

## Statement form



You can use this statement form to have your say on Northland's Draft Long Term Plan and/or the Draft Regional Land Transport Programme.

### Presenter details (please print clearly)

First name: Warren and Patricia	Surname: Slater	Mr <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mrs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ms <input type="checkbox"/>
Organisation (if applicable):				
Postal address: 'Kauri View' Riding Downs Way				
R.D.9 Whangarei			Post code: 0179	
Email: w.d.slater@xtra.co.nz				
After hours phone: 09 4594992		Business phone: N/A 0274 948955		

### Write your comments in the space provided and forward your statement to:

Have your say

Northland Regional Council

Freepost 139690

Private Bag 9021, Whāngārei Mail Centre

Whāngārei 0148

Online: via [www.nrc.govt.nz/haveyoursay](http://www.nrc.govt.nz/haveyoursay)

Fax: 09 438 0012

e-mail: [mailroom@nrc.govt.nz](mailto:mailroom@nrc.govt.nz)

### Statements should reach the council by 3.00pm, Thursday 19 April 2012

Statements received after 3.00pm are considered "late statements" and are considered at the council's discretion.

<b>I want to have my say on:</b> <i>(please tick applicable option/s)</i>				
Northland's Draft Long Term Plan only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Draft Regional Land Transport Programme only	<input type="checkbox"/>	Both
<b>Your statement</b>				
<b><u>Investing in Northland</u></b>				
I support/oppose: Reducing rates subsidies.				
Because:				
We agree with your preferred option of a 10 year transition being \$8.90 as this recognizes the hardship of much of our community in these financial times.				
<b><u>Rates subsidies – Average annual rates increase from redirection of investment income</u></b>				
We believe you should stick to what you 'should' be doing and do it well. We have seen some council's get into so called investments that have turned into liabilities. E.g. large number of un-tenanted and empty properties creating losses in their investment portfolios.				

There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.

<b>Your statement</b> <i>(continued)</i>
<p>I support/oppose: How should we use our economic development funds?</p>
<p>Because:</p> <p>On developing that, which enables progression in particular, our Port and Rail link. This could well be Northlands saving for the future.</p>
<p>I support/oppose: Economic Development -do we need a new organization?</p>
<p>Because:</p> <p>We need a group that can work with government closely to ensure such projects such as the mussel spat taken to Marlborough to grow in/on land tanks are prevented from happening again. A group that can influence Governments support of our area. We questioned Mr Heatley as to why this would happen with no real satisfactory answer.</p> <p>We have since learnt Whangarei was a safe seat, while Marlborough was marginal.</p> <p>Was this a political move? So much for the loyalty to Northland by the elected local MP.</p> <p>Mr Heatley was Fisheries Minister at this stage. How does this happen to our district when we are in much greater need of the economic group than Marlborough.</p> <p>If the minister was of little influence perhaps we do need stronger, more focused lobbying.</p>

**Your statement (continued)**

**Flood Management**

I support/~~oppose~~ Should Whangarei build a flood detention dam? Yes  
if our reasons are correct:

Because:

Should Whangarei build a flood detention dam? YES

If it is assured that this will solve the problem and not shift the problem somewhere else for others to have to live and deal with. Working with nature may prove to be more long term. Perhaps governing authorities and businesses developing our district should be encouraged to take our business districts to higher ground in the future.

**Managing our lakes, rivers, aquifers and wetlands.....**

I support/~~oppose~~: Should we target high priority catchments first? Yes

Because:

Should we target high priority catchments first? YES

We are always willing for an approach to be taken, as you describe, that allows time for public consultation that allows those most affected to participate in the outcomes which hopefully ends in well informed decision making process.

<b>Your statement</b> <i>(continued)</i>
I support/oppose: Which are our outstanding freshwater bodies?
<p>Because:</p> <p>Which are our outstanding freshwater bodies?</p> <p>We support council's decision in this area.          In our opinion, staff working in this field of expertise, have displayed in the past, responsible and well executed programs that have been supported with current data and they are far more experienced than we are to make these decisions. If anyone else knows better we will leave it to them to comment.</p>
<b><u>More Decisions</u></b>
I support/oppose: Rescue helicopters –should we keep supporting them? No
<p>Because:</p> <p>Rescue helicopters –should we keep supporting them? NO</p> <p>Not by means of a targeted rate, although this is a worthy service, so are many other causes worthy of funding and so we suggest as we did when this was first mooted, a space where people could make a donation to the cause on rates bills would be more acceptable. We believe in level playing fields for all and other organizations need such funding.</p> <p>Also at the time the service asked for funding they were struggling apparently and have since purchased extra helicopters, there are large honorariums paid, and so we believe standard fundraising donations along with other support should be sort.</p> <p>When a due diligence investigation was carried out to gain information it appeared to be like pulling teeth; totally unacceptable behaviour to put a project so good in jeopardy to withhold information, whilst appearing to protect something.</p>

