

Submission subjects		Sub #	Submission Comments	Staff Comments
1	Rates model			
Option 1:	Status Quo	5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer to pay now and have a possible surplus than face consequences of fiscal under-investment later. • With the uncertainty about 3 waters during the election year water assets should be included in rates this year. • UAGC can only be changed with a change to the LTP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One year of not funding depreciation of 3 waters assets will not have much impact in future years if 3 waters remain with Council. • A more important reason for not funding depreciation on the 3 waters is that any reserves we hold against 3 waters will reduce the amount of debt that is repaid by the entity on transfer of the assets. Council believe that getting as much debt repaid as possible will put Council in a better position going forward. • UAGC can be changed following a consultation process. This does not have to be within the LTP.
Option 2:	17.5% UAGC, no 3 waters depreciation funding.	44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The funding, or non-funding of the three waters depreciation should lie solely with those that utilise these services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The funding or non-funding of depreciation of assets only affects those that currently use those services. There is no impact on any other ratepayers.
Option 3:	17.5% UAGC with the Rural differential reduced from 1 to 0.95, and Rural Residential differential reduced from 0.75 to 0.7.			
Option 4:	20% UAGC and no funding of 3 Waters depreciation.	3, 47		
Option 5	20% UAGC with the Rural differential reduced from 1 to 0.95, and Rural Residential differential reduced from 0.75 to 0.7	11, 20		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option gives Rural & Rural Residential Ratepayers some respite as they do not receive a benefit from the removal of 3 waters depreciation payments in 2023/2024 year. • Options 1 - 4 will result in a higher Rural & Rural Residential rate increase.
2	Otira Toilets	26, 37, 41, 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the very least provide good directional signage at Otira directing traffic to Arthur's Pass Rest Rooms. • A simple composting toilet would be adequate. Placement of a donation box would help cover costs. Public toilets are not free in most other countries. Are free public toilets sustainable. • Toilets available at Arthur's Pass, Kumara and Cave Stream. • Is the capital expenditure and ongoing costs of benefit to ratepayers? • Do not build new toilets. • A better funding model determined for ongoing capital and operational costs for public toilets 	

<p>Option 1:</p>	<p>Build a permanent public toilet block and fund ongoing caretaking, cleaning and maintenance</p>	<p>3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 27, 30, 40</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happy with option 1 or 2, but need to have toilet facility in Otira. • Traveller from Canterbury - toilets essential. • Since the existing toilets were put back again, there has been a noticeable decrease in the amount of discarded toilet paper and waste in carparks and track ends along SH 73 between Ōtira and Arthur's Pass. • Necessary for supporting tourism. • Public toilets are a human right. • Toilets needed for contractors, ambulance staff and other travellers, especially when road unexpectedly closed due to snow / travel restrictions. • Temporary toilets not very clean / maintained, and hard to find. • 28 submissions in support from the Gloriavale community. • Use local contractors. • Should not be fully rates funded. Seek external funding from Heritage NZ, Waka Kotahi and Provincial Growth Fund. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff have made an application to the Tourism Infrastructure Fund to the value of \$325,000 with a council contribution component of 50% (\$162,500). We have reduced the scope of the project to provide waste tanks vs a full Oasis Waste system thus reducing the overall cost • There will still be a component of operational costs for toilet cleaning and waste disposal at a value of approximately \$50K • Capex already included in 2023/2024 AP. • Depreciation cost using values about over 50 years would be \$10k per year.
