

**From:** Heather Beddow [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 27 May 2024 10:14 am  
**To:** Michelle Higgin  
**Subject:** Re: Waitomo District Council 2024-2034 Long Term Plan - Hearing of Submitters - Tuesday 28 May 2024

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Block sender](#)

Hi Michelle, can you please attach the following to the documents for the days session.

Regarding the LONG TERM PLAN 2024 - 2034 Consultation Document, and other related documents, specifically in relation to the proposed differential on the district roading rate.

Myself and a number of others have significant concerns on the approach taken and the information (or lack of) provided to people that will be most impacted by this change.

1. The feedback process was fundamentally flawed;
  - a. The feedback document covers all proposed changes for the district and does not allow a submitter to not enter a response if the change was not relevant to them/if they have no comment. There should have been a 4<sup>th</sup> option of N/A when completing the form. As an example – on my submission I was only concerned regarding the proposed change to the roading rate but could not submit my feedback without entering a response to every other item that I had no valid input on. Therefore it is very likely other submitters, who had no input either way on this issue, could well have selected option 2 as it was the Council's preferred option, with no understanding of what the impact to others would be in doing so, skewing the response in favour of the proposed change.
  - b. It is my understanding that many of the businesses most affected by this change had little to no consultation in regard to this proposal going out to the district, and did not, in all cases, get a copy of the district plan directly with the proposal highlighted, so they were unaware well in advance of this hearing to have time to prepare an in depth response
2. The information provided in regard to this matter was limited and confusing;
  - d. There is nothing in the documents that specifies which exact roads, or parts of roads, will be impacted by this change, and what that is as a percentage of total roading in the area
  - e. The document did not provide any actual figures, numbers or examples that would explain what the preferred option 2 would mean financially to those affected
  - f. There is no detail on what the current rate is, what the proposed rate is, what that is as a percentage increase and what the total increase in revenue would be – or how that will be specifically allocated for repairs to only those roads affected
  - g. Using a Differential Factor to explain the change is nonsense! From what I understand (and can find on the internet) a differential factor is part of a calculus question, which needs more information than are given to provide an answer, and even then I believe it is being used incorrectly in this case – causing further confusion/misunderstanding. (ref screenshot Three)
  - h. If the proposal is in fact to increase the rates by x12, or by 1,200% that should be clearly spelled out in the document so that everyone, not just those affected by it, can understand the level of change
  - i. When viewing the Long Term Plan online the key information for option 3 is off the screen and unable to be viewed – ref Screenshot One below. I don't know how it was presented in a hard copy as I did not have access to one.

I have received differing feedback from both Matt Barton of Greenplan and Ben Smit of the Waitomo District Council regarding the discussions held prior to this proposal going out, and what had or had not been agreed to in relation to roads affected by Greenplan Forrestry specifically. I am unconvinced that the Council as a whole has all the information needed to make such a decision at this point in time.

Screenshot One:

[loading rate. Those that harvest utilising local roads will be charged either the Forestry Exotic or the Mixed use category, some rating examples are detailed follow:](#)

**OPTION 3**


### Funding the additional operating rate deficit

As option 2 leaves a funding shortfall, Council could introduce a targeted rate in addition to the differential rate, which would be charged to properties during harvest. An estimate of the cost of repair to roads above what these properties are paying in the differential rate could be charged for the duration of the harvesting.

Other councils have worked with forestry owners on alternative mechanisms to pay for this damage. Are there alternative solutions to addressing these issues that we could consider to improve equity for all?

	Capital Value	District 202
<a href="#">Category One Pastoral Property 265ha</a>	\$2,860,000	\$3
<a href="#">Category Two Forestry Exotic Property 265ha</a>	\$777,000	\$
<a href="#">Category Three Mixed use property 46 ha (28ha forestry)</a>	\$382,000	\$

Screenshots Two and Three:



mathcentre community project  
encouraging academics to share maths support resources  
All mccp resources are released under an Attribution Non-commercial Share Alike licence

## Solving Differential Equations with Integrating Factors

mccp-dobson-0111

**Introduction**

Suppose we have the first order differential equation

$$\frac{dy}{dx} + Py = Q$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are functions involving  $x$  only. For example

$$\frac{dy}{dx} + \frac{3y}{x} = \frac{e^x}{x^3} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{dy}{dx} - \frac{3y}{x+1} = (x+1)^4.$$

We can solve these differential equations using the technique of an **integrating factor**.

Showing results for what is the **differential** factor of 12 on 10  
 Search instead for what is the differentaial factor of 12 on 10



BYJU'S

<https://byjus.com> > [maths](#) > [hcf-of-10-and-12](#)

## Methods to Find HCF of 10 and 12

The HCF of 10 and 12 is 2. The given numbers 10 and 12 are divisible exactly by the HCF. The factors of 10 are 1, 2, 5, 10, and the factors of 12 are 1, 2, ...

Screenshot Four:

<b>Differential Category</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Differential Factor</b>
<a href="#">a) District Roading Rate - General</a>	<a href="#">All rating units in the District excluding those categorised in differential category b) and c) below (being the Forestry Exotic differential and the Mixed Use differential).</a>	<a href="#">1.0</a>
<a href="#">b) District Roading Rate - Forestry Exotic</a>	<a href="#">Rating units that have been assigned the FE category code (Forestry Exotic) by Council's Valuation Service Provider and are not located on a state highway*.</a>	<a href="#">12.0</a>
<a href="#">c) District Roading Rate - Mixed Use</a>	<a href="#">Rating units that have a mixed use (e.g. both pastoral and forestry), where the area of forestry is greater than 20 hectares, is not located on a State Highway* and the forestry area is 50% or more of the total property area.</a>	<a href="#">6.0</a>

\*Forestry properties that are located on a state highway and use only the state highway for forestry harvest will pay the general roading rate. Those that harvest utilising local roads will be charged either the Forestry Exotic or the Mixed use category. Some rating examples are detailed follow:

Regards

**Heather Beddow**

Submission Feedback Time Slot 11.40am