



Order Paper For The Meeting Of The

**Hearing of Submissions on the Review of
Fees & Charges 2017**

**Wednesday 31 May 2017
at Council Chambers, Gorge Road, Queenstown**

Statement of Proposal (March 2017)	1
Building Consent Charges (March 2017)	12
Resource Consent & Engineering Initial Fees & Other Charges (March 2017)	16
Submissions	24

Statement of Proposal

(March 2017)



PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

STATEMENT OF PROPOSAL

March 2017

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1 Section 36 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) enables the Queenstown Lakes District Council (the Council; 'QLDC') to set fees and charges payable by applicants for resource consent, by holders of resource consents, and for other matters set out in section 36 that relate to the Council's administration of its functions under the RMA.
- 2 Sections 219 and 240 of the Building Act enable the Council to set fees and charges in relation to a building consent and for the performance of any other function or service under the Building Act.
- 3 Section 150 of the Local Government Act allows a local authority to prescribe fees or charges payable for a certificate, approval, permit or consent from, or inspection by, the local authority in respect of a matter set out in a bylaw or any other enactment.
- 4 The Council has undertaken a review of the present fees and charges, which were reviewed as part of the 2016/17 Annual Plan. The Council is considering whether the present fees and charges should be amended and replaced with the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Council fees and charges.
- 5 Where the proposal includes a proposed fee increase, consideration has also been given to similar charges from other councils from a comparison point of view. The proposals would lift QLDC's fees to comparable levels with other Councils, noting that a straight comparison with printed fees schedules needs to be treated with some caution.
- 6 This Statement of Proposal has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of sections 83 of the LGA.

2. PROPOSAL

- 7 It is proposed to make a variety of adjustments to the fee schedules **Attachment A** sets out the proposed changes to the both fee schedules.
- 8 Any increase in fees needs to be carefully considered as it does impose additional costs onto the industry. However there is a cost to the Council and ultimately the ratepayers if the fees for the services are not set at an appropriate level to be able to recover the true costs of providing those services, in accordance with the Council's funding policy.
- 9 It is noted that there are separate schedules for:
 - a. Resource Consent and Engineering Fees and Other Charges, and
 - b. Building Consent Initial Fees and Other Charges
- 10 These changes are best summarised into three categories:
 - A. Proposed changes to monitoring fees
 - B. Proposed removal of footpath bonds

C. Proposed amendments to update some fees following a review of actual costs and to make other updates and amendments.

11 These categories are described below:

A Proposed Specific Changes – Monitoring Charges

- 12 A monitoring charge of \$215 has been added to every land use consent category (subdivisions are captured separately and do require the fee to be added). This change is driven by a desire to collect the monitoring charge up front as part of the consent application, rather than the current approach of invoicing once the consent has been issued.
- 13 The change will result in administrative efficiencies in that an invoice will not have to be sent after every consent is issued. Note this means there is now a 'fixed fee' component for every land use consent.
- 14 The funding policy for monitoring is an 80/20 split. 80% of the cost of providing the monitoring service should be user pays, i.e. recovered from consent holders, with 20% being paid for from rates as part of 'public good' monitoring, e.g. monitoring of permitted activities, and monitoring of complaints where no breach is identified.
- 15 Adding \$215 to each land use consent is the equivalent of 1.5 hours of a monitoring officers time, and would cover the cost of monitoring most consents should it be found to be fully complying. i.e. check consent documents and conditions, visit the site, undertake the inspection, and record the results of the inspection.
- 16 Should monitoring identify a breach of consent conditions, additional time will be charged on an 'hourly rate' basis. i.e. the time spent to achieve compliance will be invoiced to the consent holder.
- 17 The \$215 figure was selected as it is half way between the two existing monitoring charges from the current fee schedule, of either \$145 (1 hour) or \$290 (2 hours), which have been set depending on whether earthworks are included in a consent application (because earthworks require two inspections). As the monitoring fee is being collected up front with every land use consent, it is not known whether earthworks form part of the application, so a middle figure between the two existing charges was selected.
- 18 If the \$215 is collected for each of the approximately 900 land use consents that require monitoring each year, this will fund 60% of the cost of delivering the current monitoring service (approximately \$323,000 per annum). The balance of 20% which is to be recovered from user pays will be collected through compliance monitoring.

B Proposed removal of footpath bonds

- 19 QLDC currently receives a street frontage bond with each building consent where the value of the building/improvement exceeds \$5,000. Amounts range from \$100-\$1,000 depending on the nature of the street frontage. It is proposed to remove the footpath bond from the building consent fees schedule.