<p>Option 2:</p>	<p>Retain the temporary structure and fund ongoing caretaking, cleaning and maintenance.</p>	<p>2, 10, 35, 39, 47</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the existing toilets were put back again, there has been a noticeable decrease in the amount of discarded toilet paper and waste in carparks and track ends along SH 73 between Ōtira and Arthur's Pass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will still be a component of operational costs for toilet cleaning and waste disposal at a value of approximately \$50K
<p>Option 3:</p>	<p>Do not build a new public toilet block and remove the temporary structure.</p>	<p>29, 31, 34</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing toilets in Arthur's Pass are only 15 minutes away. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
<p>3</p>	<p>Fees and charges</p>	<p>6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27, 30, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hourly charge for Carnegie Gallery unreasonable - used for week-long exhibitions, not a meeting room. Commission on sale of goods could be an alternative. • Retain status quo charge for Carnegie Gallery. • Discuss a realistic hire fee for Carnegie Gallery with interested users. • Carnegie gallery charge should consider different charge for ongoing exhibitions versus one-off events. Proposed cost is prohibitive for exhibition hire. • \$25 entrance fee for Museum too high, would turn visitors away. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Museum Fees and charges will be fully reviewed as part of the LTP and/or the completion of the fit our of Carnegie and re-opening to the public. Existing fees and charges may be carried forward. No galleries will be available for meeting spaces. Council should not be seen to be competing with other venues that provide this service. Exhibitions may be accommodated in the temporary gallery, subject to determined exhibition schedules and availability. • Charges for the Council chambers are to encourage the use of other venues, which supports the organisations that own those venues.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free swimming pool entry for senior citizens over 70. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The costs of the swimming pool remain the same, therefore other swimmers or ratepayers would need to subsidise this option. • A full review of Swimming Pool fees will be undertaken for the next LTP.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in Resource Management fees of 8% too high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on cost recovery (user-pays).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the reduction metered water rates - user pays should not be subsidised by other ratepayers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The metered water charge is still a user pays system. The metered water charge has reduced for the same reasons that the water rates and sewerage rate has reduced, this is due to the proposal to not fund depreciation for the 3 waters. <p>Users of metered water are not being subsidised by any other rate payers for the charges.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support increased fees for sporting facilities to help provide fit for purpose facilities for community play and recreation. • Playing field charges at Cass Square too low for Touch, Softball, Cricket, Rugby and Soccer. • Increased playing field charges could mean a reduction of events in Hokitika. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routine maintenance and care of Cass square is \$70,800 per annum. • Special services that may be required annually depending on ground conditions (fertiliser, compaction relief, irrigation etc.) is \$63,320.00 • Revenue in 2021/2022 was \$1,208; revenue in the year 2022/2023 to-date is \$10,543. The \$10k increase is solely due to Wildfoods Festival occurring. Without this indications are that the 2022/2023 revenue would have been less than 2021/2022. • Touch rugby no longer uses Cass Square, Soccer is temporary while the field at Westland High School is under development. No softball teams utilise Cass Square.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support waste management charges. • Fee for car disposal at the Haast tip too high, may encourage illegal dumping of dead vehicles. • Increase of fee to empty waste to Hokitika Sewerage Ponds too high. Fee should be calculated on amount emptied into the system, or fee for portable toilet businesses should be calculated separately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fee for car disposal is the same across the district. • Septage discharge of waste heavily subsidised in the past. Increase in fee reflects cost recovery from users. Discourage parties from outside Westland District from using our facilities.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed fees and charges acceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted

4	Increasing rates	1, 22, 28, 29, 31, 34, 37, 39, 40, 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not agree with increasing rates. • Qualified support to rates increase - concern that the saving is false due to removal of 3 Waters depreciation, and /or a risk of larger increase in future years. • High rural rate increase for what services? Adopt a plan to change this rates increase. • Lower rates for those on single incomes and struggling with cost of living increases. • Change in UAGC unfair. • 20% increase not mentioned. • Whether targeted rates are used towards their legislative maximum. • Each dollar spent outside of the council's core competencies of infrastructure represents some form of pothole in a road or a pothole in the income and savings of the people of Westland. • Promote voluntary community work such as working bees to reduce rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rates have been artificially held low over the last two years. This now means that the rates will increase as there is a need to fund the shortfalls over the last two years. In 2022-23 the rates were held back by >\$million. In the current budget proposal \$391k is now having to be funded which is increasing the rate. • See point 1 above regarding not funding depreciation on 3 waters. • The Consultation document stated clearly that the 0.07% increase was not the full story and advised the scale of rate increases from -10% to +26%. Referred readers to check the example rates models and their own proposed rates on the Council's RID webpage. • Depending on the project voluntary work contributions can be explored as long as it doesn't compromise Health & Safety.
