

STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Committee - Development Contributions Subcommittee

FROM: Dugald Ley, Development Engineer

REFERENCE: BC110240

SUBJECT: **TASMAN EDUCATION TRUST - REPORT REP11-05-03** - Report prepared for meeting of 26 May 2011

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This report is to review the Development Contribution of 2 Wastewater HUDs (Household Unit of Demand) for the above development.

Note: No other Development Contributions were imposed in this building consent other than Reserve Fund Contribution which cannot be heard in this forum.

- 1.2 The school's administration presently occupies an existing building which I understand has two existing toilets located within it.
- 1.3 The new two-storied administration building that has five new pans will be placed in the same location as the existing building so the resultant total number of pans will increase by three.
- 1.4 As per Council's policy on HUD amounts contained in the 2009 LTCCP, Volume 2, Page 86, the wastewater calculation is based on 1 HUD per two pan or urinals. So for with three new pans the amount to be invoiced is 1.5 HUDs. Further as to Council's rounding policy on Page 86, Clause 2.3 when the HUD amount is ≥ 0.5 of fractions, the policy is to round upwards, hence the assessed account of two HUDs for the above development.

2. HISTORY

- 2.1 The school started in about 2004/2005 where a resource consent was approved for a school in a rural zone. At that time no Council wastewater reticulation was available and with high groundwater and limited disposal areas available, the only option available was to hold the wastewater in a holding tank for later disposal to the regional sewerage facility via sucker truck,

- 2.2 That proposal was solely at the request of the owners who knew that in the long-term a reticulated supply would become available. That Tasman District Council reticulation was commissioned last year with the construction of the Headingly Lane pump station rising main to Beach Road.
- 2.3 In that context, a wastewater connection was made available at the Headingly Lane boundary and subsequently the school decommissioned their holding tank and connected to the Council system.

I have been advised that no connection fees were requested by Council for this connection, which conveyed to me that this was a form of compensation for the inconvenience the school has put up with the preceding years.

3. SUMMARY

- 3.1 I am of the opinion that the contribution of 2 wastewater HUDs is fair and reasonable and consistent with the Development Contributions Policies outlined in the LTCCP 2009, and also with the "Rounding" policy also outlined in that document.
- 3.2 As alluded to in the Engineering Report RESC11-02-16 presented at the Engineering Services Committee meeting in Takaka on 3 February 2011, that as part of the 2012 LTP review the "Rounding" policy will be reviewed. Until that time, officers have no discretion but to apply the policy as written.

4. RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 THAT the Development Contribution BC110240 as discussed in this report be confirmed.

Dugald Ley
Development Engineer