

**REPORT 5**  
 (1215/52/IM)

**REPORT OF THE FUNDING AND ACTIVITY REVIEW  
 WORKING PARTY: REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS -  
 REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY**

**1. Purpose of Report**

This report summarises the Funding and Activity Review (FAR) Working Party's review of Revenue and Financing Policy related submissions on the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.

**2. Executive Summary**

Revenue and Financing Policy related submissions were received in relation to the following activities and issues:

<i>Issue /Area</i>	<i>2008/09</i>			<i>2007/08</i>
	<i>Specific submissions</i>	<i>General submissions</i>	<i>Total submissions</i>	<i>Rec'd last yr</i>
3 yearly revaluations	3	5	8	0
Rates affordability	4	2	6	9
Capital value rating	0	1	1	1
Development contributions	0	2	2	3
Marina operations fees	6*	0	6	30
Open space remission	0	1	1	1
Rates differential	0	5	5	8
Trade waste charges	2	7	9	0
Uniform charges	0	2	2	1
Waiver of consent fees on heritage properties	3	14	17	0
Water meter fees	1	1	2	0
Other fee increases	0	2	2	145
<b>Total RFP related submissions</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>198</b>

\* includes submission from the Evans Bay Marina Tenants Group Incorporated.

Of the 430 written submissions received on the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan, 19 related specifically to Revenue and Financing Policy (RFP) related issues, while a further 42 general submissions covered RFP related issues amongst other comments. There were a further 13 submissions which referred to the rates increase in general.

In total 61 submissions covered RFP related issues. This compares to 198 submissions received in relation to the RFP on the 2007/08 Draft Annual Plan. The decrease in submissions is generally reflective of the smaller volume and extent of fee changes proposed for 2008/09, on the back of the more significant changes that were required to achieve policy compliance for a number of activities in 2007/08.

Apart from the submissions related to increases in marina fees and sandwich board charges and the proposed introduction of the Trade Waste Charges Policy there were few specific submissions in regard to proposed changes to fees and charges. Instead submissions tended to focus on wider rating, affordability and valuation issues.

Having reviewed all the submissions and with the exception of the Marina Operations activity and minor changes to proposed resource consent fees, the Working Party recommends no further changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy or related fees and charges.

In regard to the Marina Operations activity, the Working Party recommends that instead of a 3% increase in fees as proposed in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan, marina fees for 2008/09 remain unchanged from 2007/08. It is further recommended that the activity remains compliant with policy (100% user charges) through a \$14,000 reduction in expenditure from that budgeted in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.

Additional increases for resource consent fees of between 0.5% and 1% are recommended to simplify them further, recognise administration costs and disbursements and reduce administrative requirements for processing fee deposits, refunds and additional fees.

The full list of changes to fees and charges is attached in Appendix 1.

### **3. Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Committee:

- 1. Receive the information.*
- 2. Recommend to Council that it agree the following variations from the Revenue and Financing Policy as outlined in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan:*

- a. *an increase in the proportion of the Building Control and Facilitation activity to be funded by users charges from 60% to 65%.*
  - b. *a decrease in the proportion of the Promoting & Hosting Cultural Events activity funded from non-rates revenue from 25% to 20%.*
3. *Recommend to Council that it agree to marina fees remaining at 2007/08 levels on the basis that Revenue and Financing Policy compliance will be maintained through a \$14,000 reduction in expenditure on the activity from that signalled in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.*
  4. *Recommend to Council that it adopt the Trade Waste Charges Policy as incorporated in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.*
  5. *Recommend to Council that it approve and adopt the 2008/09 Annual Plan Fees and Charges Schedule attached as Appendix 1.*

#### **4. Submission Considerations**

A summary of individual submission comments on Revenue and Financing Policy related issues has been previously circulated to Councillors. For each of the issues raised, this section of the report contains:

- a summary of submission comments
- consideration of submissions
- Working Party recommendations

##### **4.1. Move to 3 yearly revaluations**

#### **Submission Summary**

Of the eight submissions received on this change, six were opposed to the change and two were in favour. The key points expressed were:

- That the change was premature as another depression with likely significant decline in capital values was imminent.
- Concern by the Makara Ohariu Community Board over the impact on rural ratepayers given significant capital value increases in the last annual revaluation. The Board did not envisage that values will be retained over the next three years, and have suggested a return to the 2006 valuations.
- That there was ongoing risk of the impact of rapidly changing capital values.
- That ratepayers would be unfairly penalised because values had peaked at the last (2007) revaluation.
- That this was a positive move and that annual revaluations were unnecessary.

