section of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.
- 1.2.4 While projections of new development, measured as rating units, have been prepared for the District, the Council faces the risk of under-recovering development contributions that it expects to receive under this Policy where:
  - a) a proportion of the numbers of new rating charges estimated to be establishing in any one year, does not constitute “*development*” as defined under the Act; or
  - b) it allows reductions or waivers to the amounts of development contribution normally payable on developments for various reasons.

## Policy on Growth

---

- 1.3.1 The Council is aware of the vibrancy and economic benefits that growth and development can bring to the Thames-Coromandel District and acknowledges new growth. However the Council also recognises the potentially high costs of providing new infrastructure for development and intends to ensure that these costs are adequately and sustainably accounted for. It has made it clear that:
- a) development must be sustainable;
  - b) services must be adequate and affordable;
  - c) the Council itself must remain financially sustainable in the long-term;
  - d) it must be prudent in its financial management; and
  - e) it must be fair and equitable.
- 1.3.2 In view of the expenditure undertaken providing infrastructure, often in advance of new development and the risks of under-recovering that expenditure, the Council does not accept a “growth at all costs” approach and will only provide servicing for growth where the above criteria are met.
- 1.3.3 When this Policy is reviewed, the Council will compare the expected increase in units of demand (using forecast rating units or dwellings as a proxy for increases in infrastructure demand) on service infrastructure for each activity catchment with the actual number of units of demand that have occurred in the catchment since the Policy was last adopted. It may adjust its projections of units of demand for the catchment and may reduce or increase (as the case may be) growth related capital expenditure for the catchment accordingly.
- 1.3.4 For the purposes of calculating development contributions, each new rating unit in a catchment will constitute one Unit of Demand for infrastructure in that catchment. Projections of rating units cover all types of development in the District including residential, commercial, industrial and other developments and provide a reasonable measure of the amount of existing development in the District and all development that is expected to occur over the capacity life of the asset. However, dwelling projections have been used to calculate reserves and community infrastructure Units of Demand as these activities do not apply to commercial or other non-residential activities therefore enabling these activities to be removed from the calculations for these development types. The growth projections have been supplied by the Council external consultants.

## Financial Management Policies and Strategy

---

- 1.4.1 This Policy is a financial policy and as such it has been prepared in the wider context of the Council’s overall financial management policies including the Revenue and Financing Policy.
- 1.4.2 This Policy is made in accordance with directions in the Revenue and Financing Policy.

# Development Contributions Policy

The Council has considered all matters it is required to consider under the Act when making a development contributions policy. The policies resulting from these considerations are set out in this section.

The purpose of this development contributions policy is to enable the Council to recover from those persons undertaking development a fair, equitable and proportionate portion of the total cost of capital expenditure necessary to serve growth over the long term.

This policy takes account of the principles in section 197AB of the Act in the way the Council requires, determines and uses development contributions, and allocates the costs of assets.

## Requirement to Pay Development Contributions

2.1.1 In accordance with ~~the principle in~~ section 197AB(a) and section 199 of the Act, a development contribution may be required in relation to a development if the effect of the development (including the cumulative effect in combination with other developments) is to require new or additional assets or assets of increased capacity and, as a consequence, the Council incurs capital expenditure to provide appropriately for reserves, network infrastructure or community infrastructure, shall be payable when development is carried out, the effect of which is to require new or additional assets or assets of increased capacity and as a consequence the Council incurs capital expenditure to provide appropriately for those assets and that capital expenditure is not otherwise funded or provided for.

**Comment [SHB1]:**

This is a very important statement so we suggest following very closely the wording of section 199. It is important to recognise cumulative effects. Funding not being otherwise provided for is not part of the section 197AB principle or section 199 test.

2.1.2 Whether an application for a consent or a service connection relates to a "development" as defined in the LGA will be assessed on a case by case basis. However, in general, a Development "development" may occur when:

**Comment [SHB2]:**

Reflects approach to assessment of whether there is a development set out in *Neil* High Court decision.

- (a) additional lots are created by subdivision, including the subdivision or cross lease<sup>1</sup> of existing lots;
- (b) additional dwellings, retirement units or commercial accommodation units are built on lots;
- (c) the area of business activity is increased on lots;
- (d) the area of any other activity such as schools, churches, hospitals or clubs is increased;
- (e) new or additional service connections are made to infrastructure networks by existing activities;
- (f) areas of temporary use are converted to permanent use.

2.1.3 ~~In such cases~~ Where there is a "development", in accordance with section 198(1) of the Act, the Council may require a development contribution of money or land or both when:

<sup>1</sup> A development contribution will apply to a cross lease only where an additional unit of demand is created. The development contribution will generally have been required on the granting of a building consent for that additional unit of demand.

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- (a) a resource consent is granted under the Resource Management Act 1991;
- (c) a building consent is granted under the Building Act 2004;
- (c) an authorisation for a service connection is granted;
- (d) a certificate of acceptance is issued-granted under the Building Act 2004.

[In accordance with section 198\(2\) of the Act, the Council may only require a development contribution as provided for in this or a previous development contributions policy.](#)

**Comment [SHB3]:**  
This is the third of the 3 threshold tests or "triggers" for requiring a contribution set out in section 116 of *Neil* and should be explicit in the policy itself.

2.1.4 In terms of this Policy, development contributions will be required to meet the growth related component of capital expenditure on the following activities:

- (a) District transportation
- (b) Community transportation
- (c) Local community infrastructure – community centres and halls, public conveniences and play equipment on neighbourhood reserves
- (d) Water supply
- (e) Wastewater treatment
- (f) Stormwater - urban stormwater, environmental protection works, flood protection and mitigation works
- (g) Reserves - land and development.

2.1.5 In addition to those activities listed in **Section 2.1.4** above, for the following activities, development contributions will be required to meet the growth related component of capital expenditure only for projects completed or substantially progressed before 8 August 2014:

- (a) Cemeteries
- (b) Parks and reserves infrastructure
- (c) Harbour facilities
- (d) Libraries
- (e) Solid waste
- (f) Swimming pools
- (g) Airfields.
- (h) District community infrastructure – strategic land and buildings

## Limitations on Contributions

2.2.1 While the Council is able to seek both development contributions for infrastructure under the Local Government Act 2002 and financial contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991, section 200 of the Local Government Act 2002 contains certain limitations. The Council must not require a development contribution for a reserve, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure where it has imposed a contribution requirement on the same development for the same purpose under the Resource Management Act 1991, where developers or other parties fund the same infrastructure or where a contribution has been required for the same purpose on a building consent or certificate of acceptance.

2.2.2 Although under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Council may impose a *financial contribution* as a condition of resource consent [for various purposes set out in the district](#)



Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

~~plan, it shall in preference shall instead~~ take development contributions under this Policy on subdivisions and development for the equivalent activities set out in this policy. The exception is where Structure Plans in the district plan make provision for reserves including specifying the appropriate location: in those cases the Council will require a financial contribution rather than a development contribution for reserves – land and development under this policy.

**Comment [SHB4]:**  
High Court decision in *Domain Nominee* suggests at paragraph 68 that there should be predictability as to whether an activity is to be funded by financial contributions or development contributions – this should not be decided on a case by case basis.

- 2.2.3 However, the financial contribution requirements for car parking in the Thames-Coromandel District Plan will be retained and development contributions under this Policy will not be sought for this activity.
- 2.2.4 Nothing in this Policy will detract from any requirements under the District Plan (such as landscaping conditions and parking requirements) which impose works or financial contributions to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of any development on the environment.
- 2.2.5 Nothing in this Policy, including the amounts of development contribution payable in **Appendix B**, will detract from any other legal requirement to make a payment for community facilities other than a development contribution, including connection fees or any other fee required to be paid by agreement with the Council.
- 2.2.6 The Council will not require a development contribution for any lot that:
- a) is held in perpetuity pursuant to an open space covenant, provided for by section 22 of the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977;
  - b) is unable to be developed or used for any activity that would cause the Council to incur expenditure on infrastructure, as a result of restrictions on the title of the lot.

## Limits on Costs Eligible for Inclusion in Development Contributions

- 2.3.1 In calculating development contributions under this Policy, the capital expenditure on which contributions are based shall not include the value of any project or work or part of any project or work required for:
- a) Rehabilitating or renewing an existing asset; or
  - b) Operating and maintaining an existing asset.
- 2.3.2 ~~In accordance with section 200 of the Act, no development contribution calculated under this Policy shall include the value of any funding obtained from third parties, external agencies or other funding sources in the form of grants, subsidies or works. This limitation shall not include the value of works provided by a developer on behalf of the Council and used as a credit against contributions normally payable, which the Council may seek to recover from other developers in contributions.~~
- ~~2.3.3 The Council may require development contributions where it has not incurred capital expenditure but has provided a credit against development contributions payable by any~~

**Comment [SHB5]:**  
Section 200 prohibits contributions being required in certain circumstances, but is not about what costs can or cannot be included within the cost of growth. That is primarily a Schedule 13 issue.

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

~~person where that person has incurred capital expenditure on behalf of the Council, and which provides additional capacity to serve further development.~~

**Comment [SHB6]:**  
Suggest delete. Contributions are for Council capital expenditure.

## Subsidies and Other Sources of Funding

---

- 2.4.1 The value of any subsidy or grant toward the value of any project or work shall be deducted prior to the allocation for funding of the balance portion project cost between development contributions and other sources of Council funding.

## Vested Assets

---

- 2.5.1 ~~No expenditure on works or assets to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of any development on the environment, or to directly service that development alone, shall be included in the calculation of development contributions under this policy. Examples include works such as transportation, wastewater, water supply, local stormwater and reserve works and assets (even when these may at some stage vest in the Council) that directly service a particular subdivision or development.~~
- 2.5.2 Except as provided for in **Section 2.12.5**, the value of assets vested or expenditure made by a developer, pursuant to a requirement under the Resource Management Act 1991, shall not be used to offset development contributions payable on development unless all or a portion of such assets or expenditure can be shown to avoid or reduce the need for the Council to provide an asset that is included in its capital works programme, for which development contributions are sought.
- 2.5.3 The value of assets vested or expenditure made voluntarily by a developer, to enhance a development shall not be used to offset development contributions payable on development other than by agreement with the Council.

**Comment [SHB7]:**

Suggest delete because these assets would generally be paid for by the developer and so by definition are not Council capital expenditure that could be funded through contributions. In our view the statement is potentially confusing.

## Surplus Capacity

---

- 2.6.1 In accordance with section 199(2) of the Act, development contributions may be used to fund capital expenditure already incurred by the Council in anticipation of development prior to the first adoption of this Policy on 1 October 2004.
- 2.6.2 The Council has in recent years undertaken works or acquired land in anticipation of development, which it seeks to recover in development contributions yet to be made. The Council may include in its calculation of development contributions, capital expenditure made in anticipation of development since 1 July 2000, and the value of such expenditure will be known as “surplus capacity.”

## Service Levels

---

- 2.7.1 There will be no requirement under this Policy for new development to be serviced above Service Standards.

## Cumulative Effects

- 2.8.1 In accordance with section 199(3) of the Act, development contributions may be required under this Policy where the cumulative effect of a development ~~may~~, in combination with other developments, have is to require new or additional assets or assets of increased capacity and, as a consequence, the Council incurs capital expenditure to provide appropriately for reserves, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure. a cumulative effect on reserves and infrastructure.

**Comment [SHB8]:**  
Wording more closely reflects section 199.

## Appropriate Sources of Funding

- 2.9.1 Section 101(3)(a) of the Act states that the funding needs of a local authority must be met from those sources that the local authority determines to be appropriate.
- 2.9.2 The Council has made its considerations about appropriate sources of funding in the preparation of its Revenue and Financing Policy. These included considerations about development contributions as a source of funding, in reaching this conclusion it has considered all the factors set out in section 101(3) of the Act (see Section 5.4.1). The Council has determined that:
- Development contributions are an appropriate source of funding for recovering capital expenditure for a range of community facilities set out in **Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5** above;
  - While visitors and tourists benefit from and cause capital expenditure in most of the community facilities listed, expenditure cannot be cost-effectively determined or recovered from these groups. Funding is likely to come from District rates and/or community board rates in view of the benefits that tourists and visitors bring to the community as a whole;
  - Subsidies and grants provide an appropriate source of funding in combination with rates and development contributions for capital expenditure under some activities;
  - Capital expenditure (including past expenditure) can provide benefit to the existing community, new members of the community arriving in the Long Term Plan period and future residents and businesses arriving after the Long Term Plan period. It is appropriate to fund community infrastructure capital expenditure over an extended period of time. To distribute the benefits accordingly, the Development Contributions Calculation Period should cover assets provided in the past (in anticipation of growth), with remaining spare capacity and assets provided in the Long Term Plan period with capacity up to twenty years into the future. Where capacity may exceed twenty years, the calculation covers the asset until it reaches full capacity. (See **Section 2.14**) This is consistent with the principle in Section 197AB(b) of the Act;
  - e) It is appropriate to identify and source development contributions funding from a range of areas (catchments) as set out in Appendix E, ranging from district wide areas for activities such as transportation to local areas for activities such as water supply and wastewater treatment (See **Section 2.11**).

