

Submission Feedback:

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society is frustrated with previous Long-Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan submission processes. Over several years, there have been collective submissions developed regarding issues affecting Russell, however, Council has largely ignored these and has not made any changes in response.

This can serve to undermine public faith in what is intended to be a consultative process and could lead to cynicism about the real intentions of the Far North District Council.

Council has agreed the following response:

The special consultative procedure for both the Annual Plan and the Long-Term Council Community Plan is taken very seriously by Council. All submissions made receive due consideration by councillors and final versions of the plans reflect numerous changes made as a result points made in submissions. This does not necessarily mean that Council will act on every submission - this would be impossible given the often competing demands and priorities contained in different submissions from different parts of the district. If you do not feel that Council is paying sufficient attention to your particular submissions you may wish to take the matter up with local ward councillors who will be able to explain the rationale behind decisions made.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society supports a timely and effective Walking and Cycling Strategy for the Far North. The proposal in the Draft Annual Plan needs to be strengthened by establishing a clear timeline within the year 2008/2009.

Council has agreed the following response:

This will be addressed through the next Far North Future Plan, to be published next year. Inclusion in the Future Plan assists in obtaining subsidy. Please note: the Kerikeri Heritage Bypass and Waipapa Road improvements both include allowance for walking and cycling.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society does not want Council to provide an expensive water scheme for Russell. Their view is that it is preferable to rely on individual responsibility than to be reliant on a Council system that has been demonstrated to be of questionable quality and reliability. This also avoids the debate over fluoridation and chlorination.

The submitter wants Council to delete this item from the Draft Annual Plan and commence discussions with the Russell community on the possible provision of a communal water scheme, before making any decisions about whether to plan and budget for it.

Individual systems help to promote water conservation and are more environmentally sustainable, while aiding in the reduction of stormwater flows. If a few developers wish to have a communal water system in order to facilitate more intensive development of their own properties, then there is no reason why the wider community should be forced to subsidise this.

Council has agreed the following response:

Council has no plans for any expenditure on water systems in Russell in 2008/2009. As previously advised to the Russell Protection Society, consultation with the community will take place before any decision is taken regarding the implementation of a water system in Russell.

The submitter should note that water supplied by the Far North District Council via its reticulated

system meets the requirements of the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society supports the Broadband initiative because it is essential to the economic progression of the District. It will facilitate the setting up of home occupations and other businesses that will provide much needed employment and income to remote communities.

Council has agreed the following response:

Council agrees with the submitter's view on the importance of broadband access to the economic development of the District and will continue to explore a range of options to advance this.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society states that more care needs to be taken in the siting of cell phone towers in order to avoid irreversible damage to archaeological and historic sites as well as scenic landscapes.

Council has agreed the following response:

The rules of the District Plan identify when resource consent is required for cell phone tower proposals. Where resource consent is required the proposal is usually a discretionary application and is assessed by Council using criteria under Section 17.2.7 of the District Plan. Matters such as archaeological, historic and landscape are all covered within the criteria. Unless a proposal results in no more than minor effects the site and proposed development would be unacceptable. Council has limited control however under permitted cell phone developments such as described within rule 17.2.6.1.4.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society feels that the intent of the Resource Management Act is not only to enable sustainable development and subdivision, but also to protect the property rights of other land owners and the community in general. The simple and obvious answer is to comply with the District Plan rather than attempt to achieve more intensive development than is provided for.

Rather than adopting a policy of simply trying to reduce the number of hearings, the goal should be for Council to improve its RMA processes overall. Information and application requirements can be better defined and advice can be tendered in a more timely and professional manner.

It is also unclear as to whether the RMA would allow for self certification and given Council's views on the use of consultants, this policy needs to be reconsidered.

Council has agreed the following response:

The District Plan is a document that enables development, however, this is subject to meeting certain expectations, i.e. desired environmental outcomes, community aspirations and expectations, economic growth and development.

The way Council administers the Resource Consent process is subject to continual review to ensure best practice. Council also seeks to be efficient, timely, and cost effective.

The number of hearings required cannot be reduced (as this is determined by decisions to notify or not and any submissions received). However the process can be improved via streamlining. Anybody considering applications, in a commissioner capacity, has to have completed and passed the "Making Good Decisions" course which is run by/through the Ministry for the Environment.

Council is not presently considering the option of self certification under the Resource Management Act but may review this in the future. Any such measures will require amendments to delegations and a review of processes before consideration could be given.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society is frustrated over the fact that there are already approved, comprehensive Stormwater Catchment Management Plans for Russell Central and Matauwhi Bay; however Council has largely chosen not to implement them.

The submitter requests that Council fulfill its statutory responsibilities by fully implementing its existing Stormwater Catchment Management Plans for Russell Central and Matauwhi Bay.

