Notice is hereby given that an ordinary meeting of the Horowhenua District Council Strategy Committee will be held on:

Date:	**Wednesday 20 December 2017**
Time:	**4.00 pm**
Meeting Room:	**Council Chambers**
Venue:	**126-148 Oxford St Levin**

Strategy Committee

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Mayor	Mr Michael Feyen	
Deputy Chairperson	Mrs Victoria Kaye-Simmons	
Councillors	Mr Wayne Bishop Mr Ross Brannigan Mr Ross Campbell Mr Neville Gimblett Mr Barry Judd Mrs Jo Mason Mrs Christine Mitchell Ms Piri-Hira Tukapua Mr Bernie Wanden	
Reporting Officer	Mr David Clapperton	(Chief Executive)
Meeting Secretary	Mrs Sue Hori Te Pa	

Contact Telephone: 06 366 0999
Postal Address: Private Bag 4002, Levin 5540
Email: enquiries@horowhenua.govt.nz
Website: www.horowhenua.govt.nz

Full Agendas are available on Council's website
www.horowhenua.govt.nz

Full Agendas are also available to be collected from:
Horowhenua District Council Service Centre, 126 Oxford Street, Levin
Foxton Service Centre/Library, Clyde Street, Foxton,
Shannon Service Centre/Library, Plimmer Terrace, Shannon
and Te Takere/Library, Bath Street, Levin

Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Members require further information relating to any reports, please contact the Chief Executive Officer or the Chairperson.

ITEM TABLE OF CONTENTS **PAGE**

PROCEDURAL

REPORTS

1 Apologies

2 Public Participation

Notification to speak is required by 12 noon on the day of the meeting. Further information is available on www.horowhenua.govt.nz or by phoning 06 366 0999.

See over the page for further information on Public Participation.

3 Late Items

To consider, and if thought fit, to pass a resolution to permit the Council to consider any further items which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded.
Such resolution is required to be made pursuant to Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the Chairperson must advise:

(i) The reason why the item was not on the Agenda, and
(ii) The reason why the discussion of this item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

4 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of their obligation to declare any conflicts of interest they might have in respect of the items on this Agenda.

5 Confirmation of Open & In Committee Minutes – 8 November 2017

6 Announcements

Public Participation (further information):

The ability to speak at Council and Community Board meetings provides the opportunity for members of the public to express their opinions/views to Elected Members as they relate to the agenda item to be considered by the meeting.

Speakers may (within the time allotted and through the Chairperson) ask Elected Members questions as they relate to the agenda item to be considered by the meeting, however that right does not naturally extend to question Council Officers or to take the opportunity to address the public audience be that in the gallery itself or via the livestreaming. Council Officers are available to offer advice too and answer questions from Elected Members when the meeting is formally considering the agenda item i.e. on completion of Public Participation.

Meeting protocols

1. All speakers shall address the Chair and Elected Members, not other members of the public be that in the gallery itself or via livestreaming.

2. A meeting is not a forum for complaints about Council staff or Council contractors. Those issues should be addressed direct to the CEO and not at a Council, Community Board or Committee meeting.

3. Elected members may address the speaker with questions or for clarification on an item, but when the topic is discussed Members shall address the Chair.

4. All persons present must show respect and courtesy to those who are speaking and not interrupt nor speak out of turn.

5. Any person asked more than once to be quiet will be asked to leave the meeting.

Growth Response - Projects Update

File No.: 17/615

1. Purpose

To provide a status update on the Growth Response work programme with a focus on providing up to date information on current key projects and planning.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That Report 17/615 Growth Response - Projects Update be received.

2.2 That this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

3. Background/Current Status

Otaki to North Levin (O2NL)

Progress has been slowed on this project whilst the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) discussed transportation priorities and project timing with the New Government. It has since been announced that the second round of engagement will begin on 10 February 2018 with letters to affected or potentially affected landowners to go out on 18 January 2018. This will provide an opportunity to review and make submission on the yet to be announced shortlist of options. The subsequent confirmation of a preferred corridor is much needed for Council and the community to move forward in planning for the future. The Project Reference Group met on 7 December and were advised of the process and timing to move forward with engagement. A preferred corridor may be confirmed by the NZTA board as by June 2018.

