



MINUTES

SUBJECT	Minutes of the Lower Wairarapa Valley Development Scheme Hearing Committee considering the Proposed Rating Classification
ON	Friday, 14 December 2007
WHERE	Council Chambers, South Wairarapa District Council
TIME	9.00am
FILE	WO/02/01/26
PRESENT	Committee: Councillor Ian Buchanan (Chair), Councillor Rex Kirton, and Mark Lovett (Chair of the LWVDS Review Committee) David Bulman (Scheme Classifier), Cr Keith Sexton (SWDC part of hearing), Tim Watson, Ranjan Cyril, Mike Longworth, Ian Gunn.

The Hearing commenced at 09.00am with a presentation by Dianne and Ian Cresswell.

Councillor Buchanan from the chair welcomed the Cresswells (as he did all the submitters) reminding them that this was their opportunity to make a presentation to the Hearing Committee. The Hearings Committee has read all the submissions. This was not a forum for a debate, rather that the Hearing Committee was here to listen to the submissions with an open mind and to make recommendations on a new rating classification to the Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Submission - D&I Cresswell

Ian Cresswell opposed the dwelling charge proposed for residents within the Martinborough township. He understood how land beside the river system gained benefit but had great difficulty accepting the dwelling charge within the Martinborough township. He asked how do the residents of Martinborough receive a benefit? He believed the charge to be incorrect and the arguments put forwarded not plausible. He believed the rates should come from properties such as his son Charles's, Huangaroa.

Later in the Hearing Ian made some further comments where he disputed that the LWVDS had stimulated business in Martinborough. He believed the grape industry had been more beneficial. Ian said he represented a number of residents from within the Martinborough community.

Dianne Cresswell believed that there were a lot of poor and elderly residents within the Martinborough community who would not be able to afford the cost of the dwelling charge.

Submission - Papakowhai Trust

Matt Wall outlined how the Trust had constructed a major stopbank across the property pre the scheme. He believed that the proposed classification took no account of this fact. The Trust's

stopbank had been ignored. Various layers from the classification were shown on the overhead projector which showed the proposed schemes classification encroaching into the Trust's land behind the stopbank. Matt urged the committee to consider this issue as this land did not receive a benefit from the scheme.

Councillor Buchanan indicated that the committee would look closer at this issue.

Submission - Caldwell Trust

Jim Hedley read a prepared submission. Jim's first point was that he was concerned with the make-up of the committee. Two members had been intimately involved in the development of the proposed new rating classification for the LWVDS. Also there had been no representatives from the Pahautea-Pukio area until the review had been under way some time. He also was unhappy that a request to Ian Gunn for a copy of all the submissions had not occurred. Ian Gunn apologised for the oversight and presented Jim with a copy of the staff's response to all the submissions at the end of his presentation.

He believed the only true benefit of the scheme was to consider the areas that flood and then how long it took for the floodwaters to drain away. He had been informed that there was no reliable information on the drainage available so an approximate depth of flood waters had been used. He is also concerned that floodway land is not treated differently. The floodway has limitations on its use compared to the land which has ended up from the development of the scheme becoming flood-free, eg. Tim Wall's land on the opposite side of the river to him. Some areas within the Pukio Basin had previously remained flooded for periods of up to 3 weeks following flood events.

Jim is also concerned that land which pre scheme was flood-free and continues to be flood-free now has to pay a charge, eg Hedleys Island or the Racecourse. This area he believes has no benefit from the scheme. In terms of his land the protection layer was a minor risk to him. As regards the erosion layer he believed that the areas defined bore no relationship to what has actually occurred since the scheme has been built. He sited that there were areas on Wall's property where the stopbank had been moved back at least twice compared to his bank edge which had not moved back an inch over time yet the buffer zone on Wall's property did not reflect this. He believed the construction of the scheme may have actually stimulated erosion on the Wall's property. The levying of the \$35 dwelling charge in the Pahautea-Pukio area was untenable as these areas are now cut-off by the floodway. Pre-scheme there was access until very large floods occurred. A reduction has been given to the Ngawi-Cape Palliser residents and he believed a similar reduction was appropriate for this area. The dwelling charge could be put on the regional ratepayer as they receive a benefit. Jim did concede that he believed a charge on the basis of access was tenable for areas such as Martinborough. He did not accept the benefits attributed to the LWVDS on social and economic grounds. Many of these benefits were due to actions of local farmers.

