

## 2011/12 DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN: KEY ISSUES AND FUNDING REQUESTS

### 1. Purpose of Report

This report provides for decisions on:

- savings options outlined in the draft plan
- additional/new funding outlined in the draft plan
- increases to fees and charges outlined in the draft plan
- prominent issues and new funding requests raised during consultation by submitters.

This report should be read in conjunction with the report on oral submissions and report on community feedback.

### 2. Recommendations

Officers recommend that the Committee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Agree the following savings options - consulted on in the draft Annual Plan - be included in the final 2011/12 Annual Plan.*

#	Variance (savings)	\$000
a)	<i>Economic and cultural savings comprising:</i>	(75)
	<i>i) Contestable economic grants (\$25,000)</i>	
	<i>ii) Strategic economic grants - international assoc. (\$10,000)</i>	
	<i>iii) Marketing support for Council events (\$25,000)</i>	
	<i>iv) Wellington Sculpture Trust (\$15)</i>	

b)	<b>Botanic Gardens and local parks comprising:</b>	(419)
	i) Reduce opening hours in winter for Begonia House shop (\$19,000)	
	ii) Close Botanic Garden/Otari Wilton Bush library (\$24,000)	
	iii) Reprioritise maintenance programmes (\$55,000)	
	iv) Reduce park furniture maintenance for one year (\$20,000)	
	v) Reduce pest monitoring (\$14,000)	
	vi) Defer increase (\$77,000) for Biodiversity Action Plan	
	vii) Mowing in public places – efficiencies (\$10k)	
	viii) Defer scheduled funding increase to hazardous tree removal programme for one year (\$100)	
	ix) Defer decommissioning Patent Slip jetty one year (\$100)	
c)	<b>Libraries comprising:</b>	(105)
	i) Reduce Central Library opening hours (\$57,000)	
	ii) Close one information desks (\$28,000)	
	iii) Providing newspapers in digital format only (\$20,000)	
d)	<b>Recreation and social savings comprising:</b>	(723)
	i) Swimming pools – rephase school pool grant funding over four years (\$500,000)	
	ii) Sportsfield efficiencies (\$108,000)	
	iii) Targeted approach to dog control (\$36,000)	
	iv) Reduce maintenance of under used properties (\$48,000)	
	v) Cemeteries – reduced crematorium services and maintenance (\$31,000)	
e)	<b>Wellington Waterfront Ltd</b>	(170)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>(\$1.492m)</b>

3. Agree the following new/additional funding proposals - consulted on in the draft Annual Plan - be included in the final 2011/12 Annual Plan.

#	Variance	\$000
a)	Increase heritage grants from \$200,000 to \$329,000 per year.	129
b)	Undertake feasibility study on a deep water pool complex (including additional parking) at the WRAC.	650
c)	Bringing forward funding for planning work for earthquake strengthening the Town Hall and Council Municipal Buildings.	400
d)	Emergency management – targeted research into how we can best support the most vulnerable in the community in case of an emergency.	20
e)	Grant funding for community emergency preparedness initiatives.	100
f)	Additional funding to earthquake strengthen the water	1,000

	<i>network.</i>	
		<i>Total</i> \$2.299m

4. *Agree the following new variances to the 2011/12 draft Annual Plan.*

<b>#</b>	<b>New funding – recommended</b>	<b>\$000</b>
a)	<i>Alex Moore Park – bring forward funding for planning and resource consent work (opex)</i>	50
b)	<i>National Hockey Stadium turf replacement – bring forward funding (capex)</i>	850
c)	<i>Continue funding for the New Zealand Academy of Sport North Island Talent Development Programme (opex)</i>	45
d)	<i>Hydrotherapy pool costs (capex)</i>	TBC

5. *Note that Saints Basketball requested funding support in their submission and officer advice regarding this request will be presented at the 29 June Council meeting at which the 2011/12 Annual Plan will be adopted.*
6. *Agree the response to prominent matters and other funding requests raised during the consultation period as outlined in appendix two.*
7. *Note officers report back on community emergency preparedness initiatives raised at the 24 March 2011 Council meeting attached as appendix 3.*
8. *Agree the changes to fees and charges (included as appendix four) – consulted on in the draft Annual Plan – be included in the final 2011/12 Annual Plan.*
9. *Note that submissions that related to operational matters such as maintenance or renewal works have been provided to relevant officers and will be considered alongside existing work programmes.*

### **3. Background**

Community feedback largely focused on the key proposals of the draft plan – savings options, fees and charges and areas of investment.

Issues that were raised on the 2011/12 draft annual plan fall into four broad categories:

- i. *New funding requests raised through submissions that officers recommend*  
These are discussed in appendix one.
- ii. *Funding requests and other prominent issues raised through submissions that officers recommend are not funded/actioned at this time.*  
These are outlined in appendix two.

*iii. Operational matters within existing levels of service*

Some submitters made requests relating to relatively specific or operational type matters that do not affect levels of service. These have been provided to the relevant business units who will review the information and consider any specific requests as part of existing renewal and maintenance programmes; their relative contribution towards Council's overall outcomes; and whether there is sufficient flexibility within the work programmes to accommodate them. In all cases a response will be provided to submitters.

*iv. Matters for further consideration*

Other submissions raised issues that require further exploration or will be considered as part of preparing the 2012-22 long-term plan. This includes ideas for savings raised by submitters, changes to performance measures, the level of financial and trend data included in draft plan, changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy etc.

*v. Minor wording changes*


Some submissions requested minor wording changes to the text of some activities - where these provide context and detail without adversely adding to the length and readability of the activity – the changes will be made.

## **5. Conclusion**

The report provides for consideration of new funding requests and the key issues that were raised during the draft annual plan consultation. Having deliberated on submissions and officers' advice, elected members are now required to balance those views and agree funding decisions for the coming year.

**APPENDIX 1:**

#	Funding requests that are recommended	\$
a)	<p><b><u>Alex Moore Park</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b>            Alex Moore Park Sport and Community Inc. request that \$50,000 - that is currently budgeted in the 2014/15 financial year in CX507 (Artificial Sportsfields) - be brought forward to the 2011/12 financial year to enable planning and resource consent work for the proposed new building and artificial sportsfield at Alex Moore Park.</p> <p><b>Background</b>            Alex Moore Park Sport and Community Inc. was formed two years ago. The Board is the umbrella organisation for five sporting clubs (Olympic Harriers, Johnsonville Cricket, Johnsonville Softball, North Wellington Junior Football and North Wellington Senior Football) with over 2000 members.</p> <p>As with many other sporting organisations in New Zealand, these clubs have experienced a common theme of rising utility and maintenance costs, poor utilisation, increased administration and fewer volunteers. Alex Moore Park Sport and Community Inc. has a vision for a purpose-built shared facility at Alex Moore Park commonly referred to as a “sportsville” model.</p> <p>Officers have been working closely with the Board/clubs over the last 3 to 4 years and have agreed to jointly apply for resource consent for the proposed building and the planned artificial sportsfield for Alex Moore Park. The joint resource consent application is expected to produce efficiencies. Both organisations are ready to commence the resource consent application process.</p> <p>Funding for the proposed artificial sportsfield at Alex Moore Park is allocated in the 2014/15 year of the long-term plan. However, it is noted that on 14 April 2011, the Strategy &amp; Policy Committee approved the reallocation of funding for an artificial sportsfield at Alex Moore Park, subject to consideration as part of 2012/22 LTP deliberations, as follows:</p> <p>2012/13:       \$50k            2013/14:       \$1.875M</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b>            It is recommended that \$50,000 is brought forward from CX507 to the 2011/12 financial year to enable planning and resource consent work for the proposed new building and artificial sportsfield at Alex Moore Park.</p>	\$50,000

<p><b>Contact officer</b> <i>Neville Brown, Director City Services</i></p>	
<p><b>b) <u>National Hockey Stadium turf replacement</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> That the Council bring forward the replacement of the number 2 artificial turf at the National Hockey Stadium Mount Albert Park due to the poor condition of the existing surface. Essentially the surface that is used for 2000 hours per annum has worn out and even with repairs is unlikely to last a further playing season.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The existing surface has been inspected by Council officers and specialists in the artificial turf industry. The professional opinion is that the field will last the current winter season but it is extremely unlikely that it will last the 2011/12 season.</p> <p>It is also noted that the failure of the surface during a playing season would have serious implications on the delivery of the hockey programme for Wellington Hockey.</p> <div data-bbox="159 805 1691 1393"></div>	<p>\$850,000</p>