Council has agreed the following response:

Thank you for your submission. The current Catchment Management Plans for both Russell Central and Matauwhi Bay were originally produced in 1984 and 1989. These plans were updated in 1997 when the 1:50 year flow rates and work priorities were added. It was noted that 'computed flood flows is considered beyond the scope of this study'. Therefore the report focused more on the environmental effects of flow rates within the network. These were calculated on assumptions. Floodable areas and overland flow paths were based on inspections; flood reports were produced from local knowledge. Overland flow paths within the current documents have never been clear. Since that update standards and legislative requirements have changed and existing flow paths may have unwittingly been altered as development has occurred.

The work involved in creating the new Plans involves hydraulically modeling the piped network and clearly identifying overland flow paths from aerial contour information. This work also incorporates an increase in flow rates to 1:100 (previously 1:50) and takes into consideration climate change. Upon completion of these Plans a prioritised forward programme of works will be able to be developed. Overland flow paths will be identified and protected and this will enable future development to occur in a sustainable manner.

It should also be noted that any prioritised forward works programme will need to take into consideration priorities throughout the entire District and will be dependent upon funding allocations.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society states that recent storms have substantially eroded the sand beach at Tapeka, while sweeping away the launching ramp and swimming platform. Urgent works are required to restore the stream channel, reinstate the link between the grassy reserve and the sandy beach and rebuild the launching ramp. The loss of this ramp is now putting considerable pressure on the Russell ramp.

The Annual Plan should include a capital works provision for \$70,000 to reinstate the stream channel, foreshore and launching ramp at Tapeka.

Council has agreed the following response:

The Tapeka ramp is going to be repaired with funding from user fees in the next 3 months. Northland Regional Council has granted consent to the realignment of the stream and Council is assisting the local community with this work.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society states that the District Plan currently represents the documented aspirations of the people of the Far North. It notes that the Annual Plan proposes an internal

review of the District Plan. If Council perceives that there are issues arising from the newly reviewed District Plan, then it should spell these out in a public discussion document and invite submissions as to whether Council should then initiate any subsequent Plan changes.

Council has agreed the following response:

Submissions form a vital part of any plan change process and as all plan changes are publicly notified, there will be opportunity for the public to participate in the process.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society states that the previous structure planning for Russell Peninsula was undertaken by Auckland-based consultants without public input. Organisations in Russell submitted against proposals in the Long-Term Council Community Plan and last year's Annual Plan which suggested that the peninsula could become a 'priority growth area'. There are a number of physical, environmental, social and particularly servicing constraints that make such an idea untenable.

It is noted that the Paihia community is being supported in conducting its own visioning exercise about how it sees the future of its area. The Russell and Okiato communities also wish to be supported in the task of preparing a vision for their peninsula, rather than again being placed in a position of being dictated to by a consultant who is looking to squeeze more growth out of the Bay of Islands on behalf of the District. It is also noted that the Russell community has already prepared some of the groundwork for such a visioning exercise through work carried out by the widely supported 'Russell 2000' group.

Council has agreed the following response:

The Bay of Islands, and in fact the Eastern Seaboard, has become one of the District's highest growth areas. In order to identify constraints to growth Council will need to develop and provide these constraints and opportunities maps to the public for their assessment. These maps will need to be developed for the Bay of Islands which includes Haruru Falls, Waitangi, Paihia, Opuia, Okiato and Russell.

Once these maps have been developed and once Council identifies the next priority for structure plans, Council staff will meet with the respective communities to help facilitate their vision and strategic objectives. Any information that the Russell community has prepared would greatly assist Council in moving forward.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society challenges the figure that Council has presented in its Draft Annual Plan regarding alleged savings of \$450,000 to be gained by discontinuing the present rates discount scheme. Council needs to present a proper cost-benefit analysis which acknowledges the savings that are derived from having rates paid from the outset in one lump sum as opposed to the loss incurred through the discounted sum. These savings include the bank interest that can be derived, the quarterly rates notices that are not required, the subsequent accounting processes that are not required and the possible arrears notices and collection processes that are not required.

The submitter does not want the rates discount scheme discontinued.

Council has agreed the following response:

Thank you for your feedback on this issue. The reason why Council has removed the discount is that it has been found to be of benefit mainly to the corporate sector. Very few ratepayers have taken advantage of it whilst the rest of the ratepayers end up by paying for it. Council believes the

majority of ratepayers will benefit from this change as the savings can be used to offset possible rate increases.

Your submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2008/2009 is summarised as follows:

The Russell Protection Society believes there has already been extensive money paid out for a 'state of the art' sewerage scheme and as this is working and being managed with Russell Executive's involvement, why then is Council proposing to renew the scheme without any consultation with the community?

The submitter wants Council to delete these large capital works for Russell sewerage from the Draft Annual Plan and then consult with the Russell Executive before determining if or when any future proposals in this regard should be incorporated in subsequent annual plans.

Council has agreed the following response:

The are no plans to upgrade Russell Sewage Treatment Works in 2008/2009.