

Extra-ordinary Whangarei District Council

Notice of Meeting

A extra-ordinary meeting of the Whangarei District Council will be held in the Council Chamber, Forum North, Whangarei on:

**Tuesday
9 June 2015
9.00am**

Committee

Her Worship the Mayor (Chairperson)
Cr S J Bell
Cr S J Bretherton
Cr C B Christie
Cr P A Cutforth
Cr S J Deeming
Cr S M Glen
Cr P R Halse
Cr C M Hermon
Cr G C Innes
Cr G M Martin
Cr B L McLachlan
Cr S L Morgan
Cr J D T Williamson

OPEN MEETING

APOLOGIES

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Members are reminded to indicate any items in which they might have a conflict of interest.

INDEX

Item No	Page No
1. Draft Revenue and Financing Policy Deliberations	1
2. 2015-2018 Development Contributions Policy Deliberations.....	2
3. 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Deliberations	4
4. 2015-2016 Fees and Charges Deliberations	54
5. Old Harbour Board Referendum 2015	56

PUBLIC EXCLUDED BUSINESS

Item No	Page No
C.1 Property Matter	1

Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2012

Full consideration has been given to the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2012 in relation to decision making and in particular the current and future needs of communities for good quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost effective for households and businesses. Consideration has also been given to social, economic and cultural interests and the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment in taking a sustainable development approach.

**Recommendations contained in the Council agenda may not be final Council decisions.
Please refer to Council minutes for resolutions.**

1. Draft Revenue and Financing Policy Deliberations

Reporting officer Alan Adcock (Group Manager Support Services)

Date of meeting 9 June 2015

Vision, mission and values

This item is in accord with Council's vision, mission and values statement.

Introduction

Whangarei District Council's Statement of Proposal on the Draft Revenue and Financing Policy was adopted on 19 March 2015 and submissions opened on 24 March 2015 in accordance with the requirements of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) of the Local Government Act 2002. Submissions closed on 24 April 2015.

While no written submissions were received one submitter raised funding sources in the Policy while being heard on their submission to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Consultation Document.

Significance

The adoption of a Revenue and Financing Policy does not trigger any of the significance criteria. While there is potential for the public interest criteria to be triggered Council anticipates this to be minor. Therefore the Revenue and Financing Policy on an individual basis is not considered to be significant.

Engagement

The Revenue and Financing Policy is subject to the special consultative procedure and was consulted on concurrently with the Consultation Document for the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Submissions Received

While no written submissions were received on the Draft Revenue and Financing Policy, and there are therefore no written submissions upon which to base deliberations, one submitter to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Consultation Document did make general comments on the funding sources under the Policy while being heard on their submission to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Consultation Document.

It is recommended that staff consider these in finalising the policy for adoption on 24 June 2015.

Recommendation

1. That the information be received.
2. That the matter raised be considered in finalising the Revenue and Financing Policy.

2. 2015-2018 Development Contributions Policy Deliberations

Reporting officer Paul Dell (Group Manager District Living)

Date of meeting 9 June 2015

Vision, mission and values

This item is in accord with Council's vision, mission and values statement.

Introduction

Whangarei District Council's Consultation Document and supporting documents to the 2015- 2018 Development Contributions Policy (DCP) were adopted on 19 March 2015 and opened for submissions on 24 March 2015 in accordance with the requirements of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) of the Local Government Act 2002. Submissions closed on 24 April 2015.

There were two submissions on the DCP neither wished to speak.

The public have had the opportunity to present their views with an option to speak and elaborate on their submissions. It is now for Council to consider and respond to the submissions received to enable the completion of the final DCP document for and adoption.

Significance

Decisions from deliberations will flow through to the DCP which is scheduled to be presented to Council for adoption on 24 June 2015. These decisions are part of Council's financial planning processes and are considered to be at the lower end of the significance scale. This remains the case.

Engagement

Options considered in the development of the DCP and the potential impact of those options were outlined in the statement of proposal. The public were subsequently engaged through the special consultative procedure and the results of that engagement, along with staff analysis and recommendations, are now being presented to Council for consideration.

Process

Submitters have had the opportunity to speak to their submissions at a public hearing. These hearings were notified as part of the submissions process. All submitters received a letter or email of acknowledgement and those who indicated they wished to speak to their submission were contacted again to confirm their hearing time and date.

All submissions have been summarised and grouped in this Agenda.

The process from here is as follows:

- Council is now being asked to consider the submissions and any information provided at hearings, and to deliberate on the submissions.
- The final Development Contributions Policy will incorporate the decisions of Council and is scheduled to be presented to Council for adoption at its June meeting.

Following adoption submitters will be advised of the decisions made and the 2015-2018 Development Contributions Policy will be made publically available.

Submissions Received

Submitter	Comment
1. Fred Morgan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is not able to show the full methodology transparently because it relies on a computer based model – the outputs of this are not sufficient for transparency, accountability and consultation • Council fails to take into account the payments that the growth community (those having paid development contributions) will make as ratepayers
2. Patuharakeke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patuharakeke should not be subject to any development or financial contributions

Discussion

Submission 1

An overview of the methodology is described within the DCP and a more detailed methodology is available on request and the computer model is available for viewing at Council Offices. This is considered to satisfy the requirements of the relevant legislation.

Within the methodology there is a discount applied to all charges which recognises that when a developer becomes a rate payer they will have to pay rates. A portion of the future ratepayer contribution is discounted from the development contribution charge.

Submission 2

Development contributions are essentially a ‘user pays’ charge, that are applied proportionately to all developments that create demand on Councils services and create the need for additional assets/infrastructure.

Any charges that are not paid by a group would need to be funded by the general ratepayer.

Recommendation

1. That the information be received and the comments noted.
2. That changes, required as a result of deliberations and changes to the 2015- 2025 LTP capital expenditure list, are included in the final DCP.
3. That any amendments where appropriate, be incorporated into the 2015-2018 Development Contributions Policy which will be presented to Council for adoption prior to the 1st July 2015.

3. 2015-2025 Long Term Plan Deliberations

Reporting officer Alan Adcock (Group Manager Support Services)

Date of meeting 9 June 2015

Vision, mission and values

This item is in accord with Council's vision, mission and values statement.

Introduction

Whangarei District Council's Consultation Document and supporting documents to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan (LTP) were adopted on 19 March 2015 and opened for submissions on 24 March 2015 in accordance with the requirements of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) of the Local Government Act 2002. Submissions closed on 24 April 2015.

The public have had the opportunity to present their views with an option to speak and elaborate on their submissions. It is now for Council to consider the submissions received to enable the completion of the final LTP document for audit and adoption.

Significance

Decisions from deliberations will flow through to the LTP which is scheduled to be presented to Council for adoption on 24 June 2015. These decisions are part of Council's financial planning processes. While the decisions mark a change in approach, and funding, this is centred around maintaining existing assets and levels of service. Options considered in the development of the LTP, and the potential impact of those options, were outlined in the Consultation Document. The level of public interest through consultation was comparable to previous LTP processes.

In developing the Infrastructure Strategy projects to be included were considered to be at the lower end of the significance scale by Infrastructure and Services. While no one project or decision was considered to trigger significance at the time of writing the Whau Valley water treatment plan was identified as having the potential to trigger significance in future should public interest change. This remains the case.

Engagement

An engagement plan was outlined in the Agenda for adoption of the Consultation Document. The public were subsequently engaged through the special consultative procedure and the results of that engagement, along with staff analysis and recommendations, are now being presented to Council for Consideration.

Process

Submitters have had the opportunity to speak to their submissions at a public hearing. These hearings were notified as part of the submissions process. All submitters received a letter or email of acknowledgement and those who indicated they wished to speak to their submission were contacted again to confirm their hearing time and date.

All submissions have been summarised and grouped in a Deliberations Report according to the key issues outlined on the submission form and Council's various activity areas. Workshops were held on 20th, 26th and 27th of May, and on the morning of 28th May. Staff recommendations have now been included in the Deliberations Report to assist Council in its decision making.

The process from here is as follows:

- Council is now being asked to consider the submissions and any information provided at hearings, and to deliberate on the submissions.
- The final Long Term Plan will incorporate the decisions of Council and is scheduled to be presented to Council for adoption on 24 June 2015.

Following adoption submitters will be advised of the decisions made and the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan will be made publically available.

Recommendation

1. That the information be received.
2. That recommendations in the attached Deliberations Report, after any amendments and where appropriate, be incorporated into the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.
3. That the Acting Chief Executive Officer directs staff to review operating and capital budgets based on the outcomes of the deliberations process as well as any changes to Council's financial position and that these changes are incorporated into the final 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for the adoption meeting.

Attachment

[Deliberations Report](#)

Deliberations Report

LTP 2015-2025 Consultation Document

Table of Contents

1. Submissions relating to key issues	5
Key issue - maintaining our assets.....	5
Key issue - maintaining levels of service	7
Key issue – managing the impacts of growth	9
Key issue – impact on rates	11
Capital Works Programme	13
2. Submissions relating to Infrastructure Services	15
Transportation.....	15
Car Parking	15
Footpaths.....	15
Footpath on Kiteone Rd, Whangarei Heads.....	16
Footpath Extension on Russell Road	16
Seal Extensions.....	16
Street and Amenity Lighting	17
Transportation - General	18
Tutukaka Trailer Carpark	20
Parks & Recreation	20
Cemeteries.....	20
Coastal Protection – Climate Change.....	21
Coastal Protection – Onerahi Foreshore	21
Coastal and Harbour Protection and Structures	22
Dog Exercise Facilities	22
Indoor Sports Stadium.....	23
Langs Beach Access.....	23
Parihaka Mountain Bike facilities	23
Parks and Recreation – General	24
Playgrounds	25
Public Toilets.....	26
Sense of place.....	26
Sports Facilities.....	27
Walk/Cycle - General	28
Flood Protection	29
Hikurangi Swamp.....	29
Solid Waste	29
Solid Waste - General	29
Stormwater	30
Stormwater - General	30
Wastewater.....	30

Wastewater - General	30
Water	30
Fluoridation	30
Poroti Springs.....	31
Water - General	31
Whau Valley Water Treatment Plant	31
3. Submissions relating to District Living.....	32
Funding Requests – Annual Operating Fund	32
Friends of Matakohe Limestone Island	33
Hihiaua Cultural Centre Trust	33
Kamo Sports Charitable Trust.....	33
Ruakaka Recreation Centre	34
Ruatangata Hall and Community Association	34
Springfield Community Swim Club.....	34
Sport Northland	35
Waipu Walk/Cycleway.....	35
Waipu Museum	36
Whangarei Quarry Gardens Trust	36
Whangaruru Coastal Community & Sports Association	36
Policy, Monitoring & Regulation	37
Genetic Engineering.....	37
Policy, Monitoring & Regulation - General	37
Community Services.....	38
Youth	38
4. Submissions relating to Positive Growth	39
116 Bank Street – Company of Giants.....	39
Airport	39
Commercial Property - General.....	40
Commercial Property – Tertiary Education Hub	40
Community Property.....	40
Economic Development in the CBD	41
Economic Growth - General	41
Northland Inc.....	42
Old Harbour Board Building	42
Partnerships with Maori	43
Pensioner Housing	43
Venues & Events - General	44
5. Submissions relating to Support Services	45
Council Premises.....	45
Debt	45



Emergency Management and Civil Defence	46
Forecast Financial Statements	47
Governance - General	47
Rates - Commercial.....	47
Rates - Rural.....	48

1. Submissions relating to key issues

The Consultation Document outlined four key issues:

- Maintaining our assets
- Maintaining levels of service
- Managing the impacts of growth
- The impact on rates

In addition to these, Council's submission form asked for feedback on the capital works programme. This section of the document analyses responses from the community on these issues. Comments made have been categorised into key messages and are accompanied by response numbers and percentages.

Key issue - maintaining our assets

Issue: In the Consultation Document we explain that Council's assets are ageing, and Council believes it is prudent to consolidate and focus spending on renewing and maintaining these assets to ensure they continue to cater for the current and future needs of the community.		
Key messages from submissions:	Number of responses	Percentage of total
Consolidate and focus spending on renewing and maintaining current assets so that they remain viable.	49	52%
Consolidate and focus spending on renewing and maintaining current assets so that they remain viable but do not increase debt.	2	2%
Consolidate and focus spending on renewing and maintaining current assets so that they remain viable. No new assets unless they are core infrastructure.	6	6%
Focus on maintaining current assets so that they remain viable, and budget for more assets that improve the District.	2	2%
Focus spending on maintaining basic necessities only (roading, water, waste).	13	14%
Focus spending on maintaining basic necessities only (roading, water, waste) until debt has been repaid.	1	1%
Find a balance between maintaining assets and increasing rates.	3	3%
Reduce debt rather than maintain assets.	1	1%
Sell unnecessary assets and maintain only basic necessities.	3	3%
General comments (outlined below).	15	16%
Total Comments	95	100%
General comments and issues raised:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pensioner housing needs to be maintained better and not outsourced. • Rural roads need attention. • Maintain rural roads, and control weeds to improve visibility on corners. • Maintain and review assets within the current budget. • The Captain Bougainville Theatre needs an upgrade. 		