#### **Consideration of submissions**

The issues raised through submissions were considered and incorporated in a report to the Funding and Activity Review Working Party on 26 March 2008.

It is important to emphasise that the Council does not collect any more rates when property capital values increase. Property capital values are only used to spread the rates the Council needs to collect across the rating base. This means that the rates increase for a property will only be greater (or less) than average if the capital value of that property has increased by more (or less) than average.

There has been little movement in the relative proportions of commercial and residential properties in the city over the past ten years and there is no evidence to indicate that this will change significantly in the medium term.

All other local authorities in New Zealand revalue properties for rating purposes on a three yearly cycle. The move to three yearly revaluations will bring Wellington into line with other Councils and will tend to reduce the one-off rates impacts caused by one suburb increasing significantly in value one year and another the following year.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

Confirm agreement of the move to a three yearly revaluation cycle.

#### ***4.2. Rates affordability***

##### **Submission Summary**

Of the six submissions received that covered the issue of rates affordability, two were happy with the level of rates increases proposed and four expressed varying levels of concern. The key points expressed by the latter were:-

- That a 5% rates increase is unaffordable for many struggling families when considered in conjunction with increases in other costs such as petrol, energy, mortgage costs and food.
- Requests that Council postpone expenditure on less important items to keep rates increases at affordable levels / in line with inflation.
- A concern that the way the Council publicises its rates increases (i.e. factoring in growth in the ratepayer base) is misleading.

##### **Consideration of Submissions**

As the Council completes the 2008/09 annual planning process and prepares for a new LTCCP round, amid an environment of rising household and business costs in a range of categories, it is appropriate to review and consider affordability issues in the Wellington context. The Mayor has requested a review of affordability, incorporating analysis by BERL, to be reported back to Council through the FAR Working Party in preparation for the 2009/10 – 2019/20 LTCCP.

## **Working Party Recommendation**

That officers are requested to continue investigating how affordability issues can be managed and factored into the preparation of the 2009/10 -2019-20 LTCCP in relation to both the residential and commercial sectors.

### ***4.3. Capital value rating***

#### **Submission Summary**

One submission was received (from Vector Limited) opposing the use of the capital value rating system, in particular as it relates to utilities. The submission contends that a capital value rating basis is a disincentive to growth.

#### **Consideration of Submissions**

The Council's policy in regard to the rating of utilities was last reviewed by the 2007 FAR Working Party. It concluded that as the general rate was a general contribution to the operation of the city, as opposed to a targeted rate that was for the delivery of a specific service, it was appropriate that utilities were 'general rated' on the same basis as other commercial property. Note that utilities are not liable for targeted rates for sewerage, water, stormwater or the downtown levy.

44 of the 80 local authorities in New Zealand that use general rates use a capital value rating system. There has been a trend toward capital value rating in recent years on the basis that this is being increasingly deemed as a more equitable way of distributing general rate liability.

## **Working Party Recommendation**

No change to current policy is recommended.

### ***4.4. Development contributions***

#### **Submission Summary**

Two submissions were received in relation to the Council's Development Contributions Policy.

A submission from Victoria University contended that universities (including student accommodation) should be exempt from paying development contributions. In the case of the development of student accommodation on the Kelburn Campus, Victoria University has previously submitted to the Development Contributions Sub-committee that development contributions should be remitted for a range of reasons related to the specific nature of the development.

The Property Council submission asked that the reduction in predicted growth due to the prevailing economic climate be taken into account in capital

expenditure planning. It further requested that the reducing yield from development contributions is not recovered by merely increasing the quantum of contributions.

### **Consideration of Submissions**

The Development Contributions Policy provides the Council with a method to obtain contributions to fund infrastructure required as a result of growth.

In regard to the Victoria University submission, as is consistent with the rating policy, the ownership of residential property does determine the infrastructure requirement. The Development Contributions Policy provides for variability in infrastructure demand. For example where there is no practical connection to water or wastewater systems, the contribution payable is reduced accordingly. The Policy also provides for remission or postponement of development contributions in exceptional circumstances. The specific application to which the submission refers has been considered by the Development Contributions Sub-Committee. That said, as a general rule it is appropriate that development contributions apply equally to university owned accommodation development and private residential development.

In regard to the Property Council submission, slower than anticipated development growth may delay the receipt of development contributions payments. However with the exception of the impact on the cost of funds due to slower repayment of borrowing, this will not effect the quantum of contributions required on a per equivalent household unit (EHU) basis.