When asked by Councillor Rex Kirton what would be a fair charge Jim Hedley responded by saying no charge for the spillway area, possibly half the erosion charge and some recognition of the depth layer. Councillor Buchanan thanked Jim for his submission.

Submission - Waikore Farm

Honor and Doug Clarke read their written submission. They made the point that they had never been in the scheme up to now, that they received no direct benefits and so did not believe they should be rated. They did accept if there was a dwelling charge on all properties then they would pay. The committee responded by saying they would carefully consider their concerns.

Submission - Mrs Pamela Cole

Was unable to attend. The Hearing Committee confirmed they had read the original submission.

Submission - Jack Luttrell

David Bulman read out the submission which opposed the dwelling charge.

Submission - John Barton

John indicated that his concerns related to the ongoing lack of drainage down the Whakawiriwiri Drain. Despite two attempts by Council this had not been fixed. This had been disadvantageous to his property since 1979/80. He wants to see this issue addressed. He stated he had requested a visit from staff and this had not occurred, that there be a rate remission for wetlands of a certain size and this had not occurred.

He believed that the dwelling charge was untenable. If there were benefits to the district region and the nation then they should pay. He did not believe there was any direct benefit to households. In his rates bill he was having to pay for transport, the stadium and a regional growth strategy. The rural area was the growth engine of the region so the region should pay the dwelling charge. He has 5 houses some of which were redundant or there were problems with renting. It was immoral to take money off pensioners because the scheme needed more money. The scheme had not increased access in his area and the Hikinui road becomes blocked off usually when the floodway operates. There had been no increase in access he believed since 1960. The area still was blocked off at Oporua Spillway, Jenkins Dip and Hikinui Road.

The committee thanked Mr Barton for his submission

The open section of the meeting closed at 11.25am

General Discussion

The Hearings Committee noted that it had received a complete set of the written submissions and a set of proposed recommendations from staff for each submission. The Hearings Committee took each written submission as read.

The Hearings Committee proceeded to have a wide ranging discussion on the dwelling charge. This included discussion on whether the scheme extent layer and the dwelling charge covered similar indirect benefits. What were the indirect benefits for the Battersea area? How many dwellings were located outside of the core area? Tim Wall believed the order of \$16k was

collected from dwellings within the core area. The committee were not convinced of the social and economic indirect benefits of the scheme. The access argument was easier to understand. If the rate was built around access how should the Pahautea-Pukio area be treated?

Cr Rex Kirton was concerned about the accuracy of the dwelling charge information. It was explained that explicit information had been forwarded to all land owners indicating the number of dwellings. Many had responded to staff and corrections made to the database.

The committee asked staff to come back with:

1. a clear description of the scheme extent and dwelling charge to show it was not a double charge
2. to remove the dwelling charges from the core
3. remove the dwelling charge altogether
4. remove the scheme extent layer
5. calculate the scheme extent layer using 5 points
6. consider a universal dwelling charge of \$17.50
7. Barton property to check the neighbours in the vicinity and exclude the wetlands, consider a reduced charge for drainage along the Whakawiriwiri Drain.
8. Caldwell Trust clear concise explanation
9. Papakowhai Trust clear explanation of the benefits accruing to the area behind the pre-scheme stopbank



MINUTES

SUBJECT Minutes of the Lower Wairarapa Valley Development Scheme Hearing Committee considering the Proposed Rating Classification

ON Tuesday, 4 March 2008

WHERE Greytown Working Mens Club

TIME 10.15am

FILE WO/02/01/26

PRESENT David Bulman (Scheme Classifier), Gary Williams (River Management Consultant – arrived late due to a back problem), Ranjan Cyril (Scheme Manager), Mike Longworth, Tim Watson, Ian Gunn (GWRC)

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th December were taken as a true and accurate record.