Levin Town Centre Redevelopment

Work has continued on the Levin Town Centre Strategy to provide a clear understanding of the current issues and future opportunities for the Levin Town Centre regardless of if or when a Levin Bypass is implemented by NZTA. There is a once in a lifetime opportunity to redefine Levin’s Town Centre in response to the economic, social and transportation changes that are already happening. Preparation of the draft strategy is nearing completion with a focus on following key considerations and associated opportunities/outcomes:

- Earthquake Prone Buildings
- Potential Bypass
- Transport Options
- Town Centre Activity
- Spatial Orientation
- Identity

A positive discussion was had mid-November with the Council Community Forums around these key issues and desired future state opportunities to meet a broad range of needs for the community.

Horowhenua Growth Strategy

The review of the Horowhenua Development Plan 2008 continues. The working draft Growth Strategy has been extended out to 2040 to align with the strategic work Council is currently developing in the form of the Horowhenua 2040 Strategy and the Long Term Plan

2018-2038. The Strategy has been prepared based on the updated socio-economic growth projections adopted by Council 30 August 2017.

The review undertaken is based on assumptions of the forecasted population and the distribution of it, has identified that to accommodate the potential forecasted growth additional land will need to be released through rezoning land in the District Plan for future residential and greenbelt residential development.

Currently the process is further complicated by the delays with confirmation from NZTA about if or when the Otaki to North Levin Expressway will be built and or exactly where it will go. The recent announcement of consultation on options to confirm a preferred expressway corridor will be positive in terms of confirming effects on proposed growth areas. However, it is expected that growth will occur whether or not this section of the Wellington Northern Corridor is completed. The updated socio-economic growth projections factor in the Wellington Northern Corridor and even without this factor, the projections still indicate significant population and household growth for the district. Therefore continuing to plan proactively is essential to prevent the tight housing market from becoming a crisis.

Meetings have been held with Tokomaru, Manakau and Waikawa community associations to outline the process and receive feedback on potential growth areas. Over 300 letters with relevant maps have also been recently sent out to residents across the district highlighting areas of land potentially captured by the growth strategy as potential future growth areas. Contact is being made with a number of these landowners, with subsequent meetings arranged to discuss further details and questions they may have. Additionally a drop-in session has been arranged to allow landowners the opportunity to meet one on one with Council Officers. The purpose of this engagement is to gain a better understanding of land areas from the owner's perspective and their thoughts on its future use, suitability and opportunities to develop.

Council consultants have carried out desk top hazard assessments on potential growth areas to better understand flooding and liquefaction risks. This is to understand whether the potential growth areas could be suitable for future development. Following landowner approval further onsite investigation and testing (Stage 2) will be carried out at strategic locations where more detailed analysis is required.

4. Issues for Consideration/Planning

Otaki to North Levin (O2NL)

Key steps and timing:

- NZTA will brief Project Reference Group, Council Staff and Elected Members in late January 2018 on shortlist of options for public engagement.
- NZTA notification of potentially effected landowners from 18 January 2018.
- NZTA engagement on short listed options to commence 10 February 2018 and expected to close in Mid-March.
- External consultant Isthmus to complete a piece of work on potential O2NL alignments East of Levin to better understand fit with future growth development and form. Will provide a recommendation to be brought back to HDC to better understand the impacts and benefits of any proposed options in this area.

Levin Town Centre

The draft Levin Town Centre Strategy will be presented to Council Elected Members on 13 December 2017 with a timeline for engagement as follows:

- Late January 2018 - Draft strategy to be finalised
- February/March 2018 - Engagement with Building and Business owners

- March/April 2018 – Public engagement to commence

Additionally workshops to be undertaken with Iwi with a particular focus on developing the cultural and heritage context of the Strategy and exploring input and partnership in future opportunities to enhance the identity of the town centre and activity in this space.

<u>Horowhenua Growth Strategy</u>
A challenge for this work is maintaining momentum while the Otaki to North Levin project advances. While there is uncertainty over the preferred corridor and interchange options it maintains a level of uncertainty for the settlements in the project area with regard to the potential future growth areas.

