

18 May 2015

Memo To: Mayor and Councillors
Memo From: Administration Advisers
**Subject: COUNCIL – 20-21 MAY 2015
LATE ITEM**

1. Chief Executive's Report for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 Deliberations

Document A1347035

A report titled Chief Executive's Report for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 Deliberations is attached to be considered as a major late item at this meeting. This report was listed as item 6 on the public agenda for the Council meeting on 20-21 May 2015 to ensure elected members were aware that it would be presented to this meeting.

Section 46A(1)-(6) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and Standing Order 2.15.8 require that agendas are distributed with the associated reports. As this report was not distributed with the agenda for this meeting, it must be treated as a major late item to be considered at this meeting.

In accordance with section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and Standing Order 3.7.5, a procedural resolution is required before a major item that is not on the agenda for the meeting may be dealt with.

In accordance with section 46A(7)(b)(i) the reason why the item was not on the agenda is because it came to hand after the agenda had been distributed.

In accordance with section 46A(7)(b)(ii) the reason why discussion of this item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting is because a resolution on the matter is required before the next scheduled meeting of the Council to enable the sign off of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 before the end of the financial year.

Recommendation

THAT the item regarding Chief Executive's Report for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 Deliberations be considered at this meeting as a major item not on the agenda, pursuant to Section 46A(7)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to enable the sign off of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 before the end of the financial year.

2. Deliberations on Submissions to the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and Concurrent Consultations

Document A1337282

A report titled Deliberations on Submissions to the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and the Concurrent Consultations is attached to be considered as a major late item at this meeting. This report was listed as item 7 on the public agenda for the Council meeting on 20 May 2015 to ensure elected members were aware that it would be presented to this meeting.

Section 46A(1)-(6) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and Standing Order 2.15.8 require that agendas are distributed with the associated reports. As this report was not distributed with the agenda for this meeting, it must be treated as a major late item to be considered at this meeting.

In accordance with section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and Standing Order 3.7.5, a procedural resolution is required before a major item that is not on the agenda for the meeting may be dealt with.

In accordance with section 46A(7)(b)(i) the reason why the item was not on the agenda is because it came to hand after the agenda had been distributed.

In accordance with section 46A(7)(b)(ii) the reason why discussion of this item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting is because a resolution on the matter is required before the next scheduled meeting of the Council to enable the sign off of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 before the end of the financial year.

Recommendation

THAT the item regarding Deliberations on Submissions to the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and Concurrent Consultations be considered at this meeting as a major item not on the agenda, pursuant to Section 46A(7)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to enable the sign off of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 before the end of the financial year.

Chief Executive's Report for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 Deliberations

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide information to assist Council in reviewing submissions and making decisions on the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and related documents.

2. Delegations

- 2.1 The response to submissions relating to a Long Term Plan is a decision of Council.

3. Recommendation

THAT the report entitled Chief Executive's Report for the Long Term Plan 2015-2025 Deliberations (A1347035) be received;

AND THAT the additional information provided be considered in deliberations on the Long Term Plan 2015-25.

4. Background

- 4.1 This report is provided as an aid to Council in the process of deliberations on submissions received on the Consultation Document and concurrent consultations. It contains new/additional information that the Chief Executive considers elected members should take into consideration in making decisions.

5. Discussion

Transport

- 5.1 Parking: The Customer Service Centre team reported a level of resentment from some holders of the senior parking pass when the first hour free parking was initially introduced, as it eroded the benefits they were receiving in comparison to the general public. Pass holders were given the option of having the unused portion of their pass refunded and a number took up that option. Concern seems to be reduced now that the public is used to the change.

- 5.1.1 All visitors to the central business district have one hour free parking. It is not possible to extend this time on Trafalgar Street, as the time limit for this area is one hour parking.

Recommendation

THAT Council stops offering the senior parking pass as the first hour free parking is available to all.

- 5.2 NZ Transport Agency Indicative Funding Level for Maintenance Operations and Renewals: As part of the developing 2015-18 National Land Transport Programme (NLTP), the NZ Transport Agency Board has endorsed the indicative investment levels for the local road maintenance and renewals programmes.

- 5.2.1 Although the investment levels for programmes will not be finalised until late June, the NZ Transport Agency Board felt it would be helpful to provide indicative figures ahead of NLTP adoption to assist Council with our long-term plan development.

