



SOUTH WAIRARAPA DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARING

AGENDA 4 November 2015

WAIHINGA CENTRE HEARING:

The hearing will be held in the South Wairarapa District Council Chambers, 19 Kitchener Street, Martinborough and will commence at 9.30am. The hearings will be held in public and deliberations will be in a closed session.

1. **Apologies**
2. **Hearings Schedule**

Schedule of Hearings 4 November			
No.	Submitter	Start Time	Additional Submission (separate attachment)
2304	Alex Wall	9:40am	
2328	Christine Webley	9:45am	
1431	Martin Freeth	9:50am	Pages 27-29
2174	Graham and Patricia Higginson	9:55am	
2052	Melanie Maynard	10:00am	
1139	Martin Lawrence	10:05am	Page 3
1353	Christina Eagan	10:10am	
2471	Bill Crook	10:15am	
2350	Gregory Childs	10:20am	
3066	Bryan Lawrence	10:35am	
1799	Stephen Church	10:40am	
1697	Dean Di Bona	10:45am	
1373	Derek Anderton	10:50am	Pages 13-22
1568	Rex Thomas and Christine Webley	10:55am	
Morning Tea		11:00am	

Schedule of Hearings 4 November

No.	Submitter	Start Time	Additional Submission (separate attachment)
1340	Bill Benfield	11:15am	
2009	Ian and Diana Cresswell	11:20am	Pages 42-45
1622	Catherine de Groot	11:25am	Pages 32-33
1062	Ro and Lyle Griffiths	11:35am	
1225	Colin Carruthers and Deborah Coddington	11:45am	
1297	Winifred Bull	11:50am	
1056	Gerald Hensley	12:00pm	
1269	Victoria Read	12:05pm	Pages 6-10
1399	Graeme Thomson and Chris Cassels	12:10pm	Page 24
1899	Richard Riddiford	12:25pm	Page 40
1819	Bob Petelin	12:35pm	
2447	William Higginson	12:40pm	
Hearings Close			

All members of the public, including the media are asked to leave the Chambers. Deliberations will be undertaken in a private session and a recommendation will be made to Council for consideration at an extraordinary Council meeting to be held at 2pm, 4 November 2015.

3. Deliberation

3.1 Waihinga Centre Targeted Rate Report

Pages 1-38

SOUTH WAIRARAPA DISTRICT COUNCIL

HEARING

4 NOVEMBER 2015

AGENDA ITEM 3.1

TARGETED RATE

Purpose of Report

To present results of the Martinborough Town Hall Targeted Rate consultation.

Recommendations

Officers recommend that the hearing:

1. *Receives the information.*

1. Executive Summary

Council resolved:

Martinborough Town Hall

COUNCIL RESOLVED (DC2015/136):

1. To receive the information.
(Moved Mayor Staples/Seconded Cr Montgomerie) Carried
2. To agree in principal next steps.
3. To agree to consult on setting up a targeted rate and note this will be an amendment to the 2015/25 Long Term Plan.
4. That if the community doesn't support a targeted rate the project wouldn't proceed in its current form.
(Moved Cr Stevens/Seconded Cr Jephson) Carried

Cr Davies voted against the motion.

Consultation is now complete.

To the question: "Do you support a targeted rate to part fund the construction of the Waihinga Centre?"

- **544** responded **NO**
- **435** responded **YES**

There were 979 respondents to the 2,175 consultation forms posted.

2. Discussion

2.1 Consultation

Consultation was undertaken under the parameters set in the Local Government Act.

Section 83 was recently introduced and allows more freedom in the formal consultation process.

2.2 Consultation Process

2,175 forms were mailed to ratepayers south of the Ruamahanga River. The mail out included a paid, self-addressed envelope.

This boundary was thought to best represent the catchment of those who would benefit the most from the targeted rate.

The ratepayer base selected was those paying a "Uniform Annual General Charge".

The process for receipting, counting and entering responses into the database is as follows:

- Returns were either posted in or received over the counter
- Returns were placed in a locked "tender box"
- Returns were processed periodically as time allowed
- Two staff members opened the tender box, in the main office.
- Two staff members (coincidentally who do not reside in the Martinborough ward) opened the envelopes, sorted the returns into "yes" and "no"
 - The count was agreed by the two staff members and a register of returns completed and signed
- One staff member entered the results into a database (spreadsheet)
- The data entry was checked off against the count that was signed by the two staff members
 - Data entry included answers to the questions, and any comments (submissions) that were made.
 - Also included in this process was processing the names and contact addresses of those who wished to present their submission orally
- Once data entry was completed consultation form serial numbers were checked to ensure there were no duplicates
 - This was also done when returns were received during the process where there was some suspicion that the return may not have been valid.

2.3 Results

The following table provides an analysis of the results.

	Total	Martinborough and Surrounds area	Outside Martinborough and Surrounds area
Number of consultation forms sent	2,175	1517	658
Yes	435	339	96
No	544	397	147
Option 1 Martinborough Township and immediate surrounds	58	41	17
Option 2 Martinborough Ward south of the Ruamahanga River	126	109	17
Option 3 Martinborough Ward south of the Ruamahanga River – split funding	251	190	61

There are 34 submitters who wish to be heard.

3. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Submission Summary

Contact Officer: Paul Crimp Chief Executive Officer

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1000		1				N	Hall needs a makeover or demolition not extension. On-going cost of new facility. Location of current isite is ideal. Present playground space is excellent.
1001		1					Rural already get little benefit from rates paid
1002		1					Concerned on-going maintenance (cedar and glass) will be high.
1004	1			1		N	
1005		1				N	Set a rate that reflects what is currently charged as rates i.e. a % of rates currently charged becomes additional levy. Centre should be infrastructure cost.
1006	1			1		N	
1008	1				1	N	
1009	1			1		N	
1010	1			1		N	
1011	1			1		N	
1012	1				1	N	
1014	1				1	N	
1016	1		1			N	
1017		1					
1018		1				N	Will the building be owned by Council, have running costs been budgeted for? Is there evidence that WC will produce cash?
1020		1				N	Not fair to ratepayers who have already pledged support
1021	1			1		N	
1022		1					
1025	1				1	N	
1026		1					
1027	1			1		N	
1028	1			1		N	Option 2 or 3 ok
1031	1				1	N	
1032	1			1		N	Still a lot to add to rates bill, concerned about those on fixed incomes
1036	1			1		N	
1038		1				N	No persons living on property
1039		1					Don't like proposed design, isite is in a good location currently, libraries future uncertain
1040		1				N	Scale project down
1041	1				1	N	
1043	1				1	N	
1044	1				1	N	
1045		1					Plan over ambitious for MA town size, what are on-going costs
1048		1					

