

Topic 6 - Targeted rate - Dargaville Sportsville

Recommendation | Ngā tūtohunga

That Kaipara District Council:

a) Approves the targeted rate of \$9.78 plus GST (Option 1) to all those in the mapped area identified in the consultation document.

These recommendations do not change what was proposed in the Long Term Plan 2024-2027 Consultation Documents. Under Option 1 the operational costs would be contributed to by all properties inclusive of Dargaville, Baylys Beach, Tangiteroria, Pouto Point and Kaihu.

Introduction:

Kaipara District 'Roadmap to Recovery' Long Term Plan 2024-2027 Consultation Document said:

- Option 1 Introduce a targeted rate collected on behalf of the Kauri Coast Recreation Society for stage 1 operating expenses (\$9.78 per year)
- Option 2 Introduce a targeted rate collected on behalf of the Kauri Coast Recreation Society for stage 1 operating expenses (\$21.28 per year)
- Option 3 Do not collect a targeted rate on behalf of Kauri Coast Recreation Society (status Quo)

Kauri Coast Recreational Society has requested Council collect a targeted rate on their behalf as this would;

- Ensure the sustainability of the Dargaville Sportsville facility in the long term, and
- Provide for maintenance.

Targeted rate - Dargaville Sportsville

Observations for ratepayers/residents:

For those who live in the proposed rate area:

- 49.6% preferred the status quo
- 49.7% preferred a targeted rate (either \$9.78 25.6% or \$21.28 24.1%)



Should we collect a targeted rate on behalf of Kauri Coast Recreational Society Inc Dargaville Sportsville ?	Do not know	Do not live in proposed rate area	Live in proposed rate area	Total
Status quo	25%	24.8%	49.6%	37.6%
	4	27	66	97
Targeted rate of \$9.78 per year	25%	18.3%	25.6%	22.5%
	4	20	34	58
Targeted rate of \$21.28 per year	18.8%	18.3%	24.1%	21.3%
	3	20	32	55
Do not know	31.2%	38.5%	0.8%	18.6%
	5	42	1	48

area.

Respondents express varying opinions regarding the targeted rate for Dargaville Sportsville. Some expressed their support for the proposal, emphasising the benefits it would bring to the community, especially children and youth. However, others raise concerns about the funding model, suggesting that Sportsville should examine its business model and not seek subsidies from the community. Additionally, some respondents mention the need for accessibility in built spaces and the importance of considering the needs of disabled individuals.

Points raised from submission relating to Sportsville

- Sport Northland supported future development of Sportsville and supports Option 2. Sport Northland believe the proposed withdrawal of the Regional Sporting Facilities Rate from the NRC would place any future development of Sportsville at considerable risk. Sport Northland recognises the financial challenge facing local government and the impact on rate payers to support a higher targeted rate. Facilities such as Sportsville are a critical enabler in encouraging more people to be physically active and there are considerable health, social and economic benefits that come from communities participating in sport and active recreation.
- Northland Sports coalition support the Kauri Coast Recreation Society Inc (KCRS) in their proposal to advance the next stage of the Sportsville complex, recognizing the benefits it would bring to our communities, especially children and youth. We express concern over the proposed withdrawal of the Regional Sporting Facilities Rate (RSFR) by the Northland Regional Council in their Long-Term Plan 2024-27, as it could jeopardize the initiation of key regional projects. To ensure the continued development of Sportsville, we endorse Option 2.'
- Baylys Beach Community don't want to be included in the new targeted rate area as they have their own community and cultural centre they are paying for and don't want duplication of Sportsville costs.



Options and Assessments

Option One - Charge a targeted rate of \$9.78 per the mapped area to provide \$44,780 of income to 5,282 rateable properties.

This helps Sportsville by contributing to their operational costs and is more affordable. 49.7% of respondents who are ratepayers/residents in the area supported some form of contribution. In considering Bayly's Beach submission this does not take account of the playing fields which are not duplicated in Bayly's Beach. If Council wishes to take out Bayly's Beach then they would have to consider taking out Ruawai residents who also look after and pay for their community hall.

This is the recommended option.

Option Two - Charge a targeted rate of \$21.28 per the mapped area to provide \$97,460 of income.

This would allow Sportsville to put aside funds for future development. This is supported by the sporting bodies but less supported by the community due to affordability. 21.4% preferred this option.

Option Three - Status Quo -No targeted rate collected

49.6% preferred the status quo being no targeted rate. This option means there is no further rates burden.

Impact of recommendation on the LTP (financial and non-financial)

Sporstville will receive some annual contribution towards current operational costs.

Fit with Long Term Plan

The recommendation is consistent with the Long -Term Plan 2024-2027 in that a targeted rate is proposed to be charged and affordability has been considered and the amount is the lower amount of annual charge to be collected.

Policy Implications

The Revenue and Financing policy will need to be updated to reflect the final decision of Council to show Council has considered affordability of all its ratepayers and the input from the consultation on the CD.

Conclusion drawn:

There is good support from the community for Sportsville but it does have an impact on the rates bill as this is an extra targeted rate to pay.