

**Notes from a Public Meeting of the Himatangi Beach Community
held in the Himatangi Beach Community Hall on Wednesday, 16 October 2019
at 7.30 pm**

Present: Marty O'Fee (Chair), Debbie Edwards, Denise Bush, June Harris, Jan Lee, Judy Douglas, Brian Pinker, John Hodder, Richard Marshall, Jason Kennerley, Reneé van de Weert, Rene van de Weert, Sylvia Kavanagh, Judy Howatson, Marie Wilton, Mike Vincent, Alec McKay and Chris Rosvall.

In attendance from Council:

Mayor Elect Helen Worboys
Councillor Elect Andrew Quarrie
Councillor Elect Phil Marsh
Hamish Waugh – General Manager – Infrastructure
Mathew Bayliss – Community Facilities Manager
Janine Hawthorn – Community Development Adviser (Note Taker).

Welcome: Marty O'Fee opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He noted that the purpose of tonight's meeting was for Council's General Manager – Infrastructure to answer questions which had been raised by the community on various matters.

Sewerage:

Questions – Why have the wastewater annual charges increased so much? Why do residents sharing a pump station pay the same rates as properties who have their own pump? Why is the cost of joining the scheme so high in comparison with other wastewater schemes in the district?

The following points were noted in response to the above questions as well as questions raised by attendees:

- Council made a decision some time ago to harmonise the operational cost for wastewater across the district to spread costs across all users of the service no matter where the user lived.
- Without harmonisation the current operational charge for Himatangi Beach would be \$1,800.
- Increase to \$720 is largely due to the investment that has occurred at the Feilding Wastewater Treatment Plant.
- Feilding Wastewater Scheme users are currently subsidising the operational costs for other schemes.
- Capital contribution charge is buying users the right to connect to the scheme and is calculated by dividing the capital cost of the scheme by the number of potential connections. This equates to \$26,157 for Himatangi Beach.

- The capital contribution charge is based on a separate unit of demand connecting to the scheme regardless of whether a pump station is shared by a neighbouring property or not.
- If an additional toilet in a dwelling was determined to be an additional unit of demand then the property owner would incur an additional capital contribution charge.
- The decision to share pump stations was in order to keep the initial scheme's installation costs down to under \$10,000 per connection.
- Noted that there had been no communication from Council as to why the operational charges were continuing to increase each year. Since installation of the scheme the costs had increased by almost 100%.
- The district's wastewater centralisation project will result in six separate schemes being centralised into one which will see the operational costs coming down.
- The projections for operational costs in the future do not indicate that these costs will be any higher than what they are currently. If anything, they should come down unless Central Government imposes changes to the operation of wastewater schemes.
- In regards to developer contributions, it was noted that at the time of Council receiving a subdivision proposal the Regulatory Staff would meet with the developer to look at the needs, the costs and how these will be paid. These costs would be factored into the development contribution costs which would be charged directly to the developer.
- There is no profit margin to Council in the cost of connection to the scheme.

Action:

Council to take on board the comments in relation to the lack of communication on explaining the reasons for the increases in charges.

Flooding Issues:

Question – what is happening to mitigate flooding issues in the village in particular TeKiri/Hunia Terrace, Rangitane/Kopotara Streets and the corner of Himatangi Street/Hunia Terrace?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- Council introduced a new stormwater targeted rate which is harmonised across the district.
- Sitting behind this targeted rate is a works programme with each village having its own plan. The three areas of concern raised by the community are listed in the work programme for Himatangi Beach. This work is programmed to be undertaken in the current financial year but this will

depend on the resource consent process to discharge stormwater into the stream.

- A longer term solution was currently being worked on in relation to flooding issues in Hunia Terrace as the current system is not sustainable.

Rubbish:

The following points were noted in response to questions raised by attendees:

- It was confirmed that the additional skip bins placed at the beach will continue to be put in place and emptied over the holiday period.
- A request for doggy do bins to be installed in the reserve.

Actions:

Council to look further into the frequency for emptying rubbish bins particularly outside the dairy.

Council to erect doggy do bins in the reserve.

Street Lighting:

The following points were noted in response to questions raised by attendees:

- There had been a request from a resident for a street light to be installed outside the picnic area by the store. It was confirmed that there was no budget for additional street lighting.
- Additional street lighting would need to come through as a request to Council's Annual Plan or 10 Year Plan from the community as a whole rather than from an individual.