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1050	1				1	N	
1053	1				1	N	
1054		1				N	Existing Town Hall too small for exhibitions or sports events. Relocation of existing facilities will destroy those that exist and commercial areas of town will become vacant
1056	1			1		N	
1059	1				1	Y	Best way to raise extra money. Missed opportunity if don't go ahead.
1060	1			1		Y	
1062	1			1		Y	
1063	1			1		N	
1068	1		1				Have also donated money
1070	1				1	N	
1071		1				N	
1073		1				N	Council said ratepayers wouldn't have to pay. Reduce size/cost accordingly
1074		1				N	
1078		1					Available money should be used to earthquake strengthen and renovate existing Hall
1081		1					
1082		1				N	Demolish and build new, old building is unattractive and dangerous
1085		1				N	
1088	1		1			N	
1090	1				1	N	
1093	1			1		N	
1094	1			1		N	
1095		1					Do not live in MA
1097	1						
1100		1					Flyer does not give project completion estimated costs. Worked out costs showing a .35m shortfall and optimistic view that fundraising of .4m can be achieved. Identification of project costs which bears directly on targeted rate is sloppy. 1. as retired chartered engineer involved in strengthening projects - none have achieved preconstruction estimates. \$.9m is inadequate and is based on preliminary report. Wgtn Town Hall strengthening costs ballooned by almost 50%. A full construction risks assessment should have been done before going to ratepayer. 2. Contingency sum of \$.375m adequate for new building work but inadequate for strengthening of old building, should allow 40% of strengthening component. 3. Lifetime of the strengthened Hall may only be 20 to 40 years due to code changes. Believe Hall should be demolished and build new. 4. Destination playground of \$1.3m over the top. Landscaping should fit within budget of \$0.3k.
1101	1			1		Y	
1102	1				1	N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1103	1				1	N	
1105		1				N	
1106	1				1	N	
1107	1			1		N	Option 2 or 3 ok.
1109	1				1	Y	Fully support venture, great asset
1111		1				N	Build something affordable. Too much money for population. Strengthen Hall and restore. Turning around toilets waste of money
1114		1					
1115	1			1		N	
1116		1					
1117	1				1	N	
1118		1				N	Restore the existing Hall, best acoustics ever performed in. Outbuildings can be funded as fundraising allows. Already donated large sum for Hall, not extras
1119		1				N	Many homeowners can't afford rate. No vote to proceed with development
1122		1				N	Needs to be guaranteed fixed amount over term before support given.
1124	1		1			N	
1127	1				1	N	
1128	1				1	N	
1130	1				1	N	
1132	1				1	N	
1134		1					Already donated to Centre and on a fixed income. Money better spent on Shooting Butts Rd and Oxford St
1135		1					Support hall but not targeted rate
1136	1			1			
1137	1				1	N	
1138		1					
1139		1				Y	Acknowledge time spent by Committee. 1. Cost of upgrading Hall is uncertain. 2. Interest component of \$1.3m is \$700,000, inefficient use of money. Assume overruns will be added to targeted rate? Strengthening Hall will not save it in a big quake, std reduces risk to life, code will continue to change. Suggest redo and leave isite where it is. Library does need more space. demolish and rebuild.
1143		1					Project not supposed to be burden on ratepayer. Many could not afford extra rates
1144	1				1	N	
1145	1			1		N	Do nothing not an option. Raising \$2.2m is remarkable achievement. Centre will help future proof MA
1148	1			1		N	
1149	1			1		N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1150	1		1	1	1	N	Accept any option
1151		1				N	Rate the district, resource for all community. Schemes at this cost are too expensive for small communities
1153	1		1			N	Important for future of community. \$1 week is worthwhile investment for future generations. As a business owner in Gtn, has evidence of the financial benefits from events which have been in Hall, so extending to bigger and better events is of benefit to whole of Wairarapa
1155	1				1	N	All areas identified will benefit, but township will use more.
1159	1			1		N	Won't be used by wider rural community so locals should pay. Always thought project was overly ambitious
1161	1				1	N	Do not think the existing building has any architectural merit
1162	1			1		N	
1164	1				1	N	
1171	1				1	N	
1172		1					What does marked references mean (note: possibly couldn't see Area no at the bottom)
1175	1		1			N	
1178		1				N	
1181	1				1	N	Option 1 ok if necessary
1182		1					
1184		1					
1186	1				1	N	
1187		1					Build what you can afford
1195		1				N	Support project but not this form of funding
1196	1				1	N	
1197	1				1	N	Doesn't like name
1199		1					Project scope expanded to source funding, strategically short sighted. What problem are you solving by moving isite except to access funding? Support Hall strengthening. What are alternatives? Targeted rate not for non-essential item
1204		1				N	Sets future targeted rates precedent, future cost blowout risk, targeted rates should benefit all ratepayers not those with young children e.g. ambulance, broader health services, cycle paths
1210		1				N	
1211	1		1			N	Get on with renewing/upgrading essential facility. Trust library will continue and expand free Wi-Fi for kids. Timidity never wins day
1219	1				1	N	Good to be consulted, agrees with targeted rate concept
1220		1				N	Has consideration been given to ratepayers with multiple rates demands. Wait until more funds are available. Live within means

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1224		1					(Note: Ticked No and option 2)
1225	1			1		Y	Don't support targeted rates, only supporting as Council said project wouldn't go ahead otherwise. District should be rated.
1227	1				1	N	Building should have been demolished and start new. Those already pledged are being hit twice.
1228	1				1	N	
1230	1				1	N	
1232	1				1	N	
1233	1			1		Y	
1234		1				N	Costs are estimates only, not satisfied costs won't increase, may change mind if costs final
1237		1				N	Already donating, don't wish to donate further
1242		1					Support hall but not targeted rate
1243		1				N	Rather see a new building
1244		1				N	Cut the project size to fit the funding
1245	1			1		N	
1247	1		1			N	
1251		1					Support hall but not targeted rate
1252	1				1	N	If rate is the only way to complete the project then support. Invest for long-term benefit. Have confidence in Project Team. Great opportunity for MA to develop facility that will bring community together and attract visitors.
1255	1				1	N	If support for targeted rate isn't achieved don't scrap project go back to community to discuss fundraising options
1256		1				N	
1259		1				N	
1260	1				1		Support project.
1261	1				1	N	
1262		1					
1263		1				N	Told wouldn't impact rates. Downsize to meet funds available. Don't need big million dollars building, doesn't fit with town. Upgrade town water and pools.
1265		1					
1267	1				1	N	
1269	1			1		Y	Small price to pay for benefits to town. Included attachment on value of urban design on a community
1270		1				N	
1271		1					Idiotic expense for town of this size. Water & sewerage should be main objective
1272		1				N	Undertake strengthening only. Funds should be spent on sewerage
1277		1				N	Project costs will blow out.

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1278		1				N	Do not believe the project will complete within budget.
1279	1				1	N	
1280	1			1		N	
1281		1				N	Many have not been vocal as the project was not to be funded by rates. It would be unfortunate to invalidate pledges and rework consents and grants however less than ideal way to build. Feels alternatives weren't looked at adequately. Do the majority of ratepayers support proposal as is? Believe process inadequate.
1283	1				1		
1286	1				1	Y	Design features incorporate essential facilities town requires to build a strong and health community. \$2.2m pledged shows strong support. Bold project but should be brave and ambitious, nothing in life that is of value is easily gained. Once in a life time opportunity. Need the planned youth facilities, the destination playground will attract families to live or play in MA. Iconic buildings can drive economic and social growth. Encourage council to be brave and bold to go ahead.
1287		1				Y	Council should undertake essential services, WC not essential and is unaffordable. Places financial burden on ratepayer
1288		1				N	
1289		1				N	
1291	1				1	N	Most equitable of 3 options
1293		1					
1296	1				1	N	
1297	1				1	Y	Project will enhance Mbas economic and social development for decades. A \$15 : \$65 split could be fairer
1299	1		1			N	Support concept for future generations
1301	1				1	N	
1302	1			1		N	
1304	1				1	N	
1307		1					
1308	1			1		N	Happy with any option.
1310	1				1	N	
1311		1					Demolish Town Hall, start from scratch, a big earthquake could bowl Hall despite funds spent on it
1313		1				N	
1314	1				1	N	Should proceed for benefit of district. Never be more affordable than now.
1318		1					Please advise the total rates per year including rates to cover the borrowing to complete estimate of \$3-\$5m
1319		1					Town Hall has no architectural merit to retain, project is irresponsible

