

AGENDA

Extraordinary Council Meeting
Annual Plan Deliberations
Tuesday 24 May 2022 at 1.00pm

Northland Regional Extraordinary Council Meeting Agenda Annual Plan Deliberations

Meeting to be held in the Council Chamber
36 Water Street, Whangārei
on Tuesday 24 May 2022, commencing at 1.00pm

Recommendations contained in the council agenda are NOT council decisions. Please refer to council minutes for resolutions.

RĪMITI (Item)	Page
1.0 NGĀ MAHI WHAKAPAI (HOUSEKEEPING)	
<i>Key Health and Safety points to note:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>If the fire alarm goes off – exit down the stairwell to the assembly point which is the visitor carpark.</i><i>Earthquakes – drop, cover and hold</i><i>Visitors please make sure you have signed in at reception, and that you sign out when you leave. Please wear your name sticker.</i><i>The toilets are on the opposite side of the stairwell.</i><i>Please adhere to the recommended Covid alert guidance that applies.</i>	
2.0 KARAKIA TIMATANGA – TAUĀKI Ā ROTO (OPENING KARAKIA)	
3.0 NGĀ WHAKAPAHĀ (APOLOGIES)	
4.0 NGĀ WHAKAPUAKANGA (DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST)	
5.0 NGĀ TAKE (DECISION MAKING MATTERS)	
5.1 Council Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation Document and Supporting Information	3
5.2 Council deliberations on the User Fees and Charges 2022/23	47

**TITLE: Council Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2022/23
Consultation Document and Supporting Information**

From: Nicola Hartwell, Corporate Planner and Kyla Carlier, Corporate Strategy Manager

Authorised by Group Manager/s: Bruce Howse, Pou Taumatua – Group Manager Corporate Services, on 18 May 2022

Executive summary/Whakarāpopototanga

The purpose of this report is to provide background information and present staff advice and recommendations, as part of council's deliberation on the submissions received on the Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation Document and supporting information, and final considerations presented as part of the development of the Annual Plan 2022/23.

This is the first annual plan process carried out following the adoption of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 last year, and is an opportunity to make any adjustments required to the budget. The annual plan is focussed on any changes from the Long Term Plan.

Recommendations

1. That the report 'Council Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation Document and Supporting Information' by Nicola Hartwell, Corporate Planner and Kyla Carlier, Corporate Strategy Manager dated 26 April 2022, be received.
2. That council support the provision of an additional \$1.7M toward design and build of a maritime vessel to replace the current vessel (the Waikare), for a total cost of \$3.3M, as proposed in the Annual Plan 2022/23 supporting information.
3. That council support borrowing the full amount of \$3.3M required to design and build a maritime vessel that will replace the current vessel (the Waikare), and repay it over 15 years via the Council Services Rate beginning in 2023/24, as proposed in the Annual Plan 2022/23 supporting information.
4. That council support the \$1.6M set aside for the design and build of the maritime vessel be placed in council's Long Term Fund, as proposed in the Annual Plan 2022/23 supporting information.
5. That council supports the reallocation of CityLink funds set aside in 2022/23 year for T2 lanes (now delayed), and an increase to the targeted Whangārei transport rate of \$188,216 per year from 2022/23, to maintain and improve the services provided by the Whangārei CityLink, as proposed in the Annual Plan 2022/23 supporting information.
6. That council supports an increase in total rates revenue from the 13.79% stated in the Long Term Plan 2021/31 to 13.89% (0.1%) for 2022/23.
7. That Bruce Howse, Group Manager – Corporate Services be given delegated authority to approve any consequential amendments to the final Annual Plan 2022/23 as a result of council decisions on submissions and any minor accuracy and grammatical amendments.
8. That council notes that the amounts set out in the report are based on best estimate forecasts at the time of writing, and that the CEO be given delegated authority to approve changes required to revise the financial statement and rating information

within the final Annual Plan 2022/23 to give effect to the council's deliberations, with final amounts presented for council approval in June 2022.

9. That council does not make any changes to the Annual Plan 2022/23 as a result of the submissions received on these topics: Genetically modified organism/engineering; marine biosecurity fee.

Considerations

1. Environmental Impact

The initiatives presented as part of this annual plan will enable more efficient delivery of services, and reduced vehicle emissions, with otherwise minimal environmental impact.

2. Community views

A process of consultation has been carried out to inform the recommendations set out in this report. A summary of this consultation and the feedback received is included in this report, and in **attachment 1** to this report. Consultation was sought to inform council's decisions on a specific set of proposals. A total of 13 written submissions and one verbal submission were received. Māori impact statement

The implementation of the plan change has the potential for positive effects for all local people, including Māori. There are no known particular impacts on Māori which are different from general ratepayers or users associated with the proposals.

3. Financial implications

Financial impacts or implementation issues are addressed in recommendations included within this report. Implementation issues

4. Significance and engagement

Section 76AA of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) directs that council must adopt a policy setting out how significance will be determined, and the level of engagement that will be triggered. This policy assists council in determining how to achieve compliance with LGA requirements in relation to decisions.

The proposals set out in the Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation Document triggered council's significance and engagement policy, and the process of consultation and engagement has now been carried out. The results of this engagement have been summarised in this document to inform council's deliberations and decision-making process. The process of deliberations assists council in achieving compliance with sections 77 of the LGA.

5. Policy, risk management and legislative compliance

Consultation on the annual plan proposals has been carried out pursuant to sections 95 and 95A of the LGA and in accordance with the principles of consultation (section 82 LGA) Consideration of submissions through the process of deliberations will achieve compliance with section 77 of the LGA (Requirements in relation to decisions) and with council's Significance and Engagement Policy, in particular 'We will consult when we are required to by law, when a proposal is considered significant, and when we need more information on options for responding to an issue'.

A decision by council to include a new proposal in this annual plan that has not been through the process of consultation would require assessment against council's Significance and Engagement policy. If it were determined under that policy that consultation was required, it is unlikely that this would be achievable in a timeframe that would allow adoption of the plan

before the end of the financial year, resulting in high risk of breach of Section 95(1) of the LGA. Failure to consult in such an instance would also require consideration of Section 80 of the LGA (Identification of inconsistent decisions).

If the new proposals are not supported by council for inclusion in the plan during the process of deliberations, further public consultation will likely be required, which would not be achievable before the end of the financial year.

Background/Tuhinga

The purpose of this annual plan is to set out any differences from what was proposed in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031, and to highlight the impact on council's budget and regional rates. Annual plan consultation processes focus on these proposed changes. The proposals add an extra \$1.7 million in capital expenditure funded by lending from the Local Government Funding Agency, and \$188,216 of additional operating expenditure. This will increase the total region-wide rate in 2022/23 from the 13.79% approved in the LTP 2021/31, to 13.89% (0.1%).

The Whangārei transport rate will increase by approximately \$4.80 per Whangārei ratepayer, for a year-on-year average increase of just over approximately \$65 for Whangārei ratepayers. There will be an increase in the region-wide rate of approximately \$0.80 per ratepayer beginning 2023/24.

Consultation overview

Council invited feedback on proposals for the Annual Plan 2022/23 and User Fees and Charges during a month-long period running from 26 March to 29 April 2022. The consultation processes for both documents were carried out in tandem. This is the usual process for these annual reviews and offers synergies in terms of resources as well as producing a complete budget.

An annual plan consultation document was produced that summarised the proposals, with more detailed information and financials to support the proposals included in a supporting information document. Thirteen submissions were received during the consultation period, which included feedback on both consulted and non-consulted topics.

Members of the community were offered an opportunity to talk to councillors about the proposals during the consultation period, which occurred on 13 April 2022, and at which council received one oral submission.

Consulted Topics

Replacing the Waikare – Capex \$1.7M for a total spend of \$3.3M, to be borrowed and repaid

There were six submissions (five written, one oral) received on additional expenditure for the construction of a new vessel. Four were in favour of the proposal, and two against. One submitter in favour requested council keep a close eye on the feasibility of having an electric or hybrid vessel while another suggested council delay the project until supply chains can allow for more efficient production. One submission made against the proposal commented that the costs were nearly double, and there was nothing to indicate the total cost of construction or life expectancy of the vessel. The other submission against the proposal suggest council should not accept the increased cost and look at other options.

No submissions made comment on the proposed change to the funding model for the vessel, where council proposed to invest the original \$1.6M set aside for the vessel, borrow the full \$3.3M cost of the design and build, and repay this from the Council Services Rate.

Council has entered into a design contract for the construction of the vessel, with funds already set aside and invested in the project. The total construction cost is fixed by the contract, with life expectancy of the vessel in excess of 20 years.

Assessment of an electric/hybrid vessel was carried out and it has been determined that this is not yet feasible in terms of cost and fitness for purpose, however the new vessel will have emission reducing technology where achievable. Delaying the project may result in further increased cost, and delay delivery of service. Council may choose to adopt new technology once readily available.

Staff recommend that council proceed as proposed.

Whangārei CityLink – Opex \$188k

There were six submissions received on the proposed increased operational spend for CityLink bus services. One submitter supported the proposal. Three submitters had no objection to the additional spend, but questioned the rate being targeted to all Whangārei District ratepayers, and requested the rate be targeted to ratepayers who live within walking distance of the bus service/urban ratepayers. One submitter recommended park and ride facilities and utilising rail corridors in rural areas to create a rail trail/commute pathways to the city. One submitter requested a regular Whangārei to Kaikohe service.

While ratepayers living in close proximity to bus routes may derive direct benefit from the CityLink service, there are indirect benefits to the wider Whangārei district including lower demand for parking, reduced emissions and provision of basic services to those without other means of transport. The Whangārei transport rate does not distinguish between urban and rural ratepayers, and a new rating model would be required if a more geographically targeted approach was taken, making the rate administratively inefficient.

Staff recommend that council proceed as proposed.

Other Comments

Other submissions were received on topics that were outside of the scope of the annual plan consultation topics. Out of those submissions, two related to topics under the jurisdiction of the Whangārei District Council, three related to genetically modified organisms, one related to the marine biosecurity fee, and one raised a number of miscellaneous items.¹ These topics are summarised in the Summary of Submissions report, attached. Where appropriate, submitter comments have been passed on to the Whangārei District Council and/or relevant staff members for follow up.

Attachments/Ngā tapirihanga

Attachment 1: Annual Plan 2022/23 and User Fees and Charges summary of submissions [↓](#) 

Attachment 2: Annual Plan 2022/23 and User Fees and Charges full submission book [↓](#) 

¹ There is a lack of facilities for indoor bowls and table tennis. • Fog and topography would compromise the proposed future airport sites in Ruatangata. • Did not support daylight savings and stressed the detrimental impacts it had on people and wildlife. • Did not support fencing off creeks and rivers. • Suggested a relationship between the use of fire bans and droughts.



Summary of submissions

Annual Plan 2022 and User Fees and Charges 2022/23

Updated: 06 May 2022

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Replacing the Waikere	2
Whangārei transport rate	3
User Fees and Charges 2022/2023.....	4
Other comments	5

Introduction

This document is a short summary of the submissions received on the Annual Plan 2022 and the User Fees and Charges 2022/23. Consultation opened on Saturday 26 March 2022 and closed on Friday 29 April 2022, allowing 22 working days for submissions, or one calendar month as per the requirements of consulting under the Local Government Act.

We received a total of 13 written submissions and one oral submission during this time.

This summary has been undertaken by staff with the purpose of providing an overview of the main points raised in submissions. It is not intended to be a comprehensive capture of all points made by submitters. In addition to the summary of submissions, the following information is also available to help inform deliberations and decisions:

- the full submissions; and
- staff recommendations.

Replacing the Waikere

Six of 13 submitters responded to this question as follows:

ID	Name/Organisation	Comments
AP22_23	Oliver Krollmann	I support the changed funding model for the replacement vessel. Although it saddens me to learn that not even a hybrid vessel is feasible at this time, I understand that we're still early in the process of electrifying maritime vessels, so I appreciate that you will keep a close eye on this. I guess the fact that Ports of Auckland will soon get their first fully electric tugboat made me hopeful, but of course your vessel has a very different travel profile.
AP22_24	Rolf Mueller-Glodde	agree
AP22_26	Jude de Angulo	well overdue
AP22_29	Graham MacPherson	Nearly double the cost to replace vessel. There is nothing indicating whether the final forecast cost is total in reality. Also nothing indicating the life expectancy of the replacement vessel.
AP22_38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	This funding is accepted by Federated Farmers. If costs are related to supply issues, we would question whether this project should be delayed until the impacts of covid on the supply chain is resolved. It may be reasonable to delay this project until supply chains allow for more efficient production.
Oral submission	Alan Agnew	Council should not accept the increase in the cost to replace the maritime navigational vessel and look at other options.

Whangārei transport rate

Seven of 13 submitters responded to this question as follows:

ID	Name/Organisation	Comments
AP22_23	Oliver Krollmann	I have no objections. Anything to improve public transport.
AP22_24	Rolf Mueller-Glodde	not relevant for me in Kerikeri
AP22_25	Nathan Read	NRC puts a targeted rate on all landowners in the Whangarei District, rather than all landowners in Northland on the basis that the bus service is provided in the Whangarei District. As this is a targeted rate why not target it correctly and rate only those within a reasonable walking distance of a bus route? Rural residents in the Whangarei District get as much benefit from the urban bus service in Whangarei as the residents of Kaipara and the Far North, yet for some reason have to pay for it. My submission is that the rate be correctly targeted only on those who are able to benefit from the bus service, ie who live within reasonable walking distance of a bus route.
AP22_26	Jude de Angulo	a regular whangerei to kaikohe service please
AP22_29	Graham MacPherson	What is proposed to maximise use of the public transport. The buses need to be full which would mean less subsidisation. More thought to park and ride options.
AP22_35	Public Feedback	I agree that with increased running costs, you do need to increase the transport rate. However, I disagree with the transport rate being charged to all district ratepayers when over 45,400 people or 46% of the districts population are not serviced by public transport. It is unfair to charge these residents for a service that is not accessible to them or for a service that they would need to travel over 20kms to be able to access. The annual plan states that you are working to increase and improve the CityLink bus service, to make sure it is accessible and used. Will the rate increase ensure it is accessible to the 46% of the districts non-urban residents? If not, then they should not be charged for a service that is not accessible to them. I recommend a targeted transport rate for all urban ratepayers instead. Urban ratepayers benefit the most from the CityLink service. Urban ratepayers will also will benefit the most with improvements to the CityLink service. I also recommend providing park and ride facilities, that all residents of the district can benefit from. Once you do this, then a district wide transport rate may be justified. I also recommend utilising the rail corridor in rural areas, to create a rail trail and commuting pathways to the city. This will be a great asset to the region in terms of tourism, as well as reducing vehicles in the urban area, and also for commuting to work for those who live 10-20km away.
AP22_38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federated is in support of targeted rating those who benefit from the service that council provides. This is a transparent way of funding such services and placing the costs on those who benefit from the rate. • One question we wish to pose to council is whether this rate should be allocated equally throughout the district or based on the demographic that uses such services. Rural Whangarei would utilise this service substantially less than their urban counterparts. Federated Farmers would recommend establishing a differing rate for both urban and rural Whangarei ratepayers which would acknowledge the benefit that each group receives from the service.

User Fees and Charges 2022/2023

Six of 13 submitters responded to this question as follows:

ID	Name/Organisation	Comments
AP22_23	Oliver Krollmann	No objections.
AP22_24	Rolf Mueller-Glodde	I wished you would have simply and clearly listed the proposed changes item by item indicating each change. The provided lengthy document, which is mostly unchanged, is not user-friendly for this purpose. Thus I refrain from agreeing or disagreeing.
AP22_26	Jude de Angulo	user pays: higher dog fees, introduce cat fees.
AP22_29	Graham MacPherson	OK
AP22_37	Kerikeri Cruising Club	Submitter understands that the biosecurity fee is charged 35% general rates and 65% targeted rates, and that only registered mooring owners, marina berths and boat sheds are charged this targeted fee. Submitter considers this is unfair considering the beneficiaries of biosecurity work extends to a much wider set of users within the general community. Submitter requests the biosecurity fee be scrapped. Alternatively, submitter requests council: incorporate the marine biosecurity fee into the general rates in line with other biosecurity and biodiversity activity funding, encourage Central Government to accept that Biosecurity incursion is not caused locally and therefore identification and any subsequent eradication should not be funded by a subset of the local maritime users, is active in FNDC's review of their maritime bylaws and particularly when considering ways of identifying maritime users under the review. Submitter comments on the navigation bylaw charge (which is also levied against mooring owners) as being inequitable, particularly considering the numbers of trailer boats significantly outweighs moored recreational vessels. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
AP22_38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federated Farmers supports a high proportion of fees and charges funding council services to reduce the reliance on rates. Federated Farmers is in support of maintaining the current compliance monitoring costs associated with Dairy farm monitoring which incentivises farmers to have fully compliant systems which are charged lower under the charging schedule. We do question when there is a need for one or two officers to attend and where both costs will be recovered. We ask that this is amended to provide some more clarity with regards to situations where two officers would be necessary. Under inspection and monitoring charges 3.6 we would assume dairy farmers have been given a set charge for their type of inspection. It is also not common for other regional councils to charge for a second staff member. Our organisation has not seen this before and would not support this clause added on top of a set monitoring fee. We suggest that this clause is removed from the Fees and Charges 2022 which will ensure that Dairy inspection fees are reflective of the listed set charges.

