

Notice is given that an ordinary meeting of the Full Council will be held on:

Date: Thursday 12 December 2019
Time: 9.30 am
Meeting Room: Tasman Council Chamber
Venue: 189 Queen Street
Richmond

Full Council

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS AGENDA

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS

8 REPORTS

8.18 Tasman District Council Annual Plan 2020/2021	5
--	---

8 REPORTS

8.18 TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL ANNUAL PLAN 2020/2021

Decision Required

Report To:	Full Council
Meeting Date:	12 December 2019
Report Author:	Matthew McGlinchey, Finance Manager; Sharon Flood, Strategic Policy Manager; Alan Bywater, Senior Policy Advisor
Report Number:	RCN19-12-22

1 Summary

- 1.1 Staff have started developing Council's Annual Plan for next year. This report provides information on the proposed debt level, rates income, and capital works programme. Under the Local Government Act 2002 (Act), Council is only required to consult if there are significant or material changes proposed in the Annual Plan compared to the corresponding year in the Long Term Plan (LTP).
- 1.2 Staff have undertaken an assessment of the proposed changes and it is our view that the changes are not significant or material. Staff recommend that an informal communication process with the community is undertaken.
- 1.3 Overall, the proposed Annual Plan 2020/2021 contains a marginally higher increase in rates revenue of 2.97%, excluding growth, compared with the corresponding year in the LTP 2018-2028 of 2.46%.
- 1.4 The proposed changes will cause the incidence of rates to change from what was in the third year of the LTP.
- 1.5 The forecast net debt level in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 is \$199.7 million. This is comparable to the forecast Year 3 LTP net debt level of \$199.6 million.
- 1.6 There have been several changes to the capital works programme, resulting in an increase in the overall, the capital budget compared with the corresponding year in the LTP 2018-2028. The majority of these are changes are due to the timing of projects signaled in the LTP either being delayed or brought forward by a few years. The upgrade of Port Tarkohe is the most substantial increase in capital expenditure, with the cost to be substantially offset by a grant from the Governments Provincial Growth Fund if the application is successful.
- 1.7 The Council has a number of fees and charges that it reviews and sets each year. Under the Act, this process requires consultation using the Special Consultative Procedure. Staff propose to undertake consultation on the Schedule of Fees and Charges over March and April 2020.

2 Draft Resolution

That the Full Council

- 1. receives the Tasman District Council Annual Plan 2020/2021 report RCN19-12-22; and**
- 2. agrees that the proposed changes to the capital programme, debt levels and rates for 2020/2021, compared to those set out in Year 3 of the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 are not significant or material; and**
- 3. agrees not to produce a Consultation Document or formally consult on the Annual Plan 2020/2021; and**
- 4. notes that staff will prepare communication material on the Annual Plan including rates, debt and major projects; and**
- 5. notes that a final Annual Plan 2020/2021, and rates resolution will be brought to the Council meeting on 28 May 2020 for consideration and adoption; and**
- 6. notes that the Statement of Proposal for the Proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2020/2021 will be reported to the 13 February 2020 Council meeting for adoption for community consultation and submissions.**

3 Purpose of the Report

- 3.1 To provide information on the proposed rates, debt level and capital programme changes for the Annual Plan 2020/2021.
- 3.2 To seek a decision on whether to formally consult with the community before adopting the final Annual Plan 2020/2021.

4 Background and Discussion

- 4.1 At the Councillor only sessions on 21 November 2019 and 6 December 2019, the changes in debt level, capital programme, rates revenue, key rate movements and rating impact on example properties for the 2020/2021 year were discussed.
- 4.2 The key points covered at the briefing sessions included:
 - 4.2.1 the proposed total rates income increase in the Annual Plan will stay below the 3% Financial Strategy cap at 2.97%; and
 - 4.2.2 the proposed net debt level for 2020/2021 (and subsequent years) will stay below the Financial Strategy debt cap at \$199.7m; and
 - 4.2.3 there are several changes proposed to the capital works programme in 2020/2021.
- 4.3 The levels of service as set out in Year 3 of our LTP 2018-2028 will remain the same.