Officers will be considering the impact of the economic climate and its impact on the requirement for growth related capital expenditure as part of its preparation of the 2009/10 – 2019/20 draft LTTCP.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

No change to current policy is recommended.

#### ***4.5. Heritage consent fee waiver***

### **Submission Summary**

Three submissions were received specifically related to the proposal to implement a fund to provide for the waiving of building consent fees for listed heritage buildings. A further 14 submissions commented on the waiver as part of a more general submission. All but three submitters were in favour of the proposal, with one seeking clarification in regard to eligibility criteria.

### **Consideration of Submissions**

The Working Party notes that its 'terms of reference' does not cover the recommendation of Council expenditure initiatives. Comment on submissions

on the heritage consent fee waiver is included within this report as the initiative was proposed by the Working Party in response to the Strategy and Policy Committee's request in December 2007, for the Working Party to assess options for heritage relief for 2008/09.

Accordingly the Draft Annual Plan includes the provision of a \$50,000 Heritage Building Consent Waiver subsidy fund. In addition officers will complete a comprehensive review of options for increased support to the owners of listed heritage buildings in the preparation of the 2009/10 – 2019/20 Draft LTCCP.

Officers are in the process of formulating detailed eligibility criteria for this fund, for confirmation by the Strategy and Policy Committee.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

No change from the proposal incorporated in 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.

### **4.6. Marina Operations**

#### **Submission Summary**

Six submissions were received in relation to the Evans Bay Marina. One of these submissions was from the Evans Bay Marina Tenants Group Incorporated (EBMTG) which represents a large proportion of berth holders. Their submission and four others opposed the 3% fee increase proposed for 2008/09. The key points expressed in submissions included:-

- Some costs incorporated in the activity and funded by marina tenants contained a level of public benefit.
- A number of marina tenants were still in dispute of 2007/08 fees and it was therefore inappropriate to increase fees further until this was resolved.
- Concern over the impact vacancy rates have on the fee levels required to meet cost recovery.
- The EBMTG, which represents a number of marina tenants has provided Council officers with a detailed proposal incorporating a terms sheet for a new agreement, contracts and indicative areas for cost savings. They contend that there needs to be a period of time to allow negotiations to take place.

No submissions were received in relation to the Clyde Quay marina.

#### **Consideration of submissions**

A large number of submissions were received in relation to this activity in response to the 2007/08 Draft Annual Plan. In response to these submissions the Council reviewed the cost components of the activity where public benefit was derived and adjusted the proposed fee accordingly. However due to the infrequency of fee increases in previous years, significant increases in fees were required to meet compliance with the Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, which states that this activity be 100% user funded.

2007/08 fees were set by the Council as part of last year's Annual Plan process. From a Council perspective marina tenants are legally obliged to pay these fees.

Officers have had a number of discussions with the EBMTG in recent months and have received a substantial proposal from this group outlining a set of revised terms for the future. Officers have reviewed this information and will undertake further discussions with the tenants' representatives to progress expenditure and fee structures and in particular to develop a longer term Asset Management Plan, that better forecast both costs and likely fee impacts. This will provide tenants with a clear picture of likely fee trends over the medium term. It is proposed that this process is undertaken to feed into the 2009/10 – 2019/20 Draft LTCCP.

Given the intention to consult closely with marina tenant representatives in the development of asset management plans, it is considered prudent to delay any decisions in regard to increased maintenance cost components which are contained in budgets for the activity incorporated in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan. Removing \$14,000 of increased maintenance costs from the 2008/09 budget, will allow 2008/09 marina fees to remain at 2007/08 levels. This will provide sufficient time for a full review of both operating and capital expenditure programmes to be completed for inclusion in consultation for the 2009/10 – 2019/20 LTCCP.

### **Working Party recommendation**

Decrease the 2008/09 expenditure budget for the activity by \$14,000 to allow fees to remain at 2007/08 levels, providing time for consultation with marina tenants in regard to the development of asset management plans and related expenditure and associated fee structures to feed into the 2009/10 - 2019/20 LTCCP.

### **4.7. Open Space Remission**

#### **Submission Summary**

One submission was received from the Makara Ohariu Community Board fully supporting the continuation of the 50% general rate remission on rural properties of greater than 30 hectares (and where land value makes up at least 50% of capital value).