Other comments

Six additional comments were received that are considered out-of-scope given they were not included in the original consultation. These comments relate to:

- Development of coastal areas, particularly Hihi
- GE/GMO (three submissions)
- Increasing capacity at the Kaurihohore Cemetery
- Mooring applications and land-based facilities (note submission also included comments on the biosecurity fee, which have been included in the table above)

ID	Name/Organisation	Comments
AP22_28	Aroha Hertz	Tēnā koutou katou, I am writing on behalf of Waiaua Marae, the mana whenua of Waiaua/Waitetoki at Hihi (Far North). Our Aunty Reremoana Renata (Ngāti Kahu) is requesting a halt on any further Resource Consents for building on coastal areas, particularly in Hihi, due to her concerns regarding coastal erosion and other environmental factors. I have attached a photo of a fallen pine on Hihi Beach which demonstrates a particular problem here. Aunty Reremoana speaks on behalf of the entire whānau and marae at Waiaua/Waitetoki. Should you wish to contact her for more information regarding her concerns, her email is: waiaua@xtra.co.nz. Ngā mihi.
AP22_31	Mary Wilson	Submitter strongly supports all of the councils existing precautionary statements and provisions regarding Genetic Engineering (GE) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) that have been set in place and thinks council needs to work together with local district councils to uphold the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policy of Tai Tokerau Iwi authorities for all their respective rohe. Submitter urges council to allocate funds to address the protection of native flora and fauna and take strong measures to address climate change. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
AP22_33	GE Free Tai Tokerau	Submitter requests council prioritise prevention of Genetic Engineering (GE)/Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) in the region, including an adequate budget (\$10,000 discretionary fund at least) for councils ongoing participation in the Inter-Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation and Management Options. Additionally, the funds can be used in the event of a successful application to the Environmental Protection Authority for an outdoor GE/GMO experiment/ field trial or release in Northland {Staff summary; please see original submission}.
AP22_34	Mary McDonald	Submitter requests that council ensure all of the existing precautionary statements and provisions regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms in the present Long Term Plan are retained and also included in councils Draft Annual Plan 2022/2023. Submitter requests a minimum \$10K budget for ongoing participation in the Inter-Council Working Party on Genetically Modified Organisms Risk Evaluation and Management Options, or, in the event of a successful application to the EPA, the funds are used for an outdoor GE/GMO experiment/field trial. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
AP22_36	Kaurihohore Cemetery Trust Board	Kaurihohore Cemetery has nearly reached capacity, we have 42 lots left and on average use up to 25-30 per year. It has arisen that there is some land behind the cemetery, that is available to purchase. Due to the population increase in the area because of new subdivisions. The Board feel that the Cemetery is an important local area which needs to expand for many years to come. It was started in the 1800. We would like to seek funding to purchase this land to ensure the local Community which has a wide footprint, can be buried in the local area. We would like to have further discussion with Council and look forward to hearing from someone soon.
AP22_37	Kerikeri Cruising Club	Submitter comments on the increasing number of mooring applications in the Bay of Islands and, as it is the point of access and parking, requests it be considered an affected party in mooring applications. Submitter requests it be part of the discourse relating to land-based facilities associated with the impacts of increased recreational maritime activities. Submitter requests it

		has a role within the NRC policy process to ensure that the concerns of its members are understood by policy makers. Submitter would like the opportunity to discuss ways in which the NRC's charges can be managed in a more equitable way and would appreciate a discussion on establishing a regular forum for future planning. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
--	--	--

Oral submission by Alan Agnew

Key submission points:

- There was a lack of facilities for indoor bowls and table tennis.
- Raised concern that fog and topography would compromise the proposed future airport sites in Ruatangata.
- Did not support daylight savings and stressed the detrimental impacts it had on people and wildlife.
- Did not support fencing off creeks and rivers.
- Suggested a relationship between the use of fire bans and droughts.

Northland Regional Council

P 0800 002 004

E info@nrc.govt.nz

W www.nrc.govt.nz



Full submission book

Annual Plan 2022 and User Fees and Charges 2022/23

Updated: 06 May 2022

Agnew, Alan
Oral submission

Name	Key points of submission
Alan Agnew	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was a lack of facilities for indoor bowls and table tennis.• Council should not accept the increase in the cost to replace the maritime navigational vessel and look at other options.• Raised concern that fog and topography would compromise the proposed future airport sites in Ruatangata.• Did not support daylight savings and stressed the detrimental impacts it had on people and wildlife.• Did not support fencing off creeks and rivers.• Suggested a relationship between the use of fire bans and droughts.

de Angulo, Jude

Family Name	de Angulo
Given Name	Jude
ID	AP22_26
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	well overdue
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	a regular whangerei to kaikohe service please
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	user pays: higher dog fees, introduce cat fees.
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	
Include files	

Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Family Name	Hazelton
Given Name	Shaun
Company / Organisation	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
ID	AP22_38
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	This funding is accepted by Federated Farmers. If costs are related to supply issues, we would question whether this project should be delayed until the impacts of covid on the supply chain is resolved. It may be reasonable to delay this project until supply chains allow for more efficient production.
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federated is in support of targeted rating those who benefit from the service that council provides. This is a transparent way of funding such services and placing the costs on those who benefit from the rate. One question we wish to pose to council is whether this rate should be allocated equally throughout the district or based on the demographic that uses such services. Rural Whangarei would utilise this service substantially less than their urban counterparts. Federated Farmers would recommend establishing a differing rate for both urban and rural Whangarei ratepayers which would acknowledge the benefit that each group receives from the service.
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federated Farmers supports a high proportion of fees and charges funding council services to reduce the reliance on rates. Federated Farmers is in support of maintaining the current compliance monitoring costs associated with Dairy farm monitoring which incentivises farmers to have fully compliant systems which are charged lower under the charging schedule. We do question when there is a need for one or two officers to attend and where both costs will be recovered. We ask that this is amended to provide some more clarity with regards to situations where two officers would be necessary. Under inspection and monitoring charges 3.6 we would assume dairy farmers have been given a set charge for their type of inspection. It is also not common for other regional councils to charge for a second staff member. Our organisation has not seen this before and would not support this clause added on top of a set monitoring fee. We suggest that this clause is removed from the Fees and Charges 2022 which will ensure that Dairy inspection fees are reflective of the listed set charges.
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	Our overall view on funding throughout the region is that costs need to be recovered transparently and fairly. We recommend utilising the rating tools such as targeted rates and user chargers as a way of fairly allocating charges to those whom receive the benefit from Councils services. We also strongly support the use of UAGCs and set fees on each property which reduces the reliance on rural landowners with higher capital values paying over their fair share of rates. (Staff summary; please see original submission)
Include files	Federated Farmers of New Zealand.pdf

SUBMISSION



To: Northland Regional Council

Submission on: Annual Plan and fees and charges 2022

Date: 29 April 2022

Contact: Colin Hannah – Provincial President Northland
Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Shaun Hazelton – Policy Advisor

Federated Farmers of New Zealand

m: 0273727330 | e: shazelton@fedfarm.org.nz

Submission to Northland Regional Council (NRC) on the Annual Plan and Fees and Charges 2022

OUR SUBMISSION

1. Federated Farmers welcomes the opportunity to submit to Council on the Proposed Annual Plan 2022 and Fees and Charges.
2. Rural Northland contributes substantially to the regions funding which is why our members are invested in Councils' financial performance through this year's annual plan. We appreciate the ability to have our say on this years proposed Annual Plan and Fees and charges.
3. Our submission focuses on Councils key areas of consultation with some additional points our members wish to outline for council.
4. Our overall view on funding throughout the region is that costs need to be recovered transparently and fairly. We recommend utilising the rating tools such as targeted rates and user chargers as a way of fairly allocating charges to those whom receive the benefit from Councils services. We also strongly support the use of UAGCs and set fees on each property which reduces the reliance on rural landowners with higher capital values paying over their fair share of rates.

Funding a new maritime vessel

5. This funding is accepted by Federated Farmers. If costs are related to supply issues, we would question whether this project should be delayed until the impacts of covid on the supply chain is resolved. It may be reasonable to delay this project until supply chains allow for more efficient production.

Whangarei Transport rate

6. Federated is in support of targeted rating those who benefit from the service that council provides. This is a transparent way of funding such services and placing the costs on those who benefit from the rate.
7. One question we wish to pose to council is whether this rate should be allocated equally throughout the district or based on the demographic that uses such services. Rural Whangarei would utilise this service substantially less than their urban counterparts. Federated Farmers would recommend establishing a differing rate for both urban and rural Whangarei ratepayers which would acknowledge the benefit that each group receives from the service.

Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23

8. Federated Farmers supports a high proportion of fees and charges funding council services to reduce the reliance on rates.

9. Federated Farmers is in support of maintaining the current compliance monitoring costs associated with Dairy farm monitoring which incentivises farmers to have fully compliant systems which are charged lower under the charging schedule. We do question when there is a need for one or two officers to attend and where both costs will be recovered. We ask that this is amended to provide some more clarity with regards to situations where two officers would be necessary.
10. Under inspection and monitoring charges 3.6 we would assume dairy farmers have been given a set charge for their type of inspection. It is also not common for other regional councils to charge for a second staff member. Our organisation has not seen this before and would not support this clause added on top of a set monitoring fee. We suggest that this clause is removed from the Fees and Charges 2022 which will ensure that Dairy inspection fees are reflective of the listed set charges.

Federated Farmers of New Zealand is a primary sector organisation that represents farmers, and other rural businesses. Federated Farmers has a long and proud history of representing the needs and interests of New Zealand farmers.

The Federation aims to add value to its members' businesses. Our key strategic outcomes include the need for New Zealand to provide an economic and social environment within which:

- i. Our members may operate their businesses in a fair and flexible commercial environment;
- ii. Our members' families and their staff have access to services essential to the needs of the rural community; and
- iii. Our members adopt responsible management and environmental practices.

Ends

Feedback, Public

Family Name	Feedback
Given Name	Public
ID	AP22_35
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	<p>I agree that with increased running costs, you do need to increase the transport rate.</p> <p>However, I disagree with the transport rate being charged to all district ratepayers when over 45,400 people or 46% of the districts population are not serviced by public transport. It is unfair to charge these residents for a service that is not accessible to them or for a service that they would need to travel over 20kms to be able to access.</p> <p>The annual plan states that you are working to increase and improve the CityLink bus service, to make sure it is accessible and used. Will the rate increase ensure it is accessible to the 46% of the districts non-urban residents? If not, then they should not be charged for a service that is not accessible to them.</p> <p>I recommend a targeted transport rate for all urban ratepayers instead. Urban ratepayers benefit the most from the CityLink service. Urban ratepayers will also will benefit the most with improvements to the CityLink service.</p> <p>I also recommend providing park and ride facilities, that all residents of the district can benefit from. Once you do this, then a district wide transport rate may be justified.</p> <p>I also recommend utilising the rail corridor in rural areas, to create a rail trail and commuting pathways to the city. This will be a great asset to the region in terms of tourism, as well as reducing vehicles in the urban area, and also for commuting to work for those who live 10-20km away.</p>
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	
Include files	

GE Free Tai Tokerau

Family Name	Grammer
Given Name	Zelka
Company / Organisation	GE Free Tai Tokerau
ID	AP22_33
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	Submitter requests council prioritise prevention of Genetic Engineering (GE)/Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) in the region, including an adequate budget (\$10,000 discretionary fund at least) for councils ongoing participation in the Inter-Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation and Management Options. Additionally, the funds can be used in the event of a successful application to the Environmental Protection Authority for an outdoor GE/GMO experiment/ field trial or release in Northland {Staff summary; please see original submission}.
Include files	GE Free Tai Tokerau.pdf

From: [Linda Grammer](#)
To: [mailroom](#)
Cc: [Barry Considine](#); [Marty Robinson](#)
Subject: submission by GE Free Tai Tokerau... to NRC draft Annual Plan 2022/23 ... risks of outdoor GE/GMOs including gene edited organisms (CRISPR)
:"GENE EDITING myth & reality- a guide through the smokescreen"
Date: Saturday, 2 April 2022 9:50:17 PM
Attachments: [010b1026f294638ea501f7ceb6f347a7.pdf](#)

Submission to the NRC draft Annual Plan 2022/23

Submission by:

GE Free Tai Tokerau

Contact details:

Secretary, GE Free Tai Tokerau
PO Box 1439
Whangarei 0140
Te Tai Tokerau

email: linda.grammer@gmail.com

cc: barry.considine@xtra.co.nz

Tena koutou katoa

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in response to the NRC draft Annual Plan 2022/23, so that together we can achieve sound environmental, economic, biosecurity, biodiversity, and food sovereignty outcomes by NRC budgeting adequate funds to achieve these aims.

Our community group asks NRC to budget generous funds to protect our biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, wider environment and existing valuable GE/GMO free status. We ask that NRC continue to participate fully in the Northland/ Auckland INTER COUNCIL WORKING PARTY ON GMOs, that council prioritizes preventing any incursions of GE/GMOs in the region, and that there is adequate funding for council to do so (in order to honour important precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions/ policies and rules in local plans including the operative Northland "RPS", Northland "Regional Plan", WDC and FNDC operative District Plans, and the Auckland Unitary Plan).

Truly sustainable, integrated management and environmental regulation:

NRC should nurture, look after, monitor and enhance our natural environment, and protect it from a variety of natural and human threats (In our view, it is of critical importance that council prevent where possible unwanted incursions of unwanted new organisms, GMO or otherwise)

We ask NRC to include an adequate budget for NRC's (\$10,000 discretionary fund at least) ongoing participation (in a fiscally responsible manner, with the other ICWP on GMOs member councils) in The Inter-Council Working Party on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) Risk Evaluation and Management Options (or the funds can be used in the event of a successful application to the EPA for an outdoor GE/GMO experiment/ field trial or release in Northland

- This is of critical importance in order for council to give adequate support to the operative Northland RPS and Regional Plan's precautionary GE/GMOs policies, provisions, and rules (including on land and in the Coastal Marine Area) and important cost-recovery policies that protect ratepayers /residents from exposure to the financial risk of any outdoor experiments/field trials/ GMO use. This includes risky and controversial gene edited

organisms (which are GMOs).

- We urge council to acknowledge the important cost efficiencies and benefits of NRC continuing to work in collaboration with other (Northland/Auckland) councils as part of the Inter Council Working Group on Management of GMOs.
- This approach has been greatly effective in the past, is part of truly sustainable integrated management, and reflects the values and concerns of the diverse Northland communities. It also honours the historical legacy GE/GMO free zone policies of many councils in the past that are now part of Northland and Auckland.
- It is of critical importance that NRC uphold and respect the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policies of many Iwi/hapu, as well as ensuring that there is no genetic engineering or gene editing of taonga species like manuka or kauri. Also, Council should protect the growing organic sector including Maori organic certification (Hua Parakore) which does not permit any GE/GMO use or content/contamination.
- We note that there are significant deficiencies in the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act as identified by Local Government NZ, all member councils of the Northland/ Auckland ICWP on GMOs, Hawkes Bay, Bay of Plenty, Nelson and other councils including **inadequate liability provisions** and no mandatory requirement for the EPA to take a precautionary approach to outdoor GE/GMO applications.
- **For NRC to ensure ongoing protection from the risks/ costs of GMOs in the absence of commercial insurance cover is even more important given budget challenges from Covid-19.** Many of the economic advantages of Auckland region land use are agricultural. Our biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, soils, waterways, coastal marine area, valuable existing GE/GMO free status/regional brand reputation and primary producers must be protected in 2022/3.
- To help ameliorate climate change and adequately prepare now it is important to support truly sustainable solutions and mitigate against extra costs associated with new technologies like GMOs.
We share the concerns of many Northland and Auckland ratepayers/residents about climate change (as well as any outdoor use of GE/GMOs) and would like to see NRC (as well as the relevant agencies in NZ central and local government) prioritize swift and appropriate action to help combat climate change

Plans by irresponsible parties (including overseas multinational companies) to develop GE/GMO grasses, clovers, trees or animals in NZ (claiming that these would help address climate change) are ill-advised and of particular concern. Such new organisms would be impossible to prevent from contaminating our public conservation estate (where unwanted new organisms are already a major problem), existing GMO free agriculture, horticulture, apiculture, forestry, as well as the wider environment/ finite resources like soils and waterways.

- **Global warming- Real Problem
GE/GMO trees- False Solution**

Vectors for GE/GMO contamination include soils, water, wind, pollen, seeds, vegetative material, insects, animals, machinery, human error, extreme weather events including floods, etc.

To date proponents of these hazardous new technologies

- refuse to be personally and financially liable for unintended or unforeseen adverse impacts of an EPA approved outdoor GE/GMO experiment/field trial or release.

-are indifferent to the fact that under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms

(HSNO) Act there are inadequate liability provisions and no mandatory requirement for the EPA to take a precautionary approach to outdoor GE/GMO applications. I.e. they do not support/ actively oppose the concept of "the polluter shall pay" and the Precautionary Principle.

NZ is a signatory to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (the **Precautionary Principle**, as formulated in the **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety** to the Convention on Biological Diversity, was based on the presumption that living modified organisms - LMOs or GMOs- were likely to have adverse effects on the environment and human health).

- NRC continuing to address management of GMOs (including new GMOs from gene editing and creation of synthetic biological organisms) is particularly important in the event of an EPA approved GE/GM outdoor application for a GE/GMO experiment/ field trial/ release). We support outright prohibition of all outdoor experiments/ field trials /releases of GMOs.
- This is in response to the consultation Issues for the various Northland plans cited above and is required for council to meet the Northland operative Regional Plans precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMOs provisions/ policy and regulations (land and Coastal Marine Area).
- New types of Gene Edited GMOs, RNAi pesticides and synthetic biology are emerging risks. These demand Northland communities have agency, with Council representatives informed of the issues impacting Auckland and working in collaboration with other councils to interface with central government to prevent any outdoor experiments/ use of such controversial new technologies.
- While we strongly support robust protection of native flora and fauna and addressing Climate change, experimentation with or use of such risky new genetic technologies on private land or conservation lands (or in the CMA) would be counter productive and potentially create far more serious problems than desired solutions.

Genome editing can be imprecise, and cause unexpected and unpredictable effects. There has been mounting evidence over the last two years of the imprecision/ unpredictability of the CRISPR technique. This has been documented in various reputable scientific publications (including peer reviewed papers). Many studies have now shown that genome editing can create genetic errors in the genome-edited organism. These effects can lead to unexpected and unpredictable outcomes, such as changes in protein composition, in the resulting GMO. Genome editing techniques can create unintended changes to genes that were not the target of the editing system. These are called "off-target effects." For example, the CRISPR-Cas9 system can make unintended edits to the host's DNA at additional sites to the target location.

Reputable reports on gene editing are available. See <http://emergingtech.foe.org.au/synthetic-biology/>

and the attached report "GENE EDITING myth & reality- a guide through the smokescreen" <https://www.gmwatch.org/en/19751-gene-editing-myths-and-reality-a-guide-through-the-smokescreen>

- Please see also "Reckless Driving: Gene Drives and the end of Nature" by Civil Society Working Group on Gene Drives <https://www.etcgroup.org/content/reckless-driving-gene-drives-and-end-nature>
- Thank you for the opportunity to submit, we wish to be heard. Thank you for all your hard work on this important issue to date.

FURTHER BACKGROUND

GE/GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms)

GENE EDITED ORGANISMS (which are GMOs under NZ law and as ruled by the highest Court in the EU) and "GENE DRIVE"

It is of concern our community group (Maori and Pakeha members) that the biotech industry continues to advocate for outdoor experimentation with Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) here in New Zealand, including controversial and risky gene edited organisms (CRISPR) and "gene drive" on our private land and public conservation lands.

This is despite NZ being a signatory to the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity*, Aotearoa's valuable "Zero Tolerance Policy" for any GE/GMO content in imported seeds/ plants (including adventitious presence), the legitimate concerns about outdoor use of GMOs or "gene drive" by NZ's top independent scientists (of the calibre of Professor Jack A. Heinemann, director Centre for Integrated Research in Biosafety), and significant deficiencies in the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act as regards outdoor GMO applications.

We oppose any outdoor use of risky and controversial gene edited organisms (CRISPR) or "gene drive" (a sterility technique that presents grave risks to NZ's biosecurity, indigenous biodiversity, and wider environment) and ask that the NRC upskill on this important issue.

"Socio-cultural risks of GMOs

- effects on Maori cultural beliefs of whakapapa, mauri, tikanga
- ethical concerns about mixing genes from different species including human genes
- concerns about the long term safety of genetically engineered food.

