

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

SID:	Submitter	RID	S/O	Request	Reason/s	Heard
1	Neville Arps	1		-	-	Not specified
2	Peter Bell	1	O	Simply the Plan.	<p>Rates are a cost over all potential beneficiaries to get the maximum good.</p> <p>Councils responsibility is to encourage and regulate growth, no stifle it.</p> <p>Requiring developers to bear all costs in a town with dated infrastructure encourages growth out of town.</p> <p>Method of calculation was not developed by or for the people of the Mackenzie District.</p>	Not specified
3	Geoffrey Clement	1	S	Clarity as to the proposed changes fees should be transparent and accessible to developers prior to commencement of project & there should be an ability to negotiate in a fair and reasonable manner charges which may be duplicated or incorrect in respect of the proposed project.	Developers cannot establish a cost structure as Council fees are not transparent.	No
		2		Developers should not be charged for projects which may never eventuate e.g. parks and reserves.	Developer should only be paying for the current Council additional costs (if any) and not be charged for costs associated with deficiencies in current infrastructure.	
		3		Administration fees should be absorbed as part of the current rates paid by owners.	Staff salaries are paid from rates. To charge admin fees for processing is a double charge and morally wrong.	
4	Ian Fraser	1	S	Supports the plan change.	-	Not specified
5	Sidney Fraser	1	S	-	-	Not

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

						specified
6	Alan Gilmore	1	S	Support the requirement of new developments contributing full infrastructure costs.	New users should pay infrastructure costs they incur.	No
7	Gerald Gordon	1	S	-	-	Not specified
8	Andrew Hocken on behalf of The Mackenzie Experience Ltd	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments which are not subdivisions.	<p>Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off Section 224 certificates.</p> <p>Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists, ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers restrict growth.</p> <p>Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.</p>	Not specified
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development	

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
9	Frank Hocken on behalf of Ruataniwha Farm Ltd	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments which are not subdivisions.	<p>Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off Section 224 certificates.</p> <p>Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists, ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers restrict growth.</p> <p>Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.</p>	Not specified
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
10	Frank Hocken on behalf of Mt	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments	Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off	Not specified

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

	Cook Vineyards Ltd			which are not subdivisions.	<p>Section 224 certificates.</p> <p>Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists, ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers restrict growth.</p> <p>Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.</p>	
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
11	Grant Hocken	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments which are not subdivisions.	<p>Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off Section 224 certificates.</p> <p>Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists,</p>	Not specified

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					<p>ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers restrict growth.</p> <p>Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.</p>	
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
12	Lee Hocken on behalf of Grants Motels Ltd	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments which are not subdivisions.	<p>Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off Section 224 certificates.</p> <p>Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists, ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers</p>	Not specified

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					restrict growth. Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.	
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
13	Patricia Main	1	S	Confirm Plan Change 7 Subdivider must pay all costs of all subdivisions of any kind, urban or rural.	Existing ratepayers should not be liable for any subdivision costs nor the cost of extending existing roads, sewers or water to serve new subdivisions. Likewise, the cost of upgrading existing Council amenities to service new subdivisions should be paid by the subdivider.	No
14	Karan & Malcolm MacDiarmid on behalf of Dry Creek Properties	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments which are not subdivisions.	Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off Section 224 certificates. Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists,	Not specified

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					<p>ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers restrict growth.</p> <p>Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.</p>	
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
15	Susan McGowan	1	O	No implementation of financial contributions fees on developments which are not subdivisions.	<p>Council can easily control contributions at subdivision stage through conditions and signing off Section 224 certificates.</p> <p>Increased costs of compliance on commercial developments will be passed onto end user (tourists, ratepayers).</p> <p>Less commercial development caused by increased compliance costs and higher costs for consumers</p>	Not specified

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

					restrict growth. Council would be having two bites at the cherry through charging financial contributions and then charging increased rates. The increased rates would cover the extra usage of public services.	
		2		There should be no stormwater contribution for Twizel until Council provides a fully reticulated stormwater disposal system.	Most of Twizel is not covered by a Council stormwater disposal system.	
		3		More detail of the proposed formula should be provided for.	Questions whether the Council has annual valuations carried out on its water, sewer & stormwater assets and if they are on public record, if a better definition of Capital Reserve Balance can be provided, how the Council will determine its charge will apply in a multi unit development or commercial development such as a shop and what the Council means by per lot/residential unit equivalent.	
16	Terence McQuinn	1	S	Support Section 2 of the proposal	-	No
17	Kevin O'Neill	1	O	For Council to require a smaller % contribution for infrastructure to develop sections around Fairlie to encourage growth.	Fairlie needs sections for people to build on to move ahead. To encourage people to make land available, Council needs to encourage landowners to subdivide by lowering the financial contributions for services. Agree that developers should contribute to infrastructure but in Fairlie the return on a section does not cover the cost of developing it, Twizel and Tekapo are different.	No
18	Cornelis Raats	1	S	Council should accept the proposed	Existing ratepayers should not have to contribute	No

Mackenzie District Plan
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 7

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

				plan change 7.	financially to necessary upgrades required on existing or newly required infrastructures brought about by the development and subdivision of private land.	
19	J Surridge	1	O	Form a policy that encourages developers to invest in the long term community environment & produce good design guidelines.	Will encourage good design. Numerous developments in larger cities in NZ show that developers pay as little as possible on good design as there is no value in it.	No
		2		Communicate to developers the financial incentives for good design & not to alienate developers by making all projects 100% cost payable	MDC ratepayers would do well to invest some money in and around proposed (necessary) developments to ensure good, sustainable communities are created. Subsidies for planting, crossings etc will allow certain amount of Council involvement in appearance. A degree of integrity will be encouraged to eventuate in the built up environment.	
		3		Encourage infill subdivision	Urban sprawl is not sustainable. Encouraging in fill subdivision (in selected areas) will ensure centrality and public transport costs being affordable in the future.	
		4		Allow developers various means of financial contribution (even directly to community organizations)	This will have meaning and encourage participation.	