

**6. MT PLEASANT & HUNTSBURY AVE COST SHARE AREA -  
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

RR 8289

<b>Officer responsible</b> Water Supply Manager	<b>Author</b> John Moore, Senior Engineering Officer
Corporate Plan Output: Supply of Water	

The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the outcome of community consultation regarding the implementation of the Mt Pleasant cost share area for water supply and the Huntsbury Avenue cost share area for water supply.

**MT PLEASANT COST SHARE AREA**

The Council meeting of 25 March 1998, resolved:

1. That a Mount Pleasant cost sharing scheme be established to recover the cost of water supply infrastructure required to supply the Living zone above the Mt Pleasant 3, Upper Balmoral and Moncks Spur 2 reservoirs.
2. That those affected property owners be advised of details for the scheme inviting comment, with a further report to City Services Committee for final approval.

A letter was posted on 6 May to the 248 known property owners within the Mt Pleasant cost share area for water supply explaining the implementation of the scheme and inviting comments by 3 June 1998.

Of the 248 property owners circulated there has been written responses from:

- Mr D Julian who owns property at 329 Mt Pleasant Road being approx 19946m<sup>2</sup>
- Mr & Mrs Tritt who own 189 Major Hornbrook Road being approx 2145 m<sup>2</sup> on two lots
- Davis Ogilvie on behalf of Mt Pleasant Estates for stage III of subdivision on Major Hornbrook Road being approx 8174m<sup>2</sup>
- Mr G C Heazlewood who owns 310 Mt Pleasant Road being approx 61370 m<sup>2</sup>

All letters have been responded to further explaining the reasons for the implementation of the cost share area. As the only formal objection to the cost share area was received from Mr Heazlewood, a copy of his letter and response is attached for the Council's information. Although all other letters have been replied to addressing their concerns, it is unlikely these will fully resolve their concerns where it is perceived this scheme will incur additional costs for any subdivision they may undertake. Those who have expressed this concern have been advised that the Council can impose conditions on the developer at the time of subdivision to ensure adequate services will be provided regardless of whether the subdivision is in a cost share area. The implementation of the cost share area merely gives potential developers prior knowledge and certainty as to what conditions or contributions will be required with respect to water supply.

Mr Julian has been invited to discuss any concerns further, however no contact has been made. Mr Julian was unable to be contacted by phone.

Mr & Mrs Tritt's concerns have essentially been resolved, as although they have only one title at present the land is shown as two lots on the Deposited Plan. This allows the Council to issue a second title provided the lots comply with the areas of land required by the City Plan.

This being the case no subdivision is required for the building site to be made available. It is therefore considered that the section is existing and no cost share contribution payable.

The correspondence from Davis Ogilvie regarding the Mount Pleasant Estates subdivision is related to the application of the Cost Share area to the third and final stage of that subdivision, rather than the implementation of the Cost Share area. The concern expressed by Davis Ogilvie is that this subdivision has been in progress for approximately six years and they had not been aware that a cost share area was to be introduced. Budgeting had been carried out on the basis of costs of the previous two stages, in the belief that there would be no additional conditions that had not been experienced on the previous stages.

It has been explained to Davis Ogilvie that each stage is required to have separate subdivision consent and the ability of the infrastructure to meet demand is assessed at that time. It was a condition of approval of the last stage that the additional sections created contribute to the cost share area. The introduction of the cost share area needed to be implemented at some time, and failure to include these sections would mean that contribution from other developers would need to increase to off set this loss of income. Although there is some sympathy with the concerns of Davis Ogilvie, it was always likely that the timing of the introduction was not going to suit all developers. A reverse argument could just as well be made that the timing benefited Mount Pleasant Estates in that no contribution was requested for stages I and II.

Davis Ogilvie may pursue this matter further.

**HUNTSBURY AVENUE COST SHARE AREA**

A report on the Huntsbury cost share area was considered at the August 1996 meeting of the Council similar to that presented on the Mount Pleasant cost share area.

A letter was posted on 3 June 1998 to the 15 known property owners within the Huntsbury Avenue cost share area for water supply, explaining the implementation of the scheme and inviting comments by 1 July 1998.

There has been no written response from any of the 15 property owners circulated.

**Recommendation:** That having sought the community's views on the implementation of the Mt Pleasant and Huntsbury Avenue cost share areas for water supply, with only one formal objection within the Mt Pleasant area being received, the Council confirm the previous decision to establish the cost share areas for water supply for Mt Pleasant and Huntsbury Avenue.