#### **Consideration of Submissions**

The 2007 revaluation resulted in significant increases in rateable value for larger rural properties in the Makara Ohariu area. Officers have subsequently met with members of the Community Board and discussed the causes of these changes. It was concluded that much of the impact was due to low property sales in previous years causing a delay in value increases filtering through to rateable values. A number of property owners have exercised their right to

object to values assessed by Quotable Value and some have resulted in a revision of their rateable value.

The Working Party does not propose any change to the rating policy or classification as it applies to rural property and is supportive of the Makara Ohariu Community Board's submission related to the continuation of the Open Space Remission. It also noted that land set aside under QEII covenant is eligible for non-rateability under the Local Government Rating Act.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

No change to current policy is recommended.

#### ***4.8. Rates differential***

### **Submission Summary**

Five submissions were received in regard to the rates differential. Two of these supported the continuation of the differential transition and three were opposed.

### **Consideration of Submissions**

Commercial properties currently pay 4.2 times more general rate than a residential property of the same value. On a purely capital value basis this equates to the commercial sector subsidising the residential sector by approximately \$35m per year. The Draft Annual Plan proposes reducing this differential to 3.8 for 2008/09.

Not surprisingly the two submissions in favour of the continuation of the differential transition come from organisations representing commercial ratepayers, while those opposed come from residents.

Significant review of the background and rationale for the differential transition was undertaken as part of both 2006 and 2007 Working Party reviews. Comments contained in the current submissions are consistent with the considerations factored into these earlier reviews.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

Note that the amended 2006/07 – 2016/17 LTTCP and 2007/08 Annual Plan indicate a movement in the general rate differential from 4.2 to 3.8 for 2008/09. No change to the current policy is recommended.

## **4.9. Trade Waste Charges**

### **Submission Summary**

Nine submissions were received in relation to the proposed Trade Waste Charges Policy, consulted on as part of the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan. Of these, six were in favour of the adoption of the policy and three opposed. The key points made by those opposed included:-

- General concern over the introduction of charges. Belief that charges would only be accepted by the wider business community if fee distribution was cost neutral, increased income was used to cover network enhancements specifically for trade waste treatment, and that funds raised would be used for development of trade waste reduction technologies and strategies.
- Concern that charges will be set based on a historical basis and that there is no 'at site' measurement of volume of waste, which is currently based on input via water meter minus a credit for an estimated measure of domestic usage.

A submission from United Water International (UWI), the operator of the Council's Moa Point treatment plant proposed increasing the range of parameters for which Trade Waste fees should be applied to limit the risk to treatment works (e.g. pH, salinity, sulphate). They also advocated for a stronger charging regime through higher charges, and lower suspended solids threshold to encourage increased local removal of solids; and increased monitoring to provide increased feedback to disposers to enhance waste management planning.

In addition to the above, a further seven submissions commented on odour and discharge issues relating to the Moa Point treatment facilities.

### **Consideration of Submissions**

The introduction of Trade Waste charges is revenue neutral as the Council receives no additional rates or user charges revenue. It does mean that trade waste disposers will make an increased contribution to reflect their increased contribution to the Council's costs of sewerage disposal. This is offset by a lower contribution by other sewerage ratepayers.

The Policy provides for all trade waste disposers to be categorised based on a 'Trade Waste Index' based on data related to the historical composition of trade waste from each disposer.

The highest category disposer (category 4) will be required to have in-line metering of flow into the sewer and 24 hour auto-sampling for BOD and suspended solids, upon which charges will be based. The category approach provides for differing requirements regarding measurement frequency and method, so as to promote trade waste reduction and prevent the cost of

monitoring being prohibitive for lower category disposers. Should a particular disposer wish to establish a higher or more complex level of monitoring (at their cost) than required by the Policy this can be negotiated with the Council.

In drafting the Policy, consideration was given to a range of charging parameters, thresholds, fee levels and monitoring frequencies. The draft Policy provides a balance between the enhancement of a user pays philosophy, simplicity, affordability and an incentive to reduce trade waste disposal into the sewer.

The inclusion of charges for sulphate and temperature, factors which can contribute to sewer degradation and odour, were considered during development of the Policy. However there is currently no evidence linking sulphate and temperature levels to accelerated degradation of sewer lines flowing from the city's major trade waste disposers. Likewise it is difficult to link odour issues further through the sewer system to specific disposers. Accordingly the policy as proposed does not incorporate charges specifically related to sulphate, temperature or other parameters mentioned in the UWI submission, but contains the provision for additional charging parameters to be added at a later date, where evidence can link additional costs specifically to trade waste disposal.