Rates Revenue and Net Debt Changes

- 4.4 The proposed total rates income increase is 2.97%, compared with 2.46% for the 2020/2021 year in the LTP. .
- 4.5 While the total rates revenue increase will be 2.97%, the incidence of rates will not fall evenly across the District. This means that the impact on individual ratepayers will be variable.
- 4.6 Due to timing, there are still some outstanding matters to be resolved including the Industrial Water Supply Agreements, growth estimates and final quality control procedures on rates/ rates modelling meaning the rates incidence as provided in this report may change.
- 4.7 The key changes to individual rates when comparing the Proposed Annual Plan 2020/21 with Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028 are;
 - 4.7.1 Wastewater first Pan charge – a decrease of \$53.70. This was driven by a combination of lower NRSBU charges and a lower spend on professional fees.
 - 4.7.2 Refuse recycling rate – an increase of \$18.84. This is driven by increased kerbside costs and route extensions.
 - 4.7.3 Motueka Water Service Charge – a decrease of \$57.91. This is driven by lower capital spend and debt servicing costs.
- 4.8 The forecast net debt level in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 is \$199.7 million compared with \$199.6 million for the same year in the LTP 2018-2028. The Financial Strategy in the LTP sets a limit to external debt of \$200 million.

Changes to the Capital Works Programme

- 4.9 There are a number of changes to the capital works programme in the Proposed Annual Plan 2020/2021. The majority of these are a result of project timing, with several projects been deferred from 2019/2020 to 2020/2021 or brought forward into 2020/2021 by a few years.
- 4.10 In addition to those projects where timing has changed, there are two other projects of note. The first is the redevelopment of Port Tarakohe in Golden Bay. A \$28.6m project in total, \$10.1m is to be budgeted in 2020/2021. Of that \$8.8m will come from a Government grant and \$1.3m brought forward from the 2022/2023 year of the LTP 2018-2028. For this project to go ahead, it is dependent on funding from Government's Provincial Growth Fund.
- 4.11 The second project is the Richmond Council Offices refit and refurbishment. The Richmond buildings are no longer fit for purpose with staffing occupancy rates well above recommended levels. The current buildings do not support the strategic improvements needed in Council capacity and capability. The current office buildings are of varying ages (7 to 50+ years), are not well integrated, meaning there are difficulties to achieve a modern open plan space in many areas. The buildings also have substandard air conditioning systems, which require urgent attention. A strategic project is currently underway, which will inform decisions on the scope and funding, with the final design subject to Council approval.

Are the changes material or significant?

- 4.12 Under the Local Government Act 2002 (Act) the Council must publish an Annual Plan for 2020/2021 by 30 June 2020. There is a requirement to consult on the Annual Plan unless there are no significant or material changes from the corresponding year in the LTP.
- 4.13 Staff have undertaken an assessment of the proposed changes (**Attachment 1**) and are of a view that they are not material or significant.

5 Options

5.1 Options

- Option 1 – **Recommended Option**. Determine that the changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 compared to Year 3 of the LTP **are not** significant or material. Carry out an informal communication process with the key messages on the rates, debt and our capital work programme.
- Option 2 – Determine that the changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 **are** significant or material, prepare a consultation document and undertake a consultation process consistent with Section 82 of the Act.
- Option 3 - Determine that the changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 **are not** significant or material, and decide not to carry out informal communication.

5.2 The advantages and disadvantages of each option are summarised below.

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1 - Determine that the changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council can still promote to community Annual Plan highlights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ability for community members to make formal submissions and funding