Water Quality:

Question – what are the options to improve the water quality?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- Council is uncertain of how wide the water quality issue is as to date it had only heard from residents from Sandown. A number of residents at the meeting confirmed that the water quality was a village wide issue which ranged from smell of chlorine to the residue left by water.
- Smell of chlorine is due to the water that is being drawn from the bore being high in ammonia which is variable. The water operators are currently using less chlorine than what was used three months ago which they thought had fixed the issue with smell.
- The water had been tested. It was confirmed that it contains silica and although it is safe to drink, it does create a visual problem particularly when using the water to wash cars and houses.

- An estimate had been done on what it would cost to strip silica from the water supply which would cost in the order of \$2m. This has not been budgeted for.
- Confirmed that Council has installed a backup generator to resolve intermittent power issues.

Actions:

- 1. Residents to use tank water to wash cars and houses.**
- 2. Council would need to hear from the community as a whole rather than from individuals if it was to proceed to strip silica from the water supply.**

Wooden Barriers:

The following points were noted in response to questions raised by attendees:

- It had been reported to Council that the wooden barriers around the village needed upgrading.
- It was confirmed that most of the barriers were there as a safety issue to stop vehicles from driving around the speed humps. The barriers were part of an overall plan for ensuring a consistent look when entering the village.

Action:

Council to undertake a stock take of the barriers in the village to ensure consistency and to do immediate remedial maintenance on the safety barriers that are needing to be replaced or repaired.

Recycling Centre:

Question – is it possible to move the glass recycling bins back as there is a health and safety issue with broken glass?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- The glass bins could not be moved back as the number of reciprocals currently at the site is more than what the site was designed to accommodate.
- Residents had looked at alternative sites to relocate the recycling centre with three sites identified.
- A resident had volunteered to fill the role of caretaker for the recycling centre which would involve regular sweeping up of the broken glass.

Actions:

- 1. Until an alternative site can be agreed to by the community as a whole the recycling centre would stay at its current site.**

2. Council to ensure that the resident was provided the equipment that is needed to fulfil the recycling centre caretaker's role.

Green Waste:

Question – is it possible to allow for green waste to be deposited at the recycling centre?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- Noted that the current site was too small to allow for this service to be provided. If a bigger site was able to be found then this would allow for a green waste service to be brought in.
- Any new site would need to be agreed to by the community and a resource consent obtained before the recycling centre can be relocated and a green waste service provided.

Fire Issues:

Question – is it possible to install a fire hydrant either close to the access way to the Bowling Club and Community Patrol garage or half way down the driveway if the access way cannot be widened?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- The most cost effective solution would be to install a fire hydrant.

Actions:

- 1. Council to organise installation of a fire hydrant.**
- 2. Council's reticulation team to work closely with the Fire Brigade to ensure regular testing of all fire hydrants in the village occurs.**

Roading Issues:

Question – Barling Street is too narrow for the amount of cars now using it from Sandown. What plans do Council have for improving road access with the proposed 45 new houses in Sandown's subdivision?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- Council currently has no plans to widen Barling Street. A traffic count of Barling Street does not point to there being a safety issue.
- Council has a limited budget. Unless there is a push from ratepayers that widening streets in villages is where ratepayers want money to be spent, then it will not happen.
- Council is unable to go back retrospectively to the developer for the original subdivision, which it was noted had been lodged some years prior.

Action:

Council to move further back from the road the signpost located on the corner of Ngatiawa Street and Barling Street.

No Parking Monitoring:

Question – who is responsible for monitoring parking that occurs in no parking areas on the beach?

The following points were noted in response to the above question as well as questions raised by attendees:

- Council does not have parking wardens. If a vehicle is blocking access then this should be reported to the Police.
- Noted that contractors are currently dumping the sand out in the front. One wind gust sees it all blown backwards which doesn't help with access.
- Dunes protection project has commenced starting in the area where the blowouts have occurred.
- A request from a resident for the area in the first inlet heading north to be rebuilt up with drift wood to protect the site which is where two whales are buried. It was noted that this may possibly require a resource consent.

Actions:

- 1. Council to follow up with its contractors on where they should be dumping the sand.**
- 2. Council to look further into what could be done to protect the site where the two whales are buried.**

Meeting Closure:

There were no further questions from the floor.

The Chairman thanked everyone for coming and closed the meeting at 9.06 pm.