## Principle of Project Cost Allocation

---

- 2.10.1 The capital cost of any project or work identified in the Development Contributions Calculation Period shall, after deductions for subsidies and other sources of funding, be allocated between:
- the Existing Rateable Properties (ERP) Cost; and
  - the Additional Capacity (AC) Cost.
- 2.10.2 The Council will allocate project costs between ERP Costs for *improving levels of service and/or renewals* to existing households and businesses, and AC Costs for providing *additional capacity* to accommodate development of new households and businesses, using the methodology described in **Section 5.0** – Methodology for Cost Allocation.
- 2.10.3 The methodology used is a Unit of Demand approach to the cost allocation of all Projects based on the capacity [life](#) of each project (principle in Section 197AB(b) of the Act), and for Combined Projects it ensures that these costs are fairly and equitably spread over existing ratepayers and additional capacity (principle in Section 197AB(c) of the Act).
- 2.10.4 Council has produced a schedule of assets (principle in Section 201A of the Act) which sets out, for each new asset, additional asset or asset of increased capacity, the estimated cost of each asset and the proportion of the capital cost the Council proposes to recover through development contributions and the proportion Council proposes to be recovered through other sources. This Schedule of Assets is available on Councils website at [www.tcdc.govt.nz](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz)
- 2.10.5 There is a requirement to state Remaining Service Life (RSL) of an existing asset and Additional Service Life (ASL) given by the new asset as a crosscheck for audit purposes but with these two variables not brought into the calculation.
- 2.10.6 Development contributions will be used in accordance with the principles in section 197AB(d) of the Act.

**Comment [SHB9]:** We suggest you add a new paragraph here to refer to the section 201A schedule of assets setting out the allocation of costs (between development contributions and other funding sources) on a project by project basis.

## Areas of Service (Catchments)

---

- 2.11.1 The principle in section 197AB(g) of the Act states that when calculating and requiring development contributions, the Council may group together certain developments by geographic area or categories of land use provided:
- The grouping balances practical and administrative efficiencies with considerations of fairness and equity; and
  - Grouping by geographic area avoids grouping across an entire district wherever practical.
- The Council considers that [for most activities](#) development contributions should be required from developments on an area-by-area or catchment basis. The development contribution

catchments are set out in **Appendix E**. An analysis pursuant to section 197AB(g) is set out in **Appendix G**.

- 2.11.2 The catchment is the geographic area within which growth and development is occurring, which is likely to give rise, either solely or cumulatively, to the need for particular works or groups of works.
- 2.11.3 In general the Council uses community board areas for the recovery of costs more closely associated with growth within and around recognised local communities. Activities at this catchment level include community transportation, libraries, parks and reserves, harbours, community centres and halls, solid waste, swimming pools, public conveniences, cemeteries and airfields.
- 2.11.4 The Council uses large district-wide or sub-district catchments for the recovery of the costs of projects, which occur as a result of the cumulative effects of growth in the whole district or large parts of it. District-wide areas of benefit are used for facilities such as the district transportation network and strategic land and buildings.
- 2.11.5 The Council uses local settlement areas for the recovery of costs in specific areas such as water and wastewater connection areas, where growth relates to the need for new infrastructure.
- 2.11.6 In general, a subdivision in a rural area will pay district-wide and community contributions but will not pay toward water, wastewater or stormwater services, which are usually confined to the urban settlements.
- 2.11.7 In the case of stormwater, the Council considers that works in the wider stormwater funding catchment, such as flood protection and mitigation works, environmental protection works, works in the public domain, in town centres, on roads, parks and waterfront areas, can be of benefit to communities within those developments through the protection of their health, safety, convenience and amenity. Stormwater funding catchments may cover wider areas including whole urban areas and need not be limited to the areas of physical stormwater drainage catchments.
- 2.11.8 In those cases where funds or land have previously been collected through financial or development contributions, the Council will offset the value of these contributions against proposed expenditure on the same activity in the same activity catchment for which it was collected.

## Reserves

---

- 2.12.1 Under this Policy and pursuant to section 199(1) of the Act the Council may require a development contribution for reserves.
- 2.12.2 Reserves contributions will be collected to fund a programme of reserve land purchases and development of any kind that enables the reserve to be used for its intended purpose.

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- 2.12.3 Pursuant to Section 203(1) of the Act, the amount of such contributions shall not exceed the greater of 7.5% of the value of additional lots created by subdivision and the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional household unit created by development.
- 2.12.4 No reserve contributions shall be payable on any rural residential activity or on any non-residential activity in urban or rural areas. Reserve contributions shall be payable on any residential activity in any Coastal Village, Coastal Residential, Coastal Living, Rural Village or Rural Lifestyle zone or in any other zone within 500 metres of any residential or village zone where residential lots of less than 2500m<sup>2</sup> in area are created or developed.
- 2.12.5 Structure Plans in the District Plan make provision for the level of reserve considered appropriate to the location covered by the Plan. Where land is shown as reserve or proposed reserve for recreational purposes on a Structure Plan under the District Plan the Council may require that land to be vested in Council as a condition of resource consent. The value of the reserve land vested shall be determined pursuant to a valuation provided by a registered property valuer.

2.12.6 that where a financial contribution for reserves is required then a development contribution for reserves will not be required consistent with the requirements of section 200.

**Comment [SHB10]:** A top up contribution of this type is a breach of section 200 and was the focus of the successful challenge in *Domain Nominee*. We suggest stating instead that where a financial contribution for reserves is required then a development contribution for reserves will not be required consistent with the requirements of section 200.

## Significant Assumptions as required by the Act

- 2.13.1 Section 201(1)(b) of the Act requires this policy to set out the significant assumptions underlying the calculation of the schedule of development contributions, including an estimate of the potential effects, if there is a significant level of uncertainty as to the scope and nature of the effects.
- 2.13.2 The significant assumptions underlying the calculation of the schedule of development contributions are that:
- The rate, level and location of growth will occur as forecast in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan;
  - Capital expenditure will be in accordance with the capital works programme in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan;
  - No significant changes to service standards are expected to occur in the Long Term Plan period other than those planned for in the Asset Management Plan;
  - The level of third party funding (such as NZ Transport Agency subsidies) will continue at anticipated levels as set out in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan;
  - There will be no significant variations to predicted rates of interest and inflation to those set out in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan;
  - The revenue from rates will be sufficient to meet the operating and maintenance costs of capital expenditure funded by development contributions.
- 2.13.3 An assessment of effects, if there is a significant level of uncertainty as to the scope and nature of the effects, is set out in **Appendix F** of this Policy.

## Development Contributions Calculation Period

---

- 2.14.1 In order to include in the calculation of development contributions the expenditure incurred by the Council prior to the first adoption of this Policy on 1 October 2004, to be known as “surplus capacity” (See **Section 2.6**), the commencement of the Development Contributions Calculation Period is 1 July 2000.
- 2.14.2 Capital expenditure on infrastructure that will serve new development should be recovered over the take-up period of the project, or a period of time sufficient to allow recovery from all development that caused and will benefit from that expenditure, consistent with the principle in section 197AB(b) of the Act.
- 2.14.3 The Council has considered the period over which the benefits of capital expenditure for new development are expected to occur. The Council considers that capital expenditure on infrastructure during the long term plan period should be recovered over the full take-up period of each asset, from all development that caused that expenditure or will benefit from capacity it provides, including development occurring after the long term plan period.
- The full take-up period referred to above shall be the expected full take-up period of the asset or 40 years from the date of adoption of this policy whichever is the earlier period.
- 2.14.4 It has determined that:
- a) new development occurring in the long term plan period will contribute only to that proportion of additional asset capacity that it is expected to consume;
  - b) future development occurring after the long term plan period will contribute toward the remaining surplus capacity in assets at the end of that period.
- 2.14.5 In calculating the development contributions payable by new development for each activity type, the Council will:
- a) include the value of any past surplus capacity in assets provided after 1 July 2000, (See **Section 2.6**), that is expected to be consumed by new development;
  - b) include the value of capacity in assets to be provided in the long term plan period, that is expected to be consumed by new development; and
  - c) exclude the value of remaining surplus capacity in assets at the end of the long term plan period, which is likely to be consumed by future development.
- 2.14.6 Recovery of the whole of a project’s cost from only those households and businesses establishing in the long term plan period, may place an unfair burden on them. Households and businesses developing after the period would arrive to a fully paid up asset with spare capacity for their developments.
- 2.14.7 This Policy therefore uses a development contributions calculation period extending from 1 July 2000 (to include past surplus capacity) to 30 June 2085, 70 years after the adoption of this current Policy to ensure more equitable attribution under Schedule 13 of the Act.



Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- 2.14.8 The value of remaining surplus capacity in assets at the end of the long term plan period is not to be included in the calculation of development contributions as provided for in this Policy.
- 2.14.9 The Council has considered the fair attribution of growth related capital expenditure to new development occurring in the long term plan period and has determined that it may allocate the asset capacity of any project to new (N) development in the long term plan period, before that project is built. It may do this where that new development will eventually consume capacity in the project when it is built but has been serviced temporarily using capacity normally allocated to existing development.

### Policy on Existing Lots or Development

---

- 2.15.1 The Council shall not seek development contributions retrospectively for lots or development (Units of Demand) already legally established at the date of granting consent, other than ~~in the case of a development contribution for water supply or wastewater infrastructure where such lots or development are not yet connected to a public water supply or wastewater system and for which no development contribution can be shown to have been previously paid as set out in sections 2.15.2 to 2.15.5 below.~~
- 2.15.2 **Section 2.15.1** shall not apply to any lot or development for which a contribution has been required and has not yet been paid.
- 2.15.3 The Council may require a development contribution to be paid for any existing legally established lot or activity, which is to be connected for the first time to either the water supply network or the wastewater network, as the case may be, where no development contribution or other such payment for these services can be shown to have been previously made and:
- the connection generates a demand for water supply or wastewater infrastructure; and
  - the connection (either alone or cumulatively with other connections) requires new or additional water supply and wastewater assets or assets of increased capacity which has already or will cause the Council to incur expenditure; and
  - there is no alternative source of funding for those assets.
- 2.15.4 The Council may require a development contribution to be paid for any existing legally established lot, that has previously been prevented from being developed by any open space covenant or by any other restriction registered against the title of the lot and that covenant or restriction has been removed.
- 2.15.5 **Sections 2.15.1, 2.15.2, 2.15.3 and 2.15.4** shall apply to any lot or development that:
- was already legally established at the date on which the **Development Contributions is** Policy first became operative, ~~that is on 1 October 2004~~, other than in the case of a development contribution payable for water supply and wastewater services where a credit will not apply to any existing lot or development not already connected to either

- ~~the water supply network or the wastewater network as the case may be~~ and for which no development contribution can be shown to have been previously paid;
- b) has been legally established since the date on which the ~~is~~ Policy first became operative and for which a development contribution has ~~already~~ been paid.

## Exemptions on Network and Community Infrastructure

---

- 2.16.1 Pursuant to section 197 of the Act, which excludes the pipes and lines of network utility operators from the definition of “development”, the Council will not seek development contributions for the installation or expansion of network utility infrastructure, including pipes, lines and installations, roads, water supply, wastewater and stormwater collection and management systems.
- 2.16.2 In addition to the exemption provided in **Section 2.16.1**, development contributions shall not be required on any development that provides or supports the provision of Council network infrastructure, community infrastructure, or the purchase or development of reserve land.