Subsequent discussions have also been held with UWI and it was clarified that the Bylaw content was not currently under review, or in the scope of the Trade Waste Charges Policy. Work is underway with UWI to identify odour sources and possible mitigation. If any of these mitigations require changes to the Bylaw content, this will trigger a future review of the actual Bylaw.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

Recommend approval of the Trade Waste Policy as contained in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.

#### ***4.10 Targeted rate for water – water meters***

### **Submission summary**

Two submissions were received opposing the increase in the targeted rate for water charged through water meters. Both submissions expressed concern at the lack of incentive for residents to take up water meters and conserve water. Submitters considered that this is exacerbated by increasing water meter charges.

### **Consideration of submissions**

The increase proposed for 2008/09 represents a 15% increase in the metered water rate since the last increase four years ago. From 2004/05 to 2007/08 water rates charged based on rate per dollar of capital value have increased by

12% for the average residential property and are forecast to rise by a further 6% in 2008/09.

The 15% increase for metered water over the four year period compares favourably with 18% for those non-metered ratepayers who elect to pay for rates based on a rate per dollar of capital value.

On this basis the financial incentive remains for those on water meters to conserve water. However it is accepted that beyond the property value and consumption threshold at which an incentive for water metering exists, there is no financial incentive for those residential ratepayers who choose to pay based on rate per dollar of capital value, to conserve water.

The Working Party also notes that the increase in metered water rate is partly due to a decrease in water consumption across the city. Unfortunately a significant proportion of the Council's costs are fixed, which means that decreased consumption does not equate to a proportional decrease in overall cost for the activity.

### **Working Party Recommendation**

That in preparation for the 2009/10 – 2019/20 LTCCP, officers review options for incentivising water conservation.

## **5. Other Issues for Consideration**

### **Resource consent fees**

Proposed fees and user charges for the Development Control and Facilitation activity were included in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan for consultation. During the consultation period, further work has been undertaken to review these draft fees in order to simplify them further, recognise administration costs and disbursements and reduce administrative requirements for processing fee deposits, refunds and additional fees.

For 95% of consents this means a \$5 increase in the deposit fee from \$1,095 to \$1,100 or from \$845 to \$850. For the remaining 5% of consents it means a \$40 increase in administrative disbursements. These fee changes equate to between 0.5% and 1% movement from those consulted on through the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.

It is recommended that the Committee approve these changes which have been reflected in the 2008/09 Fees and Charges Schedule attached in Appendix 1.

## **6. Conclusion**

The Funding and Activity Review Working Party has considered the submissions received on the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan which relate to the Council's Revenue and Financing Policy.

The number of submissions received is lower than those received in 2007/08. This is consistent with the decrease in number and quantum of fee changes required to maintain compliance with the Council's Revenue and Financing Policy. This has and can continue to be achieved by continuing to review fees and charges on an annual basis in an attempt to avoid large one-off increases.

The Working Party proposes two minor changes to the fees and charges from that signalled in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan. These are to change both expenditure and user fees for the Marinas Operation activity to retain fees at 2007/08 levels and some minor changes to consent fees to better reflect administration and disbursement costs.

The Working Party recommends adoption of the Trade Waste Charges Policy as incorporated in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan.

In proposing no further changes to user fee funding proportions from those proposed in the 2008/09 Draft Annual Plan, the Working Party has placed emphasis on achieving compliance with our funding policy targets. Any failure to comply with Revenue and Financing Policy user fees targets will result in the shortfall having to be met by general ratepayers.

Contact Councillor: *Andy Foster*

Contact Officer: *Andy Matthews, Manager Funding & Financial Strategy*

## Fees and user charges

Our Revenue and Financing Policy guides our decisions on how to fund Council services. Under the policy, we take into account who benefits from a service (individuals, parts of the community, or the community as a whole) to help us determine how the service should be funded. The policy set targets for each Council activity, determining what proportion should be funded from each of user charges, general rates, targeted rates and other sources of income.

For 2008/09, in line with that policy, we have made some changes to fees and charges in the following areas.

- Development control and facilitation
- Recycling
- Burials and cremations
- Footpaths & Pavement Permissions
- Sportsfields

New fees will be implemented as of 1 July 2008 and are inclusive of GST unless otherwise stated. For more information see [www.Wellington.co.nz](http://www.Wellington.co.nz)

*Note that the following list of fees and charges is not a complete list of all fees and charges levied by the Council. It consists of those fees and charges subject to consultation through the annual plan process and where a change will apply from 1 July 2008.*

### Development control and facilitation

We are proposing to increase our fees for development control and facilitation work, including fees for consents, compliance monitoring and enforcement.