Economic risks of GMO

- loss of income through contamination (or perceived contamination) of non-GMO food products
- negative effects on marketing and branding opportunities such as 'clean and green' or 'naturally Northland'
- costs associated with environmental damage such as clean-up costs for invasive weeds or pests.

Environmental risks of GMOs include

- GMOs becoming invasive and affecting non-target species including indigenous flora and fauna
- the development of herbicide or pesticide resistance creating 'super-weeds' or 'super-pests'
- long term adverse impacts on ecosystem functioning

Associated with these risks are limited liability provisions under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996. "

excerpt from the WDC GE/GMOs webpage detailing the good work of the Northland/ Auckland "Inter Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation & Management Options"

<http://www.wdc.govt.nz/PlansPoliciesandBylaws/Plans/Genetic-Engineering/Pages/default.aspx>

The immediate past Minister of Conservation Hon Eugenie Sage clearly stated her opposition to any outdoor use of GE/GMOs, including gene edited organisms/ CRISPR or "gene drive" (which was conveyed in no uncertain terms to both the Department of Conservation and Predator Free 2050 Ltd).

"Gene editing is an unproven technology for predator control. Gene technologies are problematic and untested and have significant risks.

"They have no social licence to operate. There is a lot at stake and there is a need for the utmost caution.

"There would be serious questions around the risks to New Zealand's GE-Free reputation from being associated with any field trials of gene technology."
-former Minister of Conservation, Hon Eugenie Sage

Outdoor experimentation with GE/GMOs present significant risks (as identified by Local Government NZ, many councils, primary producer boards and Iwi/ hapu in Te Tai Tokerau, Tamaki Makaurau, Bay of Plenty etc) and contamination from outdoor use of GE/GMOs is likely to be irreversible. We only support ethical and humane medical experimentation/ research with GMOs in the strictest containment of the laboratory.

While we would like to see the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act strengthened to ensure there is a
- truly strict liability regime
-mandatory requirement for the EPA to take a precautionary approach to outdoor GE/GMO applications
this is unlikely to occur given that (despite ongoing constructive lobbying by a large number of councils including every council from south Auckland to Cape Reinga in Te Tai Tokerau, Hawke's Bay, Bay of Plenty councils and Local Government NZ) central government has failed to do so.

As mentioned above, NZ is a signatory to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (the **Precautionary Principle**, as formulated in the **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety** to the Convention on Biological Diversity, was based on the presumption that living modified organisms -LMOs or GMOs- were likely to have adverse effects on the environment and human health).

We are particularly concerned that various parties (including individuals at NZ CRI AgResearch who have a poor record of breaches of conditions of approval by ERMA/EPA at their facilities as well as overseas multinationals ala Monsanto/Bayer/Syngenta) are now advocating outdoor GE/GMOs experiments/ field trials of gene edited grasses, clovers, trees and falsely claiming that gene edited organisms are the "answer to climate change".

Simple solutions already exist that doesn't involve risky and controversial gene edited organisms or "gene drive"

Sound, non GMO science is already helping deliver solutions to the livestock methane problem (like the benefits of adding a small amount of seaweed to animal feed) or what farmers and foresters are already

doing in NZ to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

At the World Food Centre (University of California, Davis). Ermias Kebreab and his team have undertaken extensive and timely research into the benefits of adding even small amounts of seaweed in animal feed.

Researchers found cows belched out 82% less methane after putting small amounts of seaweed in their feed for 5 months. The findings build on previous research that found that seaweed could reduce cows' methane output over a shorter time span.

"We now have sound evidence that seaweed in cattle diets is effective at reducing greenhouse gases and that the efficacy does not diminish over time"- Ermias Kebreab, agricultural scientist and director of the World Food Centre.

see

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/mar/18/cows-seaweed-methane-emissions-scientists>

It is unfortunate that several individuals at NZ Crown Research Institute AgResearch have a misguided desire to undertake risky outdoor GMO experiments/ field trials out of doors in NZ.

Dr. Trevor Stuthridge made controversial comment last year (in NZ Farmers Weekly) about the alleged benefits of controversial genetically modified ryegrass and clover, without any mention of the significant risks, or inadequate liability provisions for outdoor GE/GMO experiments/field trials under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act. All councils from south Auckland to Cape Reinga have placed precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policies and rules in local plans because of the range of risks* involved with the trialling and release of GMOs.

Grasses are particularly promiscuous, exceedingly difficult if not impossible to contain. Vectors for GE/GMO contamination include soils, water, wind, pollen, seeds, vegetative material, insects, animals, machinery, extreme weather events including floods, etc. as well as human error. GE/GMO contamination would affect NZ primary producers (conventional, IPM and organic) causing some to lose their certification, at the very least their access to key markets and premiums.

In Oregon, USA the escape of GMO bentgrass caused a bitter divide between farmers, Scotts and Monsanto. Monsanto started work on the Roundup-resistant version in the 1990s. It was to be the first commercial GE grass the federal government approved.

Genetically engineered bentgrass escaped its experimental field in Oregon and still causes problems for farmers, who have to contend with great mats of it in their irrigation systems. Creeping bentgrass thrives in canals and ditches, where it collects sediment and impedes water flow, and it has proved extremely difficult to control.

Creeping bentgrass

The grass arrived uninvited, after crossing the Snake River from old seed fields in Idaho. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, which vets most new genetically engineered products, had not approved the plant's release. But in 2010, landowners discovered it growing in great mats throughout the irrigation system that stretches like a spider web across Malheur County.

Creeping bentgrass thrives in canals and ditches, where it collects sediment and impedes water flow, and it has proved difficult to control. That makes it a headache for farmers and other growers.

<https://www.hcn.org/issues/50.11/plants-genetically-modified-grass-creeps-across-eastern-oregon>



Escaped GMO bentgrass creates bitter divide in Eastern Oregon still

June 2018

https://www.oregonlive.com/news/erry-2018/07/75efd8154b4980/escaped_gmo_crop_creates_rift.html

1.

GMO grass that 'escaped' defies eradication, divides grass seed industry

https://www.oregonlive.com/business/2017/01/grass_seed_industry_fearful_ab.html

Global warming- Real Problem
GE/GMO trees- False Solution

Hertz, Aroha

Family Name	Hertz
Given Name	Aroha
ID	AP22_28
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	<p>T n koutou katou,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Waiaua Marae, the mana whenua of Waiaua/Waitetoki at Hihi (Far North).</p> <p>Our Aunty Reremoana Renata (Ng ti Kahu) is requesting a halt on any further Resource Consents for building on coastal areas, particularly in Hihi, due to her concerns regarding coastal erosion and other environmental factors. I have attached a photo of a fallen pine on Hihi Beach which demonstrates a particular problem here.</p> <p>Aunty Reremoana speaks on behalf of the entire wh nau and marae at Waiaua/Waitetoki. Should you wish to contact her for more information regarding her concerns, her email is: waiaua@xtra.co.nz.</p> <p>Ng mihi.</p>
Include files	Hihi.pdf



Kaurihohore Cemetery Trust Board

Family Name	Bigelow
Given Name	Ollie
Company / Organisation	Kaurihohore Cemetery Trust Board
ID	AP22_36
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	<p>Kaurihohore Cemetery has nearly reached capacity, we have 42 lots left and on average use up to 25-30 per year. It has arisen that there is some land behind the cemetery, that is available to purchase. Due to the population increase in the area because of new subdivisions. The Board feel that the Cemetery is an important local area which needs to expand for many years to come. It was started in the 1800. We would like to seek funding to purchase this land to ensure the local Community which has a wide footprint, can be buried in the local area.</p> <p>We would like to have further discussion with Council and look forward to hearing from someone soon.</p>
Include files	Kaurihohore Cemetery Trust Board.pdf



Submission form

Annual Plan 2022/23 and Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23

The closing date for submissions is Friday 29 April 2022

Giving your feedback

We encourage online feedback, as it helps keep costs down and reduce our impact on the environment: nrc.govt.nz/annualplan2022

Otherwise, complete this form and return it:

- **By mail** Freepost 139690, Northland Regional Council, Private Bag 9021, Te Mai, Whangārei 0143
- **By email** submissions@nrc.govt.nz
- **In person** to our main office at 36 Water Street, Whangārei; or to any of our regional offices (Covid restrictions allowing).

Important notes

We're making some changes that will have an impact on rates as follows:

- For Kaipara and Far North ratepayers, there's no additional increase for 2022/23, meaning the average increase remains around \$48 as planned.
- For Whangārei ratepayers, there's an additional increase for 2022/23 of \$4.80, meaning the average increase will now be around \$65.

We're also proposing some changes to our user fees and charges, particularly around pilotage and shipping navigation and safety services fees.

This submission form is designed to be read in conjunction with the Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation Document. To find out more, visit our website nrc.govt.nz/annualplan2022

Your name and contact details

Please provide your name and at least one other piece of contact information

Full name: Ollie Bigelow

Organisation (if giving feedback on behalf): Kaurihohore Cemetery Trust Board

Mailing address: c/- 595 Crane Road R.D.1 Kamo 0185

Email: kaurihohorecemetery2019@gmail.com

Phone/Mobile: 021 08743327

Privacy statement

Please be aware that submissions are part of a public consultation process. All information provided will be made publicly available, including submitters' names and contact details. Please see our Submissions Policy on our website.

Replacing the Waikare

We set aside \$1.6M for the design and build of replacing our current maritime vessel the Waikare and had planned to kick off the work in 2022/23. The cost of replacing this vessel has since increased by \$1.7M to \$3.3M. That's because design and build costs have more than doubled in price since we got initial quotes for a new vessel. This has no impact on rates in 2022/23, but will increase rates as the loan is repaid over 15 years (starting with \$0.80 a year in 2023/24).

Tell us what you think:



If you have more to say, feel free to attach more pages to this feedback form.

Whangārei transport rate

We're working to increase and improve the Whangārei CityLink bus service, to make sure it's accessible and used. The cost of running buses has increased substantially, and we need to make some changes to keep our services running and improving at the level Whangārei residents expect. This will increase rates in the Whangārei district only, by an average of \$4.80 in 2022/23.

Tell us what you think:



If you have more to say, feel free to attach more pages to this feedback form.

Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23

We're proposing a number of minor amendments to our User Fees and Charges 2022/23 as outlined in the Statement of Proposal at the beginning of this schedule. However, we're also proposing to update the fee structure for our Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees.

Tell us what you think:

If you have more to say, feel free to attach more pages to this feedback form.

Any other comments

Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:

Kaurihohore Cemetery has nearly reached capacity, we have 42 lots left and on average use up to 25-30 per year. It has arisen that there is some land behind the cemetery, that is available to purchase. Due to the population increase in the area because of new subdivisions. The Board feel that the Cemetery is an important local area which needs to expand for many years to come. It was started in the 1800. We would like to seek funding to purchase this land to ensure the local Community which has a wide footprint, can be buried in the local area.

We would like to have further discussion with Council and look forward to hearing from someone soon.

If you have more to say, feel free to attach more pages to this feedback form.

Talk to councillor?

If you want to talk to a councillor about what we're planning to do, we've set aside a day for this. You'll need to register first though, so please give us a call on 0800 002 004 or email robbyn@nrc.govt.nz by **Friday 8 April** to arrange a time.

Please tell us how you found out about this consultation

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Group | <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Twitter / Facebook | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of mouth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Email invite from us | <input type="checkbox"/> Website alerts service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Letter from us | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Please tell us any other ways you found out about this consultation:

P 0800 002 004 W nrc.govt.nz/annualplan2022

Kerikeri Cruising Club

Family Name	Wells
Given Name	Alistair
Company / Organisation	Kerikeri Cruising Club
ID	AP22_37
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	<p>Submitter understands that the biosecurity fee is charged 35% general rates and 65% targeted rates, and that only registered mooring owners, marina berths and boat sheds are charged this targeted fee. Submitter considers this is unfair considering the beneficiaries of biosecurity work extends to a much wider set of users within the general community. Submitter requests the biosecurity fee be scrapped. Alternatively, submitter requests council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the marine biosecurity fee into the general rates in line with other biosecurity and biodiversity activity funding • Encourage Central Government to accept that Biosecurity incursion is not caused locally and therefore identification and any subsequent eradication should not be funded by a subset of the local maritime users • Is active in FNDC's review of their maritime bylaws and particularly when considering ways of identifying maritime users under the review. <p>Submitter comments on the navigation bylaw charge (which is also levied against mooring owners) as being inequitable, particularly considering the numbers of trailer boats significantly outweighs moored recreational vessels.</p> <p>Submitter comments on the increasing number of mooring applications in the Bay of Islands and, as it is the point of access and parking, requests it be considered an affected party in mooring applications.</p> <p>Submitter requests it be part of the discourse relating to land-based facilities associated with the impacts of increased recreational maritime activities.</p> <p>Submitter requests it has a role within the NRC policy process to ensure that the concerns of its members are understood by policy makers. Submitter would like the opportunity to discuss ways in which the NRC's charges can be managed in a more equitable way and would appreciate a discussion on establishing a regular forum for future planning. {Staff summary; please see original submission}</p>
Include files	Kerikeri Cruising Club.pdf



KERIKERI CRUISING CLUB INC.

346 Opito Bay Road, R D 1, Kerikeri
Phone: (09) 407 9434 Email: info@kerikericruisingclub.org.nz

Annual Plan 2022-23

Submission from The Kerikeri Cruising Club Inc

Contact – Alastair Wells – Commodore

Organisation – Kerikeri cruising Club Inc

Mailing Address – 346 Opito Bay Rd RD 1 Kerikeri 0294

Email - info@kerikericruisingclub.org.nz

Phone – 09 4079434

The Kerikeri Cruising Club comprises over 1000 individuals directly as members. The Club has 193 berths, 40 pile, two boat ramps, a short term haul out facility, fuel jetty, laundry, showers and a licensed bar and restaurant. The Club caters for a wide range of maritime users including yachts, launches, trailer boats and dinghies. The Club has an active keelboat and centreboard racing calendar and we run learn to sail programmes including community & school outreach programmes. Our facilities are available for the public to access and many non-members avail themselves of our facilities, particularly the ramps, as we provide a high level of service with our facilities.

The Club currently pays NRC more than \$31,000 p.a. towards the biosecurity and navigation fees and therefore has a significant interest in policy and management of maritime issues in Northland.

The Kerikeri Cruising Club is concerned at a number of policy areas under the Northland Regional Council's jurisdiction and is asking that the NRC rethinks a number of areas associated with maritime activities in order to be fairer in its charging regime and to practically collaborate with other TLA's and organisations (such as ourselves) to provide clarity of purpose in terms of maritime development.

Our issues and suggestions are outlined below:

1. Biosecurity Charges:

We understand that the biosecurity fee is charged 35% general rates and 65% targeted rates. We also understand that only registered mooring owners, marina berths and boat sheds are charged this targeted fee. We consider this to be unfair considering the beneficiaries of biosecurity work extends to a much wider set of users within the general community. While we would ideally like this fee to be scrapped, we make the following comments:

- Incorporate the marine biosecurity fee into the general rates in line with other biosecurity and biodiversity activity funding
- Encourage Central Government to accept that Biosecurity incursion is not caused locally and therefore identification and any subsequent eradication should not be funded by a subset of the local maritime users

- We note that FNDC are currently (or about to) review their maritime bylaws and that they may be considering ways of identifying all maritime users as part of this review. We would encourage the NRC to be active in this review and we are active in ensuring FNDC understands the Clubs interest in this area
2. Navigation by-law:
 - We consider this charge (which is also levied against mooring owners) as also being inequitable particularly considering the numbers of trailer boats significantly outweighs moored recreational vessels.
 3. Mooring management areas:
 - Consent applications for a new mooring require the applicant to advise NRC of the land based facilities they will use. Due to the dearth of land based facilities in the Bay of Islands it is inevitable (particularly recently at Windsor landing) that applicants identify our Club as their point of access and parking. We request that any application in our area be referred to us for comment as an affected party. We also suggest that demand for moorings is growing in a crowded environment and that dedicated areas with appropriate on shore infrastructure should be the future of mooring development.
 4. Land based facilities:
 - While we appreciate that the provision of land based facilities lies with the District Council we see the impact of increasing boating activity as a joint area of interest to both the Regional and District Councils. The Club would like to be part of the discourse relating to increased recreational maritime activity.

The Club would like to establish a role within the NRC policy process to ensure that the concerns of our members are understood by policy makers. We would like the opportunity to discuss ways in which the NRC's charges to us can be managed in a more equitable way and would appreciate a discussion on establishing a regular forum for future planning.

Krollmann, Oliver

Family Name	Krollmann
Given Name	Oliver
ID	AP22_23
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	I support the changed funding model for the replacement vessel. Although it saddens me to learn that not even a hybrid vessel is feasible at this time, I understand that we're still early in the process of electrifying maritime vessels, so I appreciate that you will keep a close eye on this. I guess the fact that Ports of Auckland will soon get their first fully electric tugboat made me hopeful, but of course your vessel has a very different travel profile.
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	I have no objections. Anything to improve public transport.
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	No objections.
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	
Include files	

MacPherson, Graham

Family Name	MacPherson
Given Name	Graham
ID	AP22_29
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	Nearly double the cost to replace vessel. There is nothing indicating whether the final forecast cost is total in reality. Also nothing indicating the life expectancy of the replacement vessel.
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	What is proposed to maximise use of the public transport. The buses need to be full which would mean less subsidisation. More thought to park and ride options.
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	OK
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	
Include files	

McDonald, Mary

Family Name	McDonald
Given Name	Mary
ID	AP22_34
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	Submitter requests that council ensure all of the existing precautionary statements and provisions regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms in the present Long Term Plan are retained and also included in councils Draft Annual Plan 2022/2023. Submitter requests a minimum \$10K budget for ongoing participation in the Inter-Council Working Party on Genetically Modified Organisms Risk Evaluation and Management Options, or, in the event of a successful application to the EPA, the funds are used for an outdoor GE/GMO experiment/field trial. (Staff summary; please see original submission)
Include files	McDonald Mary.pdf

From: [Mary McDonald](#)
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Fwd: Long Term Plan Submission
Date: Tuesday, 5 April 2022 4:30:21 PM

From: **Mary McDonald** <maryroygmcd@gmail.com>
Date: Tuesday 5th April, 2022.
Subject: Submission on N.R.C. Draft Annual Plan 2022/2023
To: Northland Regional Council

Submission on Genetic Engineering (G.E.) and Genetically Engineered Organisms.
From : Mary R.G. McDonald, P.O. Box 79, Maungakarama, 0146.
Phone: 09 43 22 595
E-mail: maryroygmcd@gmail.com

Dear Chair Penny Smart and Council Members,

Thank you for this opportunity to contribute to the N.R.C Draft Annual Plan.
I request that you ensure that all of the existing precautionary statements and provisions regarding Genetic Engineering (G.E.) and Genetically Modified Organisms(G.M.O.s) in the present Long Term Plan are retained and also included in the N.R.C. Draft Annual Plan 2022/2023. These were set in place after the High Court ruling in 2019 that decided such regulations were necessary.