*There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.*

<b>Your statement (continued)</b>
<p>I support/oppose: Should we reduce funding support for Destination Northland? Yes</p> <p>Because:</p> <p>Should we reduce funding support for Destination Northland? YES</p> <p>We believe tourism whilst a revenue gatherer is not perhaps any more in need of funding as many other industries in our district. There are other industries that may require NRC support in some way and so support your proposal to make a reduction in funding. We would like to see more funding going into ensuring our district's people are catered for in some form. Happy, healthy people living in a clean environment is priority and may lead onto outcomes that by consequence will be a pleasure for tourists visit and to meet and socialize with us, the people of Northland, whilst enjoying a truly clean green district with many natural features to explore and relax in. This is what makes us unique.</p>
<p>I support/oppose: Selling our 21 year lease properties – is it a good idea?</p> <p>Because:</p> <p>Selling our 21 year lease properties – is it a good idea?</p> <p>This is not really a Yes / No question and / or answer. A lot of factors to consider. It all depends on the return on the investment. If it's not broken, then don't fix it. If the returns are poor then changes could be made for the better; not just for the sake of change.</p> <p>If properties currently leased are wanted to be purchased by the lessee, then a fair and open sale transaction should be negotiated. It needs to be on an open market tender; highest tender not necessarily accepted and the sale to the purchaser that may be the existing tenant, who will best benefit the district.</p>

**Your statement** *(continued)*

I ~~support~~/oppose: Are we investing enough in biodiversity?

Because:

Are we investing enough in biodiversity?

Yet again we support council's decision in this area. In our opinion, staff working in this field of expertise, have displayed in the past, responsible and well executed programs that have been supported with current data and they are far more experienced than we are to make these decisions.

I ~~support~~/oppose: Should we make small changes to our monitoring activity?

Because:

Should we make small changes to our monitoring activity? NO

We need to be forever vigilant; monitoring is the 1<sup>st</sup> step in keeping things right. If it is reduced, things may slip through and not be noticed until a major situation develops. NRC needs to keep watching or you may end up with, the fox looking after the hen house.

*There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.*

<b>Your statement (continued)</b>
I support/oppose: Should we join the Local Govt. Funding Agency?
Because:  Should we join the Local Govt. Funding Agency?  I have serious concerns with this question being asked. Is the intention for the NRC to start borrowing and ending up in debt like other District and Regional Councils? If it is advantageous to 'invest' into the Local Govt. Funding Agency then fine but let's not hope it is the indicator just to go and get cheap money to raise the level of debt.
I support/oppose: Our objectives – have we got them right? Yes
Because:  Our objectives – have we got them right? YES  The objectives outlined in the summary are fairly correct.  Sadly central government is considering removing the 4 well beings. Social, Economic, Cultural and Environmental. These 4 objectives we believe are important in all decision making to get a balance. If you focus totally on any one factor the other factors can suffer, so a good balance is the aim. How they are applied is the crucial aspect.

*There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.*

**Your statement** *(continued)*

I ~~support~~/oppose: Should we update our Maori capacity policy?

Because:

Should we update our Maori capacity policy?

A curly one! In my opinion everyone should be treated equally.

I ~~support~~/oppose: What should we consider significant?

Because:

What should we consider significant?

The summary covers the basics of the Significance Policy. 'Joe Citizen' is not fully aware of any council's full list of assets so most are unable to make informed comment on this issue without more information.

Council is therefore best tooled up to make these decisions.



