THAMES-COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL

2018 - 2028 LONG TERM PLAN

SUBMISSION FORM

For information about the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan and the proposals on this form see the Consultation Document or visit our **website www.tcdc.govt.nz/ltp**

Do it online! It's easier online - find our online submission form at **www.tcdc.govt.nz/ltp**

Need help? If you need any help filling out this submission form, please call us on 07 868 0200 or email consultation@tcdc.govt.nz

Submitter Details

Full name(s)	
Or organisation *(if relevant)*	
Email address	Postal address
Telephone number *(include area code)*	
Mobile	

Please select the option that best describes you

- ☐ I live in the Thames-Coromandel District
- ☐ I own a property in the Thames-Coromandel District but I live elsewhere in New Zealand
- ☐ I own a property in the Thames-Coromandel District but I live internationally:
- ☐ I am a visitor to the Thames-Coromandel District
- ☐ I am submitting on behalf of an organisation/company which is based in the Thames-Coromandel District
- ☐ I am submitting on behalf of an organisation/company which is not based in the Thames-Coromandel District

***If applicable*, which Community Board area do you spend the most time in:**

- ☐ Coromandel-Colville Board area
- ☐ Mercury Bay Board area
- ☐ Tairua-Pauanui Board area
- ☐ Thames Board area
- ☐ Whangamata Board area

2018-2028 Long Term Plan Hearing

Hearings for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan will be held in May.

Would you like to speak at a hearing in support of your submission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please make sure you tell us your telephone number and email address to ensure we can contact you to arrange a time for your presentation to Council.

Submissions must be received no later than 4pm Monday 16 April 2018

Public Information - Please note that submissions are public information and they will be published and be accessible to the public and media as part of the Long Term Plan decision-making process.

THE BIG STUFF - OUR SIGNIFICANT PROPOSALS

Road Maintenance - page 13

Council has responsibility to maintain roads for public access. Council has become aware of 24 roads which it has not been maintaining and are therefore are proposing that all structures on those roads be maintained by Council (Option A).

	OPTION A *(proposed)* Structures only	**OPTION B** - Low standard of maintenance	**OPTION C** - Higher quality which meets NZTA funding standards
What is it?	We will upgrade and maintain all structures on Council owned roads over years 1 to 4. This includes bridges, fords, retaining walls, culverts and the like.	We will upgrade and maintain Council owned roads, and where appropriate provide a lower standard of road than other roads in the district. This will be across the 10 years of the Plan.	We will maintain Council owned roads to a standard which will attract on-going NZTA maintenance subsidy. This will be across the 10 years of the Plan.
How does this impact our level of service?	This will improve the integrity and safety of structures on 24 currently unmaintained Council roads.	This will improve the integrity and safety of all 24 roads, including upgraded structures, minimal widening and improved surfaces.	The integrity and safety of all 24 currently unmaintained Council roads will be greatly improved, including upgrades to all structures, additional widening and a more even surface resulting in a smoother ride.
What will it cost?	Upgrade cost of $3.7 million. The total cost of these upgrades and future maintenance requires $15.05 each year per ratepayer across the life of the asset.	Upgrade cost of $11.8 million. The total cost of these upgrades and future maintenance requires $61.05 each year per ratepayer across the life of the asset.	Upgrade cost of $16.7 million. The total cost of these upgrades and future maintenance requires $54.40 each year per ratepayer across the life of the asset.

** Please note - If an alternate option to the proposed option is adopted after consultation then the rates required is substituted for the proposed rates required.*

Which option for Road Maintenance do you support?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B** ☐ **Option C**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Sub-regional aquatic facility - page 12

The current Thames 25m swimming pool is due for replacement in 2027, which also aligns with the long-held desire by Ngāti Maru for Council to vacate the site given it covers an urupā/burial ground.

After some initial investigations Council is proposing a sub-regional aquatic facility (Option A).

	OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B	OPTION C
What is it?	A Sub-Regional Aquatic Centre, including a 25m pool, hydrotherapy pool, a permanent building and scope for hydro slides, spa pools, a gym and sauna, and café and spectator facilities. The facility will be built in years 4 to 6.	A like-for-like 25m Thames pool within a permanent building. The facility will be built in years 4 to 6.	A Sub-Regional Aquatic Centre, including a 25m pool, hydrotherapy pool, a permanent building and scope for hydro slides, spa pools, a gym and sauna, and café and spectator facilities. The facility will be built in years 4 to 6.
How does this impact our level of service?	Increased level of service by a larger pool complex and provision of bespoke hydrotherapy pool.	Same level of service for the Thames area.	Increased level of service by a larger pool complex and provision of bespoke hydrotherapy pool.
What will it cost?	$21.1 million construction We assume that a sub-regional facility will attract $3 million in external funding from national and regional partners. Estimated $1.5 million operating cost per annum. District general rate funded, requires $130 each year per ratepayer across the life of the asset.	$11.7 million construction Construction of a like-for-like facility is unlikely to attract any external funding. Estimated $1.2 million operating cost per annum. Thames local rate funded, requires $477 each year per Thames ratepayer across the life of the asset.	$21.1 million construction Estimated $3 million in external funding. Estimated $1.5 million operating cost per annum, equally shared between district and Thames ratepayers. First $11.7 million funded by Thames ratepayers, requires $393 each year per ratepayer. Remaining $9.4 million funded district general rate, requires $68 each year per all district ratepayers. Rates impacts are across the life of the asset.