5	Major project spending	<p>1</p> <p>9, 12, 13, 22, 34, 35, 47, 50</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not agree with spending on projects such as Pakiwatiara, Swimming Pool, WCWT and associated staff costs. • Consider every project reflecting on merit and societal impact for the wider Westland District. • Support continued development of the Cass Square Playground and Skate Park • Support continued development of the Hokitika and Ross swimming pools. • Swimming pool a valuable asset needs to be kept clean and reliable, with decent management. • Disagree with spending to upgrade Cass Square playground or the skate park - Lazar park has a good playground. • 3 other playgrounds within a 1.3km radius of Cass Sq. • Support continued development of the Cass Square Playground and Skate Park. • Revisit the investment into Cass Square and the skate park. Consider investing these funds into footpaths and community halls in place of the Better Off Funding that has been reallocated for the benefit the wider community, not just Hokitika. • Support proposed funding for Museum refurbishment - important asset for the District and NZ. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • Any significant changes requires business case development and Council approval. • Noted. • Noted. • \$510k of the funding towards the playground is from Lotteries for that purpose and cannot be reallocated for other purposes. • Council formed a working group for Cass Square playground based on the successful loteries application of \$510k. The working group will look at design and also offsetting Council contribution towards the project. • Noted.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditure on exterior upgrades to Carnegie unjustified. 	<p>The corning on the Carnegie building at roof height level were loose and some were completely detached from the building and held on by gravity only. These presented a safety risk to the public in the event of minor earth tremors or high winds, with a high risk of them falling to the ground.</p> <p>The external plaster work at a high level on the building had cracks through which water was penetrating and the plasterwork was starting to detach from the brickwork behind. The plasterwork and cracks required some replacement and the rest required sealing otherwise the plasterwork would blow and fall off the building.</p> <p>The parapets on the top of building led to water penetration down the brick cavities. This was preventing the internal plasterwork from drying out and would have impacted on the building's internal moisture levels, which have to be at a consistent level as a museum.</p> <p>The columns at the top of the building, on investigation, turned out to be made of plastic water pipe. These are not designed to take a rendered finish which was consequently falling off. The choice was either to hack off the remaining render, score the plastic pipe and replace with a paint finish or leave as it is with render continuing to fall off and the blue plastic showing through.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the digital interactive spending for the Museum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Coast Wilderness Trail a liability to ratepayer that benefits older, wealthier individuals, the majority of whom are cyclists. • Visitor & businesses benefit at residents and ratepayers' expense. • No further funding in this and future Annual Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached appendix 7.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Park expenditure benefits heritage enthusiasts and should be paid by beneficiaries not general ratepayers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that Heritage Park is rate through the Hokitika Community Rate and not the general rate.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism Marketing Infrastructure: NZTA signage already provides town names. Elaborate signage not justified or necessary. • Businesses pay for their own marketing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hokitika is generally a pass through town for tourists on their way to the Glacier country after visiting the Hokitika Gorge. There has been requests from Destination Hokitika over a number of years to invest in Hokitika township promotion and sell what the town and surrounding areas has to offer. The intent was to continue this project with further investment in other towns throughout the district. Council has submitted a TIF application to offset the cost of these signs etc. 	
6	Staff costs		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inefficeint use of staff time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
7	Racecourse	9, 11, 22, 33, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Racecourse not suitable for a retirement village due to lack of public transport. • Land gifted for betterment of community - other land closer to Hokitika town centre could be used for pensioner housing. • Run open public process for this issue. Long term vision and well-informed decisions for benefit of the town and district. • Compromise of dividing into housing and recreation space a win/win for the wider community with profits from housing development being invested back into play, active recreation and sport. • Strongly oppose Council's plans for the racecourse. • Disagree with the Racecourse project - Joseph and Associates proposal should be binned. No evidence of benefit to ratepayers and already 4 other subdivisions available. • Mixed species forest park, mountain biking. • More dialogue with equestrian groups needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is currently undergoing a engagement process with key stakeholders and the wider community. Based on the outcome of that engagement process will allow councillors to set the future direction of the Racecourse land.