	<p>Photo 1 showing wear areas with backing material showing through the holes. Photo 2 showing the condition of the seams in a high wear area.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> That a budget of \$850,000.00 for the replacement of the number 2 surface currently included in 2016/17 is bought forward to the 2011/12 year to undertake the replacement surface, sock pad, and and drainage work.</p> <p><b>Contact officer</b> <i>Neville Brown, Director City Services</i></p>	
c)	<p><b><u>Talent Development Programme</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> Submission from New Zealand Academy of Sport North Island (NZASNI) for a continuation of the funding for the Wellington City Council Talent Development programme for Wellington high performance athletes.</p> <p>The Wellington City Council funded the Talent Development programme from July 2007 to June 2010 (\$103k in 2007/08, \$106k in 2008/09, and \$72k in 2009/10). The programme has been continued through to December 2011 using remaining funding.</p> <p>The NZASNI provides support to over 400 high performance “carded” athletes and over 80 coaches. The Wellington City Council Talent Development funding targets promising teenage athletes who have displayed the potential to become our future sports champions.</p> <p>The objective of the Wellington Talent Development funding is for <i>“More Wellington athletes succeeding on the national and international stage”</i>.</p> <p>The Wellington Talent Development programme provides athletes and coaches with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Individual performance plans</li> <li>▪ Support services – e.g. strength and conditioning training, physiotherapy, etc...</li> <li>▪ Group education sessions – nutrition and mental skills workshops</li> <li>▪ Best practice advice</li> </ul> <p>The submission is seeking opex funding \$45,000 per annum for 3 years.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The programme has been successful in developing young Wellington sport people to national and international achievement – this has included:</p>	\$45,000

- **Yachting:**
  - World University title 2008
  - Josh Junior ranked 6<sup>th</sup> in World Laser Championships and number 2 ranked in NZ
- **Swimming:**
  - Gareth Kean: Silver medal 2010 Commonwealth Games and number 1 ranked swimmer in NZ
  - Sam Lee: Gold medal at World Surf Lifesaving Championships
  - Natasha Hind: Silver medal 2010 Commonwealth Games in relay event
- **Wellington HP Aquatics (Diving):**
  - Won 12 out of 13 categories at NZ Diving Nationals 2010
  - Gabriel Scott named Diver of the Year and broke 3 NZ records and won 5 titles at NZ Championships
- **Netball:**
  - 3 athletes in U21 and/or secondary school national squad 2010/11
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> at U17 Nationals two years in row
- **Hockey:**
  - 4 players were members of the Junior Black Sticks team that was placed 4<sup>th</sup> at World Championships
- **Golf:**
  - Thomas Spearman-Burns top amateur golfer 2009 NZ Open
- **Basketball:**
  - 3 players made Junior Tall Black team and 2 non-travelling reserves to 2009 World Championships
  - Wellington won U17 and U19 boys national titles 2010
  - 5 players made NZ U17, U18 and/or Junior Tall Blacks 2010

This submission supports Council's role as a facilitator of recreation partnerships and provider of recreation services.

It is noted that the NZASNI will be relocating to the Wellington Indoor Community Sports Centre and this is an opportunity to provide enhanced support in the development of Wellington athletes.

**Officers recommendation**

It is recommended that opex funding of \$45,000 is approved in the 2011/12 Draft Annual Plan.

Funding for the 2012/13 and 2013/14 years will need to be considered as part of the 2012-22 long-term plan deliberations.

**Contact officer**

*Neville Brown, Director City Services*

**d) Hydrotherapy pool** - to be distributed

TBC



## Appendix 2

#	<b>Prominent issues and funding requests, not recommended, to be actioned through a different process, or to be considered further as part of the 2012-22 long-term plan</b>	<b>\$</b>
a)	<p><b><u>Fluoride</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> Fluoride Action Network New Zealand Incorporated (FANNZ) submission to end water fluoridation permanently and pass a by-law prohibiting the use of the public water supply for medical intervention purposes, or suspend water fluoridation indefinitely.</p> <p><b>Background</b> Wellington City purchases water from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) for the potable water supply in the city. GWRC provides water for the four metropolitan cities. The total annual cost of fluoridating the water is approximately 50 cents per head of population supplied. The addition of fluoride is made at the GWRC water treatment facilities at the Te Marua, Wainuiomata, Waterloo and Gear Island treatment plants.</p> <p>Fluoride is added to the water supply in the Wellington metropolitan area for dental health reasons. The major beneficiary of fluoride addition is younger children. The natural level of fluoride in Wellington's water is around 0.1 milligrams per litre or parts per-million (ppm). The Ministry of Health recommends that water suppliers adjust the amount of fluoride in drinking water to between 0.7 and 1.0 ppm, as this is considered the optimal level for good dental health.</p> <p>The Regional Council carried out a review of the fluoridation of the water supply in 1993 and at that stage recommended that the bulk supply continue to be fluoridated.</p> <p>This Council is not in a position to make a decision on the benefits or otherwise of fluoridation without professional advice. Officers attended a water fluoridation workshop by Regional Public Health Hutt Valley District Health Board in May 2011 at GWRC. That workshop covered the benefits of water fluoridation, reported issues surrounding water fluoridation and latest developments.</p> <p>The outcomes of the workshop were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a large amount of complex information is available requiring careful scientific and medical consideration,</li> <li>2. local and international evidence showing the effectiveness of water fluoridation, and</li> <li>3. water fluoridation is very safe.</li> </ol>	-

	<p>The process for water extraction, treatment and distribution would make it almost impossible to have a separate supply to one city only without considerable infrastructure expense. Therefore any changes are most efficiently made on a regional basis. Petone is able to have a separate supply of un-fluoridated water due to its location and distribution. Any consideration of water fluoridation will require a regional approach and would be best handled by GWRC as the regional bulk water provider.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> There is no prevailing evidence to support changing existing water fluoridation, and the consideration of water fluoridation issues should be directed to GWRC to provide a regional approach with other Councils.</p> <p><b>Contact officer</b> <i>Stavros Michael, Director Infrastructure</i></p>	
<p><b>b)</b></p>	<p><b><u>Lighting trees in the Town Belt</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> That Council as a point of difference install up-lights under trees on Wellington's Town Belt as an art installation for visitors and residents enjoyment.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The Town Belt Management Plan does not include any specific policies about lighting, although it allows artwork where it is appropriate to the purpose of the Town Belt (i.e. relates in the broadest sense to recreation/conservation/enjoyment of the outdoors). Arguably the lighting proposal could fit within this policy although there may be District Plan considerations.</p> <p>The council is currently developing a lighting strategy. This primarily relates to the central city area. The overall objective is to improve safety and the night time environment. It will also cover accent lighting. The initial work suggests that the Town Belt remain dark at night - as an opposite to a lit city but with limited specimen trees that are highly visible being illuminated.</p> <p>The strategy will be developed over the coming months. It will complement the work being done as part of the central city framework. The suggestions in the submission will be considered in the context of this work.</p> <p>Potential benefits: If done well it may highlight the Town Belt and its importance in the structure and shape of the City.</p>	<p>Not costed.</p>

	<p>Potential negative impact: Some may consider this inappropriate as the Town Belt is managed primarily as a natural area for Wellingtonians to 'escape' to. It may encourage night activity in the Town Belt which without full lighting would be unsafe and inconsistent with the general approach to managing the Town Belt as an undeveloped recreational area for Wellingtonians. For this latter reason, some may also consider any lighting at all inappropriate.</p> <p><b>Officers recommendation</b> That this proposal be declined. This proposal is a low priority in the context of managing the Town Belt, where track maintenance and development, and hazardous tree management are higher priorities.</p> <p><b>Contact officer</b> <i>Neville Brown, Director City Services.</i></p>	
c)	<p><b><u>Opportunity for partnership with SMEs</u></b></p> <p><b>Funding request</b> This joint submission, on behalf of Enterprise Miramar Peninsula, the Inner City Association, and the Newtown Business Association has requested that consideration be given to creating a liaison position within council to work with SMEs and business associations.</p> <p><b>Background</b> Economic development and business development support is delivered regionally through Grow Wellington. This has allowed the region to attract additional funding to provide a wide range of business development services in Wellington City.</p> <p>Grow Wellington works with a wide range of SME's to help them access the people, tools and knowledge they need to develop their business. Grow Wellington currently have a number of programmes that can be used by SME's to support their development needs.</p> <p>Wellington City Council has developed a streamlined one stop service for building and resource consents that has simplified and improved the consents process for all businesses.</p> <p>The creation of a liaison person with the council to work with SME's and business associations would therefore be a duplication of current provision</p>	Not costed.

<p><b>Officers recommendation</b> Wellington City Council has a standing agreement with the GWRC and seven Local Authorities, it is the officer's recommendation that no additional post be created as this would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. duplicate current business development provision</li> <li>b. create confusion for SME's in terms of who they should go to for business development support.</li> </ol> <p><b>Contact officer:</b> <i>Teena Pennington – Director Strategy</i></p>	
<p><b>d) <u>Solar saver programme</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> Half a dozen submissions requested Council introduce a solar hot water cylinder heating programme in Wellington within the 2011/12 Annual Plan. This proposal would involve Council facilitating or supporting a project to provide discounted solar hot water systems to householders through selected providers.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The concept of supporting solar hot water heating was considered by officers during development of the 2010 Climate Change Action Plan. However, due to the higher up-front cost and longer payback period than other measures it was decided that it was a lower priority for the Council at that time. Areas we are currently working on include home insulation and clean-heating, low-energy lighting, energy efficient appliances and hot water cylinder wraps.</p> <p>Several operators have met with Council officers to discuss solar hot water programmes which may be suitable for Wellington. This includes both Nova Energy and the “Solar Saver Programme” (in conjunction with 350.org.nz and the Nelson Environment Centre). These proposals differ in that the Solar Saver Programme is driven by the individual Council concerned, while the Nova proposal involves a commercial enterprise seeking to promote solar hot water installations. The Council has discussed options to reduce costs and streamline the solar consenting process with Nova Energy. Council is currently offering a building consent rebate of up to \$300 for clean technology which includes solar hot water heating devices – however this was a three year grant, which expires in June 2011, and due to low uptake (only about one-third used each year) there has been no proposal to extend the grant. Instead, a larger city-wide solar scheme made up of promotional offers together with Council assistance may be more effective.</p> <p>The Council is set to trial solar hot water at a Council facility (Te Whaea) through Nova Energy. If they or another organisation were to roll-out a city-wide scheme, the Council would seek to support this. However, the Solar Industries Association have recently raised concerns that such schemes may result in the promotion of a few select solar hot water providers at the expense of others in the industry. They believe that this is something that should be carefully addressed</p>	Not costed.