- Suggest regular asset audit to track annual depreciation of Council assets and initiate an infrastructure fund to respond to key challenges.
- After all these years of administration most renewals should have already been built into budgets.
- Support regular asset audit to track annual depreciation of Council assets.
- \$800k for water chemicals seems excessive.
- Poor maintenance and overspending is mismanagement.
- Council should have been setting aside a percentage of the rates money into a special maintenance fund.
- Why does Council spend \$1.6m on managing gas emissions at Pohe Island?
- \$500k for graffiti removal is a huge cost burden and is a symptom of youth feeling disconnected from the city's built environment.
- Minimal maintenance of assets unless improvement reduces cover over the long term, e.g. sealing some roads.

Staff analysis:

Most submitters who commented on this key issue agree with Council's proposal to place emphasis on maintaining current assets. A small number of these submitters would like to see the focus limited to core assets only, not building new assets unless they are core infrastructure, and keeping debt as low as possible (i.e. not using debt to fund asset renewals).

The proposed programme acknowledges that many renewals have been deferred over a number of years due to funding constraints. Expenditure programmes within the draft Plan are therefore based on the renewal requirements of assets as assessed through condition surveys and asset management practices and plans. The focus on renewals is evident in the Consultation Documents proposal for 79% of capital expenditure being committed to core infrastructure and an average ratio of renewal expenditure to depreciation of 82% per year.

Should Council wish to alter this strategy, a review of the assets to receive funding will need to be carried out and capital and operating budgets adjusted accordingly. This could have an impact on the levels of service Council could deliver as a result of budgetary changes.

Council's policy is to provide for renewals out of current expenditure and therefore does not hold a reserve for maintenance funds. The depreciation expense of assets is audited on an annual basis by Audit New Zealand as part of the Annual Report process, and depreciation rates (useful lives of assets) are examined on an ongoing basis.

Council's Procurement Policy and operational practices ensure that costs are maintained at the best price available to ensure that the cost of items such as chemicals for water treatment are reasonable.

Graffiti removal is an activity that staff acknowledges comes at a cost. Council could choose not to manage this issue and would have to consider any negative impacts.

Council is required to manage gas emissions at Pohe Island under the Resource Management Act. Consultants have however reviewed the management of gas and budgets have been adjusted to reflect the most recent advice.

A number of general comments accompanying feedback on this issue relate to specific assets which are covered in more detail throughout this report.

Staff recommendation:

1. That the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan focus on the renewal and maintenance of Council assets as outlined under option 1 in the Consultation Document.
2. That Council notes the other submissions, and with the exception of those issues addressed elsewhere in this report, that no change be made.

Key issue - maintaining levels of service

<p>Issue: In the Consultation Document we explain that in order to maintain levels of service at current levels Council would need to increase revenue through rates. Submitters were asked which option they prefer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase rates to cover the ongoing costs of maintaining levels of service at current levels; or • Reduce levels of service and keep rates increases as low as possible. 		
Key messages from submissions:	Number of responses	Percentage of total
Maintain services at current levels	35	44%
Maintain services at current levels and improve if possible.	3	4%
Maintain services at current levels but don't borrow to do it.	1	1%
Maintain services at current level, but more user pays required, e.g. sportsfields.	1	1%
Maintain at current levels without rates increases higher than inflation.	2	3%
Maintain only essential services at current levels.	11	14%
Preference for reductions in service levels and lower rates increase.	2	3%
General comments (outlined below)	25	31%
Total Comments	80	100%
<p>General comments and issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is haphazard at times and not cost effective. • Council appears to be top heavy with staff who don't know what they're doing, predominantly engineers. • Overspending is mismanagement. • Planting flowers at roundabouts is unnecessary, plant easy care plants. • Well done to Council for getting the water and sewerage issues under control. Lots of good work done with bridges, walkways, dog exercise areas. • Council needs to audit spending as savings could be made. • More checks are needed on contractors. • Service levels can be maintained by doing things more efficiently. Consultants are being hired to do things staff are being paid to do. • Ensure regular maintenance programmes for community facilities. • Spend only what Council can afford and no more. • Live within the budget. Look for savings by having an independent review. • No reduction in service levels in the libraries. Current hours barely meet the needs of working people. • By increasing transfer station costs Council has caused dumping issues. • Service levels are not high so maintaining them should cost no more than they currently do. • Keep heavy trucks off our roads and get the rail back. • Remember good old common sense when applying those 18 mandatory performance measures. • Services to roads and drains need to be maintained and improved. 		

- We have already lost a level of service with reduced transfer station hours. Do not believe that if rates go up reduced levels of service will be restored.
- Maintaining levels of service can be achieved without rates increases beyond inflation by using common sense.
- Reduce debt and operating costs to maintain core levels of service.
- Some areas such as pensioner/emergency housing, roads, flood control, the library bus require additional attention.
- Council needs to improve the way it delivers its services.
- Support maintaining and improving assets and levels of service.
- It is unclear as to why greater than inflation funding is needed.
- Users should pay.

Staff analysis:

The majority of submitters who commented on this issue support Council's proposal to maintain levels of service as they are at present for all activities across both core and community services. A number of submitters believe that only essential services should be maintained at current levels and they encourage Council to continue to live within budgets.

Expenditure programmes proposed in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document are based on maintaining current levels of service. Council's ability to do this depends upon the amount of funding applied to maintaining assets, with any reduction in renewals potentially causing a reduction in some levels of service. Any change to the proposal to maintain levels of service would require a review of budgets along with service level targets and self-imposed limits.

Council's planning processes are a statutory requirement and must be resourced at an appropriate level to ensure compliance. Council tries to ensure that these processes are as efficient as possible. From time to time staff engage the services of contractors where expertise or resourcing is not available in-house. This is done through the Procurement Policy and processes to achieve value for money. Council will continue to review contractor management processes to ensure they are efficient.

In 2011 Council underwent a full operational review and staff numbers were reduced as a result. While we continue to review efficiencies we believe that Council is currently running lean.

The 18 new mandatory performance measures are a statutory requirement. How we measure and report them is not discretionary. However, the targets we choose to set are discretionary, and are based on targets required to meet with current service levels.

The recent trial on reducing rural transfer station opening hours has almost completed, and staff are preparing further recommendations to Council on a suitable way forward.

Other general comments relate to specific activities and have been addressed elsewhere in this report.

Staff recommendation

1. That the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan commits to raising rates to cover the ongoing costs of maintaining levels of services as proposed under option 1 in the Consultation Document.
2. That Council notes other submissions, and with the exception of those issues addressed elsewhere in this report, that no change be made.

Key issue – managing the impacts of growth

<p>Issue: In the Consultation Document we explain that continuing growth in the District places financial demands on Council to provide new, or upgrade existing, public infrastructure. Submitters were asked if Council should continue to allow for growth and provide the necessary capacity in our networks, and if so should it be funded by debt, rates or something else?</p>		
Key messages from submissions:	Number of responses	Percentage of total
Allow for and fund growth, ensuring necessary capacity in our networks.	31	44%
Allow for and fund growth, ensuring necessary capacity in our networks without increasing rates beyond inflation.	1	1%
Allow for and fund growth, ensuring necessary capacity in our networks, funded by debt if necessary.	5	7%
Do not fund projects to cater for growth at all.	1	1%
Growth should be funded entirely by the private sector and increase in ratepayers.	7	10%
General comments (outlined below)	25	36%
Total Comments	70	100%
<p>General comments and issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is converting assets to liabilities and raising rates which drives out tenants. • If it means more projects like the Chinese bridge then 'no' until we have more employment and higher wages. • We need new housing estates and better control on quality of works, buildings, services, access streets etc. • Overspending is mismanagement. • Make rates affordable in the CBD and stop allowing new shops being built in Tikipunga. Poor hotels/motels charging Auckland prices don't attract tourists. • Visionary town planners will benefit Whangarei greatly. Make it a pleasant city for pedestrians. • Increase investment in internet infrastructure to encourage business investment. • Better internet and mobile coverage in rural areas will give ratepayers the option to work from home. • Roding infrastructure appears to be fragile. • Increased tourist numbers increase costs for ratepayers. • Upgrade state highways and develop an international airport at Kaikohe. • Cut all new borrowing. • We do not need a new airport. • Focus on paying down debt. • Provide for and actively encourage growth. Attract business and young people. Attract businesses that can't afford to be in Auckland. Cultural facilities make us more attractive. • Unless State Highway 1 is improved dramatically and passenger rail implemented our infrastructure cannot cope with extra tourists or businesses. • Whangarei Heads should have a separate sewerage system as continued growth will continue to overload the city system. 		

- Develop the Port Rd area and encourage increased growth in the marine industry. Encourage foreign income rather than asset sales.
- If there is no income from growth through more jobs and more rates then we all have to wait longer for things other than essential capital works.
- Plan does not appear to support identified development nodes with capital projects.
- A prudent approach and realignment of planning and policy departments are required. Core Council business is to take priority - live within our means.
- Ruakaka has the largest growth rate and needs more consideration when funding is being allocated.
- Fully support Sustainable Futures Growth Strategy to make District attractive place to live, work and play.
- Our city is growing and more people are experiencing the wonderful area we live in.
- Managing growth is of huge importance to Ruakaka. There is a need for many new facilities in the area.
- Charge families who produce kids.

Staff analysis:

The majority of submitters who commented on this issue support Council's proposal to continue to allow for growth and provide the necessary capacity in our networks. five submitters suggested that debt could be used to fund this capacity if necessary. A small number disagree and would prefer that growth not be funded at all, or that the cost of growth be covered entirely by the private sector and any increase in ratepayers.

Council often needs to build the capacity that will be needed as a result of growth into its infrastructure before the growth actually occurs in order to future proof assets. Development Contribution charges are designed to recoup some of the cost of growth from developers.

The Consultation Document proposes approximately \$22 million of growth projects funded through Development Contributions with the remainder funded out of operating revenue (i.e. rates and subsidies) and in some cases debt. The proposed Financial Strategy aims to maintain debt close to current levels and as such the draft Plan aims to limit funding growth projects using this mechanism.

When forecasting budgets staff have considered the impact of an estimated 1% population growth per annum over the next 10 years, and an estimated increase in ratepayers of 1% per year.

Altering the proposed funding ratio for growth projects would require a further review of the draft Development Contributions Policy, adjustment of operating and capital budgets and consideration of the areas in which connections to core infrastructure such as water and waste reticulation networks may need to be limited.

Growth planning aligns with the 30/50 Sustainable Futures Strategy, and various economic development and financial strategies, which aim to provide for the effects of growth through the provision of infrastructure where it is likely to be needed and encourage new business and tourism.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council continues to plan for growth capacity as proposed in option 1 in the Consultation Document.
2. That Council notes other submissions, and with the exception of those issues addressed elsewhere in this report, that no change be made.

Key issue – impact on rates

<p>Issue: In the Consultation Document we propose a step change in rates increases because the current position is not sustainable if we are to maintain current levels of service and look after our assets properly. The preferred option is an overall increase of approximately 9% for the majority of ratepayers.</p> <p>Alternative options outlined were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise affordability over service levels by limiting rates rises to inflation; and • Smaller rates increases with some reductions in the range or quality of service. 		
Key messages from submissions:	Number of responses	Percentage of total
Support the proposed 9% increase.	32	28%
Oppose the proposed 9% increase.	21	19%
Prioritise affordability over service levels by limiting rates rises to inflation.	30	27%
Smaller rates increase with some reductions in the range or quality of services.	5	4%
No increases at all.	8	7%
General comments (outlined below)	17	15%
Total Comments	113	100
<p>General comments and issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residents should be contributing to the cost of running the District, not just ratepayers. • The current rates remission and postponement policy affects the viability of the submitters business. • To keep rates down and the district affordable avoid consultancy firms, take more notice of the community and there will be less call for commissioners at hearings. Employ local experts rather than 'out of towners'. • Rates increases are inevitable, Consider reducing the increase amount by focusing on core infrastructure. There doesn't appear to be any reason why rural rates should increase by the same amount that urban rates do as they do not receive all the core services. • Living beyond our means is no way to achieve the ultimate living environment. • Consider a 10% reduction in rates next year and a 2% per annum reduction after that because services and asset conditions are inadequate. • Any increase in rates should be clearly tagged to indicate what service improvement it will provide, and a statement as to why the increase could not be provided through user charges or offset by grants/subsidies. Decouple rates from a property's value and focus more on a "user pays" system. A rates increase is inevitable but the existing mix of rates burden between commercial and residential properties is neither fair nor equitable. • Support rates increase if it is used for better cycling infrastructure. • Rates need to change in order to support asset management but please ensure elderly are not compromised. • Accept that rates need to go up but would prefer gradual rather than big jump every 4-5 years. • Support for a 2% rates increase and only if it can be verified that core council assets such as footpaths can be fixed. • Consideration of remission/postponement of rates on multiple owned Maori freehold land including where there is no occupant or person gaining economic benefit from the land and where there are 		

accessibility issues.

