



Hastings District Council

*Civic Administration Building
Lyndon Road East, Hastings*

Phone: (06) 871 5000

Fax: (06) 871 5100

OPEN

OFFICER COMMENTS DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2020/21

COUNCIL MEETING

Meeting Date: Thursday, 25 June 2020

Time: 9.30am (Adopt A/P)

**Venue: Council Chamber
Ground Floor
Civic Administration Building
Lyndon Road East
Hastings**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
6.	ANNUAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY 2020/21 - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS AND ADOPTION OF PLAN.	
	Attachment 44: Officer Comments Draft Annual Plan 2020/21	1

OFFICER COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS TO ANNUAL PLAN 2020/21

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS																												
	PART A - GENERIC ISSUES																												
	<p>WILLOWPARK TRAFFIC SAFETY</p> <table> <tr> <td>Jenn McMillan (3)</td><td>Janice Gordon (15)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ashleigh Scott (4)</td><td>Jessica Smith (16)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ricardo Fox (5)</td><td>Charlene Tuahine (17)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Shirley Goodenough (6)</td><td>Jo-ann Paton (18)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hine Karauria (7)</td><td>Tamsyn Davies (19)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Lindsey Marshall (8)</td><td>Russell Irving (20)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Carley Slade (9)</td><td>June Crawford (21)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Tia Whiti (10)</td><td>Angela Hunter (22)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Adrian Mcmillan (11)</td><td>Dawn Tyler (23)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ngahuia Harris (12)</td><td>Merryanne Afualo (28)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Krystal Thompson (13)</td><td>Brenda Walsh (29)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Annika Funnell (14)</td><td>Hayley Holloway (30)</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Stephanie Nixon (31)</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Nick Richards (38)</td></tr> </table> <p>Officer Responsible: Jag Pannu (Transportation Manager) Officer Comments: <u>Willowpark Road traffic safety</u> <i>The submitters raise safety concerns on Willowpark Road particularly in respect of the pedestrian crossing servicing the school.</i></p> <p>Traffic calming measures were identified in the action plan of the Mayfair Community Plan 2017-2021, and have recently been discussed between Council officers and representatives of the School (Mr Ricardo Fox) and community (Mr Nick Richards).</p>	Jenn McMillan (3)	Janice Gordon (15)	Ashleigh Scott (4)	Jessica Smith (16)	Ricardo Fox (5)	Charlene Tuahine (17)	Shirley Goodenough (6)	Jo-ann Paton (18)	Hine Karauria (7)	Tamsyn Davies (19)	Lindsey Marshall (8)	Russell Irving (20)	Carley Slade (9)	June Crawford (21)	Tia Whiti (10)	Angela Hunter (22)	Adrian Mcmillan (11)	Dawn Tyler (23)	Ngahuia Harris (12)	Merryanne Afualo (28)	Krystal Thompson (13)	Brenda Walsh (29)	Annika Funnell (14)	Hayley Holloway (30)		Stephanie Nixon (31)		Nick Richards (38)
Jenn McMillan (3)	Janice Gordon (15)																												
Ashleigh Scott (4)	Jessica Smith (16)																												
Ricardo Fox (5)	Charlene Tuahine (17)																												
Shirley Goodenough (6)	Jo-ann Paton (18)																												
Hine Karauria (7)	Tamsyn Davies (19)																												
Lindsey Marshall (8)	Russell Irving (20)																												
Carley Slade (9)	June Crawford (21)																												
Tia Whiti (10)	Angela Hunter (22)																												
Adrian Mcmillan (11)	Dawn Tyler (23)																												
Ngahuia Harris (12)	Merryanne Afualo (28)																												
Krystal Thompson (13)	Brenda Walsh (29)																												
Annika Funnell (14)	Hayley Holloway (30)																												
	Stephanie Nixon (31)																												
	Nick Richards (38)																												