8	Town planning		11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hokitika needs a proper plan for growth in an orderly manner, no just knee-jerk reaction currently proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The full review of the District Plan is underway with the Te Tai o Poutini Plan. The changes to the RMA will require a new spatial plan to be developed which will be the blueprint for future growth/land designations etc.
9	Road funding	12, 34		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure Haast-Jackson Bay road funding remains and remediation proceeds. • Seal unsealed 1200m road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No decision has been made on the Special Purpose Road for Haast-Jackson Bay Rd. Council is awaiting engagement on the topic with Waka Kotahi.
10	Waste management	13, 22		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bins for general rubbish are too small. • Revisit Waste to energy plant. • Resist pressure to increase size of domestic rubbish bins or lower waste disposal charges. • Encourage home composting and glass disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller rubbish bins are to encourage recycling and general waste reduction in line with the West Coast Waste Minimisation Plan. • Council is investigating glass disposal. • Home composting is a Ministry for Environment project and decision to be implemented by about 2026.

11	Borrowing	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is borrowing not paid off using reserve funds available to reduce interest costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted reserves can only be used for specific purposes. Reserves are funded by specific rates for specific activities, under the act the funds therefore need to be used only for those purposes. Depreciation funded reserves are used to replace existing assets so that further borrowing is as much as possible used to fund only new assets or where there is an increase in level of service.
12	Vehicle costs	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicles should be maintained to ensure longer term fleet car usage of existing stock. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has vehicle policy that defines the use and life of its fleet. Vehicles are maintained appropriately for the heavy mileage that they incur.
13	3 waters	13, 35, 37, 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should reject any entity taking over 3 waters assets. While we understand Council's proposal to keep rate rises down by not funding depreciation on this service, the community will at some stage have to fund these assets, even under the new national and regional 3 Waters structure. Not in support of 3 waters. Part fund the depreciation to reduce rates impact on rural rate-payers. Do not support 3 waters depreciation funded through the UAGC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are constrained by legislation and if the outcome of the review confirms that we will become part of a new entity then we are legally obliged to act including any transfer of the assets. Council has been and still is a member of Communities for Local Democracy which has been challenging the reform and process.
14	Elected members	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected members should not be part of national health campaign advertising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected members will act in the best interests of the communities that they represent.
15	Biodiversity	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of TA function in s 31(1)(b)(iii) of RMA, which concerns the maintenance of biodiversity while developing, using or protecting land. This should be remedied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Annual Plan is primarily a review of the budget forecast in the Long Term Plan process. Any references to the function referred to should be considered in an LTP review. Note that the District Plan determines the restrictions in regards to biodiversity as part of any resource consent application.
16	Public access - walking and cycling	21, 33, 35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Active West Coast submission around improved public access for walking and cycling. Support continued investment and resources into the West Coast Wilderness Trail. Pleased to see increased funding for footpaths in the plan. Encourage Council to become a signatory to the Walk21 Charter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted - the Cycling and Walking Committee oversee this as a program of work. Walk 21 Charter has already been signed.
17	Sport and recreation	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Council providing support for these activities but a wider range of sports and non-male dominated sports could be supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted

18	Coastal Hazards	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Run open public process for this issue. Long term vision and well-informed decisions for benefit of the town and district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Te Tai o Poutini Plan submission process is currently underway and Natural Hazards are a key focus. This has been an open forum process. Council is bound by Central Government decisions incorporating outcomes of the RMA review.
19	Sealing Cement Lead Road	24, 43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submissions from 12 residents and 17 residents of Cement Lead road requesting that Council budget to seal the road that is approximately 1km long. Lack of maintenance, previous agreement to seal the road, increase in housing in the area. Dust on the road affects tank water supply during dry spells. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A funding application to seal Cement Lead Road could be included within the next NLTP 2024-2027. Funding will then be either approved or declined by Waka Kotahi based on the project merits. Alternatively residents could be required to jointly fund any seal extensions along this road if it is not approved by Waka Kotahi.