The threat of GMOs and GE is increasing as these are used to make ersatz foods like the new Amazing Meat Free Burger that is now being heralded in the market place. It is a new profit making bonanza , but , it poses huge threats to our environment which is already seriously under threat from short sighted exploitation. I cite plastics , water pollution , deforestation, climate problems as just some prime examples.

This "new food" is based on Genetically Engineered Soya. Apart from its GE content it contains Roundup residue as Roundup is liberally used in its production . Roundup , or glyphosate, is a powerful herbicide which is absorbed by the plant and is therefore ingested with any parts of the plant we ingest. The United Nations has declared Glyphosate to be a carcinogen. This has been thoroughly investigated by the International Court in The Hague.

There are already many safe and healthy vegetarian alternatives to meat . We should be discouraging the marketing of foods with GMO content.

There is a problem with GMOs that needs to be addressed. If the GMO content is still live in the product it can enter the gut of those ingesting it and thence enter the sewers where it becomes a contaminant . Note how Covid 19 was being traced in this way. Also, any discarded parts of the GMO will also contain transmittable material which can be ingested by other living organisms. There is a need to set up protective measures. Once a new organism is free in our environment it cannot be recovered. We see evidence of that today in our attempts to control Covid 19. New organisms have no natural controls.

Protection from G.E. and GMOs will become an on-going expense and needs to be budgetted for . In these days of inflation that is a cost best assessed by your experts and put aside in your planning beginning in this Annual Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Mary R.G. McDonald.

From: [Mary McDonald](#)
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Submission on G.M.O.s and G.E.
Date: Wednesday, 6 April 2022 10:35:54 AM

From : M.R.G. McDonald, 475 Mangapai Road, R.D 8, Whangarei, 0178.
P.O.Box 79, Maungakaramea, 0146.
Phone : 09 43 22 595.
E-mail Address: maryroygmcd@gmail.com

Dear Chair Penny Smart and Councillors,

I would like to add a supplement to the submission I sent in yesterday, Tuesday 5th April. There are now so many plans that have to be addressed when making a submission I request that all precautionary measures regarding Genetic Engineering and Genetically Engineered Organisms be included in any plans that affect the welfare of the environment, all living organisms, soil, and water in the region. The threat of G.E. and G.M.O.s to these affects all other aspects of welfare in the region . This science is still inexact . G.E. scientists cannot predict the full genetic component of any organism they are creating or experimenting on. Their knowledge is inadequate at this stage. The fact that one gene has connections to hundreds of others and they in turn have hundreds of contacts explains that. One rogue G.M.O. could cause havoc. We have seen what one rogue organism has done during this Covid 19 outbreak. There are no known controls for a NEW organism. We have enough pests in the environment without adding others.

Yours faithfully ,

Mary R.G. McDonald

Mueller-Glodde, Rolf

Family Name	Mueller-Glodde
Given Name	Rolf
ID	AP22_24
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	agree
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	not relevant for me in Kerikeri
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	I wished you would have simply and clearly listed the proposed changes item by item indicating each change. The provided lengthy document, which is mostly unchanged, is not user-friendly for this purpose. Thus I refrain from agreeing or disagreeing.
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	
Include files	

Read, Nathan

Family Name	Read
Given Name	Nathan
ID	AP22_25
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	<p>NRC puts a targeted rate on all landowners in the Whangarei District, rather than all landowners in Northland on the basis that the bus service is provided in the Whangarei District.</p> <p>As this is a targeted rate why not target it correctly and rate only those within a reasonable walking distance of a bus route?</p> <p>Rural residents in the Whangarei District get as much benefit from the urban bus service in Whangarei as the residents of Kaipara and the Far North, yet for some reason have to pay for it.</p> <p>My submission is that the rate be correctly targeted only on those who are able to benefit from the bus service, ie who live within reasonable walking distance of a bus route.</p>
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	
Include files	

Wilson, Mary

Family Name	Wilson
Given Name	Mary
ID	AP22_31
Replacing the Waikare - Tell us what you think:	
Whangarei transport rate - Tell us what you think:	
Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 - Tell us what you think:	
Any other comments - Tell us if you have any other comments on either document:	Submitter strongly supports all of the councils existing precautionary statements and provisions regarding Genetic Engineering (GE) and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) that have been set in place and thinks council needs to work together with local district councils to uphold the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policy of Tai Tokerau Iwi authorities for all their respective rohe. Submitter urges council to allocate funds to address the protection of native flora and fauna and take strong measures to address climate change. {Staff summary; please see original submission}
Include files	Wilson Mary.pdf

From: [Mary Wilson](#)
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Submission to the NRC draft Annual Plan 2022/23
Date: Thursday, 31 March 2022 6:04:06 PM

Submission re:Genetic Engineering & Genetically Engineered Organisms.

From : Mary Tierney-Wilson
25 Karoro Road One Tree Point 0118]
Phone: 09 433 9379 Mobile 02102898463

To NRC Council Members,

I strongly support all of the NRC's existing precautionary statements and provisions regarding Genetic Engineering (G.E.) and Genetically Modified Organisms(G.M.O.s) that have been set in place.

I am thankful the submissions lodged by local ratepayers and residents (including Tai Tokerau mana whenua and Northland farmers/primary producers) and case law as a result of Environment Court Judge Newhook were acknowledged by Council.

Never the less the threat of GMOs to our cultural, economic and environmental remains.

I oppose the biotech industry's push to introduce the CRISPR / gene editing technique which is not safe or precise and has resulted in unintended adverse effects in new organisms.

I am also concerned that the imported processed American "Impossible Burger" is being sold in Countdown supermarkets without adequate labeling and that the NRC has no influence in regard to processed imported food. Surely it is important the NRC can protect our food sovereignty as well as our environment.

I think the NRC needs to work together with local District Councils to uphold the precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO policy of Tai Tokerau Iwi authorities for all their respective rohe. I urge NRC to allocate funds to address the protection of native flora and fauna and take strong measures to address climate change .

Yours sincerely,
Mary Tierney-Wilson
NZRN (Retired) BA Sociology Massey

Reference: <https://www.wdc.govt.nz/Council/Council-documents/Reports/Genetic-Engineering-Review>

TITLE: Council deliberations on the User Fees and Charges
2022/23

From: Robyn Broadhurst, Policy Specialist

Authorised by Bruce Howse, Pou Taumatua – Group Manager Corporate Services, on 17
Group Manager/s: May 2022

Executive summary/Whakarāpopototanga

This report provides background information and presents staff advice and recommendations to inform council's deliberation on the Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 and Statement of Proposal.

Staff recommend council support the Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 as consulted on, inclusive of the increased Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees and a 2.4% inflationary increase, and the addition of the removal of a note under both tables 3.6.2 and 3.6.4 relating to the number of staff attending a site visit.

Recommendations

1. That the report 'Council deliberations on the User Fees and Charges 2022/23' by Robyn Broadhurst, Policy Specialist and dated 27 April 2022, be received.
 2. That council supports the inflationary increase of 2.4% to fees and charges contained in the User Fees and Charges 2022/23, as set out in the schedule.
 3. That council supports the Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 as consulted and with the additional amendment set out in recommendation 4, and direct staff to prepare the final user fees and charges for council adoption in June 2022.
 4. That council supports the removal of the notes relating to tables 3.6.2 and 3.6.4 'Where there is a need for two officers to attend, the costs of both officers will be recovered'.
 5. That Bruce Howse, Group Manager – Corporate Services be given delegated authority to approve any consequential amendments as a result of council decisions on submissions and any minor accuracy and grammatical amendments.
-

Considerations

1. Significance and engagement

Section 76AA of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) directs that council must adopt a policy setting out how significance will be determined, and the level of engagement that will be triggered. This policy assists council in determining how to achieve compliance with LGA requirements in relation to decisions.

Engagement with the community has now been carried out. The process of deliberations assists council in achieving compliance with section 77 of the LGA.

2. Policy, risk management and legislative compliance

Consultation on the Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 has been carried out pursuant to section 150 of the LGA and in accordance with section 83 of the LGA.

Consideration of submissions through the process of deliberations will achieve compliance with section 77 of the LGA – Requirements in relation to decisions – and with council's

Significance and Engagement Policy, in particular 'We will consult when we are required to by law, when a proposal is considered significant, and when we need more information on options for responding to an issue'.

Background/Tuhinga

Consultation was carried out on council's Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 in conjunction with the process of consultation for the Annual Plan 2022/23. This is the usual process for these annual reviews and offers efficiencies in terms of staff resources and public participation as well as producing a complete budget. Consultation involved the production of a full draft user fees and charges schedule, complete with a statement of proposal that listed all proposed changes, including increases to Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees and a 2.4% inflationary increase.

Feedback on the proposals was sought during a month-long period from 26 March – 29 April 2022. A total of thirteen written submissions and one oral submission were received during the consultation period, with six directly commenting on the draft user fees and charges. The feedback is summarised in the summary of submissions document included as an attachment to the item titled "Council Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation Document and Supporting Information", in this agenda. For completeness, a full submissions book is also included as an attachment to the item above-mentioned.

The annual review of user fees and charges ensures that changes can be made regularly so that the charges do not become outdated. The draft schedule for 2022/23 proposed:

- Increasing the Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees;
- Inflationary increase of 2.4%; and
- Several minor amendments for clarity.

For a full list of amendments, please see the Statement of Proposal – Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 included as an Attachment 1 to this item.

Feedback received

The submission process allowed feedback in an open question rather than directed to the proposed changes. This was due to the fact the main proposed change, being the increase to Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees, only directly affected a handful of stakeholders.

No comments were received on the increase to Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees, nor the inflationary increase.

The six submissions received commented on the user fees and charges in general as follows:

- One individual submitter commented that they wished we would have clearly and simply listed all proposed changes item by item to save having to go through the document to find them and therefore refrained from either agreeing or disagreeing;
- One individual submitter commented that user pays: higher dog fees, introduce cat fees;
- Two individual submitters commented "OK" and "No objections" respectively;
- One submitter acting on behalf of the Kerikeri Cruising Club commented on the 35/65 split for the biosecurity fee stating that it was unfair and should ideally be scrapped, however they provided alternative solutions (please see full submission for details). Submitter also commented on the navigation bylaw charge as being inequitable, particularly considering the numbers of trailer boats significantly outweighs moored recreational vessels.
- One submitter acting on behalf of Federated Farmers commented that they support a high proportion of fees and charges funding council services to reduce the reliance on rates, and

that they were in support of maintaining the current compliance monitoring costs associated with dairy farm monitoring, which incentivises farmers to have fully compliant systems that are charged lower under the charging schedule. However, submitter questioned the need for one or two officers to attend and where both costs will be recovered, asking for an amendment to provide some more clarity with regards to situations where two officers would be necessary. Submitter further commented that they suggest this clause (relating to a second officer) is removed from the schedule to ensure that dairy inspection fees are reflective of the listed set charges.

It is noted that the Statement of Proposal, which provided the basis for consultation, clearly listed all proposed changes and the reasons for these changes, including the section the change related to, and that dog/cats fees are outside of the jurisdiction of council.

Submissions relating to the split of the biosecurity fee and the navigation bylaw charge are considered out-of-scope of this consultation and have been addressed and decided upon through previous processes. Any changes to these specific topics would require additional workshopping and subsequent consultation and would not be achievable this late in the process.

Regarding the submission relating to additional staff members attending dairy site visits, the clause 'Where there is a need for two officers to attend, the costs of both officers will be recovered' under both tables 3.6.2 and 3.6.4 was originally included as a Health and Safety measure for staff. However, this is not common practice and can therefore be removed as requested with no material change to charges resulting, or impact on council's Health and Safety obligations.

Staff recommend that council supports the user fees and charges as consulted on, with the additional amendment of removing the note 'Where there is a need for two officers to attend, the costs of both officers will be recovered' under both tables 3.6.2 and 3.6.4, resulting from these submissions.

Attachments/Ngā tapirihanga

Attachment 1: Draft User Fees and Charges 2022 [↓](#) 



DRAFT - User Fees and Charges 2022/23 Kaupapa Here a Utu 2022/23

Contents

Ihirangi

Statement of proposal	4
Introduction	8
1 General principles and policies	10
1.1 Principles	10
1.2 General policies	12
1.3 Policy on remission of charges	13
2 Policies on charging and fees for specific activities and functions	16
2.1 Provision of information and technical advice	16
2.2 Resource Management Act 1991	18
2.3 Local Government Act 2002 (land and resources)	25
2.4 Maritime activities	27
2.5 Building Act 2004	28
2.6 Biosecurity Act 1993	30
3 Schedules of fees and charges	34
3.1 Local government official information	34
3.2 Staff charge rates	35
3.3 Application to prepare or change a policy statement or plan	39
3.4 Building Act 2004	40
3.5 Annual charges	42
3.6 Inspection and monitoring charges	51
3.7 Maritime activities	54
3.8 Biosecurity	58
3.9 Miscellaneous management charges - plant and equipment charges	59

User Fees and Charges 2022/23
2

Statement of proposal



This document sets out Northland Regional Council's draft user fees and charges for the 2022/23 financial year. The User Fees and Charges 2022/23 schedule is where you can find all fees and charges (not rates) that council is authorised to set because of various pieces of legislation that it works under (details on these are covered in Part Two of this schedule).

Legislation prescribes specific, and sometimes different, requirements in terms of the process required to set fees and charges. When making a change to any of our fees and charges we take these legislative requirements into consideration and use the appropriate process.

So that an informed decision can be made, council wants to know what you think about the fees and charges we are proposing to change or set. Consultation is a big part of that decision-making process. You can find details on how to have your say at the end of this section.

We update our user fees and charges schedule annually to respond to real time and legislative changes, and to ensure that charges do not become outdated. We are proposing several minor amendments and updates to the fees, charges and policy for the 2022/23 year in addition to a 2.4% inflationary increase, which is slightly lower than the 2.9% that was approved as part of the long term plan process in 2021. Amendments and changes are outlined in the tables below.

Amendments and changes proposed to fees, charges, and policy

Section	What's new?	Why?
All applicable fees and charges within the schedule	2.4% inflationary increase	Our activity income sources subject to inflation are assumed to increase annually in line with the forecasts made by BERL. The rate of inflation forecast for 2022/23 has decreased from the 2.9% set out in the Long Term Plan 2021 – 2031.
Section 1.1.3 – Charges must be fair	Replace the term 'consent holder' with 'resource user'	To provide clarity and accuracy
Section 1.2.2 – Annual charges	Remove this section as it's a repeat of 1.2.1. Subsequent re-numbering of policies following	To provide clarity and simplify
Section 1.2.5 (now 1.2.4) – A minimum annual charge	Reword	To provide clarity
Section 1.3.2 – Policy on remission of charges	Replace the term 'group manager' with 'Northland Regional Council'	To provide clarity and accuracy
Section 3.4.4 – Technical processing etc	Change wording in column named 'Hourly charge for...' to refer back to Staff charge rates	To provide clarity and accuracy
Section 3.7.3 – Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees	Updating the fee structure/table so that some fees are removed and others are introduced/increased	To ensure all costs of providing these services are covered and recovered, and to simplify the regime
3.9.5 – Vehicles/quads	Update in line with what IRD sets	The charge-out rates for our vehicles are set by the Inland Revenue Department. They will set these rates in May 2022 so,

Section	What's new?	Why?
		although it's not yet clear what they will be, we want to indicate that these may be subject to change

What are the alternatives?

Council needs to consider what mechanisms are appropriate to meet the expenditure needs of the organisation. The charges outlined in this schedule represent the activities where council has considered that the principle of user or beneficiary pays is most appropriate.

The alternative to adopting these fees and charges for the 2022/23 year is to either: cover the cost of these activities through other means of income, which might include increasing rates or diverting income from other activities; or cease undertaking the activities that give rise to the cost, many of which council are required by law to carry out.

Should council consider that this expenditure should continue to be met through the fees and charges in this schedule, there is then an alternative option of not updating fees and charges on an annual basis, and instead letting the fees remain static, or update them on a less regular basis. By not regularly undertaking a review of charges, and updating as necessary, the likelihood of steep increases in charges when reviews are undertaken is significantly higher. This would also mean that council may not be achieving cost recovery for some activities for a period and could be subsidising activities that are intended to be 'user pays'. Conversely, there may be fees and charges set out in the schedule that council no longer charges, leading to confusion about costs.

Not reviewing and undertaking changes as necessary would mean that the policy and schedule of fees and charges has the potential to become outdated and confusing for users. It is also necessary to update charges and policy in line with legislative amendments.

How can I have my say about this schedule?

Council is inviting feedback on the Draft User Fees and Charges 2022/23 in conjunction with the process of developing the Annual Plan 2022/23. You can have your say by filling in a feedback form online at nrc.govt.nz/annualplan2022 or by emailing submissions@nrc.govt.nz

The submission period is open until Friday, 29 April 2022.

User Fees and Charges 2022/23
R

Introduction



The user fees and charges schedule is reviewed annually. Fees and charges that require formal adoption under section 150 of the Local Government Act 2002 may be consulted on in conjunction with a long term or an annual plan. The fees set out in this schedule will come into effect on 1 July 2022 and will continue until superseded. A copy of this user fees and charges schedule will also be published on council's website.

Councils are permitted to collect fees from private users of public resources, and to recover all or a portion of the costs for a range of services it performs in relation to those resources.

The law acknowledges that some of the costs associated with administering the private use of public resources have a community benefit, and should therefore be met from the general rate. For example, the Northland Regional Council (the council) grants resource consents that allow organisations and individuals the private benefit to use public resources such as air, water or the coast. Where the benefits associated with consents are solely to applicants, they pay the associated costs in full. Where the benefits accrue more widely – such as in the case of environmental monitoring – then a portion of the associated costs is met through rates.

This document sets out the policies, fees and charges that are collected by the council from private beneficiaries for a range of services it performs.

The fees and charges set out in this document are consistent with the council's revenue and financing policy, which sets out the funding and cost recovery targets for each council activity.

This document is divided into three sections:

- Part One: General principles and policies
- Part Two: Policies on charging and fees for specific activities and functions
- Part Three: Schedule of fees and charges

General principles and policies



1.1 Principles

1.1.1 Charges must be lawful

The council can only levy charges which are allowed by legislation. Section 13 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 enables the council to charge for providing information sought under the provisions of the Act or the Official Information Act 1982.

Section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991(RMA) enables the council to fix charges for its various functions (refer to Section 2.2).

Section 150 of the Local Government Act 2002 enables the council to fix charges payable under its bylaws (namely the Navigation Safety Bylaw 2017) and charges for the provision of goods, services, or amenities in accordance with its powers and duties, e.g. recovering costs of responding to environmental incidents, and inspecting dairy farms operating under permitted activity rules for discharges to land.

Section 444(12) of the Maritime Transport Act 1994 allows the council to fix reasonable charges for its activities/services relating to "Tier 1 sites".

Section 243 of the Building Act 2004 enables the council to impose fees or charges for performing functions and services under the Act. It also allows the council to recover its costs from a dam owner should we need to carry out building work in respect of a dangerous dam.

Section 135 of the Biosecurity Act 1993 enables the council to recover its costs of administering this Act and performing the functions, powers, and duties provided for in this Act by such methods it believes on reasonable grounds to be the most suitable and equitable in the circumstances.