- Positive to see WDC has identified managing debt as a significant aim however many Whangarei families would find the increase in rates difficult to manage.
- Ratepayers pay too much already. Why do farmers pay for town projects? Rates will go up by over 100% in less than 5 years and services have reduced in the rural areas. Ratepayers spray for weeds, clean out drains, allow Council contractors access to their land for road maintenance and water draw off, school buses turn around on our land, stormwater is run off through culverts under our farm which we maintain.
- Bear in mind that many incomes are not increasing. Struggling people may lose their homes.
- The Retirement Villages Association believes that the rates rebate should be extended to eligible retirement home residents.

Staff analysis:

Comments on this issue were varied, with 28% supporting the proposed rates increase, 19% opposing it and 27% favouring affordability over service levels by returning to an annual inflationary increase only.

The proposed Plan is based on an increase in rates for all sectors exceeding inflation, and Council consulted on the proposal on the basis that it provides a prudent and sustainable approach to maintaining service levels. Service levels are clearly outlined in supporting material for the Consultation Document.

If Council chooses to proceed with an alternate option operating and capital budgets would need to be reviewed to absorb the effects of reduced asset renewal programmes and any impacts on levels of service.

Equity between ratepayers and residents is achieved through user-pays mechanisms and ratepayers passing on costs to tenants, both residential and commercial/industrial.

Council has a number of remission and postponement policies which enable Council to grant a remission of part or all of a ratepayer's rates, subject to certain criteria being met. Council may choose to review and/or add to these policies. This could include additional policies such as remissions covering retirement homes should Council choose to look at this.

Council reviewed sector allocations for rates in 2012. While sector allocations were looked at again by Council in the development of the supporting documents to the Consultation Document, no changes were made. If Council wishes to pursue a review of sector allocations this could be achieved as part of a broader rating policies review. Staff acknowledge that while some rural ratepayers may not use facilities in the city, others do, and the challenge for Council is achieving a balance that is affordable for all ratepayers.

Central government's Rates Rebate scheme remains actively facilitated by Council to encourage those who qualify to apply and have a portion of their rates charge paid for them. An important function of Council's rating activity involved working with those who are struggling to pay their rates to work through options and payment plans.

Council's Procurement Policy is designed to keep costs reasonable and where possible use local services and products. From time to time staff engage the services of contractors where expertise or resourcing is not available in-house. This is done through the Procurement Policy and Processes to achieve value for money. Council will continue to review contractor management processes to ensure they are efficient.

Council acknowledges comments regarding rating policies and associated systems.

Staff recommendation:

1. That rates are increased as outlined in option 1 in the Consultation Document.
2. That Council commits to a review of rating policies, including any relevant Rates Remission and Postponement Policies, in the 2015-2016 financial year.
3. That Council notes other submissions, and with the exception of those issues addressed elsewhere in this report, that no change be made.

Capital Works Programme

Issue: While the capital works programme was not described as a “key issue” in the Consultation Document, we chose to prompt submitters (through the submission form) to comment on our proposed programme. As with the key issues, we have categorised the comments relating to that prompt into key messages and have provided response numbers and percentages.

Key messages from submissions:	Number of responses	Percentage of total
Supports the proposed capital programme.	20	26%
Supports the proposed capital programme but only if no additional debt incurred.	3	4%
Supports the use of debt for capital works with marginal rates increases to cover the finance cost.	1	1%
Supports only essential capital expenditure and those items that do not increase debt.	2	3%
Supports only essential capital expenditure.	7	9%
Disagree with some elements of the capital works programme.	15	19%
Do not support the proposed capital works programme. The capital programme is unaffordable.	11	14%
General comments (outlined below)	19	24%
Total Comments	78	100%

General comments and issues raised:

- Congratulations on expertise, smart thinking and negotiations. Collective strength aimed at the common good.
- Support work on infrastructure, waste water and sealing of roads to provide access to the regions countryside.
- Delete development of the Harbourside Building. The Town Basin has enough art galleries and cafés for now.
- Council should stick to prudent financial management of finances and services and forget about these flashy projects.
- Whangarei needs a large hotel and conference centre and a new theatre but Council can't afford it. Please encourage outside investment.
- I would like to know which components of the proposed capital works programme is for improvements and which are for maintenance and renewal. The budget should be split for each item.
- What does sense of place mean? There is a lot of money in this bucket and it needs to be better understood.
- Vehicle traffic will have to tolerate a city with no rates increase. Hikurangi people will have to tolerate a flood, they bought there. Most arguments against Whau Valley water treatment are illogical.
- Don't support theatre/conference centre. We already have Toll Stadium available & Forum North. Scale back spending on sports fields, perhaps implement a user pays system to finance this.
- Process for setting capital works programme should be changed to seek more community involvement.
- Whatever happened to Toll Stadium as a venue?
- Any asset with a lifespan should have had money set aside for a major part of the replacement.

- The capital works programme must be reviewed but does not offer any further detail.
- There is no clarity on the sense of place budget and more funding for sports fields and facilities. Where is the budget is for the arts and cultural sectors of the community.
- Prioritise capex on key infrastructure vital to business growth.
- Council needs to look carefully at capex by working smarter and understand the return on investment of current employees. New premises, new vehicles and new systems need more public information before being considered. \$12 million on a new theatre without increased capacities of the airport, public transport system and accommodation would not be viable.
- Costs for books, Parks and Recreation projects and welcome signs to the city are crazy. Don't for a moment think more about replacing the Council fleet.
- The amount of money being attributed to proposed capital works seems very high. More economical pricing should be possible.
- Proposed expenditure on library books seems excessive.

Staff analysis:

26% of submitters who commented on the capital works programme support the current proposal, with 19% disagreeing with some elements. A further 14% believe the capital programme as proposed is unaffordable.

General comments were varied, with some calling for no further spending on some community infrastructure such as facilities for the arts and culture, sports, Council's vehicle fleet and Council premises.

It is important to note that 79% of the proposed capital budget focuses on core infrastructure and the remainder on community facilities such as libraries, parks and reserves, playgrounds, recreational walkways and cycleways, community halls and pensioner housing.

Council may choose to adjust the capital works programme. This will have an impact on operational budgets that would need to be worked through with staff.

Council's Financial Strategy focuses on prudent and sustainable financial management, ensuring a balanced budget and compliance with self-imposed limits in key financial areas. Limits have been in place for several years and measure financial performance in a similar manner to the new Financial Prudence Benchmarks.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that the capital works programme be adjusted as per specific recommendations elsewhere in this document.

2. Submissions relating to Infrastructure Services

This section of the document captures comments made on topics other than key issues and the capital works programme. Less feedback was provided on these topics, and as a result percentage analysis has not been carried out.

Transportation

Car Parking
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of submitters commented on car parking facilities across the District, predominantly in the CBD, calling for a multi-storey carpark and more short-term and free parking, and overnight parking spots for campervans. • One submission requests that the carpark at the Mangakahia Community Resource Centre (Waiotomoto House) at Titoki be increased in size. • A small number of submitters express their objection to parking fees at the hospital, lack of parking at the Okara shopping centre since the arrival of Kmart and the lack of funding in the capital works programme for CBD carparking renewals and maintenance. • One submission suggests implementing parking charges on Hatea Drive at \$5 per day (estimated to be additional revenue of \$72,000 per year).
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Councils parking management strategy, adopted in 2011, sets out how Council intends to manage car parking. In brief the theory is to manage occupancy rates by charges and remove time restrictions. The majority of Council's car park facilities have an average occupancy rate of less than 50% across the whole day. Council currently operates the Central City multi-storey carpark which still has significant capacity.</p> <p>The community centre at Titoki is not a Council facility and is on land owned by the Ministry of Education. Any further development of the site is outside the remit of Council.</p> <p>Parking at the hospital and the Okara Shopping Centre is privately owned and the number of parks provided is subject to District Plan rules.</p> <p>Council has introduced parking charges to the commuting car parks at the Town Basin of \$2 per day. Occupancy rates are currently 30%. It is noted that once charges were introduced a number of drivers decided to park on Hatea Drive where there is no current charge.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Footpaths
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing footpaths need to be upgraded so they are safer and suitable for those with disabilities. • Footpath on Kopipi Crescent required. • Extension of the footpath on One Tree Point Road. • New footpath required between Pehiaweri Marae and Glenbervie School/Ngunguru Rd. • A safe footpath in the vicinity of Te Maika Rd, Ngunguru is required. • Please consider the safety of children in future planning of footpaths, and prevent 'sneaky' driveways.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Requests for footpaths are included in an ongoing footpath programme, and priorities are determined by safety and need. Currently Council holds over \$7.5 million of footpath requests in the database. The LTP</p>

has \$100,000 allocated in year three of the Plan. Any new footpath requests may be added to the footpath programme for consideration by Council. Council's planning for footpaths aligns with environmental engineering standards which cover both Council assets and new/private development.

Staff recommendation:

1. That any requests for footpaths be added to the Footpath Programme and prioritised in accordance with current criteria.
2. That Council notes the other submissions and that no change be made.

Footpath on Kiteone Rd, Whangarei Heads

Issues raised from submissions:

- A petition with 62 signatures was received requesting a footpath along Kiteone Rd from Muritai Rd to the kindergarten.

Staff analysis:

Council's policy is for requests for new footpaths to be added to the database of proposed future works and assessed at the start of each financial year to determine that years programme. This request will require 450m of footpath at a cost of approximately \$200,000 which includes the cost of roadside drainage which would be required.

Staff recommendation:

1. That the request be added to the Footpath Programme and prioritised in accordance with current criteria.

Footpath Extension on Russell Road

Issues raised from submissions:

- A petition with 172 signatures was received requesting that the existing footpath on the eastern side of Russell Rd at the southern end be extended by another 100 metres around the bend. The petition also requests that new footpaths where none exist around the Quarry Gardens entrance and the one lane bridge at the north end of Russell Rd be budgeted for.

Staff analysis:

Council's policy is for requests for new footpaths to be added to the database of proposed future works and assessed at the start of each financial year to determine that years programme. This request will require 100m of footpath at a cost of approximately \$56,000 plus \$60,000 if kerb and channeling is required.

Staff recommendation:

1. That the request be added to the Footpath Programme and prioritised in accordance with current criteria.

Seal Extensions

Issues raised from submissions:

- A number of submitters request seal extensions in the following areas:
 - Ngunguru Ford Road, Ngunguru
 - Wright/McCardle Roads, Titoki
 - Tokiri and Papa Roads, Titoki
 - Old School Road, Maungakaramea
 - McAuslin Road, Sandy Bay
 - Massey Rd, Waipu
- One submission would like Council to revisit the ratepayer contributory sealing programme that was

offered to Brooks Road ratepayers in 2010.

- Unsealed logging routes are of concern to a small number of submitters, citing dust as a health issue and heavy vehicle hazards as reasonable justification for spending the money regardless of the availability of government subsidies.

Staff analysis:

Council maintains a prioritised list of requests for road sealing that depends on available funding by Council since this category has not been subsidised by NZTA for some time. Ngunguru Ford Road and Massey Road are included on this list along with approximately 100 other requests. Council has signalled a desire to review the list and re-assess priorities before making any further decisions on seal extensions.

Old School Road, Maungakamea, will be sealed during the 2015-16 financial year and is planned to be completed towards the end of the 2015 calendar year.

At the time of deliberations Council awaits an NZTA decision on 100% subsidy for the sealing of a small number of forestry routes. If this funding is available the Wright/McCardle route will be sealed. If NZTA doesn't agree to fund sealing the entire 8.7km route Council has applied for subsidy to cover 100m seal strips in front of individual house sites instead. If both requests are unsuccessful Council will need to reassess whether these projects should proceed without any subsidy component, with funding either being diverted from within the roading budget or projects being funded through debt and/or targeted rates.