- 20 The purpose of the bond is to cover the cost of any damage to the street frontage, including road surface, kerb and channel, footpath, and grass berm, as a result of development activity on the site. The incidence of street frontage damage is estimated at one (1) building site per annum over the past few years. When damage does occur, the repair costs usually exceed the value of the bond. The bond holder is required to apply for the bond to be refunded once the work has been completed, but in many cases this has not been done by the consent holder and the bond remains with the Council.
- 21 QLDC has an accounting policy adopted by Council on 16 March 2001 regarding the treatment of expired footpath bonds. Footpath deposits are deemed to have expired if they are not repaid or transferred within 6 years of receipt by the Council. Expired footpath deposits is to be transferred to the roading revenue of the ward where the building activity was undertaken.
- 22 Deloitte, our auditors, have raised their concerns regarding the growing multi-million dollar balance in street frontage bonds in their annual letter to the Audit & Risk Committee for a number of years.
- 23 The administrative burden of managing street frontage bonds is very high for the Building Control department, RM Engineering and the Finance department with the following process in place:
 - A street frontage refund form is required to be completed by the property owner (ratepayer)
 - This form is checked against the list of bonds to confirm the validity of the refund request (Building Control & Finance)
 - An inspection is required to ensure that no damage has occurred (RM Engineering)
 - The current policy requires the street frontage bond to be refunded within 14 days of the street inspection (Finance)
 - The current policy states that the street frontage of the property and neighbouring properties will be inspected at the time of final building consent inspection, and any street frontage damage recorded (RM Engineering).
- 24 It is recommended that street frontage bonds in their current form should be abolished. The proposed fees schedule removes the reference to the bond as a result.
- 25 The existing policy should be replaced by a policy which allows QLDC to recover the costs of repair associated with any damage to street frontage as a result of property development activities as and when they occur. Inspection should be undertaken by BC officers as part of the Code Compliance Certificate (CCC).
- 26 An advertising campaign should be launched to encourage requests for refunds relating to old building consents.

- 27 Any remaining balance > 6 years old at 30 June 2017 should be transferred to roading revenue in accordance with the accounting policy for the treatment of expired footpath bonds.

C Proposed amendments to update some fees following a review of actual costs and to make other updates and amendments

RMA and RM Engineering

- 28 A range of other changes are proposed to the RMA and RM engineering fee schedule.
- 29 An administrative charge of \$90.00 has been added for entering / creating a pre-application request, to cover staff time associated with setting up the pre-app charge code, TRIM and G drive files, and linking the pre-app code to the relevant property.
- 30 The Pre-Application meeting category that required a deposit of \$1500 for complex applications has been removed as it was not used, and instead this category is just treated as a standard 'Pre-application meeting' with one hour free then the balance charged at an hourly rate.
- 31 A new category of 'Cancellation of amalgamation condition' has been added as this was missing from the fee schedule. These are similar to boundary adjustments, so the same initial fee as a boundary adjustment has been used (\$1025).
- 32 Overseas Investment Certificates have been deleted as a category as Councils' are no longer required to provide these.
- 33 A new category of 'Private Plan Changes' has been added, as this was missing from the fee schedule. The initial fee is \$10,000 reflecting the substantial amount of work involved in processing a private plan change. All time spent processing private plan changes is chargeable to the applicant.
- 34 The initial deposit for the preparation of a Development Contribution Notice (DCN) has been removed, and these are to be processed on an hourly rate basis. The collection of the initial fee proved time consuming from an administrative perspective as the DCN was often required urgently (before a Code Compliance Certificate can be issued) and unlike building and resource consents, there is no application or 'lodgement form' or lodgement fee required as such to prepare a DCN.
- 35 The charge for an 'Engineering Connection to Council Services' has increased from \$250 to \$280, to reflect the administrative time component associated with setting up the charge code, TRIM and G drive files, and linking the pre-app code to the relevant property. This now accounts for 1 hour of Planning Support officer time (\$90), currently the administration component of the charge is \$60, resulting in the increase of \$30.
- 36 Charges under the Local Government Act (LGA) have been separated out from charges under the Resource Management Act (RMA), and the reference to section 150 of the LGA has been added to reference the correct provision under

which the charges are set. The existing fee schedules mixes LGA charges in with RMA charges.

- 37 Some fine tuning of the officer hourly rate categories was made to reduce duplication.