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>Previous Bill Mathewson Park upgrade works completed by Council as part of the action plan have been well received, such as the installation of angle parking and toilets, and the removal of fences and the ticket booth. The road outside the school entrance has also been marked as a “School Zone”.</p> <p>Following the discussions with the School and Community, a traffic survey was completed in March 2020 which yielded the following data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average Speed: 44km/hr • 85th Percentile Speed: 49.8km/hr • Average Daily Traffic: 2714 vehicles per day <p>Willowpark Road is classed as a secondary collector, and its key function is to take traffic from residential roads through to the arterial roads. Given the traffic volume measured during the latest count, this classification is correct.</p> <p>When measured against Council’s traffic calming policy, Willowpark Road would not normally qualify for traffic calming measures, however the policy does not currently give specific consideration to schools or parks. This will be updated to give consideration to the Government’s new safety strategy, as detailed below.</p> <p>In December 2019, the Government launched Road to Zero: NZ’s road safety strategy 2020-2030. A new approach to tackling unsafe speeds has been identified as an immediate action as part of this strategy. A key initiative of this will be transitioning to lower speed limits around schools to improve safety and encourage more children to walk and cycle to school. The proposal is for 30km/hr limits outside urban schools, and 60km/hr outside rural schools, and is currently going through the parliamentary process.</p> <p>In previous speed limit reviews, Council has signaled support for lower speed limits outside schools, however this has not been possible to implement under the previous Speed Limit Rules. With the Government’s focus on tackling unsafe speeds and the imminent changes to the Speed Limit Rule to allow these lower</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>speed limits, Council officers are preparing an implementation programme which includes identifying schools which will require traffic calming measures to achieve these lower limits.</p> <p>From the traffic data collected on Willowpark Road, it is clear that traffic calming would be required to achieve compliance with the 30km/hr speed limit when it is changed.</p> <p>Proposed Action: Create a low speed zone by installing a raised pedestrian crossing along with speed cushions at regular intervals throughout the school zone.</p> <p>Construction estimate: \$40,000</p> <p>Potential funding source: Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency have established the Innovating Streets for People fund to enable councils to use quick, lower-cost and temporary techniques to deliver positive people-centered changes to streets. Council officers are in the process of applying for funds to implement similar traffic calming schemes at schools that have been involved in the Safer Routes to School projects. It is our intention to include the proposed traffic calming on Willowpark Road in this application, and we will begin developing a School Travel Plan with Mayfair School, in Term 3 2020.</p> <p>If we are successful in our application, this would be 90% funded by NZTA, with the remaining 10% being the local Council share. Applications close July 3rd 2020 and a response is expected in August 2020. While this application meets all the criteria, the Government funding is not guaranteed.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
<p>Marcus Hill (2) (TW Property Group)</p> <p>Karen Cooper (32)</p>	<p>HOWARD STREET DEVELOPMENT AREA</p> <p>Officers Responsible: Bruce Allan (Group Manager Corporate) Craig Cameron (Group Manager Strategy and Development)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p>Marcus Hill (TW Property Group)</p> <p><i>The submitter raises a number of points in respect of the Howard Street Structure Plan zone and the setting of Development Contributions, including independent engineering review, revised costs and reassessment of the proposed Development Contribution levy.</i></p> <p>Officers acknowledge the concerns raised by the submitter around costs and the setting of the proposed ISDC rate. Council made the decision to defer adopting the Internal Servicing Development Contribution (ISDC) as part of the Amended 2019/20 Development Contributions Policy (DCP), pending detailed design costs and further engagement with landowners and expert consultants. Unfortunately meetings held with the submitter since have not alleviated all of their concerns which they reiterate through their submission.</p> <p>Officers are satisfied that the detailed design is fit for purpose. Detailed design costs to carry out the works required under the designation have reduced the ISDC from a proposed \$33,500 to \$20,621 excl GST per Household Unit / lot.</p> <p>Council engaged engineering consultants to undertake a peer review of its rates and their estimate of the works was approximately 15% lower. In the context of the current market uncertainties, and to manage the risk to Council, officers believe it would be prudent to go with the more conservative estimate to initially set its ISDC, with a commitment to revising its ISDC at the time contract is awarded and costs are actually known. Only through going to the market and tendering for this work will Council have an accurate picture of the real costs.</p> <p>Officers reiterate that Council is legally permitted to recover only the cost it has incurred, so should there be any reductions</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>in actual construction costs, these can be passed on to landowners through the setting of a lower ISDC.