20	Lazar Park	25	<p>Requests for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$20,000 + GST for fencing from the Reserve Development Contribution Funds. \$5,000 + GST to install a drinking fountain from the Reserve Development Contribution Funds. Increase the maintenance grant - grounds maintenance and public toilet cleaning costs from \$2,000 to \$11,341.87 incl. GST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No agreement in the past for the fencing, drinking fountain and toilet funding. The current MOU with the Lions Club includes a contribution of \$2,500 (this was increased this year) towards ground maintenance. The Reserve Development Fund has been overspent in Hokitika area, this fund serves all the district. Note that the toilets are not a Council asset and are owned by Hokitika Lions as part of their building.
21	Grant funding	25, 38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request from Hokitika Lions for an annual grant of \$10,000 + GST for the Westland Puanga-Matariki Festival. Support of the on-going LTP provision for an annual grant to the Hokitika Regent Theatre and annual application of inflation adjustment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already a \$5k fund towards Matariki for iwi to arrange community celebrations. Regent Theatre - already in the AP.
22	Hokitika CBD Maintenance	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstatement of Funding for Maintenance of Hokitika CBD and grant to Lions Club of Hokitika for Maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to tendering the Hokitika CBD maintenance contract Lions were approached to bid if the contract was amended to smaller lots. Lions did not want to bid at that time. Contract let at Council meeting of 25.05.2023. Maintenance of monuments is a specialist service and needs to be undertaken with specialist skills and experience.
23	Hari Hari Civil Defence	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request \$50,000 incl. GST for a generator, security cage and wiring to enable the Hari Hari Community Hall to operate during a major power outage. 	<p>Funding options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loan funding. Hari Hari Community Complex Reserve fund could be applied to for this purpose (\$69k available). Could dedicate next 3 years of Hari Hari township development funding towards the project. This would increase the cost, as interest on the loan would need to be rated through the Hari Hari Community Rate.

24	Health and Social	35, 49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage Council to use Health and Social Impact process in developing / reviewing policies. Active West Coast offer assistance. • Undertake a comprehensive assessment of the wider implications of health and social services before committing to major housing development in Hokitika. • Allocate appropriate resources to support the development and enhancement of health and social service infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
25	Fox Glacier Community Development Funding	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose is the Glacier Country Promotions Officer funding comes from the Tourism Promotions Rate (under Community Development and Assistance) rather than the Fox/Franz Josef community rate -the current contribution from this targeted rate to the Country promotions group is \$13,000.00. <p>This would then leave \$6,500.00 that each community contributes via the Fox/ Franz targeted rate to come back to these communities and enable them to employ staff at slightly higher rate than the living wage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that a roll over of the top up funding that was agreed to last year happen again this year. We understand that this top up came from the tourism promotions levy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tourism Promotions Rate is funded district wide, the requirement for this extra funding is for tourism solely in Franz Josef and Fox Glacier. 2022/23 Council approved an additional \$13,000 for the Fox CDO role for 1 year which was funded form the tourism promotions rate.
26	Carbon Credits	40, 41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not agree with Council trading in Carbon Credits. • Plant the racecourse with trees to create a carbon sink for carbon credits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon Credits is related to the weight of waste that goes to landfill each year. The best option to reduce this cost is to reduce waste. • Mandated by Central Government.
27	Jackson Bay	46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install a new fit-for-purpose boat ramp, a boat trailer carpark and implement a fee system for recreational boat users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic overview required on all aspects of Jackson Bay future requirements.
