

## Road Encroachment and Sale Policy

Thank you for the opportunity to follow up my submission to the Road Encroachment and Sale Policy.

My family and I live at 66 Orangi Kaupapa Rd in Northland. We have a small area of encroachment, part of which contains a car port. At our point in Orangi Kaupapa Rd the carriageway is one way only. The road is narrow, steep and winding and to my assessment it will never be widened to become two way in the future.

To the immediate north of us is the Northland Lookout. This has one of the best views over Wellington City but regrettably is poorly maintained by the Council. Whilst we often call "Parks and Gardens" about this we are now told that it gets maintained once a year!! This used to be done on a more regular basis and in fact I used to augment that by maintaining part myself so to keep up standards.

To the immediate south of us is a vacant "cliff face" section. It has about 6-8 metres of distance from the sealed road to where the front boundary of the lot is – ie 6-8 metres of road reserve. This land is obviously not subject to an encroachment licence as it is "maintained" by the council slasher about once a year. It is a mess of noxious weeds (black berry, gorse and many other "nasties". This is "typical" Council maintenance.

We already pay rates exceeding \$4,100pa plus an encroachment fee. The Council needs to be careful that it is not "greedy" with it's drive to raise revenue through increasing fees. Consider these points:

1. Owners might decide to relinquish their licences if costs get too high – this would cause a loss in that revenue;
2. That would then add a further cost to Council who would now have to maintain these areas;
3. The City would look the worse for it as Council are such poor maintainers of these areas.

The three points above are real and need careful consideration as opposed to running the line that owners do not pay enough for the privilege – people with encroachment licences are actually doing the City a favour.

Council should look to raise revenue by selling more surplus land to adjoining owners. Currently, as suggested by Hugh Rennie (QC) in this mornings paper, Council are too difficult to deal with – the process is too hard. Our section has had some road stopping completed some 12 years ago (prior to our ownership) but Council would only relinquish enough to ensure that the corner of the house was no longer

partly on road reserve. Ideally the land under the car port should also be sold as the road will never be widened – there will be hundreds of cases like this across the City. We have no issue with paying a fair market price for purchasing road reserve but Council need to get more practical about making more available to interested owners and make the process easier.

I also feel that the Council Consultation Document was written in an unbalanced way. The tone was one that was saying that those with road reserve should pay more, especially if it is located in a high land value neighbourhood. It paid scant regard to the costs that would fall to the City if all licence holders relinquished their licences. It reads like a revenue raising exercise and if Council are not careful this greedy approach will backfire and us (the rate payers) will be paying to maintain more road sides and the appearance of the City will be adversely affected.

In summary, property owners look after land generally in a much better manner than the Council so in the interests of the appearance of the City let it be licenced to them at a reasonable rental (taking into account what it would cost the Council to maintain if it was given back) or sold if realistically it will never be needed for road.

Thank you for hearing me out.

Doug Buchanan  
66 Orangi Kaupapa Rd  
Northland  
WELLINGTON

29.07.10