</p> <p>In most instances, a development contribution is generally paid to council at the time of application for 224c (title) after services have been constructed and can be connected to. There will therefore be opportunity for Council to revise its DCP based on actual costs <u>prior</u> to any payment being received.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that a landowner chooses to pay Council an ISDC than is greater than any subsequent revision, Council can commit to refunding the difference between the ISDC paid and the revised ISDC rate.</p> <p>The refund would be made in the interests of 'fairness and equity' and not the provisions of the Local Government Act which does not require Council to make a refund. A number of refunds were made to landowners in Irongate under this commitment.</p> <p>Karen Cooper</p> <p><i>The submitter raises a number of points particularly in respect of the setting of development contributions and the proposed internal servicing development contributions.</i></p> <p>The general principle for the provision of infrastructures is to build the services to the property boundary with the landowner being responsible for all the internal related works. The ISDC seeks to recover the costs of the internal infrastructure from those benefiting from the infrastructure. Officers do not consider it fair and equitable for other developers (via DC's) or the wider community (via Rates) to pay for this particular infrastructure.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge the ISDC may impact the land purchase price offered, however the ISDC is in essence a cost that any developer would ordinarily expect to pay at some point when developing their land. i.e. If the cost wasn't passed on in the form of an ISDC, the developer would have to finance and construct the infrastructure themselves.</p> <p>Council is legally permitted to recover only the cost it has incurred, so it intends to revise its ISDC rate on an annual basis as more information becomes available. Whilst reductions in actual construction costs would generally lead to a reduction in</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>the ISDC rate, equally, additional costs (such as road and service corridor land compensation) or slower than anticipated uptake rates, may lead to an increase in the ISDC rate, a cost that would be picked up by any new landowner.</p> <p>A provision for land required for the Stormwater Attenuation area has been made and forms part of the wider Greenfields DC rate. No provision has been made for land required for the road and service corridor following advice from an independent valuer of the betterment value to landowners. Should compensation be made, any land acquisition costs would need to be added to the ISDC calculation.</p> <p>As part of the submissions to the Amended 2019/20 DCP, Council discussed the merits of an alternative funding approach i.e. targeted rates, which would shift the cost from developer / land owner to the end user (ratepayer) purchasing the section. However, Council supported the current approach by recovering the costs through DC's. If Council were of a view that this alternative option now had merit, it would need to be re-consulted upon. This may not be supported by all landowners as a targeted rate option requires them to pay a rate now irrespective of their development aspirations.</p> <p>Officers are very mindful of the need to conclude the land acquisitions required for the road and services corridor, construct services and bring much needed sections to the market. However, a critical path to achieving this and enabling development to occur, is agreeing a funding model to recover these costs.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	PART B – OTHER ISSUES
Jan Daffern (1)	<p>Officer Responsible: Bruce Allan (Group Manager Corporate)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Charging rates on a SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Property) basis</u></p> <p><i>The submitter seeks remission of charges on holiday accommodation currently being applied on a SUIP basis.</i></p> <p>Under the 2019/20 rates strike, the additional rating unit (accommodation unit) triggered additional uniform and targeted rates of \$548 in respect of HDC rates and an additional \$92 in respect of HBRC rates.</p> <p>In line with most councils around NZ, HDC applies its uniform and targeted rates on a ‘Separately used or inhabited basis (SUIP)’. It is acknowledged that occupancy may differ from property to property and that not all additional rating units will have the same level of impact on council services, however it’s not unreasonable to believe that the additional rating unit will place a greater impact for which a greater share of those costs should be passed on. Under this approach B & Bs are assessed as one rating unit as they are not separate (and self-contained).</p> <p>Council’s Rating Review Working Party (RRWP) discussed the basis for applying uniform and targeted rates in 2017. It recognised that not all SUIPs, particularly accommodation providers, are used equally and considered a ‘per rating unit’ (1x charge per property). However when considering the financial impacts, the RRWP made a recommendation to Council to retain the status quo approach of applying these rates on a per SUIP basis. This decision was supported by Council at the meeting held on 1 February 2018.</p> <p>Council’s Rating Review Working Party was heavily involved in developing the current Rate Remission & Postponement Policy which includes the provision for a remission where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the additional rating unit is being occupied by a dependent family member, • the additional rating unit is unable to be or incapable of being inhabited (I.e. derelict)