- 5.2.2 The NZ Transport Agency has indicated that it is unlikely to be able to co-invest maintenance, operations and renewals to the level requested in the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) as shown in the table below:

	RLTP	Indicative Funding	Difference
Maintenance	\$ 9.05M	\$ 9.05M	-
Renewals	\$ 7.83M	\$6.45M	\$ 1.39M
TOTAL	\$ 16.89M	\$ 15.50M	\$ 1.39M

- 5.2.3 In order to secure NZ Transport Agency co-investment, local authorities must have their share available to match the NZ Transport Agency co-investment (at the assigned Funding Assistance Rate). If the local share is not available then NZ Transport Agency funding is not made available.
- 5.2.4 NZ Transport Agency staff have advised that Nelson is at the top of the central region’s list to receive additional funding should other local authorities not be able to raise their local share as previously indicated by their RLTP’s.

Option	Consequence
1 - Match local share funding in the LTP to the indicative level advised by NZ Transport Agency	The sealed road surface and structural renewal backlog will grow and there will be increased risk of failure to some retaining structures that were programmed to be replaced. The backlog increase would be expected to impact on road roughness with the level of service being reduced.
2 - Budget for the difference between the RLTP and the indicative funding level split over year 2 and 3 of the LTP (local share \$700K)	Council will be in a position to take up any additional funding should the NZ Transport Agency make it available for transportation renewals as proposed by the RLTP and the Asset Management Plan. If the additional funding is not made available then Council can either: a) utilise the local share and top up to the RLTP/AMP level (Additional \$325K/pa over two years) to undertake the planned renewals, (this will result in the LTP indicating a lower rate for years 2 and 3 however this can be amended through Annual Plan(s)) or; b) offer up the local share of the 'difference' as a saving with a consequential increase in backlog as described above, (this will result in the LTP indicating a higher rate for years 2 and 3 however this can be amended through Annual Plan(s)).

- 5.2.5 Option 2 is recommended as it gives NZ Transport Agency time to advise if additional funding will be made available and gives the greatest ability to minimise the growth in the transport renewal backlog from the work planned in the Transport Asset Management Plan.

Recommendation

THAT a total of \$325,000 be retained in years two and three of the Long Term Plan so Council will be in a position to take up any additional funding should the New Zealand Transport Agency make it available for transportation renewals as proposed by the Regional Land Transport Plan and draft 10 year programme.

- 5.2.6 Urban Cycle Programme: The Urban Cycleways Programme (UCP) was announced by the Prime Minister on 18 August 2014, with the aim of making significant improvements to cycling infrastructure in the main urban centres. Of the \$100 million Urban Cycleways Fund available nationally, \$10 million is available to progress projects in 2014/15. The remaining \$90 million will be spent over the next three financial years.

5.2.7 Council has made an application to access funding from the Urban Cycle Programme for the following four projects as they align with the objective to provide primary urban cycle connections. These projects are shown in the table below:

Table 1. Projects proposed for Urban Cycle Funding

	Project	Description
1.	Maitai Path – Saltwater Bridge	A key bridge on the Maitai Path, The current bridge is narrow (single lane) and has low level of service for current and future users.
2.	Rocks Rd to Maitai	Connect to the recently completed Maitai riverside path which gives the coastal route access to the CBD and to the start of the Rocks Road project near Wakefield Quay. Currently on road cycle lanes exist for much of the route however the adjacent traffic volume is high.
3.	Rocks Road Walking and Cycling Project	Provision of improved walking and cycling provision along the SH6 waterfront from Wakefield Quay to Tahunanui
4.	Tahunanui Network	Currently this is a significant gap in the cycle network. It will provide a link from southern end of the Rocks Rd project through residential, educational and employment zones to connect with the regional cycle network at Annesbrook and/or the paths at the Airport. It will service residents, schoolchildren, employees, recreational cyclists and tourists.

5.2.8 The four projects submitted for funding are part of the primary cycling route in the Nelson region and currently form the most significant gap in the overall cycling network in Nelson. Their completion will provide Nelson with a continuous separated cycling network suitable for the interested but concerned rider, from Atawhai north of the central business district (CBD) through the CBD south, to connect with existing facilities at Annesbrook and the airport. This wider, strategic cycling corridor links into the areas south of the Nelson CBD, and onward to Tasman, for commuting, recreational, sporting (connection to regional sports facilities at Saxton Field) educational, and tourist cycling purposes.