<b>Resource Consent Fees</b>	<b>2007/08 Deposit / Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Deposit / Fee</b>
<i>Service</i>		
Pre-application meetings (per hour) - planner / expert / compliance officer. The Council offers a total of 2 hours of free officer time on pre-application meetings. Time spent after this will be charged on an hourly basis per officer involved (e.g. 1.5 hours meeting = 2 hours free and 1 hour chargeable).	\$115.00	First 2 hours of total officer time free. \$125.00 per hour thereafter
Currently, various different categories; e.g. Non-notified Consents: Land Use base fee - Central Area - minor alterations eg verandas, windows, discretionary activity signs (up to 7 hrs)	\$805.00	N / A
Non-notified Resource Consent: subdivision and / or land use - up to 8 hrs Planner / Advisor, 1 hr admin, \$30 disbursements	N / A	\$1,100.00

## APPENDIX 1

<b>Resource Consent Fees</b>	<b>2007/08 Deposit / Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Deposit / Fee</b>
Limited notified Resource Consent: subdivision and / or land use - up to 30 hrs Planner / Advisor, 8 hr admin, \$190 disbursements	\$3,450.00	\$4,500.00
Notified Resource Consent: subdivision and / or land use (includes \$2,000.00 towards the cost of the public notices) - up to 40 hrs Planner / Advisor, 8 hr admin, \$440 disbursements	\$6,600.00	\$8,000.00
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 - up to 6 hrs Planner / Advisor, 1 hr admin, \$30 disbursements	Range: \$345 - \$690	\$850.00
Certificates: Town Planning, Sale of Liquor, Overseas investments, LMVD - up to 2 hrs Planner / Advisor, 1 hr admin,	Range ; \$155 - \$290	\$315.00
Fast Track - non-notified consents only - issued with 10 days (criteria applies, and applications will only be accepted on a case by case basis)	2 x normal fee	2 x normal fee
Fast Track - non-notified consents only - issued with 5 days (criteria applies, and applications will only be accepted on a case by case basis).	3 x normal fee	3 x normal fee
<i>Additional Charges</i>		
Cost of all disbursements ie: venue hire, photocopying, catering, postage, public notification	Variable - based on actual cost	Variable - based on actual cost
Councillor costs per hour for any hearing		
- Chairperson	\$85.00	\$85.00
- Other	\$68.00	\$68.00
- Specialist consultant report (including consultant planners)	Variable - based on actual cost	Variable - based on actual cost
Independent Commissioners	Variable - based on actual cost	Variable - based on actual cost
Additional hours (per hour):		
- All consents: additional processing hours (per hour) – planner/advisor / compliance officer	\$115.00	\$125.00
- All consents: additional processing hours (per hour) – administrative officer	\$60.00	\$65.00

## APPENDIX 1

<b>Resource Consent Fees</b>	<b>2007/08 Deposit / Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Deposit / Fee</b>
<i>Bylaw Application</i>		
Applications relating to signs (Commercial Sex Premises) -up to 6 hrs	\$690.00	\$750.00
<i>Compliance Monitoring</i>		
Monitoring Administration of Resource Consents: subdivision or land use - up to 2 hrs	\$230.00	\$250.00
Cost of disbursements, e.g. materials, consultant investigations	Variable - based on actual cost	Variable - based on actual cost
Additional hours (per hour):		
- planner / expert / compliance officer	\$115.00	\$125.00
- administrative officer	\$60.00	\$65.00
<i>Subdivision Certification</i>		
Stage certification: each stage for s223, s224(f), s226 etc - up to 2 hrs	\$230.00	\$250.00
- combination of 2 or more	\$403.00	\$450.00
All other RMA and LGA certificates, sealing, transfer documents etc - up to 2 hrs	\$230.00	\$250.00
Bonds: each stage of preparation or release - up to 2 hrs	\$230.00	\$250.00
<i>Terms and late payment</i>		
<p>Deposits and additional fees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p>Terms for payment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Payment of additional fees is due by the 20<sup>th</sup> of the following month from invoice being processed. Where payment is not made by the 20th of the month following the date of the invoice, the customer agrees to pay council the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An additional / administrative fee, of the lesser of 10% of the overdue amount or \$300</li> <li>- All costs and expenses (including debt collection or legal fee's), incurred by the council in seeking to recover the over-due amount, and</li> <li>- Daily interest (rate of 15% p.a.) from the date of default</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

## APPENDIX 1

### Recycling

We are proposing to increase our fees for the recycling levy component of the landfill levy.