Moved Ian Buchanan/seconded Mark Lovett

There were no matters arising as the issues highlighted in the minutes would be discussed in the meeting.

2. Benefits definition

Staff have worked to clarify the definitions. The original definitions were incorrect. The following definitions were agreed:

- Direct Benefits. Two direct benefits have been identified;
 1. Those that have increased the productivity of the land ie, reduced flooding, erosion, course change, improved drainage, the deposition of the dredge tailings and improvements to the scheme etc. These relate to the land.
 2. Those that directly benefit infrastructure, primarily SWDC's infrastructure, including roads, sewage and water supply, built on the directly benefiting land. The original intention was to charge this directly to SWDC, they did not agree to paying a charge. As a consequence the dwelling charge was developed to cover the fact that the roading network etc is better protected as a direct consequence of the schemes' works. Two charges have been developed \$17.50 and \$35 plus GST dependant on location.
- Community area of benefits which are indirect benefits from the public works. The public works of the scheme have enabled the general community to obtain additional opportunities for both the directly benefiting land and the land at the

fringe of the directly affected area eg Western Lake road, the area upstream of State Highway 2, Battersea and on the eastern side of the scheme the land to the west of the Martinborough – Lake Ferry road. The community as a consequence is more prosperous. The indirect benefits cover the general social benefits arising from the scheme in general. It covers the advantages from higher levels of social activities to everyone, like retained or improved general services, like schooling, trade services, local transport firms. At the same time the lower residual risks mean there is a lower likelihood (less frequency) of disruption to the general social activities of the area. The boundary has been defined by the Scheme Classifier as the community of interest bounded by the 80 metres above sea level contour in some areas and property/road boundaries in other areas.

Note that the factors used to develop the benefits and the location of boundaries have resulted from consultation with the review committee, scheme ratepayers and South Wairarapa District Council. at both public and individual meetings. The rating classification is a distribution of funds based on a benefits classification. The total dollars required is determined from the works programme required to maintain and upgrade the schemes assets.

3. Community area of benefits.

In the proposed classification this was called the scheme extent layer. The scheme extent layer was described as a direct benefit and was used in the calculation of the direct benefits. This is incorrect. With the adoption of the above benefits definitions the scheme extent layer is now considered an indirect benefit layer. As a consequence everybody within the community area of benefit now pays the same charge per hectare. The points allocation to the “community benefit layer” have been reduced from 10 to 6 points. The community of benefit area has been defined by the Scheme Classifier as the community falling within the 80 metres above sea level contour to the west of the scheme and upstream of Martinborough, and, property/road boundaries between the Ruamahanga River and Featherston and west of the Martinborough-Lake Ferry road. There was considerable discussion with the committee on the designation of the boundary for the community area of benefit. David Bulman has defined the area on the area he considers to be the community of benefit. Also the area has been discussed with the review committee, public and in individual meetings.

4. Modifications to the proposed rating classification.

- The dwelling charge has been adjusted where access has been restricted due to the operation of the floodways. The charge has been reduced from \$35 to \$17.50 excl GST.
- A ponding factor varying from negative 20 to negative 40 points has been added to the Whakawiriwiri drain. Land owners downstream of Georges road have expressed their displeasure at the use of the drain to carry floodwaters from Backwater road following the operation of the Tawaha Floodway. The hydraulic model showing no stopbanks clearly shows that pre the construction of the scheme stopbanks that floodwaters exited the Ruamahanga river and reached the Whakawiriwiri drain at the following locations;

1. At the end of Georges road. During a flood floodwaters would backflow up the drain towards Moiki.
2. At Moiki.
3. From the Jenkins dip area
4. At Bartons Lagoon.

Thus there were a number of waves of flood water down the drain and the complete drainage of a property like Barton's took considerable time. The flows from Moiki and Jenkins dip often joined together.