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1322	1		1			N	
1323	1				1	N	Community asset so targeted rate appropriate.
1324		1					Plan over ambitious; upgrade Town Hall
1325	1		1	1	1	N	Accept any option
1333	1				1	N	
1334	1				1	N	
1336		1				N	Doesn't support rates while total project cost is unknown. Project commitment should only be made once fixed prices are known
1337		1				N	
1338	1		1				Happy with option 1, 2 or 3. Hugely beneficial to social and cultural life of town and district.
1340		1				Y	Waste of ratepayer money
1341	1				1	N	
1342	1				1	N	Wonderful opportunity for community and whole of Wairarapa
1343						N	NOTE: Unable to determine whether Y or N. Offer option of payment of a sum something less than \$76x20 to write off amount for that property plus reduce the amount needed to be borrowed and therefore pay less interest
1344		1				N	Big project for small town
1346	1				1	N	see Ata Rangī submission
1347	1				1	N	\$1160 over 20 years is small compared to benefits
1352	1		1			N	
1353		1				Y	Cut to meet funds available. Why include a café? Leave library where it is
1354	1				1		Ticked yes under protest as feel there is no other choice. In favour of centre but not in way it has been managed
1357		1				N	
1359	1				1	N	Seem fairer to have a sliding scale based on property values and with out for people on low incomes. Need to find a way to pay loan back faster.
1360	1				1	N	
1361	1				1	N	
1363		1					Use fund raising
1364	1			1		N	
1366	1			1		N	In principle don't support targeted rate for non essential assets however do support project and would like cost to be reduced
1369		1				N	Only earthquake proof existing Hall; MA can't sustain another café, financial numbers don't add up, only small community
1370	1			1		N	
1372	1				1		

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1373		1				Y	Support upgrading Hall but not project. Part funding shouldn't be made by subset of beneficiaries, should be district wide. Allocate costs over 80 years. The Ruamahanga border for setting rates doesn't make sense. Can SWDC legally impose a targeted rate? Consultation has been inadequate, ratepayers asked to vote and project total not given. As an accountant, struggling to understand what is proposed and risks, summary provided which is what should have been with consultation paper. Of concern is the funding not secured from at risk sources. Notes that SWDC has not yet joined LGFA and they won't lend beyond 2027. Wrong to use profits and cost savings from other activities to fund loans for the Hall upgrade. When an asset is debt funded the interest costs should be included in the cost of the asset up until the asset is in use (SWDC not doing). Level of debt funding from targeted rates could be more than \$1.3m/\$2m. Other funding sources not investigated. Council shouldn't be making surpluses, the surplus for FY15 could be used for Hall upgrade. No corresponding increase in income from user charges set in LTP. Plunket should continue to pay operating costs via a user charge. Appears that 30% rating cap for UAGC has been breached in some areas. Match the term of debt funding with the current estimated useful life of the upgrade in accordance with Council's debt repayment policy. Cut cloth and move forward with affordable upgrade, deliver core amenities. Site is in good location and small cafe isn't required and current playground well used. Keep landscaping simple. Don't alter union jack design of town. Concern that info now has altered since LTP adopted. Unreasonable for only 4 days to be allowed after public meeting. Consultation document incomplete. Option 3 won't deliver 100% of funding required.
1374		1					
1377	1				1	N	Will benefit community and help MA prosper and attract people to area. Benefit from having services together for young families. Proud of committee and locals that have donated. Happy for any option.
1381	1				1	N	
1383	1				1	N	
1386	1				1	N	Short term pain for long term gain. Urge Council to be visionary and courageous.
1387		1				N	
1388	1			1		N	Appreciate all work done, community must go forward
1389		1					Build what can afford
1391	1				1	N	Support in principal selling low value assets (e.g. holding paddocks) to enable acquisition/development of a more useful asset
1392		1				N	
1394		1				N	Costs for funding should have been explored fully before this stage
1396	1			1		N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1398	1			1		Y	
1399	1				1	Y	Asks Crs to apply max weight benefits to MA against an negative responses. Process has undergone rigorous process by Steering group and professional input. Feels many negative responses would still want the project to go ahead rather than scuttle the project votes. Votes not returned should be interpreted as not against the rate. Suggest interpreting a 50/50 vote as no is wrong, 20% project paid for by community good, shame if council did not commit
1400	1			1			
1401	1			1		N	No need for a café, use vending machines. Resulting space and resources would be a savings or could be utilised by library
1403	1				1	N	
1404		1					
1405		1				Y	Happy to support strengthening of Town Hall, current proposal is way beyond original concept. Targeted rates are for essential services. Centre would be available to all in district. Ratepayers met the costs for the Gtn Town Centre and presumably Anzac Hall upgrade. Sets precedent. Will organisations using facilities be paying full market rates for rental? Why can't Plunket, Toy Library etc. arrange their own purpose built building. Would be sorry to see playground size etc. altered.
1407	1			1		N	Equivalent to 1/4 cup of coffee a week.
1408		1					
1410		1				N	Reservations about spending money on an old building
1411	1				1	N	
1412		1					
1413		1					Can't afford existing rates, live within budget
1418		1				N	Don't do project without funding, ratepayers already committed \$2.2m.
1419	1				1	N	
1420		1				N	Build within budget
1425	1				1	N	
1426		1					
1427		1					Need to upgrade facilities but don't think the Town Hall is a sensible or cost-effective way to do this
1428	1			1		N	Doesn't really support but no one has any other options

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1429		1				N	<p>1. Project significantly increased in scope since 2012; would have liked to see option of supporting hub while opposing targeted rate</p> <p>2. earthquake strengthening estimate will escalate</p> <p>3. Exact strengthening achieved can only be determined if works proceed and more detailed calculations completed</p> <p>4. Stds and codes for old buildings change</p> <p>5. Think option of a purpose built space in hub design should be revisited</p> <p>6. Considerable funds spent and work of Committee impressive but not sufficient for Council to proceed</p>
1430		1					Support project, not targeted rates
1431		1				Y	<p>1. Too far, too fast. Not enough consultation. 2. Where is Plan B? last consultation 2012 with broad questions only 3. Flaws in Councils rationale. Needs in community haven't been driver in concept funding requirements have been. Good acoustics could be built into a new building. MA is endowed with old buildings of that type of architecture 3. All or nothing approach ignores staging option 4. town hall proposal should be based on future vision and cost/benefit analysis, LG Act s101a requires costs/benefits to be considered in funding decisions 5. investment decisions shouldn't proceed based on sunk costs. The community owes a debt of gratitude to volunteers/staff/donators and generosity can be honoured in other ways. 6. More info needed. Is Council confident SGL consulted widely enough within MA about proposal, pse provide the 44 groups spoken to and questions asked 4.2 How does SGL arrive at increase in 25% uplift in visitation (i.e. no new events on horizon 4.3 consideration of detrimental affect on businesses affected by moving isite, library and drawing custom away from others 4.4 What is justification of underwriting cafe 4.5 how has the Council factored into the proposal the various reports and advice received since 1996 restoration work?</p>
1435		1					
1436		1				N	
1438		1					
1441		1					
1444		1				N	
1448	1				1	N	
1449	1			1		N	
1450		1				N	
1452		1				N	Costs likely to blow out. Never used Hall. Come up with cheaper option
1453		1				N	Those that want it should fund it. Plans too grand for town this size
1454	1				1	N	Option 2 or 3 ok. What criteria determines the boundary of the blue area? Doesn't seem logical