** Please note - If an alternate option to the proposed option is adopted after consultation then the rates required is substituted for the proposed rates required.*

Which option for Road Maintenance do you support?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B** ☐ **Option C**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Wentworth Valley Road - page 14

As part of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan we consulted with you on the Wentworth Valley Road.

After undertaking a business case for this project, we now propose to only undertake the seal extension and not the walkway and cycle way (Option A).

	OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
What is it?	Complete sealing of Wentworth Valley Road (a total additional sealed area of 3.2km).	Do not seal the remaining 3.2km.
How does this impact our level of service?	This seal extension is an increased level of service replacing a gravel surface with asphalt resulting in a smoother ride.	No change - remains a gravel surface.
What will it cost?	A cost of $1.3 million, requires $4 each year per ratepayer across the life of the asset.	Nil.

** Please note - If an alternate option to the proposed option is adopted after consultation then the rates required is substituted for the proposed rates required.*

Which option for Wentworth Valley Road do you support?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Pottery Lane Extension- page 14

Traffic to and through Coromandel Town is stilted over busy periods, and with visitor and ratepayer numbers set to increase, relieving this congestion and redirecting traffic where possible is becoming important.

Council is proposing an extension of Pottery Lane to 255 Kapanga Road to reduce the number of service vehicles stopping on Kapanga Road which will relieve congestion from commercial traffic (Option A).

	OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
What is it?	Complete Pottery Lane Extension in Coromandel Town over three years.	Do not undertake the extension project.
How does this impact our level of service?	Residents, ratepayers and visitors will see the benefit of reduced congestion in Kapanga Road.	No change - traffic flow will remain congested at peak times.
What will it cost?	Costs $2.2 million, requires $7 each year per ratepayer across the life of the asset.	Nil.

** Please note - If an alternate option to the proposed option is adopted after consultation then the rates required is substituted for the proposed rates required.*

Which option for the Pottery Lane Extension do you support?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Totara Valley Road service extension - page 15

To help support and encourage development in Totara Valley, Council are proposing to provide key infrastructure like road sealing, wastewater, water supply and stormwater infrastructure to this area (Option A).

	OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
What is it?	Extend wastewater, roading, water supply and storm water services up Totara Valley Road to facilitate development in that area in years 1 to 3.	Do not extend these services until development is consented and seek contributions to total cost of these service extensions as part of the developments.
How does this impact our level of service?	Residents and ratepayers on Totara Valley Road will get access to improved roading, as well as enhanced Council wastewater, water supply and storm water systems. New residents and ratepayers will have access to these services from the start of the development period instead of being connected at a later date.	No change to current levels of service.
What will it cost?	Costs $2.8 million, requires $10 each year per ratepayer across the life of the assets.	Nil. Any future costs to ratepayer to be determined as and when service extensions required.

** Please note - If an alternate option to the proposed option is adopted after consultation then the rates required is substituted for the proposed rates required.*

Which option for Totara Valley do you support?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

CHANGES TO WHO PAYS

Economic Development Rate - page 16

Council is proposing to remove the economic development rate from commercial properties based on a change in direction from Council in this activity.

The focus of our economic development programme is now almost exclusively on facilitating engagement with business and developers in the district. This is a change from funding the anchor projects previously identified by Council as those projects were seen as providing a direct benefit to Coromandel businesses by fostering the visitor industry.

With this change in focus, we don't think a targeted rate on commercial and industrial properties to support economic development in the district is necessary as our new 'connect the dots' type approach requires significantly less funding and is accessible to all ratepayers who wish to engage with us.

OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
Commercial and industrial ratepayers will no longer pay $8.35 per $10,000 of improvement value. For example, a property with $1 million improvement value currently pays $835 on this rate. All rateable properties, including commercial and industrial ratepayers, will pay $22 each year as part of the general rate.	Current rating of commercial and industrial ratepayers for $8.35 per $10,000 of improvement value continues, with no increase for all rateable properties.

Which option do you support for the Economic Development rate?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Uniform Annual General Charge - page 16

The Council considers that many of its services provide the same or similar level of benefit to all ratepayers regardless of a ratepayer's location in the district, the size of the property and/or value of the property. The best match for funding services that benefit all ratepayers in an equal manner is a uniform rate where all ratepayers pay exactly the same amount.

The Council proposes to increase the amount of rating collected from the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) and reduce the amount collected from the land value based rating for the general rate.

OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
The Uniform Annual General Charge, the fixed part of the general rate, will be at a higher level than previous years and this means lower value properties will pay a higher proportion of total rates. The impact is different for every rateable property.	Uniform rates are not maximised and the UAGC is set at a similar level to previous years (showing a small increase to reflect the higher total rates required).