## Best Available Knowledge

---

- 2.17.1 The estimates of capital expenditure in this Policy, for all activities, are in keeping with the long term plan and are based on the best available knowledge of projects, their costs, their staging and timing and other related information, at the time of adoption of this Policy.
- 2.17.2 The absence of particular information on any asset or work at any given time, shall not be deemed to be reason for not requiring development contributions under this Policy.

## Financial Policy

---

- 2.18.1 Previous headworks policies have no effect and no development contributions shall be sought under those policies.
- 2.18.2 The project cost amounts used in calculating development contributions under this Policy will be those in the Council’s financial statements, which include adjustments for inflation and there will be no provisions in this Policy for an annual increase for inflation.
- 2.18.3 Interest on borrowings to provide additional capacity in infrastructure, to accommodate development, will be determined and included in the calculation of the development contributions by:
- in each catchment and for each activity determining the opening balance of loans raised for additional capacity in each year, and adding further borrowing forecast (which will equate to the net cost of capital works less forecast contributions) during the year, to provide the principal sum owing;
  - calculating interest on the principal sum owing using the “real” rates of interest to be arrived at by taking the budgeted rate of interest in the Ten Year Plan, less the “inflation

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

factor”. The “inflation factor” will be the forecast movement in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the year in question. The forecast movement in the CPI for the year in question is the CPI forecast released as part of the Reserve Bank Monetary Policy Statement in March each year and this will apply to the following Council financial year;

- c) applying interest calculated in (b) above, as simple interest, to contributions budgeted to be received in that year, in the proportion to which they bear to the principal sum owing.

2.18.4 The Council will not introduce an adjustment to the development contribution amounts, to take account of any possible long term cross subsidy from rates paid by new ratepayers to fund part of the interest on borrowings for works to deal with any service level deficiencies being experienced by existing ratepayers.

2.18.5 Depreciation of capital expenditure related to growth will be funded through rates on existing and new development, and not capitalised and collected through development contributions and a depreciation adjustment will not be included in the calculation of development contributions to offset any possible cross-subsidy between existing and new ratepayers.

## Practical Application

### Requirement for Development Contribution

---

3.1.1 Upon granting:

- a) a resource consent under the Resource Management Act 1991;
- b) a building consent under the Building Act 2004;
- c) an authorisation for a service connection; or
- d) a certificate of acceptance

the Council shall determine whether the activity to which the consent or authorisation relates is a “development” under the Act, which:

- a) has the effect of requiring new or additional assets or assets of increased capacity (including assets which may already have been provided by the Council in anticipation of development);

~~b) as a consequence requires (or has required) the Council to incur capital expenditure to provide appropriately for those assets; and~~

~~c) b) that capital expenditure is not otherwise funded or provided for.~~

3.1.2 In accordance with sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5, upon determining that the activity is a development, the Council may require development contributions for:

- a) reserves;
- b) network infrastructure, comprising roads, water supply, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure;
- c) community infrastructure, ~~comprising land (including land to be acquired by the Council) or the development of assets on land owned or controlled by the Council to provide~~

**Comment [SHB11]:** This is not part of the 3 threshold tests in section 197, 198 and 199 of the Act. We do not think paragraphs 113 and 114 of the *Neil* decision which refer to alternative sources of funding are properly part of the threshold tests, and think the correct statement of the law is in paragraph 116 of that decision.

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

~~public amenities including but not limited to community centres and halls, swimming pools, public conveniences, harbour facilities, wharves, boat ramps, libraries, cemeteries, solid waste and parks and reserves..~~

3.1.3 The Council shall calculate, ~~in accordance with section 198(2A) of the Act,~~ the development contribution payable ~~in accordance with the policy in force at the time~~ ~~at the time of lodgement of~~ the application for consent or ~~authorisation~~ ~~authorisation (accompanied by all required information is lodged).~~

3.1.4 The grantee of consent or authorisation shall pay the development contribution calculated:

- (a) in the case of a land use consent, by no later than the activity commencing;
- (b) in the case of a subdivision consent, before a section 224 completion certificate is issued
- (c) in the case of a building consent, before the first building inspection takes place;
- (d) in the case of a service connection, before the service connection is made; and
- (e) in the case of a certificate of acceptance, upon the granting of the certificate of acceptance.

3.1.5 ~~Until a development contribution required in relation to a development has been paid or otherwise made (subject to Section 208 of the Act), Council may,~~

~~(a) in the case of a development contribution required for resource consent granted under the Resource Management Act 1991,~~

~~(i) withhold the section 224 completion certificate.~~

~~(ii) prevent the commencement of a resource consent.~~

~~(b) in the case of a development contribution required for building consent granted under the Building Act 2004, withhold code compliance certificate.~~

~~(c) in the case of a development contribution where a certificate of acceptance is required and granted under the Building Act 2004, withhold that certificate of acceptance.~~

~~(d) in the case of a development contribution is required for a service connection, withhold that service connection to the development. In the case of a resource consent for land use, where a building consent has not yet been granted for the development:~~

~~(a) a contribution assessment shall be issued by the Council at the time of granting the resource consent and the Council shall advise the applicant that the resource consent shall not be exercised and building work may not be carried out until the development contributions payable under this Policy have been paid;~~

~~(b) at the time the first building consent is issued, and upon invoicing the applicant for the processing of the building consent, the Council shall advise the applicant that any~~

**Comment [SHB12]:** We suggest replacing this and the following 2 sections with a restatement of the Council's powers under section 208 in the event of a contribution being unpaid.

~~development contributions payable shall be paid prior to the commencement of works;~~

~~(c) the Council shall issue an invoice for payment of the development contribution:~~

~~(i) in accordance with (b) above when the building consent is granted; or~~

~~(ii) at the request of the applicant prior to building work commencing; or~~

~~(iii) upon payment of the development contribution being received; or~~

~~(iv) when a building inspection has been recorded; or~~

~~(v) when a Certificate of Acceptance has been issued.~~

~~3.1.6 Where building work commences prior to the payment of the development contribution the Council may withhold a code compliance certificate as authorised by the Act.~~

~~3.1.7 Where a certificate of acceptance has been applied for, the Council will withhold the issue of the certificate until payment of development contributions has been received as authorised by the Act.~~

## Amount of Total Development Contribution

3.2.1 Development contributions are assessed according to the number of "Units of Demand" the activity represents. For example, the Policy considers any new dwelling or any new residential lot, business lot (of 1000m<sup>2</sup> or more) or rural lot created in a subdivision to be one additional "Unit of Demand" for services.

The Units of Demand applicable to various activities are set out in **Section 3.3**.

3.2.2 The total development contribution payable when granting any resource or building consent, certificate of acceptance or service connection authorisation, shall be the sum of the development contribution payable for each activity, calculated as:

$$[(a) \times (\Sigma(n) - \Sigma(x))] + \text{GST}$$

Where:

(a) = the applicable development contribution per Unit of Demand determined from **Appendix B**.

$\Sigma$  = the sum of the terms inside the brackets.

(n) = for each lot at the completion of the consent or authorisation application, the total Lot Units of Demand OR the total Activity Units of Demand, whichever is the greater.

(x) = for each lot in existence (or for which a section 224 Resource Management Act 1991 certificate has been issued), prior to the date of the consent or authorisation application, the total Lot Units of Demand OR the total Activity Units of Demand for the existing development OR the total Activity Units of Demand for any previous legally established development located on the lot no more than ten years prior to the date of lodgment of the application, whichever is the greater.

3.2.3 In determining the value (a) in **Section 3.2.1**, the Council will:

- a) identify the catchment area in which the development falls, using **Appendix E**
- b) identify the development contribution per Unit of Demand for each Council infrastructure type applicable to that catchment area using **Appendix B**.

## Determination of Units of Demand

- 3.3.1 In accordance with Schedule 13 of the Act, the additional capacity (AC) component of capital expenditure associated with new development in any activity catchment will be allocated equally between the numbers of new Units of Demand expected to occur in that catchment during the Development Contributions Calculation Period.
- 3.3.2 The Council has determined that Units of Demand generated by different land use types shall be those reflected in **Table 1**.
- 3.3.3 Demand for services may be necessitated by the creation of new lots that are required to be serviced in advance of their occupation. Demand for services may also be generated by the use and development of lots including the intensification or expansion of uses on those lots.

Table 1 Units of Demand generated by subdivision and development	
Lot Unit of Demand	Units of Demand
One residential or rural lot	1.0
One mixed use residential/ commercial lot	1.0
One commercial or industrial lot with an area of less than 1000m <sup>2</sup>	Lot area divided by 1000m <sup>2</sup>
One commercial or industrial lot with an area of 1000m <sup>2</sup> or more	1.0
For the purposes of calculating water supply and wastewater development contributions ONLY, any existing legally established lot not connected to either the water supply network or the wastewater network or any proposed lot not to be connected to either the water supply network or the wastewater network as the case may be	0
Any lot designated as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977	0
One lot: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ wholly covenanted in perpetuity as provided for by section 22 of the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977;</li> <li>▪ the title of which prevents any form of development on the lot</li> </ul>	0
Activity Unit of Demand	Units of Demand
One dwelling unit	1.0
One minor unit	0.5
One retirement unit	0.5 except district transportation 0.3
One commercial accommodation unit including any hotel, motel or building for residential use of <b>two or more</b> bedrooms per unit	1.0
One commercial accommodation unit including any hotel, motel or	0.5

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

building for residential use of <b>one or less</b> bedrooms per unit	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <del>Retirement unit room</del></li> <li>◆ <del>Commercial accommodation unit room including any hotel or motel unit room</del></li> </ul> School or camp dormitory room normally accommodating more than 3 persons	The number of persons accommodated in the room divided by 6.
One self-contained cabin or site for a permanent caravan, campervan, etc, containing own water and/or wastewater facilities	For water and wastewater, 0.73 units of demand. For all other services, 0.39 units of demand.
One cabin that is not self-contained	For water and wastewater, 0.4745 units of demand. For all other services, 0.39 units of demand.
One campsite for a tent, caravan, campervan, etc, not independently supplied with water or wastewater facilities	For water and wastewater, 0.4745 units of demand. For all other services, 0.17 units of demand.
One commercial or industrial unit including the commercial part of any activity but excluding any part that comprises commercial accommodation units	For transportation, water supply, sewerage, stormwater and solid waste infrastructure only, the gross business area of the activity multiplied by the applicable unit of demand factors in this table.
Any other activity not specified above (including farm buildings)	For transportation, water supply, sewerage, stormwater and solid waste infrastructure only, the gross floor area of the activity multiplied by the applicable unit of demand factors in this table.
For the purposes of calculating water supply and wastewater development contributions ONLY, any existing legally established development not connected to either the water supply network or the wastewater network or any proposed development not to be connected to either the water supply network or the wastewater network as the case may be	0
Network infrastructure, including pipes, lines and installations, roads, water supply, wastewater and stormwater collection and management systems	0
Any Council development providing or supporting the provision of network or community infrastructure	0
<b>Unit of Demand Factors</b>	
Transportation	0.0020 per m <sup>2</sup>
Water supply	0.0017 per m <sup>2</sup>
Sewerage	0.0017 per m <sup>2</sup>
Stormwater and solid waste	0.0010 per m <sup>2</sup>

3.3.4 The different Units of Demand generated by a unit of commercial or industrial activity as compared with a unit of residential activity, arise mainly from the scale of activity. This Policy uses lot size in the case of subdivision and gross business area in the case of business

development as a proxy for assessing the different Units of Demand on services, likely to be generated respectively by residential and business activity.

- 3.3.5 Further, this Policy assumes that as well as the scale of activity, business activity has the potential to place different demands on services as compared to residential activity, as a result of the nature of the activity (e.g. as a result of higher and heavier traffic volumes). This Policy incorporates multipliers (Unit of Demand Factors) that are intended to take account of the potentially different effect of business activity on service infrastructure.
- 3.3.6 The assumptions used in this Policy to derive the Units of Demand Factors for business in **Table 1** are described in **Appendix D**.

## Information Requirements

---

- 3.4.1 The applicant for any consent and authorisation listed under **Section 3.1.1**, shall provide all information necessary for the Council to calculate the amount of a development contribution including, in the case of commercial or industrial development, the gross business area of the development.
- 3.4.2 The applicant shall be responsible for providing proof of the legal establishment of existing Units of Demand under **Section 3.2**.