<b>Your statement</b> <i>(continued)</i>
I support/oppose: User fee and charges –should we update them?
<p>Because:</p> <p>User fee and charges –should we update them?</p> <p>Due to rising costs we would like to see as many charges as possible stay at the same level however rate of inflation seems logical and so a 2.5% increase this year is acceptable.</p> <p>We must keep up with the rate of inflation as a minimal increase otherwise if there are no gradual increases when it's catch up, it becomes a major issue.</p>
I support/oppose: MINING
<p>Because:</p> <p>MINING</p> <p>NZ HERALD 5/4/12 Levels of arsenic and lead in a contaminated Thames subdivision are so high that a handful of soil could prove fatal if ingested by a small child, a toxicologist has claimed.</p> <p>Local MP Phil Heatley has recently condoned fracking, a very questionable practice, stopped in many areas. Documentaries have shown drinking water that lights up in flames in areas close to fracking sites and it is now believed this method may cause earthquakes. Because Mr Heatley agrees with it in Taranaki, will he allow it in Northland should mining take place?</p> <p>If Northland Regional Council is having difficulty dealing with pollution from dairy farming, District Council's overflows from sewerage etc , using the carrot too often and not the stick with one sector but not the other, should we have concerns re NRC monitoring pollution from mining companies." There is much research and consultation to be done.</p> <p><b>NOTES</b></p> <p>If mining is an option for Northland it can only proceed with EXTREME CAUTION.</p> <p>The money made from mining must be for Northland and New Zealand and not only to go offshore.</p> <p>Our Environment must be protected as there is no point in raping our land of resources and the proceeds used to better other country's economies.</p> <p>We need to be selfish; the employment used should be local and proceeds need to benefit our NZ economy.</p> <p>Many of the countries that may wish to come and mine here we believe possibly don't want it happening in their patch without total financial benefit to themselves.</p> <p>If you can't promise to keep New Zealand clean and green, then leave it in the ground, or the scars will never heal.</p>

There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.

<b>Your statement (continued)</b>
I support/oppose: HIKURANGI SWAMP
Because:  HIKURANGI SWAMP - Support an investigation and better management of the scheme.  All affected by issues, including councils, targeted rate payers, all on the Hikurangi Swamp should be embraced and included to work together towards a solution. There should be no exclusions. This area by many accounts has not been managed as effectively as it should have been in the past. There needs to be a professional approach to ensure this viable productive area has safeguards in place to enable it to produce to its full capabilities all the time.
I support/oppose: GMO / GE
Because:  GMO / GE  A cautious approach in the use of Genetically modified organisms in the Region needs to be undertaken.  Costs for a cleanup of something going bad could be detrimental and / or ongoing to the local economy.  Those in our community that are well informed in these issues should have consideration of their comments.  HOW EFFECTIVE IS THEIR ENGAGEMENT RE THE PROCESS?

There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.

I support/oppose: Protecting our streams, waterways and harbour
Because:  Protecting our streams, waterways and harbour.  When dealing with issues in regards to our streams, waterways and harbour be STRONG.  Use the stick, not the carrot. (it's probably gone off by now) Refer to "Ode to Craig Brown"  We think by now, you understand how we feel on this issue.

<b>Your statement</b> <i>(continued)</i>
I support/oppose: RAIL – PORT
Because:  RAIL – PORT  Having Marsden Port as one of New Zealand's major ports, the Rail Link to Marsden Point and keeping the Rail link to Auckland is imperative to the future of Northland. This is Northlands 'Point of Difference'. Seeing the recent issues at Auckland shows the country needs to have more points of entry available. If a maritime disaster like the "Rena" occurred in the Waitemata Harbour, Auckland could be crippled. North Port should be one of the NRC's driving factors to safeguard Northland's future and be essential for a growing economy.  This could well be Northland's saving grace for the future.

There is space on the next page for more comments. You can also attach more pages if necessary.

We thank Northland Regional Council for considering our opinions in the Northland Draft Long Term Plan 2012 -2022 and acknowledge the staff for their work and the detailed summary made available to us.

<b>Hearings</b>					
Hearings will be held in early May so stators can tell councillors more about their views in person. If you wish to be heard, we'll notify you of the locations, dates and times.					
<input type="checkbox"/> I DO NOT wish to appear in support of my statement					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I DO wish to appear in support of my statement					
<b>How did you find out about this consultation?</b> (Please circle applicable option/s)					
Word of mouth <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Our newsletter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Newspaper	Email alert from us <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Twitter/ Facebook <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community/ interest group
Our website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Radio advertising <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dargaville field days	Letter from us	Other (please specify):	

Signature: Warren & Patricia Slater

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> April 2012

Attach extra pages if necessary. Statements presented to council are considered public documents subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.