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>are not significant or material. Carry out an informal communication focusing on the key messages - rates, debt and capital work programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A consultation document, submissions and hearings are not required. • An opportunity for early engagement and input to the development of the LTP 2021-2031. • Allows Annual Plan to be adopted earlier (end of May 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requests for inclusion in the Annual Plan 2020/2021. • Small possibility of a legal challenge to our assessment that there are no “significant or material” changes proposed to 2020/2021.
<p>Option 2 – Determine that the changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 are significant or material, prepare a consultation document and undertake a community consultation process consistent with section 82 of the Local Government Act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the community have an opportunity to request changes and also be heard by making submissions on the Annual Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant staff resources and time required to develop the consultation document, and enable the opportunity for community submissions, hearings and decisions. • Will result in two rounds of community consultation for both the Annual Plan and early engagement on the LTP 2021-2031. • The Council has limited ability to amend some of the proposed changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021. For example a number of capital projects are delayed due to technical/operational reasons. • Risk of community consultation fatigue given other Council consultation processes underway.
<p>Option 3 - Determine that the changes in the Annual Plan 2020/2021 are not significant or material and decide not to communicate with the community on the key outcomes of the Annual Plan (e.g. rates, debt, works programmed).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost and time saving as allows staff and resources to be focused on other projects. • Allows Annual Plan to be adopted earlier (end of May 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ability for community members to make formal submissions and funding requests for inclusion in the Annual Plan 2020/2021. • Small possibility of a legal challenge to our assessment that there are no “significant or material” changes proposed to 2020/2021. • Does not provide staff and Councillors an opportunity to communicate the

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
		Council's plan for 2020/2021. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to elicit queries from the community about rates and other changes.

6 Strategy and Risks

6.1 Strategy and Risks

6.1.1 If the Council decides not to carry out formal consultation on the Annual Plan, there is a possibility that someone may challenge the significance or materiality assessment.

6.1.2 Staff consider it is unlikely that there would be a successful legal challenge based on the overall changes proposed to the rates revenue, net debt level and capital works programme.

Climate Change Impact Assessment

6.1.3 The Proposed Annual Plan includes a budget of \$100,000 to implement Council's Climate Change Action Plan.

7 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan

7.1 Section 95 of the Act states that the Council must prepare and adopt an annual plan for each financial year.

7.2 The Act identifies the requirement to consult in a manner that gives effect to the requirements of section 82 (under the principles of consultation, not a special consultative procedure) before adopting an annual plan. This requirement does not apply if the annual plan does not include significant or material differences from the content of the long term plan for the financial year to which the annual plan relates.

7.3 Under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy a matter or decision is considered to be significant if all the following three conditions are met:

7.3.1 It has a high level of significance; and

7.3.2 It is determined to be significant by the Council through resolution; and

7.3.3 The Council has not previously consulted on it using a special consultative procedure, including the LTP or Annual plan.

7.4 The Act does not define what constitutes a material change from an LTP.

7.5 If the Council decides not carry out formal consultation on the Annual Plan 2020/2021, staff propose that early engagement is undertaken with the community to inform the development of the LTP 2021-2031. This is proposed for March and April 2020.

8 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications

- 8.1 The proposed budgets for 2020/2021 show a marginally higher increase in overall rates income and a very similar net debt to that forecast in our LTP. The total capital expenditure programme has increased with a significant proportion of this increase being attributed to the redevelopment of Port Tarakohe. The change to the forecast net debt level is modest and remains below the Council's self-imposed \$200 million cap.
- 8.2 There are financial savings to the Council by not producing a consultation document or carrying out a formal consultation process. These savings include the costs of any hearings, design and printing costs, responding to submissions and advertising.
- 8.3 If the Council chooses to carry out informal communications, some minor costs will remain.

9 Significance and Engagement

- 9.1 Staff have assessed the level of significance based on the overall change to rates revenue increase, the impact of the rates increase on example properties and the changes to the capital programme proposed. Overall the level of significance is considered low to medium.
- 9.2 Staff have carried out an assessment of the significance and materiality of each of the changes in the Annual Plan in **Attachment 1**.

Issue	Level of Significance	Explanation of Assessment
Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?	Low -Medium	Any increase in rates tends to have a high level of public interest. In this case staff consider the increase to be minor at 0.52%. For most ratepayers the magnitude of change in rates is small, in many cases positive, and of low significance. For the small number of ratepayers experiencing the biggest increases, the issue is considered to be of medium significance. Public interest in the specific projects rescheduled is considered to be of low to medium interest. This assessment is based on the number of submissions received through the LTP process.
Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?	Low	The decision on rates is for the 2020/2021 year only, but these changes are carried into the following years unless the Council makes a decision otherwise (i.e. forms the base from which future increases are calculated). Council will publish a new LTP for 2021-2031 and will be considering

		the rates levels, debt levels, and capital works programme during its development.
Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)	Low	A number of projects relate to some component of Council's strategic assets, however the strategic assets list refers to the systems in their entirety.
Does the decision create a substantial change in the level of service provided by Council?	N/A	The level of service stated in the LTP is not changing
Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?	Low	The decision involves a relatively small increase in rates and the net debt level compared with that signaled in the LTP. There is a larger increase in the capital expenditure budget, but the majority is offset by an increase in non-rates revenue (Port Tarkohe).
Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?	NA	
Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?	NA	
Does the proposal or decision involve Council exiting from or entering into a group of activities?	NA	

