

Sandspit Resident and Ratepayers Association Survey



Closes 30th November.

For the area inside the red lines
(ie not including marina or
campground)

Can be accessed here:

<https://us20.list-manage.com/survey?u=aca777b43c2794875b4a15e81&id=2d46fbe0da&e=f09ac0c124>

The following pages show the survey, along with the answers Sue-Ellen entered, The notations made to the right of each page provide Sue-Ellen's opinions

6. Survey and responses

answered below

Please rate whether you agree with the following statements on a 1 to 5 scale

answered below

Development must account for future sea level rise

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

Development on the Spit has always accounted for changes of the natural environment. Resource consent would be impossible without it.

The existing reserves, open green spaces and bird habitats must be protected

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

It is inappropriate to include the open spaces, as they are within private ownership. If you were truly concerned about bird habitats you would have stopped consent for the recent bund for marina protection.

A new modern wharf structure is necessary

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

The current Service wharf is adequate and has had recent maintenance. Our rates are best spent elsewhere.

New improved building facilities are required including the Café, ticket office, toilets, Harbourmaster office, dinghy lockers

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

Existing service structures are adequate. I would prefer our rates are spent on road surface maintenance elsewhere in Rodney (like Sandspit Rd, Hill St intersection)

If you don't write something in these boxes, it won't let you submit the survey.

I expect they are hoping people to agree to these, so that they can say people want the carpark gone for environmental reasons,

I expect they are hoping people to agree to this, so that they can lobby for a wharf development more aligned with recreational activities, rather than ferry/service operations

There is a benefit to retaining the existing caretaker's house.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

This is a service location for Kawau Island

The existing parking use of the Spit needs to be reviewed

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

The purpose of the carpark is to provide parking for residents, ratepayers and commercial service to Kawau Island. The owners of the carpark are presently reviewing how to prevent Sandspit Residents from using it for guest overflow parking during the summer months.

Facilities for waste and refuse need to be reviewed

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

These are essential services to Kawau Island

There needs to be an acknowledgement of the history of the Spit

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please add your ideas and comments below

This is already in plan, through work presently being undertaken by the owners of allotment 340.

What are your additional ideas/vision for the development of the Spit over the next 25 years? Please add your comments below, or submit a separate document to the SRRA sub-committee by emailing committee@sandspit.net.nz

Maintaining efficient services to Kawau Island through ensuring the historical injustices of the past (land-grabs by wealthy pakeha) are not repeated.
Supporting delivery of the Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri Plan and the Takutai Moana Act.
An effective mangament plan must include both the Marina and the campground.

Some details about you....

- I am a Sandspit resident
- I am a Kawau Island resident
- I represent a business affected by Sandspit development

Your Name and Address (optional, in case follow up is required)

Sue-Ellen Craig
emailsueellenraig@gmail.com

I expect they are hoping people to agree to this, so that they can lobby for removal of long term parking as well as removal of rubbish facilities

This a loaded question, as it can be used to say all people want all development removed, should they not get the answers they want to the earlier questions.