5.2.9 The outcome of this application will not be known until late June 2015 when it will be announced by the Transport Minister.

5.2.10 Accessing the Urban Cycle Programme (UCP) funding comes with the following two conditions that require a change to the draft LTP:

- Local share funding for the UCP-funded cycling programme shall be approved by Council with any funding currently proposed outside of the first three years for this project brought forward into 2015-18.

- Completion of the projects by June 2018.

Recommendation

THAT the budgets for the Rocks Road to Maitai Path and Saltwater Creek Bridge projects be brought forward to comply with the Urban Cycleway Programme criteria of construction completion by 30 June 2018.

- 5.2.11 The above conditions would require Council to bring forward its funding for the Rocks Road to Maitai Path project as it currently has construction programmed for years 4 and 5. Similarly the Saltwater Creek Bridge project would also need accelerating as it is currently programmed for construction in year 4. It is recommended that changes to the Long Term Plan be made now, to signal Council's commitment to the application.

Environment

- 5.3 Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act – Changes brought about by the Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Bill are still being assessed but one major issue is the need to provide initial seismic assessments. The legislation requires territorial authorities to undertake a seismic capacity assessment of existing non-residential buildings and multi-storey and multi-unit residential buildings in their districts within five years from commencement. Officers are investigating whether it may be possible to charge customers, under the Local Government Act 2002, for the initial seismic assessments. Currently costs of 1 million + per year for the next five years are estimated. This will then steadily increase year on year from then to 2025.
- 5.3.1 Another matter that may have a financial impact on future budgets is the possibility if, as indicated under the proposed Building (Earthquake Prone) Amendment Bill 2015, the S124 Notices issued to date will no longer be covered in the Building Act 2004 (under s124 because references to 'Earthquake Prone' will be repealed), as a result it is concluded they will potentially need to be replaced with 'Seismic Work Notices' to align with the proposed legislation. There are currently 48 notices in place, which would result in around 80 hours of additional work.
- 5.3.2 Neither of these possible changes require adjustment to the budget now. In both cases, it is appropriate for Council to seek Local Government New Zealand advocacy to Government to ensure that these costs are not left with ratepayers.
- 5.3.3 Funding Model for Rural Fire: At a meeting of the Governance Committee on 6 November 2014, attended by the Principal Rural Fire Officer (PRFO) Ian Reade, Council was informed that negotiations were underway on a new funding model for Rural Fire activities. It was advised that this was likely to lead to a recommendation to increase the amount paid for Rural Fire activities. Council agreed that negotiations with stakeholders should continue with a view to bringing a figure back to Council for possible

approval in the Long Term Plan 2015-25. An estimate of the new funding likely to be required was included in the draft 10 year budget.

- 5.3.4 Negotiations have been ongoing; however stakeholders have not reached agreement on a new funding model. One of the major stakeholders, in particular, is not yet in a position to agree to the changes being proposed (there are wider, national considerations at stake). In addition, a review by the Department of Internal Affairs involving Rural Fire funding nationally has since commenced, and this review will potentially have an impact on rural fire funding around New Zealand.
- 5.3.5 Consequently, the proposed funding level for the Fire Management Services Contract and the related Landowner Levy in the first year of the LTP is \$99,250, which is the same level as 2014/15, plus CPI. As a contingency, it is proposed that the current estimate of \$127,000 remain from 2016/17 onwards, to allow for funding that may be required if a new model is agreed. Expenditure of this future allocation will be dependent on Council consideration and approval of an appropriate level of contribution.

Recommendation

THAT an allocation be made in the Long Term Plan 2015-25 of \$99,250 in 2015/16 and \$127,000 thereafter for the Fire Management Services Contract.