	<p>before the Council look to support such a scheme. We are keeping a “watching brief” on the Nelson Solar City scheme to see what the best approach may be for us to help promote solar hot water heating in Wellington.</p> <p>Development of a solar hot water heating scheme for Wellington will be further investigated during the development of the 2012-22 long-term plan and review of the 2010 Climate Change Action Plan – which is a two year plan extending through until June 2012.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation:</b> Officers considered solar hot water programmes as part of developing the 2010 Climate Change Action Plan. It is recommended that the Council do not establish such a programme at this point – but continue to hold discussions with interested parties, with the aim of assisting in the promotion of solar hot water heating. The concept of developing a Council-led solar hot water scheme for Wellington will be further investigated during the development of the 2012-22 long-term plan.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b> <i>Teena Pennington, Director Strategy</i></p>	
e)	<p><b><u>Development of Flagstaff Hill area</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> The Flagstaff Hill Residents Association requested that Council upgrade (through landscaping and improvements) the reserves around Terrace Gardens/Flagstaff Hill.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The Terrace Gardens/Flagstaff Hill reserve area (Open Space A) is just under 1000m<sup>2</sup>, and the large part of unformed legal road along Percival Street creates a sense of a relatively large green space. The area is sheltered resulting in an impressive framework of mature trees (both exotic, native and some fruit trees). The flat grassed area is currently mown, used occasionally for picnics and local gatherings, but predominantly as a commuting link.</p> <p>In early 2011, Council Officers inspected the area with representatives from the Flagstaff Hill Residents Association and agreed that the area would benefit from upgrade and had great potential as a small city park catering for residents and workers alike. No funding was identified for this work, although some design work is being undertaken in the context of the Wellington 2040 Strategy and has been discussed with members of the Flagstaff Hill Resident’s Association.</p> <p>Work required is likely to include vegetation management (largely arboricultural), upgraded pathway/stairs, opening up more access, and making the area safer and more attractive for legitimate park users. As an urban park, lighting and</p>	Not costed.

	<p>interpretative signage may also be considered.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> That the design work for this park upgrade continues and is incorporated as part of the development/improvement of inner city parks in the context of the Wellington 2040 Strategy. Funding for the upgrade should be considered as part of the long-term plan process.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b> <i>Neville Brown, Director City Services</i></p>	
f)	<p><b><u>Cobham Drive foreshore improvements</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> That the Council give priority to enhancement works on the foreshore adjacent to the north end of the runway at Wellington Airport. That funding be sourced from the Plimmer Bequest as well as airport derived revenue.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The beautification and landscape parts of the proposal would fit the criteria for the Plimmer Bequest. Reclamation works and associated rip rap work does not fit the criteria for funding.</p> <p>The Council has agreed to consult on future project ideas for Plimmer Funding during the 2012 – 2022 long-term plan. Projects such as this will be assessed and prioritised as part of this process.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> If the project is identified as a priority, detailed design work will be needed to identify what part would be eligible for Plimmer funding. The project would then be considered as part of the 2012-2022 long-term plan.</p> <p><b>Contact officer</b> <i>Neville Brown, Director City Services.</i></p>	Not costed.
g)	<p><b><u>Community Housing support</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> Submission from the Wellington Housing Trust (the Trust) for Wellington City Council to support the growth of community housing within the city. They would like to work with the Council to achieve the following:</p>	Not costed.

1. Reduce or waive development contributions for community housing organisations to increase our housing provision
2. Improve consent processes for community housing organisations to increase our housing provision
3. Offer any appropriate surplus Council owned land to community housing organisations for the provision of affordable housing
4. Provide finance in the form of short or long term loans
5. The development of a regional housing strategy.

### **Discussion**

#### Development contributions

The Trust has requested that development contributions be reduced or waived for nominated community housing organisations as part of developing their social housing portfolio.

Development contributions for a residential property are in the range of \$5,000 - \$11,000 depending on the suburb. There are approximately 700 community (i.e: excluding council and government) owned and/or operated social housing units in Wellington. Community housing providers generally operate on a business model of gaining housing stock for as close to free as possible through grants, bequeaths, sponsorship, donations (cash or in kind) reduced fees and arrangements with Housing New Zealand Corporation and other Crown agencies. There is no evidence presented that the development contribution is either an impediment to building social housing or a fees waiver being a catalyst for social housing development.

Council has not considered the Development Contributions Policy to be an appropriate vehicle for supporting social objectives. It has consistently applied a key funding principle that development contributions will fund 100% of growth related capital expenditure. This is important to ensure equitable allocation of infrastructure costs across the existing and growth communities.

Applying the principle that the growth community should fund all growth relate capital expenditure maintains transparent allocation of relevant costs to those creating the demand for additional infrastructure. Departure from that principle would, in effect, mean existing ratepayers subsidising growth related infrastructure costs.

The Development Contributions Policy does make provision for self assessments (for situations where a developer considers the impact of their development on infrastructure costs will be less than the standards application of the Policy implies) and remission applications to the Development Contributions Sub-Committee. In making decisions, however, the Sub-Committee has also consistently applied the key policy principle, and avoided mixing social objectives with the need to

fully recover growth-related infrastructure costs.

Any departure from this policy principle for social housing also opens the possibility of similar applications from other social agencies.

**Officer Recommendation**

That a reduction or waiving of development contributions for community housing organisations not be supported.

Consents processes

The Trust has suggested that the Council could alter the consent processes for community housing organisations to increase community housing provision.

Every consent application made to the Council must be assessed to ensure that the proposal meets the requirements of the relevant legislation (Resource Management Act or Building Act) and the requirements of the Council's District Plan. These legislative requirements apply regardless of the scale of a project or the organisations or individuals involved. There is no evidence presented that an altered consenting process for community housing organisations will increase social housing provision.

Quality applications which address all aspects of compliance will face few delays in the approval process. Unfortunately not all applications are of such quality.

The best time to engage with consent officers is in the early phases of planning for a project. At this time there can be discussion about areas of possible non-compliance, special features of the land or complex or unusual proposals which need to be addressed during the design phase. Possible solutions to address issues and also be discussed during pre-application meetings and in many cases to be provisionally agreed.

Both the Resource and Building Consent teams encourage applicants to arrange pre-application meetings to identify and discuss solutions to potential issues before the detailed designs have been developed, thus saving applicants the time and money involved in re-designing aspects of their proposals at a later time.

Wherever possible, officers involved in pre-applications will also be involved in assessing the application to ensure that knowledge gained during the pre-application discussion is carried through to the application assessment. Team Leaders and Managers may also be involved at the pre-application stage if there is a need for oversight of an application of significance.

As well as pre-application meetings, the Building Consent teams have recently made a number of changes to processes to



minimise the time taken to assess applications. These changes include more and clearer guidance material to help customers make quality applications, mandatory pre-application meetings for complex projects and a co-ordinated process when it is necessary to request additional information or clarification of material supplied. These changes are delivering efficiencies for all building consent applicants.

**Officer Recommendation**

That the Trust engage with consent officers before developing their proposals, to ensure that potential compliance issues are identified and addressed prior to the consent applications being lodged.

This service is already available to all applicants and does not require approval through the draft annual plan process.

Surplus land

The Trust has requested any appropriate surplus Council owned land be offered to community housing organisations for the provision of affordable housing

The legislation governing land disposals depends on the land in question with the main ones including; the Local Government Act 2002 (and 1974 for roads), Public Works Act 1981, Reserves Act 1977 and some local Acts.

By "appropriate surplus Council owned land " the Trust appears to mean that Council declared the land surplus (together with the appropriate level of consultation) and it has met all its Public Works Act section 40 offer back obligations (or others as the case may be) and the land is available for sale.

The Council generally follows Section 42 of the Public Works Act and once the offer back obligations are completed " then the Chief Executive may offer the land to the owner of adjacent land at a price fixed by a registered valuer, or it may be offered for sale by public auction, public tender, private treaty or by public application at a specified price".

Whilst Section 42 does not explicitly mention that private treaty is to be current market value but it is implied and any reasonable person would expect that to be the case.

In addition to the Public Works obligations, other legislative requirements provide for the sale of council owned land to be publically consulted upon prior to the Council making a disposal decision. This process provides an opportunity for all members of the public (including community organisations) to have a say in what happen to the land.

The Council also has existing obligations under its MOU with the PNBST and Deed of Grant with Housing New Zealand which must be met.

Therefore assuming all of the Council's disposal obligations (legislative and previously agreed) are met, for any Council owned land declared surplus, Council could enter into a private treaty with a third party at current market value (CMV) assessed by registered valuation for the land, prior to it going to an open market sale process.