1.1.2 Charges must be reasonable

The sole purpose of a charge is to recover the reasonable costs incurred by the council in respect of the activity to which the charge relates. Actual and reasonable costs will be recovered from resource users and consent holders where the use of a resource directly incurs costs to the council. A contribution from the general rate meets a share of the cost where the community benefits from the council performing its role, for example, environmental monitoring. For more information about how the council funds its activities from its various funding sources, please refer to its revenue and financing policy.

Some charges imposed on consent holders are based on the full costs of the council's administration and monitoring of their consents, plus a share of the costs of its state of the environment monitoring activities that relate to the resource used by those consent holders.

1.1.3 Charges must be fair

Charges must be fair and relate to resource users' activities. The council can only charge resource users to the extent that their actions have contributed to the need for the council's work.

The council must also consider the benefits to the community and to resource users when setting a charge. It would be inequitable to charge resource users for work done in the interests of the regional community and vice versa. We take this into account when setting the proportion of charges we wish to recover for state of the environment and/or compliance monitoring from an individual resource user.

Wherever possible, the council will look for opportunities to streamline and improve processes to ensure that consent processing and compliance monitoring functions continue to be cost effective and efficient.

1.1.4 Charges must be uniformly applied

Charges will not vary greatly within classes of activities and within the context of the scale of the activity, except where environmental incidents and non-compliance with consent conditions incur additional supervision costs.

1.1.5 Charges must be simple to understand

Charges should be clear and easy to understand, and their administration and collection should be simple and cost effective.

1.1.6 Charges must be transparent

Charges should be calculated in a way that is clear, logical and justifiable. The work of the council for which costs are to be recovered should be identifiable.

1.1.7 Charges must be predictable and certain

Consent applicants and resource users are entitled to certainty about the cost of their dealings with the council. The manner in which charges are set should enable customers to evaluate the extent of their liability.

Resource users need to know the cost of obtaining and maintaining a consent in order to manage their business and to plan for future growth and development. Charges should not change unnecessarily; any charges must be transparent and fully justified.

1.1.8 The council must act responsibly

The council should implement its user fees and charges schedule in a responsible manner. Where there are significant changes in charges, the council should provide advance warning and give consent holders the opportunity to make adjustments.

1.1.9 Resource use

The charges in this document support preferred resource use practises which as a consequence require less work to be undertaken by the council.

1.2 General policies

1.2.1 Time periods

The policies, formulae and charges set out in this document apply each year from 1 July to the following 30 June, or until replaced by new charges adopted during the annual plan or long term plan as prescribed by the Local Government Act 2002.

1.2.2 Goods and Services Tax

The charges and formulae outlined in this document are *exclusive* of GST, except where noted otherwise.

1.2.3 Debtors

All debtors' accounts will be administered in accordance with this policy and outstanding debts will be pursued until recovered.

1.2.4 A minimum annual charge

A minimum annual charge as set out in Section 3.5.1 will apply to most consents/permits. The exception to this is bore permits, sewage discharge permits for individual dwellings, and new consents granted after 1 March each year - for these permits the minimum annual charge will be waived for the remainder of that financial year.

1.3 Policy on remission of charges

1.3.1

In general, all fees and charges set out in this document are to be met by the person who has invoked the service or activity that the fee or charge relates to (for example, the consent applicant in the case of consent processing services or the consent holder in the case of consent administration, monitoring and supervision services).

1.3.2

Where a person seeks to have any fee or charge set out in this document remitted that person may make an application in writing to the Northland Regional Council for the remission of the charge setting out in detail the applicant's case which may include financial hardship, community benefit or environmental benefit.

1.3.3

Where the application/consent relates to a structure, the remission of any charge will only be considered if that structure is available at no charge for public use.

1.3.4

Existing waivers or remissions issued for charges may be subject to review, as this policy may be reviewed.

1.3.5

Decisions on applications for waivers or remissions shall be made by the relevant group manager, who may remit a charge in part or full, or decline the application. No further consideration of the application will be undertaken following issue of the final decision, except in relation to an objection against additional charges under section 357B of the Act (see section 1.3.7 below).

1.3.6

Subject to the terms of each particular remission, any remission of standard charges shall be reviewed every three years from the date of issue.

1.3.7

The council can fix charges for recovering costs for consent processing, administration, monitoring and supervision services under section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The council can also require the person liable for such a charge to pay an additional charge, where the fixed charge is inadequate to recover its reasonable costs in respect to the service concerned (s36(5) RMA). The person receiving the additional charge has the right to object to the charge under section 357B of the Act and subsequently appeal to the Environment Court against the decision on the objection. Decisions on objections not resolved at staff level will be made by independent commissioners. The council also has the absolute discretion to remit the whole or any part of a charge made under section 36 (s36AAB(1) RMA).

Policies on charging and fees for specific activities and functions



2.1 Provision of information and technical advice

The council recognises that it has a significant advisory and information role. The council has the right, under legislation, to recover the costs of providing certain information.

2.1.1 Information provided under the RMA – consents, hearings etc.

Pursuant to the Local Government Act, and sections 36(1)(e) and (f) of the Resource Management Act, the council may charge for the provision of information as follows:

2.1.1.1 Reasonable charges will be made to cover the costs of making information and documents available, for the provision of technical advice and consultancy services. These costs will include:

1. Staff costs related to making the information available – i.e., officers' actual recorded time charged at an hourly rate comprising actual employment costs plus a factor to cover administration and general operating costs (refer Section 3.2);
2. Any additional costs incurred, for example, photocopying, printing binding; and computer processing costs – refer to Section 3.9.10.
3. Where an inquiry requires less than one hour of staff time, no staff costs will be charged. Additional costs of less than \$25.00 will not be charged.

2.1.1.2 Consistency, distance, location – all time after the first hour and any disbursements involved in providing information that confers a private benefit on the recipient(s) shall be recovered by way of invoicing the cost in line with the policy set out above. This policy is consistent with that applied in local government, except when information is requested under the Local Government Official Information Act (refer to Section 2.1.2).

There is no concession for time or distance travelled by the council's officers to provide technical information. No such concession is provided by other technical consultants.

Information given by telephone is to be treated exactly the same as information provided at an interview.

2.1.1.3 Advise the cost in advance – officers must warn the person seeking information in advance, that a cost will be incurred after the first hour, and the estimated cost per hour to be charged. This process allows the applicant to weigh the value of his/her requirements, and will effectively control the level of information sought and deflect frivolous requests.

The provision of information should be charged separately from the cost of processing any future resource application.

2.1.1.4 Community and environmental groups – where an organisation clearly gains no economic or private benefit for its members from the information sought, then the free time available is also one hour, and will be treated on the same basis as requests under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (refer to Section 2.1.2) unless a regulation or plan provides otherwise. Additional time and disbursements may be charged for, as a reasonable control mechanism, to avoid frivolous or indulgent requests at the ratepayers' cost. These requests should be referred to at least a group manager for a decision on charging.

2.1.1.5 Educational information and materials, and consent holders – when council officers are involved in Resource Management Act workshops or public promotions aimed at increasing the public's awareness of the Resource Management Act consent procedures, the council's environmental role, liaison on planning issues, etc., there is a benefit to the greater community as well as the people attending. Information provided in this context clearly falls within the educational role of the council and is not charged for.

2.1.1.6 Consent holders – all consent holders are entitled to information arising from the monitoring of their consents, including district councils and other corporate bodies.

Other information sought by district councils is to be assessed on individual merit, and referred to the group manager for a decision.

2.1.2 Information provided under the Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act

The Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act enables the public to have access to official information held by local authorities because this is good for accountability and effective participation. However, official information and deliberations are protected to the extent that this is consistent with public interest and personal privacy. More information about the Act, including how to make a request for information and why it may be declined, is on the Office of the Ombudsman's [website](#).

Section 13 of the Act provides for the recovery of the cost of making information available under the Official Information Act. However, there are some exceptions to this, e.g. the council cannot charge the Inland Revenue Department for its information requests. The current charges are set out in Section 3.1 of this user fees and charges schedule.

Note: under Section 13(1) of the official information act the council has 20 working days to make a decision (and communicate it to the requestor) on whether we are granting or withholding the information, including how the information will be provided and for what cost. We will also tell the requester that they have the right to seek a review by an Ombudsman of the estimated charge. If the charge is substantial the requester may refine the scope of their request to reduce the charge. We may request a minimum estimated initial fee to be paid under the Official Information Act and the 2002 Charging Guidelines issued by the Secretary for Justice. We will recover the actual costs involved in producing and supplying information of commercial value. In stating our fee schedule we reserve discretion to waive a fee if the circumstances of the request suggest this is appropriate, for example in the public interest or in cases of hardship.

2.2 Resource Management Act 1991

2.2.1 Introduction

Under Section 36(1) of the Resource Management Act, the council may charge for costs associated with the following:

1. Processing resource consent applications, including requests made by applicants or submitters under Section 100A of the Act,
2. Reviews of consent conditions,
3. Processing applications for certificates of compliance and existing use certificates,
4. The administration, monitoring and supervision of resource consents,
5. Carrying out state of the environment monitoring,
6. Applications for the preparation of, or changes to, regional plans or policy statements, and
7. For providing information in respect of plans and resource consents and the supply of documents (also refer to Section 2.1.1).

2.2.2 Performance of action pertaining to charges

With regard to all application fees and amounts fixed under Section 36(1) of the RMA, the council need not perform the action to which the charge relates until the charge has been paid in full [RMA, Section 36AAB(2)] except if section 36(1)(ab)(ii), 36(ad)(ii) or 36(cb)(iv) apply.

2.2.3 Applications for resource consents, reviews of consent conditions, certificates of compliance and existing use certificates

2.2.3.1 Applicants will be charged for the reasonable costs, including disbursements, of receiving and processing applications for resource consents, reviews of resource consent conditions under Sections 127 and 128 of the RMA or Sections 10, 20, 21 and 53 of the Aquaculture Reform (Repeals and Transitional Provisions) Act 2004, certificates of compliance and existing use certificates. These costs include:

a. Minimum estimated initial fee on application as set out in Section 3.2.1 and Staff Charge Rates (which are rates derived from actual employment costs plus a factor to cover administration and general operating costs) charged at the relevant hourly rate as set out in in Section 3.2. These are minimum charges for resource consent applications and are charges 'fixed' under Section 36(1) of the RMA (they are therefore not subject to objection rights). All consent processing costs which exceed the minimum estimated initial fee are considered to be additional charges pursuant to Section 36(5) of the RMA and these may be progressively charged on a monthly basis or invoiced at the end of the consenting process. Prior to consideration of the application, the Chief Executive Officer is authorised to require an additional minimum estimated initial fee of up to \$20,000 for complex applications.

b. Hearings – the costs of pre-hearing meetings and hearings will be charged to the applicant. The costs of councillors who are members of hearing committees (panel) will be recovered as determined by the Remuneration Authority. Staff costs and hearing panel members' fees or the reasonable costs of independent (non-councillor) commissioners at formal hearings will be charged.

Charges relating to joint hearings will be apportioned by the authorities involved, according to which authority has the primary role of organising the hearing.

Where a hearings panel has directed that expert evidence is pre-circulated then all persons who are producing such evidence shall be responsible for providing the prescribed number of copies of such evidence to the council. In the event that the council needs to prepare copies of such evidence the person producing the evidence will be charged for the copying.

Submitters that request that independent hearing commissioners under Section 100a of the RMA will also be charged a portion of the cost of those hearing commissioners in accordance with Section 36(1)(ab).

c. *External costs* disbursements will also be charged; for example, advertising, legal and consulting advice, laboratory testing, hearing venues and incidental costs.

d. *Withdrawn applications* are subject to the minimum fees set out in Section 2.2.7.4, Section 3.2.1 or Section 3.4 as appropriate, or the actual costs of the work completed to the date of withdrawal (whichever is greater).

2.2.3.2 *The final costs of processing each resource consent application* will be based on reasonable costs and will include the charging of staff time at the rates set out in Section 3.2 and disbursements. In the event that consultants are used to assist the council in processing resource consent applications, the actual costs of the consultants will be used in calculating the final costs.

2.2.3.3 *Where an application is for multiple activities involving more than one type of consent*, minimum estimated initial fees are required for each type with the following exceptions:

1. The fee for land use consents for earthworks and/or vegetation clearance (including mining, quarrying, forestry, bridging and gravel extraction) also includes the water and discharge permits to divert and discharge stormwater where these are required;
2. The fee for discharge permits for sewage volumes greater than three cubic metres per day (e.g. communal subdivision systems, marae etc.) includes the associated discharge to air resource consent; and
3. The fee for discharge permits to discharge stormwater includes the associated water permit to divert stormwater.

Notwithstanding the above, the council may determine that other 'packages' of consent applications do not require individual minimum estimated initial fees for each consent type.

2.2.3.4 *The consent holder will be invoiced the amount of the minimum estimated initial fee for reviews* of consent conditions at the time the review is initiated by the Council.

2.2.3.5 *There is a 'fixed fee' for applications for discharge permits for burning of specified materials*, including vegetation, by way of open burning or incineration device (e.g. backyard burning). This fixed fee only applies to such applications if they are able to be processed on a non-notified basis and no additional charges will be invoiced for such applications even if the costs exceed the fixed fee. However, in the event that the application is required to be limited notified or publicly notified then the council will require the applicable minimum estimated initial fee for notified and limited notified applications (as outlined in Section 3.2.1 before notification of the application.)

2.2.3.6 *The council will provide a discount, if applicable, on the administrative charges imposed under Section 36 of the RMA* in accordance with the Resource Management Discount Regulations 2010 for all applications lodged on or after 31 July 2010.

2.2.4 Administration, monitoring and supervision of resource consents

2.2.4.1 *Administration* covers how the council records and manages the information it has on the resource consents it grants. The council is obliged to keep "*records of each resource consent granted by it*" under Section 35(5)(g) of the RMA, which must be "*reasonably available [to the public] at its principal office*" [Section 35(3) of the RMA]. The council keeps this information on hard copy files or electronic databases. The costs of operating and maintaining these systems are substantial.

The minimum annual resource consent charge set out in 3.5.1 recovers some of the costs of the administration of resource consents.

2.2.4.2 *Monitoring* is the gathering of information to check consent compliance and to ascertain the environmental effects that arise from the exercise of resource consents. The council is obliged to *monitor "the exercise of the resource consents that have effect in its region"* under Section 35(2)(d) of the RMA.

2.2.4.3 *Supervision* covers functions that the council may need to carry out in relation to the ongoing management of resource consents. This can include the granting of approvals to plans and other documentation, review and assessment of self-monitoring *results* provided by the consent holder, provision of monitoring information and reports to consent holders, meetings with consent holders relating to consent compliance and monitoring, and participation in liaison and/or peer review groups established under consent conditions or to address issues relating to the exercise of resource consents.

In determining charges under Section 36 of the Resource Management Act, the council has given consideration to the purpose of the charges and the council's functions under the Act. It is considered that consent holders have both the privilege of using resources and responsibilities for any related effects on the environment. It is the council's role to ensure that the level of effects is managed, monitored and is acceptable, in terms of sustainable management and the community's values. The annual charges for the administration, monitoring and supervision of resource consents are based on the assumption that those consents will be complied with and exercised in a responsible manner.

Annual resource consent (management) charges will be based on a set minimum charge plus charges for consent monitoring and/or supervision undertaken by council staff. Where appropriate, a portion of costs associated with State of the Environment (SOE) monitoring of resources used by consent holders is also collected, for example, the costs of running council's hydrological sites, water quality monitoring networks and associated surveys such as macroinvertebrate and fish monitoring. This particularly applies to water take consents, both surface and groundwater, and marine farms.

2.2.5 Invoicing non-scale fees

2.2.5.1 The majority of large-scale activities or activities with high potential adverse effects (where annual monitoring costs exceed \$1,000 GST inclusive) and certain small-scale activities such as short-term earthworks/construction type consents, will be monitored, the results recorded/reported and subsequently invoiced to the consent holder on an actual and reasonable cost basis.

2.2.5.2 Invoices will be generated once the costs of any work have exceeded a prescribed sum. This will be determined by the scale of the activity. Costs will be invoiced in a timely manner during the progress of the work to ensure that large amounts of costs do not accrue, unless otherwise authorised by the consent holder.

2.2.5.3 In the case of significant water takes, charges will generally be invoiced annually in line with Section 3.5.3 and any further supervision charges will be invoiced on a regular basis as costs are incurred by council.

2.2.6 Timing

2.2.6.1 Invoicing of consent annual charges will be in the quarter following the adoption of the Long Term Plan or Annual Plan by the council or after monitoring of the consent has been undertaken (post billing).

2.2.6.2 In some cases, such as consents relating to short-term activities, invoicing of charges may be deferred until after the council has completed all, or a significant portion, of its planned monitoring of a consent.

2.2.6.3 Where any resource consent for a new activity is approved during the year and will be liable for future annual charges, the actual costs of monitoring activities will be charged to the consent holder subject to Section 2.2.7.4 below. Many consents for activities in the Coastal Marine Area are also subject to the Navigation Water Transport and Maritime Safety Bylaw Charges and some are also subject to a Marine Biosecurity Charge.

2.2.6.4 In any case, where a resource consent expires, or is surrendered, during the course of the year and the activity or use is not ongoing, then the associated annual charge will be based on the actual and reasonable costs of monitoring activities to the date of expiry or surrender, and also the administrative/monitoring costs incurred as a result of the expiry/surrender of the consent.

2.2.6.5 Where a resource consent expires during the course of the year but the activity or use continues and requires a replacement consent, then the annual charges will continue to be applied.

2.2.7 Setting of annual resource consent (monitoring) charges

2.2.7.1 Basis of charges

1. The charges reflect the nature and scale of consented activities. In general, those activities having greater actual or potential effects on the environment require greater supervision and monitoring from the council. In setting these charges, the council has duly considered that their purpose is to recover the reasonable costs in relation to the council's administration, monitoring and supervision of resource consents and for undertaking its functions under Section 35 of the Resource Management Act.

2. In respect of the council's administration role, a standard minimum annual charge will apply to cover some of the costs of operating and maintaining its consents-related information systems.
3. Where appropriate, a proportion of the costs of monitoring the state of the environment (Section 35(2)(a)) is incorporated in the charge to the consent holder. In such cases, the council has had particular regard to Section 36AAA(3)(c), that is, the extent that the monitoring relates to the likely effects of the consent holder's activities or the extent that the likely benefit to consent holders exceeds the likely benefit of the monitoring to the community. The costs to the council associated with this activity may be shared between consent holders and the community. This recognises that there is value and benefit to the community of work the council undertakes with respect to monitoring the state of the environment. In the council's judgement this is a fair and equitable division. To date, a state of the environment charge has been incorporated into the annual charges applying to consents for water takes, known as the (water take) resource user charge (refer to Section 2.2.7.2).
4. In relation to swing/pile moorings within the Marine 4 Management (MM4) Areas which meet the permitted activity criteria, the costs of providing council services will be recovered as outlined in Sections 2.4.2 and 3.5.5.
5. In relation to swing/pile moorings outside the MM4 Areas without consent (non-consented), costs will be recovered through the Navigation and Safety Bylaw until consent is gained.
6. The charges for consents for minor to moderate activities are often based on scales (refer to Section 2.2.7.4 and 3.5). The general method for charging for large-scale activities is to apply the formulae in Section 2.2.8.6.