Focus for progression of Strategy covers the following:

- Continued engagement with key stakeholder and landowners potentially affected by the Growth Strategy.
- Continue with technical assessment of proposed growth areas including onsite testing to inform flooding and liquefaction hazard assessments.
- Analyse feedback from landowners and revise growth areas accordingly.
- Preparation of Structure Plans for future growth areas including the feedback received from landowner engagement.
- Public engagement on proposed future growth areas
- Prepare Growth Strategy for adoption by Council and to guide the development of a plan change to the District Plan. A hold point prior to proceeding with plan change is to understand how NZTA have progressed with identifying a preferred corridor and interchange options and the impact on proposed future growth areas. Current indications are that a best performing option will be presented to the NZTA board in May/June 2018 for subsequent approval of a preferred corridor.

Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

<u>Confirmation of statutory compliance</u>

In accordance with section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002, this report is approved as:
a. containing sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions; and,
b. is based on adequate knowledge about, and adequate consideration of, the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.

Signatories

Author(s)	Daniel Haigh **Growth Response Project Manager**	

Approved by	David Clapperton **Chief Executive**	

Development Contributions and Financial Contributions - Discussion Paper

File No.: 17/636

1. Purpose

To provide Council with background information on Development Contributions and Financial Contributions.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That Report 17/636 on Development Contributions and Financial Contributions - Discussion Paper be received.

2.2 That this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

2.3 That the Strategy Committee recommends to Council that the issue of Development Contributions (and capital vs land value rating) be deferred until growth and growth related expenditure are confirmed as part of the 2018-2038 LTP process.

2.4 That on completion/adoption of the 2018-2038 LTP Council embarks on a funding 'tool kit' review that explores future funding mechanisms available to it to fairly and equitably fund development and operations, with that review to consider all funding mechanisms available to Council including (but not limited to) Development Contributions and rating system(s).

3. Background/Previous Council Decisions

At the 27 November 2017 Extraordinary Council meeting, the following resolution was passed, arising from a Notice of Motion for consideration to be given to the reintroduction of Development and/or Financial Contributions:

> *THAT in light of the District's current and potential growth, discussion on the reintroduction of Development and/or Financial Contributions commences through the Strategy Committee at its December 2017 meeting.*

4. Issues for Consideration

As outlined in the **attached** Discussion Paper.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Discussion Paper - Development Contributions and Financial Contributions - Background Information	13

<u>Confirmation of statutory compliance</u>

In accordance with section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002, this report is approved as:

a. containing sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions; and,
b. is based on adequate knowledge about, and adequate consideration of, the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the

decision.

Signatories

Author(s)	David Clapperton **Chief Executive**	

Approved by	David Clapperton **Chief Executive**	

DISCUSSION PAPER

DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS AND FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

20 December 2017

Background Information

1. What are Development Contributions (DCs)?

DCs are provided for under the provisions of the Local Government Act (LGA 2002). Their intended purpose as set out under the Local Government Amendment Act is as follows:

> *"To enable territorial authorities to recover from those persons undertaking development a fair, equitable and proportionate portion of the total cost of capital expenditure necessary to service growth over the long term."*

A developer has a wide meaning in this context and would include individuals as well as corporate developers.

Example — When a development takes place (subdivision or building, for example) a developer will develop the services required within the development to service it. The additional demand those services create on the Council's infrastructure means that the Council will eventually have to upgrade its services to maintain the existing level of service to the community. Each "Unit of Demand" in the development (e.g. a house or new lot) triggers a develo0pment contribution. Those development contributions are then used to fund the necessary upgrade of external service infrastructure (e.g. the water treatment plant) caused by the new demand.

Whilst individual developments are generally small they create incremental demands on our infrastructure upgrades, the upgrades of which are needed to maintain the current level of service. Thus an upgrade to a water treatment plant will be partially funded by DCs consistent with the increased capacity needed to meet the new demand.

Each Council must have a DC policy (even if it does not require any development contributions). The policy need not be in the LTP but must be reviewed every three years. Council has decided to review the requirement for DCs in 2018/19, post the completion of Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy and 20 year 2018-2038 LTP.

2. What are Financial Contributions?

Financial Contributions are not the same as Development Contributions. Financial Contributions are provided for under the Resource Management Act. They are set out in the District Plan and would normally be required as a condition of a resource consent. They are intended to be used to mitigate adverse environmental effects arising from consented activities. HDC has not collected Financial Contributions since 2011 under Plan Change 23, at the same time DCs were introduced.

3. <u>How are DC's calculated?</u>

The methodology is set out in Schedule 13 of the Local Government Act 2002. In simple terms it requires:

- The identification of capital expenditure that is expected to be incurred to meet increased infrastructure demand arising from growth.
- Assessment of the number of units of demand from new growth (using growth projections). That will be serviced by the planned capital expenditure.
- Calculate the individual development contributions needed.

Example: a $5m upgrade to a water treatment plant in the LTP includes proposed additional capacity to service 250 new lots over and above the 750 it already services (i.e.: growth is 25% of total planned capacity of 1000 units)

Assume 25% of the cost ($1.25m) will go to creating capacity for the 250 new lots.

Divide the growth cost by the actual growth to calculate the development contribution. That is, $1.25m/250 = $5,000 per new lot (each lot being one Unit of Demand).

Notes:

1. DCs can only be collected if the Council projects growth that will create the demand for additional services. Growth projections are critical to the process and are reviewed at least every three years.
2. DCs are calculated in a schedule to the policy for each item (or programme) of capex in the LTP for which DC's may be collected.
3. DC calculations are usually distinguished between those that apply on a catchment basis (e.g. reticulated services) and those applied uniformly across the district (e.g. roads).
4. DCs not used for the purpose for which they are collected must be refunded.
5. In many cases the upgrade takes place advance of the full demand being created. This means that the Council has to fund a portion of the upgrade and recover those DC's over time.

3. <u>What was included in the DC Policy before 2015</u>?

The Council's Development Contributions Policy is set out in the 2012 LTP (pages 174 – 218).

The main features include:

- Key assumptions. The policy assumes a growth of 135 Units of Demand per annum over the ten year period of the policy.
- The Council required DCs for the following activities.

o	Water	(catchment based)
o	Wastewater	(catchment based)
o	Roading and Stormwater	(uniform across the District).
o	Reserves	(uniform across the District).
o	Community Infrastructure	(uniform across the District).

· The District was broken down into seventeen different areas each with separately calculated DCs for any Units of Demand created in those areas. Actual DCs varied from $5,465 in rural areas (no water or wastewater contributions) to $18,294 in Levin Development Area No. 2. (the area bounded by Arapaepae/Gladstone/Tararua roads and Queen Street East).

· The policy included a sliding scale of exemptions from DCs for dwellings built on new lots created before the introduction of the policy in 2006. That ranged from 20% for lots created between 1 July 2004 and 1 July 2006 to a 100% exemption for lots created prior to 1 July 2001 (ref page 183 of the LTP).

· The policy included a generic requirement for DCs for non-residential uses (except for farm buildings). That was based on floor area but did not include a reserves or community infrastructure contribution (330m2 of new floor area equals one unit of demand). The policy included specific provision for review on a case by case basis (those provisions were never used.

DCs were triggered by:

:

- o a subdivision consent being granted for the creation of new lots.
- o the granting of a building consent
- o the authorisation of a new service connection.

· The policy included review provisions authority which were delegated jointly to the Chair of the Hearings Committee and the Chief Executive.

4. <u>What changes occurred in the legislation</u>?

In 2013 The Ministry of Internal Affairs instigated a review of DCs which resulted in changes to the LGA 2002. Of particular note, the review concluded that DCs can be an appropriate method of funding infrastructure except for public amenities, e.g. civic buildings and museums. It was also concluded that it was widely accepted that improvements should be made to both the legislation and the way DCs are applied across New Zealand. These improvements have been included in the Local Government Act 2002 Amendments Bill No 3. An extract from the explanatory note to that Bill stated:

"A 2013 government review of Development Contributions identified difficulties associated with the current legislative framework and how it is being implemented by Councils. For example, Development Contributions are being used to fund types of infrastructure that may be better funded from general revenue sources, and the degree of transparency in apportionment of the costs and benefits of infrastructure is variable. There are also limited mechanisms for resolving challenges to Development Contribution charges and opportunities to encourage greater private provision of infrastructure."