10 Conclusion

- 10.1 The Council carried out a robust process in developing the Long Term Plan 2018-2028. The budget and programme of work for 2020/2021 is substantially aligned with that set in the LTP. A small increase in the level of rates income, the level of net debt and variations to the capital works programme are the main changes proposed in the Annual Plan 2020/2021.
- 10.2 Staff do not consider that the impact of the changes from the LTP 2018-2028 in the proposed Annual Plan 2020/2021 are significant or material. Consequently, staff do not consider that formal consultation is required under the Act.

11 Next Steps / Timeline

- 11.1 If the Council decides to not formally consult on the Annual Plan:
- a) Staff will plan to communicate the key messages of the Annual Plan 2020/2021 (rates, debt and major projects) and look to undertake early engagement on the LTP 2021-2031.

- b) The timeline is for the Council to adopt the Annual Plan 2019/2020 and rates resolution on 31 May 2020.

12 Attachments

- 1. Annual Plan 2020/2021 - Materiality and Significance Assessment

15

Item 8.18

Annual Plan 2020/2021 - Materiality and Significance Assessment

Topic	Materiality		Significance	
	Criteria	Assessment	Criteria	Assessment
1. Key changes to capital works programme.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Port Tarakohe upgrade - \$10.1m offset by expected Government grant \$8.8m Roading non-subsidised - \$1m. Brightwater Town Centre upgrade \$0.8m increase (approved by Council at 9 May 2019 and 7 Nov 2019 meetings). NZTA subsidy - increase of \$0.8m Water Supply – increase of \$3.9m due to project timing changes – Motueka WTP, Mapua Main trunk and Wakefield WTP. Council building refit - \$2.1m provisionally included still subject to Council approval Wastewater- reduction of \$1.4m due to project timing changes - Wakefield to Three Brothers corner scope still being considered 	<p><i>Does the difference involve a change to the Financial Strategy (FS) or Financial Impact Statement (FIS)?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The total of rates excluding water are very similar to the forecast levels. There are differences in the incidence of rates. There are no changes to the financial strategy proposed - staying below both the 3% rates cap and the \$200m debt cap. Higher growth levels than expected have helped to keep rates increases within the FIS limits. 	<p><i>Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?</i></p>	<p>Port Tarakohe – project consulted on separately.</p> <p>Brightwater Town Centre –consultation has been carried out with the Brightwater community.</p> <p>The Motueka Water treatment plant, Mapua Trunk main and Waimea Bore Pump were all consulted on as part of the LTP 2018-2028.</p> <p>Council Richmond office refit – final cost will be subject to a Council decision. Overall public interest likely to be low to medium</p>
	<p><i>Would the difference(s) alter a reasonable person's conclusions about the affordability of the plan?</i></p>	<p>Because we are carrying forward capital projects into 2020/2021, the overall spend across the first three years is similar to what was forecast in the LTP 2018-2028.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase of 2020/21 budget for water supply does not lead to total overall budget increase compared to LTP 2018-2028 	<p><i>Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?</i></p>	<p>The impact of the duration of the decision is considered low as Council is under no obligation to undertake the projects.</p> <p>Many of the changes related to the timing of the projects either being delayed or brought forward by a few years. Therefore the duration of the changes is relatively short.</p>
	<p><i>Would the difference(s) lead to a reasonable person deciding (or not deciding) to make a submission on any consultation document (e.g. has some policy shift been signalled)?</i></p>	<p>The changes to the capital programme are unlikely to lead people to want to make a submission on the Annual Plan, noting that Port Tarakohe upgrade was consulted on separately.</p>	<p><i>Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)</i></p>	<p>Port Tarakohe is a strategic asset - separate consultation was undertaken.</p>
			<p><i>Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?</i></p>	<p>The debt impact of the proposed changes is minor for 2020/2021. While there is additional rates in year 3, overall the capital programme across the first three years of the LTP is less than that budgeted. The increase remains within the Financial Strategy caps.</p>
			<p><i>Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?</i></p>	<p>No</p>
			<p><i>Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>CONCLUSION Total Capital Change \$17.9m – including \$9.3m of grants income</p>		<p>Overall the proposed changes in the Annual Plan are assessed as having no or low materiality</p>		<p>Overall the changes proposed in the Annual Plan are considered to be of low to medium significance. Most of the projects were consulted using the SCP as part of the LTP 2018-2028. Several of the other projects have had extensive consultation processes undertaken.</p>