## Special Assessments

---

- 3.5.1 Developments that have special features, which mean their demands on the Council's infrastructure are not well represented through the assessment procedure set out in this policy and by the Units of Demand in **Table 1**, may be subject to a special assessment at the discretion of an authorised officer.
- 3.5.2 Examples of activities which special assessments will be applied are petrol stations.
- 3.5.3 In carrying out a special assessment, the Council will use (and may require an applicant to provide) such information as it considers necessary to more accurately represent the Units of Demand generated by a development.

## Private Developer Agreements

---

- 3.6.1 The Council may enter into a development agreement for the provision, supply, or exchange of infrastructure, land, or money to provide network infrastructure, community infrastructure, or reserves in accordance with the Act.
- 3.6.2 A development agreement will not be used to provide a discount on any development contributions assessed on a development, but may be used to provide flexibility as to the manner and timing of the payment of the assessed contributions.



Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- 3.6.3 A development agreement must clearly state the departures from the standard processes and calculations under this Policy, and the reasons for these departures.
- 3.6.4 In deciding whether to enter into any development agreement and the terms of that agreement, the Council shall take into account the requirements of its Procurement Policy.
- 3.6.5 In making decisions and declining or entering into private development agreements, the Council will conduct its business in an open, transparent and democratically accountable manner and ensure prudent stewardship of its resources in the interests of the District. The Council will manage its financial dealings prudently and in a manner that promotes the current and future interests of the community.
- 3.6.6 Accounting treatment of transactions included in development agreements will be in accordance with those under **Section 3.7** (vested assets).

### Credits for Work Done or Land Vested

---

- 3.7.1 The Council shall apply to a development contribution calculated under **Section 3.2**, a credit equal to the actual and reasonable costs of works (including the value of any land to be vested) incurred by the applicant on behalf of and by prior agreement with the Council, which prevents the Council from having to undertake capital expenditure identified in the calculation of development contributions under this Policy.
- 3.7.2 Subject to **Section 2.12.5**, in the event that the credit payable under **Section 3.7.1**:
- a) is less than or equal to the amount of development contribution otherwise payable, then the amount of the contribution shall be reduced by the amount of the credit;
  - b) is greater than the amount of development contribution otherwise payable, then a refund will be payable by the Council upon granting any consent or authorisation.
- 3.7.3 Where
- a) assets are vested in or expenditure is made to Council by a developer; and
  - b) this contribution to Council can be proven to reduce the need for Council to provide an asset within its capital works programme; or
  - c) a development agreement has been entered into under **Section 3.6** of this policy between Council and the developer providing land or works in exchange for development contributions on infrastructure;
- a credit will be provided against the development contribution deemed payable by that developer (as assessed in accordance with the procedures in this Policy).

The credit will reflect either the market value of the assets provided or the actual physical contribution made by the developer. The market value of any vested assets will be determined by Council (in conjunction with its external valuer).

- 3.7.4 If a development agreement is entered into for a developer to provide network infrastructure, community infrastructure or reserves (land or development) in a catchment other than that in which their development is located, the Council will ensure that the value

of the works or land will be credited against the relevant activity or activities in the catchment for which development contributions were required.

## Reconsideration under section 199A(1) of the Act of Development Contributions Assessed

---

- 3.8.1 An applicant who is required to make a development contribution may request a reconsideration of the requirement if they believe that:
- (a) the development contribution was incorrectly calculated or assessed under this Policy; or
  - (b) this Policy was incorrectly applied; or
  - (c) the information used to assess the development against this Policy, or the way the information was recorded or used, was incomplete or contained errors.
- 3.8.2 A request for reconsideration must be provided in writing to the Council within 10 working days of the applicant or their agent receiving notice from the Council of the development contributions that the Council requires.
- 3.8.3 If an applicant considers the assessment breaches **Section 2.12.3** which sets out the maximum reserve contribution that may be collected, they may provide within 20 working days of the applicant or agent receiving notice of the development contributions requirement a valuation obtained at their expense to support their request for reconsideration. The valuation provided must be determined no more than 90 days prior to the request for reconsideration.
- 3.8.3 The Council will check the development contributions assessment made against the grounds for reconsideration made by the applicant and will, within 15 working days [of receiving all required relevant information in relation to the request](#), advise in writing the outcome of the reconsideration to the applicant who has lodged the reconsideration request.
- 3.8.4 The Council delegates to its Chief Financial Officer the responsibility for overseeing reconsideration requests. The Chief Financial Officer will ensure that the reconsideration is not undertaken by the staff member who carried out the initial assessment.
- 3.8.5 The Council will not accept an application for a reconsideration if an objection to the development contribution requirement has already been lodged under **Section 3.10** of this Policy.

**Comment [SHB13]:** Reflects wording of s199B and means clock does not start until the Council has all the information it needs

## Review of Development Contributions Payable on a Development

---

- 3.9.1 The Council will, at the request of an applicant, when considering an application for consent or authorisation for development, consider whether a reduction of a development contribution is appropriate and may require a lesser development contribution than that normally calculated.

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- 3.9.2 Any applicant who is required to make a development contribution at the time a consent or authorisation for development is granted, may formally request the Council to review the development contributions required. Any such request shall be made in writing no later than 15 working days after the Council has advised in writing of the development contributions required, or such longer time as the Council may allow, setting out the reasons for the review.
- 3.9.3 In considering requests for review of development contributions, the Council will take into account:
- (a) the extent to which the value and nature of works proposed by the applicant reduces the need for works or the purchase of land proposed by the Council in its capital works programme;
  - (b) the extent to which the nature of the development reduces the need for works or purchase of land proposed by the Council in its capital works programme.
- 3.9.4 The Council will waive or reduce the reserve contribution required where:
- (a) an oversupply of reserve land already exists in the general locality of the subdivision or development; or
  - (b) the Council does not intend to or is unlikely to incur costs in acquiring reserve land in the general locality within the Development Contributions Calculation Period.
- 3.9.5 In considering an application by a non-profit organisation for consent or authorisation for development, the Council may reduce or waive a development contribution where it considers there is a fair and reasonable justification for doing so and this results in a clear benefit created towards social, economic, environmental or cultural well-being within the district community.
- 3.9.6 Prior to accepting any request for review, the Council may require the applicant to provide specific details of the manner in which its proposals will reduce the need for works or purchase of land proposed by the Council in its capital works programme.
- 3.9.7 In undertaking the review of the development contribution the Council or a Committee or staff member of the Council so delegated:
- (a) shall, as soon as reasonably practicable, consider the request;
  - (b) may determine whether to hold a hearing for the purposes of the review and if it does so, hold that hearing within 90 days of receipt of the request and give at least 5 working days' notice to the applicant, of the date, time and place of the hearing;
  - (c) may at its discretion uphold, reduce, postpone or waive the original amount of development contribution required and shall advise the person in writing of its decision within 10 working days of making that decision;
  - (d) may charge such fee as determined in its annual schedule of fees, to consider the request.

- 3.9.8 In making any decision under **Section 3.9.7**, the Council shall be satisfied that:
- (a) the value and nature of works proposed by the applicant or the nature of the development reduces the need for works or the purchase of land proposed by the Council in its capital works programme to a similar extent to that by which the contribution is sought to be reduced; and/or
  - (b) there is an oversupply of reserves in the area or the Council does not intend to acquire reserve land in the area (in relation to reserve contributions only); or
  - (c) waiving or reducing development contributions on a proposed development by a non-profit organisation will provide a public benefit in accordance with **Section 3.9.5**.
- 3.9.9 A waiver or reduction of development contributions granted to a non-profit organisation on the basis of benefit to the community does not eliminate the need for the infrastructure required to service that development. Where a waiver or reduction is granted on this basis, the Council will fund the cost of the contributions assessed from ratepayer funds collected for social development. Where the benefit is to the local community, the funding will be drawn from community rates. Where a benefit is considered to be provided to the wider District, funding will be obtained from rates collected District-wide.

### **Right to Object to Independent Commissioner**

---

- 3.10.1 A person who requested a reconsideration under section 199A(1) of the Act who is required to make a development contribution may lodge an objection to the development contributions assessed to an independent commissioner in accordance with the Act.

## Refunds of Development Contributions

---

3.11.1 The Council will refund development contributions in accordance with the requirements of the Act. In doing so, the Council shall retain a development contribution taken for a specific reserve purpose for a period of 20 years commencing the date upon which the contribution was made, as provided for by the Act.

## Statement on GST

---

3.12.1 Any development contribution referred to in this Policy and any development contribution required in the form of money pursuant to this Policy is exclusive of Goods and Services Tax. GST is payable on all development contributions except any interest component required under **Section 2.17.5**.

## Audit

This Policy shall not be subject to any audit procedures other than those included in the Act.

## Methodology for Cost Allocation

The calculation of the separate portions of the cost of any project between that for improving levels of service or providing additional service life to existing households and businesses ([i.e. renewal](#)), (the ERP Costs) and that for providing additional capacity to accommodate new development of households and businesses (the AC Cost), as required by **Section 2.10.1**, shall be carried out using the following methodology.

## Listing Projects and Information Required

---

- 5.1.1 Every project in the capital works programme of the long term plan shall be listed.
- 5.1.2 Where possible, distinct stages of a project or distinct parts of a project shall be listed as separate projects and separate calculations carried out for each.
- 5.1.3 The Council may include in the calculation of development contributions, capital expenditure projects carried out in anticipation of development since 1 July 2000.
- 5.1.4 Each project in the capital works programme shall be categorised as one of the following project types:
  - a) *Existing shortfall or renewal project* – a project intended to deal only with shortfalls in levels of service to existing households and businesses or to provide for the renewal or replacement of an asset. The cost of the project shall be allocated to ERP Costs only.

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- b) *Additional capacity project* - a project intended to provide additional capacity to service new and future households and businesses. The cost of the project shall be allocated to AC Costs only.
- c) *Combined project* – a project intended to deal with shortfalls in existing levels of service, renewal or replacement of existing assets and to provide capacity for further growth. The cost of the project shall be allocated between ERP Costs and AC Costs using the methodology in this section.

5.1.5 The *total project cost* of each project shall be listed.

5.1.6 The amount of any *subsidy or grant* toward the project from any other source of funding shall be deducted from the *total project costs* to give the *net project cost*.

5.1.7 For each combined project the following information shall be provided or calculated:

- a) the reasons for carrying out the project;
- b) the reason for the service level deficiency, replacement or renewal;
- c) the year in which the project was/will be carried out, the year in which project capacity started or will start being consumed and the total capacity of the project so that the year in which the total capacity of the project will be reached can be calculated;
- d) the *remaining service life (RSL)* of the asset serving existing *rating charges*;
- e) the *economic life (EL)* that the combined project will give existing *rating charges*;
- f) the *AC units of demand* being the number of additional new and future households and businesses stated as *rating charges*, that the *combined project* will provide capacity for.

## Cost Allocation of Combined Projects

---

5.2.1 The Unit of Demand approach shall be carried out as follows:

- (a) the cost of the project less any subsidies (from NZTA, or other third party) received or expected to be received is calculated to determine the Net Project Cost.
- (b) the number of *ERP units of demand* for the project is calculated as the number of *rating charges* at the project commencement year (unless this was prior to 1 July 2008. Where this is the case the number of rating charges at 1 July 2008 are used);
- (c) the *total units of demand* for the project is the *ERP units of demand* plus the *AC units of demand, which is equal to the capacity of the project*;
- (d) the *ERP Cost* is calculated as the Net Project Cost divided by the total units of demand multiplied by the *ERP units of demand*;
- (e) the *AC Cost* is calculated as the *net project cost* less the *ERP Cost or the Net Project Cost* divided by the total units of demand multiplied by the *AC units of demand*.

## AC Cost allocation Between New and Future Rating Charges

---

5.3.1 The following information for each *combined project and each additional capacity project*, shall be used to fairly attribute *AC cost* between *new and future rating charges*:

- a) the year in which capacity of the project started or will start to be taken up;

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

- b) the year in which the capacity of the project is expected to be reached or 40 years from the date of adoption of this policy whichever is the earlier.
- 5.3.2 The AC Cost of the project shall be divided between *new rating charges (N)* arriving in the catchment in the long term plan period and *future rating charges (F)* arriving after the end of the long term plan period, as follows:
- a) the AC Cost to F is the AC Cost determined in **Section 5.2** above multiplied by the years of capacity take up after the long term plan period divided by total years of capacity take up;
- b) the AC Cost to N is the AC Cost less the AC Cost to F; and
- c) the AC Cost per AC Unit of Demand remains the same for N as for F as prescribed under the Act.
- 5.3.3 Only the AC Cost to N shall be used in the calculation of development contributions.