The current status for the mentioned roads is:

- Ngunguru Ford Rd 2.5kms seal request at a cost of \$900,000. Included in Ratepayer Subsidised Seal Programme, currently low priority.
- Wright/McCardle Roads, Titoki 8.7km seal request. \$4.5 million requested at 100% NZTA subsidy.
- Tokiri and Papa Roads, Titoki, 2.2km seal request at a cost of \$800,000. Would be treated as a ratepayer subsidised seal, currently low priority.
- Old School Road, Maungakamea, 2.2km to be sealed at a cost of \$700,000. Currently funded for 2015/16. Ratepayer subsidised.
- McAuslin Road, Sandy Bay, 640m seal request at a cost of \$250,000. Would be treated as a ratepayer subsidised seal, currently low priority.
- Massey Road, Waipu. 3.2km at a cost of 1.28m. Included in Ratepayer Subsidised Seal Programme.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council continues to work with NZTA to encourage provision of subsidy for seal extensions.
2. That, if subsidy becomes available Council review the seal extensions programme.
3. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Street and Amenity Lighting

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters request that budget be set aside to provide new and improved street and amenity lighting, particularly in areas where crime could be reduced, for example under verandas.
- One submission supports the conversion of street lighting to LED but suggest that at the same time an audit of lighting also be carried out identifying areas that would benefit from sensor lighting. The submitter suggests that the savings from electricity could be spent on books for the library.
- One submission requests a street light in front of Korokota Marae as a high volume of visitors from various parts of the community and beyond are received there.

Staff analysis:

New amenity lights (i.e lights that are not required for traffic safety) are not a subsidised activity. General improvement in lighting standards is also not a subsidised activity.

New lights cost approximately \$1,000 each and \$4,000 if a pole is required. Council currently has 375 requests in the database for new amenity lights. No funding has been allocated in the supporting

documents to the Consultation Document.

Council is investigating changing existing lights to LED's to achieve up to 50% in power and maintenance cost savings. This is a subsidised activity and will also allow the opportunity to achieve a general improvement in lighting standards for existing lights. No funding has been allocated in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document until 2019/20 for the replacement of lights with LED.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Transportation - General

Issues raised from submissions:

- A large number of comments from submitters were received requesting the following:
 - A total ban of all heavy traffic in the CBD.
 - Improved roading and footpaths on Bank Street.
 - Resolution to morning congestion at the new Riverside/Te Matau a Pohe roundabout.
 - Straightening of Three Mile Bush Road between Gumtown Road and the northwestern end of the road.
 - An improved rail system to reduce the number of logging trucks on our roads.
 - Beautification of the northern entrance to Kamo.
 - Repainting the Walton Street rail overbridge. It is dirty and unattractive.
 - Increased focus on road maintenance at Whangarei Heads.
 - Launch more initiatives to get people out of cars and into cycling, motor cycling and walking.
 - Improved cycle lanes on key commuter routes.
 - Build a bypass to Onerahi to accommodate increased commuter and heavy traffic to and from Whangarei Heads.
 - Improved road signage at Maungatapere (does not currently include Pakotai or Nukutawhiti).
 - Safer intersections and crossings at Kensington Avenue, Tikipunga High School and all primary schools.
 - Invest more in rural roads.
 - Continue to lobby central government to make Mangakahia Road a State Highway.
 - Crossing, bus turn and student drop off zone at Parua Bay School to ensure the safety of children.
 - Repair the bridge on Cove Road in Waipu.
 - Raise flood-prone areas of Mangakahia Rd (Titoki, Whatitiri/Kokopu and Frasers Flat).
 - Lower the speed limit by the Titoki Store and Mangakahia Area School to 45kph.
 - Incorporate wider shoulders for cyclists on all roads as they are being rehabilitated.
 - Reconfiguration of Kamo Road to a more suitable urban village design with walkability focus and provide disabled carparks.
 - Convert the one lane bridge at Ruakaka South to two lanes.
 - Maintain all of Rockell Road to provide residents and visitors safe and reliable access to properties and the beach.
 - Undertake a land swap and/or realign the section of Rockell Road owned by the submitter to ensure the public road does not cross private land.
 - Implement an 80kph section on Rockell Road north of Whananaki estuary to Pareparea Beach.
 - Increased budget for dust suppression on unsealed roads.

- Explore alternate roading models such as shared-space and pedestrian refuge concept.
- Continue current transport subsidies (70+ parking scheme, Total Mobility). Provide more sheltered bus stops.

Staff analysis:

- A solution to congestion at Riverside/Te Matau a Pohe roundabout is being investigated but funding for 2014-15 has been deferred due to flood damage. No further funding has been allocated until 2019/20.
- Straightening of Three Mile Bush Road is not economical. The existing road has just been rebuilt.
- The rail bridge on Walton Street is not Council property.
- No funding for rehabilitation or resilience improvements to old slip sites at Whangarei Heads has been allocated in the LTP.
- The Cycleway strategy is intended to get people out of cars and into cycling, motor cycling and walking. \$6.5 million has been allocated over the first three years of the Plan.
- Council has carried out a lot of work recently to improve cycle lanes on key commuter routes. No further works are planned.
- Staff do not believe that a bypass to Onerahi is justified at this time, although this initiative has been investigated.
- Staff are investigating additional road signage at Maungatapere to include Pakotai and Nukutawhiti, however the Signs manual rules limit signage to significant population sites on the premise that too many signs make them unreadable.
- Intersections at Kensington Avenue will be made safer through completion of current projects on State Highway 1 and the Mill Rd/ Nixon St project. Funding is proposed in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document improve the intersection by Tikipunga High in 2019/20. Speed limits outside all schools are limited to 40 kph through the School Zone programme.
- Staff agree that additional funding for rural roads is desirable. The proposed capital works programme includes \$1 million in road metalling budget over 800km of rural roads in the District. This provides for 10mm of surface coverage per annum. If Council chooses to increase funding to the unsealed roads capital item other capital items within the Transportation activity would need to be altered. This may have subsidy income implications.
- Staff agree that Council should continue to lobby central government to make Mangakahia Road a State Highway. The NZTA Board has agreed to making Mangakahia Road a state highway in principle.
- Staff are currently working with the Parua Bay School and community to provide safe pedestrian crossings for children. School bus turnarounds are the responsibility of the Ministry of Education.
- Replacing the one lane bridges at Cove Road in Waipu and Ruakaka South with two lane bridges is not a subsidised project by NZTA as funding is only available for structurally deficient bridge replacements. Both bridges are considered to be sound, and would cost approximately \$1.3 million each to replace. Should Council choose to include these items in the capital programme funding to other activities would need to reduce.
- The cost of raising flood-prone areas on Mangakahia Road would cost approximately \$3 million and would require flood water consents. This is not a subsidisable initiative.
- Motorists are subject to a 40 kph speed limit outside the Mangakahia Area School as part of School Zone speed restrictions.
- Incorporating wider shoulders for cyclists on all roads as they are being rehabilitated could require funding from within cycleway capital project items which are currently targeted to the Urban Cycleways Strategy and Implementation Plan.
- The Kamo area is the subject of a proposed plan change, and a walkability focus would require the allocation of funding.
- Rockell Road is currently a paper road. In order for Council to take responsibility for its ongoing maintenance the land owners would need to invest their own funds in bringing it up to engineering standards before Council could consider including it in maintenance programmes. Legalisation of

this road may occur if landowners agree and there is a commitment to apportionment of legal costs. All rural roads are open speed limit (i.e. up to 100kph subject to conditions), and the onus is on the driver to drive safely. All speed limits within the District will be reviewed once Government completes a review of speed limit setting rules.

- Dust suppression has proved to be an uneconomic method of dust control. Council is considering full sealing or 100m strip seals on house frontages.
- Council roading staff ensure that new roading methods, technologies and concepts are considered and applied where practical. The design for the Cameron and James Street laneway incorporates the concept of shared space for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
- Council has no plans to discontinue the 70+ parking and Total Mobility initiatives at this time. Council provides bus shelters on NRC public transport routes only.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council continue to investigate congestion problems in the vicinity of Riverside Drive and Dave Culham Drive.
2. That Council staff continue to work with the Parua Bay School and community to determine a workable solution to safety concerns raised.
3. That funding of \$250,000 in year 6 and \$250,000 in year 7 be included in the capital works programme to support infrastructure requirements as a result of the current Kamo Plan Change.
4. That Council continues to work with NZTA on making Mangakahia Road a state highway.
5. That Council notes all other submissions and that no changes be made.

Tutukaka Trailer Carpark

Issues raised from submissions:

- Nine submitters request the urgent provision of a trailer carpark at Tutukaka in order to free up the village green and the area in front of marina shops.

Staff analysis:

A number of years ago a piece of land was identified as being suitable for conversion to a trailer carpark, and since that time Council has been unsuccessful in coming to an agreement with the owner. No alternative locations have been identified, and as a result this there was no provision for a trailer carpark at Tutukaka in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council investigate whether a land swap can be achieved.

Parks & Recreation

Cemeteries

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters would like to see land set aside for eco burials.
- The Ruakaka Residents and Ratepayers Association believes Ruakaka needs a cemetery.
- One submission wants Council to provide reasonable access from the main road to the Kioreroa Cemetery.

Staff analysis:

An eco-burial area is set aside at the Maunu Cemetery but requires additional capital funds for development of approximately \$250,000.

Provision of a cemetery in the area would require purchase of large blocks of flat land at substantial cost.

The submission is suggesting improved access to the Kioreroa Cemetery from the state highway which is maintained by NZTA. The Cemetery access is otherwise landlocked and to provide alternate access Council would need to purchase and develop adjacent land.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council staff engage with communities in the Ruakaka area to review cemetery requirements prior to the next Long Term Plan.
2. That Council notes other submissions and that no changes be made.

Coastal Protection – Climate Change

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters expressed concern regarding climate change and sea level rise, and the effect on coastal protection structures. These submitters request that the issue of climate change be addressed along with plans to mitigate seal level rises in the Long Term Plan.

Staff analysis:

Council future proofs the District through various controls within its District Planning process, which is a statutory requirement that incorporates the requirement to plan for natural hazards, including climate change. The Regional Assessment for hazards also feeds into this process. Effects on coastal protection structures would be considered through the design and consenting process where relevant.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council include wording regarding practices to address climate change in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Coastal Protection – Onerahi Foreshore

Issues raised from submissions:

- The community group Onerahi Foreshore Forsure are interested in consultation and collaboration with Council on enhancing the foreshore along Beach Road for recreational purposes. To this end the group request:
 - A hold on further work or developments on the foreshore while consultation and collaboration is underway
 - That Council supports the group in this community-driven process
 - That the area be recognised by Council as an area of special significance
 - That the process of consultation that has begun with Council be formalised and continued.

Staff analysis:

Parks and Recreation has no current or future projects planned for the Onerahi Beach Road area. Council has a formal village planning process but we are also mindful that informal working arrangements may be more suitable for engaging with local communities. The village planning programme continues to be funded every year throughout the draft plan in the “Themed Communities” capex item.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council direct staff to continue to discuss matters relevant to the Onerahi community either through the Village Planning process or direct discussion.

Coastal and Harbour Protection and Structures

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters request that Council make upgrading the One Tree Point boat ramp a priority.
- Ngunguru residents would like their sea wall repaired and foreshore developed.

Staff analysis:

Staff agree that coastal and harbour protection is a major issue and sufficient funds are required now and in the future. The Consultation Document proposes a budget of \$7.8 million to carry out repairs and renewals on coastal protection structures, including sea walls, across the 10 years of the Plan. This budget includes planned work on the One Tree Point boat ramp, and at present Council is pursuing a resource consent prior to planning remedial works. This programme is developed based on the condition of structures, and is subject to the timing of consents, engineering and final costs. Given the unpredictability of coastal weather patterns the programme is revised every two years to incorporate issues relating to storm damage. The level of funding proposed will allow Council to attend to major repairs and renewals across the District. Ngunguru seawall is currently included for repairs but not for the larger work proposed by the community.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.
2. That Council liaise with NRC on consenting issues.

Dog Exercise Facilities

Issues raised from submissions:

- Frequent users of the dog park on Dave Culham Drive request facility improvements such as paths, lighting, shelters, drainage, grass fields, trees/landscaping and water troughs. Driveway entrance potholes need to be filled and the carpark needs to be increased in size. Wheelchair accessibility is required.
- One submission suggested that upgrades to the dog park could be part funded by rates and part funded by dog registration revenue.
- One submission suggests that Council consider the use of some paper roads as dog exercise areas in rural locations.

Staff analysis:

The biggest issue at the current dog park is drainage, so before any other improvements are undertaken this issue would need to be resolved at an approximate cost of \$145,000. No upgrades to the dog park on Dave Culham Drive are budgeted in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document. There are over 20 dog exercise areas in the District plus beaches in the winter months. A list is provided in the Dog Management Bylaw and is available online.

Money collected from dog-related fines and registrations must be spent on dog-related facilities and amenities.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council direct any available dog-related surpluses to the provision of improvements at the dog park on Dave Culham Drive.
2. That Council investigate external funding options to fund further improvements.