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1457		1				N	
1462		1					
1466	1				1	N	
1470		1				N	Interest rates fluctuate, cut your coat according to your cloth
1472	1			1		N	
1473		1					
1474		1				N	No targeted rates, will donate will do so on own. Build when money is available.
1478	1				1	N	
1484	1				1	N	
1487		1				N	
1489		1					
1493	1		1			N	Hall worth saving
1494	1				1	N	
1495	1				1	N	
1496		1				N	should be funded by those that want it
1498		1				N	
1500		1				N	
1502	1		1			N	
1504	1				1	N	
1506		1				N	
1517	1		1			N	
1518	1			1		N	
1521	1				1	N	
1522		1					Why did Council think could sell Pain Farm when already had a ruling in 1995. Not against Town Hall upgrade but Centre over the top.
1523		1				N	Project has become extravagant and unaffordable. Beneficiaries struggle, don't spend money don't have
1524		1					
1525	1			1		N	
1527		1				N	1. Keep within budget 2. vote should be about retention or demolition of Hall 3. Endorse Waghorn's submission and letter from Stephen Church
1529	1				1	N	
1530		1					Most economical option should be pursued. Debt and high rates should only be for future proofing water and sewerage
1531	1				1	N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1532		1					Supportive of project but think there are other options for funding. Targeted rates have potential not good for low income earners. A community that needs food in schools shouldn't be presented with a rate increase
1534		1					Endorse letter from Stephen Church and submission from Terry and Adrienne Waghorn
1538		1				N	
1539		1					
1543	1			1		N	
1545	1				1	N	
1548	1				1	N	
1550		1					Will be paying twice (2 titles). Demolish. Used less than 10 times in 50 years.
1551		1				N	Demolish Town Hall and rebuild a CD ready utilitarian building like Gtn Museum.
1552		1					
1553		1					
1554		1					
1555		1				N	Already donating, don't want to pay more
1556	1				1		
1561	1			1			
1564	1				1		Asset to all
1565	1				1	N	
1566	1			1		N	Would happily pay a one-off payment of \$1,000 to reduce interest costs, maybe others would too?
1568		1				Y	
1570	1				1	Y	Great opportunity to revamp Hall. Will engender a sense of local well-being and boost local economy
1575		1				N	Demolish Town Hall, build community event centre, leave isite where it is
1577	1			1		N	
1579		1				N	Plan doesn't consider future of the Hall and focuses on new additions which are superfluous.
1582		1					Scale project down. Already plenty of cafes, look for volunteers to build playground and landscape
1588	1				1	Y	needs to be visionary. \$1.4m raised by fundraising is extraordinary. Targeted rates always controversial
1590	1				1	N	Centre will enliven town, encourage visitors. Be bold in creation of new project. Have confidence in people working to secure project. Community will reap the reward in future. Don't want \$1.4m gifted funding to be wasted.
1593		1				N	Scale project back. If shortfall now, may be struggle to maintain and resource properly to ensure utilised sufficiently.

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1600	1			1		N	
1601		1				N	Keep fundraising, don't need a café
1603		1					
1604	1		1				Strongly support. Benefits to Ctn and Gtn a strongly visible. MA needs this to increase its community activities
1606	1			1		N	
1607		1					
1609		1					
1610	1				1	N	
1611		1				N	Extension unnecessary and doesn't fit with town. Doesn't support moving isite - traffic congestion. Healthy water more pressing.
1612		1					
1614	1				1	N	Town Hall is great asset both acoustically and historically. Gtn and Ctn have grown as a result of development of town centres. Option 2 ok as well
1619	1					N	Any option ok
1622	1				1		Design features incorporate essential facilities town requires to build a strong and health community. \$2.2m pledged shows strong support. Bold project but should be brave and ambitious, nothing in life that is of value is easily gained. Once in a life time opportunity. Need the planned youth facilities, the destination playground will attract families to live or play in MA. Iconic buildings can drive economic and social growth. Encourage council to be brave and bold to go ahead.
1624	1				1	N	
1627	1				1	N	Important project for community, SWDC needs to find a workable solution so can proceed.
1628	1			1		N	
1630		1				N	
1632	1				1	N	
1634		1				N	Youth facility more important, project suits on % of population not the whole. Need to do something for people who struggle to make ends meet.
1636		1				N	Won't use, rates high already, user should pay.
1641		1				N	Live within means, delay until money is available
1642	1			1			
1646		1				N	Consider and report on votes from green area who vote in favour of Option 1 but don't wish to pay themselves. Should add these to the blue area votes that oppose the targeted rates
1647	1				1	N	
1652		1					
1656		1				N	As per submission to Mayor

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1657	1					N	
1658		1				N	Continue fundraising, fixed income.
1659		1					(Note: Ticked No and Option 3). Nice to be consulted - thanks.
1660		1				N	
1661		1				N	
1665		1					
1666	1				1	N	invaluable asset for community and cost worth it. Current Hall great asset but under used. Now is the opportunity to turn and asset into a community hub for future generations
1667	1				1	N	
1669	1			1			
1671		1				N	Support strengthening of Hall but not rest of development. If rate is applied then should be district wide
1673	1				1	N	Appreciate the organising group's efforts.
1674	1				1	N	
1675	1		1			N	Strongly support
1677		1				N	Build within budget
1678		1					
1680	1			1		N	Rates already really high
1683	1		1				
1684	1				1	N	
1686		1					Shouldn't happen before possibility of amalgamation. Should have investigated possibility of sales of property before spending ratepayer money. Don't believe out of towners would use new town hall as a wedding venue, playground ideal as is, plunket inclusion not appropriate, architecture attachment unattractive, rates already increased 40% over 5 years.
1687		1					Town Hall is old, ugly, freezing, earthquake risk and not used. New building ditto. Small pop of MA can't sustain new Hall. Demolish and replace.
1689	1			1		N	MA needs a sizable multi-function venue to sustain growth. Bundling service providers makes sense
1690		1				N	1. Funding proposal is flawed 2. No final plans for project so no reliable cost projections 3. Inevitable cost of refurbishing an old building will exceed best estimates 5. what happens if amount collected by rates is insufficient? 6. on-going costs would probably be higher than existing equivalents, how will these be met. Is there a business plan for marketing and management of the Centre 7. If provision of library is core activity should this charge be included as targeted rate? 8. isite, cafe, theatre, exhibition centre are commercial rather than core, why fund by targeted rate when they produce revenue for Council 9. prospect of LG reorganisation