Building Consent and Other Charges Fee Schedule

- 38 A range of other adjustments have been made to the building consent and other charges fee schedule, as summarised below:
- 39 With regard to the heating appliance consent fee (charged for checking installation of a wood burner), this has increased from \$295 to \$335 to recover actual costs associated with this service.
- 40 With regard to requests for Minor Plan Variations, this has changed to an hourly rate, rather than a fixed fee of \$110 to reflect the actual cost in range of dealing with minor variations.
- 41 With regard to Certificates of Public Use (CPU), this is a certificate from Council confirming it is safe for people to use parts of premises intended for public use that are affected by building work. This has been increased and a split price structure put in place for Commercial 1 & 2, and Commercial 3, to better reflect the actual costs associated with this service.
- 42 CPU Amendment/Exemptions/Change of use – following a review of the actual costs of providing these services, this has been increased from \$115 to \$190 to better reflect the actual costs of providing the service.
- 43 Swimming Pool fees – the fee structure has changed to reflect the changes to the Building (Pools) Amendment Act 2016. This places a focus on registration and inspection rather than exemptions. The cost structure has been set to recover the predicted costs associated with this service.
- 44 Connection to Council services – duplication and inconsistency between the two Planning and Development fee schedules has been removed. The change now only shows under the RMA and Engineering fee schedule.

3. REASON FOR PROPOSAL

- 45 The primary reason for the proposal is to undertake a variety of adjustments and amendments following the substantive review undertaken as part of the 2016 /17 Annual Plan. In undertaking the review, it became apparent that there are a number of Planning and Development services currently being provided which were missing from the schedules, for example cancellation of amalgamation conditions, and processing of private plan changes. The attached proposed fees schedule includes those services with a proposed fee.
- 46 It was also recognised that invoicing after every resource consent has been granted for the monitoring fee was not efficient for either the Council or the applicant, and the monitoring fee could be collected as part of the initial fee paid when the application is lodged. A corresponding system for refunds of the

monitoring fee when a consent is declined or does not progress will provide for the return of the funds to the applicant.

- 47 With regard to the street frontage bonds, again it was realised the system in place was not efficient or effective and this change It is recommended that street frontage bonds in their current form should be abolished. The proposed fees schedule removes the reference to the bond as a result.
- 48 The existing policy should be replaced by a policy which allows QLDC to recover the costs of repair associated with any damage to street frontage as a result of property development activities as and when they occur. Inspection should be undertaken by building control officers as part of the Code Compliance Certificate (CCC).
- 49 Council has a funding policy that requires the following public-private split for funding the various activities within Planning and Development:

Area	Private	Public
Building Control	80	20
Resource Consents / RM Engineering	80	20

- 50 It is important that the fee schedules are monitored and updated regularly to ensure that the funding policy is being achieved. The private contribution is through the fees and charges the Council charges for the delivery of certain services.
- 51 The costs of providing some building control services have continued to increase as a result of a higher standards being required in order to maintain accreditation, both in processing systems and in the number of inspections required of the physical building work.

4. OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 52 This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for assessing the matter as required by section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002.

53 Option 1 Retain the current fee schedule

Advantages:

- Does not increase costs to the industry
- Retains the fees structure that many are familiar with
- Does not require a separate Special Consultative Procedure as no change is proposed

Disadvantages:

- Does not address the known gaps and deficiencies with the fee schedule.

- A number of services that are currently provided would continue not to be able to be charged for
- Would not assist in meeting the revenue targets or achieve the funding policy for the Planning and Development activities as contained in the draft 2016/17 annual plan and may result in a funding deficit for the year

54 Option 2 Increase Council fees and charges as shown in **Appendix A**

Advantages:

- Reflects the true costs of providing the services.
- Provides for the charging for services currently provided but which are not able to be charged for under the present fees schedule.
- Should be able to achieve the revenue targets and achievement of the funding policy outcomes as contained in the Draft 2016/17 Annual Plan.

Disadvantages:

- Increases costs to the industry in some areas.

55 Option 3 Increase Council fees and charges, but to a lesser extent to that shown in Appendix A

Advantages:

- Reduces the cost increase to the industry and goes some way to reflecting the true costs of providing the services
- Provides for the charging for services currently provided but which are not able to be charged for under the present fees schedule

Disadvantages:

- Increases costs to the industry
- Will not assist in achieving the revenue targets and funding policy outcomes as contained in the Draft 2016/17 Annual Plan
- Likely to result in increased rating being required to fund the activities in the future

56 The Council resolved to consult on Option 2 as its preferred option for addressing the matter.

5. TIMETABLE FOR CONSULTATION

57 The following dates represent the key times in the consultation programme:

- a. The draft Annual Plan goes to Council – 24 March 2017.
- b. Advertisement in Otago Daily Times, Southland Times, Mirror and Wanaka Sun stating that submissions open on 27 March 2017 and close on 28 April 2017.

- c. Submissions heard on between 31 May and 1 June by a subcommittee of Councillors (to be confirmed).
 - d. Council considers outcome of consultation process.
 - e. Final Annual Plan goes to Council for adoption on 29 June 2017.
- 58 The proposed fees and charges come into effect subject to the above.

6. INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS AND OBTAINING COPIES

- 59 Copies of this Statement of Proposal and the proposed fees and charges schedules may be inspected, and a copy obtained, at no cost, from:
- a. either of the Council offices at 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown or the Wanaka Service Centre, 47 Ardmore Street, Wanaka;
 - b. any Council library within the Queenstown Lakes District; or
 - c. the Council website – www.qldc.govt.nz

7. RIGHT TO MAKE A SUBMISSION AND BE HEARD

- 60 Any person or organisation has a right to be heard in regard to this proposal and the Council encourages everyone with an interest to do so.
- 61 The Council would prefer that all parties intending to make a submission:
- a. go to the Queenstown Lakes District Council website: www.qldc.govt.nz or email feesandcharges@qldc.govt.nz
 - b. post their submission to: Planning & Development, Queenstown Lakes District Council, Private Bag 50072, Queenstown 9348.
- 62 Submissions must be received by **28 April 2017**. The Council will then convene a hearing, at which any party who wishes to do so can present their submission in person. The Council will give equal consideration to written and oral submissions.
- 63 The Council will permit parties to make oral submissions (without prior written material) or to make a late submission, only where it considers that special circumstances apply.
- 64 Every submission made to the Council will be acknowledged in accordance with the LGA 2002, will be copied and made available to the public, and every submission will be heard in a meeting that is open to the public.
- 65 Section 82 of the LGA 2002 sets out the obligations of the Council in regard to consultation and the Council will take all steps necessary to meet the spirit and intent of the law.

8. MAKING AN EFFECTIVE SUBMISSION

- 66 Written submissions can take any form (e.g. email, letter). An effective submission references the particular aspect of the proposed initial fees and other charges you wish to submit on, states why the initial fee or charge is supported or not supported and states what change to the proposed initial fee or charge is sought.
- 67 Submissions on matters outside the scope of the proposed initial fees and charges cannot be considered by the Hearings Panel.

Mike Theelen
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Appendix A – Proposed Amendments to the 'Resource Consent and Engineering Fees and Other Charges', and the 'Building Consent Initial Fees and Other Charges' fee schedules

Building Consent Charges

(March 2017)

Building Consent Initial Fees and Other Charges

Charges for processing building consents and for the performance of other building control functions or services have been set by the Queenstown Lakes District Council in accordance with section 219 of the Building Act 2004.

The following schedule of initial fees and charges is effective from 1 July ~~2016~~2017.

- All charges and initial fees are inclusive of GST and are payable on application.
- The initial fees are minimum charges based on the expected reasonable costs relative to the estimate value of work. Further costs will be invoiced on a time basis and are payable before further work is completed.
- The Estimated Value of Building Work is defined in section 10 of the Goods and Services Act 1985, which includes the cost of building materials, labour, design costs, siteworks, but excludes furnishings, carpets and appliances.
- The use of external consultants where required will be charged on a full recovery basis. Disbursements will be charged on a full recovery basis.

HOURLY RATES		\$
Building Control Officer (BCO)		145.00
Administration		90.00

BUILDING CONSENT NO PIM (Initial Fee)				(No PIM) \$
Estimated Value of Building Work (Incl GST)				
-	-	5,000		325.00
5,001	-	20,000		715.00
20,001	-	180,000	Unlined Accessory Building	1,155.00
20,001	-	180,000		1,750.00
180,001	-	500,000	Single Residential	2,850.00
180,001	-	500,000	Commercial	3,100.00
500,001	-	1,000,000	Single Residential	4,350.00
500,001	-	1,000,000	Commercial	4,800.00
Over		1,000,000	*	5,300.00
* for every \$50,000 or part thereof over \$1,000,000 an additional initial fee of \$55.00				

BUILDING CONSENT INCL PIM (Initial Fee)				(Incl PIM) \$
-	-	5,000		365.00
5,001	-	20,000		755.00
20,001	-	180,000	Unlined Accessory Building	1,180.00
20,001	-	180,000		1,775.00
180,001	-	500,000	Single Residential	2,875.00
180,001	-	500,000	Commercial	3,125.00
500,001	-	1,000,000	Single Residential	4,375.00
500,001	-	1,000,000	Commercial	4,825.00
Over		1,000,000	*	5,325.00
* for every \$50,000 or part thereof over \$1,000,000 an additional initial fee of \$55.00				

Building Consent Initial Fees and Other Charges

SPECIFIC BUILDING TYPE (Initial Fee)		\$
Heating Appliances	335.00	295.00
Demolition - Residential		230.00
Demolition - Commercial		335.00
Demolition - Minor		115.00

GOVERNMENT LEVIES (for all building work of value \$20,000 and over)		
Building Research Levy BRANZ	\$1.00 per \$1,000 of building work	
Department of Building and Housing Levy	\$2.01 per \$1,000 of building work	