Which option do you support for the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC)?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Removing the rates remission available for second dwellings - page 17

131 ratepayers in the district currently have been granted a rate remission for a second dwelling on their property through our Rates Remission Policy. In the past ratepayers that could show that these dwellings would not be used for payment could apply for the remission.

Council is proposing to remove this remission on the basis that the use of these second dwellings regardless of who is using them has an impact on Council services and the applicable ratepayers need to pay for this impact. (Option A).

OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
Remove the rates remission for properties with a second dwelling which is not rented for payment. This will increase rates for the 131 current remitted properties by between $710 and $2,006 and reduce the overall rating impact by approximately $230,000.*	Do not remove the rates remission for properties with a second dwelling which is not rented for payment. No change to the current rating for all ratepayers in the district as a result.*

** The draft LTP budgets referred to in this document are based on the current remission remaining in place.*

Which option do you support for rates remission for second dwellings?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Bed & Breakfast accommodation providers - page 17

Council is proposing to return 8 Bed and Breakfast accommodation providers with four or more bedrooms available for rent to the residential category. (Option A)

These ratepayers were classified as commercial as part of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan which meant that they were paying the economic development rate and higher wastewater rates. The scale of Bed and Breakfast businesses across the district varies and this means the commercial wastewater rate is not always appropriate. Without the Economic Development rate we think it is best to return the large bed and breakfast businesses back to the residential rate category.

OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
Move B&B providers with 4 or more beds to residential ratepayers (affects 8 properties).	Retain B&B properties with 4 or more beds as commercial ratepayers.

Which option do you support for Bed and Breakfast accommodation providers?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

FEES AND CHARGES

Resource Consent fees - page 17

The Resource Management Act requires that we specifically consult on any changes to the resource consenting fees.

Small changes to reflect inflation and the actual cost of consent processing are proposed.

The fees can be viewed at **www.tcdc.govt.nz/ltp**

Do you support the proposed changes to the Resource Consent fees?

- ☐ **Yes** I support the proposed changes
- ☐ **No** I do not support the proposed changes
- ☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

Harbour Facility fees - page 17

Council is proposing to align the fees for boat ramp and harbour facilities across the district, unless the service particularly warrants a higher or lower fee.

This change means that in the Coromandel-Colville area there will be a charge of $1.00 per embarkment and disembarkment.

The fees can be viewed at **www.tcdc.govt.nz/ltp**

Do you support the proposed change to how we calculate Harbour Facility fees?

- ☐ **Yes** I support the proposed changes
- ☐ **No** I do not support the proposed changes
- ☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

THAMES

Rhodes Park club rooms and grandstand - page 21

A proposal for Council to rebuild the club rooms and grandstand at Rhodes Park is the third of three big projects for Active Thames 2018, the first two being the Jack McLean Community Recreation Centre and the Thames Skate Park.

We are proposing to defer this project until 2019/20 within this Long Term Plan to allow for further investigation of feasibility of this project in light of an under commitment of external funding and higher costs with the first two projects, and to see what alignment there may be with the proposed sub regional aquatic facility. This will also give us an opportunity to undertake an assessment of the risk from flooding and coastal inundation to any major facility at Rhodes Park in line with new guidance from the government on planning for climate change. (Option A)

	OPTION A *(proposed)*	OPTION B
What is it?	Rebuild of Rhodes Park grandstand and club rooms undertaken in years 2 and 3.	Do not rebuild Rhodes Park grandstand and club rooms.
How does this impact our level of service?	A rebuilt grandstand is intended to cater for more user groups than the current facility can.	Grandstand and club room facilities at Rhodes Park are retained at current service levels.
What will it cost?	Total cost of $3.1 million. Up to 23% of this will be sought from Rhodes Park user groups and external grants. Constructing this facility requires $62 each year per Thames ratepayer across the life of the asset.	Nil.

** Please note - If an alternate option to the proposed option is adopted after consultation then the rates required is substituted for the proposed rates required.*

Which option for Rhodes Park do you support?

☐ **Option A (proposed)** ☐ **Option B**

☐ Other *(please provide comment)* _____

_____

UNDERSTANDING WHAT THE FUTURE MAY BRING

Water supply and wastewater service extensions - page 27

National standards around drinking water supplies and wastewater disposal continue to be a focus and we think it's only a matter of time before councils will be required to take responsibility for drinking water and wastewater disposal of all settlements in their district. We also know that community water supplies are coming under pressure as the enthusiasm of volunteers who look after these services wanes, and that individual property wastewater systems have detrimental impact on waterways as they come to the end of their life.

Over the first four years of this Long Term Plan we will be undertaking investigations into extending existing wastewater and water supply services to unconnected properties in hahei, Wharekaho, and area surrounding Thames.

We are interested in your feedback on the increased service and cost this would bring for residents and ratepayers in these locations.

Have more to tell us? Please provide details here…

Thank you for your submission

If you require further information about the 2018-2018 Long Term Plan please visit the Council website **www.tcdc.govt.nz/ltp**

THAMES-COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL
Private Bag, 515 Mackay Street, Thames 3540
Phone: 07 868 0200 Fax: 07 868 0234
consultation@tcdc.govt.nz
www.tcdc.govt.nz/ltp

THAMES COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL