

Notice is given that an ordinary meeting of the Full Council will be held on:

**Date:** Friday 4 May 2018  
**Time:** 9.30am  
**Meeting Room:** Tasman Council Chamber  
**Venue:** 189 Queen Street  
Richmond

---

## Full Council

### AGENDA

---

#### MEMBERSHIP

<b>Mayor</b>	Mayor Kempthorne	
<b>Deputy Mayor</b>	Cr King	
<b>Councillors</b>	Cr S Brown	Cr D McNamara
	Cr S Bryant	Cr D Ogilvie
	Cr P Canton	Cr P Sangster
	Cr M Greening	Cr T Tuffnell
	Cr P Hawkes	Cr A Turley
	Cr C M Maling	Cr D Wensley

(Quorum 7 members)

Contact Telephone: 03 543 8405  
Email: [kate.redgrove@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:kate.redgrove@tasman.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.tasman.govt.nz](http://www.tasman.govt.nz)



# AGENDA

**1 OPENING, WELCOME**

**2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Recommendation**

**That apologies be accepted.**

**3 PUBLIC FORUM**

**Recommendation**

- (a) That the public be excluded from speaking at this meeting as it would be inappropriate to allow submitters a further chance outside the formal submission process to influence Council’s decision making at this late stage; and**
- (b) It would also be inappropriate to allow those that did not make a submission the chance to influence Council’s decision.**

**4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**5 LATE ITEMS**

**6 CONFIRMATION OF LONG TERM PLAN HEARING MINUTES**

**That the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on Wednesday, 18 April 2018, Monday, 23 April 2018 and Tuesday 24 April 2018 be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.**

**7 PRESENTATIONS**

Nil

**8 REPORTS**

- 8.1 Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Deliberations Report ..... 5**



## 8 REPORTS

### 8.1 LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028 DELIBERATIONS REPORT

Decision Required

<b>Report To:</b>	Full Council
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	4 May 2018
<b>Report Author:</b>	Alan Bywater, Senior Policy Advisor; Sharon Flood, Strategic Policy Manager; Matthew McGlinchey, Senior Management Accountant
<b>Report Number:</b>	RCN18-05-01

#### 1 Summary

- 1.1 This report summarises the key matters raised in the consultation on the Long Term Plan (LTP) 2018-2028 Consultation Document, supporting information and concurrent consultations. It seeks Council direction on these matters to enable information on the financial impacts to be prepared for the Council workshop on 14 May 2018 and subsequently the Council meeting on 24 May 2018 at which formal decisions will be made.
- 1.2 There were 484 submissions, including four late submissions, to the LTP Consultation Document, supporting information and concurrent consultations. This report attempts to cover the main points raised by submitters, and provide staff comments and in some cases proposed changes. Councillors may wish to raise other matters at the deliberation meetings from the written submissions or hearings.
- 1.3 The current step in the consultation process is for you to deliberate on the written and verbal submissions received. Once you have considered the submissions, and taken any further advice, we request that you provide staff with directions for the Full Council meeting on 24 May 2018.
- 1.4 The report to the 24 May 2018 Council meeting will include recommendations on the proposed changes to the LTP 2018-2028.
- 1.5 Staff will prepare the final LTP 2018-2028 for review by Audit New Zealand at the beginning of June and adoption by Council at the 28 June 2018 Council meeting.
- 1.6 The five Key Issues in the consultation document received the greatest numbers of submissions. There was a total of 196 submissions on Rates Affordability and Managing Council's Debt, 171 on Growth and Infrastructure and 79 on the Development and Financial Contributions Policy. There were 166 submissions on Drinking Water Supply and Capacity and 72 on funding Motueka's Water Supply. Other popular topics were transportation, particularly cycleways, Waimea Community Dam, Kohatu Motorsport Park and freedom camping. The concurrent consultations received a small number of submissions, ranging from one submission on the Rates Remission Policy to seven submissions on the Significance and Engagement Policy.

<b>2</b>	<b>Draft Resolution</b>
----------	-------------------------

**That the Full Council:**

- 1. receives the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Deliberations Report; and**
- 2. directs staff to bring forward draft recommendations on the matters as recorded in the minutes of this meeting to the 24 May 2018 Council meeting; and**
- 3. directs staff to report back on the financial implications of those changes at the 24 May 2018 Council meeting.**

**3 Purpose of the Report**

- 3.1 To provide a summary and outline the key issues and themes raised by submitters to the LTP Consultation Document, supporting information and the concurrent consultation documents.
- 3.2 To provide Councillors with the opportunity to discuss and obtain advice from staff on the matters raised in submissions.
- 3.3 To seek your direction on draft recommendations for inclusion in the report for the 24 May 2018 Council meeting for changes to the LTP 2018-2028 and the documents consulted on concurrently.

**4 Background and Discussion**

- 4.1 The matters included in the Consultation Document, supporting information and concurrent consultation documents were developed through 2017 and 2018. They were adopted for consultation at Council meetings on 14 December 2017 and 22 February 2018.
- 4.2 The Consultation Document identified five key issues for the District over the next 10 years:
  - Rates Affordability and Managing Council's Debt
  - Growth and Infrastructure
  - Development and Financial Contributions Policy
  - Drinking Water Supply and Quality
  - Funding Motueka's Water Supply
- 4.3 The consultation document also listed a number of other proposed projects and funding changes proposed in the LTP, including for example the Motueka Library development, increased funding for rural gravel roads, and improved footpaths and pedestrian facilities.
- 4.4 The Financial Strategy indicates that with the current proposed projects and activities, we will be below our self-imposed rates increase cap for the first three years of the LTP. We will then stay below our cap, but with little scope for further increases in years 4-6 (see diagram below).

**BUDGETED RATES INCREASES (EXCLUDING GROWTH)**



4.5 Our proposed forecast debt levels will also remain below our self-imposed cap of \$200 million, but approach the cap in years 4 to 6 of the LTP (see diagram below).

**TOTAL NET DEBT**



4.6 There were a number of supporting documents that we relied on to develop the LTP Consultation Document that were made available for consultation and open for submissions including:

- a. Funding Impact Statement
- b. Community Outcomes
- c. Accounting Information (including prospective financial statements and assumptions)



- d. Financial Strategy
- e. Infrastructure Strategy
- f. Summaries of Groups of Activities and Activity Management Plans
- g. Summary of the Growth Model
- h. Statement on fostering Māori participation in Council decision making
- i. Treasury Risk Management Policy, including Liability Management and Investment Policy
- j. Other Projects and Changes Information.

4.7 The LTP supporting documents that we concurrently consulted on, as required by legislation, included:

- Revenue and Financing Policy
- Development and Financial Contributions Policy
- Significance and Engagement Policy
- Rates Remission Policy
- Policy on Remission and Postponement of Rates on Māori freehold Land
- Schedule of Charges.

## 5 Submissions and Hearing Process

- 5.1 Submissions opened on 1 March and closed on 5 April 2018.
- 5.2 Council held 13 meetings around the District between 5 March and 3 April 2018, and attended the Motueka Market on 18 March 2018. The consultation meetings were generally well attended.
- 5.3 We received 484 submissions, including four late submissions, on the Consultation Document, concurrent and supporting information. The Council agreed at the hearing meetings of 18 and 24 April 2018 to accept all of the late submissions.
- 5.4 Hearings were held in Richmond, Golden Bay, and Motueka from 18-24 April 2018 and over 100 submitters took the opportunity to present their submissions to Council.

## 6 Report Structure

- 6.1 The remainder of this section considers the topics on which submissions have been received and provides staff comment and proposed changes on the issues raised in submissions. We have set out the report in the following order:
  - a. Updated Information – matters raised by staff
  - b. Five Key Issues raised in the Consultation Document
  - c. Corporate Services - including submissions on the following concurrent consultations:
    - Revocation of Policy on Early Payment of Rates

- Revenue and Financing Policy
- Rates Remission Policy
- Remission of Rates in Māori Land
- Schedule of Fees and Charges

d. Engineering Services

e. Environment and Planning

f. Governance

g. Community Development – including the Significance and Engagement Policy

h. Other Matters Raised by Councillors

6.2 We have grouped the matters raised in the submissions received into various subject topics to assist with deliberations. The subject topics are not mutually exclusive, and although we have attempted to cover the majority of points raised in the submissions, there may be some minor ones we have summarised. For these reasons, the numbers of submissions points quoted in this report for each subject are indicative.

## 7 Updated Information – Matters Raised by Staff

7.1 The financial information for the Consultation Document, supporting information and concurrent consultations was finalised in December 2017. Since that time, we have received new information on certain budget lines items that will have financial implications for our debt and rates in Year 1. These changes result in an overall unfavourable impact of \$150,000 or a 0.21% increase on total rates revenue.

7.2 The changes are summarised in the table, and outlined in more detail below.

<b>Favourable Changes</b>	<b>\$000's</b>
Revenue from NCC Pan Charges	\$20
Revenue from Solid Waste – Joint Landfill	\$37
Savings from Commercial Restructure	\$47
Use of the existing water reserves	\$490
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$595</b>

<b>Unfavourable Changes</b>	<b>\$000's</b>
Increase in Three Waters Operational Contract	\$596
Freedom Camping Bylaw Implementation	\$10
Planview Licences	\$39
Aquatic Centre - Pool retiling	\$14
Insurance costs - 12% increase	\$81
Motueka Community Board - Grant for Litter Cart	\$5

<b>Unfavourable Changes</b>	<b>\$000's</b>
Total	<b>\$745</b>
<b>Difference – Cost implication for budgets</b>	<b>\$150</b>

### Favourable Changes

- 7.3 Staff did not include the pan charge revenue from Nelson City Council domiciled residents in the Champion Road area. An annual revenue of \$20,000 is expected.
- 7.4 We received a late request from Nelson City Council to increase the amount of the levy that each Council receives from the Joint Landfill. We were not able to incorporate this change into our Consultation Document because of timing. Overall there was a favourable movement of \$37,000 in this area as some additional costs were identified that offset the increased levy.
- 7.5 When the LTP budgets were collated, the outcome of the Property Department restructure was not known. All staff positions have now been filled and equated to a savings of \$47,000.

### Unfavourable Changes

- 7.6 Council has incurred cost increases associated with the Three Waters Operations and Maintenance Contract. These were noted in a report (RCN18-04-03) to Council on 5 April 2018. In addition to these costs are extra resourcing costs to the value of \$231,000, resulting in the total of \$596,000. In order to mitigate the impact of these added costs we have used existing Water Reserves, and we have distributed the associated costs across the next 10 years.
- 7.7 We expect an additional cost of \$10,000 for the implementation/enforcement of the Freedom Camping Bylaw. This is a one-off cost.
- 7.8 In 2017, Engineering Services purchased the Planview Project management tool. The ongoing licencing costs of \$39,000 associated with this product were not included when LTP budgets were initially collated.
- 7.9 A report to Council on 5 April 2018 indicated that increased costs were required for the tiling of the lane pools at the Aquatic Centre. This capital spend of \$274,000 is loan funded.
- 7.10 Our insurers have advised that there is a 12% increase in our insurance premiums for the 2018/2019 financial year. When completing the budgets we had assumed an increase but not to this extent. The increase in premiums is linked to the Kaikoura earthquake.
- 7.11 The Motueka Community Board is seeking an additional \$5,000 to fund the litter cart in Motueka.
- 7.12 In a report to Council on 22 February 2018 (RCN18-02-15), Council approved changes to the timing of the Bateup Road widening budget and the reallocation of budgets to fund the increased spend. These changes have no impact on rates.

### LTP Years 1 to 10 Changes

- 7.13 The following projects and budget changes outlined below will have financial implications on our debt from Year 1 and our rates beyond Year 1.
- 7.13.1 Earthquake Strengthening: Work is required to strengthen numerous buildings in the District. A \$200,000 budget was incorrectly omitted from Year 10 of the LTP.

- 7.13.2 Golden Bay RFC account: An additional zero was added to a line item this has been corrected and results in a reduction in debt of \$1.56 million across the 10 years.
- 7.13.3 Waimea Community Dam: Due to a number of circumstances, financial close of this project has been delayed. No funds will be required this financial year, and our closing debt as at 30 June 2018 will be lower by \$14.1 million than forecast. We now expect the transfer to be made in the 2018/2019 financial year.
- 7.13.4 The Saxton Field capital works programme was confirmed via Council resolution at your Council meeting on 5 April 2018 (RCN18-04-04). The overall programme remained the same but there were movements between years.
- 7.13.5 NRSBU: A decision was made in February 2018 to recognise that NRSBU capital works could attract a development contributions charge from Tasman if the project related to growth. While the increased charges were reflected in our LTP consultation, the impact on the overall LTP figures was not. We have made a correction to address this issue.
- 7.14 Debt and Rates: The financial model that we use to calculate overall rates and net debt is complex, reflecting the nature of Council business. While the above changes are for direct inputs, other changes occurred as a result of the changes listed. For example the impact on overheads of the additional Planview licencing costs, and the impact on the closed account balances via interest because more reserves are being used.
- 7.15 There were a number of other minor changes made to budgets that do not materially impact the results.

<b>8 Key issue - Rates Affordability and Managing Council Debt</b>
--

- 8.1 Council's proposed options in the LTP were to:
- 8.1.1 Cap maximum total rates income increase to 3% per annum plus an allowance for growth.
- 8.1.2 Cap external net debt to \$200 million.
- 8.2 In total we received 196 submissions on this key issue, with 109 commenting on our rates affordability and 87 on our proposed debt cap.

### **Rates Affordability**

- 8.3 We received 109 submissions on rates affordability and our proposed rates income increase cap of 3% (plus an allowance for growth). Of those 47 supported the cap, 33 did not support the proposal and 29 did not know/other.
- 8.4 Of those that supported the proposal, 25 submitters made comments
- Six submitters (18203, 18246, 18474, 18494, 18503 and 18543) raised issues of rates affordability with several particularly focusing on the impact of increasing rates on older people, people on fixed incomes and people on low incomes.
  - Six submitters (18213, 18214, 18354, 18549, 18592 and 18639) raised concerns about whether Council will have sufficient resources to respond and recover from extreme weather events and the effects of climate change.

- Four submitters (18049, 18217, 18523 and 18634) raised concerns about the Waimea Community Dam and whether Council could remain inside the rates cap if this project was funded.

8.5 Of those submitters that opposed the rates cap, 27 submitters made comments including:

- Thirteen submitters advocated for lower rates citing such issues as rates affordability for people on fixed or low incomes, Council's inefficiency in managing finances, staff wages increasing to a lesser degree, and the need for Council to reduce 'non-core' expenditure. A number of these submitters did not want any rate increase (or even a reduction in one case).
- Four submitters (17701, 18013 18306 and 18460) questioned whether the 3% per annum rates income increase cap was high enough to cater for growth and existing issues in the District, as well as to respond to unforeseen events. One submitter was prepared to accept higher rates increases if it resulted in lower debt.
- Three submitters (18236, 18529 and 18616) suggested that rates increase limits should be set as a relationship to inflation.
- Two submitters (18306 and 18464) commented on our Council's high rates compared with other councils.
- Three submitters (18325, 18524 and 18444) raised issues associated with the Waimea Community Dam in relation to rates.

8.6 Of those that indicated don't know/other, 11 made comments about the rates cap:

- Seven submitters indicated that the proposed cap is too high with three (18091, 18536 and 18551) citing hardship for those on fixed incomes, and three (18091, 18336 and 18536) noting that the cap is higher than the rate of inflation.
- Two submitters (18448 and 18627) advocated for a higher level for the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) and one (18551) argued that Council uses too many fixed charges, including the UAGC, and that this is regressive.

### Staff Comment

8.7 Setting a rate cap helps Council to balance the needs of the community with affordability. We acknowledge that our rates are already at the higher end compared to other Councils, but are of the opinion that the 3% rates income increase limit will help to keep any further increases at a sustainable level. The proposed cap is a limit, and over the past three years average rate increases have come through at figures below our cap. There are a number of high priority projects competing for the available funding each year. The combined rates and debt cap help us to ensure we prioritise when those projects are funded so that they are affordable for our community.

8.8 The upper 3% rates income increase cap is an average. Staff acknowledge that the rates paid on individual properties will vary and in some cases exceed the 3% in any one year. Rates are influenced by property values, the services a property receives, and by the movement in general and targeted rates.

8.9 Council does not look to fully rate for disaster or natural hazard events in any one year, instead we rate each year to build up a reserve. If no disaster occurs this amount is added to

the existing balance. Should a disaster occur, Council looks first to surplus funds within the specific activity, then to the Emergency Reserve Fund.

- 8.10 With regard keeping rates at the CPI, the CPI does not include many of the items that the Council uses, including the cost of construction. Generally, construction price increases are more than the household CPI. Council has the ability to change the UAGC, however as discussed during the workshops, there are advantages and disadvantages of doing so.

### **Council's Debt**

- 8.11 There were 87 submissions on our proposed debt cap of \$200 million. Of these 32 supported the proposed cap, 29 did not, and 26 did not know/other.
- 8.12 Of the submitters that supported Council's proposed debt limit, 16 made comments.
- Four submitters (18261, 18273, 18281, 18645) indicated that \$200 million was too high and would prefer a lower cap.
  - Three submitters (18645, 18261, 18049) advocated for not proceeding with the Waimea Community Dam to order to help reduce Council's debt.
  - Two submitters (18281, 18273) raised concerns about debt creating a burden for future generations.
  - Two submitters (18213, 18214) commented on the debt cap limiting Council's ability to manage important infrastructure and other projects. One of those submitters (18214) suggested the current low interest rates created an opportunity to advance these projects.
- 8.13 Of the 29 submitters that did not support the proposal, 28 made comments, with the majority indicating their preference for a lower debt cap. Two submitters (18463, 18540) commented that there should be no debt at all.
- Submitter 18306 suggested that the debt cap may be too low, and that Council should take advantage of the current low interest rates to borrow more in order to invest in the District.
  - Two submitters (18236, 18529) suggested that the cap should be established on the basis of debt as proportion of revenue. Submitter 18599 suggested setting a cap on interest payments.
- 8.14 Of those that indicated don't know/other, nine made comments about the debt cap:
- Three submitters (18303, 18338, 18536) raised concern about debt levels as a result of the Waimea Community Dam.
  - Submitters raised other issues including: targeting debt levels at the national average (18576), setting a cap on the amount of interest to be paid rather than on debt (18520), taking a conservative approach (18295), decreasing debt (18543), and there is too much attention on debt at the expense of foreseeing and addressing emerging issues (18249).

### **Staff Comment**

- 8.15 Staff support continuing our self-imposed debt cap as set in the LTP 2015-2025. The cap ensures we keep our debt as low as practicable whilst balancing the needs of the community with affordability. Debt on its own is not a complete measure; it is the servicing cost of that debt. We have been through a period of low interest rates that has helped us to reduce our debt further than forecast. However, we do not predict this to continue. Our view is that it is financially prudent to retain the proposed debt cap of \$200 million per annum.

- 8.16 In this LTP, we are proposing significant expenditure on new infrastructure in order to support a medium/high level of growth over the next 10 years. Funding for this growth related infrastructure will largely be paid for through development contributions, rather than through rates or debt. The other projects in the draft LTP are focused mainly on providing core services to our community such as stormwater, drinking water supply and quality improvements. The mechanism Council uses to provide those core services is through debt. Council typically uses debt funding to pay for assets, which have long term benefit so that each generation of ratepayers will pay for the services they receive – known as intergenerational equity.
- 8.17 A factor often forgotten when comparing us with other councils is that we are a unitary authority, meaning we carry out both territorial and regional council functions. These functions add to the costs of managing our Region. Tasman also is a large region where our residents are disbursed across 17 settlements, all of who expect a range of services and facilities.
- 8.18 Through the early round of LTP community engagement and the draft LTP submission process, we have received numerous requests for additional projects and spending. Council will need to make decisions on these requests and their priority.

<b>9</b>	<b>Key Issue - Growth and Infrastructure</b>
----------	--

- 9.1 Council's proposal in the draft LTP was to:
- 9.1.1 Provide land and invest in new infrastructure to support a medium/high level of growth with a total growth investment of \$58 million over 10 years.
- 9.1.2 Selectively upgrade and improve some assets with a total capital investment of \$157 million over 10 years.
- 9.2 We received 91 submissions on the key issue of Growth, and 80 submissions on Infrastructure. Approximately half those submitters indicated support for Council's proposed options, 25% were not in support, and the remainder were neither clearly for nor against.

### **Growth**

- 9.3 Eleven submitters commented that they did not want development to occur on productive land. These included submitters both for and against the proposed option. A similar number of submitters asked that intensification options be considered for future development.
- 9.4 A number of submitters sought that Council plan for low or medium growth, or that Council limit population growth. Several submitters (18512, 18312, 17832, 18409 and 18213) suggested Council consider growth in visitor numbers when planning infrastructure and services.
- 9.5 Two submitters were of the opinion that the Statistics NZ population projections were too low, for Murchison (18525) and Tapawera (18595).
- 9.6 Submitter 18639 supported the proposed option based on the view that Motueka will have high population growth, and the alternative option would only service Richmond and Mapua.
- 9.7 Submitter 18625 expressed concern that infrastructure planned for Mapua's future development may not provide sufficient capacity or level of service required, particularly walkways and cycleways.

**Staff Comments**

- 9.8 We are planning to undertake a review of the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP) later this year. That review will consider how and where future growth can be accommodated and in what form. It will also look at the tensions between the need for further land for homes and protecting the productive capacity of our rural high quality soils.
- 9.9 Population growth is driven by factors which are largely outside of our control, such as the births, deaths and people moving to or from the District. In recent years, our annual population growth rate has been higher than that projected. This has had implications for our infrastructure planning as in the LTP 2015-2025 where we based our programme on medium levels of growth. We are now faced with a higher demand than anticipated for land and housing. New Government legislation means we are now required to ensure there is sufficient development capacity to meet our predicted levels of growth. The proposed investment aims to ensure we meet those requirements and at the same time address housing affordability issues and overcrowding.

**Infrastructure**

- 9.10 Feedback from submitters on this Key Issue was generally in relation to specific infrastructure projects and assets they wanted addressed.
- 9.11 Several submitters commented on flood protection and coastal inundation (17995, 18249, 18548).
- 9.12 Submitter 18213 requested that the Manoy-Talbot Street link road project be brought forward to Year 4 from Year 9.
- 9.13 Submitters 18213 and 18214 requested that the timing of the Riwaka Flood Mitigation works be undertaken at the same time as the Motueka Flood Mitigation work.
- 9.14 There were five submissions relating to the Motueka Bridge, High Street intersections, and the need for a bypass (18355, 18368, 18544, 18535, 18545). These submissions are covered in the Transportation section on Motueka (section 15.17).
- 9.15 Submitter 18539 supported upgrades to the reticulated wastewater and water schemes, particularly in Mapua, noting that the breakages and wastewater discharges have been a regular complaint from residents at Mapua for many years.
- 9.16 Submitter 18639 did not support an emphasis on Mapua development due to limited local carrying capacity of infrastructure and services and limited naturally occurring water in the area.
- 9.17 Some submitters wanted certain asset types to be prioritised, with submitter 18463 requesting a focus on poorly performing infrastructure, especially water leaks, with no upgrades unless the asset was broken. Submitter 18555 only wanted stormwater and wastewater upgrades. Submitter 18273 requested that Council prioritise water assets most at risk of failure.
- 9.18 Two submitters wanted more work to be done by Council staff rather than contracted out (18358 and 18463).
- 9.19 Eight submitters expressed their opposition to the Waimea Community Dam project.

**Staff Comments**

- 9.20 Due to our debt peaks occurring in the first six years of the draft LTP, we do not support changing the project timings for the Manoy-Talbot Street link road. There are a number of



other transportation project requests not included here, but are addressed below under the heading 'Engineering Services, Transportation'.

- 9.21 The draft LTP includes funding in the first two years to undertake a study of the Motueka River to better understand the consequences of stop bank failure and overtopping, and to identify suitable mitigation measures. Funding is also included to mitigate flooding of specific properties at Cooks Corner in Riwaka. The scope of funding for the Riwaka work was based on the known flood area prior to Ex-cyclone Gita. That event has shown that the flood hazard can affect a much wider range of properties than anticipated. With that knowledge we support extending the Motueka Flood Mitigation Study to include the Riwaka catchment with funding implications as indicated below.
- 9.22 The prioritising of our proposed work programmes takes into account the risk of delaying or not undertaking the work. The infrastructure projects in the LTP have been prioritised on this basis. We have planned to address our biggest risk areas, e.g. Mapua's reticulated wastewater and water first, followed by projects that are of lower priority.

### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 9.23 Riwaka Flood Mitigation Works: Staff recommend removing this project of \$660,000 in Years 3, 4 and 5 (2020–2023) and adding funds into the Motueka Flood Mitigation Study. The recent cyclone events have shown that there are larger issues in the Riwaka/Brooklyn area that may require a wider range of intervention than this small and specific project would provide.
- 9.24 Motueka Flood Mitigation Study: Staff recommend increasing the budget from \$150,000 to \$350,000 (\$175,000 in Year 1 and \$175,000 in Year 2) to extend the scope of the work from identification of flood consequences in Lower Motueka catchment to include the Riwaka catchment which includes Brooklyn. Ex-cyclone Gita showed that the flood hazard can affect a much wider range of properties and that we need to consider the wider area.
- 9.25 Following the study, staff propose that funding for the mitigation works is included in the next Long Term Plan 2021-2031, when measures and relative costs are known.

## **10 Key Issue - Development and Financial Contributions Policy**

- 10.1 The proposal in our draft LTP was to adopt the amended Development and Financial Contributions Policy. The Policy now identifies three catchments for wastewater, water supply and stormwater, and retains transport as a single wide catchment. Lower charges are also proposed for smaller homes.
- 10.2 Of the 80 submissions received on the Policy, 45 indicated that they supported Council's proposals, two did not support, and 32 indicated don't know/other.
- 10.3 Of those submitters who indicated support, only 10 made specific comments. Three submitters (18293, 18295 and 18627) noted their support for the discount for smaller homes, while one suggested proportional development contributions for different size homes. Two submitters (18394 and 18433) supported the proposal on the grounds of user pays. One submitter's (18535) support for the proposal was conditional on people being able to continue using bores and not being forced to connect to water supplies or paying connection fees.

- 10.4 One submitter supported using incentives to improve deficient existing rental housing stock (18281), while another requested that Council transition to development contributions for neighbourhood reserves and community infrastructure as Nelson City Council does (18313).
- 10.5 Submitters 18502, 18460 and 18463 suggested that we should increase fees for greenfield developments, with submitters 18502, 18460 also stating brownfields should be reduced.
- 10.6 Submitter 18450 requested that Council forego charges for the Te Āwhina Marae o Motueka development to recognise its community benefit.
- 10.7 Submitter 18639 requested that charges be set as part of the resource consent process to provide certainty, but not to be payable at this stage to avoid front loading the costs of developments. They requested that charges are based on the actual demand from the development on Council's infrastructure, and allowing for the option for developers to provide on-site solutions. The timing of some growth related projects in Motueka west were also questioned.
- 10.8 Submitters 18638 and 18607 raised concerns about development contributions charges in Table 7 of the Policy being shown exclusive of GST, and that the charges shown in this manner are misleading and could cause confusion or misinterpretation. They also sought that the transport charge be shown in each catchment calculation to show the total cost.
- 10.9 Submitter 18293 requested that we amend Table 4 to include a category for tiny homes (less than 40 m<sup>2</sup>) to recognise and reward those seeking to have a minimal impact on our infrastructure. They also suggested that we consider an extra charge for those dwellings greater than 200 m<sup>2</sup> in size. At the hearings, the submitter also recommended that the small house category include three bedroom dwellings under 110 m<sup>2</sup>.
- 10.10 Of the two submitters that indicated they did not support the proposal, submitter 18549 commented that Tasman is one entity and that all areas within it should support each other.
- 10.11 Of the 32 submitters that indicated don't know/other, three (18347, 18506 and 18609) supported lower development contributions for smaller houses, while another three (18609, 18638 and 18645) supported changing to the catchment based approach.

### Staff Comments

- 10.12 Overall the majority of submitters support the new catchment based approach, discounts for smaller homes, and the payment term changes proposed in the draft policy. Staff do not support the majority of the changes suggested, including, charging greenfield development more and brownfields less, exempting people in the service contribution areas if they have alternative servicing solutions, changing the timing for when development contributions are levied, or adjusting the basis for allocating past expenditure or revenue. Past contributions were under a single catchment policy approach used by the Council at the time and cannot be credited to the relative catchment areas.
- 10.13 Reserve financial contributions will be incorporated into development contributions as part of our 2020/2021 Policy review.
- 10.14 We do not support the request to exempt Te Āwhina Marae from development contributions as the proposed development will place significant peak demand loads on our infrastructure. Whilst we recognise the important role the Marae plays in our community, we do not offer exemptions for any community based organisations or facilities. Special treatment would raise issues of policy consistency, and the capacity taken up by the Marae would still need

to be paid for. In this case, the costs would need to be funded separately from rates, as we could not legally shift this cost onto other developments.

10.15. With respect to Table 7 in the proposed Policy, we have historically shown the charges inclusive of GST so we understand why there could be some confusion. We propose below that Table 7 is amended as requested.

10.16. Staff seek guidance from Council as to whether the small home thresholds are set appropriately in the Policy. Staff do not support a 'tiny home' category, but consider it is worth discussing whether Council wish to entertain the proposal of including three bedrooms dwellings under 110 m<sup>2</sup> in the small house category. The main reasons for making this change would be to minimise manipulating of the system and encourage smaller homes generally.

### Staff Proposed Changes

10.17. Amend the format of Table 7 to better reflect the total charges, and clarify the GST inclusive cost.

10.18. Amend the Development and Financial Contributions Policy as follows to help clarify and improve our communities understanding:

- a. Include a definition of bedroom to avoid against claiming bedrooms as studios. This would define a bedroom in a residential unit that is greater than 4.5 m<sup>2</sup> in floor area and capable of being used for sleeping purposes. We also recommend providing staff with discretion to waive this test where we are satisfied a room will not be used as a bedroom, even if it technically meets this definition. For example, where a room is clearly an anteroom or vestibule.
- b. Include text that clarifies that for each activity and catchment, development contributions fund the programme as a whole on an aggregated basis. Development contributions paid by any individual development are not allocated to a specific project. This is an often misunderstood aspect of development contributions.
- c. Include text clarifying that development contribution charges are based on the long run term average cost of growth within each catchment for each activity. This includes those growth related projects planned in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 and also those growth related projects that have already been completed.

<b>11</b>	<b>Key Issue - Enhancing Water Supply Capacity and Security</b>
-----------	---

11.1 The proposal under this issue was to enhance water security and supply in accordance with the programme outlined in the Water Asset Management Plan with a total capital investment of \$31.6 million over the next 10 years.

11.2 We received 86 submissions on this issue, with 34 indicating support for the proposal, 25 not in support, and the remainder (27) neither clearly for nor against.

11.3 A number of submissions received commented on specific water supply projects and timing.

11.3.1 Submitter 18013 requested an upgrade of the Mapua/Ruby Bay water supply due to the current issues being experienced.

11.3.2 Submitter 18222 sought clarification on the area to be serviced by the new water treatment plant at Parker Street in Motueka.

- 11.3.3 Submitter 18190 requested that Council consider introducing a potable water supply for St Arnaud.
- 11.3.4 Submitter 18638 supported several projects planned for Richmond including Richmond South Reticulation Reservoir and Water Main, Water Treatment Plant Capacity Upgrade, and Lower Queen St Trunk main. They noted that these were critical to enabling urban growth.
- 11.4 Several submitters (18502, 18245, 18411) suggested that Council encourage onsite rainwater collection of drinking water, while submitter 18551 suggested water saving measures should be implemented.
- 11.5 Submitter 18520 commented that various water supply systems in Tasman District have an ample supply of water available, Motueka being one of these. They noted that the Waimea Community Dam would address inadequate supply in Richmond and the surrounding area. They suggested the funding of other water supplies in the District should be delayed until after the dam is completed to ensure the ratepayers and/or their debt burden should not be too heavily inflicted over too short a period.

### Staff Comments

- 11.6 The planned works programme is designed to meet our regulatory requirements including the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand. The order of new and upgraded infrastructure is based on priority and risk, and the support from submitters is noted.
- 11.7 In Mapua, we are planning a series of water supply infrastructure upgrades starting with the renewal of the water main on Aranui Road and Stafford Drive in 2018/19. This will be followed by the renewal of the trunk mains on Rabbit Island and Best Island in 2020/2021. The upgrade of our storage capacity at the Pomona Road and Stage Coach Road reservoirs is also planned between years 2021 to 2023.
- 11.8 The new water treatment plant at Parker Street in Motueka will supply the local Motueka community only and will not extend to other communities as previously considered. Houses within the 'zone of effect' will be provided with reticulation to their property boundary.
- 11.9 Currently we do not have plans for a reticulated water supply in St Arnaud due to the significant associated costs to source and treat water, and the required reticulation infrastructure. A project of this nature would have significant budget implications on both debt and rates.
- 11.10 Council has rules requiring new houses in rural and rural residential zones to install water tanks, when the house is not connected to a reticulated system. Rainwater tanks are optional in residential zones but staff note it can be a difficult and costly exercise as section sizes tend to be smaller. The cost of including rainwater tanks may have a significant effect on the affordability of new homes, especially those targeted at first home buyers.

### Waimea Community Dam

- 11.11 Related to enhancing our water supply capacity is the Waimea Community Dam project. We received 122 submissions on this subject, 14 of which indicated their support, 105 noted their opposition, and three submitters did not clearly state whether they were for or against.
- 11.12 Of those submitters that noted their opposition to the Dam, just under half of those (39) requested that Council hold a referendum. Some of the reasons for requesting a referendum included:

- the project has a high degree of significance, meaning it must be approved by voters.
- Council cannot adequately manage large-scale projects therefore there will be cost overruns, for example the Queen Street upgrade and associated increased costs.
- submissions from the past round of Dam consultation indicated a high degree of opposition from the public.
- the community have never been asked if they want a dam or not.

11.13 Two submitters (18423, 18264) referred to our Significance and Engagement Policy and were of the opinion that we are in breach of it. They reasoned that because the project is of high significance and there is known opposition to it, Council must undertake a referendum.

11.14 The majority of submitters in opposition to the Dam were completely opposed to the entire dam project. There were a number of common themes from these submitters including:

- a) Farmers and horticulturists should pay for the Dam and water if they want it and ratepayers should not be subsidising business costs (18645, 18529, 18593, 18196, 18568, 18245, 18643).
- b) Ratepayers outside the Zone of Benefit, such as in Golden Bay, Murchison, and Motueka do not benefit from the project and should not have to contribute to the cost (18307, 18091, 18537, 18617, 18222, 18556, 18232).
- c) There are other more cost effective alternatives to the proposed Dam – for example weirs, collection ponds, onsite water storage and fixing leaking water pipes (18532, 18488, 18384, 18407, 18645, 18295, 18491, 18195, 17928, 18570, 18643).
- d) There is uncertainty over final costs, potential cost overruns, proposed rate rises and potential exceedance of Council's debt cap (18093, 18499, 18332, 18556, 18624, 18323).
- e) The funds are better spent on other projects and new priorities (18602, 18538), including helping landowners move to more sustainable farming practices (18127). The funds related to the environmental benefit should be spent on other environmental protection projects (18127).
- f) The proposed Council underwrite of the loan to WIL (18576, 18317), and ratepayers paying for project cost overruns over \$3 million (18346).
- g) Concerns over the geological nature of the dam site and earthquake risk (18527, 18199, 18530, 18245).

11.15 Several submitters referred to our Revenue and Financing Policy and were opposed to Council being able to rate WIL affiliated consent holders for any overruns over \$3 million (18329, 18456, 18528).

11.16 One submitter requested that a full review of water security for the Region should be instigated in partnership with Nelson City Council (18236). Submitter 18573 requested that Council start with a smaller dam and increase the capacity at a later date if needed.

11.17 Of the submitters in support of the Dam, their reasons included:

- The security of water supply will improve the quality of the Waimea River and provide water security for users for the next 100 years (18267, 18326, 17712, 18595).
- There is a proven need for an augmented water supply and the dam is essential for urban and rural water supply with no alternatives planned or possible in the near future (18603, 18325).

- It is important to include the funding for the proposed Dam in the LTP so as to have allocated sufficient funds to complete the project (18326).
- The proposed Dam is the most cost effective solution for meeting the community needs for good quality local water supply (18456).

11.18 Three submitters were neither in support nor opposition (18612, 18213, 18053). Submitter 18612 referred to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi) and the importance of water to Māori and its mauri and wairua. That submitter sought further investigation and analysis of the project. Reference was also made to iwi land rights in the Dam area and ongoing negotiations with the land owner.

11.19 Submitter 18213 noted their concerns around the final costs, WILs ability to raise its capital and the impact on Council's debt and ongoing liability. They noted that Councillors needed to satisfy themselves and the community that the Dam decision was the correct one.

11.20 Submitter 18053 asked whether the proposed dam could be coincided with a hydro scheme to augment some of the costs associated with the Dam.

### Staff Comments

11.21 There is no requirement in our Significance and Engagement Policy (or elsewhere) that we must carry out a referendum on the Waimea Community Dam (Dam). The Local Government Act 2002 states that it is Council's responsibility to make, in its discretion, judgements about how to achieve compliance with the requirements to consider community views in decision making. Council has chosen not to carry out a referendum on the Dam because referendums are either yes or no as opposed to consultation which generates views, preferences, alternatives, ideas, and concerns. As prudent decision makers, Council must focus on the reasons and logic.

11.22 Many submitters referred to the cost of the Dam being \$82.5 million. From their comments a large majority seemed to be under the misunderstanding that ratepayers were funding the total amount of the Dam (\$82.5 million), and were unaware of the separate funding contribution from irrigators and Government. Council's share that is being funded through rates and revenue in the LTP is \$26.8 million.

11.23A share of the Dam costs have been attributed to all ratepayers as the Dam will provide wider community and environmental benefits where the whole community will benefit to a greater or lesser degree. Council funds a number of projects in this manner including for example flood protection, solid waste and recycling, and museum funding.

11.24The alternative options to the Dam have previously been analysed and assessed by Council. At its meeting on the 27 July 2017, Council resolved that the proposed Dam in the Lee Valley was the best solution for meeting the community's need for good quality local water supply.

11.25The Dam allows Council to continue providing water to Brightwater, Richmond, Mapua, and the Redwood Valley Scheme throughout droughts without a shortfall in winter. Without the proposed Dam, Council and these communities will face significant shortfalls in water supply almost every year. The proposed Dam is also crucial to securing Council's water supply for future growth in the Waimea plains and Mapua. The Dam is therefore just as crucial to urban users as it is to irrigators.

11.26 With regard to rating for cost overruns, when Council accepts an obligation to meet a cost it must consider how to fund that cost. Council's funding sources comprise rates, returns on

investments and fees and charges. Providing for a targeted rate to be levied enables us in the future to rate for that cost, having assessed the distribution of benefits. Staff note however that the Revenue and Financing Policy has been incorrectly drafted. The way the policy is currently worded is inconsistent with the intent in the LTP Consultation Document, where it states that any cost overruns are to be recovered from ratepayers including irrigators. The intent was not to target rate affiliated water users exclusively.

- 11.27 Including the Dam project into the LTP and providing for its funding, cost allocation and governance does not commit the Council to it. It does enable the concurrent work streams to continue so that a decision on whether or not to proceed can be made with all the facts. If the Dam does not proceed, Council will need to find an alternative water supply solution for our urban water users, which is likely to come at a higher cost to our community.
- 11.28 In relation to a potential hydro electrical scheme on the Dam, Council has commissioned the development of a full business case that will be considered by prior to Financial Close. A hydro scheme would need to provide sufficient returns to cover its costs, and not significantly impact on the key outcomes or timelines for the proposed Dam.

### Staff Proposed Changes

- 11.29 To address the highlighted inconsistency between the LTP Consultation Document and our Revenue and Financing Policy in relation to the rating of WIL affiliated consent holders and cost overruns, staff recommend that we make an amendment to the Revenue and Financing Policy. This will clarify that the recovery of any cost overruns will be funded by both ratepayers and WIL affiliated consent holders.

<b>12 Key Issue - Improving Drinking Water Quality</b>
--

- 12.1 Council's proposal is to upgrade our existing water treatment plants, or build new plants, to comply with drinking water standards, in accordance with the proposed programme in the Water Asset Management Plan. Total capital investment of \$27 million is planned over the next 10 years for major water treatment upgrades.
- 12.2 We received 80 submissions on this issue, with 37 indicating support for Council's proposed option, 17 not in support, and the remainder were neither clearly for nor against.
- 12.3 Submitter 18394 suggested that we prioritise the projects in areas with the highest risk of contamination, while submitters 18599 and 18520 also suggest we prioritise the work and then programme over a longer timeframe.
- 12.4 Several submitters (18295, 18462, 18463, 18572, 18618 and 18514) suggested that Council should instead subsidise or require water tanks, and onsite treatment.
- 12.5 Submitter 18241 supported the proposed option and requested that Council consider the appropriate time of all planned upgrades with regard to commitments made in our Water Safety Plans. They also recommended that affordability arguments be weighed against Council's legislative duties (under the Health Act 1956) to take all practicable steps to achieve full compliance with the Drinking Water standards within the shortest possible timeframe.
- 12.6 Submitter 18241 also supported the alternative option of permanently chlorinating Richmond, Kaiteriteri, Motueka and Upper Takaka water schemes. Several submitters (18355, 18519, 18535 and 18641) indicated they do not support adding chlorine or other chemicals to the water supply.

- 12.7 Several submitters (18540, 18541, 18376, 18634) suggested the environment and pollution in areas surrounding water sources be addressed. Three submitters (18551, 18555, 18616) queried whether there was evidence of a water quality problem.
- 12.8 Submitters 18424, 18427, and 18458 commented on the 88 Valley Water Supply Scheme and raised their concerns about possible changes and increased costs.
- 12.9 Submitter 18600 referred to the poor drinking water quality in Marahau, and linked it to the poor performance of older wastewater systems in the vicinity of those bores. They requested that the reticulated water scheme for Marahau be brought forward from Year 2029/30.
- 12.10 Submitter 18549 suggested free water testing be made available for private supplies, while Submitter 18213 raised affordability concerns and suggested Council seek financial support from Government.

### Staff Comments

- 12.11 Council is under pressure to upgrade existing water treatment plants and/or build new water treatment plants to meet the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand. The Havelock North Inquiry is placing increased pressure on all water supply authorities to comply with the standards as soon as possible. We have a programme of works planned to achieve compliance with the standards in a realistic timeframe, balancing public health risks, debt and practicality of contractors to complete the work. Priority is given to the projects that pose the greatest risk to the communities they service. The first two projects in the programme include new treatment plants for Motueka and Wakefield.
- 12.12 Currently Council has rules requiring new houses in rural and rural residential zones to install water tanks where the house is not connected to a reticulated system. In residential zoned areas this can be difficult and costly and it is more cost effective to run a small number of large treatment plants rather than purchase and maintain many small individual household systems.
- 12.13 Council has planned the projects in the shortest possible timeframe whilst considering affordability, practicality and availability of local contractors to complete this work. We are focused on completing Water Safety Plans to identify and address the risk for each water supply and have engaged consultants to help complete this work as soon as possible.
- 12.14 We are currently in discussions with the 88 Valley Water Supply Committee to discuss water supply upgrade options. Meeting the Drinking Water Standards is a directive imposed by Government. We expect a response and further direction from Government later this year in response to the Havelock North Inquiry findings. This direction will guide scheme upgrade requirements and options.
- 12.15 Chlorination of drinking water is a sensitive issue. Most Council schemes are already chlorinated, and the remaining schemes will have emergency chlorination installed as they are upgraded.
- 12.16 General rate funding would not be considered appropriate for the regular testing of water for individual property owners. The testing of private water supplies is a responsibility of the private home owner.
- 12.17 Unfortunately there is no current financial support available from the Government to subsidise infrastructure upgrades to meet the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand. This



position may change once the Government have considered how to implement the recommendations of the Havelock North Inquiry.

<b>13</b>	<b>Key issue - Funding Motueka's Water Supply</b>
-----------	---

- 13.1 Council's proposal in the draft LTP is to introduce a fixed service charge to all properties connected to the reticulated service in Motueka. The fixed service charge would begin at the lower level and progressively increase to the full level by Year 3. The remainder of the costs would continue to be funded through volumetric charging.
- 13.2 We received 72 submissions on funding Motueka's water supply. Of those 30 were in support of Council's proposal, 14 did not support the proposal, and 28 were neither clearly for nor against.
- 13.3 Of those submitters who indicated support for the proposal:
- Two submitters (18295 and 18463) supported user pays.
  - Two submitters (18325 and 18555) indicated that they wanted to stay out of the Urban Water Club.
  - Other issues and comments from individual submitters included: affordability, support for volumetric charging, use of storage tanks, bore supplies should not pay, new areas should pay their own costs, there should be no charge for drilling a bore, a fixed charge for everyone (not just those connected), change to Development Contributions catchments disadvantages developers in Motueka.
  - One submitter wanted more information on costs (18513), and one submitter would prefer that funding be diverted from the Motueka Library (18605) to the water supply quality work.
- 13.4 Of those submitters who indicated that they did not support Council's proposal.
- Four submitters (18368, 18523, 18535 and 18599) indicated that all the charging options were unacceptable and unaffordable.
  - Three submitters (18360, 18460 and 18543) indicated a preference for increased volumetric charges, while Submitter 18519 indicated a preference for no volumetric charging.
  - Other charging options suggested were: making a charge to everyone in the area whether connected or not (18334), a preference for the full fixed charge in Year 1 (18394) and the fixed charge to vary based on the size of the property (18504).
- 13.5 Of the submitters who did not indicate a preference, only a few provided comments.
- Submitters 18273 and 18551 preferred that Motueka join the Urban Water Club and that Motueka should be treated the same way as the rest of the District.
  - One submitter was of the view that a fixed charge disproportionately impacts low income earners (18273), while another suggested that we should charge commercial water carriers by volume at a higher rate (18273). Submitter 8551 was of the view that the fixed charge should be a large component of the water supply cost.

**Staff comment**

- 13.6 Historically the total water rates paid by an average water user in Motueka have been lower than the Urban Water Club rates paid by the rest of the District. Despite the proposed increases in Motueka over the coming years, this is still expected to be the case.
- 13.7 It is very difficult to charge connected properties based on property size. The costs and benefits of the water supply are not directly proportional to property size and fixed service charges are a typical charging mechanism for water in the local government sector. Introducing a fixed charge is also consistent with the user pays objective as the connected properties have access to Council infrastructure and water supply.
- 13.8 Staff note that property owners are able to drill bores without requiring a resource consent or fees if the bore is less than 8 metres deep and is used for domestic supply purposes.
- 13.9 Given the support for the proposal and feedback received, there is no proposal to amend the proposed option.

<b>14 Corporate Services</b>
------------------------------

The following addresses the submissions received on a range of topics and issues that are within Council's Corporate Services area of responsibility.

**Draft Revenue and Financing policy**

- 14.1 Two submitters (18456 and 18628) including Waimea Irrigators Limited (WIL) opposed the Revenue and Financing Policy enabling Council to introduce a targeted rate to WIL affiliated consent holders in the event of a cost overrun in excess of \$3 million on the grounds that it contravenes the Project Agreement Term Sheet.
- 14.2 One submitter (17882) suggested that Council create a rating fee structure similar to our river rating schemes for direct coastal oceanfront communities, coastal cliffside communities, and low lying coastal communities.
- 14.3 Submitter 18440 did not support Council's involvement in commercial ventures citing its unaffordability.
- 14.4 Submitters 18236 and 18444 opposed the inclusion of rating for the Dam in the Policy.

**Draft Rates Remission Policy**

- 14.5 Only one submission (18203) was received on the Draft Rates Remission Policy. It advocated for a rates postponement scheme for people over 65 in the event of hardship, with the unpaid rates being deducted from the person's estate when they die.

**Revoking of Policy on early Payment of Rates in the Current Financial Year**

- 14.6 One submission (18411) was received on the proposal to revoke the Policy on Early Payment of Rates in the Current Financial Year. This submission sought the restoration of a mechanism for an early payment rebate to improve Council's cashflow.

**Policy on Remission and Postponement of Rates on Māori Freehold Land**

- 14.7 Four submissions were received on this policy, with three (18368, 18612 and 18639) advocating for the policy to apply to a wider range of Māori land, not just Māori freehold land. One submitter drew attention to the Te Ture Whenua Māori reforms that promote changes to clarify Māori land law and strengthen protection of ownership and use of Māori land. It advocated for the policy to align to these changes and also for Council to develop rating

policies for marae and papakainga. The submission from Wakatū Incorporation and Ngāti Rārua Ātiawa Iwi Trust (NRAIT) recommended Council amend the policy to extend rates remissions to Marae on a similar basis as sporting, recreation and community benefit.

14.8 Submitter 18411 considered the policy to be an example of reverse racism.

### **Commercial Activity**

14.9 Three submitters (18194, 18457, 18572) highlighted the importance of Takaka Airport following damage to the Takaka Hill Road following Ex-cyclone Gita, and advocated for the sealing of the cross runway to enable larger aircraft to land.

14.10 Three submitters (18390, 18553, 18595) requested funding and policy support for walking and cycling tracks in Borlase Forest to add to the range of recreational opportunities in and around Tapawera.

14.11 Submitter 18572 expressed their support for the planned investment in our commercial camping grounds and Port Tarakohe.

### **Local Information Centre Funding**

14.12 We received 15 submissions on the funding of local information centres, 14 of who supported the increased funding proposed. Several submitters cited the important role that the Takaka Information Centre played in advising tourists following the closure of the Takaka Hill Road as a result of Ex-cyclone Gita.

### **Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA) Funding**

14.13 Submitter 18621 (NRDA) seeks that Council reconsider the reduction of their funding by \$100,000/ year, and that the funds be re-committed to allow them to continue to build on the seasonally focused regional visitor marketing efforts in partnership with the visitor industry. They also seek additional funding of \$50,000 in 2018/2019 for the development of the Top of the South Economic Growth Strategy. NRDA reported that both NCC and Marlborough District Council have been approached to provide funding at this level.

14.14 Three submitters (18430, 18604, 18314) supported NRDA and advocated for their funding to be increased back to \$400,000 per annum. One submitter supported economic development more broadly. Two submitters involved in regional tourism and the NRDA noted that in addition to good sources of information, there is a need for active marketing to encourage visitors that arrive in our Region to stay longer and experience. They also identified the need to rethink the i-SITE/visitor information model to respond to modern trends in the use of communication devices and visitor preferences. Their view was that the current business model was not sustainable.

### **Staff comment**

14.15 The matter of the Revenue and Financing Policy and rating for cost overruns related to the Dam project is addressed above in Section 11 under Waimea Community Dam. Staff propose that the Policy is amended to be consistent with the intent in the LTP Consultation Document.

14.16 Council has planned to undertake further work to better understand and plan for the natural hazards that are facing our communities over the next few years. This will include a specific focus on coastal areas. Until this work is complete, staff do not recommend revising the related rating policy.

- 14.17 With regard to the rates on Māori land, we are uncertain what Government changes will come at this point and how they could influence the future direction of Council policy. When this becomes clear, we will review the impacts. Any policy proposed changes would be subject to public consultation. We have identified that there are approximately 15 pieces of rateable Māori freehold land in the District, and plan to further investigate the nature of each property to facilitate the process of reviewing this Policy in the future.
- 14.18 We have investigated other Councils' experience with rates postponement policies. The feedback we have received is that the schemes are quite costly to setup and administer, and uptake has been quite low. It is expected that the cost of the scheme would be entirely funded by those whose rates are postponed - without cross subsidisation from other ratepayers - which is not consistent with the below market interest rates and low costs.
- 14.19 Council recently adopted an internal policy on Recreation Use of Council Plantation Forests. The Policy identifies Borlase Forest as primarily a commercial forest. Council is able to consider the installation of track systems in the forest, however a decision cannot be made without advice from our Forest Managers, plans of track proposals and a proposed funding model. Staff will look further into this matter and prepare a report on the issues relating to forming recreational tracks in Borlase Forest for Council consideration.
- 14.20 The issue of the sealing of the cross runway at Takaka Airport will be considered when the aerodrome management is transferred to Council.
- 14.21 There is strong support to increase funding for the NRDA by \$100,000 back to Council's previously committed support of \$400,000 per annum. NRDA are seen as an important part of the tourism industry in our Region and important contributor regarding economic development.

### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 14.22 Staff propose that Council increase funding for the NRDA by \$100,000 per annum back to the previously committed \$400,000 total per annum in order to contribute to seasonally focused regional visitor marketing efforts. You may like to consider requiring some of this funding to be used to develop a coordinated Nelson-Tasman information centre approach. This recommendation is a budget increase, and is in addition to the proposed funding in the draft LTP for the local information centres and Nelson Tasman Business Trust.
- 14.23 Noting the submission from NRDA (18621) and the Tasman Bay Promotions Association (18550) in relation to the sustainability of the current visitor information business model and the need to transition, Council may wish to consider introducing a sunset arrangement. Such an arrangement could see funding to local information centres, limited for example to first three years of the LTP as opposed to funding over the full 10 years. Such a clause is seen as necessary to avoid disincentivising a necessary shift away from the current visitor information model. Whether you wish to include a similar arrangement for the Nelson Tasman Business Trust funding also requires discussion.
- 14.24 Staff recommend that funding of \$50,000 is provided in Year 1 to NRDA to ensure that Tasman's interests are sufficiently considered in the Top of the South Economic Growth Strategy. An effective economic development strategy is required to enable access to the Government's Provincial Growth Programme. The funding criteria require that projects align with regional priorities and that they have been discussed and agreed with relevant local stakeholders.

**15 Engineering Services****Transportation**

- 15.1 123 submitters commented on Transportation projects in the LTP, with a number commenting on more than one project.
- 15.2 Seven submitters requested improved Public Transport services for Golden Bay (18556, 18365), Mapua and Brightwater (18460), Motueka (18392), Wakefield and Tapawera (18595) and between Richmond and Nelson (18598, 18054).
- 15.3 Submitters 17921 and 18609 requested that the upgrade of the Lower Queen Street and Berryfield Drive intersection be brought forward. Submitter 18609 also requested that as development has occurred at a faster rate than predicted, that the Borck Creek ford project be brought forward to Year 3.
- 15.4 Submitter 18311 commented on the need to upgrade the Champion Road/Salisbury Road intersection and requested that Council bring the construction of the intersection upgrade works forward to 2019/2020 year, from 2021/2022.

**Staff Comments**

- 15.5 Staff acknowledge that demand for public transport is increasing around the District. We are working with Nelson City Council to make improvements to the existing bus route between Richmond and Nelson which is currently has good patronage, as well as looking at extensions to bus services within Richmond. A further study is required to determine demand and how it could be met across the District.
- 15.6 Staff are concerned about the traffic on Lower Queen Street through development of Richmond West occurring faster than anticipated. Ideally the intersection should be upgraded at Berryfield Drive and Lower Queen Street and the Borck Creek ford developed in Year 3. However, financial constraints currently prohibit this. As below staff are of a view that the projects could be brought forward to Year 6.
- 15.7 Staff have been working with the submitter on the Champion Road/Salisbury Road upgrade. We are seeking expert opinion of the alternative options suggested and early indications are that they will offer a satisfactory level of safety to the vulnerable users. Staff recommend bringing the roundabout upgrade forward to Year 1, and maintaining the underpass works in Year 4. If the safe pedestrian crossing works are successful, Council may wish to remove the underpass project in the future. If the level crossing does not expectations, the underpass can still proceed. The submitter has noted that they are prepared to contribute to the funding of the pedestrian crossing.

**Staff Proposed Changes**

- 15.8 Public Transport Study: Staff recommend including \$60,000 in Year 2 (2019/2020) to review all our public transport networks to meet residents demand and new central government funding priorities. This will be undertaken alongside Nelson City Council to recognise the high degree of Cross-boundary interdependence.
- 15.9 Lower Queen Street and Berryfield Drive intersection upgrade: Staff recommend moving the \$990,000 project from Year 8 (2025/2026) to Year 6 (2023/2024), noting that it may need to bring this further forward if growth proceeds faster than anticipated.

15.10 Borck Creek Shared Pathway Crossing: We recommend moving the \$673,700 project from Years 8 & 9 (2025/2026 – 2026/2027) to Year 6 (2023/2024). Noting that this may need to bring this further forward if growth proceeds faster than anticipated.

15.11 Champion Road/Salisbury Road intersection: Staff recommend that we bring the roundabout upgrade (\$899,000) forward to Year 2 (2019/2020) from Year 4 (2021/2022), but that the underpass remain in Year 4. Whilst the cost of the roundabout is \$899,000, Council's contribution is around \$200,000.

### **Cycleways**

15.12 A total of 68 submitters noted their support for the Pohara-Takaka shared pathway project, while 16 submitters expressed support for cycleways in general. Several submitters (18091, 18305, 18572, 18270, 18314, 18117, 18556) requested more cycleways in Golden Bay including cycleways between Takaka and the turnoff to Rangihaeata, Wainui and Takaka, and Takaka to Puponga.

15.13 Five submitters noted their support for the Tasman Great Taste Trail improvements (18595, 18409, 18347, 18373, 18553).

### **Staff Comment**

15.14 We recognise that the road between Pohara and Takaka does not cater well for the wide range of transport modes that people may wish to use on this route. This project is an effort to alleviate concerns and also meet the latent demand in this area for active transport options.

15.15 Staff plan to update Council's walking and cycling strategies, especially in the light of Government placing a higher emphasis on active transport modes. We anticipate that the new strategies will highlight a number of potential projects. In relation to the new Golden Bay cycleways requested, we will monitor the uptake of the Pohara and Takaka link once it is in place to assist in determining latent demand for these facilities.

### **Motueka**

15.16 Several submitters requested improvements to Motueka's High Street (18520, 18535, 18347, 18599), the Motueka Bridge (18216, 18053, 18347) and the need for a Motueka bypass (18216, 18053, 18611).

### **Staff Comment**

15.17 The bypass for Motueka, High Street, and the Motueka Bridge are part of the State Highway network and are administered by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). The NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) is currently working on changes to State Highway 60/High Street, which late last year went through a public submission process. We believe that NZTA will release their preferred design shortly.

15.18 We are currently working with NZTA to address longer-term travel delays and restrictions at the Motueka Bridge. Additionally we have project planned to improve the amenity and functionality of the Motueka town centre in 2022 after NZTA has made its changes. One of the goals of our project is to make improvements to walking, cycling and mobility scooters in the town centre.

### **Gravel and Rural Roads**

15.19 Several submitters expressed support for the increased maintenance of these roads (18457, 18571, 18548, 18394, 18054). There were several requests for sealing some roads.

**Staff Comment**

15.20 Currently our policy is not to undertake sealing of gravel roads due to the associated costs with the seal and on-going maintenance.

**Specific projects**

15.21 We received a number of specific requests for a variety of transport projects as detailed below.

15.22 Submitter 18525 requested improvements to the parking, signage and beautification of Murchison Town Centre.

**Staff Comment:** This will be funded out of existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

15.23 Submitter 18554 requested the footpath near 125 Mapua Drive be extended. This request was supported by a petition from 52 neighbouring residents.

**Staff Comment:** This short section of footpath is not a priority for completion as pedestrians are required to cross the road as there is no footpath beyond Seaton Valley Road. This road does not have a high priority compared to other roads in the District that don't have footpaths on either side.

15.24 Submitter 18625 and 18411 requested footpath improvements in Mapua.

**Staff Comment:** A footpath alongside Mapua Drive to Coastal Highway is on the list of new footpath projects.

15.25 Submitter 18450 requested footpath improvements on Pah St past the marae.

**Staff Comment:** Staff agree there is a need for a footpath along Pah Street and it has been included in the footpath matrix.

15.26 Submitter 18573 requested a shared pathway between Kaiteriteri and Marahau and a footpath along Martin Farm Road. Submitter 18595 has requested support for a formed walkway from the Tapawera village centre to the old Forestry camp for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Staff Comment:** The LTP does not have a specific project included for this, we have identified as a new walking facility in our new footpaths budget. There is no confirmed date to undertake this work.

15.27 Submitter 18600 requested an improvement in carparking in Marahau.

**Staff Comment:** We acknowledge that Marahau experiences significant levels of traffic at peak periods. This traffic can create disruption and we are currently working with the community to address the parking issues at Otuwhero Spit. We have a project to create a footbridge across Marahau River. The footbridge has been included in our new footpath matrix and is prioritised against all other new footpaths required in the District. We do not believe there is a need to provide additional parking and cycling facilities given the town has a 30km/h slow speed shared road environment.

15.28 Submitter 18491 and 18645 requested a footpath connecting Takaka township with the Rec Centre and Health Centre.

**Staff Comment:** We are aware of the need to provide better transport connections between Takaka and the Recreation Centre and Health Centre. This project is noteworthy, and we will consider it for inclusion in the next Long Term Plan.

15.29 Submitter 18481 and 18477 requested footpaths in Upper Moutere.

**Staff Comment:** In response to concern about the lack of a shared pathway between Upper Moutere Village and the Moutere Hills Community Centre, we are working with the local community to establish a preferred route. Allowance for this has been made in our new footpath programme of works, so work can be completed once a route has been secured. In response to the request to complete the footpath from the end of Sunrise Valley Rd to the end of the existing footpath, this project is on our new footpath matrix and was investigated and consulted in 2015. The project has been designed, but it may not be completed for some time due to there being higher priority projects and limited funding.

15.30 Several submitters (18594 18643 18644) requested a speed reduction outside Ngatimoti School.

**Staff Comment:** We periodically undertake reviews of speed limits in the District. The speed past Ngatimoti School could be addressed by Council at the next review.

15.31 Submitter 18511 (Blind Foundation) made a number of requests and submissions.

**Staff Comment:** Accessibility has been identified as a key issue for the transportation activity. To facilitate this, there is funding for dedicated and separated cycle and walking paths, new footpaths, improvement of existing footpaths and intersection improvements to improve safety of pedestrians. Additionally, total mobility funding has been changed to match expected growth in community requirements and funding for a new Richmond bus service. Vulnerable user parking is currently being considered in the Richmond and Motueka town centre parking strategy. We also work with vulnerable user groups, like the Blind, in the Nelson/Tasman Accessibility for All forum.

15.32 Submitter 18241 (Nelson Marlborough Health) also had a number of suggestions relating to Transportation, Active Transport, Cycle Infrastructure, Drinking Fountains, Shade structures.

**Staff Comment:** The cycle infrastructure and drinking fountains will be considered in each of the town centre upgrades. The Queen Street upgrade has included bike stands and already has a fountain feature in Sundial Square. We will continue to identify opportunities for better facilities to support active transport.

### Natural Hazards

15.33 We received 49 submissions on the topic of natural hazards with a range of specific requests across our District. We also received requests that were more general in nature such as researching the overall impacts of the recent cyclone events as the basis for developing a comprehensive action plan, an investigation into how to develop resilient communities, managing retreat, alternative housing areas, adaptation to the effects of climate change, placing a higher priority/greater resources into the LTP, and to abolish the differential river rate. Issues with the inspection, maintenance and clearing of drains, culverts, streams and rivers were raised by 11 submitters at a range of different locations in the District. A number of submitters encouraged Council to share information from research and investigations or hazard information more broadly with the public.

15.34 Mapua: Four submitters commented on coastal issues in Mapua with two (18539, 18625) requesting that we investigate why the Old Mill Walkway coastal protection was more effective than the Broadsea Avenue seawall. Submitter 18013 requested that we undertake dredging from the Mapua Wharf to McKee Point to reduce wave action and erosion along the shoreline.

15.35 Ruby Bay: Three submissions were received on Ruby Bay. Submitter 17995 requested that the sea wall be restored to its original standard, while Submitters 18023 and 18025 sought



the construction of a seawall from Tait Street to Pinehill Reserve. Both expressed concern about stormwater runoff from a Council walkway and road into their property, while Submitter 18013 sought an effective stormwater outfall.

- 15.36 Brooklyn: 10 submitters focused on issues in Brooklyn with the majority requesting an immediate investigation into the issues associated with flooding and damage in the Brooklyn Stream catchment during Ex-cyclone Gita. These submitters also opposed the transfer of funds from X-rated rivers to Z-rated landowners, at least until there has been public consultation on a report on the state of rivers and streams following Ex-cyclone Gita.
- 15.37 Riwaka: Seven submitters commented on issues associated with the Riwaka River. Three submitters requested that Council construct further stopbanks (18108, 18210, 18483) to prevent flooding in the area. Submitter 18237 identified silt and vegetation build up as an issue, while Submitter 18546 thought the culverts were inadequate. Submitter 18639 requested that Council develop a flood risk management plan for the Riwaka catchment and the resolution of the issue of current stopbanks occupying their land. Submitter 18267 offered to provide information to Council about the flooding on their property. One submitter provided specific suggestions about work to prevent future flooding on School Road. Submitter 18546 identified that flood flows through the touch fields threaten houses.
- 15.38 Motueka: Six submissions were received on the Motueka River. Two submitters (18347, 18346) advocated for greater capacity for the Motueka River stopbanks and two submitters (18503, 18273) wanted to ensure Council had included sufficient budgets in the LTP for the maintenance of the stopbanks. There was one request for a flood risk control plan (18639), one request for modification of the tributary flood control measures (18273) and for improved stream bed maintenance (18273). Submitter 18520 objected to being rated for further planning for Motueka flood control given the previous work carried out on this topic. Two submitters (18347, 18376) commented on the risk and damage to properties in Motueka from seawater. Submitter 18347 requested that Council mitigate the risk from storm surges.
- 15.39 Marahau: Submitter (18600) on behalf of the Marahau community noted the significant impacts from Ex-cyclone Gita on their community and that there has not yet been time to fully understand the causes and what can be done to reduce the impact of future events. The submission identified the need for an investigation to be carried out and that this may lead to a need for capital projects that are not currently planned in the LTP.
- 15.40 Submitter 18237 suggested a number of wording changes to the Coastal Assets Activity Management Plan including Table 18.

### **Staff Comment**

- 15.41 Council's water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation activity management plans include funding to undertake risk, resilience and recovery planning in Years 1 and 2. The scope of this work is yet to be determined. The initial purpose is to consider how natural hazards impact these assets and what Council's priorities should be in the short, medium and long term to mitigate risks and improve community resilience. We are also using advice received from the Ministry for the Environment that outlines different interventions for different levels of investment.
- 15.42 Maintenance of land drains, which are primarily for the benefit of draining private land, is the responsibility of the adjacent landowner as prescribed in the Land Drainage Act, even where those drains are located in road reserve. In rural areas Council undertakes maintenance on drains for the purpose of road surface drainage. The proposed LTP includes additional funding to maintain road reserve culverts and drainage.

- 15.43 We are proposing to undertake a coastal protection strategy in the next few years. The coastal erosion and inundation issues raised by submitters will be considered as part of this work.
- 15.44 Mapua/Ruby Bay: The Ruby Bay Seawall and the Old Mill Seawall are currently maintained to their respective original designed condition in line with the resource consent. Both seawalls were designed to prevent further erosion of the coastline that has seen significant portions of land eroded over the years. Neither wall was designed to prevent inundation. Council has an interim position on coastal works that they will not invest in coastal protection works to protect private property nor to protect Council property unless there are substantial capital works at threat.
- 15.45 Motueka, Brooklyn and Riwaka: We continually maintain our stopbanks. There have been no major improvements to the Motueka stopbanks since they were built. A previous proposal to upgrade the stopbanks to improve flood protection was rejected by the community as unaffordable.
- 15.46 Marahau: We will continue to engage with the Marahau community to identify what can be done to reduce the impact of future extreme weather events and bring through any changes that are required in future Annual Plan or LTP processes.
- 15.47 Coastal Assets Activity Management Plan: Staff will review each of the submitter's recommended changes against the intention of the paragraph and document, and include any recommended changes in our report to Council on the 24 May 2018.

### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 15.48 Staff propose changes to the timing and funding of the Riwaka Flood Mitigation Works and Motueka Flood Mitigation Study as detailed in paragraphs 9.24-9.26 of this report.

### **Stormwater Projects**

- 15.49 There were 29 submission relating to stormwater management. Of these 16 related solely to stormwater issues in Ruby Bay. Submitters requested that Council invest in stormwater infrastructure to address flooding issues for properties in Stafford Drive, Tait Street and Broadsea Avenue. Submitter 18539 also raised concerns about Seaton Valley Stream, requesting that the final phase be completed.
- 15.50 Several submitters raised concerns about stormwater management in Motueka (18213, 18214, 18215, 18561).
- 15.51 Submitter 18033 requested stormwater upgrades for Reservoir Creek and Submitter 18607 provided feedback on stormwater capacity to service growth in Richmond South.
- 15.52 Submitters 18127 and 18237 requested that stormwater design consider the wider environmental impact of engineering solutions.

### **Staff Comments**

- 15.53 The development of Catchment Management Plans over the next five years will take a whole-of-catchment and long-term approach to stormwater management across the District.
- 15.54 Stormwater management in Ruby Bay will be considered and prioritised as part of the catchment management planning process, and will take into account climate change effects. The key constraint for stormwater discharge in Ruby Bay is caused by the natural topography and low elevation in combination with stormwater discharges to the sea being limited during high tides. Some localised flooding issues at 72 to 84 Stafford Drive are

planned to be addressed in Year 1 of the proposed LTP. These works will be combined with works on the wastewater network and a new pump station. Where appropriate, Council may be able to progress some minor improvement works through its proposed reactive stormwater improvements programme.

- 15.55 Staff acknowledge the existing flood risk in the lower areas of Mapua that are serviced by the Seaton Valley Stream. However, evidence from recent storm events has shown that the Seaton Valley Stream is performing well and there have been no complaints in regard to flooding of habitable floor levels in this area. We are undertaking stormwater modelling of the Seaton Valley Stream which will confirm the design upgrade requirements of the Stream upgrade - Stage 2.
- 15.56 Council is undertaking stormwater modelling to identify potential stormwater improvements in Motueka, including for the Clay Street/Moffat Street area. Key areas of concern in Motueka will be prioritised through the Catchment Management Plan and incorporated into our next LTP. Stormwater improvement works in Poole Street are currently underway and programmed to be completed in 2018. Improvements to High Street/Wratt Street are anticipated to be part of Motueka Discharge West solutions.
- 15.57 Regarding the Reservoir Creek catchment, we are undertaking stormwater modelling to determine current and future capacity of our stormwater network in Richmond. A Catchment Management Plan is being developed through which different improvement options will be identified and prioritised. Stream banks that are subject to erosion will be assessed and maintained if and when required as part of Council's general maintenance programme.
- 15.58 Upgrades to the stormwater infrastructure downstream of Paton Rise are programmed within the first six years of the LTP, based on current growth expectations. Council will continue to communicate directly with the development community to address issues where timing of upgrades are unable to meet demand.
- 15.59 We are currently promoting a more natural approach to stormwater management, also known as water sensitive design. This includes the protection and enhancement of streams and their ecological values, treatment of stormwater discharges, and infiltration of stormwater into the ground. We will continue to monitor the state of the environment in accordance with current monitoring programmes with existing staff resources. Stormwater quality treatment for new developments will be addressed through the proposed Land Development Manual once adopted.

### **Refuse/Recycling Routes and Rating Areas**

- 15.60 We received 19 submissions through the LTP process on proposed changes to our refuse and recycling routes and ratings areas. In addition to consultation on our LTP, we also contacted affected property owners by mail and received additional feedback by telephone and email from affected residents.
- 15.61 The following table summarises the feedback received from all sources on the proposed extensions and changes to the various rating areas.

<b>Proposed Extension</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>N/A*</b>	<b>Total</b>
Abel Tasman Drive	2		10	12
Flaxmore Road	2	2	5	9
Harley Road			8	8

Proposed Extension	Oppose	Support	N/A*	Total
Horton Road		2	1	3
Matenga Road	4	6	9	19
Pigeon Valley South Branch Road	3	1	4	8
Quail Valley Road			8	8
Sunrise Valley Road	1		6	7
Sunset Valley Road	4	1		5
Supplejack Valley Road			8	8
Weka Road / Wood Loop	1		10	11
Bridge Valley Road - Moore Road	1	3	15	19
Greenvine Lane		1		1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>118</b>

\*N/A indicates there was no response.

15.62 Of those who submitted via our LTP submission process and who opposed the additional services, the following comments were made: some properties are holiday homes or empty sections so rarely occupied, submitters are happy making their own arrangements, submitters create little waste, do not want to pay for the service, do not want service as live up a long drive and will have difficulties with bringing the bin to the roadside.

15.63 One submitter supported the additions from the Bridge Valley Adventure Centre (18247) and saw the potential for the additions to help educate children on recycling. Submitter 18309 requested that Council extend collection services to the Westbank Road.

15.64 Other comments received through the submissions included a desire for Council to place more emphasis on minimising waste and that extending these services runs counter to the aim of zero waste. They submitted that Council should not extend the collection services but make refuse and recycling drop-off free.

#### Staff Comments:

##### *Abel Tasman Drive and Matenga Road, Golden Bay*

15.65 The two submissions received were both against extending the service in these locations. This area of Abel Tasman Drive has been serviced for many years and in the last three years it has been excluded from the rating area in error due to the redrafting of the rating area map.

15.66 Matenga Road has seen significant development in the last three years, and we have received requests from residents who wanted the service extended. Through follow up telephone calls we received support from five other ratepayers, while three other ratepayers neither supported nor opposed.

15.67 For Abel Tasman Drive, given that the service has been provided for many years and there were not a large number of objections to the proposal, we recommend the rating area be extended as proposed. Due to upcoming development in the area, we recommend that the rating area for Matenga Road be extended as proposed.

*Upper Moutere: Flaxmore, Harley, Horton, Sunrise Valley, Sunset Valley and Supplejack Roads*

15.68 Six submissions were received, four which did not support the extension for their roads (Flaxmore, Sunrise Valley (2) and Sunset Valley) and two of which did (Flaxmore and Horton). There were no submissions about the service being extended for the other roads, although additional feedback was received.

15.69 Staff do not recommend extending the rating area for Flaxmore, Sunrise Valley, Sunset Valley or Supplejack Road.

15.70 Staff recommend extending the area for Harley and Horton Road.

*Brightwater/Wakefield: Greenvine Lane, Pigeon, Quail, and Bridge Valleys Roads*

15.71 Staff do not recommend extending the rating area for Greenvine Lane.

15.72 This section of Pigeon Valley is outside of the rating area but due to multiple requests for services we are now servicing four of these eight properties and invoicing them the equivalent of the targeted rate.

15.73 Staff recommend extending the area for Pigeon Valley South Branch Road, Quail Valley Road, Bridge Valley Road/Moore Road,

*Tasman: Weka Road/Wood Loop*

15.74 As there is no clear support for the proposal, and the road is close to the Mariri RRC we do not recommend an extension of the rating area, except to include the property already invoiced for this service.

**Staff Proposed Changes**

15.75 Staff recommend that the following rating areas that were proposed for extension in the draft LTP be removed:

- Flaxmore Road
- Supplejack Valley Road
- Sunset Valley Road
- Sunrise Valley Road
- Weka Road/Wood Loop
- Greenvine Lane

*St Arnaud*

15.76 The table below summarises the feedback received on the proposed removal of refuse and recycling services in St Arnaud.

Removal of Service	Neutral	Oppose	Support	N/A*	Total
Cotterell Place	1		2	5	8
Holland Street	5	2		12	19
Robert Street			2	7	9
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>

\*N/A indicates there was no response

15.77 In total, four submitters supported removal of the service, six submitters were neutral and two submitters supported retention of the services at Cotterell Place, Holland Street and Robert Street in St Arnaud.

**Staff Comment**

15.78 These streets are narrow and difficult to safely service. In response to the submissions received, staff support the draft proposal to remove the recycling services from the three streets listed in St Arnaud with the exception of the two properties on the edge of the rating area.

**Staff Proposed Changes**

15.79 We propose that the rating area be reduced as proposed with the exception of the two properties on the edge of the rating area. Staff also propose that further work be carried out to investigate drop-off options for St Arnaud.

**Waste Management and Minimisation**

15.80 Nine submissions were received on waste management and minimisation.

15.81 Three submitters (18548, 18502, 18241) supported increasing the number and locations of recycling drop-off points.

15.82 Two submitters commented on services in Golden Bay. Submitter 18460 suggest a collection truck and compactor be located in Golden Bay. Submitter 18219 requested a green waste composting facility at the Takaka transfer station.

15.83 Submitter 18368 requested that Council makes sure recycling is in a closed loop system which does not create more rubbish and educates people about reducing and reusing.

15.84 Other submitters requested Council consider ways to reduce plastic packaging (18295) and illegal dumping (18127), and to support recycling electronic waste (18502).

**Staff Comment**

15.85 We are currently redesigning our Resource Recovery Centre in Golden Bay and considering ways to handle and transport recycling more efficiently, and this may include a compactor. Setting up a commercial composting facility is an expensive undertaking as it requires a high capital investment. Over the last two years Council has twice sought expressions of interest for composting services, including Golden Bay. In both instances there has been no interest expressed from Golden Bay businesses, and we have entered into a contract to transport greenwaste from around the District to a processing facility near Brightwater. We consider that home composting is the most cost effective and sustainable solution and we continue to promote this and provide subsidies for purchase of composting bins.

15.86 The Nelson Tasman Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is currently under review and we be out for consultation later in this year. The revised document will have a greater emphasis on waste avoidance and support of businesses that reduce waste. The Plan will address product stewardship including e-waste. The Government has indicated that there will be progress on product stewardship in the near future. In the meantime we will promote responsible disposal of waste and recommend that Council consider financial support of local e-waste recycling services from existing product stewardship and waste minimisation budgets. All recycling collected in the Region goes to markets for recycling (including glass to Auckland for glass bottle manufacturing).

## Infrastructure Strategy

- 15.87 We received a total of five submissions on our Infrastructure Strategy.
- 15.88 Submitter 18241 noted their support for the infrastructure priorities identified in the Strategy, and Submitter 18563 sought that Council ensure it lives up to the infrastructure priorities outlined in the LTP Consultation Document.
- 15.89 Submitter 18612 highlighted their concern over the disposal of wastewater to water and advocated for Council to investigate and trial land based disposal options. They also requested that the existing wastewater schemes be relocated away from water to meet the needs of future generations.
- 15.90 Submitter 18639 requested that the water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure in Motueka West be brought forward in the programme to Year 2 to allow the zoning deferment to be uplifted. They also requested that the Motueka Wastewater Treatment Plant be completed in Year 2 (2019/2020) as there is currently a mismatch in timing for this upgrade if the improvements are necessary to accept the additional wastewater flows expected from the Motueka West development.
- 15.91 Submitter 18490 queried what Council is doing to prevent wastewater overflows affecting beaches at Rabbit Island and Tahunanui, when Council is proposing to shift the Motueka Wastewater Plant, and why the issue of forestry debris and silt flow was not identified in the Infrastructure Strategy. The submitter highlighted confusing information about river control and flooding depreciation, questioned whether Council would have sufficient funds for emergency funds given proposed funding of the Waimea Community Dam, and advocated for renewals to include planning for extreme weather events.

## Staff comments

- 15.92 Motueka West: We have generally programmed the provision of new infrastructure services in Motueka West to coincide with projected high population and housing growth. A new water main to Motueka West is planned for completion prior to the end of Year 3. A wastewater main and pump station to connect Motueka West to the Motueka wastewater treatment plant is planned for completion by Year 5, as well as a stormwater discharge system by Year 7. Provision of water is critical to enabling development in Motueka West. We have assumed that developers will be able to provide interim solutions such as low pressure pump systems for wastewater and detention for stormwater that will allow them to develop once the water main is in place. There may be a need to advance the water reticulation work to Year 2 if development proceeds more quickly than expected. We will work with Wakatū Incorporation to coordinate its and Council's plans for this area.
- 15.93 The Motueka wastewater treatment plant currently has adequate capacity for the Motueka West development area and advancement is not necessary.
- 15.94 The Motueka wastewater treatment plant was upgraded recently to improve the quality of water discharged from the plant to the environment. The plant has a resource consent that allows it to remain there for approximately another 20 years. The plant has been sized to accommodate population and business growth that may occur over that time. Once the current consent expires, the plant will need to be relocated away from the coast. We have planned to undertake this around the Year 2035. During 2020/2021 we plan to undertake preliminary work to identify a suitable site.
- 15.95 The National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) becomes operative on 1 May 2018. The Standard sets out national regulations covering the eight core forestry

activities of afforestation, pruning and thinning, earthworks, river crossings, forestry quarrying, harvesting, mechanical land preparation, and replanting. The regulations will replace our forestry rules in the TRMP. In some limited circumstances the NES-PF does allow us to develop plan rules that are more stringent including on erosion prone land. We are currently considering how our rules may be changed to provide more control over forest activities where appropriate. That work is likely to be completed in late 2018. Also see the section on Forestry below beginning at paragraph 16.36.

### **Wastewater**

- 15.96 Submitter 18241 supported the proposed actions and projects outlined in the Wastewater AMP related to reducing the number of overflows as these present a risk to environmental and public health.
- 15.97 Submitter 18597 noted that the location of the Bells Island treatment plant is offensive to iwi. They requested that an alternative location be found.
- 15.98 Submitter 18600 referred to the poor drinking water quality in Marahau, and linked it to the poor performance of older wastewater systems in the vicinity of those bores. They made reference to the TRMP rules and wastewater standards not being implemented and requested that the standards are made clearer and implemented.
- 15.99 Submitters 18609 and 18638 are supportive of the Headingly Lane Pump Station and Rising Main Upgrade project, but they noted that it is currently under construction so queried why funds for it were included in the draft LTP.

### **Staff Comments**

- 15.100 The Nelson Regional Sewerage Business Unit is aware of the request from iwi to relocate the wastewater treatment plant. At this stage it has not been included in the 30 year Infrastructure Strategy. However, a more detailed assessment is required and when this is undertaken we will ensure iwi are engaged in any assessment of potential new sites
- 15.101 The issue of wastewater standards and enforcement of rules in relation to Marahau as been referred to the Environmental Policy team as it reviews the TRMP rules.
- 15.102 Council has recently upgraded the wastewater pipe that runs along Headingly Lane from Lower Queen Street to the end of Headingly Lane. The project proposed in the draft LTP relates to the upgrade of the Headingly Lane pump station and section of rising main that runs from this pump station to the Beach Road pump station.

### **Rivers and Coastal**

- 15.103 We received a total of six submissions on the topic of Rivers and Coastal. Two submitters (18368, 18461) made reference to the damage caused by Ex-cyclone Gita. Submitter 18368 noted the need to monitor the Brooklyn and Shaggery Streams as they have become considerably shallower as a result of the event.
- 15.104 Submission 18461 requested that an inspection of the Riwaka Wharf be undertaken in early 2018 including remedial works.
- 15.105 Submitter 18627 sought that Council provide more resources for river flood protection work. They are of the opinion that this could be met by increasing the ability to extract gravel to support the increased rivers budget.
- 15.106 Submitter 18382 noted their objection to the Ruby Bay rock wall being enlarged, and to having to contribute to that cost.



- 15.107 Whilst acknowledging the statements in the Settlement Report about the special character of Marahau, Submitter 18095 questioned the spending of \$45,000 on renewal works to the jetty which they believe is used mainly by commercial operators.
- 15.108 Submitter 18490 queried the \$100,000 budget for the development of a Climate Change Policy (believing one should be in place) and the omission of a timeline for the project, as well as the assumption of stepped changes in natural hazard events. The submitter also queried the low and reducing budget for operations and maintenance for coastal asset renewal.

### Staff Comments

- 15.109 We are continuing to work through issues in the aftermath of Ex-cyclone Gita. We have historic river and stream depths, which we will be comparing to current depth profiles. Our aim is to keep river bed depths of fully maintained rivers within a certain envelope. A review of the river rating system is required to inform discussion about increased level of service for rivers.
- 15.110 Gravel extraction is a major theme of the draft River Activity Management Plan. We have increased the surveying of rivers to readily respond to gravels build up, but also to manage the river bed within a sustainable envelope.
- 15.111 Over the next three years, we are going to undertake a complete review of the coastal assets which will include the Riwaka Wharf. Once complete, we will be able to determine the long term needs and function of the wharf. We are aware that the surface of the wharf was damaged during the recent ex-cyclone. In relation to other damage that occurred elsewhere, this is of a low priority for repair. Council's contractors are aware of the need to fix the surface and this will be done as soon as resources allow.
- 15.112 The charge for the maintenance of the Ruby Bay seawall is in recognition that the seawall not only protects the properties from coastal erosion, but also much of the infrastructure that is used in the area.
- 15.113 The jetty at Marahau is provided for the use of the community. The renewal budget recognises that all infrastructure has a lifespan, especially that in the coastal zone. The money will be spent on maintenance to return the jetty to the desired level of service.
- 15.114 We propose to undertake two pieces of work in the first year of the proposed LTP. The first is to develop a coastal policy to replace the interim position. The second is to gather better information on the current coastal assets we administer. The main reason operations and maintenance is appearing to drop is halting sand replenishment in Marahau and constructing a small rock revetment. Coastal rock protection is designed to resist erosion not inundation. The current interim position does not consider protection of private property and only protects substantial Council owned assets.

### Regional Boat Ramp

- 15.115 We received eight submissions on this proposed project, six in support and two in opposition.
- 15.116 Submitters 18382, 18359 and 18411 all in support of the boat ramp made reference in their submissions to the need for a boat ramp in Mapua. The three other submitters referred to the need for a regional boat ramp facility due to the lack of all tide launching ramps in the Region, and the economic benefits that recreational fishing and boating

contribute to the regional economy. Submitter 18127 requested Council undertake regional integrated planning for all motor boats.

- 15.117 Two submitters objected to the proposed project and did not support the \$1.2 million funding (18460,18538).

#### **Staff comments**

- 15.118 Although a small number of submitters expressed support for this project, due to the tight financial constraints especially in Years 5 and 6, and the other key infrastructure projects that Council must now fund in this LTP, this is a project that could be delayed.

#### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 15.119 Staff propose that Council consider deferring the regional boat ramp project to outside the 10 years of the LTP. In the draft LTP there is an operational budget in Year 2 of \$30,000 to develop a boat ramp and jetty strategy, and capital budget of 108,000 in Year 5 (2022/23) and \$963,000 in Year 6 (2023/24).

<h2><b>16 Environment and Planning</b></h2>
---

#### **Public Health and Safety**

- 16.1 Three submitters commented on public health and safety. Submitter 18273 recommended that whenever a Civil Defence emergency is activated, Council staff should travel around the area affected, contacting, face to face, residents and business owners directly affected by the emergency.
- 16.2 Submitter 18411 requested that no more liquor licences be approved for Mapua and that special licences are restricted, to reduce noise issues associated with these events.
- 16.3 Submitter 19066 requested \$100,000 of funding from Council towards the Coastguard rescue vessel replacement.

#### **Staff Comments**

- 16.4 Council staff constitute the majority of Civil Defence responders and, as has been shown in the latest events, engage across the board with the public during and after the event.
- 16.5 The Council acknowledges the work that Coastguard does to support water safety. However to commit capital funding for a third party asset would pose a difficulty for us. Given our priorities and funding caps, we are not in a position to contribute an identified amount, but it is open to Coastguard to make application for a community grant when they open for public offering.
- 16.6 Other matters raised by the submitters are outside the scope of the LTP, and have been forwarded to the relevant Council Departments for their information.

#### **Environmental Management**

- 16.7 We received a total of 17 submissions on this issue that addressed a number of topics.
- 16.8 Submitter 18572 expressed support for the work that staff are doing, including ensuring that our rivers are swimmable. Several submitters (18538, 18592, 18127, 18502) requested more resources to increase our level of monitoring and compliance. Submitter 18241 supported our environmental monitoring programme, and recommended that it be refined to increase our response times.

- 16.9 Sedimentation in both our freshwater and marine environments and its negative effects was raised by a number of submitters (18127, 18345, 18502, 18392, 18572). They requested stricter land use regulations and more emphasis on protection of the marine environment in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay.
- 16.10 Submitter 18127 requested a range of actions in the environmental space including: the development of a strategic plan for climate change, the development of a biodiversity strategy, more consent control over forestry, predator control and eco-system restoration, a cat policy, the provision of energy efficiency advice to the community, more support for weed control, better environmentally friendly stormwater systems for subdivisions (wetlands), support for habitat restoration projects, legal protection for Higgs Reserve and Dominion Flats, and the Waimea Inlet to be considered as a key catchment.
- 16.11 Several submitters wanted Council to work with Nelson City Council and offered to work with us to help achieve shared outcomes (18502, 18345 and 18394).
- 16.12 Submitters 18392 and 18592 sought greater control of dogs to protect birdlife especially in Motueka and in our migratory bird locations.
- 16.13 Submitter 18392 requested that our coastal assets include beaches, estuaries, and flora and fauna. Several submitters sought greater protection of our waterways for their inherent value and for drinking water safety (18376, 18502).
- 16.14 Submitter 18538 noted that costs associated with the water conservation order for Te Waikoropupu Springs is limited to 2 years, but that there will be ongoing monitoring and compliance costs that need to be considered.
- 16.15 Submitter 18572 requested that we apply a levy or rate to marine farmers to occupy sea space.
- 16.16 A more regional focus was sought by Submitter 18592. They also requested that we stop any increase in water allocation for irrigation in the Takaka Valley or increase dairying due to increased nitrates.
- 16.17 Submitter 18502 requested more support for Native Habitats Tasman.
- 16.18 Submitter 18596 requested that funding for Project Devine be increased from \$7,500 per year to \$22,500 per year (50% budget, the remainder funded by the Rata Foundation) to enable the Trust to expand its operations.
- 16.19 Submitter 18549 requested that Council fund drinking water supply testing for properties using water from private wells, tanks and bores.

### **Staff Comments**

- 16.20 For the majority of issues raised by submitters, many of these are being dealt with outside the LTP. However many have funding implications in terms of staff resources and/or the development of strategies. For a number of these we are either undertaking actions or they are planned. There is an increasing expectation that we lift our management of waterways, especially in regard to sediment. We also recognise that additional compliance officer resource will be required to meet the requirements of National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards such as Plantation Forestry.
- 16.21 In the biodiversity space, we have a commitment an additional \$58,000 per year for the 10 years of the LTP. In addition we have added another \$30,000 per year to the biosecurity space to assist with programmes such as wilding conifer control and an additional

biosecurity officer. We have also included budget for a new catchment focused fund (\$100,000/year) to work in priority catchments. We have an additional land and water compliance officer starting on 1 July 2018.

- 16.22 The budgets referred to by the submitter for Te Waikoropupu Springs are for the Water Conservation Order (WCO) process. Staff believe that there are more than adequate monitoring processes in place already. If any there are further monitoring requirements that come from the WCO or FLAG processes, Council will need to consider these as additional work through an Annual Plan or future LTP process.
- 16.23 Project Devine has an excellent track record of delivering plant and pest management in the area from Riwaka to Wainui Bay. They are actively engaged with the community, allowing Council to have an effective input for limited cost, mostly for office administration. There is \$7,500/year budgeted in the draft LTP. This funding has been static for three years and there is potential to increase funding.
- 16.24 The costs associated with funding free water testing for private wells, rainwater tanks and other sources would put an additional burden on the ratepayer to subsidise these private costs and is not supported by staff. However, in the coming year, we propose to undertake a survey of private domestic bores in the Motueka urban area to gain a better understanding of the existing situation and to identify any major risks.

### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 16.25 Project Devine: Staff recommend an increase in funding allocation to \$11,250 per year. If Council wished to fund the entire request (\$22,500 per year), an additional budget increase of \$10,000 would be required from Year 2 in the LTP (Year 1 can potentially be covered by budget carry-forward).

### **Bio Strategy**

- 16.26 Nine submitters provided comment on the Bio Strategy, most of whom support the Bio Strategy. Submitter 18091 stated that the biodiversity strategy is important and that a marine management plan should also be developed for Golden Bay. Submitter 18502 strongly supports a biodiversity strategy that is developed in consultation with the conservation community. They were of the view that funding and support of biodiversity work in our Region has been limited in comparison to other Councils, (e.g. NCC and Nelson Nature) and strongly urge Council to invest in its biodiversity work and mandate this through the LTP.
- 16.27 Submitter 18592 supported the development and establishment of the Biodiversity Strategy, adequate ongoing resourcing of Native Habitats Tasman and the incorporation of compliance monitoring. They also commented on a number of related workstreams including improving land management to enhance river quality, nutrient management and riparian planting plans, and preventing the increase in dairy herds. They also requested that compliance monitoring be adequately resourced to prevent unsafe ongoing nutrient management practices.
- 16.28 Submitter 18592 sought that Council develop a separate animal pest strategy to support private landowners to control animal pests as well as weeds. They also requested more compliance monitoring of resource consent conditions.
- 16.29 Submitter 18237 sought that the policies and actions to protect and enhance the biodiversity of Waimea Inlet will feature prominently in the Bio Strategy.

16.30 Submitter 18295 requested targeted pest plant control at Parapara (infestation of Taiwan Cherry on public and private land) and in the area between Totara Avenue and Collingwood.

16.31 Submitter 18384 requested that Council protect our remaining wetlands as a matter of urgency.

### **Staff Comment**

16.32 Submitter support is noted for the funding included in the draft LTP to develop a Bio Strategy. The strategy will provide direction for both Biodiversity and Biosecurity outcomes and align with other Council activities and initiatives.

16.33 In terms of the marine environment the Strategy may identify areas and themes requiring further work such as a marine pathway management plan under the provisions of the Biosecurity Act 1993 and Resource Management Act 1991, but these work areas have yet to be defined or agreed to.

16.34 The Regional Pest Management Plan has received submissions related to the future management of Taiwan Cherry as a pest species and will need to resolve this matter. Additional guidance as appropriate may be provided through the Bio Strategy.

16.35 Council is currently mapping wetland areas to provide greater certainty of their location and presence and to enhance their protection.

### **Forestry**

16.36 A total of 15 submitters commented on Forestry: Many of the submissions received were in relation to forestry plantation rules.

16.37 Submitter 18054 requested that Council introduce regulations around clean-up of skid sites near water creeks and rivers. Submitter 18306 sought that Council require forestry companies to plant and harvest in a more sustainable manner, and suggested Council needs to rethink its policy on forestry and tree management.

16.38 Submitters 18355 and 18594 requested that Council prohibits forestry for logging on Separation Point Granite soils. The submitters suggested replanting the hills affected by the ex-cyclones with native forest, keeping forestry accountable for the damage caused, and monitoring existing logging sites for forestry slash. Submitter 18594 requested better resourcing (funds and personnel) to increase monitoring and enforcement of consents, and permitted activities on Separation Point Granite soils.

16.39 Submitter 18643 commented on the plantation forestry controls and noted their lack of confidence in the NES-PF addressing the current problems on separation point granite soils. They requested that Council proactively consult with local land occupiers and communities in the development, introduction and enforcement of land use and forestry practice controls and standards.

16.40 Submitter 18644 requested that the forestry rules change regarding Separation Point Granites. The submitter provided commentary on rules regarding setback distances, roads, slope angles, and forestry slash. They also sought that Council proactively monitor logging practices.

16.41 Submitter 18392 recognised that forestry was an important financial asset for the Region, but noted associated problems of erosion, flooding, major silting of rivers and estuaries, and disturbance of indigenous vegetation.

- 16.42 Submitter 18451 raised concerns around the impacts on their property from forestry debris as a result of the recent cyclone events. Along with Submitter 18358, they requested that Council hold logging companies accountable for their damage to private properties and Council infrastructure.
- 16.43 Submitters 18491 and 18530 requested that Council address a NIWA report which stated that almost 90% of the highly detrimental sediment clogging river mouths and bays are “directly attributed to pine forest harvesting”. They also sought that rules allowing pine forests above residential dwellings, be reviewed.
- 16.44 Submitter 18592 requested that Council address the issue of sediment runoff from logging to the coast and that new forestry implementation standards are adequately funded. They sought no replanting or any new forestry areas be permitted close to the coast especially on the Totaranui granites or Ligar Bay hills. Additionally they requested that Council provide for compliance monitoring of the new forestry rules (NES-PF) which come into force 1 May 2018.
- 16.45 Submitter 18612 commented on the recent storm events and damage caused in Marahau. They recommended that Council provide funds to undertake native tree planting projects and increase riparian margins as we did following the Ligar Bay floods in 2011.

#### **Staff Comment**

- 16.46 The commentary from submitters around the NES-PF and forestry rules are largely outside the scope of the draft LTP. Those matters raised will be considered as part of the implementation of the NES-PF and the review of our land disturbance rules. There is work currently being undertaken to consider how Council rules may change to provide more control over forest activities. That work is likely to be completed in late 2018.
- 16.47 We recognise that the NES-PF will have a significant impact on Council resources and we are currently considering a proposal to employ an additional staff resource to meet our obligations. This will need to go through a decision making process. We will continue to provide a dedicated monitoring programme for forestry activities and cost recover where applicable.

#### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 16.48 Staff propose that we may need to increase funding for additional resources to acknowledge the anticipated additional forestry monitoring requirements under the NES-PF and in recognition of the views expressed in submissions. It is likely that a budget of approximately \$100,000 will be required for this purpose, with the expectation that \$50,000 will be cost recovered. Staff will reprioritise our monitoring requirements and report back to Council with a proposal to reallocate current resources if the increased funding is required.

#### **Housing Supply and Choice**

- 16.49 Sixteen submitters commented on land use zones and changes needed to increase housing supply.

#### **Staff Comment**

- 16.50 Feedback from submitters will be considered when we review the TRMP later this year. That review will consider how and where future growth can be accommodated and in what form.

#### **Freedom Camping**

- 16.51 We received a total of 53 submissions on the issue of freedom camping.

- 16.52 The majority of the submissions related to Motueka, with 21 submitters commenting specifically on Decks Reserve, 11 commenting on Motueka Beach Reserve /Motueka Quay, and four on Alexander Bluff (18309, 18428, 18542, 18644).
- 16.53 Submitters were mostly opposed to allowing non self-contained freedom campers at these three locations and/or were of the opinion that the Freedom Camping Bylaw wasn't working well at these locations. Submissions received outlined the issues and in some cases solutions. Several submitters requested that freedom camping not be allowed anywhere within Motueka town or other residential locations, and/or that Council provide designated freedom camping sites with facilities outside of towns (e.g. at Mariri).
- 16.54 Submitters highlighted problems relating to compliance and lack of enforcement where views were expressed freedom campers were breaking the rules and getting away with it.
- 16.55 Many of the submitters were of a view that freedom campers should contribute financially towards related infrastructure, as they saw it an unfair burden on ratepayers to have to shoulder these costs.
- 16.56 Three submitters (18594, 18514 and 18644) suggested that NZ introduce an arrival tax that could be used to fund infrastructure for freedom campers.
- 16.57 Submitter 17832 requested that the LTP includes sufficient resourcing to initiate an integrated freedom camping management regime, which may require a comprehensive review of relevant rules, policies and bylaws, and that the LTP explicitly recognises the value of the NZMCA Motorhome Friendly Scheme.
- 16.58 Several submitters would like to see the Freedom Camping Bylaw reviewed and/or the wider issues relating to freedom camping dealt with more strategically.

### Staff Comments

- 16.59 Those matters raised by submitters in relation to our Freedom Camping Bylaw falls outside the scope of our LTP. Submitters' comments and suggestions have been passed onto the relevant Council Department.
- 16.60 The Council could consider to commence a review of the Bylaw, but as this was only done in 2017 that may not be a good use of resources. The request for more and stricter enforcement is something that could be considered in this LTP. This year \$40,000 has been spent between the period of 1 November 2017 to 31 March 2018, leaving \$5,000 for the remainder of the year. Staff have proposed to include an additional \$10,000 for 2018/19 as included in the Table of Updated Information in Section 7 of this report. Additional enforcement has been suggested using volunteers which is supported by staff.
- 16.61 Regarding the comments received around the facilities in Decks Reserve, we did not increase these on purpose. If Council consider the ongoing use of Decks Reserve for freedom camping or an alternative site, we may need to consider additional facilities being made available at an unknown cost.

## 17 Governance

- 17.1 We received seven submission points from five different submitters on governance issues. Two submitters (18288, 18374) advocated for further consideration of amalgamation with Nelson City Council.

- 17.2 The other issues raised were to increase the delegations to community boards (18298), objecting to Golden Bay residents having to travel to Richmond for citizenship ceremonies and community service recognition functions (18298), staff numbers, pay level and distribution around the District (18520).
- 17.3 Submitter 18538 wished to see Council put funds into sustainable environmental issues and they questioned the value of engagement processes that involve groups with vested interests (18538).

#### **Staff Comments**

- 17.4 Amalgamation with Nelson City Council is not proposed in the LTP 2018-2028. Council will continue to work on joint delivery and funding of regional scale activities.
- 17.5 We recommend that Council remains open to requests from the two community boards to increase their delegations and continues to offer to hold citizenship and award ceremonies in Golden Bay.
- 17.6 Staff advise that where staff are based in the District is not a factor that can be used to set rates
- 17.7 Council addresses sustainable environmental issues primarily through its regional council functions, especially its environmental stewardship role. Council takes these functions seriously and allocates significant resources to them. Issues like the best means to engage communities and whether the positions people take are seen as vested or in the wider public interest are central in the debate about the allocations of the commons. There is no right or wrong but we can and do try to be better.

<b>18 Community Development</b>
---------------------------------

#### **Significance and Engagement Policy**

- 18.1 We received seven submissions on our Significance and Engagement Policy. Three submitters (18244, 18338, 18460) linked the changes in wording as an attempt to avoid holding a referendum on the Waimea Community Dam.
- 18.2 One submitter (18312) recommended changing the name of the policy to the 'Engagement Policy' on the grounds that including significance in the title downplays the importance of effective engagement.
- 18.3 Submitter 18639 (NRAIT) requested a minor wording change to the Policy to acknowledge their land interests (since 1840), rather than just their interests in land they currently own.

#### **Staff Comments**

- 18.4 Neither our Significance and Engagement Policy or anything else in the Local Government Act 2002 requires Council to carry out a referendum on any issue. To make the Policy clearer a minor amendment is proposed as below.
- 18.5 We do not support changing the name of the Policy as the existing name complies with the Local Government Act 2002 and better describes the content of the Policy.
- 18.6 We support the change proposed by submitter 18639 to acknowledge their land interests.



### Staff Proposed Changes

18.7 Staff recommend the following minor changes to the wording of the Significance and Engagement Policy:

- Section 1.4 'The exact form and extent of consultation and engagement will be determined by Council on a case by case basis, taking into account the level of significance of the matter and any statutory requirements'.
- Section 2.2: Where appropriate, Council will work with Wakatū Incorporation and Ngāti Rārua Ātiawa Iwi Trust (NRAIT) when dealing with matters relating to the land holdings of those agencies and will also work with those agencies when they represent the manawhenua interests of the traditional owners.

### Schedule of Charges

18.8 Three submitters (18409, 18614 and 18638) commented on our proposed Schedule of Charges for 2018/2019. One was supportive, while submitter 18614 raised concerns over proposed charges to the Condition Trade Waste Conveyance and Treatment Charges. They were of the opinion that the increase in charges at the Richmond Resource Recovery Centre (RRC) was unjustified and goes against the determination from the Commerce Commission dated 24 April 2017 and lessens competition between the Richmond RRC and York Landfill.

### Staff Comment

18.9 The proposed trade waste charges pass on the additional disposal charges at York Valley and do not directly raise additional income, although the RLBU is projected to return a greater local disposal levy to Council in the coming year. The increase in charges at Richmond reflects a flat fee approach proposed across all Resource Recovery Centres and is offset by reductions in charges at Mariri, Takaka and Murchison. All Resource Recovery Centres are now treated as a single cost centre and there is no intention to use reduced income as a basis to reduce hours or services in more remote sites.

### Kohatu Motorsport Park

18.10 We received 77 submissions on this issue. Seventy six submitters requested that the LTP include support for the Kohatu Motorsport Park both in reference to the facility in the LTP, and in funding. A number of submitters acknowledged the support from Council to date.

18.11 Submitters outlined the range of economic benefits from increased Council investment on the Motorsport Park including national, regional and local employment and investment opportunities. Submitters also referred to the existing community based structure that would manage and maintain the facility without needing ongoing Council Funding (18235, 18476 and 18327).

18.12 One submitter (18234) noted that at least 50 clubs with active members in the Tasman area have registered interest in Kohatu Motorsport Park and the planned facilities. Several submitters made comparisons of the motorsport facility with Saxton Field in its capacity to help attract visitors to large events and cement Tasman as a key sport and adventure tourism focused region. Providing a safe venue for younger drivers, driver training, and drag racing was also noted by several submitters as a positive advantage of the project.

18.13 Submitter 18243 did not support the Motorsport Park and was of the view that it would be environmentally unfriendly and un-neighbourly.

**Staff Comment**

- 18.14 Council has currently contributed to the motorsport facility through providing funding for a feasibility study and having to absorb approximately \$15,000 of costs for the project. Council is also paying approximately \$300,000 to upgrade the intersection to the motorsport park. We do not consider that we are able to provide further funding for this project in the LTP at this time. We are however open to including reference within the LTP that Council supports this project.

**Staff Proposed Changes**

- 18.15 Staff propose that we include appropriate reference in the LTP of Councils support of the Kohatu Motorsport Park project, including the funding provided to date.

**Library Services**

- 18.16 We received 14 submissions on our Library services, with most in regard to the proposed new Motueka library.
- 18.17 Four submitters did not think the Motueka Library development was a priority for Council, with Submitter 18571 of the view that the library is currently adequate. Others considered that the funding should be provided outside the cycle of this LTP. Submission 18273 was of the view that the proposal is out of scale with the size of the community and requested that Council defer the project until the Motueka water supply upgrade has been undertaken.
- 18.18 The remaining submitters were all in support of the proposal, with Submitter 18599 also suggesting that the choice of internet contract be reviewed. Submitter 18213 requested that Council consider the timetabling of the Motueka Library project and reallocated the funding of \$300,000 to Year 1 and the balance of \$3,405,000 to Year 2 allowing construction to commence in 2019/2020.

**Staff Comment**

- 18.19 Council has considered the feedback received on the redevelopment of Motueka Library and staff support proceeding with this project, commencing in 2019/2020. The timing of the Motueka Library project has been set to allow a feasibility study of the primary redevelopment options to be completed by June 2018. A decision on the library location will be made and contracts tendered. The project is also timed to align with other Council priorities across the 10 years of the LTP.