- 5.4 Landfill: Council previously approved a Regional Landfill with Tasman District Council (TDC) subject to the signing of a formal agreement, with the effective date commencing 1 July 2015. Agreement with TDC on the details of the deed has not yet been reached, and therefore a regional service will not commence on 1 July 2015 as planned. As a result, the budgets for next year (2015/16) will need to reflect this delay. Officers continue to communicate to TDC this Council's support for one regional landfill. As a way of testing the analysis done by each Council, Deloitte's will again be commissioned (costs to be shared between the two councils) to undertake further modelling.
- 5.5 Signage costs for Alcohol Ban Areas: the recently adopted bylaw has expanded the alcohol ban area. When deliberating on the matter the Committee expressed a strong preference for good communications and signage to ensure effectiveness. Officers have had discussions with Police and estimate an additional \$20,000 in 2015/16 is required for communications and signage associated with the implementation of the Urban Environments Bylaw.

Social

- 5.6 Arts Festival: The Festivals Team provide the information below to ensure Council has all appropriate information when considering the proposal for the Arts Festival as in the Consultation Document.
- 5.6.1 The proposal for an external trust to operate the festival is strongly supported by the majority of Council's partners and the Festivals Team itself. The benefits of an external trust governing the arts festival are:
- The ability to access different funding organisations (currently the Arts Festival is ineligible due to not having donee status);
 - Cementing the Festival's place and funding with Creative New Zealand (CNZ) which has difficulty funding something a local authority sees as a core service. So far, CNZ has continued to fund because it is aware of the conversation happening about an independent trust. A trust would also be eligible for kahikatea funding (biennial funding, and the arm where most festivals sit) which means the potential to receive more than the current \$65,000 cap;
 - A trust would be able to attract and retain benefactors. Currently the Arts Festival receives no funding from benefactors (compared, for example, with \$90,000 for the Southern Lakes Festival Of Colour). The reason for this is the lack of donee status and, feedback suggests, there is a reluctance from private benefactors to subsidise Council operations;
 - A well-chosen board of trustees would bring a wide range of relevant professional experience to contribute to the success of the Arts Festival and would have more freedom in programming.
- 5.6.2 There are of course aspects that would need an agreement between Council and the Arts Festival to facilitate a smooth transition to external status. Aspects such as storage room, administration support and logistics, and financial support would have to be negotiated to support the growth and success of the Arts Festival.
- 5.6.3 The proposal to hold an arts festival every second year has some challenges that would need considering:
- Sponsors have indicated that they would not sponsor a local festival, and there is a risk that with the Arts Festival being absent every second year it would be harder to retain sponsors. There is a lot of competition for sponsorship money and any gap is quickly filled;
 - Currently Nelson's Arts Festival is the only annual regional arts festival in New Zealand (the Auckland Arts Festival recently became annual, however it is not considered regional). This gives the Arts Festival great leverage with CNZ, as each year it partners up with another festival to bring larger international acts

to New Zealand. In the odd numbered years (2015, 2017, etc) it partners with the Tauranga Arts Festival (sharing nine shows this year), Kokomai Arts Festival (sharing three shows), to a smaller degree the Taranaki Arts Festival (two shows), and the Christchurch Arts Festival (two shows). In the even years it partners with Arts Festival Dunedin (eight shows last year). Should the Arts Festival not present one year, either the Tauranga Arts Festival or Arts Festival Dunedin would suffer. By funding the Arts Festival annually, CNZ is effectively keeping three festivals alive, and this raises the Nelson Festival's value to it;

- It is believed that CNZ wouldn't fund local works as it has already invested in the development of other works - most shows that reach Nelson have already had substantial central funding investment;
- Other considerations are whether the Arts Festival brand would be negatively affected, the need for more audience development for local theatre (when included in the Arts Festival previously these tickets have experienced the lowest sales of all), competition with the newly created Nelson Fringe Festival, impact on the Masked Parade and Readers and Writers Week.;
- It should also be noted that the Nelson Festival already has the highest percentage of local acts participating in the festival in New Zealand. With the Granary sessions, Stage One, Masked Parade and Carnivale, Nelson Civic Choir, Pecha Kucha and Couch Stories, and visual arts, Nelsonians are well represented in the Arts Festival.

- 5.7 CCTV cameras – A report will go to the Community Services Committee on 22 May requesting \$7,000 (\$3,500 in each of 2016/17 and 2017/18) be allocated in the Long Term Plan for ongoing operational costs of the CCTV cameras installed at Victory Square. It is necessary to make provision for the amount in the 10 year budget through this deliberations meeting and if the Committee decides against supporting these costs then the amount will be removed before adoption of the Long Term Plan.