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1691	1				1	N	
1695	1		1			N	
1696	1				1	N	
1697		1				Y	If worth support pay out of general rates.
1698	1			1		N	
1699	1				1	N	
1700	1				1	N	
1702	1				1	N	
1703		1				N	
1704		1					
1705		1				N	Support strengthening and renovating of Hall. Don't see the need for larger modern complex
1706		1					
1707		1				N	
1709		1				N	If vote is yes then Option 2. If no, then how does this get funded? Consider more user pays
1710		1				N	
1711	1				1	N	
1715		1				N	Strengthen Town Hall and raise supper floor. Isite better where it is. Town Hall not a significant bldg
1717		1				N	Scale down plans to fit budget
1718		1				N	Rate district
1725		1				Y	Fund shortfall by making savings in other areas
1726	1				1	N	
1728	1				1	N	
1729		1				N	(Note: Ticked No and option 2)
1730		1					
1731		1				N	SWDC assured ratepayer not funded via rates
1740		1					Don't get into debt the town can't afford
1741		1					
1742		1				N	
1743		1					Are you building a castle for the Queen?
1748	1				1	N	
1753		1				Y	Basic doubts about finances
1755	1						
1756	1				1	N	Will there be a clause specifically addressing liquidated damages in the fixed price contract pertaining to cost and/or time overruns

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1757	1				1		
1758		1					
1759	1				1	N	Thanks to people who have done so much
1760	1				1	N	Entire district will benefit
1761		1					
1767	1				1	N	
1769		1				N	
1772		1					
1776		1				N	Make current plans cost effective (remove café)
1777		1				N	Love concept but we can't afford. \$2.6m could build a decent centre, too expensive
1781		1				N	Isite, Library and Plunket already exist, demolish Town Hall and build simple rec centre.
1782	1			1		Y	
1784		1				N	
1786	1				1	N	Only one chance make it count
1787		1				N	MA too small for investment this size, rates already high. Town mostly pensioners on fixed income. Fix Town Hall without add-ons
1788		1				N	
1789		1				N	
1790		1					Paying enough rates already, don't support options
1791		1				N	
1795	1				1	N	
1796		1				N	Rethink entire project now there is a shortfall
1797	1				1	N	
1799		1				Y	Refer email of 25 Sept to mayor/CEO/Crs; Opposed to targeted rate for non-essential services and request alternatives i.e. staging project, raising funds privately or disbanding project in present form
1804		1					
1805		1					Aim for further fundraising, delay start, downsize. Rates already too high for services. What if targeted rate goes up over 20 years
1807		1					
1809		1				N	Debt not for non-essential services, enough cafes in town, isite in good position and toy library can operate anywhere.
1811		1					Build within budget
1812	1				1	Y	
1813		1					
1816		1				N	More important things to spend money on e.g. footpaths, rates already high don't waste money

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1817	1				1	N	
1819		1				Y	Support the Waihinga Centre to go ahead with funds currently available, further development to be added as funds become available
1820	1				1	N	Foolish to scrap given hours and money spent getting so far. Restarting would mean more costs to end up with lesser centre. Was considering making a voluntary donation, however this must now become an involuntary one
1821	1		1			N	
1822	1				1	N	
1823		1					Demolish and build new, don't need café or new playground.
1824	1				1	N	Any option ok
1825		1				N	
1826	1		1			N	
1827	1				1	N	Not my main residence, should a discount apply to non-residents?
1830	1				1	N	Happy with option 1, 2 or 3. Rural communities should do as much as possible to entice people to area. Centre will be a huge asset. Proud to be part of a community that has pledged large amounts of cash, astounding that shortfall is only the size it is. Centre would service district. Ask Council to take a long term view and stand behind supporters.
1831	1				1	N	
1834		1				N	Majority of community already contributed via fund raising. Doesn't believe MA needs a \$5m Town Hall.
1836	1				1		System is ok provided same system is used if Gtn or Fstn want to improve assets, and that the increase in rates does stop in 20 yrs
1843		1					
1844		1					Existing library sufficient, don't fund projects can't afford
1846		1				N	Selling house, new owners don't need more expense
1850		1				N	
1852		1				N	If this goes ahead how will cost overruns be funded?
1854		1					
1857		1				N	Anticipated funding from sale of council owned land should have been investigated earlier. Build what can afford
1858		1				N	
1860		1				N	
1861		1				N	
1865	1			1		N	Think design is a bit over the top but agree with project and willing to pay to support future generations
1867	1		1			N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1870		1				N	1. For price build new building, or strengthen Hall within a lower budget. Review Lowe report. Isite ideal location where it is. Plunket could upgrade their own building and include Toy Library. Against selling Huangarua Park, playground suitable as is.
1876		1				N	Need proper event management process in place. Do not support. Noise complaints are not investigated for existing Town Hall, will be worse after
1877	1				1	N	Entire ward would benefit
1878	1				1	N	
1880	1			1		N	
1882	1		1			N	
1884	1			1			
1885		1				N	1. Costs always over estimates 2. Design shouldn't get RMA - over the top 3. Work required for sewerage will require rates increases 4. Redesign with realistic goal
1886	1			1		N	
1888		1				N	No guarantee proposed funding will finish project. Library and café takes from existing businesses
1889	1			1		N	
1890	1				1	N	
1892		1				N	Project is expensive for size of community and doesn't fit with historic building
1893	1				1	N	
1899	1			1		Y	Very important for future of MA, would move town to next level now wine and tourism is levelled. Pulls together empty centre of town, to not do would be a mistake for town's progress
1903		1				N	
1905		1					Rates increased 40% in last 5 years. Hall is an ugly building. What is projected usage and income. Should have investigated possibility of sales of property before spending ratepayer money. Don't believe out of towners would use new town hall as a wedding venue, playground ideal as is, plunket inclusion not appropriate, architecture attachment unattractive.
1911	1			1		N	
1912		1				N	
1916	1			1		N	
1917	1			1		N	
1919	1			1		N	
1920		1					
1922		1				N	
1923		1				N	
1926		1					

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1929	1				1	N	
1931	1		1			N	
1934	1			1		N	
1935		1				N	
1937	1		1			N	
1939		1				N	
1942	1			1		N	
1943		1					
1945		1				N	
1947	1				1	N	
1949	1				1	N	Supported demolition and replacement, however if the building is to be strengthened and restored option 3 seems fairer
1951		1					
1952	1			1		N	
1956	1				1	N	
1957		1				N	
1959	1				1		To the team that worked hard - you won't please everyone keep up great work.
1961		1				N	
1962		1				N	Agree to upgrade Hall, disagree with project and costs. Difficult now budgeting for rates
1964	1			1			
1965		1				N	
1967	1				1	N	Can't let this fail
1971	1				1		
1976	1			1		N	
1977	1				1	N	Happy with option 1, 2 or 3
1978		1					
1979		1				N	
1979		1				N	
1981		1					
1982		1				N	Rather fund new building, old building cold, dark and won't be used
1983		1					
1985	1				1	N	
1988		1				N	Hall needs strengthening, but don't like all in one design or architecture
1990		1					
1992	1				1	N	
1993	1				1	N	
1995		1				Y	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
1996	1			1		N	
1997	1			1		N	
1998	1			1		Y	
1999	1			1		Y	
2001		1				N	Realised after hearing engineer say that strengthening won't save Hall in big quake that Hall needs to be demolished
2004	1				1	N	Will be heavy users of the space, looking forward to construction
2005		1					
2006		1				N	
2008		1					These are not options, build within budget
2009	1				1	Y	Town hall had become very rundown, not used much. Town Hall Committee began plan of action to upgrade Hall. Plans were produced which had high level of community approval. Became aware Hall must be earthquake proofed. Town Hall Group changed and focus was on wide community use of hall to get funding. Ambitious scheme hatched, don't like all the scheme but is there a scheme that everyone loves? We must press ahead. As part of this project the 1913 Court House building and land deserves some special consideration. Project seems to large and ambitious (on-going upkeep?). Not in favour of targeted rating. Playground size would decrease. Cafe is unnecessary. Good site for library and isite. Favour reduced project with no extra rates or less than proposed.
2011	1				1	N	Option 2 2nd preference
2013		1				N	Both members of household say No
2014	1				1	N	
2015		1					
2020	1				1	N	Wider district should contribute to lesser extent.
2021		1					
2023		1					Targeted rates shouldn't be used for nonessential amenities
2026	1						Go for it, community must have
2027	1					N	No preference for option. Great project
2028		1				N	
2029	1		1				Maybe money placed in bonus bonds, alternatively interest on money used to fund loan
2032	1		1			N	
2034	1			1		Y	
2035		1					Strengthen the Town Hall, refurbish and continue fundraising to do extension at a later date
2037		1				N	Opposed
2039		1				N	Council promised no rates for this project
2044	1			1		N	Those who have significant pledge (\$1500) should be exempt otherwise we don't support

