

# **Public consultation report**

## **Technical Property Services fee changes**

# Contents

<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Next steps .....	2
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
What are we seeking feedback on? .....	3
Fee changes schedule.....	4
<b>Consultation</b> .....	<b>5</b>
What we asked you .....	5
Activities to raise awareness .....	5
How people provided feedback .....	5
<b>Your feedback</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Overview .....	6
Feedback .....	6

## Summary

We consulted on this proposal September 2020 and received generally 2 submissions:

- One person felt the that the new fees were ‘about right.’
- One person felt that current processes for removing Building Line Restrictions (BLRs) could be overhauled and that AT should remove all BLRs that were imposed on properties where roads less than 20.12m in width were created.

### Next steps

The proposed fee structure will be adopted and the Technical Property Services team will switch to using the new fee structure on the 1 May 2021 and revise forms and documents to reflect this change.

# Background

## What are we seeking feedback on?

Recent customer feedback highlighted that our current fee structure and invoicing process did not provide a clear framework on our fees. Our new proposed fee structure will provide clarity and transparency for our customers on our fees. We are constantly making improvements to our application processes.

Recently the Building Line Restriction Cancellation process has benefited from an automation review which streamlined the process and now provides a clear timeframe for customers. The changes will allow customers to book preapplication meetings with the Technical Property Services staff to cover complex issues related to their application. The current fees have not changed since AT began 10 years ago. The new fees structure will be in line with other Council organisation charges and include a wider range of services.

The Building Line Restriction Cancellation and Removal of Limitations as to Parcels application fees are proposed to increase from \$200 to \$575 per record of title/property. The deposit fee for encroachment applications is proposed to increase relative to the type and complexity of the proposed encroachment ranging from \$1,500 to \$2,500 and staff time beyond the deposit can be charged where the deposit is exceeded.

Benefits of the new fee:

- To bring the fees charged by the AT Technical Property Services team for processing applications in line with those of AC and other Council organisations across the country.
- Improve customer satisfaction with the process.
- Provide clarity by making the fee structure and charging schedule more straightforward
- Allow greater engagement with public by providing pre-application meetings and consultation.
- Recover property staff processing costs.

## Fee changes schedule

Application type	Current fees		Proposed fees	
	Including GST	Approximate staff labour hours	Base fee	Including GST
Building Line Restriction Cancellation	\$200	6 hours	\$500	\$575
Removal of Limitations as to Parcels	\$200	3.5 to 4 hours	\$350	\$402.50
Affected Party Consents	\$200	6-8 hours (sometimes longer)	\$500	\$575
<b>Encroachment Licences</b>				
Subsoil Minor – small pipes, no rental	\$1000 deposit*	14 – 20 hours	\$1,500	\$1,725
Subsoil Major – CBD ground anchors, attracts rental	\$1000 deposit*	25 hours plus	\$2,500	\$2,875
Construction and Maintenance - low access wall, driveway, no rental	\$1000 deposit*	18 hours	\$1500	\$1,725
Construction and Maintenance - parking bays, paper road formations, large retaining walls civil works, attracts rental	\$1,000 deposit*	Approx. 35 hours	\$2,500	\$2,875
Surface Licence – miscellaneous works, often retrospective, usually attracts rental	\$1,000 deposit*	18 hours	\$1500	\$1,725
Airspace Minor – canopy for retail, no rental	\$1000 deposit*	14 hours	\$1500	\$1725
Airspace Major – architectural features, balconies, attracts rental	\$1000 deposit*	25 hours	\$2500	\$2,850
<b>Pre-application Meetings</b>				
On request of public, providing advice on applications or proposed issues for encroachments – for a one-hour meeting	nil	(charged in addition to fee or deposit)	\$300	\$345
<b>Charging for additional staff costs at Labour Recovery Rates</b>				
For additional processing and technical time (including any meetings with applicant) required once the application fee or deposit has been expended.	nil	As required on advice to applicant	As per labour rates in AT policy	e.g. currently \$85.00 \$110.00 \$125.00
<b>Charging for encroachment administration fee as provided for in Road Surface, Airspace and Subsoil Encroachment Policy</b>				
The above policy provides charging for any changes to existing leases/licences. This applies to any changes to a lease/licence holder, use of the road encroachment, or size of the encroachment.	nil	3 to 5 hours plus	\$350	\$402.50

**\*Note:** Deposit was non-refundable

# Consultation

We consulted on the proposed fee changes through September 2020 and gave a second opportunity to give feedback in January 2021.

## What we asked you

We asked:

- What do you think of the new size of deposits? Why did you choose this option?
- Would you or your organisation find pre-application meetings helpful?
- Does a charge of \$300 for a pre application meeting sound fair to you?
- Do you have any other feedback on the proposed fee changes? Please outline your feedback here.

## Activities to raise awareness

To let you know about our consultation, we:

- Sent emails to a 81 key stakeholders who regularly engage with the technical property services team
- set up a project webpage and an online feedback form on our website
- placed a notice on 'Our Auckland' website

## How people provided feedback

You could provide feedback using an online submission form (on our [Have Your Say website](#)) or email your feedback to [ATEngagement@at.govt.nz](mailto:ATEngagement@at.govt.nz).

# Your feedback

## Overview

We received public feedback on the proposal from 2 people via the feedback form on our website.

## Feedback

One person agreed 'with the logic and calculations provided by Auckland Transport.' They also felt that preconsultation meetings would be helpful, but were unsure whether \$300 was an appropriate price to pay for the meeting.

The other person felt that the current processes for removing Building Line Restrictions (BLRs) could be overhauled and that AT should remove all BLRs that were imposed on properties where roads less than 20.12m in width were created. They felt like the current BLR restrictions were a make work sheme that is over complicated and slow. They did not feel that preconsultation meeting would be helpful to them, but felt that \$300 was an appropriate price to pay for the meeting.