The existing process provides an opportunity for the Trust to consider its potential interest in any proposed council land disposal and for Council to consider that interest along side any other interest expressed by other members of the public (including other community based organisations) as part of its normal decision making processes.

#### **Officer Recommendation**

That the Trust continues to liaise with officers regarding surplus land they consider appropriate for community housing initiatives and that they make this interest known through the public consultation process so that Council can consider this in relation to other potential interests as part of its decision process.

#### Loan finance

The Trust has requested the Council to provide short or long term loans at better rates than the Trust can obtain in the open market.

Council's borrowing and lending policies are governed by the Investment and Liability Management Policy published in the LTCCP. With respect to the Council making loans to other organisations (non-Council related) the policy states:

*"The Council may consider the provision of loans to Community Groups but only in exceptional circumstances."*

It is difficult to make a case that the provision of loans to the Trust on the basis of the Council being able to fund at cheaper rates is "exceptional" - and Council would generally be required to add a margin that reflects the credit risk which would negate the cheaper funding advantage enjoyed by the Council.

The Trust do not indicate that their social housing programme is hampered by not being able to access funding and their objective is stated as being to "obtain cheaper funding" therefore it would appear that the "exceptional circumstances" test would be difficult to meet.

#### **Officer Recommendation**

That the Trust's request for assistance with short or long term loans not be supported.

#### Regional housing strategy

The Trust has requested that Council provide resourcing to the Affordable Housing Project that forms part of the Wellington Regional Strategy. The need for a regional housing plan or strategy was promoted

at a recent hui organised by the Wellington Housing Forum and Regional Public Health group. There is no specific funding or staff resourcing request.

The Council contributes to numerous regional planning and strategic projects that impact on the location, provision and service levels of housing in the region. These include participation in the Regional Social and Community Housing Working Group, and the Wellington Regional Strategy senior officer group and associated projects.

In the regional context, the Council also promotes the development and support of housing related activities through its District Plan, Urban Development Strategy, Centres Policy, Social and Recreational Strategy, Older Persons Policy and Housing Services Policy. Such strategies and plans form the basis for Council's response to social housing activities, the most recent of which has been the development of District Plan Change 72 (Residential) and 73 (Centres). These plan changes once operative will support and encourage opportunities for diverse and affordable housing in Wellington. This will take advantage of the current and future infrastructure and community facility investment.

Also following the release of the *Home and Housed* report by the Housing Shareholders Advisory Group in April 2010, the Government has begun adopting many of the report's recommendations designed to improve housing affordability and access to social housing. Recommendations included the establishment of a stand alone organisation for major renewal schemes in regions of high need, and facilitating other social housing options from the private and community sectors. Such programmes would be in association with local authorities, community groups and the private sector. Now that the social/affordability housing policy function is transitioning to the Department of Building and Housing, any regional housing planning exercise would be best supported through a national process in the first instance.

Community social housing organisations such as the Wellington Housing Trust could be represented as part of any regional initiative at the appropriate time.

In summary, the Council already contributes to regional and local housing planning processes through numerous mechanisms. Any further regional planning work on social and affordable housing needs to be aligned to government policy and programmes that are currently being developed. By continuing to participate in community housing initiatives, council officers can make the necessary links to national policy as local government's role in this becomes clearer.

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council officers continue to participate in regional social and affordable housing projects.

**Contact officer:**

*Greg Orchard, Director Property, Consents and Licensing.*

<p><b>h) <u>Cycle Aware Wellington</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b>  Cycle Aware Wellington (CAW) have submitted on a number of issues within the 2011/12 draft Annual Plan. Specifically they have requested a number of projects for cycling infrastructure be investigated and funded for implementation in the coming year.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p><i>Providing Cycle Lanes along Jervois Quay:</i>  Consideration has been given to improved provision for cyclists, however there is not consistent width available to provide a continuous facility along the Quay route, there are several pinch points that would mean stopping the cycle lane. Officers believe that this could lead to less confident cyclists being “stuck” and prefer that more use be made of the parallel shared path on the waterfront.</p> <p><i>Providing a slip lane where Thorndon Quay meets Mulgrave Street</i>  Officers have looked at making this improvement, however cyclists would still be required to stop for all pedestrian crossings on Thorndon Quay. Once the pedestrian phase has terminated it is then possible to run a cycle phase, this would allow cyclists to continue along Thorndon Quay towards Bunny Street. A more detailed study is needed to assess the benefits as it is likely that only a few seconds could be gained for the cost of several thousand dollars to reconfigure the signals.</p> <p><i>City-wide residential speed limit reductions</i>  The Strategy and Policy Committee will consider a report in August on the results of the existing speed limit programme and consider recommendations for the programme going forward.</p> <p><i>Improvements to the Hutt Road to make it more cycle friendly</i>  Over the last 12 months Council has invested over \$250,000 on this route to improve safety, further investment is unwarranted at this time until the success of the existing measures is understood. Long term there is a proposal to install Bus/Cycle lanes along the Hutt Road, this is conditional on improving capacity on the motorway and is likely to be about five years away.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b>  Officers will continue to work with Cycle Aware Wellington to develop a programme that is consistent with the Council’s Cycle Policy and meets financial assistance criteria.</p>	<p>Not costed.</p>
--	--------------------

	<p><b>Contact officer:</b>  <i>Stavros Michael, Director Infrastructure.</i></p>	
<p><b>i)</b></p>	<p><b><u>Using LEDs to light the city's streets</u></b></p> <p><b>Submssion request</b>  The submission makes two proposals: 1) progressively upgrading outdoor lighting using more effective and efficient technology and 2) Preventing light pollution.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b>  The Council has been actively involved in investigating more effective and efficient technology. We are currently investigating LED . This technology is relatively new. To date, manufacturers have not been able to provide warranties which match the claimed life of LED luminaires - up to 35 yrs in some cases. We also have some reservations about whether LED lighting is appropriate in all situations. For example, our current GL 500 sodium lighting delivers the appropriate levels of lighting required for vehicle purposes on arterial, principal, collector and local routes. In our view LED lighting would not offer any additional economic benefit in this specific situation. We are however already using LED technology for traffic signal purposes and pedestrian crossing belisha beacons.</p> <p>While the Council is keen to take up new technology, it is important to make sure this technology is proven, reliable and delivering the life cycle savings claimed. At this stage the Council is still in the process of trialling this technology. These trials include using LED luminaires in a car park environment, and, on paths where access for maintenance purposes is difficult and where typically we incur higher than normal labour and equipment costs.</p> <p>We are also considering preventing light pollution thought he district plan process and the development of a street lighting strategy for the council.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b>  The findings from our investigations are pending and a final view on the efficacy of this technology, including what cost and energy savings is still to be determined.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b>  <i>Stavros Michael – Director Infrastructure.</i></p>	<p>Not costed</p>

<p><b>j) <u>Civil Defence and Emergency Management</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission requests</b></p> <p>The Mt Victoria Residents' Association wanted to see specific work undertaken regarding emergency preparedness. The Association requested: public meetings to discuss emergency preparedness in their suburb; the introduction of tsunami blue lines in Mt Victoria; tsunami evacuation routes marked for the inner city and WIAL - with a specific note regarding obstruction caused by the fence at Miramar Golf Course; the provision of pamphlets and advertising material for evacuation routes, along with flood and fire prevention measures; and raised concerns about overhead power cables, that they could pose a fire risk in an emergency, and that they should be buried.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>CDEM is everyone's responsibility, not just Council's, however, Council staff are happy to assist local communities in developing such planning. This can occur any time in Mt Victoria or anywhere across the city and WEMO staff are happy to work with the local community and to participate in such meetings.</p> <p>Officers are also happy to work with communities regarding painting of blue tsunami lines, and will only do this at the behest of the community - it will not work if it is a Council imposed initiative.</p> <p>Firefighting - before and after an earthquake - is the domain of the New Zealand Fire Service. Officers would be happy to arrange NZFS advice but the Council is not competent to provide this advice direct. Council's policy on undergrounding overhead cables is for this to be community led.</p> <p>In regards to WIAL, it is responsible for its own egress routes (but the potential problem with the fence will be raised with WIAL)</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no barrier to any of the proposals suggested where Council is responsible. For the others, NZFS and WIAL are likely to be happy to engage on the issues raised. It is not recommended that any changes are made to the draft annual plan.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b>  <i>Stavros Michael - Director Infrastructure.</i></p>	<p>Not costed.</p>
--	--------------------

<p><b>k)</b></p>	<p><b><u>Public toilets and playgrounds</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission requests</b> The Strathmore Park and Progressive Association requested improvements to the playground at Monorgan Rd play area, and the Tawa Community Board advocated for the provision of a new public toilet in Linden.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Council’s Asset Management Plan (AMP) and long-term plan funding for public conveniences is currently committed towards upgrading and maintaining existing public toilet facilities.</p> <p>Existing public toilets models are now designed to be all gender, disabled accessible, to provide child changing facilities and are designed with safety of the public in mind. These are the standards we are in the process of meeting.</p> <p>Once existing facilities have been upgraded to required standards then Council focus is towards assessing the need for provision of public toilets in areas that have been identified as likely to experience demand based on future growth and or redevelopment.</p> <p>Council will consider improvements to the Monorgan playground and the installation of a picnic table in the 11/12 financial year from within existing resources.</p> <p><b>Officers recommendation</b> That no new funding be allocated for additional public conveniences at this time.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b> <i>Neville Brown, Director City Services</i></p>	<p>Not costed.</p>
<p><b>l)</b></p>	<p><b><u>Mt Victoria roading/safety improvement</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> MVRA has highlighted that the lack of a safe pedestrian crossing on the north side of Kent Terrace/Elizabeth Street intersection is a long-standing issue for Mt Victoria residents. MVRA Newsletter showed that there have been unaddressed concerns about safe crossing for the last 25 years.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> Council’s records show that new traffic signals were installed at the intersection of Kent Terrace/Elizabeth Street in early</p>	<p>Not costed</p>

1985 (25 years ago) replacing the earlier 'Give Way' controls and long zebra crossings across Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace. This installation was done 25 years ago to reduce the high accident rate at the intersection which involved a high percentage of pedestrians.