"The Bill provides a new purpose for Development Contributions and principles to direct and guide how they are used by Councils. Secondly, there are provisions that clarify and narrow the range of infrastructure that can be financed by DCs. Thirdly, the Bill introduced

a DC objection process, with the decisions made by independent commissioners. In addition, the Bill encourages greater private provision of infrastructure through the use of Development agreements and includes provisions to improve the transparency of Councils' Development Contribution policies."

5. <u>Development Contributions in the Horowhenua District – Discussion on effective funding and implications on growth</u>

HDC adopted a Development Contributions Policy as part of its Long Term Plan in 2006. HDC reviewed the DC charges every three years, with reviewed undertaken in 2009 and 2012.

The 2006 Development Contribution Policy did not include charges for commercial development. This was introduced by Council in 2009.

Council collected DCs to support the following activities:

Network Infrastructure	Community Infrastructure
Roading	Reserves
Water Supply	Public and civic amenities
Wastewater	
Stormwater	

Under each of these activities were a number of specific projects included in the Development Contribution Policy which was formally adopted as part of the Long Term Plan.

The Development Contribution amount triggered by a development was calculated by using units of demand on infrastructure.

For residential development each allotment in addition to the original allotment was assessed as one unit of demand. For residential development on existing sites, any additional residential dwelling (as defined in the District Plan) over and above that on the site was assessed as one unit of demand.

Non-residential developments were assessed on the demand that they created. The number of units of demand generated by the development was determined by using a conversion function based on gross floor area of the development.

DCs were charged over a 15-20 year period to cover the incremental growth of increased demand on Council's infrastructure over time. This lengthy period was intended to achieve a situation where the costs were apportioned between the community and the developer.

Whether a development attracted a DC depended on the type of activity and use, and DCs could be charged for developments of all types and scales. For instance, a one into two lot subdivision, an extension to an industrial workshop and a comprehensive commercial development would commonly attract a DC.

Accessory buildings (as defined in the District Plan0 associated with primary production activities in the rural zone would not be liable for a DC unless a new connection to the Council water, wastewater or stormwater infrastructure was imposed as a condition of the Resource or Building Consent or was requested by the applicant.

Essentially, any development or change of land use that would generate more demand on infrastructure than current use of the land would attract a DC.

With regard to keeping scale and type of development in mind, it is important to outline that ‘developers’ and developments relate to a range of people and scales. The point is that ‘development’ in general is the holistic growth of the district and the accumulation of both small and large developments. DCs are charges to the developer, but ultimately the cost would be passed on to businesses and tenants or capitalised in the price of the development.

6. Review of DCs in 2015

In the Horowhenua District context in 2015, HDC received feedback about DCs being a disincentive to business development and new residential development. In the then current low population growth, average economic growth, below average employment growth environment in Horowhenua, the issues surrounding DCs were amplified in particular where the application of a DC to a Brownfield or even Greenfield type development could be the tipping point between investment or not. This was of particular relevance when the property market was fairly flat as the risk of over-capitalisation was a very real risk when investments were considered in relation to other markets with increasing property prices.

There were two major schools of thought with regard to DCs. The proponents stated that the LGA funding principles supported that the developer as exacerbator and beneficiary of costs, incurred by Council to support growth, should pay for a portion of those costs as the people causing and or benefitting from that expenditure. The logic flow looked something like:

(i) Council provided infrastructure and community facilities for the community;
(ii) Those services had restrictions around capacity to service a constrained number of users;
(iii) New developments used up existing service capacity and required the Council to increase the scale of the service to cope with increased users;
(iv) New developments picked up a benefit from being able to use the existing service which had been funded by existing properties;
(v) Therefore, a logical extension was that new developments should contribute to the additional costs that growth would impose on the Council and other ratepayers.

The opponents took a slightly different view. They typically did not refute that growth imposed costs. Their logic flow looked something like this:

(i) There was no growth in the Horowhenua District;
(ii) As there was no growth in the district, the new developments were not using up existing infrastructure capacity;
(iii) Council was keen to see growth in the community as more ratepayers shared a largely fixed cost of service;
(iv) New ratepayers who came into the community, even if they did pick up a share of the unutilised capacity, lowered the average cost for all ratepayers;
(v) New ratepayers also picked up a proportionate share of existing debt which was often incurred on capital items that were not designed to meet growth requirements. In doing so they lowered the average cost for existing ratepayers;
(vi) Development Contributions are an uncertain mechanism for recovery and attributing costs, and this uncertainty impacted on decisions by developers;
(vii) Development Contributions were an obstacle to development.