Indoor Sports Stadium
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 311 submissions were received requesting the re-use of the old Countdown building at Kensington as a shared indoor sports stadium. These submissions were accompanied by 15 letters of support from local businesses and associations.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>The submission while it relates to indoor bowls is not made on behalf of Whangarei Indoor Bowls Association who have recently begun improving current facilities which can host tournaments. As Council does not own this site a significant investment would be required at this location and this would need to be compared to investment in other areas with lower land value.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council consider the requirements of indoor bowls in the development of the Recreation Strategy.
Langs Beach Access
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A petition of 100 signatures requesting a concrete beach access ramp for people in wheelchairs, mothers with strollers and the ageing population.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>A resource consent would be required and the concept would need to be assessed for feasibility. If Council wishes to proceed funds would need to be allocated in the LTP.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council staff engage with the community to identify options.
Parihaka Mountain Bike facilities
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Whangarei Mountain Bike Club and a number of club members and mountain biking enthusiasts are eager to further develop the Parihaka mountain bike trails and ask that Council set aside funding to assist the club and its volunteers to put in new tracks and improve drainage for existing tracks.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Existing tracks are currently budgeted for renewal in year one of the LTP. To date the club has completed a majority of the work voluntarily with materials supplied by Council. The asset is well used in excess of the clubs official numbers.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submissions and that no changes be made.

Parks and Recreation – General

Issues raised from submissions:

- A large number of submissions covering multiple topics relating to parks and recreation in general were received covering the following topics:
 - Suggestion for a cable car from the Town Basin to the top of Parihaka.
 - The provision of multi-generational exercise equipment in recreational spaces with seating, shelter, water and toilet amenities.
 - Clean up the Whau Valley parklands and cap the mine shaft that is adjacent to the playground.
 - Remove more mangroves from the Town Basin and Onerahi beachfront.
 - Plant jacaranda trees on the loop walkway.
 - Removal of all trees that cost the ratepayer to maintain, restrict tree height to 3 metres to avoid possible harm during storms, and permit only small native trees to be planted in urban areas.
 - Clean up the Reotahi reserve, trim trees and control weeds across the District.
 - Find alternatives to glysohate for weed control.
 - Dedicate more funding to Whangarei Falls to attract more visitors.
 - Develop a marine park off the Tutukaka Coast.
 - Make use of the Wairua River for recreational purposes with boat/kayak launch facilities, school campgrounds, cycling from Hikurangi to Dargaville.
 - Beautify the city’s southern entrance.
 - Skate parks at Ruakaka and Kamo.
 - Jungle gym at Glenbervie Forest.
 - Provide a bus shelter for use by Intercity bus passengers at the service station at the roundabout at the SH1 and SH15A junction at Ruakaka. The owner of the land has offered to make space available at no cost.
 - Assist the owner of the above land in the cleaning and servicing of public toilets to be provided by the owner.

Staff analysis:

A cable car to Parihaka is not in the current LTP and would require significant research, study and investment.

Multi-generational equipment is being provided at the Town Basin in 2015.

The drain at the Whau Valley Parklands is being assessed for functional requirements, and renewals to degraded areas will be carried out as part of the LTP renewals programme.

Additional mangrove removal is not currently budgeted in the LTP and would require consents and additional funding to complete this work.

Trees used for walkway plantings will be appropriate to the conditions and environment.

Before any trees are removed as suggested resource consent would be required and as a result significant funds would have to be included in the LTP. Council would also need to alter the tree policy to restrict the height of all trees.

Reotahi reserve improvements are not currently budgeted in the LTP and would require allocation of sufficient funding.

Glyphosate is one of several sprays used and when alternatives arise they are considered. Council has a District-wide weed control programme that focuses on safety/visibility.

Renewal of the carpark at Whangarei Falls has been budgeted, however an additional \$300,000 (estimated) would be required to carry out other improvements as requested.

In 2011 NRC set up a committee called “National Marine Park for Northland”, with WDC representation. In 2014 an NRC Council meeting received the National Marine Park for Northland Scoping and Review report.

As a result NRC passed two resolutions:

1. 'Council does not proceed with undertaking a full business case assessment of the National Marine Park for Northland'; and
2. 'That the Regional Policy Committee include marine spatial planning in the process for the plan review'.

Council has no plans at this point to establish recreational facilities on the Wairua River. If Council wishes to pursue this initiative additional operational and capital budget would need to be allocated.

The Community Amenities capital works programme was put in place during the 2012 LTP process and is ongoing. Its intention is to provide recreational facilities such as playgrounds, skateparks and jungle gyms, and annual funding has been allocated throughout the LTP. Ruakaka and Kamo have been included in the list of locations.

Council's policy is to provide bus shelters on NRC bus routes only. There are no current plans to put in a shelter at Ruakaka for the Intercity service.

Discussions with the above land owner regarding infrastructure to support public toilets are ongoing.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council staff investigate the feasibility of a cleanup of the Whau Valley parklands from within current budgets.
2. That Council funds \$100,000 in year 2 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for improvements to visitor facilities at Whangarei Falls.
3. The Council encourages ongoing dialog with regard to public services provided by the developer of the private land near the SH1 Marsden Point roundabout.
4. That Council notes all other submissions and that no changes be made.

Playgrounds

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters suggest the following:
 - No new playgrounds unless they are part of a housing development.
 - New playgrounds in Korau Rd and Cobham Rd reserves.
 - Expand and repair the BMX track alongside Whangarei Boys High School.
 - Children's playground at the Mangakahia Sports Complex at Poroti.

Staff analysis:

Council's policy is that new playgrounds will only be established where gaps in provision relate to population, demographic and distance.

The Korau Road reserve has been included in the playgrounds renewal programme that is funded in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document.

The Whangarei Boys High BMX track is not a Council facility.

Mangakahia has explored options for a natural play area with Council staff and this could be easily achieved with volunteer labour.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Public Toilets

Issues raised from submissions:

- A number of submitters from the Mangakahia ward expressed their concern at public toilets originally budgeted for at the Mangakahia Sports Complex at Poroti no longer being funded. One submission from this area also asks that toilets at the Triangle Park at Titoki and at the Twin Bridges be given some consideration.
- One submission requests that public toilets be provided in Otangarei.
- One submission is concerned about the state of the public toilets at the Okara shopping centre, and believes they should be demolished and rebuilt.

Staff analysis:

Council considers public toilets in high use areas to be of significant importance and maintains a list based on public requests for new facilities and are prioritised by need. No funding for new toilets has been allocated in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document. The cost of a new toilet block is approximately \$150,000 with an additional operating cost of \$15,000 per annum to maintain and operate.

The public toilets at the Okara Shopping Centre are not Council-owned or maintained.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council funds \$300,000 each year for the first three years of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for the building of two new public toilets per year.
2. That Council review the public toilets programme to determine which projects to proceed with.

Sense of place

Issues raised from submissions:

- A substantial number of submissions were received on the topic of sense of place and planned projects:
 - Several submitters encourage increased focus on the CBD and support any initiative that will revitalise our city centre, with a focus on the basics such as graffiti, vandalism, litter, clearance of stormwater drains and general upgrades to public toilets and parking facilities. Positive Ageing support the continuation of City Safe along with well-lit streets & surveillance in the CBD.
 - The Bank Street Revitalisation group would like to partner with Council to improve the Bank and Cameron Street areas, and would like to see the footpaths on Bank Street paved, improved signage for parking and street names, and by creating a heritage trail through Whangarei's original main Street. Hanging baskets under veranda roofs on both sides of Cameron Street (maintained by business owners) would look good.
 - A small number of submissions oppose the Cameron Street canopy.
 - The Ruakaka Residents and Ratepayers Association believes that Ruakaka would benefit from a combined heritage and information centre. It also submitted on the need for more community and recreational facilities to cope with growth and to promote a Sense of Place.

Staff analysis:

Safety in the CBD is important and the recent development of more stringent alcohol policies, and the continuation of the CitySafe programme and CCTV monitoring, will have a positive impact.

No funding has currently been allocated to carry out suggested beautification works in the CBD, although Council could choose to allocate some.

Council continues to place importance on revitalisation of the CBD and funding has been allocated to continue work on the CBD and Town Basin connection. The tender for the canopy in the Cameron Street Mall has been let and the tender for the laneway is expected to be let in the near future.

The information centre model Council has invested in consists of the Tarewa iSite and Te Manawa - The

Hub. Additional information centres would have cost implications and are outside of the current model.

Council is committed to initiatives to increase the Sense of Place, including support provided to community and recreational facilities, across the District. In the Bream Bay Ward Council has previously agreed to provide funding for completion of the Great Barn subject to the availability of funding surpluses at the end of this financial year. As there is no surplus Council would need to allocate funding in the LTP if it is to support the completion of this project.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council continue to run the City Safe and Summer Safe programmes and CCTV monitoring.
2. That Council engage with the Bank Street Revitalisation group to further explore improvement ideas for Bank Street and Cameron Street
3. That Council funds \$20,000 per annum for the purpose of beautification, revitalisation, and signage across the City
4. That Council confirm a capital grant of \$100,000 to the Great Barn project at Waipu subject to a funding agreement That all other submissions be noted and that no change be made.

Sports Facilities

Issues raised from submissions:

- A large number of submissions received from various sporting codes support renewals budgets for sporting facilities in general with specific mention of Bream Bay, Morningside and Parua Bay, and believe that more needs to be done to ensure the resilience of existing fields through using sand bases and introducing flood lighting.
- Sport Northland are particularly concerned about the removal of funding for a second urban sports park now that Kensington Park is at capacity. The organisation does not believe that the development of Blue Goose is the right thing to do as these types of facilities need to be centrally located and able to cater for both organised sport and informal sport and recreation.
- The Northland Rugby Union encourages Council to complete development of William Fraser Memorial Park on Pohe Island and continue to support the amalgamation of Marist and Old Boys clubs in a shared facility at this location through allocation of funds within the LTP as a backup should the NRU be unsuccessful in securing funding from other agencies.
- NAGST would like to see Council set funding aside for future renewals at the ASB Sports Arena.
- Hockey Northland believes a fourth hockey turf will be required in 2023 and asks that Council consider the provision of adequate funding in the LTP, along with support in general asset renewals

Staff analysis:

The LTP sportsfield renewal programme includes renewal of fields, especially those with associated facilities like flood lights and clubrooms from soil to sand, as the submission requests. Lighting would require additional budget.

A second urban park would be ideally located at Denby as it would cater for growth and levels of service in sports across many sectors in a central location. The Blue Goose park at Otaika may not be suitable as a major venue as it requires substantial roading works in order to develop it into a high-use facility.

The ASB Sports Arena is not a Council asset and as such future renewals are not currently funded. If Council chooses to provide for facility renewal it would need to allocate funding to match the amount of depreciation on the facility, currently approximately \$500,000. As the facility is not Council owned this could only be payable as a grant. Council would need to consider the viability of this proposal.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council's renewal programme for sports fields maintain a strong focus on conversion to sand fields where practical.
2. That Council include wording in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan noting its support for the Northland Rugby Union in its endeavours to amalgamate the Marist and Old Boys clubs and establish suitable facilities.
3. That Council acknowledges the potential need for additional hockey facilities in the future in the wording of the Long Term Plan and engage with Hockey Northland for further discussion.
4. That Council notes other submissions, and with the exception of those issues addressed elsewhere in this report, that no change be made.

Walk/Cycle - General**Issues raised from submissions:**

- A significant number of submissions were received on the topic of walk and cycleways, with requests for tracks and trails at:
 - Tutukaka Coast/Ngunguru through to the Whangarei Falls and city
 - Waikaraka
 - Whangarei Heads to Parua Bay
 - Glenbervie Primary School to Huanui orchard
 - Limeburners foot bridge
 - Otangarei stream
 - Mangapai.
- The Kukupu Collective (comprising Quarry Arts Centre, Quarry Gardens, Kiwi North, Te Kowhai Print Trust, Pukenui Forest Trust and Quarry Craft Co-op) wish to collaborate with Council to promote the Pukenui Forest walkways, but recognise that investment is required to upgrade the existing paths to a standard suitable for all visitors, weed control, directional signage and story boards. The Collective requests Council's financial support in this endeavour. The Collective also request advice from Council regarding the significance of the area to Tangata Whenua so that the collective can be inclusive and sensitive to local Maori maramatanga.
- A number of other submitters expressed their support for walkways and cycleways in general, urging Council to continue to provide focus in this area, and to look at other initiatives such as walking school bus programmes for primary schools and cycle training programmes for children.

Staff analysis:

Activity programmes are not currently funded by Council and would require additional operational funding.

New requests for walkways are not included in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document. If Council wishes to include new walk/cycleways additional capital funding would need to be allocated. In some cases Council will engage with the community through Village Planning initiatives.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council funds \$60,000 for the Ngunguru cycleway in year 2 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.
2. That Council funds \$300,000 for a foot bridge over Limeburners Creek in year 6 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.
3. The Council staff work with volunteers regarding a clean up the walking track between the Northland Craft Trust and the Quarry Gardens.
4. That Council notes the other submissions and that no changes be made.