### **Consideration of Appropriate Funding Sources**

- 5.4.1 The Council has considered the matters referred to in section 101(3)(a) of the Act and considers these matters to be well reflected in its cost allocation methodology, in particular through the categorisation of projects under section 5.1.4, the analysis of combined projects under section 5.1.7, and the allocation of costs of combined projects under sections 5.2 and 5.3 between existing ratepayers (who pay the ERP cost) and new and future growth who pay (through development contributions) the AC cost to N and AC cost to F respectively. The Council has also considered under section 101(3)(b) of the Act the overall impact on the community of the proposed allocation of the cost of capital expenditure set out in Appendix C of this policy, and considers this impact to be fair and reasonable.

**Comment [SHB14]:** Requires explicit reference to section 101(3) considerations Council has done this but it needs to document it has done so.

## **Growth Projection Methodology**

### **Calculation of Development Contributions**

Development contribution amounts originate from the 10-year capital costs in the long term plan.

Council calculates in accordance with **Section 5.0** that part of total capital expenditure in the 10-year programme that is related to new development and growth. It then divides this expenditure by the amount of development (measured in new units of demand) that is expected to take place. Development projections are measured as rating units. Annual rating unit estimates to 2045 are provided for each catchment by applying expected percentage rating unit growth rates to the known numbers of rating units at the start of the long term plan period.

Only the resulting additional capacity (AC) costs are taken into account. They are totalled for the catchment and that total expenditure is divided between all new and future units of

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

demand expected to consume the additional capacity or otherwise benefit from that expenditure. Put simply:

$$\text{Contribution amount (\$) per Unit of Demand} = \frac{\text{Total AC capital expenditure (\$) for catchment divided by the:}}{\text{Number of new and future units of demand expected in the catchment}}$$

- 6.1 In order to calculate the amount of development to which the growth related portion of capital expenditure (AC Costs) for infrastructure will be attributed, catchment projections of new and future units of demand for services in the period 2015-2045 are required.
- 6.2 The Council maintains a detailed rating database that provides the numbers of rating units for different activities in all areas of the District.
- 6.3 The numbers of rating units provide a close correlation with numbers of lots in the District and the number of multiple units of activity on any lot where this is the case. They are therefore considered to provide a reasonably sound measure of units of demand for services.
- 6.4 Notwithstanding that projections are based on rating units this shall not exempt any development that is currently an existing rating unit from paying a development contribution under this policy.
- 6.5 Assumptions have been made as to the expected annual increase in the numbers of rating units and hence units of demand for services out to 2045,, in all areas of benefit, using District and area growth rates for rating units.
- 6.6 Development in each catchment will be monitored. The Council may adjust its projections of units of demand for the area of service upward or downward and may reduce or increase (as the case may be) growth related capital expenditure for the area accordingly.



## APPENDIX A - Definitions

**Comment [SHB15]:** suggest additional definitions.

The definitions of terms contained in the Council's Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (GAAP) and in the Glossary of Terms Used in the Long Term Plan, shall apply to any term not defined below.

**AC cost:**

the cost for providing additional capacity in reserves and community and network infrastructure to service the development of new households and businesses, to be expressed as the AC Cost.

**Accommodation units:**

Units, apartments, rooms in 1 or more buildings, or cabins or sites in camping grounds and holiday parks, for the purpose of providing overnight, temporary, or short term rental accommodation

**Activity unit of demand:**

the demand for Council infrastructure generated by development activity other than subdivision.

**Additional capacity project or AC project:**

a capital project in the Long Term Plan intended only to provide additional capacity in reserves and community and network infrastructure to service new and future households and businesses.

**Additional service life or ASL:**

the number of years of service at the service standard, in addition to the remaining service life, that a new asset will give existing households and businesses.

**Area of service:**

see "catchment"

**Bedroom:**

a room used for sleeping, normally accommodating no more than 3 persons.

**Catchment:**

the whole or any part of the District, set out in Appendix E, which will be served by a particular public service or infrastructure type.

**Combined project or AC/ERP project:**

a project in the Long Term Plan intended to deal with shortfalls in levels of service to existing households and businesses by bringing assets up to the service standard and/or by providing additional service life and to provide capacity for further growth.

**Community facilities:**

has the meaning given to it in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002. At time of the draft Policy being prepared, the definition is "reserves, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure for which development contributions may be required in accordance with section 199" of the Act.

**Community infrastructure:**

has the meaning given to it in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002 (which at time of the draft Policy being prepared comprised community centres and halls, play equipment on neighbourhood reserves and public conveniences) for projects commenced on or after 8 August 2014; and for projects substantially progressed prior to this date including swimming pools, airfields, solid waste, harbour facilities, wharves, boat ramps, libraries, cemeteries, and parks and reserves.

**Development:**

has the meaning given to it in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002. At time of the draft Policy being prepared, the definition is:

- "(a) any subdivision, building (as defined in Section 8 of the Building Act 2004), land use or work that generates a demand for reserves, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure; but
- b) does not include the pipes or lines of a network utility operator."

**Development Contributions Calculation Period:**

the period commencing 1 July 2000 and ending on a date when the capacity of growth related projects are reached (Expectations are that this will be a twenty year period, but may vary for certain projects), or such date as the Council may determine under any review of this Policy.

**Dwelling Unit:**

any building or group of buildings or any part of those buildings, used or intended to be used solely or principally for residential purposes and occupied or intended to be occupied by not more than one household.

**Farm Buildings:**

Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

structures designed for farming and agricultural practices, including but not limited to the growing and harvesting of crops or trees and raising livestock and small animals.

**Gross Business Area:**

- (a) the gross floor area of any building measured from the outer faces of the exterior walls; plus
- (b) the area of any part of the lot used solely or principally for the storage, sale, display or servicing of goods or the provision of services on the lot.

The “gross business area” will exclude permanently designated vehicle parking, manoeuvring, loading and landscaping areas, the conversion of which to another use would require resource consent.

The “gross business area” will also exclude the area of network infrastructure including pipes, lines and installations, roads, water supply, wastewater and stormwater collection and management systems, but will include the area of buildings occupied by network service providers, including offices, workshops, warehouses and any outside areas used for carrying out their normal business.

The “gross business area” does not include the areas of any lot used solely for primary production such as mineral or aggregate extraction sites.

**Gross Floor Area:**

the gross floor area of any building measured from the outer faces of the exterior walls but not including permanently designated vehicle parking, manoeuvring, loading and landscaping areas, the conversion of which to another use would require resource consent.

The “gross floor area” does not include the areas of any lot used solely for primary production such as, forest areas, land used for cropping and for grazing livestock.

The “gross floor area” also does not include any area of a lot used to provide or support the provision of Council infrastructure.

**ERP cost:**

the cost of improving levels of service to existing households and businesses by bringing assets up to the service standard and/or by providing additional service life.

**Improved level of service project or ERP project:**

a capital project in the Long Term Plan intended only to deal with shortfalls in levels of service to existing households and businesses by bringing assets up to the service standard and/or by providing additional service life.

**Legally established:**

for the purposes of this Policy, means :

- any lot for which a title has been issued, or for which a section 224 Resource Management Act 1991 certificate has been issued;
- any building granted Building Consent/Permit prior to 31 March 2005;
- any building granted a Building Consent since 31 March 2005 and a Code Compliance Certificate;
- any building for which a Certificate of Acceptance has been issued; or
- any development that has been granted a land use consent.

**Lot:**

any land and/or building capable of being disposed of separately.

**Lot unit of demand:**

the demand for Council infrastructure generated by the creation of lots through subdivision.

**Neighbourhood Reserve:**

reserve land that is primarily provided for use by local communities for casual recreation, play, relaxation, community activity, links to other areas, or quiet open space.

**Network infrastructure**

The provision of roads and other transport, water, wastewater, and stormwater collection and management.

**Parks and Reserves development contributions:**

contributions collected for projects providing infrastructure on reserves where such projects which were completed or for which substantial progress or effort had been made toward completion prior to 8 August 2014.

**Remaining Service Life (RSL) of an asset:**

the number of years before an asset serving existing households and businesses will require replacement or substantial renewal in order to maintain the service standard.

**Reserve Contributions:**

funding for a programme of reserve land purchases and development of any kind that enables a reserve to be used for its intended purpose.

**Residential Activity:**

the use of land or buildings as permanent or temporary accommodation such as a dwelling, commercial accommodation, retirement unit and school or camp dormitory.

**Retirement Unit:**

any residential unit in a retirement village where retirement village has the meaning specified in section 6 of The Retirement Villages Act 2003.

**Service Standard:**

a level of service for any network infrastructure, community infrastructure or reserves set by the Council having due regard to one or more of *the following factors*:

- a) demand data based on market research;
- b) widely accepted and documented engineering or other minimum standards;
- c) politically endorsed service levels based on community consultation;
- d) safety standards mandated by local or central government;
- e) environmental standards mandated by local or central government including those in the Council's District Plan;
- f) existing service levels, where these are recognised by all concerned parties to be adequate but have no formal ratification;
- g) efficiency considerations where service standards must take account of engineering and economic efficiency requirements which require a long term approach to optimality.

**Surplus Capacity:**

Infrastructure provided prior to the adoption of the Development Contributions Policy in October 2004, for and in advance of new development anticipated to occur at a future time.

**Unit:**

any independent unit capable of being used separately and independently of any other unit whether or not it is dependent on common or shared facilities of any kind.

**Unit of demand:**

a unit of measurement by which the relative demand for Council infrastructure, generated by different types of development activity, (existing or proposed) can be assessed. A unit of demand may be expressed as a lot unit of demand or an activity unit of demand.

# APPENDIX B - Schedule of development contributions payable by area – excluding reserves contributions

**Comment [SHB16]:** Contributions for reserves also need to be specified in the policy under section 202(1)(a).

## Development Contributions Payable (including GST) For the year ending 30 June 2016

Catchment	District	District	Solid	Community	Parks &	Halls	Harbours	Swimming	Libraries	Cemeteries	Public	Airfields	Water	Waste-	Storm-	TOTAL
	Roading	Community	Waste	Roading	Reserves			Pools			Conveniences			water	water	
Infrastructure																
Hahei	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	2,236	2,177	0	8,011
Matarangi	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	92	367	425	4,481
Whitianga	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	2,029	7,049	659	13,334
Whangapoua	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	0	0	3,597
Cooks-Beach	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	991	0	4,588
Opito-Bay	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	0	0	3,597
Kuaotunu-West	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	0	0	3,597
Kuaotunu	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	0	0	3,597
Hot-Water-Beach	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	0	0	3,597
Tairua	1,318	73	12	1,212	361	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,913	8,254	753	14,019
Pauanui	1,318	73	12	1,212	361	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,113	8,254	28	12,494
Thames	1,318	73	12	204	87	0	0	0	189	0	33	102	199	528	1,706	4,451
Matatoki	1,318	73	12	204	87	0	0	0	189	0	33	102	6,055	0	0	8,073
Thames-Valley	1,318	73	12	204	87	0	0	0	189	0	33	102	4,226	0	0	6,244
Whangamata	1,318	73	12	1,279	11	241	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,869	7,388	282	13,472
Onemana	1,318	73	12	1,279	11	241	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,934
Coromandel	1,318	73	12	344	1,111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,773	67	6,698
Oamaru-Bay	1,318	73	12	344	1,111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,858
Rural-Mercury-Bay	1,318	73	12	912	946	65	18	0	0	113	140	0	0	0	0	3,597
Rural-Tairua-Pauanui	1,318	73	12	1,212	361	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,099
Rural-Thames	1,318	73	12	204	87	0	0	0	189	0	33	102	0	0	0	2,018
Rural-Whangamata	1,318	73	12	1,279	11	241	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,934
Rural-Coromandel-Colville	1,318	73	12	344	1,111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,858