There were three recorded crashes in the last 5-year data and none involved a pedestrian. This result is due to the improvements made 25 years ago and recent upgrades implemented in response to last year's and previous years' DAP submissions which new technologies permitted such as advanced calling and synchronising of pedestrian walk phases across Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace.

Pedestrians on the north side of Elizabeth Street wanting to cross Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace are currently provided with signalised crossing facilities at Majoribanks Street intersection. Officers had assessed the proposal to install a pedestrian crossing on the northern side of Elizabeth Street by conducting on-site survey and intersection analysis. The projected increased delays to public transport and vehicles outweigh the time benefits for the pedestrians where there are currently safe crossing options at Majoribanks Street.

Officers are currently consulting on the Pirie St crossing with the affected residents. This consultation will provide the opportunity to raise issues directly affecting these residents and discuss possible options.

Data is being collected on the pedestrian usage and traffic flows on the proposed Majoribanks St pedestrian crossing. These data will be analysed and provide justification for the most appropriate locations for the Majoribanks St pedestrian crossing in terms of desire lines for pedestrian usage, safety for vulnerable pedestrians (young children and elderly) and impact on existing kerbside parking.

Officers will continue to work with MVRA on both pedestrian crossings to ensure overall public safety in particular children walking to schools. The support of MVRA in the implementation of these pedestrian crossings is valued and welcome.

**Officers recommendation**

Regarding the pedestrian crossing on the north side of Kent Terrace/Elizabeth Street intersection, officer will continue to work with MVRA to collate views and insights from all stakeholders including public transport so that decisions are formulated to mutually benefit all users.

**Contact officer:**

*Stavros Michael – Director Infrastructure*



**m) Heritage audits**

**Submission requests**

A number of heritage related matters were raised, primarily by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and a residents association.

The requests include:

- A heritage audit of Mt Victoria including trees
- A heritage and Reserves Act assessment of the onshore features of Clyde Quay Boat Harbour
- Funding for pilot project to explore range of approaches to achieve affordable seismic retrofitting for the Cuba Street Historic Area
- Funding for a pilot to establish a design review panel for significant and complex consent proposals (previously rejected by Council)
- Additional funding for identification and documentation of previously unrecorded archaeological sites
- Expanding criteria for the existing heritage fund can be used to assist heritage property owners with earthquake strengthening requirements including detailed engineering assessment work

**Discussion:**

*Heritage audit of Mt Victoria*

A programme of place-based heritage assessments will be considered as part of preparing the 2012-22 long-term plan.

*Clyde Quay Boat Harbour*

Council is currently working closely with users of Clyde Quay Boat Harbour, exploring options for the area. Clyde Quay and its surrounds are listed as a Heritage Area in the Wellington City District Plan. This listing provides significant protection for the boat harbour and associated facilities.

A conservation plan has been prepared for the area. The plan lists the features of heritage significance and assesses and evaluates them. It provides a statement of significance and assesses the relative significance of different parts of the area.

*Heritage funding to support earthquake prone buildings*

- Council is currently reviewing the Earthquake Prone Building Policy. As a part of the review it is proposed that there will be a series of seminars or workshops to which owners of heritage buildings will be invited. Approaches to

	<p>options for considering how contiguous groupings of buildings may be strengthened will be considered. This will be particularly appropriate for the Cuba Street Heritage Area.</p> <p><i>Built Heritage Incentive Fund</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Built Heritage Incentive Fund assessment criteria were reviewed and reprioritised at a meeting of the Strategy and Policy Committee on 5 May 2011. The Committee resolved the following:</li> </ul> <p>“That the priorities for the 2011-2012 year will be to Place a high priority on applications that aim to reduce or limit potential hazards (ie. fire protection or seismic strengthening) while retaining a focus on identifying and addressing risks to the conservation of heritage materials or fabric through natural processes (decay).”</p> <p>This refocus of the criteria will ensure that applications for funding which come within this range, including seismic strengthening, will receive priority.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b></p> <p>The majority of requests are included in the Council’s heritage work programme for the next year and beyond, and the heritage team looks forward to continuing to work closely with both parties on the matters raised in their submissions.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b>  <i>Teena Pennington, Director Strategy</i></p>	
<p>n)</p>	<p><b><u>Edible Wellington</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b></p> <p>That Council develop a food strategy for the city and that Council commits funding to setting up a food policy council - Edible Wellington - that will develop a food strategy and provide analysis of plans and projects that would assist Wellington to create a vibrant and strong food system.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>The Council is already delivering on a number of initiatives that address the role of food in the city. These include supporting community groups that deliver on components of the submitter’s proposal.</p> <p>The Council currently supports the development of strong well connected neighbourhoods and local resilience by supporting existing and the development of new community gardens and orchards, food distribution schemes (such as Kaibosh and food banks) as well as ensuring resources and tools are available to encourage local sustainability.</p>	

	<p>The Council is also working with interested community groups and agencies (such as Wesley Community Action who have an interest in food security) to hold a workshop to provide an opportunity to share, enhance and explore common linkages relating to food and community wellbeing.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> That Council officers facilitate further discussion with interested groups and agencies to map and collate existing activities and initiatives that highlight the role food plays in the local resilience and sustainability and the wellbeing of the city.</p> <p><b>Contact officer:</b> <i>Wendy Walker – Director City Engagement</i></p>	
o)	<p><b><u>Community Garden Coordinator</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b> The submission from Innermost Gardens Community Garden group requested Council fund a new position - a Community Garden Coordinator.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> The Council supports community gardens/orchards initiatives through various mechanisms which include access to sites on Council land through an agreement to lease.</p> <p>Council also supports the Sustainability Trust through a three year funding agreement and the agreed outcomes for this include holding community gardening workshops as well as strengthening connections with other organisations working in the sector. While aspects of this have been fulfilled, further workshops need to be facilitated by the trust to complete the outcome.</p> <p>The Grants Subcommittee considered an application from the Sustainability Trust requesting funding for an Urban Food Production Project Manager role which included coordination of community gardens across the city. The committee felt that there needed to be further work to identify the need and interest from the community and officers will work with the trust to facilitate a community workshop (as part of their contract outcomes) to determine community interest in the proposed coordination role.</p> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b> Agree that this request be further considered in the current grants framework.</p>	

	<p><b>Contact officer:</b>  <i>Wendy Walker – Director City Engagement.</i></p>	
<p><b>p)</b></p>	<p><b><u>Fair Trade City</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request</b>  The proposal from Fair Trade City Wellington is to include \$20k in the annual plan for a new coordinator position to manage Fair Trade City Wellington Group and progress the implementation of the Fair Trade Action Plan.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b>  Wellington city has Fair Trade status and the Council continues to implement its obligations for maintaining this status by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- supplying fair trade products in Council tea rooms</li> <li>- promoting fair trade initiatives in Wellington city</li> <li>- assisting with media coverage to raise awareness of the fair trade movement</li> <li>- contribute to steering group discussions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer recommendation</b>  It is recommended that funding to support the coordinator position is most appropriately applied for through Council's social grants programme where it can be considered against other applications and prioritised accordingly.</p> <p><b>Contact officer</b>  <i>Teena Pennington – Director Strategy.</i></p>	<p>\$20,000</p>
<p><b>q)</b></p>	<p><b><u>Newtown Community and Cultural Centre</u></b></p> <p><b>Submission request:</b>  Newtown Community and Cultural Centre Trust seeks to be resourced to have the funding levels for community centre staff (who are not employed by Council) raised so that they might be paid comparable rates with Council employed staff.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b>  As part of the annual 2010/11 draft Annual Plan process Council agreed to range of initiatives to improve community facilities including a new methodology for funding community centres to reflect an equitable approach to provision of funding across the network of community centres, and increase funding available for community centres by \$203,800 -</p>	

bringing the total pool to \$621,992.

Newtown Community and Cultural Centre received an increase of funding (from \$86,781 P/A to \$107,912 P/A) – this does not include funding for Smart Newton computer hub.

**Recommendation**

Employment conditions for employees (including salaries for the coordinators) of the community centres are the responsibility of the management committees - not Council. Officers are arranging regular opportunities for the centres' management committees to meet with Councillor Lester (Portfolio Leader Community Facilities) and they will also have the opportunity to discuss issues and concerns with Council officers. It is recommended further discussion of equity for centre coordinators be discussed as part of this platform.