2.2.7.2 (Water take) resource user charge

1. Some of Northland's water resources are highly allocated and are under pressure. It is difficult to assess the natural flows/levels of water bodies as there is limited data available on water use and flows/levels in some areas. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 requires the council to set water quantity limits for all of Northland's water bodies.
2. In order to address this, the council developed a Sustainable Water Allocation Plan. This project requires ongoing resourcing by council to implement. The work provides benefit to both water users and the wider community. Much of the information provided by council's current hydrometric network is the basis for this work and as such, a part of the cost of running this network shall be recovered from water users through the (water take) resource user charge.
3. The details of this charge are outlined in Section 3.5.3
4. The resource user charge for water take consents for hydroelectric generation will be considered on a case by case basis because they can be substantial and complex in nature.

2.2.7.3 Other State of the Environment charges

1. Where appropriate, annual charges will include a specified amount which contributes towards the recovery of costs incurred by council as part of its state of the environment monitoring and/or the hydrometric network.
2. The estimated monitoring costs are then rounded to an appropriate sum which becomes the expected annual charge. These formulae and the historical cost data of monitoring like consents provides a reasonable estimate of the actual costs of monitoring consents each year and will be used to provide the expected costs of monitoring in the forthcoming years.

2.2.7.4 Calculation of monitoring charges

Charges for the monitoring of consents include:

Labour (refer to Section 3.2)

Sampling and testing

Monitoring equipment

Administration

State of the Environment monitoring charge/resource user charge

2.2.8 Additional monitoring/supervision charges

2.2.8.1 Where non-compliance with resource consent conditions is encountered, or not programmed, additional monitoring is necessary the costs will be recovered in addition to the set annual charge.

2.2.8.2 The purpose of additional supervision charges is to recover costs of additional supervisory work that is required to be undertaken by council when people, including consent holders, do not act in accordance with consents or council's rules relating to resource use.

2.2.8.3 Additional supervision charges relate to those situations where consent conditions are not being met or adverse effects are resulting from the exercise of a consent; or unauthorised activities are being carried out.

2.2.8.4 When consent non-compliance or an unauthorised activity is found, the person is, if possible, given the opportunity to remedy the situation and is informed that costs of additional supervision will be recovered. Such activity may also be subject to infringement notices, enforcement orders or prosecutions.

2.2.8.5 Charges for additional supervision will be calculated on an actual and reasonable basis.

2.2.8.6 The costs that make up the charge will include:

1. Labour costs; officers' actual recorded time spent, including travel time, in following up the non-compliance matter or unauthorised activity (charged at the appropriate hourly rate listed in Section 3.2); plus
2. Any sampling and testing costs incurred; plus any equipment costs (excluding vehicle running costs) associated with the monitoring of the non-compliance; plus
3. Any external costs incurred (e.g. external consultants, hire of clean-up equipment).
4. For consent holders only, no additional supervision charge will be applied where the annual charges for their consents are sufficient to cover the costs incurred in following up their consent non-compliance.
5. In the case of water takes, annual charges are estimated on the basis of normal summer flows and consequently during drier than normal years further monitoring may be required in the form of flow, water level and/or water abstraction measurements. The costs of this further work will be charged to the consent holder in the form of additional supervision charges as outlined above.

2.2.9 Charges for emergency works

Under Section 331 of the Resource Management Act, the council may charge for the costs associated with any emergency works required for the:

1. Prevention or mitigation of adverse environmental effects;
2. Remediation of adverse effects on the environment; or
3. Prevention of loss of life, injury, or serious damage to property.

The costs charged will be the actual and reasonable costs incurred by council to do the works.

Charges for labour, supply of information and the council plant and equipment are detailed in Sections 3.2 and 3.9.

2.2.10 Changes in resource consent status

1. Where any resource consent is approved during the year, and will be liable for annual charges, the actual costs of monitoring activities will be charged to the applicant. The annual minimum fee will continue to apply per the council's policy in Section 2.2.7.2.

2. For large-scale activities where a resource consent expires, or is surrendered, during the course of the year and the activity or use is not on-going, then the associated annual charge will be based on actual and reasonable costs incurred to the date of expiry or surrender, including costs incurred as a result of monitoring and administration activities associated with the expiry or surrender of the consent. The annual minimum fee will continue to apply.
3. Where a resource consent expires during the course of the year but the activity or use continues and is subject to a replacement process, then the annual charges will continue to apply.

2.2.11 Charges set by regional rules

2.2.11.1 When developing a regional plan, the council may create regional rules to prohibit, regulate or allow activities. These rules may specify permitted activities, controlled activities, discretionary activities, non-complying activities, prohibited activities and restricted coastal activities.

2.2.11.2 Permitted activities are allowed by a regional plan without a resource consent, if the activity complies with any conditions, which may have been specified in the plan. Conditions on a resource consent may be set in relation to any matters outlined in Section 108 of the Resource Management Act. They may include a specific condition relating to a financial contribution (cash, land, works and services) for any purpose specified in a plan.

2.2.11.3 The council therefore reserves the right to set other charges pursuant to regional rules in regional plans. These charges will include staff costs for giving evidence in a New Zealand court; matters pertaining actions required under the Maritime Transport Act 1994 or Biosecurity Act and any other regulated activities. Any new charges would be notified through the public process required for a regional plan prior to its approval.

2.2.11.4 Actual and reasonable costs will be charged for fees set by regional rules. These costs will include:

1. Staff costs – officers' actual recorded time charged at an hourly rate comprising actual employment costs plus a factor to cover administration and general operating costs. (See Staff Charge Rates in Section 3.2)
2. Hearings – the costs of pre-hearing meetings and hearings will be charged to the applicant. Council members' hearing costs will be recovered as determined by the Remuneration Authority. Staff costs and committee members' fees or the actual costs of independent commissioners at formal hearings will be charged.
3. For applications relating to restricted coastal activities, the applicant will also be charged the council's costs of the Minister of Conservation's representative. Charges related to joint hearings will be apportioned by the authorities involved, according to which authority has the primary role of organising the hearing.
4. External costs, disbursements, are additional to the above charges, for example advertising, consulting and legal advice, laboratory testing, hearing venues and incidental costs.

2.2.12 Preparing or changing a policy statement or plan

2.2.12.1 Any person may apply to the council for the preparation of or change to a regional plan. Any Minister of the Crown or any territorial authority of the region may request a change to a policy statement.

2.2.12.2 When considering whether costs should be borne by the applicant, shared with the council, or borne fully by the council, the following will be taken into account:

1. the underlying reason for the change; and
2. the extent to which the applicant will benefit; and
3. the extent to which the general community will benefit.

2.2.12.3 For the receipt and assessment of any application to prepare or change a policy statement or plan, actual and reasonable costs will be recovered. The charging policies are outlined below:

1. All applicants will be required to pay a minimum estimated initial fee set out in Section 3.3 based on the expected costs of receiving and assessing the application, up to but not including the costs of public notification. Actual and reasonable costs based on an hourly rate set out in Section 3.2, mileage and disbursements will be included in the minimum estimated initial fee. Any additional costs incurred in processing the application will be invoiced to the applicant.
2. For any action required to implement a decision to proceed with the preparation or change to a policy statement or plan, a minimum estimated initial fee as set out in Section 3.3 shall be made for the costs of public notification. This will be followed by a case-by-case assessment of where the costs should fall. Any costs charged will be invoiced monthly from the date of public notification.

Prior to public notification, an estimate of total costs will be given to the applicant. The applicant will have the option of withdrawing the request on receipt of notice of the estimated costs.

Withdrawn requests are subject to payment of the actual and reasonable costs of relevant work completed to the date of withdrawal.

2.2.13 National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry

Under regulation 106 of the National Environmental Standards for plantation forestry, the council may charge for monitoring of permitted activities specified by regulations 24, 37, 51 and 63(2) of the standards. This monitoring will be charged in accordance with sections 1.1 and 1.2 of this charging document. Charges will cover the travel and inspection time of the officer(s) undertaking the inspection (as per section 3.2), as well as any sampling costs where required.

2.2.14 National Environmental Standards for Freshwater

Under Part 4 of the standard, the council may charge for monitoring of permitted activities covered by the Standard. These will be charged in accordance with sections 1.1 and 1.2 of this charging document. Charges will cover the travel and inspection time of the officer(s) undertaking the inspection (as per section 3.2) as well as any sampling costs where required.

2.3 Local Government Act 2002 (land and resources)

The charges for the following council activities/services have been set according to Section 150 of the Local Government Act:

2.3.1 Monitoring/inspections of permitted activities

Charges are payable to recover the costs of inspections of permitted activities to determine compliance with the permitted activity rules in the regional plans. The inspections are conducted in order that adequately carries out its functions and responsibilities under Sections 30, 35 and 36 of the Resource Management Act.

2.3.1.1 Farm dairy effluent discharges

1. Administration costs incurred will be charged in addition to the costs of the site visit/inspections, plus the actual and reasonable cost of any specific water quality testing and/or enforcement action required (see Section 3.6.1).
2. Where there is a need for two officers to attend, the costs of both officers will be recovered.
3. The charges are listed in Section 3.6.
4. For charges for consented farm dairy effluent discharge consents, refer to Section 3.6.3.

2.3.1.2 Coastal structures

All costs incurred with a triennial site/visit inspection, averaged over the three year period (see section 3.5.5.2) plus the actual and reasonable cost of any additional monitoring/enforcement.

2.3.1.3 Other permitted activities

1. The costs of the site visit/inspections, plus the reasonable cost of any specific water quality testing and/or enforcement action required will be charged.
2. The costs of monitoring RMA regulations that do not specifically provide for cost recovery will be charged as set out in sections 3.2 and 3.9 of this charging document.

2.3.2 Environmental incidents

Where a person (or persons) carries out an activity in a manner that does not comply with Sections 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 315, 323, 328 or 329 of the RMA, the council will charge that person (or persons) for the actual and reasonable cost of any inspection/investigation it undertakes in relation to the activity. This cost may include:

1. Time spent by the council staff identifying and confirming the activity is taking or has taken place.
2. Time spent by council staff identifying and confirming the person(s) responsible for causing or allowing the activity to take place or to have taken place.
3. Time spent by council staff alerting and informing the person(s) of their responsibilities in relation to the activity, including any guidance or advice as to how any adverse effects of the activity might be managed.
4. Staff travel time and vehicle mileage.
5. Costs of any specific testing of samples taken.
6. Costs of professional services contracted to assist in the inspection/investigation of the activity.
7. Clean up costs and materials.

The council will only charge for time spent that exceeds 30 minutes. Travel time will be included in the calculation of that time.

Where an incident occurs on a site that 'holds' a resource consent and a breach of consent conditions is confirmed, then this section does not apply. Any actual and reasonable costs incurred in the investigation of the incident will be recovered as additional consent monitoring charges.

2.3.3 Investigation of land for the purposes of identifying and monitoring contaminated land

The council is responsible for identifying and monitoring contaminated land under Section 30(1)(ca) of the RMA. Council will recover the costs of inspections plus the actual and reasonable cost of site investigations including any specific testing of samples taken. Staff charge rates, sampling and equipment costs are outlined in Sections 3.2 and 3.9.

2.4 Maritime activities

These charges – which the council is enabled to set under a number of legislative instruments – are presented together for the purposes of clarity.

2.4.1 Charges for maritime-related incidents (Local Government Act 2002)

These charges are made to recover the costs incurred by the council as a result of staff responding to any incident that causes or may have the potential to cause, adverse environmental effects or effects on navigation and safety. The response action taken by council staff may include, but will not be limited to, monitoring, inspection, investigation, clean-up, removal, mitigation and remediation works. Actual costs for consumables, plant and equipment used/hired during a response will also be charged in addition to staff hours (as set out in Section 3.2) as appropriate.

For incidents occurring outside normal business hours, a minimum call out fee of three hours at staff charge rates shall apply (includes oil spill response, training exercises, and emergency response).

2.4.2 Northland Regional Council Navigation Safety Bylaw Charges

1. The Navigation Safety Bylaw regulates navigation, water transport and maritime safety in Northland.
2. The charges are set out in section 3.5.5 and are collected for functions, duties, powers or services carried out by the council and must be paid on demand by the consent holder or owner, to the council.
3. The current Navigation Safety bylaw is available on the council's website or from council offices.
4. The fees and charges collected contribute to the upkeep of the region's maritime services, for example, the harbourmaster, buoys and beacons, etc.

2.4.3 Standard charges for Marine Tier 1 Oil Transfer Sites (Maritime Transport Act 1994)

2.4.3.1 Maritime Rule Part 130B requires that the operator of an oil transfer site obtain the approval for a site marine oil spill contingency plan from the Director of Maritime New Zealand. The power to approve these plans has been delegated by the director to the Chief Executive Officer (sub-delegated to council employees) of the Northland Regional Council in an Instrument of Delegation pursuant to Section 444(2) of the Maritime Transport Act 1994.

2.4.3.2 Section 444(12) of the Maritime Transport Act 1994 allows the council to charge a person a reasonable fee for:

1. Approving Tier 1 site marine oil spill contingency plans and any subsequent amendments.
2. Inspecting Tier 1 sites and any subsequent action taken thereafter in respect of preparation of inspection reports or reporting on non-conformance issues.

2.4.3.3 *Basic fee* – the council will charge a minimum fee and any additional staff costs, as set out in Section 3.7.8.

2.4.3.4 *Additional staff costs* – in addition to the basic fee set out above, additional charges may be applied for staff costs. The costs are based on officers' actual recorded time charged at an hourly rate set out in Section 3.2 of this document, comprising actual employment costs plus a factor to cover administration and general operating costs. Should travel be required, additional costs for mileage will be charged at the standard rate as approved by the Inland Revenue Department.

2.5 Building Act 2004

2.5.1

Section 243 of the Act specifically allows for the council to impose a fee or charges for:

1. Issuing a project information memorandum.
2. The performance of any other function or service under this Act.
3. Recovering its costs from the owner if it carries out building work under Section 156 of this Act.
4. Where a fee or charge is payable for the performance of a function or service, then the council may decline to perform the function or service, unless the fee or charge is paid.

2.5.2

Costs incurred beyond the fee are to be recovered on the basis of actual and reasonable costs incurred by the council.

2.5.3

The minimum fees for the different consent activities are set out in Section 3.4.

2.5.4

Charges fixed under the Building Act 2004 are resolved by the council and fixed pursuant to the Local Government Act 2002 process until subsequently amended.

2.5.5

Policies set out in Section 3.4 also apply to Building Act applications.

2.5.6

All applications for a project information memorandum and a building consent, as well as the issuing of notices to rectify will be subject to a minimum estimated charge as set out in Section 3.4.

2.5.7

Charges for Building Act functions other than the issuing of project information memoranda and building consents will be charged a set fee per individual element, or on the basis of actual and reasonable cost, as set out in Section 3.4.

2.5.8

These functions include the issue of compliance schedules, requests for information on building consent applications, extension of valid term, actions re dangerous buildings, inspections and technical processing.

2.5.9

The "Minimum Estimated fee" is payable upon application for a PIM/LIM. Final actual and reasonable costs are payable upon uplifting the PIM/LIM based on staff charge rates in Section 3.2.

2.5.10 Building consents and certificates of approval

Incorporating receipt of a building consent application, the issue of a building consent, including project information memorandum, payment of a building research levy and/or Department of Building and Housing levy (where applicable) and the issue of a code of compliance certificate (where applicable).

2.5.11 Dams

Under section 244 of the Building Act 2004, council has decided to transfer the Building Act functions for consenting dams to the Waikato Regional Council. Fees will be charged in accordance with the Fees and Charges policy set by Waikato Regional Council. All fees and charges for consent processing will be invoiced directly to the applicant by Waikato Regional Council.

2.5.12 Requests for information on building consents

Charges will be the actual and reasonable costs based on staff charge rates shown in Section 3.2.

2.5.13 Technical processing and the exercising of other functions, powers and duties under the Building Act 2004

For technical processing and other functions under the Building Act, full costs over and above the minimum estimated initial fee will be recovered in accordance with the additional hourly charges.

2.5.14

All charges are payable upon invoice, provision of service or upon the exercise of the function, power or duty. Progressive charging may be used where costs are greater than \$500 (excluding GST).

2.5.15

When building consent non-compliance or an unauthorised activity is found, the person is, if possible, given the opportunity to remedy the situation and is informed that costs of additional supervision will be recovered. Such activity may also be subject to infringement offence notices, enforcement orders or prosecutions.

2.5.16

An enforcement officer who observes a person committing an infringement offence or has reasonable cause to believe that an infringement offence is being or has been committed is authorised and warranted under Section 229 of the Building Act 2004 to issue an infringement notice.

2.6 Biosecurity Act 1993

2.6.1 Regional Pest Management Strategies or Plan, or Pathway Management Plan Cost Recovery Policy

Section 135 of the Biosecurity Act provides regional councils with options to recover the costs of administering the Act and performing the functions, powers and duties under a pest management strategy or plan, or a pathway management plan. This recovery must be in accordance with the principles of equity and efficiency. Section 135 of the Biosecurity Act authorises the recovery of costs by such methods that they believe to be the most suitable and equitable in the circumstances, including fixed charges, estimated charges, actual and reasonable charges, refundable or non-refundable deposits paid before the provision of the service, charges imposed on users of services or third parties, and cost recovery in the event of non-compliance with a legal direction.

2.6.2 Request for work

An authorised person may request any occupier to carry out specified works or measures for the purposes of eradicating or preventing the spread of any pest in accordance with the Northland Regional Pest Management Strategies.

2.6.3 Legal directions

An authorised person may issue a legal direction to any occupier to carry out specified works or measures for the purposes of eradicating or preventing the spread of any pest in accordance with a Northland Regional Pest Management Strategies. The legal direction shall be issued under Section 122 of the Biosecurity Act and specify the following matters:

1. The place in respect of which works or measures are required to be undertaken;
2. The pest for which the works or measures are required;
3. Works or measures to be undertaken to meet the occupier's obligations;
4. The time within which the works or measures are to be undertaken;
5. Action that may be undertaken by the management agency (generally the council) if the occupier or occupiers fail to comply with any part of the direction;
6. The name, address, telephone number and email address of the management agency and the name of the authorised person issuing the legal direction.

2.6.4 Failure to comply with a legal direction

Where a legal direction has been given to an occupier under the Northland Regional Pest Management Strategies or Pest Management Plan or Marine Pathways Management Plan, and the occupier has not complied with the requirements of the legal direction within the time specified, then the council may enter onto the place specified in the legal direction and carry out, or cause to be carried out, the works or measures specified in the legal direction, or such other works or measures as are reasonably necessary or appropriate for the purpose of giving effect to the requirements of the legal direction.