BUILDING ADMINISTRATION		\$
Minor Plan Variation (No additional processing work and very simple changes)	hourly BCO rate	110.00
Relodged / Split Building Consent Application (no change in value of work)		420.00
PIM only - Residential (cost is later deducted from subsequent full Building Consent Initial Fee)		230.00
PIM only - Commercial (cost is later deducted from subsequent full Building Consent Initial Fee)		390.00
PIM Amendment Assessment		70.00
Certificate of Public Use (sect 363)	250.00 (Com 1&2) 350.00(Com3) 235.00	
Certificate of Public Use amendment (sect 363)	190.00	115.00
Change of Use Consideration (if no building work required)	145.00	80.00
Exempted Building Work consideration	250.00 initial fee plus hourly rate 110.00	
Certificate of Acceptance	Full Building Initial Fee based on value of work	
Relocation assessment and report		235.00
Notice to Fix (where no building consent active)		235.00
Building Across 2 allotments (sect 75)	hourly rate plus legal disbursements	
Natural Hazards (sect 72 certificate)	hourly rate plus legal disbursements	
Alternative Solution Approval	hourly BCO rate	
Pre-Application meetings	hourly BCO rate	
Cancellation of Building Consent	unused initial fee returned	
Application to extend time frame for which Building Consent is valid	hourly rate	7090.00
Monthly BC Issue information report - per annum (or \$35 per month)		360.00

Building Consent Initial Fees and Other Charges

RELATED APPROVALS (Fixed Fee)		\$
Building Certification - Sale of Liquor Act		140.00
Utility Services – admin fee only (new connection Water, Sewer, Stormwater, Crossing) – each		60.00
Utility Services – Approval and inspections of physical works – each		130.00

FOOTPATH BONDS	-	-
Footpath bonds	-	per separate schedule

BUILDING WARRANT OF FITNESS CHARGES (Fixed Fees)		\$
Compliance Schedule (issue and register)		235.00
Amended Compliance Schedule		115.00 145.00
Annual BWO certificate		90.00
BWO audit on-site (approx 3 year intervals)		hourly rate

FENCING OF SWIMMING POOLS (Fixed Fee)		\$
Pool Registration		220.00
Initial Pool Inspection or Application for Exemption		
Pool Inspection		145.00
Annual Inspection for Exemptions granted		130.00
Waiver and Modifications		145.00

NEW ZEALAND FIRE SERVICE - DESIGN REVIEW UNIT (Fixed Fee)		\$
Some plans will require assessment by the NZ Fire Service. This assessment will incur a charge from the Fire Service, based on the time required, which will be passed on to the applicant, and an administration fee of \$60 will also be charged to cover costs incurred by Queenstown Lakes District Council.		65 90.00

LAND INFORMATION MEMORANDUM (Fixed Fee)		\$
Residential - standard 10 working days		200.00
Commercial - Standard 10 working days		305.00
Residential - Speedy 3 working days		315.00
Commercial - Speedy 3 working days		420.00

Resource Consent & Engineering Initial Fees and Other Charges (March 2017)



Resource Consent and Engineering Fees and Other Charges – from 1 July 2017

Charges for processing resource consents, [private plan changes](#) and undertaking related activities have been set by the Queenstown Lakes District Council in accordance with section 36(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 ([RMA](#)) and section 150 of the [Local Government Act](#). Council has fixed a formula for charges as provided by section 36(1). The charges are comprised of an administrative fee of \$225.00 including GST per consent, plus an amount calculated as the reasonable time spent processing the application by the staff involved at the hourly rates scheduled below. The initial fees and charges are set out below.

In accordance with section 36(3) [of the RMA](#), the applicant is also required to pay an additional charge to cover the actual and reasonable cost of items such as printing, advertising, postage, additional reports and commissioners that may be required in the processing of their application.

At the time of lodging an application the applicant is required to pay the applicable initial fee set out below. They will then be invoiced monthly for other amounts payable under the fixed formula and for any additional charges payable under section 36(3).

Applications will not be received and processing will not continue while charges remain unpaid or overdue.

The following schedule of initial fees and charges is effective from 1st July ~~2016~~2017.

- All charges and initial fees are inclusive of GST and are payable on application.
- The initial fees are minimum charges based on the expected reasonable costs relative to the work. Further costs will be invoiced on a time basis and are payable before further work is completed.
- The use of external consultants where required will be charged on a full recovery basis. Disbursements will be charged on a full recovery basis.