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the additional rating unit is for an employee who is essential and must reside on the rating unit for the ongoing running of the business. <p>Council can consider extending its policy where it believes it is fair and equitable to do so, although it would need to be mindful that any remission is passed on to other ratepayers.</p> <p>Council is required by legislation to review its Rates Remission & Postponement Policy at least every 6 years with a review due as part of the 2021 LTP. This would seem an appropriate opportunity for Council to consider any changes it wishes to make to its policy.</p> <p>Officer Responsible: Martin Jarvis (Waste & Data Services Manager) Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Charging and services under the WMMP (Waste Management & Minimisation Plan)</u></p> <p><i>The submitter requests open and transparent discussion for properties being charged on a SUIP basis in respect of the services and charges being delivered under the new WMMP.</i></p> <p>Refuse and recycling targeted rates are applied on each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit and based on the provision or availability to the land of the service provided. These rates are applied in accordance with the Rating Act provisions. If a property falls within the area of service, and the service is available to that property, a rate is applied irrespective of whether the owner / occupier choose to use the service or not.</p> <p>The rates are applied twice because of the reasons outlined by Bruce Allan (HDC Group Manager Corporate) in his response above.</p> <p>It is noted that the collection point for the property in question is at the northern extremity of the collection area and in a 100km per hour speed zone. Council officers are happy to meet the submitter onsite to review the safety and appropriateness of servicing the property.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
Jo Coughlan (24)	<p>Officer Responsible: Alison Banks (Group Manager Community Facilities and Programmes) Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Funding support for NZ Chinese Language week</u> <i>The submitter requests funding support of \$5,000 toward delivery of NZ Chinese Language Week.</i></p> <p>This submission has some alignment with the goals and planned actions contained in the draft Hastings District Council Multicultural Strategy. Goal 1 of the Strategy is “<i>multiculturalism & diversity is celebrated in the Hastings District</i>” and an identified action to contribute to this goal is “<i>increase the acknowledgement, promotion & celebration of language weeks</i>”.</p> <p>Within Council it is intended that this action will be led by the Hastings District Libraries and the Communications & Marketing team.</p> <p>HDC would have considered an application to the Community Grant Fund for this submission however this round has now closed.</p>
Michelle Loveday (25)	<p>Officer Responsible: Alison Banks (Group Manager Community Facilities and Programmes) Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Request for Mahora Community Plan</u> <i>The submitter requests the development of a community plan for the Mahora community.</i> Officers support this submission however this is unable to commence until the end of the 2020/21 financial year.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
<p>Warren Elliott (26) (Keirunga Gardens Arts & Crafts Society)</p>	<p>Officer Responsible: Colin Hosford (Public Spaces and Building Assets Manager)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Land leased by Keirunga and the Creative Hub</u></p> <p><i>The submitter raises various points in respect of the Keirunga Creative Hub and other identified hazards, security and protection of the Council owned buildings and the surrounding areas.</i></p> <p>1 - Removal of bamboo – The removal of the bamboo stubble is planned for July 2020 as part of the new financial year's renewal programme. An appropriate low level barrier will also be installed to ensure cars can park safely.</p> <p>2 - Installation of additional street light in carpark – Officers advise that a new streetlight will cost \$9000. Officers will action this request through the existing 2020/21 parks new works budgets.</p> <p>3 - Re-allocation of carpark spaces – The re-marking of the carpark area had been deferred until 2020/21 as officers waited for the construction of the Creative Hub to be completed. This task and the consideration of improved traffic safety signs will be undertaken in 2020/21 utilising existing funds.</p> <p>4 - Carpark reseal – Officers advise that some minor repairs are to be undertaken in conjunction with the re-marking and traffic safety improvements scheduled in the 2020/21 renewal programme.</p> <p>5 - Safety fence request – Officers have viewed the fall hazard and agree that a barrier should be erected. It is estimated that this will cost \$2000 and can be funded out of existing parks development funds.</p> <p>6 – Upgrade of William Nelson Homestead Room – Officers have received a cost estimate of \$20,000 for the upgrade of the room. If Council is of the mind, it could allocate funds in the 2020/21 Annual Plan to undertake the work immediately, or conversely it could defer the decision and consider the request for inclusion in the Reserve Management Plan (RMP) that is</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>currently being consulted on. This proposed work could then be considered alongside other actions likely to be raised in the RMP.</p> <p>7 - Security scoping investigation request- Officers can advise that a CPTED analysis of Keirunga Gardens is to be carried out in August. Officers will include a specific safety audit of the Creative Hub area to be carried out in collaboration with HDC security manager. Recommendations will be brought back to Council as part of the Reserve Management Plan process.</p>