## Development Contributions Payable (including GST)

**For the year ending 30 June 2017**

Catchment	District	District	Solid	Community	Parks &	Halls	Harbours	Swimming	Libraries	Cemeteries	Public	Airfields	Water	Waste-	Storm-	TOTAL
	Roading	Community	Waste	Roading	Reserves			Pools			Conveniences			water	water	
	<b>Infrastructure</b>															
Hahei	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	2,320	2,288	0	8,322
Matarangi	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	96	371	453	4,634
Whitianga	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	2,117	7,197	683	13,711
Whangapoua	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	0	0	3,714
Cooks Beach	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	1,075	0	4,789
Opito Bay	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	0	0	3,714
Kuaotunu West	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	0	0	3,714
Kuaotunu	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	0	0	3,714
Hot Water Beach	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	0	0	3,714
Tairua	1,350	80	12	1,234	375	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,003	8,520	817	14,518
Pauanui	1,350	80	12	1,234	375	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,154	8,520	28	12,880
Thames	1,350	80	12	210	92	0	0	0	196	0	34	110	253	551	1,770	4,657
Matatoki	1,350	80	12	210	92	0	0	0	196	0	34	110	6,281	0	0	8,365
Thames Valley	1,350	80	12	210	92	0	0	0	196	0	34	110	4,802	0	0	6,886
Whangamata	1,350	80	12	1,352	11	284	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,270	7,663	298	14,318
Onemana	1,350	80	12	1,352	11	284	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,088
Coromandel	1,350	80	12	353	1,152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,934	73	6,952
Oamaru Bay	1,350	80	12	353	1,152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,946
Rural Mercury Bay	1,350	80	12	912	1,016	65	19	0	0	117	143	0	0	0	0	3,714
Rural Tairua Pauanui	1,350	80	12	1,234	375	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,177
Rural Thames	1,350	80	12	210	92	0	0	0	196	0	34	110	0	0	0	2,084
Rural Whangamata	1,350	80	12	1,352	11	284	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,088
Rural Coromandel Colville	1,350	80	12	353	1,152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,946

**Development Contributions Payable (including GST)  
For the year ending 30 June 2018**

Catchment	District Roading	District Community	Solid Waste	Comnty Roading	Parks & Reserves	Halls	Harbours	Swimming Pools	Libraries	Cemeteries	Public Conveniences	Airfields	Water	Waste- water	Storm- water	TOTAL
<b>Infrastructure</b>																
Hahei	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	2,399	2,394	0	8,635
Matarangi	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	100	380	480	4,802
Whitianga	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	2,201	7,334	707	14,084
Whangapoua	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	0	0	3,843
Cooks Beach	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	1,156	0	4,998
Opito Bay	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	0	0	3,843
Kuaotunu West	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	0	0	3,843
Kuaotunu	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	0	0	3,843
Hot Water Beach	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	0	0	3,843
Tairua	1,380	86	12	1,256	347	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,090	8,777	878	14,958
Pauanui	1,380	86	12	1,256	347	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,194	8,777	29	13,212
Thames	1,380	86	12	215	97	0	0	0	203	0	36	118	306	574	1,830	4,859
Matatoki	1,380	86	12	215	97	0	0	0	203	0	36	118	6,496	0	0	8,644
Thames Valley	1,380	86	12	215	97	0	0	0	203	0	36	118	5,371	0	0	7,519
Whangamata	1,380	86	12	1,427	11	326	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,660	7,925	313	15,142
Onemana	1,380	86	12	1,427	11	326	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,243
Coromandel	1,380	86	12	361	1,192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,087	78	7,196
Oamaru Bay	1,380	86	12	361	1,192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,032
Rural Mercury Bay	1,380	86	12	925	1,084	65	20	0	0	121	149	0	0	0	0	3,843
Rural Tairua-Pauanui	1,380	86	12	1,256	347	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,213
Rural Thames	1,380	86	12	215	97	0	0	0	203	0	36	118	0	0	0	2,148
Rural Whangamata	1,380	86	12	1,427	11	326	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,243
Rural Coromandel-Colville	1,380	86	12	361	1,192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,032

APPENDIX C – SOURCES OF FUNDING

Community Facility	Total Cost of Capital Works Projects	Cost of Capital Works Projects - Historic	Cost of Capital Works Projects - Projected	Other Sources of Funding	Other Sources of Funding - Historic	Other Sources of Funding - Projected	Total Improved Level of Service Component	Total Improved Level of Service Component - Historic	Total Improved Level of Service Component - Projected	Total Capital Expenditure for Growth (To be funded by Development Contributions)	Total Capital Expenditure for Growth (To be funded by Development Contributions) - Historic	Total Capital Expenditure for Growth (To be funded by Development Contributions) - Projected	Total Capital Expenditure for Growth (To be funded by Development Contributions from N)	Total Capital Expenditure for Growth (To be funded by Development Contributions from F)
District Transportation														
Cemeteries Pub Conv Land & Buildings														
Solid Waste														
Community Transportation														
Community Infrastructure														
Water Supply														
Wastewater														
Stormwater														
Reserves														
Total														

**Comment [SHB17]:** At present the list of community facilities in the left hand column does not include all activities listed in appendix B for which contributions will be required – and so does not comply with s106(2)(d). We do not think the "community infrastructure" heading can be used to lump together activities identified separately in appendix B.

# APPENDIX D – Demand factors for business development and other activities

Schedule 13(2) of the Act requires the Council to demonstrate in its methodology that it has attributed units of demand to particular developments or types of development on a consistent and equitable basis. It cannot simply assume that a business development or other activity will generate 1 unit of demand for infrastructure, as would a single dwelling unit.

The assumptions for the calculations of business units of demand for transportation, ~~have been in place some time. Council has benchmarked these assumptions and have determined that these remain a reasonable basis for demand. Water supply and wastewater calculations have been updated to incorporate current data on residential and non-residential water consumption. Water supply and wastewater are those determined in the Environment Court Consent Order settling the financial contributions appeal in Rodney District Council v Turvey Company Limited and Others.~~

**Comment [SHB18]:** This is now well over 10 years old and from a different district. While it may not be inaccurate we suggest you check the unit of demand assumptions against those used by other councils for the purposes of their development contributions policies.

For the purposes of the Transportation, Community Infrastructure and Solid Waste unit of demand calculations in D.1 and D.3 below, the demand placed on infrastructure by business developments is assumed to bear some relationship to the number of employees measured as Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) on a given business area. It is considered that employee numbers give a reasonable indication of likely trip generation from a business site and the use of community facilities. Trips generated by employees and use of community facilities by employees is then compared to trip generation and resident numbers in the average dwelling (1 Unit of Demand)

While it is accepted that for transportation, customers and suppliers may generate additional trips, and the Units of Demand for business could be raised accordingly, the Courts ~~have~~ accepted it is not always possible to predict the particular types of business that will locate in catchments. Retail businesses may generate high customer trips numbers while offices, warehouse or storage facilities may generate low customer and supplier trip numbers. The Transportation calculation therefore uses employment as a proxy measure for trip generation on business sites.

The water supply and wastewater calculations in D.2 ~~use current district wide water consumption data for residential and are based on water consumption data for~~ business premises ~~used in the Rodney case.~~ The stormwater calculation is based comparisons of average gross business area when compared to the area of an average sized dwelling.

The assumption for the stormwater demand factor of business activity in D.3 is based on the gross business area of a development and the assumption that this will act as a measure of the level of development activity occurring which will benefit from and cause the need for additional capacity to be provided in the local stormwater area.

Activities other than residential and business activities can take various forms. The assumption used in this Policy is that the levels of activity and hence the units of demand generated by other activities will be similar to those generated by businesses. The units of demand for other activities will be calculated using the unit of demand factors in D.1 to D.3 multiplied by the gross floor area of the activity and the units of demand will be subject to any review under Sections 3.8 and 3.9.

## D.1 Transportation

### Assumptions

Average business site size = 1500m<sup>2</sup>

Gross Business Area is 60% of site - 1000m<sup>2</sup>



Statement of Proposal – Development Contributions Policy

Employees/ha of business = 30 FTE's/ha (FTE (Full Time Equivalent))  
Average Household Unit Trip generation = 9 trips per day = 1 Unit of Demand  
Sites per net ha = 5 (7500m<sup>2</sup> sites, 2500m<sup>2</sup> roads)  
Gross business area per hectare = 5 X 1000 = 5000m<sup>2</sup>  
Each site of 1500m<sup>2</sup> and each 1000m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Business Area has = 30/5 FTE's = 6FTE's  
Minimum trip generation 3 trips per FTE per day = 18 trips per day  
**Unit of Demand Factor = 18/9 = 2 per 1000m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Business Area OR 0.002 per m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Business Area**

#### **D.2 Water and Wastewater**

##### **Assumptions**

Residential consumption of a dwelling occupied over half the year 180,624 litres per year = 1 Unit of Demand  
Average business water consumption 260 litres per year per m<sup>2</sup> gross business area  
**Unit of Demand factor is 0.0014 per m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Business Area.**

#### **D.3 Community Infrastructure, Stormwater and Solid Waste**

##### **Assumptions**

Average household occupancy 2.7 persons  
Average business site size = 1500m<sup>2</sup>  
Gross Business Area is 60% of site - 1000m<sup>2</sup>  
Employees/ha of business = 30 FTE's/ha (FTE (Full Time Equivalent))  
Sites per net ha = 5 (7500m<sup>2</sup> sites, 2500m<sup>2</sup> roads)  
Gross business area per hectare = 5 X 1000 = 5000m<sup>2</sup>  
Each site of 1500m<sup>2</sup> and each 1000m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Business Area has = 30/5 FTE's = 6FTE's  
Assumption is that a 1000m<sup>2</sup> of Gross Business Area (6FTE's) will generate the equivalent demand of a single household unit (2.7 persons)  
**Unit of Demand Factor is 1.0 for 1000m<sup>2</sup> of business area OR 0.0010 per m<sup>2</sup> of business area.**

## APPENDIX E – Development contribution catchments

Council Infrastructure	Catchment	Development to which Development Contribution applies
District transportation	District	Development anywhere in the District will pay the contribution
Strategic land and buildings	District	Development anywhere in the District will pay the contribution
Public conveniences and cemeteries	Thames, Mercury Bay, Whangamata, Coromandel and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Community transportation	Thames, Mercury Bay, Whangamata, Coromandel and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Parks and reserves	Thames, Mercury Bay, Whangamata, Coromandel and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Harbours	Thames, Mercury Bay, Whangamata, Coromandel and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Community Centres and Halls	Thames, Mercury Bay, Whangamata, Coromandel and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Solid waste	Thames, Mercury Bay, Whangamata, Coromandel and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Libraries	Thames, Mercury Bay and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Airfields	Thames and Tairua /Pauanui community board areas	Development in each community board area will pay the contribution for that area
Swimming pools	Thames community board area	Development in the Thames Community Board Area will pay the contribution for that area
Water supply	Areas served by water supply schemes	Development connecting to a scheme will pay the contribution for that scheme
Wastewater treatment	Areas served by wastewater treatment schemes	Development connecting to a scheme will pay the contribution for that scheme
Stormwater	Areas served by urban stormwater networks	Development in any urban stormwater area

## APPENDIX F – Assessment of effects in relation to significant assumptions

Assumption	Level of uncertainty	Potential effects
The rate, level and location of growth will occur as forecast in the rating growth projections accompanying the Long Term Plan	High	Lower than forecast growth will result in a significant under-recovery of development contributions revenue
Capital expenditure will be in accordance with the capital works programme in the Long Term Plan	Moderate	In current circumstances significant changes to the capital programme are unlikely
No significant changes to service standards are expected to occur other than those planned for in the asset management plans	Low	No significant effects anticipated
The level of third party funding (such as New NZ Transport Agency subsidies) will continue at anticipated levels set out in the Long Term Plan	Low	No significant effects anticipated
There will be no significant variations to predicted rates of interest and inflation to those set out in the Long Term Plan	Low	No significant effects anticipated, however periods of high inflation and interest may necessitate revision of the capital works programme due to affordability.
The revenue from rates will be sufficient to meet the operating and maintenance costs of capital expenditure funded by development contributions	Low	No significant effects anticipated

## **APPENDIX G – Assessment of grouping by geographic area - section 197AB(g) of the Local Government Act 2002**

Section 197AB(g) of the Act requires that when calculating and requiring development contributions, the Council groups together developments by geographic areas or by categories of land use. When grouping for development contribution purposes, the Council must:

- a) group in a manner that balances practical and administrative efficiencies with considerations of fairness and equity; and
- b) ensure grouping by geographic area avoids grouping across the entire district wherever practical.