Recommendation

THAT provision be made for \$3,500 in each of 2016/17 and 2017/18 for the ongoing operational costs of the CCTV cameras installed at Victory Square, noting that the Community Services Committee will make a decision on the issue at its 22 May 2015 meeting.

- 5.8 Nelson 175th Anniversary Celebrations 2017 – Celebration of Nelson’s 175th anniversary in 2017 has been brought to the attention of the Mayor. It is not feasible to make any budget provision at this stage. Instead officers propose to undertake some work and report to the Community Services Committee.

Parks and Active Recreation

- 5.9 Trafalgar Centre Reopening Project - The Annual Plan 2014/15 has \$3 million funding identified for the Trafalgar Centre Reopening. In June 2014 Council approved up to \$450,000 to appoint a project manager to drive an investigation process to inform the preparation of concept design and deliver the first iteration plans to Council. In July 2014 the project was scoped to be undertaken in 3 stages; Concept Design, Detailed Design and Construction and Opus Consultants were engaged as the project manager in August 2014.

- 5.9.1 The concept design phase was completed and reported to Council in February 2015. The options presented at the time still had significant uncertainty, primarily around ground improvement. This was reflected in the estimated costs of the options ranging from \$12.1 to \$19.3 million. Council resolved to progress with further site specific seismic hazard assessment to increase certainty around ground improvement. Council also resolved to progress with an early contractor involvement (ECI) process for the detailed design phase. The intention being to investigate and identify a more cost-effective solution.

- 5.9.2 The costs incurred up to 31 March 2015 for the concept design phase and the start of the detailed design phase were \$324,000. The increased effort and expertise contributing to the ECI process is likely to cost an additional \$350,000. At least \$250,000 of this additional cost is likely to occur prior to 30 June 2015. By including a construction estimate of \$8.5 million the total project estimate currently stands at \$9.63 million. The detailed design phase incorporating the ECI process will result in an accurate project cost by mid August 2015. In the meantime a more accurate estimate of the design solution will be developed for Council by the end of June 2015. This will give a more accurate estimate of the scope of the physical work and allow Council to decide on its options for the northern building.

Recommendation

THAT \$250,000 be brought forward from 2015/16 into the current financial year to cover additional expertise engaged to contribute to the early contractor involvement process for the Trafalgar Centre.

- 5.10 Rubbish bins: There has been feedback from the public asking for more rubbish bins at Saxton Field and also along the new Maitai Walkway from Trafalgar Street and all the way to the marina. There are four rubbish

bins recently installed along the Maitai walkway. The number of rubbish bins at Saxton Field is usually only an issue during tournaments and then it is the responsibility of the tournament organiser to manage waste.

- 5.11 Rutherford Park – At its meeting on 30 April 2015, Council resolved to bring funding forward to initiate detailed design and consenting work for the roading and carpark component of the concept plan, with the intention of completing the detailed design and physical works concurrently with the Trafalgar Centre Project as part of the Early Contractor Involvement process.
- 5.12 Further analysis of the work needed suggests an additional \$200,000 is required for the grassed areas and it is recommended that \$300,000 is brought forward from 2016/17 into 2015/16 for walkways and cycleways. There will be cost savings and disruptions will be minimised by doing all of this work together. This would bring expenditure in 2015/16 to \$2,400,000.

Recommendation

THAT an additional \$500,000 be allocated in 2015/16 for the Rutherford Park upgrade, \$300,000 of this amount being funding brought forward from the 2016/17 budget for Rutherford Park walkways and cycleways, and \$200,000 as additional funding.

Corporate

- 5.13 Contingency budget: There is contingency funding of \$150,000 per annum in the 10 year budget. It is suggested that this is removed and if funding is needed to cover unbudgeted expenditure, operating budgets should be reallocated when that occurs. If no budget was available at that time, then additional funding would be requested through a Council meeting. The contingency funding is primarily used for smaller unexpected expenditure not major weather events and is usually not spent. It would be more consistent with the philosophy of only rating for what we need to remove this allocation from the Long Term Plan.

Recommendation

THAT contingency funding of \$150,000 per annum be removed from the Long Term Plan and if/when funding required, Council allocate additional funds for unbudgeted expenditure that cannot be met through reallocation of operating budgets.