**Nelson Tasman Business Trust**

- 18.20 We received six submissions on the Nelson Tasman Business Trust (NTBT) funding.
- 18.21 Four of the submitters (18013, 18501, 18281, 18430) noted their support for the funding. Submitter 18281 was of the view that the funding amount proposed was too low. Submitter 18430 although in support was concerned that the funding came at the expense of reducing the funding for the NRDA.
- 18.22 Submitter 18358 did not support funding for the Trust, while submitter 18384 was of the opinion that the Trust should have to apply for contestable funding as it is not core business for Council.

**Staff Comment**

- 18.23 Successful businesses are essential to maintaining vibrant communities. Council has a role in ensuring the environment and the infrastructure supports the business community. Staff

therefore support retaining the proposed \$15,000 per annum funding for the NTBT. However please note paragraph 14.22 concerning the duration of this funding.

### Community Facilities

- 18.24 A total of 15 submitters commented on our community facilities.
- 18.25 Submitter 17673 did not agree that a new community facility is required for Wakefield, and was of the view that the existing hall is adequate. They requested that the project should be removed from the budget.
- 18.26 Submitter 18241 commented on the importance of community facilities as places that build community strength, and supported the Saxton Field and Motueka Library developments, and the proposed local museum funding.
- 18.27 Submitter 18371 supported Richmond Town Hall as a priority, while Submitter 18642 from Motueka requested that we provide lights in the public toilets.
- 18.28 Submitter 17697 requested that Council contribute funding towards development of a new therapeutic pool at Richmond Aquatic Centre (to replace Ngawhatu Pool). The estimated total cost for the pool was thought to be between \$3.5 million to \$4 million. The submitter suggested that Council, NCC and pool users contribute towards the cost (the latter have \$340K to contribute).
- 18.29 Two submitters (18392, 18421) requested that Council contribute funds towards the development of a covered, heated swimming pool in Motueka (Motueka residents are already raising funds for this project). Submitter 18053 asks that more money be spent on areas for Motueka locals, similar to Mapua wharf upgrade.
- 18.30 Submitter 17861 requested \$20,000 for the restoration of the Motueka War Memorial prior to its 100 year anniversary at end Nov 2018.
- 18.31 Two submitters requested funding for tennis courts: Submitter 17698 asked for funding to reseal the Hope tennis courts, and extend the club rooms. Submitter 18072 requested two new asphalt public tennis courts at Waterfront Park in Mapua, and that we astroturf the two existing asphalt courts at Mapua Recreation Reserve.
- 18.32 Submitter 17704 requested funding assistance for the maintenance and improvements at the Riwaka Croquet Club building and grounds.
- 18.33 Submitter 18600 requested that a budget be provided to provide the following facilities in Marahau: a community hall, public open spaces and a children's playground, and improvement of the public toilets and rubbish facilities.
- 18.34 Submitter 18736 requested a 'Tiny Tots' water feature be considered in future development of the Aquatic Centre.

### Staff Comment

- 18.35 The majority of submissions received have all requested funding for a wide variety of worthwhile community projects. Staff support providing funds for the repair of the War Memorial, and the replacement of the six astroturf courts at Hope Recreation Reserve. Although we support the other community projects, if we are to keep rates affordable and debt levels acceptable to our residents, we do not have the available budget to provide all of the funding support requested.
- 18.36 In Marahau, we have committed funding for a playground in Newhaven Crescent. We have also been successful in our application to the Governments Tourism Infrastructure Fund

and will be installing a new two pan toilet to replace the existing one opposite the Outdoor Adventure Centre, and the installation of more rubbish bins. We have also worked with the community to improve the level of servicing for toilet maintenance and rubbish collection during the busy summer period. Staff propose to submit an application to the Tourism Infrastructure Fund (TIF) round 2 to undertake a feasibility study for Marahau.

### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 18.37 Staff recommend that \$18,500 is granted for the repairs to the War Memorial and concrete surrounds. Funds of \$7,000 for the Memorial repair will be made available in the 2017/2018 Reserves and Facilities Memorials budget, and \$11,500 for the concrete surrounds repair will be made available in Year 1 of the LTP.
- 18.38 Staff recommend that funding for the replacement of six astroturf courts at Hope Recreation Reserve, come from a \$50,000 grant and a \$50,000 loan over 15 years, and that funds are made available in Year 1 of the LTP in the Reserves and Facilities operating budgets.

### **Parks and Reserves**

- 18.39 A total of 15 submissions were received on our parks and reserves.
- 18.40 Submitter 18527 supported selectively upgrading parks, and one submitter supported great work being done in this area (18572).
- 18.41 Submitter 17993 focused on the shortage of long term affordable housing in an area that accommodates high numbers of visitors and seasonal workers, and noted that McKee Domain was a valuable resource for workers (including those with families) as overflow temporary accommodation. Submitters 18411 and 18382 requested the restoration of McKee Reserve.
- 18.42 Submitter 18241 wanted to see more drinking fountains, shade structures, playgrounds, toilets, cycle stands, smoke free areas and events to improve health outcomes.
- 18.43 The lack of parks in new subdivisions in Mapua was highlighted by Submitter 18625. Submitter 18630 highlighted the need for more frequent planning of parks (at least 10 yearly) to take into account changing circumstances.
- 18.44 Several submissions were received on specific areas within the District. Submission 17890 requested work on the existing Stephens Bay to Little Kaiteriteri walkway rather than Anarewa Crescent Esplanade works. Submitter 18237 sought earlier programming of the Habitat Protection and Restoration Work Plan at Rabbit Island than 2019. Submitter 18411 requested that we formalise areas such as Dominion Flats Reserve into protected reserves. Submitter 18595 raised an issue regarding the use and lack of adequate maintenance of the Shedwood Bush Walk.
- 18.45 Submitter 18362 noted their support for cycling initiatives and infrastructure, and requested that Council values and supports off road cycling and mountain biking as well, both for residents and visitors.
- 18.46 Submitter 18290 thanked Council for the \$15,000 budgeted in the draft LTP in Year 1 for mountain bike track works, and requested that Council set aside an additional \$50,000 for each of the first three years of the LTP. They committed to match this funding and further develop and maintain the tracks in Kingsland Forest.

- 18.47 Submitter 18110 requested a greater equality of funding between cycling and other recreational areas noting that equestrian activities are not funded to the same degree. The submitter suggested providing more bridleways to reduce use of roads.

#### **Staff Comment**

- 18.48 Council is currently looking at options to address the ongoing issues of infrastructure on the McKee reserve and will be reporting back to Council in mid-2018.
- 18.49 Dominion Flats Reserve is a Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 and so is protected under that legislation.
- 18.50 Council has been working closely with community groups with regard to the development of tracks in the forest areas and Dellside Reserve of Kingsland Forest. The recent addition of the tracks in Silvan Hills has been a significant benefit to the community. Staff note that part of Kingsland Forest will be logged in the next few years which may impact on track development.
- 18.51 With regard to mountain bike trails, staff will continue to liaise and work with the mountain bike groups to provide tracks and associated facilities where possible within budget allocations.
- 18.52 The reserve management plan programme is progressing as quickly as staff resources permit. The level of service for reserve provision is that at least 85% of properties zoned residential are located within 500 metres of open space. In some instances where there is a multi-staged or a wider development plan for an area we may take reserve land adjoining the next proposed development with the intention of extending the reserve land when the next development takes place.
- 18.53 In regards to allocating space on reserves and decisions on use, we are directed by the applicable legislation, the zoning and status of the land along with any policies and objectives in our Reserves General Policies and the Reserve Management Plans. We will be consulting our community during the preparation of the proposed concessions policy for reserves.
- 18.54 Ongoing development and maintenance of Shedwood Bush Walk is not programmed and staff suggest the submitter approach the Department of Conservation who is the landowner.
- 18.55 The Rabbit Island Management Plan's proposed Habitat Protection and Restoration Work Plan is on the Council's work programme to be completed.
- 18.56 The majority of the Stephens Bay to Little Kaiteriteri walkway is not on Council owned land. Although, in the past, the walkway was not maintained to a high standard, we are working to improve this. As the subdivision of Beaches and Bays development progresses, and the land the walkway is situated on comes into Council ownership, we will continue to improve the walkway standard. Funding allocated to the Anarewa Crescent project was capital funding put aside a number of years ago for this project.
- 18.57 We will endeavour to provide additional facilities such as drinking fountains and shade sail area as budgets permit. We have made provision in our budgets for the replacement of older playgrounds and construction of new ones throughout the 10 years of the LTP.
- 18.58 With respect to the request for more bridleways for equestrian activities, we look out for a variety of opportunities for recreation when reviewing subdivision or other major resource

consent applications. Council has also supported the Walking Access Commission requests where possible for linkages in rural areas.

### **Golden Bay**

- 18.59 We received seven submissions on community facilities and issues for Golden Bay.
- 18.60 Submitters 18013 and 18592 supported the increased funding for the Golden Bay Community Board, while Submitter 18091 supported the additional spending on Golden Bay special projects, local museum funding and Takaka Information Centre).
- 18.61 Two submitters (18530 and 18194) requested that Council provide funding for modern video conferencing to allow Golden Bay residents to remotely participate in consultations. They noted that this is more pertinent now given the recent natural emergencies restricting/preventing travel over the Takaka Hill.
- 18.62 Submitter 18005 supported the additional \$100,000 for Golden Bay being included, and suggested Council consider moving projects forward, such as the Port Tarakohe upgrade, to stimulate investment and job creation.
- 18.63 Submitter 18572 did not support an additional targeted rate of \$10,000 and was of the view that this funding should come from the general rate and not Golden Bay residents.
- 18.64 Submitter 18592 raised concerns about the leaching of nitrates into groundwater and the associated negative health outcomes as residents are on bore supply.

### **Staff Comment**

- 18.65 The timing of the projects in the capital work programme have been carefully considered with the aim that the necessary design work, consenting and land negotiations can be reasonably completed before the funding for the physical works is budgeted. The capacity of the relevant organisation and contractors to carry out the full programme of works each year and the requirement for us to stay within the debt and rates caps in our Financial Strategy was also considered.
- 18.66 There is work underway, as well as funding in the first three years of the LTP, to upgrade the cameras and microphones in the Richmond Office, Council Chamber. This would allow for video conferencing from, for instance, the Golden Bay Service Centre. This equipment could also enable live streaming of meetings. Live streaming will be considered as part of Council's wider Digital Services Programme in the next few years. Council would need to make a decision as to whether public forum video conferencing for Council meetings would be allowed. This would require an amendment to Council's Standing Orders.
- 18.67 Nitrate levels in water is a known issue in Golden Bay. Council does not have control over private water supplies and this is an area primarily under the control of the Department of Health. Council provides guidance on its website and one to one advice on request. Monitoring of consents with regards to negative effects on water supplies will improve when the additional Compliance Officer is employed for this purpose from 1 July 2018.

### **Community Outcomes**

- 18.68 Submitter 17990 expressed concern over the lack of vision, mission and key performance indicators in our Consultation Document.
- 18.69 Submitter 18241 noted their support for our Community Outcomes.

**Staff Comment**

18.70 The supporting information to our Consultation Document outlined our vision, mission and key performance indicators. They will be included in our final LTP document.

**Digitisation of Council Services**

18.71 We received five submissions on our proposal to digitise of our services. Two submitters opposed the funding for this work (18460, 18358), while two were in support (18013, 18169). Two other submitters were of the opinion that the cost was too high (18384, 18460).

**Staff Comment**

18.72 The digitisation of Council's online services is an immediate short-term priority, which we will implement over several years. The programme is aimed at making it easier for our ratepayers and customers to interact and do business with us. We aim to achieve this by consolidating the large number of systems we have in order to simplify our processes and provide a "single view" of information and services.

**Museums and Heritage**

18.73 We received 10 submissions on this matter, all in support of the provisions in the draft LTP.

18.74 Submitter 18626 referred to the need for a storage facility for the Nelson Provincial Museum and requested funding in the order of \$3 million to \$4 million.

18.75 Submitter 18192 requested additional funding for further off-site storage for Motueka District Museum.

18.76 Submitter 18520, queried the benefit that Motueka ratepayers receive from the Museum rate, while submitter 17881 suggested that we develop a Heritage Strategy for Golden Bay.

**Staff Comment**

18.77 Council is currently working with the Nelson Provincial Museum Working Group and we will present recommendations to Council later this year.

18.78 For the 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 years, we have allocated an additional \$33,600 to the Golden Bay, Motueka and Murchison Museums. This allocation has been carried forward annually, with inflation adjustments, into draft LTP budget. We expect that this allocation, alongside other income, should meet the Museum's expenses.

18.79 The Provincial Museum partners with the District Museums to provide support, advice, professional development training and access to their exhibitions and collection, as well as housing significant regional collections including the Tyree photos. The 2018 Appo Hocton exhibition and last year's award winning Mai I Hawaiki – Te Ahi Ka Roa exhibitions are good examples of this partnership.

18.80 Council currently does not have a Heritage Strategy and we do not recommend developing one. The TRMP in Section 16.31 currently deals with activities associated with heritage buildings, structures, protected trees and cultural heritage sites.

**Social Housing**

18.81 This topic attracted seven submissions. All but two (18520, 17993) noted the increasing need for affordable housing for older residents.

- 18.82 Submitter 17993 focused on the need for affordable housing for working and non-working families in Motueka, while Submitter 18520 questioned the high governance overhead for pensioner housing, suggesting it needed review.
- 18.83 Submitter 18241 supported the continuation of Council community housing and requested that housing affordability be given more profile in the LTP as a specific topic as it affects the social wellbeing of residents and detracts from the attractiveness for people wishing to move here.
- 18.84 Several submitters discussed specific housing needs in rural settlements with two relating to the difficulty of rural residents to age in place (Motueka – submitter 17993, Murchison - submitter 18525 and Tapawera – submitter 18595).
- 18.85 Submitter 18525 supported improving all existing units to the standard of the unit recently upgraded. Two submitters (18241, 18615) suggested closer collaboration between Council and other organisations to meet shared goals such as the setting up of a working party on community housing options.
- 18.86 Submitter 18495 signalled the need for more Abbeyfield housing developments to form part of the solution to provide housing for our ageing population. They suggested Council facilitate this through financial support, gifts of land or advice on land availability, advice relating to building and resource consents, abating development contributions and advocating on housing needs and initiatives with Government.

#### **Staff Comment**

- 18.87 We are not planning to construct any new cottages in the District, and Council has recently upgraded the cottages in Murchison.
- 18.88 The recent Richmond Housing Choice Plan Change in the TRMP enables more intensive housing development in parts of Richmond. We are also processing several special housing area applications. These activities should help enable developers to provide more affordable and smaller housing suitable for older people living in our communities. We are also proposing to undertake a review of options for our housing for older persons over the coming year.
- 18.89 Where opportunities arise, Council will advocate for the need for more social housing to central government.
- 18.90 With respect to the suggestions from Submitter 18495, Council has no spare land, and it is not normally Council's policy to forgo development levies or resource/building consent costs.
- 18.91 We have noted submitter 18520's concern about the high governance overheads and will be investigating this further.

#### **Community Relations**

- 18.92 We received seven submissions on this issue. Submitter 18493 acknowledged the support of Council, and particularly staff, in the success of the EnviroSchools network. Submitter 18127 sought additional funding of educational measures across Council activities to ensure our community understand the importance of avoiding degradation of the environment.
- 18.93 Submitter 18533 requested funding of \$250,000 to go towards the cost of the new Nelson Tasman Hospice. A similar request was also made to Nelson City Council (the new facility



will include a flat to accommodate people travelling to see a relative and this may have special relevance to rural families in the Tasman region).

- 18.94 Submitter 18562 requested funding of the Suter Art Gallery and requested CPI increases for 2016/2017 and 2018/2019 as per a 2008 letter of undertaking, plus that the grant level be increased to provide 16% of the combined base operating grants (as per 2008). The latter is a request for funding of \$125,000 in 2018/2019 rising to \$208,000 plus CPI in Year 10 of the LTP.
- 18.95 A request for an interest free loan from Council to support small businesses funded by the not for profit Nelson Enterprise Loan Trust (NELT) was made by submitter 18455.
- 18.96 Submitter 18615 requested that Council explicitly state it will proactively collaborate with community organisations to achieve shared outcomes.
- 18.97 One submitter, 18616, was of the view that Council expenditure on publications to residents was excessive and that our community engagement is impersonal.

#### **Staff comments**

- 18.98 In order to achieve Council's desire to stay within our current rates and debt cap, and deliver the agreed work programme, staff propose declining the funding requests from Submitters 18455 (NELT) and 18533 (Nelson/Tasman Hospice).
- 18.99 Staff support ongoing collaboration with community organisations to achieve shared outcomes. Continuing the environmental education programme funding in the LTP builds on current success with education to the community.
- 18.100 Council is constantly looking to improve communications with a focus on providing all residents with the opportunity to participate or at least be informed of Council decision-making.

#### **Staff Proposed Changes**

- 18.101 Staff recommend the reinstatement of the CPI increase annually on the \$87,813 funding to the Suter Art Gallery (Submitter 18562), reversing a Council decision made in 2014/2015 to no longer fund the CPI increase.

#### **Fostering Māori Participation in Council Decision Making**

- 18.102 We received seven submissions on our draft Statement on Fostering Māori Participation in Council Decision Making.
- 18.103 Submitter 18411 did not agree with the intention of this document and did not believe that Council should give rates concessions on Māori land.
- 18.104 Several submitters (18597, 18502, 18625, 18612, 18194, 18634) supported the Statement. One submitter requested that we undertake more rapid, meaningful and effective engagement with iwi. Suggestions as to how this could be effected included the establishment of a Māori ward, a Kaihautu position, and iwi specialist input.
- 18.105 Several submitters noted the very significant Māori history in the area. They also set out the important concept of Kaitiakitanga and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the RMA.
- 18.106 Submitter 18597 (Tiakina Te Taiao) detailed Council's obligations to Māori involvement in decision-making. They requested that cultural precinct information recorded by Council be expanded and improved in accordance with iwi cultural maps and areas that iwi have

recorded as being of significance. They also sought funding of \$70,000 per annum for specialist input to Council planning documents such as reserve plans, the TRMP and the Iwi Management Plan. In addition they sought that Council fund each iwi \$40,000 per annum to assist with administrative costs related to responding to RMA and LGA consultations.