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2045		1				N	Sooner we join Wgtn the better
2046		1				N	Fund shortfall by making savings in other areas
2049		1					Don't waste ratepayers money
2050		1				N	Rather have new building, old one cold, dark. Won't be utilised.
2052		1				Y	Want to see alternative options for funding. Work could begin but fundraising efforts continue. Info on outstanding amount is equivalent to landscaping
2053		1					
2055	1		1			N	
2057	1			1		N	
2058		1				N	
2063		1				N	Would be hard to pay on a fixed income
2065		1					
2067	1			1		N	
2070		1				N	Best current estimate not enough info to agree. Continue fundraising.
2071		1				N	Demolish Hall, build new for lower cost that we can afford.
2073		1					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposed to targeted rates for non-essential services 2. What will cost of the loan to ratepayers be? What happens if cost overruns occur? 3. Can Council go ahead with project regardless of outcome of submissions? 4. Who can make a submission? 5. Like a representative to scrutineer decisions before final decision made 6. Have other options been considered?
2074	1		1			N	
2076		1					Reassess project
2077		1					Cut down wish list and redo costings
2078	1			1		N	
2079		1					
2081	1			1		N	
2086	1				1		Like to see plan for how Centre will be marketed to ensure on-going revenue and benefit to community. Who responsible for marketing? Could revenue enable reduction of loan will rate be reduced?
2088		1				N	
2091		1				N	
2094		1				N	
2095		1				N	Strengthen Town Hall, spend money on upgrading water
2097		1					
2098	1				1	N	
2099		1					Fix water, footpaths required, don't sell assets

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2100		1				N	
2101		1				N	
2102	1			1		N	
2103		1					Don't even have a footpath
2104		1					
2105	1		1				Have also donated money
2106		1					CH and M Hunt (number cut off)
2108		1					Architect shouldn't be on Board (conflict of interest), use funds available, should be able to provide great centre with funds available
2109		1					
2115		1				N	Too ambitious for small number of rate payers. What is total interest cost? Support redevelopment (suggestion for retaining façade and demolishing/selling materials provided). When hall is freehold then consider including plunket and library.
2118	1				1	N	small price to pay for community facility
2122	1				1	N	Option 1 ok too.
2124	1				1		
2126		1				N	Funding should be in place before starts, ratepayers shouldn't be tapped for shortfall, fixed income and can't afford
2130	1				1	N	Please consider lack of children's play space beside Town and Medical Centre
2134	1				1	N	
2140		1				N	Better water quality and new bridge would be better way to spend rates
2143	1				1	N	
2144	1			1		N	
2157		1				N	
2159	1			1		N	As a parent, home owner/investor and business owner project must go ahead
2160	1		1			N	
2164	1				1	N	
2166	1		1			N	
2169		1				N	Rates high enough. Project scale out of control, don't need fancy bells and whistles
2170		1				N	1. plan was no rates increase 2. matter of principal 3. Fix Town Hall affordably
2172		1				N	Fix back of the Hall. Sell Council owned farms if you want to spend money
2173	1			1		N	Like isite to stay where it is.
2174		1				Y	1. Amount of loan is unknown 2. inadequate consultation on project 3. potential cost over-runs, other priorities for town 4. vote no
2177		1				N	Would have to pay twice (2 properties).
2181	1				1	N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2188	1			1		N	Rural MA will use facility too. Did SWDC district contribute to Gtn Hall upgrade? All wards need to fund their own town upgrades
2189		1				N	
2190		1				N	
2192		1				N	Support ideas to incorporate Plunket, toy library, playground, but need space for wider sectors of community i.e. youth area doubled as indoor netball, badminton etc.
2193		1				N	Downgrade project, Esther St footpath higher priority
2198		1				N	
2200	1		1	1	1	N	Accept any option
2207	1			1		N	
2208		1				N	Town Hall hardly used, money better spent elsewhere
2214		1				N	Funds required should be raised before project starts
2215		1				N	Funds required should be raised before project starts
2216		1				N	
2218	1				1	N	
2219	1		1				
2220		1					
2225	1			1		N	
2227	1			1		N	
2233	1			1		N	
2235		1				N	Want a footpath on Esther Street
2237		1					
2240	1				1	N	
2243		1				N	Huge expenditure for future sewerage, more residents on fixed income will leave MA
2248		1				N	Targeted rates shouldn't be used of non-essential services
2249		1					Council shouldn't get involved in facilities that compete with local businesses (cafés)
2251		1				N	(selected option 3)
2252		1				N	Told asset sales would fund, clearly not enough research undertaken.
2257	1				1	N	
2258		1				N	Salvage materials from the Hall and then demolish and rebuild frugally out of available funds
2261		1					
2263		1					Demolish, build new.
2266	1		1			N	
2267	1			1		N	Just do it
2270		1				N	
2271		1					Lack of consultation re existing building