Flood Protection

Hikurangi Swamp
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRC ask that further consideration for a proactive renewal programme for Hikurangi Swamp pumps be made.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>The Scheme working party believes that a renewal programme for pumps is not appropriate considering the amount of debt the scheme currently carries. Furthermore, spare pumps have been recently renovated and all stations are fully operational.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.

Solid Waste

Solid Waste - General
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening hours for rural transfer stations are a concern to a number of submitters who request that original hours be restored. Submitters believe reduced hours have caused dumping of refuse. A small number of submitters believe that removing rubbish bins from beaches has been successful, while others think it was not. Some submitters think they are paying three times for refuse – as part of their rates, in buying rubbish bags and again to dispose of green waste at the local transfer station.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Staff are planning a workshop with Councillors to review the results of the trial reduction in rural transfer station hours and will discuss further recommendations with Councillors at that time. Outcomes will be communicated with the public and affected communities.</p> <p>Bin removal has been very successful in places. Council will continue to work with individual communities to determine the best strategy for their area.</p> <p>The District-Wide Refuse Rate goes towards subsidising transfer station operation and running litter collection (rubbish bins, etc). The bag charges cover the cost of rubbish collection and disposal. Charges at the transfer stations partly pay of the cost of handling and transporting rubbish or green waste. These are all separate charges.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Stormwater

Stormwater - General
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of submitters, including NRC, support the proposed investment in stormwater assets, and request particular attention on the Shortland Street/Mill Road area.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>The Mill Rd / Shortland Street area is to be reviewed as part of Council's annual minor works contract. Staff believe this will alleviate the issue raised.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Wastewater

Wastewater - General
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A small number of submitters commented on wastewater in general, urging Council to continue investing in this area, particularly in the Waipu and Ruakaka areas. One submission suggested extending the reticulated system to marina berths for use by boaties, believing this would further protect our harbour from pollution. The Northland District Health Board has signalled a wish to be involved in the development of the Integrated Harbour Management Plan.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Council's current wastewater investment is District-wide and covers the Waipu and Ruakaka areas. A boat sewage collection system is not funded in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document although it may need to be considered in the medium-term future as the use of the area increases. This is likely to be outside of the life of the 2015-25 Long Term Plan.</p> <p>Staff note the NDHB request for involvement.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the NDHB request for involvement in the Integrated Harbour Management Plan. That Council notes the other submissions and that no change be made.

Water

Fluoridation
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eight submitters registered their opposition to fluoridation of water supplies.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Whangarei does not fluoridate its water supplies and has no plans to do so. The last referendum held on the subject in 2002 showed 62% of respondents opposed fluoridation.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Poroti Springs
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One submission believes that a kaitiaki te wai puna Whatitiri be set up to manage the Whatitiri aquifer and surrounding waterways. This should include hapu, nominated stakeholders/users and the community. Water testing and flow test systems at the Springs reserve (with joint funding between Council and NRC) is required.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>While the NRC is responsible for the management and consenting of waterways and aquifers, and has granted consents in this area, Council continues to engage with the local community on issues of concern.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council continues to engage with the community on issues of concern.
Water - General
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A small number of submitters commented on water supplies in general, including those who believe households should be encouraged to install tanks and use grey water rather than use the reticulation system. One submission believes Council's levy to join the reticulation network deters people from connecting and claim that lost revenue per household could be up to \$300 per annum per household that does not connect. One submission requests that the reticulation network be extended to Mangakahia communities.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Property owners can weigh up the costs and benefits of installing tanks on their properties should this be an option they choose to pursue. Council neither encourages nor discourages the use of water tanks as an alternative to reticulation connection.</p> <p>Developments in urban areas are generally required to connect to the Council network as a condition of consent.</p> <p>The cost of connecting rural communities is proportionally higher due to the dispersed nature of the settlements. The cost to extend the water main to the Mangakahia settlement would be in excess of \$2 million.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the submissions be noted and that no change be made.
Whau Valley Water Treatment Plant
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General feedback from the public supports the development of a new water treatment plant at Whau Valley rather than upgrading.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Staff are proceeding with the investigations for a new water treatment plant.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the submissions be noted and that no change be made.

3. Submissions relating to District Living

Funding Requests – Annual Operating Fund

The following requests for funding were received:

- **Anawhata Museum Trust** seeks an annual operating grant from Council for the Packard and Pioneer Museum to enable it to continue to provide a tourist attraction for visitors to Whangarei.
- **Northland Craft Trust** requests an increase in operational funding of \$25,000 to reduce end of year pressure. The Trust requests a further \$50,000 to \$80,000 to assist them in expanding their workshop programme.
- **Sport Northland** seeks annual funding of \$40,000 towards their Community Sport initiative which aims to develop world class community sports systems within six to eight communities in Northland.
- **Te Moananui o Kiwa** request \$40,000 annual funding to support the 2016 Pasefika Fusion Festival.
- **Volunteering Whangarei** seek a rent concession for the office at suite 11 in the Municipal Building as well as a contribution towards operating costs. They suggest an annual operating grant of 70c per resident.
- **The Waipu Museum** requests an increase in operational funding of \$20,000 per annum for four years to provide front of house support for donor management while the next stage of development is underway.
- **Whangarei Youth Space Trust** request an annual operating grant of \$50,000.

Staff analysis:

Anawhata Museum Trust has received two grants from Council in the last 5 years from outside of the Annual Operating Grant fund.

Northland Craft Trust (Quarry Arts Centre) received \$37,000 from the Annual Operating Fund in the 14/15 year.

Sport Northland receives grants from Council for Kensington Stadium and the Aquatic Centre. However, they don't currently receive an annual operating grant.

Te Moananui o Kiwa has not received a grant from Council in the last five years.

Volunteering Whangarei has received four grants from Council in the last five years plus one contribution from the CEO's office. The estimated amount of funding to satisfy this request (based on 84,400 residents) is \$59,080.

The Waipu Museum currently receives an Annual Operating Grant of \$56,000.

Whangarei Youth Space has received one grant from Council and a rent concession since opening its doors just over a year ago.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council include provision for a contestable operating grant fund of \$50,000 in each year of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan and that applications to the fund be considered by the Community Funding Sub-Committee.

Friends of Matakohe Limestone Island
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission is asking for funding to maintain and repair buildings on the island. Submitter does not specify the amount of funds required.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>This is not currently allocated in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document and would need to be considered as a one-off capital contribution.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submission and that Parks & Recreation staff continue to engage with the Friends of Matakohe Limestone Island to find ways to help them meet their goals
Hihiaua Cultural Centre Trust
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Trust is seeking a grant from Council of \$500 000 in the first year of the LTP to progress the Hihiaua cultural centre. One submission believes that the Hihiaua centre should be left for the Haukanga hapu to debate with Council as they hold ahi kaa/mana whenua over this rohe (they being Te Parawhau, Te Kahu o Torongare and Patuharakeke).
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>The Trust currently receives a rent concession through the Community Services Department. There is no allocated budget for such large capital grants, nor are there any criteria. As stated in the draft Funding Policy these grants are entirely at the discretion of Council.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council provide the Trust with a \$500,000 capital grant in year 1 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan subject to a funding agreement between Council and the Trust.
Kamo Sports Charitable Trust
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Trust is seeking a grant of \$250,000 to help with funding a new building for Kamo Tennis and Cricket. Remaining funding will be raised through grants and within the community. The Trust also seeks a one-off grant of \$40,000 to cover overdue maintenance of the Kamo tennis courts.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>This is not currently funded within the supporting documents to the Consultation Document as the facility is club owned. Council would need to include the contribution in its funding model to provide for these requests.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council provide the Trust with a \$100,000 capital grant in year 1 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan subject to a funding agreement between Council and the Trust and on the proviso that the Trust provides fully accessible public toilets as part of their development.

Ruakaka Recreation Centre
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 155 submitters request funding to construct a multi events centre on land administered by the Ruakaka Recreation Centre.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>The land is owned by Council. The Ruakaka Recreation Centre committee requires a letter of support from Council as the landowner before they can proceed with feasibility studies and funding applications.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council provides the Ruakaka Recreation Centre with a letter of support in development of multi-events centre on Council land.
Ruatangata Hall and Community Association
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ruatangata Hall and Community Association would like Council to reintroduce the previous rating contribution to help them cover insurance costs for the hall.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Insurance costs are challenging for all hall committees.</p> <p>The establishment of the Community Halls Fund was partly a result of the disestablishment of targeted rates. The Community Halls Fund supports all committees with maintenance costs, not administrative costs such as insurance. Last year, unspent funds were reallocated to provide hall committees a \$1,000 contribution towards insurance – this worked very well.</p> <p>Resolving this issue through the re-establishment of a targeted rate could require further consultation within the ward and potentially across the District.</p> <p>Options could be: (1) Begin community consultation on re-establishing a targeted rate; (2) increase the Community Hall Fund by \$30,000 to cater for a \$1,000 contribution towards insurance for all eligible community halls that apply (there are 30); or (3) status quo.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.
Springfield Community Swim Club
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Springfield community pool will need to be repainted this year at a cost of between \$5,000 and \$7,000. The swimming club seeks Council's assistance in funding this.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Whilst staff recognise the need for accessible opportunities to develop water safety skills in Northland, this request does not meet the requirement for any funding mechanisms within the Community Services function of Council.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.

Sport Northland

Issues raised from submissions:

- Sport Northland seek funding from Council for the following projects at the Aquatic Centre:
 - Second disabled hydrotherapy change room – estimated cost of \$20,000
 - Big family change room at a cost of \$115,000
 - A future upgrade to the centre at some stage during the 2015-2025 period.

Staff analysis:

The need for a second changing room has frequently been raised at the quarterly meetings of the “Hydrotherapy Pool’s Stakeholders group” – convened by our Disability Advisory Group. This stakeholder group consist of physiotherapists, pool management, stroke and arthritis foundations, WDC & Tiaho Trust. The Aquatic Centre is owned by Sport Northland. This funding is not currently within the supporting documents to the Consultation Document and Council would have to include additional funding to provide for the submitters request. Third party funding may be available although it is not clear if Sport Northland have sought this as yet.

Staff recommendation:

1. That, subject to a funding agreement between Council and Sport Northland, Council provide Sport Northland with a capital grant of \$20,000 in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for the purpose of building a disabled hydrotherapy changing room.

Waipu Walk/Cycleway

Issues raised from submissions:

- A petition of 450 signatures and 32 individual submissions were received requesting that Council brings forward sufficient budget for the Waipu walk and cycleway to the 15/16 financial year to cover the shortfall of funding raised by the community of \$105,400 to complete stage one of the walkway.

Staff analysis:

The Waipu Cycle and Walkway Group confirm that most of the funding for stage one of the walkway has been raised by the community and they are awaiting the outcome of a Lottery Grants application. There is a high level of confidence in the grant being approved which will leave a shortfall of \$105,400. Funding for this walkway and others in the Bream Bay area is included in the “Cycleways – Unsubsidised” item spanning years 6 to 9 in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document. Staff believe \$105,400 brought forward to the 2015/16 financial year could be accommodated should Council wish to.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council provides a \$105,000 capital grant to the Waipu Cycle and Walkway Group in year 1 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan for the completion of the first stage of the Waipu Cycle and Walkway.

Waipu Museum
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Waipu Museum requests a capital grant of \$500,000 to complete their plans for the development of the museum.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>There is no fund and therefore no allocated budget for such large capital grants, nor are there any criteria. As stated in the draft Funding Policy, these grants are entirely at the discretion of Council.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.
Whangarei Quarry Gardens Trust
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Trust requests a capital grant of \$159,000 and agreement to a loan of \$100,000 to make up the balance of funding required to complete the new visitor centre.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>There is no fund and therefore no allocated budget for such large capital grants, nor are there any criteria. As stated in the draft Funding Policy these grants are entirely at the discretion of Council.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That, subject to a funding agreement between Council and the Trust, Council provide the Quarry Gardens Trust with a \$159,000 capital grant in year 1 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan. That Council enters into discussions with the Trust regarding a \$100,000 loan.
Whangaruru Coastal Community & Sports Association
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The association has submitted to Council for several years requesting assistance in developing the Oakura Recreation Ground for the use of the Whangaruru community in general. The Association asks that Council renew their commitment to assisting the Whangaruru community to fund this centre.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>This proposal is well advanced thanks to previous Council funding. A further \$112,000 is budgeted in the supporting documents to the Consultation Document for the 2016/17 financial year.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That Council notes the submission and moves this funding forward to 2015/16.