- 18.107 Submitter 18612 (Ngāti Tama) sought to enhance parts of the LTP to assist Council to facilitate a Treaty based relationship with Ngāti Tama, Iwi and Māori. They detailed relationship building, committee representation, a Marae development policy, a sites of significance work programme, Māori urban design, promotion of Te Reo Māori and training.
- 18.108 Submitter 18639 (NRAIT) noted that are significant land owners and sought iwi representation on Council, co-management of reserves or areas of cultural significance through committee representation, Māori input, developing Māori capacity and commitment to Councillor and staff training on iwi perspectives and Nelson/Tasman history and rates remission and postponement.

### Staff comments

- 18.109 The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires Council to have a policy on the remission and postponement of rates on Māori freehold land. Our proposed Policy effectively treats Māori freehold land the same as the rest of the land in the District unless otherwise specified by the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002. Council is also required under the LGA to include a Statement on Fostering Māori Participation in Council Decision-Making into its LTP.
- 18.110 We have previously engaged Tiakina Te Taiao as a service provider, and we are currently considering a further service agreement with them. We will report back the outcomes from those discussions to Council to consider. Council has previously funded development of the Tiakina initiated Iwi Management Plan and notes no progress has been evident since it provided comprehensive feedback on a draft in 2014
- 18.111 Staff recognise the limitations of the current cultural precincts in the TRMP, and we are planning to undertake a review later this year. We plan to address the issue of cultural precincts through the TRMP review. To help facilitate iwi involvement in policy development, staff and iwi trust resource management representatives have established an iwi policy working group with the intent to identify resource management issues of concern and possible solutions to them in partnership. As part of that partnership agreement, we have committed to resourcing iwi on a time/cost recovery basis.
- 18.112 We are currently reviewing how to improve our internal capability in this area, including our approach to enabling Māori and tangata whenua participation, meeting our post Te Tiriti o Waitangi settlement obligations and building the organisation's capability and capacity in Te Reo and tikanga.
- 18.113 Staff suggest that Council consider requesting the new CEO review this area, with a view to Council considering any changes ahead of the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

### Saxton Field

- 18.114 We received a total of seven submissions on Saxton Field.
- 18.115 Submitters 18013 and 18241 noted their support for the proposal to fund projects at Saxton Field. Submitter 18358 objected to the provision of funding.

- 18.116 Submitters 18021, 18251, 18369 and 18484 requested that Council provide development and support of essential services within a facilities pavilion (administration and spectator space, toilets and storage). The submitters proposed a joint Council and Champion Green Facilities Committee member effort to achieve this at an estimated cost of \$1.55 million with a proposed Council contribution of \$488,250.
- 18.117 The submitters also requested a multi-use sports circuit (multi code, schools and public use) with an estimated total cost of \$400,000.
- 18.118 Submitter 18367 requested funding to purchase lights at Champion Green so that the field could be used as a training ground for their league teams during the season and potentially night games. The submitter also requested that Council provide suitable facilities including toilets and changing rooms as well.

### Staff Comments

- 18.119 Staff recommend that for Champion Green, Council continues with its maintenance, renewal and improvement plans for Saxton Field as considered by Council at its meeting on 5 April 2018.
- 18.120 Staff do not support providing funding for lights at Champion Green for league teams. We have previously advised the submitter, that they would need to fund raise for them. The Councils have provided power cabling to the area, which the lights could be connected to. Council has also recently constructed a new toilet, shower, and changing facility to service users of Avery Field, the Velodrome and Champion Green.

### Other/ Miscellaneous

- 18.121 One submitter (18184) recommended Council adopt 23 principles that highlight the need to apply human rights principles systematically, endorse the model trade and investment treaty process offered in the [www.dontdoit.nz](http://www.dontdoit.nz) petition and consider Raworth's 'Doughnut Economics'. This submitter also recommended that Council support the Local Government (Four well Beings) Amendment Bill.
- 18.122 Submitter 18620 suggested Council focus to a greater degree on improving the economic self-reliance of the Region.
- 18.123 One submitter (18203) asked Council to be mindful of the extent of wages paid and the number of staff Council employs.
- 18.124 Submitter 18260 considered that Council has focused on the short term at the expense of attention to longer term issues that take longer to develop.
- 18.125 Submitter 18491 requested improved video conferencing facilities to enable resident of Golden Bay to be included in Council meetings and hearings without extensive travel. Submitter 18571 suggested Council has a system by which members of the public can report faults or requests for service via the telephone, email or Council website for the fault or issue to be resolved
- 18.126 One submitter (18519) was of the view that Council should be promoting more affirmative action on Māori participation.
- 18.127 Submitter 18576 was of a view that Council is adopting a 'borrow and hope' approach which is unsustainable recommending the use of targets, productivity benchmarks and values based decision making, honest and open accountability, reporting and decision making.

- 18.128 Several submitters shared their views on the process used to develop the LTP. Submitter 18281 shared their insights about the likely changing demand for services and facilities that will be required to respond to the ageing of our population and one submitter (18628) suggested Council use a more structured strategic planning process in its LTP. Submitter 18630 considered that March/April 2018 was relatively late to start our community consultation. Submitter 17712 commented on elected members' role in decision making in a representative democracy and warned the Councillors against being swayed by popularism.

### Staff Comments

- 18.129 Many of the items covered in these miscellaneous submissions fall outside the scope of the LTP, so are not addressed in this report e.g. adopting principles to systematically apply human rights principles, endorsing model trade and investment treaty process, considering 'Doughnut Economics', supporting the Local Government (Four well Beings) Amendment Bill and increasing regional economic self-reliance.
- 18.130 All new and replacement staff positions go through a review and approval process that considers the business and service delivery needs prior to any approval being given. Council also uses a rigorous process for determining salary ranges for each position, which includes benchmarking against national salary data.
- 18.131 The LTP has a time horizon of 10 years and the Infrastructure Strategy has a 30-year time horizon. Consequently, the LTP process looks beyond the short term.
- 18.132 There is work underway, as well as funding in the first three years of the LTP, to upgrade the cameras and microphones in the Richmond Office, Council Chamber. This would allow for video conferencing from for instance the Golden Bay Service Centre. This equipment could also enable live streaming of meetings. Live streaming will be considered as part of Council's wider Digital Services Programme in the coming years.
- 18.133 Council has a system for requests for service to be reported by the public and acted upon. The requests for service are monitored and however if the work required to resolve the fault exceeds the amount available in routine maintenance budgets, it is considered as part of Long Term Plan or Annual Plan processes
- 18.134 Council's commitment to providing opportunities for iwi and Māori to participate in its decision-making processes is detailed in the Statement on Fostering Māori Participation in Council Decision Making. This includes the establishment and maintenance of processes to provide these opportunities for iwi and Māori, to consider ways in which we may foster the development of iwi and Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes and to provide relevant information to iwi and Māori for these purposes.
- 18.135 The Financial Strategy sets a cap on total debt that is well within the limits set by Local Government Funding Agency. Credit ratings company Standard and Poors has given Council a credit rating of AA- with a positive outlook indicating it has a high degree of confidence that Council can adequately service its debt. The projects planned in the Infrastructure Strategy and Activity Management Plans have been carefully prioritised and their timing scheduled to enable Council's debt to stay below its self-imposed cap. Debt is used as a tool to assist in charging those benefiting from services at the time the service is received.
- 18.136 Council will continue to consider the changing needs of our ageing population in its planning and activities and how to continually improve its LTP process through each

three-yearly review cycle of the Plan. We carried out early community engagement for the LTP 2018-2028 in March and April 2017. We attended over 14 community meetings in combination with our Annual Plan 2017/18 round of consultation in order to provide an opportunity for members of the community to provide their input at an early stage.

## 19 Other Matters Raised by Councillors

- 19.1 This section provides Councillors with the opportunity to raise any other issues or matters from the submissions and hearings that may have not been covered in the report. This is especially for those matters where further discussion is required or where potential changes should be made prior to the finalisation of the LTP.

## 20 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications

- 20.1 The Consultation Document proposed a rates income increase cap (after an allowance for growth) of a maximum of 3% per annum. The proposed rates income in the Consultation Document was 1.91% for Year 1, 2.10% for Year 2 and 2.26% for Year 3. The rates income increases in Years 4-6 range between 2.88 and 2.98% in the Consultation Document.
- 20.2 The Consultation Document also proposed a net debt cap of \$200 million. The debt levels proposed were \$189 million in Year 1, \$192 million in year 2 and \$198 million in Year 3. Debt is proposed to reach its maximum if \$199 million in Year 5.
- 20.3 In considering any additional capital expenditure the following information is provided to enable you to estimate the impact on rates. An additional \$1 million in capital expenditure plus an associated approximately \$50,000 for related operational expenses, means approximately \$150,000 per annum to be funded by rates and charges.

## 21 Summary of Staff Proposed Changes

- 21.1 The following is a summary of the staff proposed changes to the draft LTP.

### *Updated Information – Matters Raised by Staff*

- 21.2 Updated information has been received since the financial information for the Consultation Document, supporting information and concurrent consultations was finalised in December 2017 as listed in section 7.1. This results in an overall unfavourable impact of \$150,000 or a 0.21% increase on total rates revenue. We recommend that these changes are included in the final LTP.

### *Infrastructure/Natural Hazards*

- 21.3 Riwaka Flood Mitigation Works: remove this project of \$660,000 in Years 3, 4 and 5 (2020 – 2023) and add funds into the Motueka Flood Mitigation Study. The recent cyclone events have shown that there are larger issues in the Riwaka/Brooklyn area that may require a wider range of intervention than this small and specific project would provide.
- 21.4 Motueka Flood Mitigation Study: increase the budget from \$150,000 to \$350,000 (\$175,000 in Year 1 and \$175,000 in Year 2) to extend the scope of the work from identification of flood consequences in Lower Motueka catchment to include the Riwaka catchment including

Brooklyn. Ex-Cyclone Gita showed that the flood hazard can affect a much wider range of properties than predicted and that we need to consider this wider area.

- 21.5 Following the study, staff propose that funding for the mitigation works is included in the next LTP 2021-2031, when measures and relative costs are known.

*Development and Financial Contributions Policy*

- 21.6 Amend the format of Table 7 to better reflect the total charges, and clarify the GST inclusive cost, and amending the Development and Financial Contributions Policy as follows to help clarify and improve our communities understanding.

- Include a definition of bedroom to avoid against claiming bedrooms as studios. This would define a bedroom in a residential unit that is greater than 4.5 m<sup>2</sup> in floor area and capable of being used for sleeping purposes. We also recommend providing staff with discretion to waive this test where we are satisfied a room will not be used as a bedroom, even if it technically meets this definition. For example, where a room is clearly an anteroom or vestibule.
- Include text that clarifies that for each activity and catchment, development contributions fund the programme as a whole on an aggregated basis. Development contributions paid by any individual development are not allocated to a specific project. This is an often misunderstood aspect of development contributions.
- Include text clarifying that development contribution charges are based on the long run term average cost of growth within each catchment for each activity. This includes those growth related project planned in the LTP 2018-2028 and also those growth related projects that have already been completed.

*Enhancing Water Supply Capacity and Security*

- 21.7 Waimea Community Dam: due to the highlighted inconsistency between the LTP Consultation Document and our Revenue and Financing Policy in relation to cost overruns, amend the Policy to clarify that any cost overruns will be recovered from ratepayers as well as WIL affiliated consent holders.

*Tourism and Economic Development*

- 21.8 Staff recommend that we increase funding for the NRDA by \$100,000 per annum back to the previously committed \$400,000 total per annum in order to contribute to seasonally focused regional visitor marketing efforts. You may like to consider requiring some of this funding to be used to develop a coordinated Nelson-Tasman information centre approach. This recommendation is made in addition to the funding proposed in the draft LTP for our local information centres and Nelson Tasman Business Trust.
- 21.9 Staff recommend that Councillors consider introducing a sunset arrangement. Such an arrangement could see funding to local information centres, limited for example to the first three years of the LTP as opposed to funding for the full 10 years. Such a clause is seen as necessary to avoid disincentivising a necessary shift away from the current visitor information model. Whether you wish to include a similar arrangement for the Nelson Tasman Business Trust funding also requires discussion.
- 21.10 Staff recommend we provide funding of \$50,000 in Year 1 to NRDA to ensure that Tasman's interests are sufficiently considered in the Top of the South Economic Growth Strategy. An effective economic development strategy is required to enable to access to the Government's Provincial Growth Programme. The funding criteria require that projects

align with regional priorities and that they have been discussed and agreed with relevant local stakeholders.

#### *Transportation*

- 21.11 Public Transport Study: include \$60,000 in Year 2 (2019/2020) to review all our public transport networks to meet residents demand and new central government funding priorities. This will be undertaken alongside Nelson City Council to recognise the high degree of Cross-boundary interdependence.
- 21.12 Lower Queen Street and Berryfield Drive intersection upgrade: move the \$990,000 project from Year 8 (2025/2026) to Year 6 (2023/2024), noting that it may need to be brought further forward if growth proceeds faster than anticipated.
- 21.13 Borck Creek Shared Pathway Crossing: move the \$673,700 project from Years 8 & 9 (2025/2026 – 2026/2027) to Year 6 (2023/2024). Staff note that this may need to be brought further forward if growth proceeds faster than anticipated.
- 21.14 Champion Road/Salisbury Road intersection: bring forward the roundabout upgrade (\$899,000) to Year 2 (2019/2020) from Year 4 (2021/2022), but that the underpass remain in Year 4. Whilst the cost is \$899,000, Council's contribution is around \$200,000.

#### *Refuse/Recycling Routes and Rating Areas*

21.15 The following rating areas proposed for extension are removed from the LTP:

- |                           |                        |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| a. Flaxmore Road          | b. Sunrise Valley Road |
| c. Supplejack Valley Road | d. Weka Road/Wood Loop |
| e. Sunset Valley Road     | f. Greenvine Lane      |

21.16 The Weka Road/Wood Loop is removed as above, with the exception of the property already invoiced for this service.

21.17 Reduce the rating area as proposed in St Arnard, with the exception of the two properties on the edge of the rating area, and carry out further investigations into drop-off options for St Arnard.

#### *Regional Boat Ramp*

21.18 Council consider deferring the capital expenditure for the regional boat ramp (\$1.07m) to outside the 10-year LTP programme. Funding for the feasibility study (\$108,000) is currently in Year 5 (2022/2023) and capital expenditure of \$963,000 in Year 6 (2023/2024).

#### *Environmental Management*

21.19 Project Devine: increase funding to \$11,250 per year. If Council wished to fund the entire request (\$22,500 per year), an additional budget increase of \$10,000 would be required from Year 2 in the LTP (Year 1 can potentially be covered by budget carry-forward).

#### *Forestry*

21.20 Staff propose that we may need to increase funding for additional resources to acknowledge the anticipated additional forestry monitoring requirements under the NES-PF and in recognition of the views expressed in submissions. It is likely that a budget of approximately \$100,000 will be required for this purpose, with the expectation that \$50,000 will be cost recovered. Staff will reprioritise our monitoring requirements and report back to Council with a proposal to reallocate current resources if the increased funding is required.

*Significance and Engagement Policy*

21.21 Make the following minor changes to the wording of the Significance and Engagement Policy:

- Section 1.4 'The exact form and extent of consultation and engagement will be determined by Council on a case by case basis, taking into account the level of significance of the matter and any statutory requirements'.
- Section 2.2: Where appropriate, Council will work with Wakatū Incorporation and Ngāti Rārua Ātiawa Iwi Trust (NRAIT) when dealing with matters relating to the land holdings of those agencies and will also work with those agencies when they represent the manawhenua interests of the traditional owners.

*Kohatu Motorsport Park*

21.22 Include appropriate reference in the LTP of Council's support of the Kohatu Motorsport Park project, including the funding provided to date.

*Community Facilities*

21.23 Provide \$18,500 in funding for the repairs to the war memorial and concrete surrounds. Funds of \$7,000 for the Memorial repair will be made available in the 2017/2018 Reserves and Facilities Memorials budget, and \$11,500 for the concrete surrounds repair will be made available in Year 1 of the LTP.

21.24 Fund the replacement of six astroturf courts at Hope Recreation Reserve, from a \$50,000 grant and a \$50,000 loan over 15 years, with the funds made available in Year 1 of the LTP in the Reserves and Facilities operating budgets.

*Community Relations*

21.25 Suter Art Gallery: reinstate the CPI increase annually on the \$87,813 funding to the Suter Art Gallery, reversing a Council decision in 2014/2015 to no longer fund the CPI increase.

<b>22 Conclusion</b>
----------------------

22.1 We received a total of 484 submissions, including four late submissions on the LTP Consultation Document, supporting information and concurrent consultations during the submissions period. Council heard from over 100 submitters who spoke to their submissions in Richmond, Golden Bay and Takaka.

22.2 Councillors are now requested to provide direction to staff about the changes they wish to make in these documents to enable the subsequent stages of the LTP process to be completed within the statutory timeframes.

22.3 Staff are currently undertaking a high-level analysis to determine the overall impact on rates and debt of the staff proposed changes. We are aiming to provide you with this analysis at the Deliberations meeting.



**23 Next Steps / Timeline**

- 23.1 The changes to the draft LTP and concurrent consultation documents are due to be discussed further at a Council workshop on 14 May 2018. Staff anticipate that at that workshop we will be able to discuss the financial impacts of the directions from this meeting.
- 23.2 At the 24 May 2018 Council meeting, Councillors will make formal decisions on the changes to be incorporated into the LTP and supporting documents.
- 23.3 At the 28 June 2018 Council meeting the LTP 2018-2028 is due to be adopted along with the rating resolutions for the 2018/2019 year.

**24 Attachments**

Nil