Topic	Materiality		Significance	
	Criteria	Assessment	Criteria	Assessment
2. Rates Review				
<p>Of all our ratepayers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59% will have lower rates than forecast in Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028. 39% will have rates that are higher than forecast in Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028 by \$200 or less. 1% will have rates increases that are higher than forecast in Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028 by \$200 or more. <p>See Attachment 1 for rating impact on representative sample properties compared to Year 3 of LTP 2018-2028</p>	<i>Does the difference involve a Change to the Financial Strategy (FS) or Financial Impact Statement (FIS)?</i>	Minor change in the FIS driven by overall rates revenue change. No change to FS.	<i>Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?</i>	The proposed rates increase is small and the overall rates increase is modest. For most rate payers the changes are small (and in some cases positive). Considered to be of low to medium interest.
	<i>Might the difference(s) alter a reasonable person's conclusions about the affordability of the plan?</i>	No. The overall change in rates revenue increase is small. Relatively few properties will have larger adverse changes to their rates. The larger dollar increases are relatively small percentage increases.	<i>Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?</i>	No. The proposed rates only affect 2020/2021 year and are reviewed each year. The following year will be through the development of the LTP 2021-2031.
	<i>Might the difference(s) lead to a reasonable person deciding (or not deciding) to make a submission on any consultation document (e.g. has some policy shift been signalled)?</i>	Minor change to overall rates revenue. Only a small number of properties will have larger rates increases. However, these are relatively small percentage increases compared to that forecast in the LTP.	<i>Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)</i>	Not applicable
			<i>Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?</i>	The change has only a minor effect on overall rates revenue income, with no significant impact.
			<i>Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?</i>	Not applicable
		<i>Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?</i>	Not applicable	
CONCLUSION Increase in rates from 2.46% in LTP to 2.99% in Annual Plan (0.53%)		While a small number of ratepayers will be adversely impacted by increased rates, overall the changes to the amount of rates collected is not material.		Overall the increase in rates revenue is considered to be of low to medium significance, to ratepayers as the majority (59%) will have lower rates than forecast in the LTP.

Topic	Materiality		Significance	
	Criteria	Assessment	Criteria	Assessment
3. Levels of Service	<i>Might the difference(s) alter a reasonable person's conclusions about the levels of service contained in the plan?</i>	No. The levels of service set out in the LTP and that we are working to achieve are unchanged.	<i>Does the decision create a substantial change in the level of service provided by Council?</i>	Existing levels of service remain unchanged
CONCLUSION		The levels of service were consulted on as part of the LTP. There are no material changes to our levels of service as a result of changes to the capital works programme.		The levels of service were consulted on as part of the LTP. There are no significant changes proposed to the level of service for 2020/2021. There may be some members of the public who would like the levels of service increased or decreased from those set out in the LTP and they will not have an opportunity to submit. However, the most appropriate time to reassess all levels of service is part of the LTP 2021-2031 process.