**Contact officer:**

*Wendy Walker – Director City Engagement*

---

## REPORT BACK ON COMMUNITY PREPAREDNESS INITIATIVES

---

### 1. BACKGROUND

As part of finalising the 2011/12 draft annual plan for consultation in March, the Council requested officers investigate a range of community resilience initiatives and report back as part of the final annual plan deliberations.

### 2. DISCUSSION

Officers consider that any initiatives should:

- Help residents to help themselves, rather than creating an undeliverable expectation that Council will be able to provide immediate direct assistance.
- Complement existing work programmes and initiatives, rather than replace or compete with them. (This precludes most infrastructure projects).
- Be cognisant of the proposed Regional approach.
- Manifest tangible and measurable improvement in community resilience.

Officers support the establishment of Community Preparedness Grants as the most appropriate vehicle for delivering the objectives while being cognisant of the principles above. Council already promotes social well-being by providing a wide range of opportunities, facilities and initiatives which includes supporting projects that encourage community resilience and local sustainability, and Community Preparedness Grants provide a logical and efficient extension.

Officers have already drafted an evaluation framework that will ensure that grants contribute to the following outcomes:

- An increase in personal and household preparedness for an emergency
- An increase in collective preparedness for an emergency
- An increase in connectedness in the case of an emergency.

Grants would need to meet these additional criteria:

- Local neighbourhood initiative.
- Will strengthen local connectedness, is sustainable and have an ongoing benefit to the neighbourhood.
- Will increase emergency preparedness locally.
- Is open to the whole neighbourhood.

- Must be at least 15 homes or a defined geographic community such as walkways or apartment buildings.
- Improves the well-being of people in the community.
- Improve the sense of safety within the community.

Informal groups (see above criteria – must be at least 15 households) may apply for Community Preparedness Grants. In this case the upper limit for grants would be \$1000 with specific accountability requirements.

The grants criteria are included for adoption in the following report on this agenda: 'revised focus areas for general grants and criteria for the community preparedness grants.'

**Contact officer:** *Stavros Michael Director Infrastructure*  
*Wendy Walker Director Community Engagement*

## Appendix 4:

### Recycling, Waste Minimisation and Disposal

Recycling, Waste Minimisation & Disposal	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Landfill levy (per tonne inclusive of recycling levy)	\$100.10	\$105.00
Rubbish Bags (RRP each)	\$2.10	\$2.21

### City Archives

City Archives	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Digital copy	New	\$2.00

### Swimming Pools

All Pools except Khandallah	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Adult Swim	\$5.60	\$5.70
Child Swim	\$3.40	\$3.50
Under 5 Swim	\$1.20	\$1.20
Adult - Passport to Leisure	\$2.90	\$2.90
Child - Passport to Leisure	\$1.70	\$1.70
Family Pass (2 adults, up to 3 kids)	\$14.50	\$15.00
Adult 12 Swim Concession	\$56.00	\$57.00
Adult 30 Swim Concession	\$140.00	\$142.50
Child 12 Swim Concession	\$34.00	\$35.00
Child 30 Swim Concession	\$85.00	\$87.50

Khandallah Pool	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Adult Swim	\$2.00	\$2.00
Child Swim	\$1.00	\$1.00

Swim Memberships - All Pools Except Khandallah	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Adult Monthly	\$56.40	\$57.80
Adult Yearly	\$676.20	\$693.10
Child Monthly	\$33.80	\$34.60
Child Yearly	\$405.80	\$415.90

### Sportsfields

Sportsfields	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
<b>Cricket</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1	\$272.00	\$321.00
Level 2	\$180.00	\$213.00
Artificial pitch on concrete base	\$116.00	\$137.00
Artificial pitch on grass base	\$116.00	\$137.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1	\$2,055.00	\$2,425.00
Level 2	\$1,715.00	\$2,024.00
Level 3	\$1,000.00	\$1,180.00
Artificial pitch on concrete base	\$685.00	\$809.00
Artificial pitch on grass base	\$545.00	\$644.00



<b>Sportsfields</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Rugby, League, Soccer, Aussie Rules</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1	\$100.00	\$118.00
Level 2	\$75.00	\$89.00
Level 3	\$58.00	\$69.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1	\$1,415.00	\$1,670.00
Level 2	\$1,080.00	\$1,275.00
Level 3	\$915.00	\$1,080.00
<b>Softball</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1	\$124.00	\$147.00
Level 2	\$87.00	\$103.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1	\$520.00	\$614.00
Level 2	\$350.00	\$413.00
<b>Touch, 5-a-side, Ultimate Flying Disk, Gridiron</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1	\$130.00	\$154.00
Level 2	\$105.00	\$124.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1	\$1,080.00	\$1,275.00
Level 2	\$835.00	\$986.00
<b>Netball - per Court</b>		
Court per season	\$100.00	\$118.00
Off-season or organised	\$7.00	\$9.00
Casual	\$30.00	\$36.00
<b>Tennis</b>		
Court per season	\$135.00	\$160.00
Off-season or organised	\$12.00	\$15.00
Casual	\$30.00	\$36.00
<b>Cycling</b>		
Casual	\$122.00	\$144.00
Seasonal	\$1,230.00	\$1,452.00
<b>Athletics</b>		
Casual	\$445.00	\$526.00
WRFU Speed Trials	\$99.00	\$117.00
Seasonal	\$7,440.00	\$8,780.00
<b>Croquet - One Lawn</b>		
Casual	\$120.00	\$142.00
Seasonal	\$565.00	\$667.00
<b>Training</b>		
<b>Ground Only</b>		
1 night	\$75.00	\$89.00
1 night (season)	\$270.00	\$319.00

<b>Sportsfields</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
2 nights (season)	\$540.00	\$638.00
3 nights (season)	\$810.00	\$956.00
4 nights (season)	\$1,080.00	\$1,275.00
5 nights (season)	\$1,350.00	\$1,593.00
<b>Training</b>		
<b>Ground and Changing Rooms</b>		
1 night	\$135.00	\$160.00
1 night (season)	\$568.00	\$671.00
2 nights (season)	\$1,136.00	\$1,341.00
3 nights (season)	\$1,704.00	\$2,011.00
4 nights (season)	\$2,272.00	\$2,681.00
5 nights (season)	\$2,840.00	\$3,352.00
<b>Elite Parks</b>		
Rugby League Park	\$450.00	\$531.00
Newtown Park	\$450.00	\$531.00
<b>Picnics</b>	\$40.00	\$48.00
<b>Marquees</b>		
Booking Fee (non-refundable)	\$60.00	\$71.00
Marquee up to 50m2	\$360.00	\$425.00
Marquee up to 100m2	\$600.00	\$708.00
Marquee > 100m2	\$955.00	\$1,127.00
<b>Add-Ons</b>		
Groundsman - hourly rate (minimum 2 hours)	\$25.00	\$30.00
Toilets Open	\$25.00	\$30.00
Toilets and Changing Rooms Open	\$60.00	\$71.00
Litter collection	Discretion	
<b>Golf Course</b>		
Passport to Leisure - Round	\$7.50	\$7.50
Adults - Round Weekdays	\$15.50	\$15.50
Adults - Round Weekend	\$22.50	\$22.50
Junior - Round	\$7.50	\$7.50
Passport to Leisure - Yearly	\$195.00	\$195.00
Passport to Leisure - Half Yearly	\$112.00	\$112.00
Adults - Yearly	\$390.00	\$390.00
Adults - Half Yearly	\$220.00	\$220.00
Juniors – Yearly	\$92.00	\$92.00

### **Synthetic Turf Sports fields**

<b>Synthetic Turf Sports Fields</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Nairnville Synthetic Turf</b>		
Peak (per hour)	\$41.00	\$51.50
Off Peak (per hour)	\$25.50	\$32.00
Junior/College (per hour)	\$20.50	\$25.50
<b>Full Size Synthetic Turf</b>		
Peak (per hour)	\$60.00	\$75.00
Off Peak (per hour)	\$40.00	\$50.00
Junior/College (per hour)	\$30.00	\$37.50

<b>Synthetic Turf Sports Fields</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Winter Weekend Daily Rate	\$600.00	\$750.00
National Hockey Stadium	\$29,859.00	\$31,350.00
<b>Notes:</b>		
<i>Charges for events, tournaments and commercial activities are by quotation.</i>		
<i>Charges for charity events will be charged at the Operation Manager's discretion.</i>		

## Recreation Centres

<b>Wellington Indoor Community Sports Centre</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Court hire per hour – peak	New	\$55.00
Court hire per hour - off peak	New	\$37.00

## Marinas

<b>Marinas</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Clyde Quay Marina - Facility Type</b>		
Boat Shed (2 to 13)	\$2,046.00	\$2,144.00
Boat Shed (14 to 27)	\$1,836.00	\$1,928.00
Boat Shed (38B)	\$1,470.00	\$1,548.00
Boat Shed (38A to 42B, 48A and 48B)	\$2,118.00	\$2,224.00
Boat Shed (43A to 47B)	\$2,448.00	\$2,572.00
Moorings	\$966.00	\$1,020.00
Dinghy Racks	\$168.00	\$180.00
<b>Evans Bay Marina - Facility Type</b>		
Berths (12m to 20m)	\$2,496.00	\$2,580.00
Berths (8m)	\$1,470.00	\$1,520.00
Boat Shed Small	\$984.00	\$1,016.00
Boat Shed Medium	\$1,968.00	\$2,032.00
Boat Shed Large	\$2,952.00	\$3,048.00
Dinghy Lockers	\$294.00	\$304.00
Live Aboard (per person per annum)	\$516.00	\$532.00