HOURLY RATES	\$
Senior Planner	165.00
Planner	145.00
Monitoring / Compliance	145.00
Compliance	145.00
Development Contributions Officer	145.00
Engineering	165.00
Environmental Health	125.00
Administration Support	90.00

INFRASTRUCTURE AND PARKS	\$
Senior Infrastructure Engineer	165.00
Infrastructure Engineer/ Logistics	145.00
Infrastructure Other	145.00
Parks & Reserves Senior Planner / Planning Manager	165.00
Senior Parks & Reserves Planner	165.00



Parks & Reserves Planner / Officer	145.00
Parks & Reserves Officer	145.00



QUEENSTOWN
LAKES DISTRICT
COUNCIL

www.qldc.govt.nz

MONITORING (Initial Fees)		\$
Land Use Monitoring	Compliance inspections	hourly rate 145.00
Earthworks Monitoring		290.00

Formatted Table

ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGE (Fixed fee)		\$
Administrative charge per consent		225.00
Administrative charge per pre-application request		90.00

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS (Initial Fees)		\$
Pre-Application Meeting	including preparation (Minor) - first hour free, after which at the applicable hourly rate.	hourly rate
Pre-Application Meeting	complex applications requiring input from multiple Council departments	1,500.00

Formatted Table

LAND USE CONSENTS (Initial fees, plus a fixed monitoring fee of \$215)		
Breach of site standard other than earthworks (all zones except Town Centre, Business and Industrial)		825.00 1045.00
Breach of site standard other than earthworks, Town Centre, Business and Industrial zones		1,025.00 1240.00
Breach of zone standard (all zones except Town Centre, Business and Industrial)		1,300.00 1,515.00
Breach of zone standard Town Centre, Business and Industrial zones		1,950.00 2,165.00
Comprehensive residential development Low Density Residential zone		5,650.00 5,865.00
Controlled Activity		980.00 1,195.00
Design control minor (e.g. building in Town Centre, Business or Industrial zones or dwelling in any special zone)		980.00 1,195.00
Design control other (e.g. dwelling in Rural Residential zone or dwelling on a platform in Rural Lifestyle zone)		1,280.00 1,495.00
Earthworks minor (e.g. single dwelling or similar)		1,025.00 1,240.00
Earthworks other		3,125.00 3,340.00
Establish residential building platform in Rural General		3,850.00 4,065.00
Extensions or alterations to existing Rural General dwelling		1,300.00 1,515.00
Heritage Orders		1,950.00 2,165.00
Minor alterations to heritage building		515.00 730.00
New Rural General dwelling not on building platform		3,850.00 4,065.00
Non-residential activity in residential or special zones		3,200.00 3,415.00



QUEENSTOWN
LAKES DISTRICT
COUNCIL

www.qldc.govt.nz

Signs	640.00 855.00
Visitor accommodation 1-2 units Low Density Residential zone	1,025.00 1,240.00
Visitor accommodation multi-units Low Density Residential zone	6,400.00 6,615.00
Visitor accommodation 1-2 units High Density Residential zone	640.00 855.00
Visitor accommodation or residential multi-units High Density Residential zone	5,125.00 5340.00
Other applications	1,025.00 1,240.00

SUBDIVISION CONSENTS (Initial fees)		\$
Amalgamation Certificate - fixed fee		102.00
Boundary adjustment		1,025.00
Controlled activity up to two lots		1,300.00
Controlled activity more than two lots		1,950.00
Engineering Review & Acceptances, Inspections and Road Naming		412.50
Other subdivision (e.g. Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle)		3,200.00
Rural General subdivision		3,850.00
Registered Bond / release of Registered Bond (each)		102.00
Right of Way consent	512.00	
Cancellation of amalgamation conditions (s241)	1025.00	
Section 223 Certificate		140.00
Section 224(c) Certificate		250.00
Signing and Sealing other plan or certificate		102.00
Development Contribution Assessment and Estimates – residential	145.00	
Development Contribution Assessment and Estimates – commercial	290.00	

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

MULTIPLE ACTIVITIES

Where an application includes both land-use and subdivision activities or multiple activities, only the higher or highest relevant charge is payable

OTHER APPLICATIONS / PROCESSES (Initial Fees)

Notice of Requirement for a Designation	3,850.00
Alteration of Designation	640.00
Removal of Designation or Heritage Order	195.00