4. Debt				
Net debt is forecast to be \$199.7m compared to \$199.6m in Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028	<i>Does the difference involve a Change to the Financial Strategy (FS) or Financial Impact Statement (FIS)?</i>	The forecast net debt will be slightly higher to that in Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028 by 0.1m, meaning change to the FIS. There are no proposed changes to the Financial Strategy as we stay below within the \$200m debt cap.	<i>Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?</i>	No. We are proposing mostly to deliver on the same projects as consulted on as part of the LTP 2018-2028. The main exception is the upgrade of Port Tarakohe, which is dependent on and funded largely through a Government loan (if approved). The debt level increase is not significant.
	<i>Might the difference(s) alter a reasonable person's conclusions about the affordability of the plan?</i>	No. In terms of Council's total budget, this change in debt level is not material as relatively few properties have large adverse changes to their rates and debt level is still within our debt cap.	<i>Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?</i>	The decision is only for the 2020/2021 year. Although the projects are included in the Annual Plan it does not commit Council to undertaking them. Debt levels will be reviewed again through the development of our LTP 2021-2031
	<i>Might the difference(s) lead to a reasonable person deciding (or not deciding) to make a submission on any consultation document (e.g. has some policy shift been signalled)?</i>	As the increase in debt level is modest and stays within the financial debt cap, this is considered unlikely to elicit any or many submissions.	<i>Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)</i>	Port Tarakohe – where the proposed upgrade has been consulted on through a separate process.
			<i>Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?</i>	No, the proposed increase in debt level from \$199.6m to \$199.7m is not considered substantial, and is of low significance.
			<i>Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?</i>	Not applicable
		<i>Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?</i>	Not applicable	
CONCLUSION The total proposed debt change is an increase of \$0.1m		The proposed changes to the level of debt is not considered to be material compared to the forecast in Year 3 of the LTP		The proposed changes to the level of debt is not considered to be of low significance.

Attachment 1: Sample Properties –Rating Impacts

Of the 26 representative sample properties, the rates level reduces for 50% and increases for the other 50%, compared with that forecast in Year 3 of the LTP 2018-2028.

	2020/2021 Proposed rates	Year 3 LTP	% Change from Year 3 LTP	Change from year 3 LTP
Residential - Takaka	2,612	2,630	-0.7%	-18
Residential- Murchison, with 101m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	2,359	2,461	-4.2%	-102
Residential- Mapua (no wastewater/metered water)	2,430	2,391	1.6%	39
Residential- Mapua, with 146 m3 of water, Urban Metered Water Supply	3,641	3,710	-1.9%	-69
Residential - Kaiteriteri, with 279m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	4,764	4,832	-1.4%	-68
Residential - Brightwater, with 129m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	3,730	3,777	-1.2%	-47
Residential- Wakefield, with 176m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	3,495	3,570	-2.1%	-75
Residential - Motueka, with 94m3 of water, Motueka Water Supply Metered Connections	3,298	3,386	-2.6%	-88
Residential - Richmond (Waimea Village,) with 24m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	2,629	2,693	-2.4%	-64
Residential - Richmond, with 89m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	3,989	4,037	-1.2%	-48
Residential- Richmond, with 210m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	5,910	5,946	-0.6%	-36
Dairy Farm - Collingwood-Bainham	22,086	21,447	3.0%	639
Forestry- Motueka	10,805	10,529	2.6%	276
Horticultural - Hope	4,779	4,682	2.1%	97
Horticultural - Ngatimoti	2,891	2,850	1.4%	41
Horticultural - Waimea West, with 9 hectares, with Water Supply Dams- Wai-iti Valley Community Dam	7,972	7,789	2.4%	183

Item 8.18

Attachment 1

	2020/2021 Proposed rates	Year 3 LTP	% Change from Year 3 LTP	Change from year 3 LTP
Pastoral Farming (Fattening)- Upper Moutere	3,390	3,331	1.8%	59
Lifestyle- Wakefield, with 3m3/day restrictor, Eighty-Eight Valley Rural Water Supply	6,920	6,834	1.3%	86
Lifestyle- East Takaka	2,036	2,016	1.0%	20
Lifestyle- Neudorf, with 2m3/day restrictor, Dovedale Rural Water Supply	3,146	3,083	2.0%	63
Lifestyle, Tasman with 2m3/day restrictor, Rural Water Extension to Urban Water Scheme	4,146	4,191	-1.1%	-45
Lifestyle- Bronte, with 3m3/day restrictor, Redwood Valley Rural Water Supply	5,796	5,727	1.2%	69
Commercial - Queen St, Richmond, with 284m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	9,320	9,488	-1.8%	-168
Commercial - High St, Motueka	7,315	7,304	0.2%	11
Industrial - Cargill Place, Richmond, with 51m3 of water, Urban Water Supply Metered Connections	3,863	3,906	-1.1%	-43
Utility	185,299	182,226	1.7%	3,073