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2277		1				N	Rates already high, need footpaths, don't think should save existing Hall
2278	1				1	N	
2282	1			1		N	
2283		1					
2285		1				N	Funding should be found elsewhere or scale back project. Targeted rate would set bad precedent
2289		1					Could build new with present funding
2291		1				N	
2293		1				N	Fixed income, rates already expensive. Keep fundraising.
2294	1			1			Build a new version at reduced cost (e.g. chch). Water improvements and more plantings in village are needed. Would like to see costs of a new building would be
2295	1				1	N	
2297		1				N	
2298	1				1	N	
2304		1				Y	Stop spending money don't have. Are a small community, think on that level.
2305		1					
2311		1					
2312	1				1	N	
2314		1					Project likely to have cost overruns as nothing finalised. Want money spent on sewage and clean water
2315	1		1			N	
2318		1					\$6.2m too much for this town. Too many unknowns. New building in keeping with village community. Hire a professional funder.
2319		1					Demolish Town Hall. Build something new, low maintenance and practical
2321		1					
2325		1				N	
2328		1				Y	Council has assets with a lower ROA ratio and less users it could sell (e.g. holding paddocks which are old concept). Initial project was to strengthen Hall, project expanded from \$900k to \$6.4m
2331		1					
2333	1			1		N	Stage project to save costs and use local trades
2334		1				N	A town of 1300 can't afford development of this scale
2335		1				N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2338		1				N	Sectors in community rates already a burden
2339		1				N	
2345		1					
2346		1					
2349		1					
2350		1				Y	Council doesn't have mandate to proceed from the majority of ratepayers
2352	1			2		N	Whole region benefits
2354		1				Y	Option 4: seek central govt funding for shortfall. Visitors to mba spend and pay GST
2355		1					
2358	1			1		N	
2359		1				N	Costs on pension are hard to allow for. Said no extra rates for this project. Starting to think Town Hall should be demolished
2360		1					Pensioners can't afford costs. Said no extra rates for this project. Get Council to do fundraising.
2363		1				N	Targeted rate for non-essential items is wrong.
2364		1				N	
2367		1				N	
2367		1				N	
2368	1			1			
2370	1				1	N	Keep up great work
2373	1			1		N	
2376		1				N	Rather see a new building
2379		1					
2380	1				1	N	
2383		1				N	On fixed income. Support Town Hall complex if it was affordable
2385		1					Demolish Town Hall, build new
2387		1					
2390		1					
2391		1					
2393	1				1		
2394	1				1	N	Good to get local businesses involved in build, don't outsource all work to large companies
2396		1				N	
2398	1				1	N	Lets get on with it
2399		1				N	Choice unfair and incomplete, doesn't explain if project can be scaled back or slowed down, until options are explained can't support targeted rate
2400		1					

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2403	1		1				Happy with options 1, 2 or 3
2404		1					No mandate to proceed
2405		1					Fundraise, don't rate
2406	1				1	N	
2407		1					
2408		1				N	
2409	1		1			N	
2410		1				N	Only spend money available, oppose projects that raise rates
2411		1					Leave isite where it is. Council building by isite would make ideal library. Save façade of Town Hall and renew behind, proposed architecture hideous. Playground too grand.
2415		1				N	Targeted rates not for non-essential services. Spending is extreme for a town size of MA. Could have a fantastic Town Hall without this debt
2416		1				N	
2419		1				N	Do we need another café or cinema, cut costs to what can afford
2421		1				N	
2424	1				1	N	
2425		1				N	
2426	1				1	N	
2431		1					
2432		1				N	
2433		1				N	Replace Hall staircase and upgrade existing Hall, don't built extra building, rate the district, all will use.
2434	1				1	N	If we lose Town Hall, won't get another, stick with project
2436		1				N	
2443		1				N	
2444		1				N	Centre does not need to be so large, better served with a sports centre
2446		1				N	No to losing playground area, opposed to water area, no to rate, wait until you can afford
2447		1				Y	Don't relocate toilets. Don't redesign Texas St (alters union jack). No to pedestrian crossing. No to rate. Why cut down playground?
2451	1				1	N	Leave isite where it is, use space for library, do we really need a café?
2452	1				1	N	Happy with option 1, 2 or 3
2453		1					
2455	1			1		N	
2456		1				N	Don't need a grand building at such a large cost
2457		1				N	Spend within budget. Isite in great location, don't need more cafes
2459	1				1	N	Happy to go for option 1 if option 3 rejected
2460		1				N	Scale project back

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
2462	1			1		N	Centre must be completed, will enhance district. Can't be left behind.
2465		1					Struggle for retirees to pay rates as is. A one off payment would be preferable.
2467		1				N	
2469		1				N	
2470		1					
2471		1				Y	Develop new facility from available funds
2473		1				N	Not what rates are for. Don't need another café
2474	1				1	N	
2475		1					Don't spend money on Town Hall - demolish and invest in something new. Don't want to loose children's park, Hall doesn't get used often, need a new bridge into town.
2477	1				1	N	
2485	1				1	N	
2493	1		1				
2495	1				1		
2501		1					just fix up existing Hall (back wall)
2504	1				1	N	
2505	1			1			
2506	1			1			Keep up great work
2508	1				1		
2509	1				1	N	
2512		1				N	
Total Urban	339	397	41	109	190		
3001	1				1	N	
3004		1					Concerned costs will continue to escalate. Money better spent on a new building
3008	1		1			N	Option 2 ok as well (details to remain private)
3015		1				N	
3016	1				1	N	
3017		1					Would have liked to know full cost of the project not adding info piece meal.
3018	1				1	N	
3019	1				1	N	
3020		1				N	
3023		1					
3024	1			1		Y	
3025	1				1	N	Only residential properties should be included. Pay rates on 4 properties, 1 occupied. Difference between \$29 or \$116 if option 3 was chosen

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3026	1		1				Only residential properties should be included. Pay rates on 4 properties, 1 occupied. Difference between \$29 or \$116 if option 3 was chosen
3028	1				1	N	
3031	1			1		N	
3033		1				N	
3035	1				1	N	Rate must not increase at any stage
3037	1				1	N	Ok for option 2, but believe option 3 is fairer to people who won't use it as much
3039		1				N	Admire vision for WC but downsize. Budget too optimistic. Council should have researched funding before starting.
3044	1				1	N	
3045		1					
3051	1				1	N	Favour higher levy for short time, save on interest. Do figures for Option 3 add up, seems light?
3052	1				1	N	
3053		1				N	
3056		1					Demolish Hall build smaller meeting place. Keep library out and don't compete with Carterton Events Centre
3060	1		1				
3061	1				1	N	
3065		1					
3066		1				Y	Don't like design. Additions should be in similar style to original form.
3071	1				1	N	
3072		1					
3075		1				N	
3080	1			1		N	
3082		1					
3083		1					
3084		1				N	
3085		1				N	Other areas require funds e.g. Shooting Butts road sealing and Oxford Street footpath
3086		1					
3090	1		1			N	
3100	1		1			N	
3111		1				N	
3112		1				N	Prefer targeted rates to speed up discharge of sewer to land; clean water should be priority over Town Hall
3113	1				1	N	
3114	1				1	N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3116	1				1	N	
3117	1				1	N	
3119	1		1			N	
3133		1					Pirinoa already has an underutilised community funded Hall. Don't need another white elephant especially going into debt. User pays. Rates already high.
3135		1					Agree to upgrading Town Hall but better uses for rates than building a new building when so many are empty
3137		1					Plunket already has a building and land
3138		1				N	
3141		1				N	
3144		1				N	
3148		1					Whole thing waste of taxpayers money. Excellent venue in Carterton and excellent movie theatre and café
3150	1				1		
3152		1				N	
3155		1				N	
3157		1				N	
3158		1				N	Best intentions, but feel will be underutilised. If Gtn Town Centre didn't have Library may not be used so regularly.
3159	1				1		
3160		1				N	
3162		1					High build and on-going costs, low usage, don't need coffee shop, support strengthening only
3164	1				1	N	
3165		1				N	
3178		1					
3180		1					
3183	1				1	N	
3187	1					N	
3188	1		1			N	
3193		1					
3194		1				N	Targeted rates should be used for infrastructure; sewerage, environmental, pollution etc.
3196	1				1		
3197		1				N	
3200		1					
3201	1				1	N	
3203		1				N	No use for centre