Certificate of Compliance	640.00
Existing Use Certificate	640.00
Extension of lapse period of a resource consent	640.00
Outline Plan Approval Section 176A	640.00
Outline Plan Waivers Section 176A(2)(c)	300.00
<u>Overseas Investment Certificate</u>	<u>640.00</u>
Surrender of consent	195.00
Trees e.g. <i>trimming or removal of protected or heritage tree</i> Residential Arrowtown Historic Management zone (with supporting Arboriculturist's report)	195.00
Variation to resource consent conditions	640.00
<u>Private plan change</u>	<u>10,000.00</u>
<u>Traffic Management Plans</u>	<u>125.00</u>
<u>Licence to Occupy</u>	<u>600.00</u>
<u>Temporary Road Closures</u>	<u>500.00</u>
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT CHARGES (Initial Fees)	
<u>Section 348 Right of Way certificate</u>	<u>512.00</u>
<u>Development Contribution Assessment and Estimates</u>	<u>hourly rate</u>
<u>Traffic Management Plans</u>	<u>125.00</u>
<u>Licence to Occupy</u>	<u>600.00</u>
<u>Temporary Road Closures</u>	<u>500.00</u>
<u>Corridor Access (Road Opening Permits)</u>	<u>< 20 m 185.00</u>
	<u>20-100 m 375.00</u>
	<u>100-500 m 560.00</u>
	<u>500-2000 m 750.00</u>
	<u>> 2000 m 1,875.00</u>
<u>Engineering Connection to Council Services (one connection)</u>	<u>280.00</u>
<u>Engineering Connection to Council Services (for each additional connection)</u>	<u>120.00</u>
OTHER APPLICATIONS / PROCESSES (Fixed Fees)	
<u>Urban Design Panel (prior to lodging resource consent)</u>	<u>250.00</u>
<u>Urban Design Panel (post lodging resource consent)</u>	<u>500.00</u>
<u>Corridor Access (Road Opening Permits)</u>	<u>< 20 m 187.50</u>
	<u>20-100 m 375.00</u>
	<u>100-500 m 562.50</u>
	<u>500-2000 m 750.00</u>
	<u>> 2000 m 1,875.00</u>
<u>Engineering Connection to Council Services (one connection)</u>	<u>250.00</u>
<u>Engineering Connection to Council Services (for each additional connection)</u>	<u>120.00</u>

NOTIFIED AND LIMITED NOTIFIED APPLICATIONS (Initial Fees)

Resource Consent & Engineering Initial Fees & Other Charges – 1 July 2016 — 2017
page 5 of 5

Formatted Table

Formatted: Left

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt


www.qldc.govt.nz
Limited Notification / Service (Section 95B)

The charges fixed by council under section 36(1) include the following extra charge if limited notification of an application is required. The extra limited notification charge is also payable at the time of lodgement. However, where the need for notification / service is not apparent at the time of lodgement, the extra \$1,300 is payable as soon as it becomes apparent that limited notification is required.

1,300.00

Notified Applications (Section 95A or 95C) (Initial Fees)

The charges fixed by council under section 36(1) include the following extra charge if full notification of a resource consent or designation is required. The extra notification charge is payable at the time of lodgement or as soon as it becomes apparent that notification is required and is to proceed. Public notification will not occur before payment is made.

4,500.00



INITIAL CHARGES FOR HEARINGS (Initial Fees)		
Where a hearing is required the applicant is liable to pay the costs for Commissioners attending hearings, undertaking site inspections and writing decisions as well as the cost of attendance of professional and secretarial staff.	Half Day	6,000.00
	Full Day	11,000.00
Prior to a hearing date being confirmed, an estimate of the hearing time (including site visit) will be made and the applicant will be required to pay the appropriate hearing initial fee. If the cost of the hearing and decision writing exceeds the hearing initial fee, the additional amounts will be invoiced. If actual charges are less than the initial fee, a refund will be issued.	Each additional day	9,700.00

Submissions

Sub #	Name	Email Add	Support Oppose	Wishes to speak @ Hearing
1	Bruce McLeod		Oppose	No
2	Remarkables Park Limited (RPL)		Oppose	Yes



Do you support the proposal?

No

The particular parts of the proposal that I support or object to

The use of irregular initial fee amounts for what are only deposits. While I understand these proposed fees will be aligned to average costs or similar logic, the rather exacting values tend to make it harder for the layman to understand that the fee is only a deposit. For example, paying \$412.50 as merely a deposit in the first instance does sound a little daft!

My submission would be met by the Council making the

Normalise the initial fees to nearest \$50 or even \$100.

Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments may be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I understand



Please select the statement that applies to you:

I DO wish to be heard in support of my feedback at a public hearing

I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments may be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I understand

Submission by Remarkables Park Limited (RPL) on QLDC Fees and Charges Review 2017

Monitoring Charge

RPL strongly opposes the proposal to charge a \$215.00 monitoring fee on every resource consent application at the time of application. The concept of requiring payment of a fee for monitoring a consent before processing of the application has even commenced, or before the consent is even granted, is fundamentally flawed.

At the time of lodging a resource consent application, an applicant cannot be assured that his consent will be granted (unless the application is for a controlled activity) and he doesn't know what conditions might be imposed on the consent if it is granted. So (except in the case of an application for a retrospective consent for a controlled activity) no one knows for certain at the time of lodgement that a consent will be implemented. Council staff will know from their own records that a significant number of resource consents that have been granted have never been implemented.