2.6.5 Recovery of costs incurred by management agency

Where the council undertakes works or measures for the purposes of giving effect to the requirements of a request for work or a legal direction it shall recover the costs incurred from the occupier pursuant to Sections 128 and 129 of the Biosecurity Act and may register the debt as a charge against the certificate of title for the land. Refer to section 3.8 for the fee structure covering notice of directions.

2.6.6 Recovery of costs for Marine Biosecurity Activities

Council has an ongoing programme of marine biosecurity inspection, monitoring and response work, that is undertaken for the purposes of implementing its pest management strategies and plans. (Some) cost recovery is sought for these marine biosecurity activities as provided for by Section 135 of the Biosecurity Act 1993. Cost

recovery is set as an annual charge, specified as a 'Marine Biosecurity Fee' and is applied to all moorings, marina berths, boat sheds, and ports as set out in Section 3.5.5 of this user fees and charges schedule. The charge applies whether inspection, monitoring and/or response is carried out on that individual structure or not.

2.6.7 Failure to pay

Section 136 of the Biosecurity Act provides for regional councils to apply a penalty to charges under the Biosecurity Act that remain unpaid for more than 20 working days since the charge was demanded in writing. Council will apply a penalty of 10% of unpaid charges to the debt incurred, after a period of 20 working days from the due date stated on the original invoice. In addition to this, 10% will be applied for every completed period of six calendar months that the debt remains unpaid (six month period will be calculated from the 21st day of the charge remaining unpaid).

2.6.8 Equity and efficiency of Marine Biosecurity Activities

Section 135 (2) of the Biosecurity Act requires that, in determining appropriate mechanisms for the recovery of costs of a particular function or service, a recovering authority shall ensure that it is not recovering more than the actual costs of the function. This is based on the actual costs for that year, taking into account any shortfall in recovery of costs in the preceding year, and any over-recovery of costs in the preceding year.

There was no over-recovery of costs in the 2021/22 year. The proposal to recover only the actual costs of the function for the current (2022/23) year is considered to be an equitable and efficient means of recovering cost of the marine biosecurity function.

Schedules of fees and charges

3.1 Local government official information

In some cases, the council is permitted to charge for the provision of official information. Requesters will be advised in advance if the council decides to apply a charge.

Black and white photocopying or printing on standard A4 or foolscap paper where the total number of pages is in excess of 20 pages will be charged out at 10 cents for each page after the first 20 pages. All other photocopying and printing charges will recover the actual and reasonable costs involved.

For staff time	\$ including GST
First hour	No charge
Additional hours	Ministry of Justice, Charging Guidelines
First half hour (after the initial free hour)	38.00
Per hour	76.00

See also Section 3.2.2 for charges relating to the supply of information provided under the Resource Management Act 1991.

3.2 Staff charge rates

Charges are applicable for a range of services performed by council staff:

- Processing of consents under the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Environmental and consent monitoring of:
 - Large-scale activities;
 - Permitted activities; and
 - Contaminated land.
- Exercises and training for oil spill exercises and training, standard staff charge out rates apply.
- Technical assessment and administration of functions under the Building Act 2004.
- Maritime-related incidents.
- Mooring inspections/assessments.
- Preparing or changing a policy statement or plan.
- Discretionary amendments, variations or additions to commercial or residential property leases at the lessee, tenant or a third party's request.
- Provision of commercial or residential property related information, consultation, advice or consent

Description	Hourly rate \$ excluding GST
Technician Administrator	79.00
Officer Analyst	105.50
Specialist Manager	155.50
Group manager Harbourmaster	184.50
Consultants	Actual costs

Notes:

Where there is a need for two or more officers to attend, the costs of all officers will be recovered.

For oil spill responses (excluding planned exercises) an additional charge of \$14.00 per hour (excluding GST) per staff member will apply.

3.2.1 Resource consent applications - minimum estimated initial fee

Schedule of minimum estimated initial fees

Description	Minimum estimated initial fees \$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Notified and limited notified applications		
• Coastal Permits(excluding moorings), Land Use Consents, Water Permits, and Discharge Permits	3,173.48	3,649.50
• Moorings	1,587.83	1,826.00
New non-notified applications		
• Coastal Permits (excluding moorings), Land Use Consents (excluding Bore Drilling Permits), Water Permits, and Discharge Permits (including Farm Dairy Effluent and Domestic On-site Wastewater)	846.09	973.00
• Moorings	581.30	668.50
• Bore Drilling Permits	348.26	400.50
• Plus per additional bore	36.52	42.00
• Fixed Fee for Discharge Permit for burning of specified materials, including vegetation, by way of open burning or incineration device (e.g. backyard burning)(see Note 7)	63.48	73.00
Replacement non-notified applications		
• Coastal Permits(excluding moorings), Land Use Consents, Water Permits, and Discharge Permits (excluding Domestic On-site Wastewater)	741.30	852.50
• Moorings	476.96	548.50
• Domestic On-site Wastewater Discharge Permits	530.00	609.50
Certificate of compliance	476.96	548.50
Existing use certificate	476.96	548.50
Deemed permitted activity	369.57	425.00
Transfer of consents from the consent holder to another person (payable by the person requesting the transfer)	81.74	94.00

Description	Minimum estimated initial fees \$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Request for a change to consent holders name (payable by the person requesting the change)	81.74	94.00
Transfer existing water permit between sites within catchment		
• Notified (including limited notification)	741.30	852.50
• Non-notified	464.35	534.00
S127 Change or cancellation of consent conditions		
• Notified (including limited notification)	1,110.43	1,277.00
• Non-notified	476.52	548.00
Request to review deemed coastal permit to reflect actual space (off-site review) under s53 of the Aquaculture Reform (Repeals and Transitional Provisions) Act 2004		
• Notified (including limited notification)	3,173.48	3,649.50
• Non-notified	846.09	973.00
S128 Review of consent conditions, and review of deemed coastal permits under S10(4), 20(3) and 21(3) of the Aquaculture Reform (Repeals and Transitional Provisions) Act 2004 (see Note 7)		
• Notified (including limited notification)	1,110.43	1,277.00
• Non-notified	476.52	548.00
Extension of period until a consent lapses	294.35	338.50
Hearing costs (per hearing day per committee member) at hourly rates set by the Remuneration Authority* or the actual costs of Independent Commissioners.	(Per RA)	
* Determination dated 1 July 2006 of consent hearing fees payable and defining the duties covered by the fee or excluded, currently \$80 per hour (Committee Member) and \$100 per hour (Chairman).		
Mooring licence amendment fee	193.91	223.00
Requests by applicants and/or submitters for independent commissioner(s) to hear and decide resource consent applications as provided for by S100A(2) of the RMA:		

Description	Minimum estimated initial fees \$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In cases where only the applicant requests independent commissioner(s), all the costs for the application to be heard and decided will be charged to the applicant. • In cases where one or more submitters requests independent commissioner(s), the council will charge as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant will be charged for the amount that the council estimates it would cost for the application to be heard and decided if the request for independent commissioner(s) had not been made; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The requesting submitters will be charged equal shares of any amount by which the cost of the application being heard and decided in accordance with the request exceeds the amount payable by the applicant outlined in a) above. • Notwithstanding the above, in cases where the applicant and any submitter(s) request independent commissioner(s) all the costs for the application to be heard and decided will be charged to the applicant. 		

Note: Approved resource consents attract annual charges. For Building Consent Application Fees – Refer Section 3.4.2.

3.2.2 Photocopying costs for information provided under the RMA – consents, hearings etc.

Please see Section 3.9.10 for photocopying charges. See also Section 3.1 for charges relating to the supply of information provided under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

3.3 Application to prepare or change a policy statement or plan

Description	Minimum estimated initial fee \$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Minimum estimated initial fee required for receipt and assessment of any application to prepare or change a policy statement or plan	6,643.91	7,640.50
Minimum estimated initial fee of required to implement a decision to proceed with the preparation or change to a policy statement or plan for the costs of public notification	3,321.74	3,820.00

3.4 Building Act 2004

Charges fixed under the Building Act 2004 are resolved by the council and fixed pursuant to the Local Government Act 2002 process until subsequently amended.

3.4.1 Project and Land Information Memoranda (PIM/LIM)

Estimated value of work	Minimum estimated initial fee (MEC) \$ excluding GST	(MEC) \$ including GST
All applications	1,271.74	1,462.50

Notes:

- MEC is payable upon application for a PIM/LIM.
- Final actual and reasonable costs are payable upon uplifting the PIM/LIM based on standard labour charges in Section 3.2.

3.4.2 Building consents and certificates of approval

Incorporating receipt of a building consent application, the issue of a building consent, including project information memorandum, payment of a Building Research Levy and/or Department of Building and Housing Levy (where applicable) and the issue of a code compliance certificate (where applicable).

Under section 244 of the Building Act 2004, council has decided to transfer the Building Act functions for consenting dams to the Waikato Regional Council. Fees will be charged in accordance with the fees and levies set by Waikato Regional Council ([fees and levies can be found here](#)). All fees and charges for consent processing will be invoiced directly to the applicant by Waikato Regional Council.

3.4.3 Requests for information on building consents

Charges will be the actual and reasonable costs based on standard labour charge rates shown in Section 3.2.

3.4.4 Technical processing and the exercising of other functions, powers and duties under the Building Act 2004

For technical processing and other functions under the Building Act full costs over and above the minimum estimated initial fee will be recovered in accordance with the additional hourly charges.

Function	Minimum estimated initial fee \$ including GST	Hourly charge for exercise of functions or to recover additional costs
Action to be taken in respect of buildings deemed to be dangerous or insanitary		Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates
Issue of a Notice to Fix		Minimum charge of \$107.00 and further charges for inspections and other action to confirm compliance based on section 3.2 Staff charge rates

Function	Minimum estimated initial fee \$ including GST	Hourly charge for exercise of functions or to recover additional costs
Lodge Building Warrant of Fitness	126.50	Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates
Amendment to compliance schedule	1,271.50	Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates. Actual and reasonable for expert advice
Building Warrant of Fitness audit		Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates
Certificate of Acceptance	Large dam ⁽¹⁾ - 5081.50 Medium dam ⁽²⁾ - 2,540.00 Small Dam ⁽³⁾ - 633.50	Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates. Actual and reasonable for expert advice
Lodge dam potential impact category	126.50	Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates
Lodge dam safety assurance programme	126.50	Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates
Lodge annual dam safety compliance certificate	126.50	Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates
Other functions		Refer to section 3.2 Staff charge rates

1. Above \$100,000 value
2. \$20,000 - \$100,000 value
3. \$0 to \$20,000 value

3.5 Annual charges

3.5.1 Minimum annual charge

Minimum loaded with additional fees post monitoring

Fee level	Annual charge \$ excluding GST	Annual charge \$ including GST
MON001	101.74	117.00

3.5.2 Compliance monitoring/ supervision

Staff time will be charged as the actual and reasonable costs based on standard labour charge rates as shown in Section 3.2 and will be invoiced as and when monitoring occurs.

3.5.3 Water takes charge scales

For more information on administration charges, please refer to Section 2.2.7.1(2).

Scale of annual charges for water takes

Charge code	Fee scale based on abstraction amount	Administration charge \$ including GST	Resource user charge \$ including GST	Total annual charge \$ including GST
ADM001	0 – 9 m ³ per day	117.00	0.00	117.00
ADM001 RUC001	10 – 29 m ³ per day	117.00	31.00	148.00
ADM001 RUC002	30 – 69 m ³ per day	117.00	75.00	192.00
ADM001 RUC003	70 – 199 m ³ per day	117.00	216.00	333.00
ADM001 RUC004	200 – 499 m ³ per day	117.00	541.50	658.50
ADM001 RUC005	500 – 999 m ³ per day	117.00	1,084.50	1,201.50
ADM001 RUC006	≥ 1000 m ³ per day	117.00	2,170.50	2,287.50

For the basis of charging, refer to Section 2.2.7 Setting of annual resource consent (monitoring) charges.

3.5.4 Water Use Returns

Annual charges for Water Use returns

Charge code	Annual return method	Total annual charge \$ including GST
WUR001	Paper	81.00
WUR002	Electronic (e.g. Excel)	54.50
WUR003	Telemetered	22.00

Note: Monthly Water Use Returns received via any method will be charged double the amount shown in the table above.

In addition to the above, the following charge will apply for any late returns

	Any Water Use Return received seven or more days late	81.00 (inc. GST)
--	---	------------------

3.5.5 Moorings and Coastal structures (post construction or installation)

Annual charges for moorings and coastal structures are set pursuant the Resource Management Act 1991, the Biosecurity Act 1993, and the Maritime Transport Act 1994.

The Navigation Safety Bylaw fee is set pursuant to the Maritime Transport Act 1994, in conjunction with the Navigation Safety Bylaw for Northland. The Owner⁽¹⁾ of every Maritime Facility⁽²⁾ or Mooring⁽³⁾ in the region shall pay to the council this annual navigation fee. The navigation safety bylaw fee shall be payable on the number of berths available at the maritime facility, whether or not all berths are used. The council's Harbourmaster shall determine the number of berths available at any maritime facility.

These bylaw charges were notified pursuant to the Local Government Act 2002 and were set at a meeting of council on xx xx xx, where the decision was also made to adjust for inflation for the 2022/23 year.

1 "Owner" includes: a) in relation to a vessel, the agent of the owner and also a charterer; or b) in relation to any dock, wharf, quay, slipway or other maritime facility, means the owner, manager, occupier or lessee of the dock, wharf, quay, slipway or other maritime facility.

2 "Maritime facility" means any jetty, jetty berth, wharf, ramp, slipway, boatshed, marine berth, pontoon or, whether private, commercial or a recreational public facility, that is located within the coastal marine area of Northland

3 "Mooring" means any swing or pile mooring whether private, commercial or recreational mooring that is located within the coastal marine area of Northland.

3.5.5.1 Scale of annual charges for Moorings and Marina Berths

Fee level	Description/Criteria	RMA administration fee or mooring licence fee per mooring or berth \$ including GST	Navigation safety bylaw fee per mooring or berth \$ including GST	Marine Biosecurity Charge per mooring or berth \$ including GST ⁽¹⁾	Total fee \$ including GST
MOR001 MOR002 BIO001	Individual swing, pile and jetty moorings with or without resource consents.	117.00	106.00	88.50	311.50
MOR004 MOR002 BIO001	Swing and pile moorings owned by one person or organisation, comprising 10 to 24 moorings (per mooring and berths). Note: No additional charge will be set for those structures which are an integral part of the mooring area, so long as those facilities and activities do not give rise to any significant adverse environmental effects.	100.00	106.00	88.50	294.50
MOR005 MOR006 BIO001	Pile moorings and jetty berths owned by one organisation, comprising 25 berths or more, but no more than 75 berths (per berth). Note: No additional charge will be set for those structures which are an integral part of the mooring area, so long as those facilities and activities do not give rise to any significant adverse environmental effects.	64.50	78.00	88.50	231.00
	Marinas comprising more than 75 berths.		70.50	88.50	159.00

1. Unpaid marine biosecurity charges will incur a 10% penalty 20 working days after the due date stated on the invoice. Please see section 2.6.7 for more

Mooring license amendment fee

Any changes to the mooring license conditions, such as position, size or design of a mooring, or the maximum length of vessel allowed to use the mooring must be approved by the harbourmaster as required by the Navigation Safety Bylaws. The fee relates to the actual work involved in processing the application, including checking the effect on adjacent mooring holders.	223.00 (inc. GST)
The recording of any new mooring in a Mooring Zone	125.00 (inc. GST)
A reinstatement fee following suspension or cancellation of a mooring, to be applied at the harbourmaster's discretion	223.00 (inc. GST)
On-site assessment of moorings Mooring holders who require an on-site assessment or inspection of their mooring, or proposed mooring, by the maritime staff for their own benefit will receive a fee based on the actual officer's time charged, at an hourly rate comprising actual employment costs plus a factor to cover administration costs (as per the staff charge rate see section 3.2).	

Pursuant to the provisions of Navigation Safety Bylaw clause 3(1)(6), should any mooring licence fees or other charges due to the council under the provision of this bylaw remain unpaid for a period of 60 days, then the harbourmaster may remove, or cause to be removed, the mooring and detain the vessel using the mooring, until such fees and charges, including the cost of removing the mooring and storing the vessel, have been fully paid and discharged. Should such debts have not been paid and discharged within a further 60 days, the council has the right to sell the mooring and/or vessel to recover the debt.

3.5.5.2 Scale of annual charges for coastal structures

Fee level	Description/Criteria	RMA administration and supervision charge, or mooring licence fee \$including GST	RMA inspection fee \$ including GST	Navigation safety bylaw fee ⁽¹⁾ \$ including GST	Marine Biosecurity Charge ⁽²⁾ \$ including GST	Total \$ including GST
CST100 STR001 NAV001	Small jetties between 10m ² and 200m ²	169.00	6.50	84.00		259.50
CST100 STR002 NAV002	Large jetties 200m ² or greater	169.00	10.00	168.00		347.00
CST100 STR003	Non-marine related buildings less than 25m ²	169.00	20.50			189.50
CST100 STR004	Non-marine related buildings 25m ² or greater	169.00	26.50			195.50
CST100 STR005 NAV001 BIO001	Marine related buildings less than 25m ²	169.00	20.50	84.00	88.50	362.00
CST100 STR006 NAV002 BIO001	Marine related buildings 25m ² or greater	169.00	26.50	168.00	88.50	452.00
CST100 STR007 NAV001	Boatramps 15m length or 4m width or greater	169.00	10.00	84.00		263.00

Fee level	Description/Criteria	RMA administration and supervision charge, or mooring licence fee \$ including GST	RMA inspection fee \$ including GST	Navigation safety bylaw fee ⁽¹⁾ \$ including GST	Marine Biosecurity Charge ⁽²⁾ \$ including GST	Total \$ including GST
CST100 STR008 NAV002	Grids	169.00	6.50	168.00		343.50
CST100 STR009 NAV003	Wharves less than 300m ²	169.00	41.00	473.00		683.00
CST100 STR010 NAV004	Wharves between 300m ² and 1000m ²	169.00	61.50	2,053.00		2283.50
CST100 STR011 NAV005	Wharves 1000m ² or greater	169.00	82.00	3,632.00		3883.00
CST100 STR012 NAV003	Boat maintenance facilities less than 50 tonnes	169.00	20.50	473.00		662.50
CST100 STR013 NAV004	Boat maintenance facilities between 50 and 500 tonnes	169.00	26.50	2,053.00		2248.50
CST100 STR014 NAV005	Boat maintenance facilities 500 tonnes or greater	169.00	34.00	3,632.00		3835.00

³ Schedules of fees and charges
47

Fee level	Description/Criteria	RMA administration and supervision charge, or mooring licence fee \$including GST	RMA inspection fee \$ including GST	Navigation safety bylaw fee ⁽¹⁾ \$ including GST	Marine Biosecurity Charge ⁽²⁾ \$ including GST	Total \$ including GST
CST100 STR015 NAV002	Fuel facilities	169.00	30.00	168.00		367.00
CST100 STR016	Small miscellaneous structures - non-marine related less than 200m ²	169.00	6.50			175.50
CST100 STR017	Large miscellaneous structures - non-marine related 200m ² or greater	169.00	13.50			182.50
CST100 STR018 NAV001	Small miscellaneous structures - marine related less than 200m ²	169.00	6.50	84.00		259.50
CST100 STR019 NAV002	Large miscellaneous structures - marine related 200m ² or greater	169.00	13.50	168.00		350.50
CST200 STR020 NAV001	Marine farm administration fee Marine farm - per hectare	284.50	31.50	84.00		400.00
	Administration fees and any applicable navigational or biosecurity charges will be applied once per suite of consents Marine farm inspection charges are based on developed area and rounded to nearest 0.5 hectare Biosecurity charges applied only to buildings where the primary purpose is for housing of berthed vessels.					