28	Federated Farmers submission	40		
a	Rates increases for rural property		Change to rates system to burden rural ratepayers	<p>The rates are struck based on the Capital value system.</p> <p>Rural ratepayers tend to have property valued much higher than the residential properties and Capital value system uses those values to set the rates.</p> <p>The suggested change to the UAGC and differentials reduces the burden on rural ratepayers.</p> <p>The rates samples in the Consultation document show the rates for each of the samples under the different options.</p>

b			The UAGC increasing is unfair to rural ratepayers	<p>The proposal to increase the UAGC from 17.5% to 20% has actually acted to lower the general rate that is driving the increase to rural properties.</p> <p>The rates samples in the consultatoin document show the rates for each of the samples under the different options.</p>
c			Communication of plan rate increases	<p>The consultation document and draft annual plan provides detailed information around the increase in the general rate and how it is impacting different ratepayers.</p> <p>The general rate is increasing, mainly due to the decisions made in previous Council, where for 2021-22 year the rates were a zero % increase to allow some respite due to COVID.</p> <p>In year 2022-23 rates were kept at the CPI rate at the time of 6.9% regardless of the fact that costs had increased. This rates smoothing is not sustainable and the main increase in this plan is due to having to reclaim back some of the smoothed costs.</p> <p>The impact of keeping the rates at artificially low increases was well communicated at the time to ensure that ratepayers understood that this would increase rates in the future.</p>

d			<p>3 Waters depreciation funding is causing rural ratepayers to subsidise other ratepayers.</p>	<p>The depreciation funding of 3 waters is proposed not to be rated to the extent that it will not be required. This actually reduces the total amount of rates owed.</p> <p>Rural ratepayers have not funded 3 waters depreciation previously as they do not get those services, there is no change to this in the draft plan. Rural ratepayers are not subsidising other ratepayers.</p> <p>By changing the UAGC and differentials as proposed and recommended in the consultation document and draft annual plan, other ratepayers are subsidising the rural sector as this means that the general rate is lowered to provide for a higher UAGC.</p> <p>All general rates have increased, including the general rates for rural residential, commercial and residential. The reason it appears that these are being reduced is that they are no longer funding in full the depreciation of the 3 waters through the targeted water rates or targeted sewerage rate, so these rates have decreased. Rural ratepayers have never paid these targeted rates, so they don't get the benefit of the reduction in these targeted rates.</p> <p>To clarify, rural ratepayers are not funding or subsidising any other ratepayers.</p>
e			<p>Council can increase the targeted 3 waters rates to fund depreciation to get through the reform.</p>	<p>Council already have reserves for this purpose, to increase these reserves means that once the assets are transferred, the reserves will offset the amount of debt repayment that Council will get from the entity to repay debt associated with 3 waters.</p> <p>Increasing the 3 waters targeted rate will have no impact on reducing the general rate. It will not reduce the general rate the rural ratepayers are seeing.</p>

f			Do not support the 3 waters depreciation being funded through the UAGC.	<p>Council is not funding any 3 waters depreciation from the UAGC.</p> <p>If Council were to continue to fund depreciation on the 3 waters, it would be funded through the targeted rates for water and sewerage, so that only ratepayers with 3 waters services would fund it.</p> <p>There are still charges being rates through the targeted rates for 3 waters other than funded depreciation, those that do not have the benefit of these services such as rural properties with their own supply do not pay rates towards these charges.</p>
g			Oppose the reduction in the metered water charge as should be a user pays system.	<p>The metered water charge is still a user pays system. The metered water charge has reduced for the same reasons that the water rates and sewerage rate has reduced, this is due to not funding depreciation for the 3 waters.</p> <p>Users of metered water are not being subsidised by any other rate payers for the charges.</p>
h			Council should not trade in Carbon Credits	<p>Council is legislated to use Carbon Credits to offset waste in landfills.</p> <p>The price of purchasing these credits increases each year, if Council purchases more than each year on an annual basis and holds them on the balance sheet, the cost expensed to the Income Statement each year is less than if Council purchased only what is required each year. This in turn reduces the amount Council needs to fund through rates each year.</p>
i			Introduce a rural rates cap	<p>The differentials that WDC use as part of its capital value rating system effectively already act as a rates cap.</p> <p>The draft plan has reduced the differentials for rural ratepayers in this plan in order to reduce the effect of the general rates increases across all ratepayers. Ratepayers other than rural are subsidising the rural sector by this proposed decrease in differential and increase of the UAGC.</p>
j			Rates remissions policy for conservation value	<p>This is not recommended as rates will increase for all ratepayers including the rural sector as any remission has to be funded through rates. All other ratepayers would therefore be subsidising this remission.</p>