### **1. Grouping by geographic areas or by land use.**

The Council has previously grouped for development contribution purposes using geographic areas or “catchments”. The legislation now also allows grouping by land use – in other words, the council may calculate and require different contributions for different types of land use.

After considering the matter, the Council is satisfied that its current method of calculating and requiring contributions for different types of land use by assessing the varying demands that each type place on network infrastructure, community infrastructure and reserves using Table 1 of the development contribution policy, is an appropriate method of grouping by land use. The table applies different demands to different land uses and exempts certain land uses from paying particular contributions.

## 2. Grouping by geographic areas

Activity	Current geographic area "catchment"	Practical and administrative efficiency s197AB(g)(i)	Fairness and equity s197AB(g)(i)	District wide grouping avoided wherever practical s197AB(g)(ii)	Consideration of factors	Proposed geographic area
District transportation	District	Practically and administratively efficient to operate with a single catchment.  Retaining status quo is practical and workable	District transport network is available to whole community. Single geographic area is fair and equitable	Not practical to avoid a district catchment and try and collect different contributions from communities and groups that all use and benefit from the same network	All s197AB(g) factors combine to favour a single district wide geographic grouping	<b>District</b>
Public conveniences and cemeteries	District	Practically and administratively efficient to operate as a single network at a district level BUT it would not be unduly complex to use local community board geographic areas.  Smaller areas may become more complex and impractical to administer	A single district geographic area may be acceptable <b>if</b> levels of service are common across the district.  Any variations in levels of service across the district favour separate geographic groupings	It would be practical to avoid a single district wide catchment	There are variations in levels of service across the district.  It is practical to administer contributions at a community board level and this grouping is favoured when considering s197AB(g) factors.  It becomes more complex to administer smaller groupings e.g. individual urban areas	<b>Community board areas</b>

Activity	Current geographic area “catchment”	Practical and administrative efficiency s197AB(g)(i)	Fairness and equity s197AB(g)(i)	District wide grouping avoided wherever practical s197AB(g)(ii)	Consideration of factors	Proposed geographic area
Community transportation	Five community board areas	Reasonably practical and efficient to operate at a community board level.  Retaining status quo is practical and workable	There is a good case for separate local community based geographic groupings to ensure fairness and equity if there are significant budgeted capital expenditure differences or levels of service between community board areas	A district wide grouping can be practically avoided.	All s197AB(g) factors combine to favour separate community based groupings	<b>Community board areas</b>
Community centres and halls	Five community board areas	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	<b>Community board areas</b>
Play equipment	New category	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	<b>Community board areas</b>
Parks and reserves	Five community board areas	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	As for community transportation	<b>Community board areas</b>
Water supply	Areas served by water supply schemes	Each scheme is a closed system – relatively easy to combine any development connecting to each scheme into one group.	Any significant cost differences between schemes can impose an unfair burden on some communities if costs are shared at district or sub-	A district wide grouping can be practically avoided.	All s197AB(g) factors combine to favour separate scheme-by-scheme based groupings	<b>Water supply scheme</b>

Activity	Current geographic area "catchment"	Practical and administrative efficiency s197AB(g)(i)	Fairness and equity s197AB(g)(i)	District wide grouping avoided wherever practical s197AB(g)(ii)	Consideration of factors	Proposed geographic area
		<p>Contributions by scheme are simple to administer.</p> <p>Retaining status quo (scheme-by-scheme) is practical and workable</p>	<p>district levels.</p> <p>Price averaging across schemes can create inequities if levels of service vary between schemes.</p> <p>Within each scheme area parties enjoy a common level of service so smaller geographic groupings should not be necessary</p>			
Wastewater treatment	Areas served by wastewater treatment schemes	As for water supply	As for water supply	As for water supply	As for water supply	<b>Wastewater treatment scheme</b>

Activity	Current geographic area "catchment"	Practical and administrative efficiency s197AB(g)(i)	Fairness and equity s197AB(g)(i)	District wide grouping avoided wherever practical s197AB(g)(ii)	Consideration of factors	Proposed geographic area
Stormwater	Areas served by urban stormwater networks	Reasonably practical and efficient to use those main urban areas where stormwater service is provided for groupings.  Becomes impractical and inefficient to group down to smaller, more localised parts of urban areas	Any significant cost differences between different urban areas can impose an unfair burden on some communities if costs are shared (averaged) at district or sub-district levels.  Price averaging across different urban areas can also create inequities if levels of service vary between them	A district wide grouping can be practically avoided	All s197AB(g) factors combine to favour separate geographic groups for each of the urban areas that have the stormwater service	<b>Main urban areas</b>
<b>Community infrastructure assets completed or significantly progressed</b>						
Strategic land and buildings	District		Retain status quo until contributions fully recovered			
Harbours	Five community board areas		As above			
Solid waste	Five community board areas		As above			
Libraries	Three community		As above			



Activity	Current geographic area "catchment"	Practical and administrative efficiency s197AB(g)(i)	Fairness and equity s197AB(g)(i)	District wide grouping avoided wherever practical s197AB(g)(ii)	Consideration of factors	Proposed geographic area
	board areas					
Airfields	Two community board areas		As above			
Swimming pools	One community board areas		As above			

Draft Development Contributions Policy



### **3.1 Hearing Commissioners for Joint Hearing - Coromandel Land Use consent**

---

<b>TO</b>	Thames-Coromandel District Council
<b>FROM</b>	Angela Jane -Governance Manager
<b>DATE</b>	8 May 2015
<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>Hearing Commissioners for a Joint Hearing between Waikato Regional Council and Thames Coromandel District Council for a land use consent for earthworks, vegetation clearance and several stream crossings to re-instate a paper road at 527A Colville Road, Colville - RMA2012/213 - Applicant David Stone.</b>

---

#### **1 Purpose of report**

The purpose of the report is to seek approval to include Independent Commissioners Phil Mitchell, Rob van Voorthuysen and Steven Wilson (matters of significance to Maori) on the Council's list of approved Commissioners - Schedule of Commissioners dated September 2013 so that they can preside over a joint hearing application.

#### **2 Background**

The current Approved Schedule of Commissioners was last updated in September 2013. This schedule sits within the Judicial Committees Terms of Reference, providing a pool of Independent Commissioners who can be selected for appointment to Resource Management hearings.

Under the Judicial Committee's terms of reference the following delegations for the Council's hearing committee and appointment of commissioners are in place:

The Chief Executive and the Chairperson of the Judicial Committee jointly shall have delegated authority to:

1. appoint hearings commissioners for the purposes the Section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991,
2. select a commissioner or commissioners from the list of accredited commissioners on the Council's schedule of approved commissioners to hear a particular matter.

PROVIDED THAT the power to select a commissioner or commissioners to hear a particular matter shall only be exercised in the following circumstances:

1. The Council or an individual councillor may otherwise be perceived to have an actual or perceived conflict of interest e.g. the Council is the applicant or has a significant interest.
2. Determination of objections made under section 357B of the Act relating to local authority charges.
3. When matters are outside the technical knowledge or experience of elected representatives or the Council's own staff.
4. When one or more committee members may have, or may be perceived to have a closed mind on the proposal.
5. For combined or joint hearings under section 102 of the Act where a neutral chair person or adviser is considered desirable.

6. To assist councillors in carrying out their duties during times when councillors are not available due to conflicting meeting times, or heavy workloads
7. To cover lengthy hearings which councillors would be unable to attend on a continuous basis due to business, financial, family or other limitations.
8. Hear applications, plan changes or carry out other functions of councillors immediately after local authority elections when committees who may normally hear resource consent applications and plan changes have yet to be appointed.
9. A request has been made by the applicant or a submitter on an application, for a resource consent under section 100A of the Act for a Hearings Commissioner/s to hear and decide the application.

The appointed hearings commissioner shall have delegated authority to:

1. Hear, consider and determine resource consent applications, to determine procedural matters which may occur prior to or during the hearing, including all applications for resource consent where pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 the application, or a submitter on an application, has requested that one or more hearings commissioners hear and decide the application, and as directed decisions pursuant to Sections 91(Deferrals where additional consents required), 95A - E (Notification matters) and Section 87D - F (Direct referrals to the Environment Court) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

### **3 Issue**

This application is to be heard as a joint hearing with WRC. TCDC and WRC do not have the same list of approved commissioners. It would be unreasonable for the applicant to incur the costs of two separate hearings and the RMA provides for joint hearings between consenting authorities and this would be the most efficient way for the application to be heard.

The application is scheduled to be heard in June or July 2015 and the applicant is in agreement with the nominated commissioners.

The nominated Independent Commissioners are accredited with MFE and are suitably experienced and qualified to manage the hearing process and reach a sound decision on the respective application.

### **4 Discussion**

The inclusion of the respective commissioners within the schedule of approved commissioners will provide a wider skill base from which Council can make a selection in future should similar joint hearings apply.

### **5 Suggested Resolution(s)**

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Receives the 'Hearing Commissioners for a Joint Hearing' report, dated 8 May 2015.
2. Resolves to update the current approved Schedule of Commissioners with the following commissioners - Phil Mitchell, Rob van Voorthuysen and Steven Wilson.

### **References - Agenda Attachments**

**Attachment A-** Commissioners' CVs

**Attachment B** - Schedule of Commissioners dated September 2013

### **3.1 Hearing Commissioners for Joint Hearing - Coromandel Land Use consent**

---

<b>TO</b>	Thames-Coromandel District Council
<b>FROM</b>	Angela Jane -Governance Manager
<b>DATE</b>	8 May 2015
<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>Hearing Commissioners for a Joint Hearing between Waikato Regional Council and Thames Coromandel District Council for a land use consent for earthworks, vegetation clearance and several stream crossings to re-instate a paper road at 527A Colville Road, Colville - RMA2012/213 - Applicant David Stone.</b>

---

#### **1 Purpose of report**

The purpose of the report is to seek approval to include Independent Commissioners Phil Mitchell, Rob van Voorthuysen and Steven Wilson (matters of significance to Maori) on the Council's list of approved Commissioners - Schedule of Commissioners dated September 2013 so that they can preside over a joint hearing application.

#### **2 Background**

The current Approved Schedule of Commissioners was last updated in September 2013. This schedule sits within the Judicial Committees Terms of Reference, providing a pool of Independent Commissioners who can be selected for appointment to Resource Management hearings.

Under the Judicial Committee's terms of reference the following delegations for the Council's hearing committee and appointment of commissioners are in place:

The Chief Executive and the Chairperson of the Judicial Committee jointly shall have delegated authority to:

1. appoint hearings commissioners for the purposes the Section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991,
2. select a commissioner or commissioners from the list of accredited commissioners on the Council's schedule of approved commissioners to hear a particular matter.

PROVIDED THAT the power to select a commissioner or commissioners to hear a particular matter shall only be exercised in the following circumstances:

1. The Council or an individual councillor may otherwise be perceived to have an actual or perceived conflict of interest e.g. the Council is the applicant or has a significant interest.
2. Determination of objections made under section 357B of the Act relating to local authority charges.
3. When matters are outside the technical knowledge or experience of elected representatives or the Council's own staff.
4. When one or more committee members may have, or may be perceived to have a closed mind on the proposal.
5. For combined or joint hearings under section 102 of the Act where a neutral chair person or adviser is considered desirable.

6. To assist councillors in carrying out their duties during times when councillors are not available due to conflicting meeting times, or heavy workloads
7. To cover lengthy hearings which councillors would be unable to attend on a continuous basis due to business, financial, family or other limitations.
8. Hear applications, plan changes or carry out other functions of councillors immediately after local authority elections when committees who may normally hear resource consent applications and plan changes have yet to be appointed.
9. A request has been made by the applicant or a submitter on an application, for a resource consent under section 100A of the Act for a Hearings Commissioner/s to hear and decide the application.

The appointed hearings commissioner shall have delegated authority to:

1. Hear, consider and determine resource consent applications, to determine procedural matters which may occur prior to or during the hearing, including all applications for resource consent where pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 the application, or a submitter on an application, has requested that one or more hearings commissioners hear and decide the application, and as directed decisions pursuant to Sections 91(Deferrals where additional consents required), 95A - E (Notification matters) and Section 87D - F (Direct referrals to the Environment Court) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

### **3 Issue**

This application is to be heard as a joint hearing with WRC. TCDC and WRC do not have the same list of approved commissioners. It would be unreasonable for the applicant to incur the costs of two separate hearings and the RMA provides for joint hearings between consenting authorities and this would be the most efficient way for the application to be heard.