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3207		1					
3209		1					
3211	1			1		N	
3216		1				N	Out of character with MA, no new income introduced facilities already exist, spend what can afford
3219	1				1	N	
3220	1		1			Y	Many land owners south of the Ruamahanga river will receive no benefit
3221	1				1	N	
3223	1				1		
3224		1					
3226		1				N	Can't afford rates increase. Fundraise
3227	1				1	N	
3229		1					Rates already high with limited services (Lake Ferry).
3230		1				N	
3232		1					
3238	1				1	N	Fully support the Centre
3241		1					
3243	1				1	N	
3244		1					
3245	1		1			N	Only of benefit to ratepayers in close contact with MA
3247	1			1		N	
3250	1				1	N	Important facility
3252		1				N	
3253		1				N	Funds should be available before project goes ahead (not borrowed). Community done great job
3258	1			1		N	
3260		1				N	Like concept but if can't afford need to live within budget
3268		1				N	
3269	1		1			N	
3270	1				1	N	
3272	1				1	N	
3274		1				N	Don't support extension to historic building. Isite and exhibitions have breached promises previously. No use for toys or plunket
3276		1				N	Don't get in more debt, build what can be afforded
3278		1					Seems to be uncertainty in the funding and control of project. More important projects e.g. sewage that require funding.
3279		1				N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3285	1		1			N	
3289		1					Demolish. Waste of money
3290		1					
3295		1				N	
3302		1					Don't go to MA, wouldn't use centre.
3303		1				N	Pay more rates than should for holiday bach. Don't use MA facilities.
3307	1				1	N	
3313	1				1	N	Option 2 ok as well. Option 1 not fair.
3314		1				N	
3316	1				1		
3323		1				N	
3325		1					
3334		1				N	
3339		1				N	
3340		1					Crs have no right to commit ratepayers to long term debt
3347		1				N	Agree with having a community centre, but not a restoration of the old building. Demolish and build new.
3348		1					
3349	1		1			N	
3351	1				1	N	
3354	1				1	N	
3357		1					
3358	1			1		N	
3359		1				N	Waihinga Centre good project, but should develop with funds available and stage as funding becomes available or cut the project back
3363	1				1	N	Live on coast and unlikely to need/use the Centre
3365		1				N	
3372		1				N	
3373	1				1	N	
3381		1				N	
3384	1		1			N	Important for community to have facilities but they should be funded by people in MA immediate surrounds
3385	1				1	N	
3387		1					
3392	1				1	N	
3394	1				1	N	

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3395		1				N	Non rate payers are also users of facilities so work out how they can contribute and will support
3396		1				N	
3401		1				N	No option to say if vote is yes then support option 1
3403	1		1			N	
3404		1					
3412	1				1		
3413		1				N	Not part of MA township and don't use Town Hall
3415		1				N	Prefer targeted rates for footpaths
3416		1					Non-essential service, detracting from core Council business. Stand down from project now, debt funding over 20yrs is an extravagance, no assurance budget won't be exceeded. Preference is for rates to provide essential services. Assumption is MA is the centre of cultural and social district - it's not.
3419		1					
3425		1				N	Demolish and build new
3426		1				N	
3427		1				N	
3431		1					Wouldn't use facility
3432		1				N	
3434		1				N	Support update but will not benefit. Luke-warm on Levy (also ticked option 3).
3437	1				1	N	
3444		1					
3452	1				1	N	Rate must not increase at any stage
3453		1				N	Would donate, but compulsive rates not the answer. Costs always escalate. User Pays.
3455	1				1	N	Good to keep things safe and wonderful for MA
3457		1				N	
3458		1				N	
3462		1					Rate district. Do project in stages
3465		1					
3468	1				1	N	
3469		1				N	
3471		1				N	Don't support rate, but if goes ahead select option 3 (be mindful of financial need to maintain the road to Cape Palliser)
3472	1			1		N	
3474		1				N	Struggling with rates payments, don't want to pay for something will never use
3477	1			1		N	
3478		1					

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3479		1				N	Demolish and build new. If go ahead want to see project plan that is realistic
3482		1					
3483		1				N	
3484		1				N	Requests report published with names of yes/no
3485	1				1	N	
3486		1					
3487		1				N	Admire vision for WC but downsize. Budget too optimistic. Council should have researched funding before starting.
3495		1					
3496	1				1	Y	Effort by team waste if doesn't go ahead, unlikely to get a team working like this again, one off opportunity
3498		1					
3499		1					
3501		1					Support strengthening only, money better spent on water, sewerage
3508		1					Will never use
3510		1				N	At LTP consultation mtg, a rates reduction was signalled, the community said would prefer better roads. Prefer money spent on roads in Tora/Tuturumuri/Te Awaiti and White Rock. Don't believe Hall will benefit wider community
3511		1				N	
3518	1				1		
3523	1				1	N	Keep up the good work
3526	1			1			
3527	1				1	N	
3528	1				1	N	
3540	1		1			N	
3541	1				1	N	
3542		1				N	
3543	1			1		N	Don't agree with assumption that best place for isite is at gateway to town. Moving will help draw visitors into town. Centralised centre is great idea
3545		1				N	White elephant, too far from town centre, no assurance it will meet earthquake stds in 20 yrs, don't want children burdened with rates
3546		1					No use for facility
3548		1				N	Demolish Town Hall and rebuild with funds available, large venues exist in district, population doesn't warrant another hall.
3549		1					Even after upgrade will continue to be earthquake nightmare.
3550	1				1	N	
3554		1				N	Already pay for services don't use. Seal roads at Te Awaiti, project for locals to support

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3555	1		1			N	
3557	1			1		N	Agree with development, however disagree Town Hall should be strengthened. Keep façade and create new.
3558		1				N	
3560		1				N	Won't use
3561		1					Build, repair, replace within budget. Would expect written quote not best estimate
3566	1			1		N	Happy for option 2 or 3. Centre will be an asset.
3569		1					Money better spent on environmental issues on coast e.g. rubbish, toilets, fences, erosion, reserves - all used more than proposed Waihinga Centre
3570	1				1	N	
3573		1				N	Don't agree with targeted rate for non-essential services
3574		1					
3582		1				N	
3584		1					
3586		1					
3587	1			1		N	
3588		1					Pensioners struggling with rates and insurance already
3589		1				N	SWDC said would not ask rate payers for funding, disappointed with change
3590		1				N	
3593		1					
3594		1					
3596		1				N	
3598		1					
3600	1		1			N	People who have an interest in MA should help fund. Don't want to pay for MA amenities I won't use
3603		1					
3607		1				N	
3609		1				N	Informed no extra rates required. If have to proceed option 3.
3611		1					
3612	1				1	N	
3616	1				1	N	
3623		1					Tuturumuri Hall in desperate need of maintenance and money. Already donated money.
3624	1				1	N	Country people have their own halls to upkeep as well.
3625		1				N	
3630	1			1		N	
3635		1				N	Too far away to derive benefit, if residents closer want to support then option 1
3637		1				N	Not used in 50 years, white elephant

Appendix 1 - Submission Summary

Ratepayer Number	Targeted Rate Yes	Targeted Rate No	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Present Submission	Summary
3651		1					
3655	1				1	N	Area needs more development and necessary infrastructure (including police presence)
3656	1				1	N	Have 15 rateable properties which would be \$435, not keen on that but happy to contribute
3657	1			1		N	
3658	1			1		N	
Total Rural	96	147	17	17	61		
TOTAL	435	544	58	126	251		