Memory Kaukau (27)	<p>Officer Responsible: Jag Pannu (Transportation Manager)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Footpath extension Moteo Pa Road</u></p> <p><i>The submitter requests an extension to the footpath on Moteo Pa Road and additional lighting and traffic safety measures.</i></p> <p><u>Footpath</u></p> <p>The current footpath extends 150m past #189 Moteo Pa Road to one other house being #205. There are 3 empty sections that this footpath had anticipated would serve after it was built. The cost to build a new footpath to #229 is approximately \$20,000. Any new footpaths would likely be damaged during construction, so officers consider that the new footpath should be constructed once all houses that form the Papakainga are built on the sections between #205 and #229.</p> <p><u>New Street Lights</u></p> <p>The cost to install streetlights on the existing poles is approximately \$4000 each. There would be up to 8 lights required once the new houses are built to ensure there is consistent lighting in this area costing a total of \$32,000.</p> <p><u>Traffic Safety Measures on Moteo Pa Road</u></p> <p>Council's Road Safety Engineer will undertake an investigation of road safety needs in this area considering the future works. Any works required as a result of the future development will occur once development is complete.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
Murray Douglas (33)	<p>Officer Responsible: John O'Shaughnessy (Group Manager Planning and Regulatory) Officer Comments: <u>Stallholder licence fee</u> <i>The submitter comments on the Food Act 2014 and suggests that the Stallholder Licence is no longer required.</i></p> <p><u>Officer comments</u> We agree with the comments made by Mr Douglas in relation to the Food Act, whereby a stallholder's licence is not required for public space not owned or administered by Council i.e. the Farmers Market on private land as quoted in the submission. The Council is not requiring a stallholder's licence in this case.</p> <p>However, for public spaces that Council either owns or has authority over, stall-holders licences are issued "in relation to the approval for the use of the space". That is the fee that still remains in the schedule of charges within the Annual Plan that the submitter makes reference to, i.e. in the case of the night market.</p>
John Roil (34)	<p>Officers Responsible: John O'Shaughnessy (Group Manager Planning and Regulatory) Bruce Allan (Group Manager Corporate) Craig Cameron (Group Manager Strategy and Development) Officer Comments: <u>Rates Increase</u> The submitter comments on the proposed rates increase.</p> <p>Council recognises the impact COVID-19 has had across the entire community, and is working hard to set rates that are affordable for the community whilst maintaining our expected levels of service. This culminated in a proposed average rate increase of 1.9% across the district (Before 4.4%), although impacts will vary from property to property due to the 2019 district-wide revaluation.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p><u>Revenue and Funding policy</u></p> <p><i>The submitter comments on the proposed changes to charges in the building and consents area and calls for an independent review of the advantages and disadvantages of retaining a building processing unit.</i></p> <p>1.0 Context</p> <p>1.1 Hastings District Council has been experiencing significantly increased levels of activity within the Building Control area and Environmental Consents.</p> <p>Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, work volumes were predicted to nearly double. A similar pattern was also predicted in the resource consent field, with the increase in work volume predicted to come from more complex resource consents and an increase in hearings.</p> <p>The Council considered a range of options from (1) all processing done in-house, (2) a hybrid combination (in-house and outside contractors) and (3) fully contracting out consent processing (retaining administration in-house).</p> <p>When this matter was considered, Council already had outside building and resource consent processing contractors.</p> <p>2.0 Revenue and Funding Policy (Building & Planning)</p> <p>2.1 Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was proposed to hold a Building Industry & Planning Group meeting to consult with local industry.</p> <p>Unfortunately the COVID pandemic took our attention over this period, with our focus being the continued building and resource consent processing.</p> <p>It is accepted Council could have done better with its consultation by using its development email database to inform its primary customers in addition to the normal Annual Plan consultation channels.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>3.0 Building Control</p> <p>The decision by Council to go to an enhanced hybrid model for building consent processing was made on the basis of the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk: Council has identified that building consent processing involves both a latent liability and reputation risk. • The impacts of changes to Building Control legislation often do not surface for a number of years as was the case with the “leaky buildings era”. Note: Council has commissioned an updated actuarial assessment of the risk posed by the hybrid model (greater external contractors). • The need to process the significant number of new housing being developed by Kainga Ora. • Council has had a relatively low turnover in staff numbers in both Building and Planning. With the movement of staff to external contractors this has meant new staff need to be trained. While this requires resource it reduces the risk and as councils are the only bodies training staff in this area, it avoids the issue of lack of suitably trained staff in the industry. • To be able to match complexity with appropriate resources and maintain greater control over high risk consents (reducing risk). • Ensure processing times are met and HDC maintains a flexible consenting capacity. <p>Within Council there are two primary activities within the Building area namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Consenting Authority (BCA) work • Council’s “territorial authority responsibilities”

