



Report **04.31**
Date 27 January 2004
File WP/03/06/05

Committee **Rural Services and Wairarapa**
Author **Steve Blakemore Manager, Planning & Resources**

Orui Cost Objection

1. Purpose

To obtain Committee consideration of an objection to consent processing charges made by G Meredith of Orui Station.

2. Background

- 2.1 Application was made on 19 May 2003 to apply waste oil to the Orui private road for dust suppression.
- 2.2 Regional Rules provide for this activity to be a discretionary activity and there are strict requirements relating to consent applications and the activity itself.
- 2.3 The details in the original application were not considered to be adequate and further information was requested. The further information that was provided subsequently was also considered to be inadequate.
- 2.4 The applicant was advised on 22 October 2003.....that the consent could not be processed as non notified. Advice was also given that there was a strong likelihood that the consent would be declined.
- 2.5 Following protest, the consent was transferred to the Wellington Consents Department for review.
- 2.6 Following the receipt of sign off from all affected parties a non-notified consent was issued on 16 December 2003.
- 2.7 An objection to the charges was received on 12 January 2004. (Attachment 1.)

3. The Charges

- 3.1 The objection concerns additional charges of \$1820.00 plus GST.
- 3.2 The applicant has been charged for only the Wairarapa costs up to the time the application was sent for review. No subsequent time or costs or management time has been charged.
- 3.3 The costs are attributed to deficiencies in the application and the additional staff time incurred as a result of this.
- 3.4 Chargeable hours were reduced by 17.5 hours by management, giving an effective discount of \$1225.00 plus GST.

4. Discussion

This is a somewhat complex matter that requires careful consideration of the circumstances. It is suggested that this would be best undertaken by a small Sub-Committee of, say, the Committee Chairman and one or two other members with power to act.

5. Communications

No additional communications are proposed.

6. Recommendation

- (1) *That the matter be referred to a sub-committee with delegated authority to determine the objection;*
- (2) *That the sub-committee comprise the Committee Chairman and two other members.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

Steve Blakemore
Manager, Planning & Resources

Colin Wright
Divisional Manager, Wairarapa