<b>Landfill Fees</b>	<b>2007/08 Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Fee</b>
Recycling Levy (per tonne)	\$16.90	\$20.90
Landfill Levy (per tonne)	\$61.10	\$61.10
<b>Total Landfill Fee (per tonne)</b>	<b>\$78.00</b>	<b>\$82.00</b>

### Footpath Management

We are proposing to increase our fees for sandwich boards and other temporary obstructions as part of the overall Footpath Management Policy.

<b>Sandwich Boards (and other temporary obstructions such as welcome mates and menu boards)</b>	<b>2007/08 Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Fee</b>
CBD	\$150	\$175
Suburbs	\$90	\$100

### Burials and Cremations

We are proposing to increase our fees for burials and cremations.

<b>Burials &amp; Cremations</b>	<b>2007/08 Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Fee</b>
<i><b>Cremations</b></i>		
Delivery Only	\$480.00	\$535.00
Committal Service	\$495.00	\$540.00
Full Service (1 hour)	\$545.00	\$590.00
Chapel hire (per half hour)	\$90.00	\$100.00
Bio Tissue (Wellington Hospital)	\$480.00	\$525.00
Certificate of Cremation	\$40.00	\$50.00
Cremation Overtime	\$290.00	\$300.00
Chapel hire Burials	\$115.00	\$130.00
Chapel hire Cremations Elsewhere	\$170.00	\$190.00
Viewing Casket charge	\$70.00	\$80.00
Late Service fee	\$115.00	\$130.00
Express Ash	\$180.00	\$200.00
<i><b>Burials @ Karori</b></i>		
<b>Ash Interments</b>		
Ash Plot ( 2 Interments )	\$710.00	\$720.00
Ash Disinterment	\$200.00	\$210.00
<b>Burials</b>		
Breaking of Concrete Floor	\$160.00	\$180.00

## APPENDIX 1

<b>Burials &amp; Cremations</b>	<b>2007/08 Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Fee</b>
Grave Reuse (Disinterment, Dig Down, Re-enter below new burial)	\$1,580.00	\$1,600.00
Grave Disinterment	\$1,580.00	\$1,600.00
Vault Placement	\$250.00	\$300.00
Burial Overtime	\$400.00	\$450.00
<b>Niches</b>		
Double Granite Niche (new)	\$1,100.00	\$1,500.00
Niche placement / removal	\$100.00	\$120.00
Plaque placement / removal	\$50.00	\$60.00
<b><i>Burials @ Makara</i></b>		
<b>Ash Interments</b>		
Ash Beam ( 4 Interments )	\$225.00	\$250.00
Ash Circle Plot	\$450.00	\$500.00
Beam Fee	\$130.00	\$145.00
<b>Lawn Cemetery</b>		
Beam Fee	\$130.00	\$145.00
<b>Denominational</b>		
Plot	\$970.00	\$1,080.00
Extra Depth (per 300mm)	\$170.00	\$180.00
Extra Width (per 300mm)	\$85.00	\$130.00
Plot maintenance	\$480.00	\$535.00
Beam fee	\$130.00	\$145.00
Interment fee	\$555.00	\$600.00
Internment fee - 10yrs & under	\$ -	\$135.00
Muslim Boards (Adult)	\$135.00	\$150.00
Muslim Boards (Child)	\$80.00	\$90.00
<b><i>Disinterment Taita Cemetery</i></b>	\$1,400.00	\$1,500.00
<b><i>Miscellaneous</i></b>		
Temporary Grave Markers	\$100.00	\$120.00
Permits	\$100.00	\$120.00
Change of Deed	\$40.00	\$50.00
Funerals booked after 3:30pm Burial	\$80.00	\$100.00

## APPENDIX 1

### Sportsfields

We are proposing to increase our fees for sportsfields.