DCs are an important part of the Local Government funding toolkit. However, they are a tool to be selected with some care. In reality, there is a strong logic for both charging and not charging DCs. So there is no right or wrong stance to take.

There is a perception that the imposition of DCs restricts development. This has not been clearly established to be true or false.

7. Analysis

The analysis of DCs should be undertaken from the viewpoint not of the tool but of the circumstances for the community. In this type of analysis, important elements to consider are:

- Understanding the actual costs of growth, whether these costs are necessary for growth or drivers by growth;
- Identifying the reality of growth in the context of the services and assets;
- Understanding the revenue and funding impacts and the costs of the alternatives.

Analysis of the Long Term Plan capital programme and projected revenue from DCs reveals:

- The 10 year costs of growth for capital are $27.477m of a total capital budget of $172.355m;
- Development Contributions revenue is budgeted at $15.965m.

For the last three years Council's Annual Reports show the following breakdowns of growth capital expenditure against budget:

($000)	Budget	Actual	Variance
2011/12	1,738	537	(1,0201)
2012/13	1,759	1,745	(14)
2013/14	1,714	1,040	(674)
Total	5,211	3,322	(1,889)

The following table shows actual Development Contributions revenue against budget:

($000)	Budget	Actual	Variance
2012/13	1,366	784	(582)
2013/14	1,366	463	(903)
Budget 2014/15	1,461	646	(815)
Total	4,191	1893	6,084

Two major things stand out with regard to the above:

Firstly, the level of growth related expenditure is 36% below forecasted expenditure, indicating a deferral of growth related capital expenditure.

The second item is that the revenue from DCs is significantly below budget. The revenue from this source accounts for 1.2% of actual total revenue. As such, the DC Policy and its management are not strong contributors to the revenue or the indebtedness of Council.

Another consideration with regard to DCs is that it is a complex and expensive process for obtaining income. The cost of preparing the policy, reviewing and implementing is estimated to be on average $83k per annum. This has not been precisely calculated but is a reasonable estimate based on staff time for reviewing, calculating DCs, debtors and debt recovery administration, CEO and Mayor time dealing with complaints and the time taken for appeals. This point becomes more important when considering funding sources. The cost of the administration sits as an operational cost and is funded from operational revenue. However, the revenue from DCs sits as a capital funding source which reduced operations funding to the extent of the interest component as cost of funds. Therefore, the operating costs of Council are lower by approximately $104k over the last three years through the interest effect, while the operating costs are more than double that sum through the costs of administering the policy.

There is an argument in the Horowhenua context that as a mechanism for collecting a small amount of revenue, DCs do not evaluate well as a tax system. It is expensive to administer relative to revenue, it impacts on the behaviours of the payers, and it does not have a broad base. The financial arguments for keeping it as a mechanism are also not strong. It does not yield a significant amount of revenue and imposes risks on the organisation due to the uncertainty of it as an income system.

8. <u>Key Questions for Council to Consider</u>

- Ø Does Horowhenua District Council require Development Contributions to fund the costs of new or additional assets or assets of additional capacity required as a result of growth?
- Ø Would Horowhenua District Council's Development Contribution Policy be robust enough to meet the scrutiny of independent commissioners?
- Ø Does Horowhenua District Council have sufficient infrastructure capacity in the short, medium and long term to service new development in the district for:
  - Water
  - Wastewater
  - Roading
  - Stormwater?
- Ø Should Council utilise alternate funding mechanisms to fund infrastructure for specific growth areas?
- Ø Shortcomings of existing Policy and need for strengthening.
- Ø Development Contributions as part of a funding 'tool kit' available to Council: : - Rates
  - Debt
  - Connection Fees
  - Developer Agreements
  - Public/Private Sector Partnerships
  - Capital Contributions
  - Rating System (Capital vs Land Value)
  - Financial Contributions
  - etc.
- Ø The need to finalise the potential use of a mix of the above funding tools in the context of: Future Projected Growth
  Growth-related Capex.