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>The area of building consent processing being contracted out is the building consent authority processing of consents which only forms part of this building consent process.</p> <p>In summary, the consenting processes set under the Resource Management Act and Building Act provide the framework for development approvals by territorial authorities such as Hastings District Council.</p> <p>We are monitoring the activity levels in the development industry and it is still uncertain in the longer term which direction the local development economy will take so there is a need to retain flexibility. Initial indications are that the residential development, horticultural service industries and industrial demand is still strong with the lead indicators that are coming through the resource consents being submitted to Council.</p> <p>Considering all the factors involved in these complex areas of activities, it is considered that the hybrid model of a combination of internal and external consent processing for Building & Resource consents is the most appropriate. The proposed funding of these activities is considered to accurately reflect that the primary beneficiaries of this service delivery model are applicants deriving the direct benefits. It is considered the proposed hourly charges accurately reflect the “exacerbator pays” principle.</p> <p><u>Development Contributions (DCs) and Rates</u></p> <p><i>The submitter comments on the interconnection between development contribution and rates.</i></p> <p>Prior to 2007, Council recovered a share of growth related infrastructure through Development Levies applied under the Resource Management Act, although a portion of these costs were funded from rates across the district. Since 2007, Council’s general approach is that ‘growth pays for growth’ (via DCs), with rates funding renewals and operational costs so there is no ‘double dipping’.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge that growth from either change in land uses or increase in land values from the rezoning of land, generally has a positive impact on rates, as it will lead to an</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>increase in the rating base that rates are then shared across. This is not exclusive to just Irongate as horticulture / farming land rezoned for residential purposes will also increase our rating base.</p> <p>The average Land Value (LV) increase across the district under the 2019 revaluation was 51%, however, this will inevitably vary from sector to sector and of course property to property. Land value increases in areas such as Irongate and Whakatu (typically 150% to 200%), have been much higher than the average and as a consequence these properties' share of rates increases. Officers acknowledge that some of the rates increases are significant however they are driven by revaluation which Council has historically not intervened with. Each landowner was given the opportunity to object to their LV.</p> <p>It should be noted that a revaluation does not increase Council's rate take. Council sets its rating requirement through its Annual Plan / Long Term Plan. A revaluation simply affects the share of rates of each property is required to pay.</p> <p>To date DC's have been paid on approximately 47ha (of the 94ha chargeable area) with the remaining 47ha estimated to be developed over the next 14 years.</p> <p>Under the Local Government Act (LGA), councils are not permitted to over-recover DCs and must only recover the costs (including interest) they incur. To ensure HDC does not over recover over the lifetime of the project, Officers continue to monitor all assumptions (including uptake) that underpin its calculation and undertake a revision annually. A 2% increase in the DC rate is proposed for Irongate as part of the Draft 2020/21 Development Contributions Policy.</p> <p>If any recalculation results in a DC rate lower than what was paid by landowners, Council is committed to refunding the difference between the rate. Whilst this is not specifically provided for under the LGA, Council will undertake this in the interests of fairness and equity to all landowners within the catchment area.</p> <p>The provisions of the LGA enable Council to recover a DC that relates to future capital expenditure that support growth, so paying a DC in advance of some works being completed is</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>therefore not uncommon. The DC rate reflects a component of credit interest on such payments within its calculation.</p> <p>Council can choose to reflect the wider economic benefits to the community from the economic development occurring within the industrial development by considering a reduction its DC rate and reflecting a 'public good'. Any reduction would need to be recovered from other sources (Rates).</p>