Sportsfields	2007/08 Fee	2008/09 Fee
<b>Cricket</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1 (per game)	\$225.00	\$235.00
Level 2 (per game)	\$150.00	\$155.00
Artificial on concrete base (per game)	\$95.00	\$100.00
Artificial on grass base (per game)	\$95.00	\$100.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1 (per season)	\$1,500.00	\$1,575.00
Level 2 (per season)	\$1,255.00	\$1,320.00
Artificial on concrete base (per season)	\$500.00	\$525.00
Artificial on grass base (per season)	\$400.00	\$420.00
<b>Rugby, League, Soccer, Aussie Rules</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1 (per game)	\$80.00	\$85.00
Level 2 (per game)	\$60.00	\$65.00
Level 3 (per game)	\$45.00	\$50.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1 (per season)	\$1,190.00	\$1,225.00
Level 2 (per season)	\$905.00	\$930.00
Level 3 (per season)	\$765.00	\$790.00
<b>Softball</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1 (per game)	\$100.00	\$105.00
Level 2 (per game)	\$70.00	\$75.00
Level 3 (per game)	\$70.00	\$75.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		
Level 1 (per season)	\$430.00	\$450.00
Level 2 (per season)	\$290.00	\$300.00
Level 3 (per season)	\$290.00	\$300.00
<b>Touch, 5-a-Side, Ultimate Flying Disk, Gridiron</b>		
<b>Casual</b>		
Level 1 (per game)	\$105.00	\$110.00
Level 2 (per game)	\$85.00	\$90.00
<b>Seasonal</b>		

## APPENDIX 1

<b>Sportsfields</b>	<b>2007/08 Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Fee</b>
Level 1 (per season)	\$900.00	\$930.00
Level 2 (per season)	\$700.00	\$720.00
<b>Netball</b>		
Per court	\$80.30	\$85.00
Off-season or organised (per court, per hour)	\$5.00	\$5.50
Casual (per court, per hour)	\$25.00	\$26.00
<b>Tennis</b>		
Per court	\$110.00	\$115.00
Off-season or organised (per court, per hour)	\$10.00	\$10.50
Casual (per court, per hour)	\$25.00	\$26.00
<b>Cycling</b>		
Casual (per session)	\$100.00	\$105.00
Seasonal (per season)	\$1,035.00	\$1,065.00
<b>Athletics</b>		
Casual (per day)	\$375.00	\$385.00
WRFU Speed Trials (per trial session)	\$80.00	\$85.00
Seasonal (per season)	\$6,240.00	\$6,430.00
<b>Croquet - one lawn</b>		
Casual (per session)	\$100.00	\$105.00
Seasonal (per season)	\$470.00	\$485.00
<b>Training</b>		
<b>Ground only:</b>		
1 night (per night)	\$60.00	\$65.00
1 night (per season)	\$224.00	\$230.00
2 nights (per season)	\$448.00	\$460.00
3 nights (per season)	\$672.00	\$690.00
4 nights (per season)	\$896.00	\$925.00
5 nights (per season)	\$1,120.00	\$1,155.00
<b>Ground and Changing Rooms:</b>		
1 night (per night)	\$110.00	\$115.00
1 night (per season)	\$475.00	\$490.00
2 nights (per season)	\$950.00	\$980.00

## APPENDIX 1

<b>Sportsfields</b>	<b>2007/08 Fee</b>	<b>2008/09 Fee</b>
3 nights (per season)	\$1,425.00	\$1,470.00
4 nights (per season)	\$1,900.00	\$1,960.00
5 nights (per season)	\$2,375.00	\$2,450.00
<b>National Hockey Stadium - level 1</b> (per season)	\$28,358.00	\$29,210.00
<b>Elite Parks</b>		
Rugby League Park (per game)	\$380.00	\$390.00
Newtown Park (per game)	\$380.00	\$390.00
<b>Picnics</b>	\$35.00	\$36.00
<b>Marquees</b>		
Booking Fee (per booking; non-refundable)	\$50.00	\$51.50
Marquee up to 50m2 (per day)	\$300.00	\$310.00
Marquee up to 100m2 (per day)	\$500.00	\$515.00
Marquee >100m2 (per day)	\$800.00	\$825.00
<b>Add-Ons</b>		
Groundsman (per hour, minimum 2 hours)	\$20.00	\$21.00
Toilets Open (per day)	\$20.00	\$21.00
Toilets and Changing Rooms Open (per day)	\$50.00	\$51.50
Litter collection	Discretion	
<b>Golf Course</b>		
Passport to Leisure - Round	\$6.00	\$6.50
Adults - Round Weekdays	\$12.00	\$13.00
Adults - Round Weekend	\$18.00	\$19.00
Junior - Round	\$6.00	\$6.50
Passport to Leisure - Yearly	\$160.00	\$170.00
Passport to Leisure - Half Yearly	\$90.00	\$95.00
Adults - Yearly	\$320.00	\$335.00
Adults - Half Yearly	\$180.00	\$190.00
Juniors - Yearly	\$75.00	\$80.00
Trundler Hire	\$5.00	\$5.50
Club & Trundler Hire	\$15.00	\$16.00
Club Hire	\$10.00	\$10.50