The application is scheduled to be heard in June or July 2015 and the applicant is in agreement with the nominated commissioners.

The nominated Independent Commissioners are accredited with MFE and are suitably experienced and qualified to manage the hearing process and reach a sound decision on the respective application.

### **4 Discussion**

The inclusion of the respective commissioners within the schedule of approved commissioners will provide a wider skill base from which Council can make a selection in future should similar joint hearings apply.

### **5 Suggested Resolution(s)**

That the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

1. Receives the 'Hearing Commissioners for a Joint Hearing' report, dated 8 May 2015.
2. Resolves to update the current approved Schedule of Commissioners with the following commissioners - Phil Mitchell, Rob van Voorthuysen and Steven Wilson.

### **References - Agenda Attachments**

**Attachment A-** Commissioners' CVs

**Attachment B** - Schedule of Commissioners dated September 2013

## CURRICULUM VITAE

### Philip Hunter Mitchell

#### PERSONAL DETAILS

**Education:** 1979 BE (Hons), 1983 PhD (Canterbury)

**Professional Memberships:** Past President and Executive Committee Resource Management Law Association

Member New Zealand Planning Institute

#### INTRODUCTION

Dr Mitchell is the founder and Managing Partner of Mitchell Partnerships. He has wide ranging experience in providing environmental advice to both the private and public sectors, and has an in-depth knowledge of New Zealand's environmental legislation and its implementation.

Dr Mitchell is currently advising many of the country's leading enterprises and has undertaken a considerable number of assessments of environmental effects and planning assessments. He is an experienced and skilled expert witness and has acted as a hearings commissioner and hearings chair on a number of occasions. He is accredited in that role.

Dr Mitchell is a past President of the Resource Management Law Association and a member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.

#### RELEVANT EXPERTISE

Over the last 25 years, Dr Mitchell has undertaken assessments of environmental effects, planning evaluations and the co-ordination and project management of many applications for approvals under the RMA. His expertise includes assessing the environmental effects of: water supply projects; wastewater discharges; mining; port developments; waste management projects; energy generation developments; roading projects; forestry; meat processing; dairy processing; and coastal and marine projects.

#### RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Dr Mitchell has extensive experience in assessing and consenting major corporate and infrastructure developments. A selection of the more significant projects undertaken, including hearing commissioner appointments, is set out below.

## SELECTED HEARING COMMISSIONER APPOINTMENTS

- Te Rapa Bypass (Chair)
- Hamilton City District Plan – Variation 16 (Chair)
- Hamilton Aviary
- Holcim Oamaru Cement Manufacturing Plant (Chair)
- Variation 4 to Waitaki District Plan (Chair)
- Port of Napier expansion (Chair)
- Napier Cross Country Drainage Network
- Hawkes' Bay motorway extension (Chair)
- Oxley Hotel reconstruction (Chair)
- Finegand meat processing plant
- Ashwood Park subdivision

## SELECTED MAJOR PROJECTS

- Mangere Wastewater Treatment Plant.
- Waikato River Water Supply Pipeline.
- Lichfield Dairy Factory.
- Methanex Methanol Plant, including Waitara Outfall.
- Port Otago Capital Dredging Project.
- Shakespeare Bay Timber and Coal Port.
- Tongariro Power Development.
- Kiwi Cogeneration Plant.
- Masterfoods Manufacturing Facilities.
- Matahina Dam Strengthening Project.
- Dredging of the Port of Auckland.
- Waikato River Water Allocation.
- Auckland Power Crisis Emergency Overhead Link Project.
- Auckland CBD Underground Power Cable Project.
- Transpower 400 kV Transmission Corridor
- Huntly Energy Efficiency Enhancement Project.
- Rotowaro Opencast Coal Mines.
- Ohai Opencast Coal Mine.
- West Coast Coal Export Project.
- Golden Cross Gold Mine.
- Stockton Opencast Coal Mine.
- Cypress Opencast Coal Mine.
- Huntly East Underground Coal Mine.
- Huntly West Underground Coal Mine
- Weavers Opencast Coal Mine.
- Southdown Cogeneration Power Station.
- LVL Northland Plant.
- Kuku Mara Deep Water Marine Farms.
- Marlborough Mussel Co. Ltd Banks Peninsula Marine Farms.
- Tasman Pulp & Paper Mill.
- Kinleith Pulp & Paper Mill.
- Kinleith Geothermal Investigation Project.
- Kinleith Forest Harvesting Operations.
- Kinleith Cogeneration Plant.



3

- Mataura Mill.
- Whakatane Board Mills.
- Fletcher Wood Panels Taupo Mill.
- Huntly Power Station.
- Awhitu Wind Farm.
- Wairakei Geothermal Power Station.



Environmental Limited

Bowman Building, Market Street  
PO Box 566, Napier  
Phone. 06 834 4307  
Fax. 06 834 4301  
Mobile. 027 2482822  
Email. [rob@vvenvironmental.co.nz](mailto:rob@vvenvironmental.co.nz)  
Web. [www.vvenvironmental.co.nz](http://www.vvenvironmental.co.nz)



## Rob van Voorthuysen

Rob has been the Director of van Voorthuysen Environmental since July 2008.

### Qualifications

Master of Public Policy (Distinction)  
Victoria University of Wellington, 1992

Bachelor of Engineering (Agricultural - 1st Class Honours)  
University of Canterbury, 1983

Management Diploma  
New Zealand Institute of Management, 1989

### Affiliations

New Zealand Planning Institute (Full Member since 1998)  
Resource Management Law Association (Member)

### Previous Employment History

Environmental Management Services Ltd  
Director (July 1998 to June 2008)

Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
Group Manager Environmental Management (August 1992 to July 1998)

Waikato Regional Council  
Senior Planner (January 1990 to August 1992)

Department of Conservation  
Senior Conservation Officer (April 1987 to January 1990)

Ministry of Works and Development  
Assistant Engineer and Economic Analyst (December 1983 to March 1987)

### Experience

#### Hearings Commissioner

Rob has acted as Independent Commissioner in 135 Hearings and has served as Chairperson for 71 of them.

Rob has completed the following Ministry for the Environment commissioner training courses:

- Making Good Decisions (excellent grade) in 2005
- Making Good Decisions Refresher Course in 2006
- Making Good Decisions Chairpersons course in 2008

Councils for whom Rob has acted are:

- Auckland Regional Council
- Environment Waikato
- Environment Bay of Plenty
- Horizons Regional Council
- Horowhenua District Council
- Masterton District Council
- Northland Regional Council
- Palmerston North City Council
- Rangitikei District Council
- Ruapehu District Council
- Taranaki Regional Council
- Taupo District Council
- Waitakere City Council
- Wanganui District Council
- Whakatane District Council

Consent activities covered in the hearings include industrial discharges to land, water and air; surface water and groundwater takes; sewerage discharges to land and water; dairy discharges, piggery discharges, harbour and lagoon dredging, forestry harvesting, mangrove removal; seawalls; flood control works; wharves, reclamations, wetland and land drainage works; stream diversions, rat poison drops; crematorium discharges to air; landfills; clean fills; timber treatment plants; apartment buildings; heritage building alterations and demolition; airport runway expansions, arterial roads.

Rob has also acted as a commissioner on hearings for regional plans, notices of requirement, and private district plan changes.

### **Policy Analysis and Planning**

Rob specialises in regional council policy analysis and planning matters and has appeared before the Environment Court in an expert planning witness capacity for Horizons Regional Council and Environment Waikato.

### **Management and Review**

Rob has undertaken corporate and management reviews for a range of councils and private sector companies. The types of reviews undertaken include:

- Building Act Manual compilation and drafting
- Civil Defence and Emergency Management functions
- Council compliance management
- Council consents management
- Council funding policies
- Council iwi liaison procedures

- Council performance indicators
- Council section 36 charge regimes
- Council staff overheads
- Resource consent process disputes
- Tender evaluation process disputes
- Transfers of powers

#### Resource Consents

Rob is proficient in all aspects of the resource consents process, having acted as both a reporting officer for councils (section 42A reporting) and as a planning consultant for applicants. The types of applications which Rob has dealt with include:

- Aerial spraying;
- Coolstore packhouse;
- Dairy farm effluent discharges;
- Groundwater takes;
- Hot mix asphalt plant discharges to air.
- Industrial discharges to land and air;
- Landfills;
- Municipal sewage discharges to land and water;
- Sludge disposal to land;
- Surface water takes;



## Maximize Consultancy



Maximize Consultancy Limited has a focus on maximising opportunity, creating value and building relationships in Māori organisations and in the ability of Corporate and Government organisations to work productively with Māori. Its Chief Executive Officer, Steven Wilson, has extensive experience across a wide range of fields. Steven has a Bachelor of Sciences and is also finalising a dissertation on Governance

Models in Māori organisations to complete a Masters in Business Administration from the University of Waikato. Steven has experience in a national management role, his own business, and sales and marketing and is well used to applying current business thinking and theory to market place realities.

Recently these transferable skills have been applied in Māori organisations to support them in achieving innovative, sustainable results, and as part of the Senior Management Team of a non-Māori NGO. Steven is also skilled at working with Corporate and Government organisations so they can form positive relationships with Māori. Fluency in Māori and English serve well in facilitation and dispute resolution roles. Project planning, project management, strategic planning, critical analytical thinking and successful applications for funding are other areas of strength.

Attendees at different wānanga that Steven facilitated noted that he was "very sensitive to the communication needs of the people whilst enabling all information to be imparted within the tight timeframes," and that he "set the scene holistically which lay a foundation for enlightening and productive hui; diplomatic and efficient; clarified issues in both English and Māori." Still another noted that it was "the most relaxed, comfortable and confident I have ever felt in any Māori training sessions anywhere" "Feedback received from participants indicated that they had a better understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and learned a great deal from the session. They also highlighted that Steven was an excellent facilitator who was coherent, confident and provided an excellent style of delivery." (Te Putara, Oct 2009, [http://www.ermanz.govt.nz/resources/periodicals.html#Te\\_Putara](http://www.ermanz.govt.nz/resources/periodicals.html#Te_Putara))

Steven has been involved in the successful development, teaching and roll out of reo, tikanga and Treaty of Waitangi programmes for a Crown Entity.

Steven was the inaugural chair of the Ngāti Tura Te Ngākau Hapū Trust in Te Arawa and has been chair of Parawai Marae. He is also the inaugural Treasurer of the Ngāti Korokī Kahukura Trust in Waikato/Raukawa and the former secretary of Pōhara Marae. He is currently undertaking projects for his marae and hapū.

For any enquiries please email [enquiries@maximize.co.nz](mailto:enquiries@maximize.co.nz) or phone +64 (21) 476645.

*Maximising opportunity  
Creating value  
Building relationships*

**Attachment B**

**Schedule of Commissioners dated September 2013**

Steve Abley	Tim Kelly
Mark Apeldoorn	Mick Lester
Doug Arcus	Joanne Lewis
Simon Berry	Leigh McGregor
Harry Bhana	Burnette O'Connor
Alan Bickers	Pamela Peters
Frank Boffa	Karen Price
Terry Broad	Graeme Ridley
Terry Brown	Paul Rogers
Greg Carlyon	Kathleen Ryan
John Childs	Craig Shearer
Paul Cooney	William (Bill) Smith
Peter Crawford	Darrell Statham
Russell De Luca	Conway Stewart
Alan Dormer	Dorothy Wakeling
Mark Farnsworth	Bill Wasley
David Hill	Alan Watson
Greg Hill	David Wren
Wyn Hoadley*	

## 4 Public Excluded

---

### Resolution to Exclude the Public

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

### Recommendations

That the public:

1. Be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting namely:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Business</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Public Excluded LTP Deliberations - Mercury Bay utility easement</b>

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 (1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<i>General Subject of Each Matter to be Considered</i>	<i>Reason for Passing this Resolution</i>	<i>Ground(s) Under Section 48(1) for the Passing of the Resolution</i>
LTP deliberations - Mercury Bay utility easement	(7)(2)(i) – Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).	LTP deliberations - Mercury Bay utility easement