- 5.14 Ratepayer base growth: In the Long Term Plan, the growth in the ratepayer base is assumed to be 1% per annum. This means each year there are 1% more rating units to pay the required rates and therefore the 'average' rate increase is assumed to be 1% less than it actually is. Historically, the growth has been around 1% but it needs to be noted

that to 15 May 2015, the growth in the rating base is only 0.5% with few lots to be added before 30 June 2015. This is a risk that Council needs to be aware of and is another thing that needs to be considered when looking at potential rate increases.

- 5.15 Parking revenue: The parking revenue for the LTP has been revised down by \$155,000 per annum to reflect updated revenue from over the summer. Of this revenue foregone, 25% will be allocated to the inner city differential.

6. Options

- 6.1 Council is required to adopt a Long Term Plan 2015-25 by 30 June 2015. It is recommended that Council consider the matters in this report and take them into account as appropriate when making decisions about the Long Term Plan 2015-25.

7. Alignment with relevant Council Policy

- 7.1 The Long Term Plan sets out the Council's intentions for the next decade. Once the Long Term Plan 2015-25 is adopted there will be a process to align other Council policy, particularly its asset and activity management plans, with the Long Term Plan.
- 7.2 The Long Term Plan process aligns with Goal 2 of Nelson 2060: We are all able to be involved in decisions. The process also aligns with the Council's Community Outcomes, particularly: Our Council provides leadership and fosters partnerships, a regional perspective, and community engagement.

8. Assessment of Significance against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy

8.1 The development and adoption of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 is a significant matter and consultation has been carried out in a manner required by Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

9. Consultation

9.1 Council has followed the special consultative procedure to seek public feedback to inform the Long Term Plan 2015-25 in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.

10. Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

10.1 Māori have been specifically consulted as part of the overall Long Term Plan process.

11. Conclusion

11.1 This report is provided for information.

Clare Hadley
Chief Executive

Deliberations on Submissions to the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and Concurrent Consultations

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide supporting information and recommendations on matters to be considered when making decisions on submissions on the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and concurrent consultations.

2. Delegations

- 2.1 The response to submissions relating to a Long Term Plan is a decision of Council.

3. Recommendation

THAT the report *Deliberations on Submissions to the Consultation Document for the Long Term Plan 2015-25 and Concurrent Consultations (A1337282) and its attachments (A1353191, A1354077, A1354078, A1358090, A1358177, A1351910, A1354997, A1358294, A1358299, A1358304 and A1272431) be received;*

AND THAT the spreadsheet in Attachment 1 (A1353191), as amended, be used as the basis of responses to submitters on matters raised and to amend the draft Long Term Plan 2015-25 as necessary.

4. Background

- 4.1 Changes to the Local Government Act 2002 that came into force in 2014 required Council to consult with its community on its 10 year plan and budget through a Consultation Document, rather than via a draft Long Term Plan. The Consultation Document was required to be a fair representation of the matters to be included in the Long Term Plan 2015-25, to explain the choices facing Council over the 10 years of the Plan and the consequences of the different options.

- 4.2 When making decisions Council must be mindful of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002 which prescribes decision-making processes. It requires Council to be rigorous in its decision-making by identifying all reasonably practicable options for achieving the objective of a decision. It must assess those options by considering the benefits and costs in terms of the present and future well-being of the community and the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted. Council is also required to consider the impact of each option on its capacity to meet present and future needs in relation to its statutory responsibilities. For any decision which is significantly inconsistent with existing policy Council must clearly identify that inconsistency, the reasons for it and any intention to consequently amend the policy or plan.
- 4.3 The submission period for the Consultation Document ran from 26 March 2015 to midday on 28 April 2015. 594 submissions were received. Hearings were held on 6, 7, 8 and 11 May 2015 and 182 submitters spoke to Council over those four days.
- 4.4 In addition to the Consultation Document, Council also provided the community with a range of related documents. Some of these were provided as additional information to inform the community, others were for concurrent consultation under either section 82 (the draft Development Contributions Policy, the Revenue and Financing Policy, the Funding Impact Statement (Rates) and the Rates Remission Policy) or section 83 (the Schedule of Charges – Resource Consent Fees and Charges) of the Local Government Act 2002. To simplify this new and more complicated consultation process for the community, and to meet legislative deadlines, submissions on all these matters were invited on a single submission form. The matters were heard during the same hearings process and will be deliberated on during this meeting and a meeting on development contributions on 28 May.
- 4.5 This report covers the main issues raised in submissions by activity category. It also contains sections to support deliberations on the documents that were consulted on concurrently with the Consultation Document:
- Section 16: the Schedule of Charges – Resources Consent Fees and Charges;
 - Section 17: Revenue and Financing Policy, the Funding Impact Statement (Rates) and the Rates Remission Policy;
 - Decisions on the draft Development Contributions Policy will be considered at the Council meeting on 28 May.