## Burials and Cremations

<b>Burials and Cremations</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Karori Cemetery</b>		
<b>Rose Garden Plots</b>		
Granite Book Memorial	New	\$350.00
<b>Interment Fees</b>		
Indigent	\$100.00	\$200.00
<b>Children's Lawn Unmarked (max 3'6" casket)</b>		
Maintenance Fee	New	\$252.00
<b>Children's Headstone (max 3'6" casket)</b>		
Maintenance fee	\$180.00	\$252.00
<b>Extras</b>		

<b>Burials and Cremations</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Grave plot probe		\$50.00
Non-compliance fee for no permit	\$50.00	\$70.00
Outside district fee - 2nd interment into existing plot		\$870.00
Outside district fee - ash scatter		\$40.00
Plot search charges. 1-3 no charge. 4> \$1 per search	\$2.00	\$6 per search 15 for 3
Plot Photo (where not already on database)	\$5.00	\$10.00
Maintenance fee	\$390.00	\$546.00
Plaque polishing	New	\$30.00
<b><u>Makara Cemetery</u></b>		
<b>Adult Plot (Plaque Lawn)</b>		
Maintenance fee	\$390.00	\$546.00
<b>Denominational Areas</b>		
Maintenance Fee	\$545.00	\$763.00
<b>Natural Burial</b>		
Maintenance Fee	\$510.00	\$612.00
<b>Adult</b>		
Delivery Only	\$560.00	\$672.00
Committal Service (1/2 Hour)	\$685.00	\$822.00
Full Service (1 Hour)	\$730.00	\$876.00
<b>Children</b>		
1 to 10 years	\$155.00	\$186.00
Birth to 1 year	\$60.00	\$72.00
Stillborn	\$55.00	\$66.00
<b>Chapel Hire:</b>		
Per 1/2 hour	\$155.00	\$185.00
Chapel Hire for Burials & Cremations per 1/2 hour	\$165.00	\$200.00
Chapel hire for cremation elsewhere		\$228.00
<b>Miscellaneous:</b>		
Cleaning chapel/ crematorium		\$50.00
Chapel Overtime		\$200.00
Bio Tissue Cremation [Wgtn Hospital]	\$560.00	\$672.00
Foetal Tissue [Wgtn Hospital]	\$55.00	\$66.00
Ash scatter for hospital		\$75.00

## **Public Health Regulations**

<b>Health Licensing and Inspection</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Temporary License</b>		
Temporary/mobile food stalls base fee	\$168.00	\$175.00
Temporary/mobile food stalls base fee- charge over 1hr (per hr)	\$112.50	\$120.00
Fairs: "small"	\$140.50	\$145.00
One day food stall	\$112.50	\$120.00
Fairs "large"	\$338.00	\$350.00

<b>Annual License For Registered Premises</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Trade Waste</b>		
Trade Waste License fee		
Initial inspection fee	\$173.75	\$180.00
High risk	\$1,748.00	\$1,800.00
Medium risk	\$865.50	\$895.00
Low risk	\$288.50	\$300.00
Minimal risk	\$122.50	\$125.00
<b>Collection &amp; Transport of Trade Waste</b>		
Initial application fee	\$144.00	\$150.00
Charge after first hr (per hr)	\$115.50	\$125.00
Annual license fee	\$173.25	\$180.00
<b>Conveyance &amp; Transport of Trade Waste</b>		
Processing fee (per hr of part thereof)	New	\$125.00
Above 7000m3/day	\$0.69/m3	\$0.68/m3
Above 3150 kg/day	\$0.68/kg	\$0.56/kg
Up to 1575kg/day	\$0.30/kg	\$0.28/kg
Above 1575kg/day	\$0.57/kg	\$0.67/kg
<b>Animal Control</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Impounding Fees</b>		
* First per animal (free if registered)	\$76.75	\$100.00
* Subsequent impounding	\$153.25	\$160.00
* Sustenance per day	\$15.25	\$17.50
* Destruction fee	\$30.75	\$33.00
Collection or delivery of dog on behalf of owner	\$25.50	\$27.50
After hours callout for collection or delivery of dog	\$25.50	\$27.50
Replacement of registration tag	\$10.25	\$10.75
Infringements	\$102.00-\$767.00	\$100.00-\$750.00
<b>Pavement Permissions</b>		
Initial application	\$177.25	\$180.00
Renewal	\$88.50	\$90.00
Extension of liquor licensing area	\$88.50	\$90.00
Central city (per m2)	\$81.75	\$85.00
Suburbs (per m2)	\$51.00	\$55.00
<b>Gambling Permissions</b>		
Initial application & renewal	\$92.00	\$120.00

## **Building Control and Facilitation**

<b>Building Consent Fees</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Small Works fees</b>		
Additional inspection fee	\$103.50	\$112.50
<b>Customer Services</b>		
Pre-application meetings: consent officer / expert / compliance officer (2 hours total officer time free, then a charge per hour thereafter).	\$138.00	\$150.00
Monthly report of Issued Building Consents	\$69.00	\$71.25
Administration Fee	\$69.00	\$71.25

<b>Lodging fee</b>		
Lodging Fee for building consents	\$92.00	\$95.00
Code Compliance Certificate (for category 1 applications)	\$92.00	\$95.00
Code Compliance Certificate (for category 2 applications)	\$92.00	\$95.00
Code Compliance Certificate (for category 3 applications)	\$115.00	\$118.75
<b>PIM (if lodged with building consent)</b>		
PIM only – single resident dwelling including accessory buildings	\$327.00	\$355.00
PIM only – other	\$419.00	\$455.00
<b>Building Consent Fees</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Plan Check Fees</b>		
<\$10,000 (Category 1)	\$310.75	\$338.00
<\$10,000 (Category 2)	\$483.50	\$525.00
<\$10,000 (Category 3)	\$621.50	\$675.00
\$10,001 - \$20,000 (Category 1)	\$690.00	\$750.00
\$10,001 - \$20,000 (Category 2)	\$690.00	\$750.00
\$10,001 - \$20,000 (Category 3)	\$690.00	\$750.00
\$20,001 - \$100,000 (Category 1)	\$759.50	\$825.00
\$20,001 - \$100,000 (Category 2)	\$759.50	\$825.00
\$20,001 - \$100,000 (Category 3)	\$759.50	\$825.00
\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Category 1)	\$828.00	\$900.00
\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Category 2)	\$1,242.00	\$1,350.00
\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Category 3)	\$1,242.00	\$1,350.00
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000 (Category 1)	\$1,932.00	\$2,100.00
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000 (Category 2)	\$2,208.00	\$2,400.00
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000 (Category 3)	\$2,484.00	\$2,700.00
\$1,000,001 + (Category 1)	N/A	N/A
\$1,000,001 + (Category 2)	\$2,555.50	\$2,778.00
\$1,000,001 + (Category 3)	\$2,555.50	\$2,778.00
For each \$500K or part thereof over \$1,000,000	\$664.50	\$722.00
Consent suspend fee (to review additional information). Charged per additional hour of officer re-assessment time.	\$138.00	\$150.00
<b>Plan Check for National Multi-use approval fees (NMUA)</b>		
Building Consent Fee, for applications using a NMUA (approved by Dept. of Building & Housing). Deposit of 3 hours, then hourly rate and charges apply after this.	\$414.00	\$450.00
<b>Building Certificate (pre-requisite for liquor licence application)</b>		
Where application received with application for town planning certificate	\$138.00	\$150.00
Where application received independently	\$230.00	\$250.00
Additional charge per hour for processing Building Certificate. Where processing times exceeds that allowed for in the base charge	New	\$150.00
<b>Certificates of Acceptance</b>		
If the certificate is NOT for work carried out under urgency (or other special circumstances) a 20% surcharge applies to the below fees. Includes deposit for inspections. Additional inspections charged at \$150 per hour.		
<\$10,000 (Category 1)	\$678.75	\$738.00
<\$10,000 (Category 2)	\$851.50	\$925.00
<\$10,000 (Category 3)	\$989.50	\$1,075.00