Keith Newman (35) (WOW)	<p>Officer Responsible: Graeme Hansen (Director Major Capital Projects Delivery)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Protection of Cape View Corner</u></p> <p><i>The submitter commends Council on its approach and progress with the rock revetment to protect Cape View Corner, noting the consenting issues that need to be worked through.</i></p> <p>Works have progressed on the Cape View Corner project in preparation for the consents process. The design report has been produced and consent application documents prepared. Discussions have been had with affected landowners and consultation with Iwi and DOC is to progress over the next month, up to consent lodgement.</p>
Mark Aspden (36) (Sport Hawke's Bay)	<p>Officer Responsible: Alison Banks (Group Manager Community Wellbeing and Services)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Sport and Recreation</u></p> <p><i>The submitter comments on the work of Sport HB in conjunction with the Council and encourages Council to continue to support sport and recreation within the district during these challenging times.</i></p> <p>HDC currently supports Sport HB with a Contract for service to the value of \$75k. This current 3 year contract ends 30/06/2021</p> <p>HDC currently supports the work of Sport Hawke's Bay as it contributes to the current and future needs of our community in the following areas:</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the health and wellbeing of our local communities • Increase sport and active recreation in the community. • Increase the number of and capability of sport and active recreation leaders in the community • Work with Council to support facility, community and sport planning <p>The Council's work programme as set out within the Long Term Plan is unchanged including its commitment to sport and recreation.</p>
Brent Sheldrake (37) (Sport New Zealand)	<p>Officer Responsible: Alison Banks (Group Manager Community Wellbeing and Services)</p> <p>Officer Comments: <u>Sport and Recreation</u></p> <p><i>The submitter comments on the challenges facing the sport and recreation sector and encourages Council to continue to work in partnership and to invest in the sector.</i></p> <p>HDC currently supports the work of Sport NZ as it contributes to the current and future needs of our community in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the health and wellbeing of our local communities • Increase sport and active recreation in the community. • Increase the number of and capability of sport and active recreation leaders in the community • Work with Council to support facility, community and sport planning <p>The Council's work programme as set out within the Long Term Plan is unchanged including its commitment to sport and recreation.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS																								
Louise Gould (39) Luke & Krissy Shadbolt (40)	<p>Officer Responsible: Colin Hosford (Public Spaces and Building Assets Manager)</p> <p>Officer Comments: <u>Waimarama Domain</u></p> <p><i>The submitters request that works within the Waimarama Reserve Management Plan be brought forward, particularly in respect to the new entrance through Gilray Place and the proposed tennis court.</i></p> <p>The Waimarama Reserve Management Plan was adopted in 2014. Among various actions, it included two key actions to enhance the Waimarama Domain. Firstly the construction of a hard court area and secondly the construction of a new, additional entrance way at Gilray Place.</p> <p>Funding has been included in future years of the 2018-28 LTP for these actions.</p> <table><tr><td>RMP Actions</td><td>20-24</td><td>24-25</td><td>25-26</td><td>26-27</td></tr><tr><td>Hard Court area</td><td></td><td>\$100,000</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Gilray Place access</td><td></td><td></td><td>\$150,000</td><td>\$150,000</td></tr><tr><td>Tracks, planting and signs</td><td>15,000 pa</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Officers are in support of undertaking these community led actions while noting that Council has made provision for them in the future.</p> <p>It is also noted that a local Waimarama resident has also offered \$20,000 to help with the hard court project. This kind donation has proved to be a catalyst to kick start and potentially bring the tennis/hard court project forward.</p> <p>The new access at Gilray Place is also part of the future plan, and current visitor and vehicular pressure at other access points to the main reserve this past summer has also highlighted the desire to</p>					RMP Actions	20-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	Hard Court area		\$100,000			Gilray Place access			\$150,000	\$150,000	Tracks, planting and signs	15,000 pa			
RMP Actions	20-24	24-25	25-26	26-27																					
Hard Court area		\$100,000																							
Gilray Place access			\$150,000	\$150,000																					
Tracks, planting and signs	15,000 pa																								