With stopbanks flows from Bartons Lagoon cease. Floodwaters are held at the end of Georges road until the flood peak has passed. Flooding at Hedleys occurs first from Hikinui sill flows rather than from upstream in the Whakawirirwiri drain.

5. Site visit to Papakowhai Trust and response to their submission.

Ranjan visited the site with Matt Wall the owner. Ranjan confirmed that in terms of drainage the land receives a partial benefit so the allocation of the lowest drainage points is appropriate. The site visit confirmed that the Papakowhai Trust land does receive basic protection from the LWVDS regardless of the higher standard of protection they constructed prior to the development of the LWVDS scheme. The land is influenced by the Tauherenikau (not considered in the original classification) and Ruamahanga rivers and Lake Wairarapa.

An updated analysis of the Papakowhai Trust situation was considered by the committee and accepted. The recommendation is to not change the classification.

6. Jim Hedley submission.

The following points were agreed by the committee;

- The effect of the floodway has now been incorporated in the scheme with a differentiation at the upper end of the floodway in the vicinity of Hikinui sill.
- The scheme extent layer has changed from a direct benefit to an indirect benefit layer called the community area of benefit.
- A ponding factor has been applied to the Whakawirirwiri drain even though the drain has always received flood waters from the Ruamahanga River from a number of locations.
- The lack of erosion on his property has not negated the requirement to undertake work in the vicinity of the Hikinui sill bend.
- The dwelling charge has been reduced to \$17.50 to recognise the effect of the floodway on access.

7. John Barton submission.

The following points were agreed;

- Floodwaters down the Whakawiriwiri drain have been reduced by the LWVDS with a consequent improvement to the drainage of his land. This is clearly shown on the hydraulic model which has been created based on LIDAR surveys.
- David Bulman has visited the Barton property during the development of the proposed classification
- The rates remission as suggested by Barton is incorporated in the proposed rating classification.
- The dwelling charge is now considered a direct benefit to cover the benefit to the roading infrastructure. One dilapidated dwelling has been removed from the rates.
- Those dwellings affected by the operation of floodways now pay the reduced dwelling charge of \$17.50.
- The council has consulted widely with the community on the proposed rating classification holding public meetings, fielding individual enquires such as his, and forwarding newsletters and the proposed rating schedule to all those affected.

8. Waikore Farm submission.

The following points were agreed;

- That the farm does fall within the community area of benefit so it will incur rates on the basis of the dwelling charge and the community area of benefit charge.

The rates will decrease as a result of the reduced points allocated to the community of benefit from \$217.92 to \$147.82.

9. Submissions related to the dwelling charges – I&D Cresswell, LM McCarthy, MG McGavin, R&R Sparks, G O’Keefe, GV Luttrell.

Agreed no change to the proposed recommendation as this charge relates primarily to the roading infrastructure administered by South Wairarapa District Council which receives a direct benefit from the scheme’s works.

10. Submissions related to the dwelling charge in the vicinity of the floodways – C Cross, K Simmonds, R Glencarry, J McCosh, H&D Clarke, J Hobbs, C Cross, P Ashby, S Crowley.

Agreed to reduce the dwelling charge from \$35 to \$17.10 to recognise the effect of the floodways on access.

11. JDW Luttrell submission

Submitted against both the dwelling charge and the scheme extent layer.

Agreed this property receives the direct benefits and falls within the community area of benefit. The rates will reduce from \$108.29 to \$92.97 due to the reduced charge on the community area of benefit.

12. MK Kruetefeldt submission

Submitter believes that the charge is excessive.

Agreed this property receives the direct benefits and fall within the community area of benefit. The rates will fall from the existing rate of \$469.34 to \$234.74.

Ian Buchanan moved seconded by Rex Kirton that the proposed new rating classification with the above amendments be recommended to the full Wellington regional council. This was adopted unanimously.

Ian Buchanan thanked the staff for their input into a complex matter. He was pleased to see how the suggested new rating classification had been received by the ratepayers.

The meeting closed at 12.20pm.