\$10,001 - \$20,000 (Category 1)	\$1,058.00	\$1,150.00
\$10,001 - \$20,000 (Category 2)	\$1,058.00	\$1,150.00
\$10,001 - \$20,000 (Category 3)	\$1,058.00	\$1,150.00
\$20,001 - \$100,000 (Category 1)	\$1,403.50	\$1,525.00
<b>Building Consent Fees</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
\$20,001 - \$100,000 (Category 2)	\$1,403.50	\$1,525.00
\$20,001 - \$100,000 (Category 3)	\$1,403.50	\$1,525.00
\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Category 1)	\$1,472.00	\$1,600.00
\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Category 2)	\$1,886.00	\$2,050.00
\$100,001 - \$500,000 (Category 3)	\$1,886.00	\$2,050.00
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000 (Category 1)	\$2,576.00	\$2,800.00
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000 (Category 2)	\$2,852.00	\$3,100.00
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000 (Category 3)	\$3,128.00	\$3,400.00
\$1,000,001 + (Category 1)	N/a	N/a
\$1,000,001 + (Category 2)	\$3,199.50	\$3,480.00
\$1,000,001 + (Category 3)	\$3,199.50	\$3,480.00
For each \$500k or part thereof over \$1,000,001	\$1,032.50	\$1,122.00
<b>S77 Fees (building over two or more allotments)</b>		
Processing time	\$138.00	\$150.00
<b>Vehicle Access</b>		
Linked to building consent or resource consent	\$276.00	\$300.00
<b>Received Independently</b>		
Received independently (small)	\$291.25	\$315.00
Received independently (large)	\$490.50	\$530.00
<b>Vehicle Crossing</b>		
Initial inspection fee	\$138.00	\$150.00
Vehicle crossing inspection fee over 1 hour	\$138.00	\$150.00
<b>Amended Plan</b>		
Lodging fee	New	\$71.25
Initial fee (includes 1 hour processing time)	\$207.00	\$150.00
Processing time over 1 hour	\$138.00	\$150.00
<b>Marquee Licenses</b>		
Consent processing	\$138.00	Removed
Inspection (per hour)	\$138.00	Removed
<b>Compliance Schedule / Building Warrant of Fitness</b>		
New compliance schedule (linked with Building Consent). This is the minimum charge (based on one hour of processing), additional charges will apply for time taken over this, at \$150 per hour for additional hours	\$138.00	\$150.00
Alterations & Amendments to compliance schedule (linked to Building Consent) will be charged on a time taken basis. At \$150 per hour of officer time	\$138.00	\$150.00
Additional charge per hour for new compliance schedule (linked with Building Consent)	\$138.00	\$150.00
IQP Registration Fee (New & Renewal)	\$138.00	\$150.00
Additional charge for each new competency registered	\$69.00	\$71.25
<b>Building Consent Fees</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>

Building Warrant of Fitness - Annual Certificate. This is the minimum charge (based on one hour of processing), additional charges will apply for time taken over this, at \$150 per hour for additional hours	\$138.00	Replaced
Building Warrant of Fitness - Annual Certificate. This is the base charge for 1 specified system. Additional charges will apply for time over 0.5 hours	New	\$75.00
Building Warrant of Fitness - Annual Certificate. This is the base charge for 2 - 10 specified systems. Additional charges will apply for time taken over 1 hour	New	\$150.00
Building Warrant of Fitness - Annual Certificate. This is the base charge for 11+ specified systems. Additional charges will apply for time taken over 1.5 hours	New	\$225.00
Building Warrant of Fitness Inspection (per hour)	\$138.00	\$150.00
<b>Fire Service</b>		
Fire service review deposit, collected with consent	\$279.00	Replaced
Fire Service Review base fee collected with consent. Additional fees from NZFS will be charged at actual.	New	\$202.35
Fire Service Review admin	New	\$71.25
Fire Service Courier charge		Actual cost
Consultants reports		Actual cost
<b>Producer Statement Rebates</b>		
Building Design - Plan Check Fee minus	\$0.30	Removed
Plumbing Design - Plan Check fee minus	\$0.30	Removed
Building & Plumbing Design - plan check fee minus	\$0.60	Removed
Structural design - structural check fee minus	\$0.90	Removed
Standard building - structural fee waived and document check fee minus	\$0.60	Removed
<b>Building Consent Fees</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Structural Fee Deposits &amp; Additional Charges</b>		
Structural fee for checking elements of specific design on projects comprising structural works, supported by a producer statement from a Chartered professional engineer		
Deposit for all categories for structural checking not supported by a producer statement from a Chartered professional engineer	\$550.00	\$596.00
<b>Swimming Pool</b>		
Fencing inspection: additional standard inspection - 45mins (first standard inspection fee)	\$103.50	Replaced
Pool fencing inspection per hour. Fees charged on actual time spent.		\$150.00
Exemptions: Base fees (including 5.5 hours of processing time)	\$759.00	\$825.00



Exemptions: processing costs after the initial 5.5 hours	\$138.00	\$150.00
<b>Building Inspections</b>		
Hourly charge: Deposit based on estimate of inspections required. Charges on basis of actual time.	\$138.00	\$150.00
Engineering inspections (not covered by a Producers Statement), including fire, engineering, structural engineering for unusual proposal, specific design	Actual costs plus \$90.00	Actual costs plus \$90.00
<b>Special Activity &amp; Monitoring</b>		
Hourly charge for officer time considering proposals and monitoring compliance	\$138.00	\$150.00

## Development Control and Facilitation

Resource Consent Fees Service	Current Initial / Fee	Proposed Initial / Fee
<b>The following four initial fees have been amended to better reflect estimated officer time on consent applications. Final fees payable are on actual officer time, administration and other disbursement costs.</b>		
Pre-application meetings: planner / expert / compliance officer (charge per hour).	\$138.00	Actual time at \$150.00/hr
Non-notified consent: subdivision and/or land use - initial fee includes officer time and disbursements	\$1,222.00	\$1,500.00
Limited notified consent: subdivision and/or land use - initial fee includes officer time and disbursements	\$5,305.00	\$8,000.00
Notified consent: subdivision and/or land use - initial fee includes officer time and disbursements	\$13,304.00	\$15,000.00
All other approvals including: Non-notified resource consent application for earthworks only, Outline Plan approval; Certificate of Compliance; Extension of time (s125); Change or cancellation of conditions (s127); Consents notices (s221); Amalgamations (s241); easements (s243), Right of Way or similar - initial fee includes officer time and disbursements	\$956.00	\$1,040.00
Certificates: Town Planning, Sale of Liquor, Overseas investments, LMVD - initial fee includes officer time and disbursements	\$348.00	\$385.00
<i>Additional Charges</i>		
Additional hours (per hour):		
- All consents: additional processing hours (per hour) – planner/advisor / compliance officer	\$138.00	\$150.00
- All consents: additional processing hours (per hour) – administrative officer	\$72.00	\$85.00
<i>Bylaw Application</i>		
Applications relating to signs (Commercial Sex Premises) -up to 6 hrs	\$828.00	\$900.00

<i>Compliance Monitoring</i>		
Monitoring Administration of Resource Consents: subdivision or land use	\$138.00	\$150.00

- minimum of 1 hr, (previously based on up to 2 hrs), - then based on actual time over and above that.		
Additional hours (per hour):		
- planner / expert / compliance officer	\$138.00	\$150.00
- administrative officer	\$72.00	\$85.00

<i>Subdivision Certification</i>		
<i>Below are minimum fees. Charges will be based on actual time if over and above that.</i>		
Stage certification: each stage for s223, s224(f), s226 etc - up to 2 hrs,	\$276.00	\$300.00
Combination of two or more Stage certifications: s223, s224(f), s226 etc - up to 4 hrs, (previously based on 3.5 hrs)	\$552.00	\$600.00
Certification s224 (c) - up to 4 hrs, (previously based on 2 hrs)	\$552.00	\$600.00
All other RMA and LGA certificates, sealing, transfer documents etc - up to 2 hrs - disbursements will be on-charged	\$276.00	\$300.00
Bonds: each stage of preparation or release - up to 2 hrs	\$276.00	\$300.00

<i>Terms and late payment</i>		
Deposits and additional fees:		
- As set out above, the fees are based around initial deposits with further charges to be invoiced if there is additional time spent processing requests or disbursements incurred. Initial deposits will be required prior to the processing of requests. Additional fees and refunds will only be payable / refunded for amounts greater than \$65		
Terms for payment:		
- Payment of additional fees are due by the 20 <sup>th</sup> of the following month from invoice being processed. Where payment is not made by the 20 <sup>th</sup> of the month following the date of the invoice, the customer agrees to pay council the following:		
- An additional / administrative fee of the lesser of 10% of the overdue amount or \$300		
- All costs and expenses (including debt collection or legal fees), incurred by the council in seeking to recover the over-due amount, and		
- Daily interest (rate of 15% p.a.) from the date of default		

## **Transport – Network-wide Control and Management**

<b>Transport Management</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Administration Fee	\$56.22	\$65.00
Inspection Fee	\$76.67	\$90.00
Prior Approval	New	\$80.00
Temporary Traffic Management Plan Approval	New	\$80.00
Late notice (per notice)	\$306.67	\$400.00
Further delay (per day)	\$25.56	\$30.00
Extra processing (per notice)	\$76.67	\$80.00
Follow -up inspection (per inspection)	\$76.67	\$90.00
Texturising fee	\$5.11	\$6.00
Instruction/Building maintenance use of Road Reserve processing fee	New	\$100.00

<b>Transport Management</b>	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Special Licence Application Processing Fee	New	\$65.00

## **Parking**

	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Hourly Parking Charge – Fee area 1	\$4.00	\$5.00
Hourly Parking Charge - Fee area 2	\$3.00	\$4.00
Hourly Parking Charge - Fee area 3	\$1.50	\$2.50

	<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
Applicable: Monday to Thursday 6pm to 8pm Friday 8pm to 10pm		
Hourly Parking Charge – Evening parking zone 1	No charge	\$5.00
Hourly Parking Charge – Evening parking zone 2	No charge	\$3.00
Hourly Parking Charge – Evening parking zone 3	No charge	No charge