Policy, Monitoring & Regulation

Genetic Engineering

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters congratulate Council on its precautionary approach against the risks of outdoor use of genetically modified organisms and support the Far North and Whangarei District councils plan changes 18 (FNDC) and 131 (WDC).
- One submission requested that Council include the precautionary GE/GMO policy in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Staff analysis:

Council continues to be committed to plan change 131.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that staff be directed to include narrative regarding GMO in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Policy, Monitoring & Regulation - General

Issues raised from submissions:

- One submission would like Council to consider alternate funding models to respond to community-led initiatives, such as crowd funding platforms and believes that this would set our District apart from all other councils in the country and promote Whangarei as a place that embraces innovation and empowers its communities.
- A small number of submissions expressed concern regarding plan changes, asking that Council relax restrictions on land development and stop imposing “green agendas” on private land owners, and that Council’s rolling plan change review pick up areas where re-zoning is required One submitter registered concern regards Plan Change 130 and its impact on ratepayers.
- Two submitters do not believe that Council should provide any funding or support for private plan changes, although they do not explain why.
- Council’s community village plan programme is embraced. The Parua Bay community is interested in discussing future plans.
- One submission asks for Council support for the NGO sector in the form of emergency housing and the provision of food.
- Show commitment to becoming a Child & Youth Friendly City by naming it in the LTP. Consider what can easily be done to achieve this. Work towards including children and youth in future planning and evaluation of current service. One submitter asks that Council take full cognisance of the outcome of the LAP policy consultation and prevent any more liquor outlets to be established in the community.
- Reconnecting Northland requests Council’s ongoing support in assistance with specific projects.

Staff analysis:

Council explores numerous funding models including grants, and where new concepts such as crowd funding are looked at these need to be in alignment with Council policy and legislation.

District Planning is a fully inclusive public process which includes both non-statutory and statutory engagement Resource Management Act, the Regional Policy Statement and direction from Council itself. Staff anticipate review of zones as a part of the rolling plan change.

Council decides on a case by case basis whether it will contribute to the cost of a private plan change depending on the level of public good that may result from the change.

Council recognises the value of Village Planning across the district. The barrier to continuing planning for a village that has completed the process is resourcing, both from a planning and financial perspective.

EECA asks that Council support greater energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives, and proposes that Council initiate a voluntary targeted rate to help homeowners improve their household insulation.

The provision of shelter and food for the homeless is managed by other agencies.

In June 2014 WDC’s CEO and Mayor signed a statement of Intent as part of the Northland Intersectoral

Forum to pursue 'Child Friendly City' accreditation from UNICEF. Shortly after, Whangarei was declared the first city in New Zealand to register/commit to the journey of becoming a Child Friendly City. Since then Manaia PHO, who lead this project, have been working with UNICEF to define the requirements of the accreditation process. Staff have been participating on the project's steering group and supporting the project where needed e.g. graphic design, this includes all access to Youth Advisory Group resources.

There is a specific legislative process for the development of a LAP. Council has approved a draft Policy for consultation. The submitter may wish to submit to that process.

Council continues to support Reconnecting Northland particularly with regard to the Kiwi Coast project.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council increases Village Planning funding by an additional \$155,000 in year 6 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.
2. That Council notes other submissions and no change be made to the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Community Services

Youth

Issues raised from submissions:

- The Whangarei Youth Space Trust believes they will need a larger facility within the next one or two years and seeks Council's support and assistance with locating suitable premises. The Trust would, however, like to retain the current space in Cafler Park and develop it into a youth-focused social enterprise hub.
- The Trust also requests recognition of its contribution to the fitout of the current Youth Space in Cafler Park as they believe their investment has added value to a Council-owned property.

Staff analysis:

It is acknowledged that the Trust is a critical service provider in meeting the present and future needs of our District, and in particular our city. The central location of the Youth Space is critical to its success. A larger premises would also have to be central.

At present the only impact from the above request would be a budgetary one. Whangarei Youth Space has received one grant from Council and a rent concession since opening its doors just over a year ago.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council continue to engage with the Whangarei Youth Space Trust to address issues of concern.

4. Submissions relating to Positive Growth

116 Bank Street – Company of Giants
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company of Giants have been using the space at 116A Bank Street for the past five months. They submitted that over 1000 people have seen work that has been carried out there and over 700 have been to events. • Company of Giants submitted a petition consisting of 460 signatures proposing that Council retain ownership of the building and allow them to continue using it under the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A 12 month trial lease at minimal cost with a review near the end of the period to assess the success of the project and its value to the community. – Following the review process a lease agreement between Council and a charitable trust formed to oversee the facilitation of a youth-focused community performing arts centre. – Company of Giants will cover rates, outgoings and maintenance of the building during the 12 month trial period.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Council needs to give consideration to the future of this building under a separate process outside of the LTP. In light of submissions, should Council wish to consider developing the building as per the proposal outlined a resolution to do so will be required.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Council notes the submission and engages with the submitter to look at their proposal in more depth. 2. That Council note that this building is subject to a separate process outside the LTP. .
Airport
<p>Issues raised from submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 submitters commented on the proposed capital project to investigate the potential development of a new airport: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Eight submitters fully support the investigative project, believing it an airport with more capacity will be good for the District and region. – Two submitters would rather see a passenger rail link from Whangarei to Auckland. – Two submitters oppose the development of a new airport at this point in time and suggest it be revisited once core service issues have been addressed. – One submission believes the costs for investigating options seem high. – One submission opposes funding for this and believes that the NRC 30 year transport strategy contradicts WDC's rationale in that a new location for the airport is not considered feasible.
<p>Staff analysis:</p> <p>Air transportation is considered to be a critical piece of infrastructure for both business and tourism within a growing city or District. The problems identified with the current airport have been examined and it is considered that investigating alternative locations for an airport to meet future needs is vital.</p> <p>The project referred to by submitters is investigation only, and costs are considered to be reasonable. A passenger rail service is outside of the gambit of Council.</p>
<p>Staff recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Commercial Property - General

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters suggest that Council's commercial property portfolio be reviewed to identify (and subsequently sell) those properties with no return and use the proceeds for infrastructure. General concern is expressed by these submitters that rent on Council-owned leased properties is, however, too high, and this is why there are so many empty shops and buildings in Whangarei.
- Channel North request a peppercorn rental for their use of the Parihaka Mast.

Staff analysis:

Council's current direction is to sell properties south of Limeburners along with other non-strategic properties with the proceeds going into the Property Reinvestment Reserve. Reinvestment in commercial properties that meet Council's requirements may occur at some time in the future as funds allow and opportunities arise.

Council suggests that Channel North apply for a grant to cover rental of the Parihaka Mast.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Commercial Property – Tertiary Education Hub

Issues raised from submissions:

- NorthTec would like Council to identify land suitable for a tertiary education hub and student accommodation in the Whangarei CBD, with investigative work undertaken by Council staff. NorthTec requests that land for these two purposes be provided at a peppercorn rental.

Staff analysis:

If Council wishes to investigate this item further suitable land would need to be purchased. This would need to be considered alongside the broader commercial property portfolio.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.

Community Property

Issues raised from submissions:

- The Tamaterau Hall Management Society would like Council to install French doors opening on to the deck or a large window facing the beach reserve along with sound proofing. The hall is owned by Council and therefore the Society cannot apply for grants to do upgrades.

Staff analysis:

This initiative has been discussed by the Society for a number of years. The approximate cost would be \$45,000 including building permits, materials and labour. If Council wishes to provide funding for this provision in the LTP budget would be required.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.

Economic Development in the CBD

Issues raised from submissions:

- A small number of submitters commented on the revitalisation of the CBD mentioning high rates, parking fees, the popularity of Okara shopping centre taking business away from town, graffiti, vandalism, empty shops and excessive Council focus on the Town Basin.
- In general these submitters would like Council to focus some funding on resolving these issues in the CBD.

Staff analysis:

Council's planning protects the CBD as the entertainment, boutique shopping, financial, day-shopper meeting place, and Council remains focused on improving the overall CBD in any way that it can within current budgets.

In terms of parking, Council's fees are not considered to be a barrier based on research. A no-cost parking strategy would result in workers occupying available spaces, making it much more difficult for visitors and shoppers to find available spaces.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Economic Growth - General

Issues raised from submissions:

- One submission asks that Council pass a resolution supporting Whangarei becoming a Fair Trade District and that \$20,000 be allocated to "Welcome to Whangarei – New Zealand's first Fair Trade District" signage. (move to economic development). A petition containing 1131 signatures was also tabled by the Steering Group for Making Whangarei a Fair Trade District at the hearings.
- Transition Whangarei asked Council to support the Transition Towns initiative. 12 submitters commented on this topic expressing concern that more needs to be done to improve the economy in the District through:
 - More jobs
 - Tourism initiatives.
 - Creating and maintaining a business-friendly environment.
 - More attractions to draw visitors.
 - Networking with Auckland businesses and education providers to encourage increased presence in Whangarei.
 - Increased internet availability and free wi-fi across the city.
 - Support energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives.
 - Continue to support other economic development agencies in the District.
 - Focus on being business friendly and collaborating with the Chamber of Commerce to determine what behaviour changes are required.

Staff analysis:

Staff have been investigating the Fair Trade concept with a view to bringing something back to Council in the near future. Council may in the future also consider other initiatives of a similar nature, i.e. Transition Towns.

Council has a number of strategies and plans in place which address these issues, including the Events Strategy, the Visitor Plan, the Property Plan and the Economic Development Plan. If Council wishes to amend these plans discussions would need to be held through the Finance and 20/20 Committees and appropriate funding allocated.

At this time Council is contributing to the whole of Northland expression of interest to expand the availability of broadband within urban and rural areas and address mobile black spots. There are no current plans to provide free wi-fi facilities in the District.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes that the outcomes of an investigation on Fair Trade are to be reported back to Council.
2. That Council notes other submissions and with the exception of those issues addressed elsewhere in this report that no change be made.

Northland Inc**Issues raised from submissions:**

- Northland Inc ask that Council reinstate an annual contribution to enable it to build capacity. A first step of 0.25% of rating income increasing to 1% over the course of the LTP is suggested.

Staff analysis:

0.25% of Council's rating income is approximately \$179,000. Northland Inc currently receive annual funding of \$105,000. If Council wishes to further support Northland Inc additional funds would need to be allocated.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.

Old Harbour Board Building**Issues raised from submissions:**

- A large number of submissions were received about the old Harbour Board building, expressing their thoughts on what Council should do with it.

Staff analysis:

The fate of the old Harbour Board Building is in the public's hands through the binding referendum underway at present.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan reflect the outcome of the referendum for the Old Harbour Board Building.

Partnerships with Maori

Issues raised from submissions:

- A number of submitters commented on Council's partnerships and relationships with Maori in the District. Comments included:
 - Continue to support the principles agreed to in the Treaty of Waitangi.
 - Please provide technical and financial support to assist with development of hapu management plans to ensure a greater level of involvement in local government decision-making processes.
 - Exclusion of s27B Memorialised Lands and/or previously Maori owned lands acquired by Council under the Public Works Act from Council's register of strategic and non-strategic assets, and refrain from future sale of these assets until due consultation has been undertaken.
 - Cease charging Development Contributions on Papakainga development.
 - Fragmentation between Te Huinga and Te Tai Tokerau Maori Advisory Committee is still occurring, and a forum needs to be developed to bridge that gap to ensure consistent and meaningful dialogue and practice both at a governance and operational level in the local government space.
 - Establish a strategic partnership forum to develop a Mana Whenua Sustainability Framework identifying Maori outcomes for the District.
 - Establish a responsible Tiriti-based relationship with Council along with adequate community engagement.

Staff analysis:

Council is committed to the hapu-based partnership through Te Karearea where the above issues are being addressed. Should Council choose to resume any Council-owned memorialised lands this would have budgetary implications.

Exempting Papakainga developments from Development Contribution charges would have funding implications as these charges recover the cost of growth expenditure. Ratepayers would therefore have to bear the cost.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Pensioner Housing

Issues raised from submissions:

- A number of submitters acknowledge the funding set aside for renewals to pensioner housing units. Although one submission does not believe pensioner housing is Council's responsibility, others state that the provision of additional housing and the maintenance of the current portfolio should be a priority, particularly with an aging population.

Staff analysis:

Council is committed to the ongoing provision of pensioner housing units and believes that the budget allocations are sufficient to ensure an adequate priority-based renewal and maintenance programme.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Venues & Events - General

Issues raised from submissions:

- A number of submitters commented on our current venues as well as the planned new theatre.
 - Six submitters oppose the new theatre as proposed.
 - Two submitters agree with the proposal for a new theatre but believe Forum North or Old Boys would be ideal locations.
 - Two submitters believe the current Toll Stadium would suffice as a conference centre rather than spending on a new theatre complex.
 - One submission vehemently opposes ‘wasting money on car rallies, concerts and other social services that are clearly the responsibility of central government’.
- The Whangarei Film Society has an urgent need to operate in a Council-owned venue where the necessary up to date screening technology can be installed.

Staff analysis:

The proposal for the theatre/expo/conference centre has always intended for the complex to be on the Forum North site, and to that end the functionality of current conference and expo facilities would need to be accommodated. Although Toll Stadium does have conference facilities, it is not an expo centre.