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>advance the implementation of improved access to the wider reserve.</p> <p>Officers also note that the adopted funding streams for the new access way and hard court were set in 2014. Officers have undertaken a review of the estimates to ensure they are still current. Recent costings on a new concrete half court indicate that a fenced full court will cost a minimum of \$100,000. Similarly a sealed internal road, as specified in the RMP has been re-costed and the estimate of \$300,000 is appropriate under current contracting conditions.</p> <p><u>It is suggested that Council has 3 options:</u></p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>On the basis of the desire to maintain a tight rein on expenditure and not impose additional rate increases, it could decide to not advance any funds and decline the current request. It could also signal a willingness to reconsider the priorities as part of the upcoming LTP review.</p> <p>Option 2</p> <p>Conversely Council could consider bringing forward funds to progress only one of the projects and defer the second project and reassess the request next year as part of the 2021-31 LTP deliberations. Officers suggest \$100,000 could be brought forward to undertake the hard court project. As the designated hard court area is near the existing playground and internal access, it could be progressed as a standalone project. This proposal would incur the additional costs on rates of \$5,000pa to cover interest and loan repayments. This option would advance a smaller scale project in Waimarama while possibly also signalling a desire to reconsider the timing of the Gilray Place access way next year as part of the upcoming LTP.</p> <p>Option 3</p> <p>Alternatively Council could also consider undertaking both projects and bring forward all of the funds. . This proposal would incur the additional costs on rates of \$20,000pa to cover interest and loan repayments. This action would be well received by the submitters but will have an upward impact on rates.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
Peter Bloor (41)	<p>Officer Responsible: Bruce Allan (Group Manager Corporate) Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Rates Increase</u></p> <p><i>The submitter requests Council makes further cuts to the proposed rate increase for 2020/21.</i></p> <p>Officers acknowledge the submitters concerns around rate increases, particularly in light of the COVID-19 impact and drought conditions currently being experienced across the Horticulture / Farming sector.</p> <p>Whilst a 1.7% rate revenue increase is proposed for the budget in Rating Area Two, the impacts of the recent district-wide revaluation will mean that rate increases will vary from property to property depending on their own individual land value change. This is a dynamic that affects the apportionment of rates across properties at each 3 yearly revaluation.</p> <p>As a significant portion of the submitters (Brownrigg) properties (owned and leased) are contiguous, the driver for their 'higher than average increase', is the revaluation where they have seen an average Land Value increase of 48% across the properties identified on their schedule (vs 39% average across RA2). Historically Council has not intervened or adjusted its rating policy to counteract any revaluation impact as the impacts of a revaluation do tend to even themselves out over time.</p> <p>Council considered a number of options (including the setting of a 0% rate increase) before finalising its draft 2020/21 Annual Plan budget, which strives to achieve a balance between affordability and providing expected levels of service. In addition Council recently contributed \$200,000 towards the Hawkes Bay Drought Relief Fund to provide financial assistance for those in need.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
Tristan Seccombe (42) Havelock North Wanderers	<p>Officer Responsible: Colin Hosford (Public Spaces and Building Assets Manager)</p> <p>Officer Comments:</p> <p><u>Upgrade of Changing Rooms</u></p> <p><i>The submitter requests Council support toward a new gas hot water system at the Sportsground Changing Rooms on Guthrie Park.</i></p> <p>Officers are aware that football in general, and the HN Wanderers club in particular, are experiencing strong growth. This growth is now putting the existing hot water system under stress as it struggles to cope with the increasing demand for after-match showering.</p> <p>With the growth in football at Guthrie Park, it is clear that the changing rooms as a whole need extending to cope with the extra demand. Officers believe the shortcomings in the existing changing room facilities at Guthrie Park will need to be considered in the upcoming Long Term Plan, where a substantial fund will need to be considered. To meet the growing needs of sport, the rooms will need to be extended to cater for the increased numbers. A new hot water system would be included in the upgrade.</p> <p>The issue for Council is whether it wants to improve the hot water system immediately to help alleviate current shortcomings or whether it would rather defer the expenditure until the upgrade is considered next year in the formulation of the LTP and funds set aside.</p> <p>While officers are aware that the changing rooms are struggling to cope with the increased number of players utilising them, officers also advise that we are unaware of any serious failure in the hot water system, apart from it struggling to cope with the sheer volume of showers.</p> <p>Officers have spoken with the plumbing company to ascertain whether the proposed system would be able to be retained and integrated into an extended facility and have been advised it could be retained or retrofitted into a larger water heating solution.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44

SUBMITTER & SUBMISSION NUMBER	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>On this basis if Council was of the mind to fund this requested upgrade, it could consider making \$10,000 immediately available in 2020/21 and be assured that the system would still be able to be re-utilised in a reconfigured solution in the future.</p>
Des Ratima (43)	<p>Officer Responsible: Alison Banks (Group Manager Community Wellbeing and Services) Officer Comments: <u>Whakatu Community Plan</u> <i>The submitter suggests a number of initiatives to assist in supporting communities and implementing community plans.</i></p> <p>The Council's current approach to advancing actions within Community Plans is through an annual Council seed fund of \$50,000.</p> <p>In addition, where appropriate actions are incorporated within other Council work streams i.e. Reserve Management Plan implementation, or by leveraging of other agencies where the actions do not sit with Council.</p> <p>Council will be discussing the future direction of Community Plans through its impending Long Term Plan workshops which is suggested as the appropriate forum to also consider the future funding arrangements.</p>

Item 6

Attachment 44