1. A navigation safety fee will be applied if the structure is primarily used for berthing of vessels, at \$84.00 per berthed vessel
2. Unpaid marine biosecurity charges will incur a 10% penalty 20 working days after the due date stated on the invoice. Please see section 2.6.7 for more.

3.5.5.3 Inspection fees for permitted activity coastal structures

Fee level	Description/Criteria		LGA inspection fee \$ including GST		
STR021	Seawalls		41.00		
STR022	Small jetties less than 10m ²		37.50		
STR023	Small boatramps less than 15m length or 4m width		37.50		

Note: All structures may be subject to additional charges that recover the costs incurred by the council for extra monitoring, such as sampling a discharge. Were the costs of monitoring the structure and discharge exceed the annual charge herein, the council will recover the balance in accordance with Section 36(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

3.5.5.4 Annual charges for ports

Description/Criteria	Marine Biosecurity Charge \$ excluding GST ⁽¹⁾	Total fee \$ including GST
Northport Limited	3,598.70	4,138.50
Golden Bay Cement	3,598.70	4,138.50
Port Nikau Limited	3,598.70	4,138.50
New Zealand Refining Company Ltd	3,598.70	4,138.50

1. Unpaid marine biosecurity charges will incur a 10% penalty 20 working days after the due date stated on the invoice. Please see section 2.6.7 for more

3.5.6 Land use consents for boating-related structures in waters upstream of the coastal marine area (post construction)

Scale of annual charges for land use consents for boating-related structures in waters upstream of the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) with minor environmental effects.

Fee level	Description/criteria	RMA \$ excluding GST	Total fee \$ including GST
MON046	Minor structures and jetties: not more than 10m ² in plan area.	129.13	148.50
MON047	Jetties and other structures: more than 10m ² in plan area.	135.22	155.50

Note:

1. Consents for new boat-related structures or to alter boat-related structures in water-bodies will be subject to an inspection during their construction phase based on staff time and rates set out in section 3.2.
2. Refer to Section 2.2.8 setting of annual resource consent (monitoring) charges of the user fees and charges schedule for bases of charges.

3.6 Inspection and monitoring charges

3.6.1 Permitted activity monitoring/inspections – fees

The fees will be charged on a cost recoverable basis (officer time, sampling and equipment costs). Refer to section 3.2 staff charge rates and section 3.9 miscellaneous management charges.

3.6.2 Permitted activity dairy discharges – fees

The charges are as follows:

		\$ excluding GST
	(i) Inspection and monitoring fee:	
FDE020	Grades full compliance and minor non-compliance	198.00
FDE021	Grades significant non-compliance	297.00

Where there is a need for two officers to attend, the costs of both officers will be recovered.

Administration costs incurred will be charged in addition to the costs of the site visit/inspections, plus the actual and reasonable cost of any specific water quality testing and/or enforcement action required (see section 3.9).

Note: For charges for consented farm dairy effluent discharge consents, refer to section 3.6.3.

3.6.3 Farm dairy effluent inspection charges

Scale of charges for consents for farm dairy effluent discharges (full and minor non-compliance and significant non-compliance).

3.6.3.1 Full and minor non-compliance

Sampling and testing required where indicated.

	Description/criteria	Charge \$ excluding GST	Charge \$ including GST
FDE000	Per inspection – (no sampling or testing)	299.13	344.00
FDE001	Per inspection – (single sample only)	355.65	409.00
FDE002	Per inspection – (two samples)	412.17	474.00
FDE003	Per inspection – (three samples)	468.70	539.00
FDE004	Per inspection – (four samples)	525.22	604.00

	Description/criteria	Charge \$ excluding GST	Charge \$ including GST
FDE005	Per inspection – (five samples)	581.74	669.00
FDE006	Per inspection – (six samples)	638.26	734.00

3.6.3.2 Significant non-compliance

Sampling and testing required where indicated.

	Description/criteria	Charge \$ excluding GST	Charge \$ including GST
FDE010	Per inspection – (no sampling or testing)	400.87	461.00
FDE011	Per inspection – (single sample only)	457.39	526.00
FDE012	Per inspection – (two samples)	513.91	591.00
FDE013	Per inspection – (three samples)	570.43	656.00
FDE014	Per inspection – (four samples)	626.96	721.00
FDE015	Per inspection – (five samples)	683.48	786.00
FDE016	Per inspection – (six samples)	740.00	851.00

3.6.4 Follow-up inspections

	Description/criteria	Charge \$ excluding GST	Charge \$ including GST
	Per inspection – standard follow-up	291.30	335.00
	Per inspection – abatement notice follow-up	311.74	358.50

Where there is a need for two officers to attend, the cost of both officers will be recovered.

Note: For fees charged under the Local Government Act for the inspection of non-consented dairy effluent discharge systems, refer to Section 2.3.1 of the user fees and charges schedule.

3.6.5 Coastal structures (construction or installation phase) – monitoring inspection charges

The fees will be charged on a cost recoverable basis (officer time, sampling and equipment costs). Refer to section 3.2 staff charge rates and section 3.9 miscellaneous management charges.

Note: Refer to Section 2.2.8 setting of annual resources consent (monitoring) of the user fees and charges schedule for the bases of charges.

3.7 Maritime activities

3.7.1 Fees for maritime-related incidents

Staff time will be charged at the minimum charge out rate applicable to the staff members involved. See 3.2 Staff charge rates.

3.7.2 Jet Ski Registration Fees

As resolved and prescribed by the Auckland Council ([information can be found here](#)), which undertakes this function on behalf of the Northland Regional Council under delegated authority.

3.7.3 Pilotage and Shipping Navigation and Safety Services Fees

		\$ GST exclusive
a.	Pilotage	
	Charges for Bay of Islands apply for vessels entering inside the pilotage limits as marked on chart NZ 5125	
	Where GT ⁽¹⁾ is greater than 500 up to 3000	3000.00 ⁽²⁾
	Where GT is greater than 3000 up to 18,000	5000.00
	Where GT is greater than 18,000 up to 100,000	7000.00
	Where GT is greater than 100,000 up to 150,000	9000.00
	Where GT is greater than 150,000	10,000.00
	Additional fees and charges	
	(i) Pilotage in the Bay of Islands - pilotage cancellation ⁽³⁾ and late booking and change booking fee ⁽⁴⁾	
	Less than 1 month of the date of booked pilotage	10% of pilotage charge
	With less than 48 hours notice of the: booked time of pilotage, or notice of booking	20% of pilotage charge
	(ii) Ships to anchor in the Bay of Islands - public holiday surcharge	
	Pilotage and shipping navigation is required on all observed New Zealand public holidays, including Northland Anniversary Day	1947.34 surcharge

	(iii) Where GT is less than 3000 and a Whangarei based pilot is used ⁽²⁾	1000.00 surcharge
	(iv) Pilotage charges based on 1 hour onboard. If delayed e.g. due to waiting for passenger embarkation or other reasons an hourly charge applies	1000.00 per hour
b.	Shipping navigation and safety services fee	
	(i) Navigation and Safety Services Fee per ship visiting the Bay of Islands regardless of which pilotage organisation or company actually services the vessel	
	Where GT is greater than 500 up to 3000	3000.00
	Where GT is greater than 3000 up to 18,000	6000.00
	Where GT is greater than 18,000 up to 100,000	8000.00
	Where GT is greater than 100,000 up to 150,000	9000.00
	Where GT is greater than 150,000	10,000.00
c.	Shipping	
	(i) Navigation and Safety Services Fee per ship visiting the Bay of Islands when the master is exempt from compulsory pilotage	
	Up to 3000 GT	\$1.26/GT
	(ii) Navigation and Safety Services Fee per ship visiting the Poor Knights Area to be avoided under Maritime NZ approval for exemption from applicable Marine Protection Rules.	
	Over 45 metres length overall	\$1.26/GT
	(iii) Navigation and Safety Services Fee per ship greater than 500 GT visiting the Whangaroa Harbour, except when the ship has paid the above fee to visit the Bay of Islands during the same voyage	
	Over 500 GT	\$1.26/GT
	(iv) Navigation and Safety Services Fee per ship greater than 45 metres length overall, or 500 GT, anchoring in Northland waters and not subject to any other Navigation and Safety Services Fee	\$20.50/metre of length overall

³ Schedules of fees and charges
55

1. *Gross tonnage means the gross tonnage of a ship as defined in the Navigation Safety Bylaw for Northland*
2. *A Bay of Islands based pilot will be used in preference. If unavailable a Whangarei based pilot may be available with a surcharge due to external costs*
3. *Pilotage cancellation fees apply when cancellation notice is given, and pilot and crew are not mobilised. In the event that a pilot attends a vessel arrival but the vessel does not remain or anchor, then the services provided will be charged at the full rate (discounted at harbourmasters discretion), and a cancellation fee will not apply*
4. *Late booking fee applies for booking within time, at harbourmaster discretion depending on availability of pilot*

Where the harbourmaster cancels pilotage in the Bay of Islands, no charge will apply.

NOTE: A marine biosecurity charge is also applied to ships between 500 GT and 3000 GT. Please see section 3.8.3.

3.7.4 Harbourmaster's Navigation Safety Services Fee

	\$ GST exclusive
a. North Port Limited	149,538.00
b. For water transport operators not serviced by a port company, at actual time and cost.	
c. Where the actual costs on a labour time and plant recovery basis exceed the annual fee, the council will recover any balance on an actual cost basis.	

3.7.5 Applications for Reserved Area for Special Event (clause 3.13 of the Navigation Safety Bylaw 2012)

	\$ GST exclusive
Special Event Processing Fee	176.24
The council shall recover from the applicant all actual and reasonable costs incurred in arranging for the publication of a public notice. These costs are additional to the above fee. Where the actual costs on a labour time and plant recovery basis exceed the annual fee, the council will recover any balance on an actual cost basis.	

3.7.6 Pilot Exemption Exam Fee

	\$ GST exclusive
Pilot Exemption Exam Fee	454.60

3.7.7 All navigation and other fees specified herein are exclusive of Goods and Services Tax

The fees shall apply for the period 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023 and will continue to apply until superseded by a subsequent bylaw change fixed by resolution and publicly notified or by the review required by section 158 of the Local Government Act 2002.

3.7.8 Standard charges under the Maritime Transport Act 1994 – Marine Tier 1 Oil Transfer Sites

		\$ GST exclusi
<p>Maritime Rule Part 130B requires that the operator of an oil transfer site obtain the approval for a site marine oil spill contingency plan from the director of Maritime New Zealand. The power to approve these plans has been delegated by the director to the Chief Executive Officer (sub-delegated to council employees) of the Northland Regional Council in an Instrument of Delegation pursuant to Section 444(2) of the Maritime Transport Act 1994.</p> <p>A Minimum fee will apply.</p> <p>Section 444(12) of the Maritime Transport Act 1994 allows the council to charge a person a reasonable fee for:</p>		
a.	Approving Tier 1 site marine oil spill contingency plans and any subsequent amendments.	302.77
b.	Renewal of Tier 1 site marine oil spill contingency plan, where staff time is less than one hour.	No charge
c.	Inspecting Tier 1 sites and any subsequent action taken thereafter in respect of preparation of inspection reports or reporting on non-conformance issues.	Charged at hourly rate of attending staff member
<p>A minimum fee is charged and further charges may apply based on officer's actual recorded time charged at an hourly rate comprising actual employment costs plus a factor to cover administration and general operating costs. Should travel be required, additional costs for mileage will be charged the standard rate as approved by the Inland Revenue Department.</p>		

3.8 Biosecurity

3.8.1 Pest control products

All pest control products, including traps, pesticides, pre-feed, bait (including pindone), bait stations, and associated equipment will be sold to Northland landowners at the price they are purchased from the manufacturer by council.

3.8.2 Notice of direction

The time taken in issuing a notice of direction under the Biosecurity Act 1993, will be charged to the owner or occupier at actual recorded time at the relevant hourly staff charge rate as set out in section 3.2 of this schedule. This includes time related to investigations prior to issuing a notice of direction and in subsequent monitoring for compliance with a notice.

3.8.3 Marine Biosecurity Charge for ships

	\$ GST exclusive
Applied for a 12 month period, per ship between 500 GT and 3000 GT, anchoring in Northland waters ⁽¹⁾	\$76.67

1. This charge will not apply to international vessels that are subject to the 'Craft Risk Management Standard: Biofouling on vessels arriving to New Zealand 2014' and that do not move between designated places under the Northland Regional Pest and Marine Pathway Management Plan 2017-2027

3.9 Miscellaneous management charges - plant and equipment charges

The council's Resolution of 8 December 2004, "that pursuant to Section 150(6) of the Local Government Act 2002, council managers be authorised to set or vary labour, plant and equipment hire fees and fees for miscellaneous services provided by the council as necessary from time to time." The council's labour, plant and equipment charges to external parties are as follows:

3.9.1 Field Test Charges

Job Ref. No.	Description/criteria	Per sample \$ excluding GST	Per sample \$ including GST
7369	Conductivity	5.65	6.50
7368	Dissolved oxygen	5.65	6.50
7370	pH	5.65	6.50
7371	Salinity	5.65	6.50
7372	Temperature	1.39	1.60

3.9.2 Labour – general

Labour costs for the council's staff not previously specified in this schedule will be charged at an hourly rate determined from actual employment costs, including overtime rates if applicable, plus a multiplier to cover overheads and any internal costs incurred. When tradesmen are called out, and their service is cancelled, all costs incurred by the council are payable by the hirer, at the above charge-out rates.

3.9.3 Plant

Where any of the council's plant is hired, extra costs including additional labour cost in overtime hours, travelling allowance, transport charges, etc., shall be recovered from the hirer of the plant. Where plant is ordered and its services cancelled, all costs incurred by the council are payable by the hirer.

3.9.4 Water quality monitoring devices

	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
YSI Sondes per day	73.91	85.00
ISCO Automated Sampler per day	62.17	71.50

All labour incurred in the hire of water quality monitoring devices, is additional and charged in accordance with the charge out rates specified in Section 3.2.

3.9.5 Vehicles/quads

Inland Revenue approved mileage rates for annual work-related kilometres travelled	External rate per km \$ excluding GST
First 14,000 kilometres travelled by the vehicle in a year	
Petrol or Diesel	0.79
Petrol Hybrid	0.79
Electric	0.79
Travel over 14,000 kilometres in a year	
Petrol or Diesel	0.27
Petrol Hybrid	0.16
Electric	0.09

Note: The internal rate per kilometre of travel is charged at 0.30 excluding GST

3.9.6 Floating plant – standard rates

(a) Workboat hire (per hour)	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Workboat – "Waikare"	813.04	935.00
Standby – "Waikare"	307.83	354.00

For significant commercial projects, the council will negotiate hire, standby and total costs with contractors and other parties.

(b) Small launch hire (per hour)	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
BOI Patrol Boat – "Karetu"	290.43	334.00
Standby – "Karetu"	116.09	133.50
5 metre – "Mangapai"	173.91	200.00

(b) Small launch hire (per hour)	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Standby - "Mangapai"	116.09	133.50
Whāngārei Work Boat - "Ruawai"	290.43	334.00
Standby - "Ruawai"	150.43	173.00
All labour and transport costs incurred in the hire of vessels, are additional and charged at the appropriate staff charge-out rate, with a minimum of two crew members		

Floating plant rates do not include crew labour charges or any relocation charges.

NB: (Additional rates may apply in overtime hours)

3.9.7 - Lease of council owned moorings

Mooring lease	Per day	Per day \$ including GST	Per week	Per week \$ including GST	Per month	Per month \$ including GST
2 Tonne mooring	7.83	9.00	59.57	68.50	188.70	217.00
4 Tonne mooring	11.74	13.50	79.57	91.50	248.26	285.50

Note: vessels temporarily moored on a council owned mooring as a result of council action (eg, seized, abandoned/adrift vessels) will incur the daily mooring lease charge.

Other plant not specified above

Each request to hire other council plant or equipment is to be referred to the appropriate manager for approval, who shall apply a realistic charge-out rate and notify the finance manager so that an invoice can be raised.

3.9.8 Hire charge – council, committee, training/meeting rooms

Catering is the responsibility of the hirer. Any refreshments provided by the council will be on-charged at cost.

Per day	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Council Room	177.83	204.50
Committee Room	59.57	68.50
Council and Committee Rooms	214.35	246.50
Kaipara Training Room	177.83	204.50

Per day	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Whangaroa Meeting Room	59.57	68.50
Kaipara and Whangaroa Rooms	214.35	246.50
Other meeting rooms	59.57	68.50

3.9.9 Hire charge – council video conference facilities

Hire charge includes a meeting room	\$ excluding GST	\$ including GST
Price per hour	178.26	205.00

Bookings will be subject to the availability of a meeting room and the video conferencing unit. Priority will be given to council business. Video conferencing units are Polycom with 55 inch screens. Connection is IP/Skype for Business only and is not configured for ISDN.

3.9.10 Photocopying

Per page	\$ excluding GST			
	Colour A4	Colour A3	Black A4	Black A3
Applicants/Staff	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Other parties	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10

Note: Double-sided is equivalent to two pages.

Labour costs also to be recovered.

3.9.11 Publication charges for RMA and miscellaneous documents

Plan	\$ including GST
Regional Policy Statement	19.50
Regional Policy Statement Maps	122.00
Regional Coastal Plan	117.00

Plan	\$ including GST
Regional Coastal Plan Maps	106.00
Regional Air Quality Plan	48.50
Regional Water and Soil Plan	119.50
Proposed Regional Plan	22.00
Proposed Regional Plan on memory stick	no charge
Proposed Regional Plan Section 32 Report	87.50
Statutory Acknowledgements	no charge
Regional Land Transport Plan	55.50
Regional Passenger Transport Plan	55.50
On-site Wastewater Disposal from Households and Institutions	24.50
Plans ⁽¹⁾ on memory stick	no charge

1. *Excluding proposed regional plan*

Any council publications not made freely available to ratepayers may be purchased at cost from the council. Contact the council for further details.

User Fees and Charges 2022/23
R4



P 0800 002 004

W nrc.govt.nz

E info@nrc.govt.nz

Northland
REGIONAL COUNCIL 
Te Kaunihera ā rohe o Te Taitokerau