With regard to events, Council has a commitment to the Whangarei Events Strategy and has committed funds to implement this. Central Government limits its investment in events to large scale major events.

The Film Society uses the Capitaine Bougainville Theatre but often gets deferred in favour of other bookings.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council removes \$2 million of funding in year 6 from the new theatre/expo/conference centre.
2. That Council engage with the Whangarei Film Society to investigate further their requirements.
3. That Council notes all other submissions and that no further changes be made.

5. Submissions relating to Support Services

Council Premises

Issues raised from submissions:

- 77 submitters commented on the proposed Council Premises project, with only 1 submission disagreeing with the need to bring Council staff and functions into one building. Most of these submitters identified their preferred option:
 - 61 prefer that Forum North be redeveloped but that a \$10 million budget is excessive.
 - 3 prefer that the old Harbour Board building on the waterfront be used as a Council base.
 - 7 approve the \$10 million budget and are in favour of redeveloping Forum North.
 - Remaining submitters did not specify their preferred option.
- A very small number of submitters made the following comments:
 - Council should consider work from home options. Most of the work could be done remotely and buildings to house workers will eventually be an outdated idea.
 - Forum North can be connected to Northern Advocate by a simple first floor walkway.
 - The Hihiaua Cultural Centre Trust would like to meet with Council to discuss the possibility of one venue for Council offices and a Maori cultural centre.

Staff analysis:

Analysis of submissions shows general support for Council staff to operate from within one building. How we achieve this still needs to be worked through, and a reasonable level of operational funding is required in order to achieve this.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council investigates Forum North as one of the options for new Council premises.
2. That Council notes submissions and that no changes be made.

Debt

Issues raised from submissions:

- Most submitters who commented on this topic were generally opposed to additional debt and wished to see a reduction in debt.
- Other submitters felt that debt could be used to fund projects where necessary and where there was benefit, e.g. enhancing quality of life, show a reasonable return on investment, take advantage of Government subsidies and low interest rates.
- A number of general comments were made:
 - Council should resign if they cannot stay within budget and reduce debt.
 - Good management works within a budget, a private business would go broke. A pensioner has to manage with a rather small income
 - WDC ranks very poorly compared to other Councils on financial stability, debt contributes to this poor rating.
 - Support Council borrowing to fund growth and development in the Bream Bay area.
 - Debt must be arrested and repaid before any ongoing dreams are realised. If you can't afford it, you can't have it.
 - Additional \$120m debt in 10 years is completely unacceptable. Rates have doubled in 10 years and this has to stop.
 - Live within our means without borrowing even if it means increasing rates.
 - The reported debt level is incorrect. It does not include the millions owing to the property reserve

account. Leasehold properties were generating considerable income but were sold and the funds spent.

- Council needs a more robust debt policy. Debt repayments should be spread over the expected life of the asset with a 30% comfort margin.
- Reduction of debt and ongoing prudent financial management is required - too much has been spent on outside consultants and activities not directly associated with Council's core responsibilities.
- Expenditure using debt on "crazy schemes" needs to stop. Council needs to figure out how to fund core needs without increases to rates.
- Borrowing and debt is at an all-time high and not repaying in order to decrease debt is causing unnecessary interest payments.
- Debt is too high, how are we repaying? Nothing is mentioned in the plan.
- Cap Council debt at current levels.
- Interest costs over the 10 years of the plan will be \$95m - this should be spent on facilities, infrastructure, services, or alternatively be used to pay back debt. Why has the option to leverage Council's LGFA membership for better funding arrangements by requesting access to Reserve Bank lines of credit at an administrative charge only?
- Borrow directly from the Reserve Bank at no interest for capital works projects.

Staff analysis:

One of the over-riding focuses for Council in arriving at the budgets proposed in the draft Plan was not to increase debt. This has been achieved i.e. within the debt cap of \$161.5 million. The funding for the proposed Council Premises project, to have staff operate from one building, is additional debt but should be viewed as being ring-fenced with a 12-year payback period from savings generated by moving to one building.

Council's treasury management practices and combined with its shareholding in the Local Government Funding Agency ensures that the cost of borrowing is kept as low as possible.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Emergency Management and Civil Defence

Issues raised from submissions:

- Two submitters support a focus on the development of civil defence plans for communities in remote rural areas including climate change related resilience and safety works extending to flood control and protection.

Staff analysis:

Council's Civil Defence representative works closely with the regional CDEM group and communities to develop community civil defence plans across the region. Until recently the focus was on coastal communities which are particularly vulnerable to the effect of weather and other hazards such as tsunamis. 14 coastal plans are now in place. Plans for rural communities that are prone to isolation and where lifeline services such as power and telephone may be cut off as a result of storms, slips and floods are underway as part of planning across the region. The Hikurangi plan has been completed. The Whakapara-Towai plan, which includes Hikurangi Swamp and covers part of our District, has been drafted, and staff will next look at the Opouteke-Pakotai communities.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submissions and that no change be made.

Forecast Financial Statements

Issues raised from submissions:

A submission delivered a verbal submission questioning a number of items in the Forecast Financial Statements issued as supporting documents to the Consultation Document, notably receivables and financial position.

Staff analysis:

Council's forecast financial statements are developed in compliance with accounting standards and subsequently audited by Audit NZ to ensure all statutory processes are adhered to. However, submitters comments will be considered with adjustments made where necessary in arriving at the final 2015-2025 Long Term Plan financials.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submission and where necessary adjustments be made in the final 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

Governance - General

Issues raised from submissions:

One submitter believes that Council should not appoint non-elected representatives to committees.

Staff analysis:

The Local Government Act 2002 provides for the appointment of non-elected representatives.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council notes the submission and that no change be made.

Rates - Commercial

Issues raised from submissions:

- A large number of submitters have expressed their concern at increases to their commercial property rates as a result of Council's commercial rating review to charge for individual rateable units, the proposed increase as communicated in the Consultation Document, and increases to NRC rates.
- A number of these submitters believe Council's rating policies should be reviewed.

Staff analysis:

The current situation with commercial rates has arisen partly as a result of the proposed step-change in rates, and partly because of a review of the rating data held for commercial properties. In a number of cases the data review has resulted in substantial increases where properties that were formerly rated as one SUIP will now be rated as multiple SUIPs following development on the property that Council was not aware of until now.

Changing this situation will require complete review of the rating policies and depending on adjustments made a number of Rates Remission and Postponement Policies may also need to be reviewed.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council review the rating policies in the 2015-16 financial year, including any relevant Rates Remission and Postponement Policies.

Rates - Rural**Issues raised from submissions:**

- One submission would like to see Council's policy of rural rates postponement continued and a more flexible approach where the efforts of the landowner are aligned with the interests of the wider community.

Staff analysis:

From time to time farmers and/or lifestyle block owners put areas of their land into conservation or covenants for the benefit of the wider community. The area put into covenants are then non-rateable in accordance with the Rates Remission Policies.

Staff recommendation:

1. That Council review the relevant Rates Remission and Postponement policies as part of the rating policies review.

4. 2015-2016 Fees and Charges Deliberations

Reporting officer Paul Dell (Group Manager District Living)

Date of meeting 9 June 2015

Vision, mission and values

This item is in accord with Council's vision, mission and values statement.

Introduction

Whangarei District Council's Statement of Proposal for the Draft Fees and Charges for 2015-16 was adopted on 19 March 2015 and opened for submissions on 24 March 2015 in accordance with the requirements of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) of the Local Government Act 2002. Submissions closed on 24 April 2015.

The fees subject to consultation were for consents, inspections, and other approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991, Fencing of Swimming Pools Act 1987, Gambling Act 2003 and the Racing Act 2003, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (for Land Information Memorandums) and Council bylaws.

The public have had the opportunity to present their views with an option to speak and elaborate on their submissions. It is now for Council to consider and respond to the submissions received to enable the completion of the final Fees and Charges for adoption.

Significance

The setting of fees and charges does not trigger any of the significance criteria. While there is potential for the public interest criteria to be triggered (particularly where the increase is over and above LGCI), Council anticipates this to be minor. Therefore fees and charges on an individual basis are not considered to be significant.

Engagement

The fees and charges subject to the special consultative process were consulted on concurrently with the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan SCP.

Fees and charges not subject to the SPC will be adopted by Council resolution and the public will be informed on the Council website prior to 1 July 2015.

Process

Submitters have had the opportunity to speak to their submissions at a public hearing. These hearings were notified as part of the submissions process. All submitters received a letter or email of acknowledgement and those who indicated they wished to speak to their submission were contacted again to confirm their hearing time and date.

The process from here is as follows:

- Council is now being asked to consider any submissions and information provided at hearings, and to deliberate on the submissions.
- The final Fees and Charges will incorporate the decisions of Council and is scheduled to be presented to Council for adoption at its June meeting.
- Following adoption submitters will be advised of the decisions made and the 2015-16 Fees and Charges will be made publically available.

Submissions Received

Five submissions were received during the SCP that comment to any extent on fees and charges:

Submitter	Comment
Bradbury, R	Get rid of “petty” charges (like parking) which discourage growth.
Dannatt, R	Dog license fees should be higher and there should be a license fee for cats.
Newman, F	An efficient consents department run on a cost recovery basis should have a charge out rate of 25% LESS that the private sector.
Youth Advisory Group	YAG recommend that the facilities inside Kensington Stadium, the Athletics Track and similar facilities not incur a cost for casual use by the youth in our District.
Chilcott, R	Submitter suggests charging a flat fee for pensioners for their parking exemption for each period but maintain option.

Discussion

Council uses parking charges along with time restrictions to ensure that the carparking spaces are being used appropriately and that there is reasonable turnover in occupancy. The charging policy attempts to achieve 90% occupancy and adjusts charges accordingly.

In terms of dog licence fees Council can only recover its actual costs of this activity and is not able to arbitrarily increase fees. Also the legislation does not allow Council to bring into force a licensing regime for cats.

From external comparisons on RMA charges with other G9 councils, Council’s fees have generally been at the mid range level. With changes in legislation, particularly the Building Act, the cost of doing business for Council has increased. For Resource Consent applications it is more the time taken to process an application than the hourly rate that impacts the full cost. Therefore, Council continues to focus on being efficient and effective in its processes. The proposed fee increases are seen as balancing the needs of the customer and Council’s legislative role and the sharing of costs between the ratepayer and individual customer.

With regard to Resource Consent processing, Council is required to maintain significant databases and records associated with consents, whereas private companies are not. Council’s fees therefore reflect the nature of the business but recognise that only actual and reasonable costs can be recovered and that elements that make up charges must be related to the service provided.

Kensington Stadium and the Athletics Track are not managed by Council and fees are set by the managing entity. Discounted fees for students are currently available in some areas. Removing fees for youth altogether would incur significant cost given that there are 10,000 people in our District between the ages of 12 and 24. Council already subsidises losses at Kensington Stadium and Whangarei Aquatic Centre to ensure prices are kept as low as possible to make the activity accessible to as many as possible. Any further adjustments would require further investment from Council in these entities.

In terms of a flat fee for pensioners, Council has a free parking for over 70s permit which is a significant financial benefit to individuals and is funded by the general ratepayer. Any further adjustments for pensioner parking would become an additional cost to the ratepayer.

Recommendation

1. That the information be received and submission comments noted.
2. That the Resource Management Act, Resource Consents and Planning fees be adopted as proposed with no amendments.
3. That the Building Compliance Land Information Memorandum fees be adopted as proposed with no amendments.
4. That the increased Cemeteries fees be adopted as proposed with no amendments.
5. That the recommendations, after any amendments and where appropriate, be incorporated into the 2015-2016 Fees and Charges and presented to council for adoption.

5. Old Harbour Board Building Referendum 2015

Reporting officer P Dell (Group Manager District Living)

Date of meeting 9 June 2015

Vision, mission and values

This item is in accord with Council's vision, mission and values statement.

Background

At the Extra ordinary Council meeting held 12 November 2014 council resolved to consider three options for the Old Harbour Board building and to undertake a binding referendum to determine which project to pursue.

Voting closed at noon Friday 5 June, subsequent to the agenda for this meeting being circulated.

A report outlining the outcome of the referendum and any funding implications for the Long Term Plan will be circulated prior to the meeting.

Recommendation

That the information be received.

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC		
Move/Second		
That the public be excluded from the following parts of proceedings of this meeting.		
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:		
General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution
C.1 Property Matter	Good reason to withhold information exists under Section 7 Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987	Section 48(1)(a)
This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, are as follows:		
Item	Grounds	Section
C.1	To enable the Council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage negotiations	Section 7(2)(i)

Resolution to allow members of the public to remain

<p>If the council/committee wishes members of the public to remain during discussion of confidential items the following additional recommendation will need to be passed:</p> <p>Move/Second</p> <p>“That _____ be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of his/her/their knowledge of <u>Item _____</u>.</p> <p>This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because _____.</p>
--

Note:

Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public.