Even where a resource consent is implemented, there can often be a gap of some years between the date of application and the time when work has commenced and there is an activity to monitor. The RMA itself obviously contemplates this and provides a standard lapse period of five years for a resource consent to be implemented.

No justification is provided in the Council's proposal for collecting a monitoring fee in advance. The proposal simply contains the statement: *"This change is driven by a desire to collect the monitoring fee up front as part of the consent application, rather than the current approach of invoicing once the consent has been issued."* (para 17). Later at para 46 under the heading "Reason for the Proposal", we find the statement: *"It was also recognised that invoicing after every consent has been granted for the monitoring fee was not efficient for either the Council or the applicant, and the monitoring fee could be collected as part of the initial fee paid when the application is lodged. A corresponding system for refunds of the monitoring fee when a consent is declined or does not progress will provide for the return of the funds to the applicant"*.

As a regular applicant for resource consents RPL can categorically state that it is not efficient for it as an applicant to pay any fee months or years in advance of the time when the service will be provided. No explanation is given of the supposed inefficiency of sending an invoice after a consent has been granted or following a discussion with the applicant as to the likely date for commencement of implementation. From Council's perspective, a typical, simple resource consent currently takes a couple of calendar months from lodgement to issue. During that time Council is likely to send an applicant a couple of invoices relating to processing charges. We do not believe there is any inefficiency in the generation of such invoices (even though they record

much more detail than a typical monitoring invoice.). We believe that a few keystrokes is all that is required to generate such an invoice.

Ironically the same fee review document proposes to suspend Council's historic practice of charging \$200.00 pavement bonds at the time of building consent applications. The reason for this is that Council's external auditors have raised concerns about the practice and the "growing multi million dollar balance (of) street frontage bonds" that have never been returned to those who paid them. Does Council not see that, with its advance monitoring fee collection proposal, it is at risk of reinstating, a comparable practice to the footpath bond fee it has just been told to discontinue? Holding \$215.00 monitoring fees for five years or more until a consent has lapsed and the applicant may or may not have remembered to claim it back has got a certain ring to it.

While RPL's principal concern is with the proposed timing of collection of the monitoring fee, it also needs to be said that the proposed fee of \$215.00 represents a huge 48% increase on the current monitoring fee for a simple consent. If Council believes there is a need to increase a fee by 48% it should state clearly that that is what it intends and it should also provide some justification for that level of increase. As noted below, that justification must be based solely on recovering Council's reasonable costs.

Revised Resource Consent Fee Schedule

RPL's main concern with this part of the proposal is not that there are increases to the initial fees for land use consents listed at pages 3 and 4 of the schedule, but that no justification has been provided for these specific increases other than that: *"it is important that the fee schedules are monitored and updated regularly to ensure that the funding policy is being achieved"*. The only other comment that possibly attempts to justify the increases is at para 5 in the introduction and states: *"Where the proposal includes a proposed fee increase, consideration has also been given to similar charges from other councils from a comparison point of view. The proposals would lift QLDC's fees to comparable levels with other Councils, noting that a straight comparison with printed fees schedules needs to be treated with some caution"*.

The proposed price increases are not insignificant. For the most simple category of resource consent application the proposed initial fee is a 27% increase on the current charge (which we understand was set last year). One other example (where we might have expected the fee to have been kept low) is the initial fee for "Minor alterations to heritage building", where the proposed increase is 42%.

RPL's concern is that the RMA sets out in Section 36 the criteria that a council shall have regard to when fixing consent charges. Section 36(4) states;

"When fixing charges referred to in this section, a local authority shall have regard to the following criteria:

(a) the sole purpose of a charge is to recover the reasonable costs incurred by the local authority in respect of the activity to which the charge relates.”

The criterion is simple and clear. It does not authorise a Council to set resource consent charges to ensure that its funding policy is being achieved. Neither does it authorise a Council to set its charges by reference to the charges that other councils impose. Other councils' charges may well provide an interesting comparison but the task imposed on QLDC when setting charges is to examine the costs that it incurs in providing the activity (so it knows what to recover) and to also ensure that the costs then charged to applicants are reasonable.

RPL submits that:

- Council should completely abandon the proposal to require every applicant to pay a monitoring fee at the time that an application is lodged for a resource consent.
- Council should initiate a practice of sending resource consent monitoring invoices to applicants after a consent has been issued and after contact has been made with the
-
- T applicant to ascertain when the consent is likely to be implemented.
- Council should also defer changing the land use consent charges at pages 3 and 4 of the Resource Consent Fees Schedule until it has followed the process mandated by s36(4) of the RMA.

RPL does wish to be heard in support of this submission