5. Discussion

- 5.1 Following are the key issues raised by submitters covered under the relevant activity. Also attached is a spreadsheet of other issues raised in submissions (see Attachment 1), with suggestions as to how Council could respond. These may need to be reviewed after decisions have been made on matters raised in this report.

6. Transport (Category 1 of submissions)

- 6.1 Footpaths – there were many submissions on footpaths. Overall there was significant support for Council’s proposal to make footpath condition a priority in the Long Term Plan and to allocate \$5.6 million across the 10 years for renewing the existing footpaths and building new links. A number of submitters noted that the increase in mobility scooters meant that footpaths had to be finished to a higher standard so that wheeled vehicles did not have to deal with unevenness, particularly changing levels at driveways.
- 6.2 More than half of the \$5.6 million allocated is for renewing the existing footpath surface. This includes easing the steep driveway grades that make walking uncomfortable and wheeled use difficult and dangerous, but often does not meet full standards compliance due to the existing site constraints. The renewal sites are prioritised by their existing condition and the likely number of users. Often however the programme is amended to work in with the installation of the ultra fast broadband. This can mean delaying the ideal renewal time to allow the UFB to be installed, or renewing early as a cost sharing opportunity exists.
- 6.3 The new footpath budget is for installing new footpath in areas where there is a missing link. These new footpaths are prioritised based on the following factors; the adjacent road volume, the existence of a footpath on the other side, proximity to a high generator of pedestrians, and value for money. New footpaths need to meet requirements set out in Council’s Land Development Manual to ensure that they are comfortable to use, suitable for pedestrians of all abilities including the mobility and visually impaired and easy and cost effective to maintain. (refer section 4.3.12.1 of the Land Development Manual). The new footpath priority list is contained within the Transport Asset Management Plan. The forward work programme for each financial year will be reported via the Councillors’ newsletter annually, and this allows for any adjustment to the scheduling as a result of changed circumstances. The scheduling referred to below assumes no change to current assessments.
- 6.4 Concerns about specific footpaths were as below:
- 6.4.1 Songer Street, western side between numbers 70 and 120 (submission 16): this upgrade is scheduled to occur in 2016/17.
- 6.4.2 Scotia Street (submission 30): the completion of the footpath link on Scotia Street is currently 13th priority on the footpath deficiency list. On the assumption no other higher priority footpaths are identified then this missing link could be expected to be constructed within the period of the Long Term Plan.
- 6.4.3 Tasman Street (submission 168): the process of having kerbing and a footpath installed on the other side of Tasman Street is currently underway. Miro Street/Hinau Streets (submission 168): Historically developers did not always “finish” the street with footpaths and

kerbing and so there is a legacy of streets in need of more work. Streets with missing footpaths are prioritised in Council's work programme according to need. Miro and Hinau Streets are unlikely to be upgraded in the short to medium term as they are low volume and low speed streets and there are higher need projects elsewhere that have been prioritised in the work programme.

- 6.4.4 Tipahi/Franklyn/Alfred Streets (submission 389): A project titled Wigzel Area speed reduction was proposed in the Transport Asset Management Plan to mitigate a number of the concerns raised by the submitter. This project was not included within the 10 year budget when assessed against other priorities. The footpath component has been assessed against the other footpath priorities which shows that construction would occur in the mid to latter half of the 10 year programme and in conjunction with the programmed utilities upgrades.
- 6.5 Cycle/walkways, and off road cycling - Off road cycling is provided for under the Parks and Active Recreation activity, but for the purposes of considering submissions and dealing with issues raised, is included here.
 - 6.5.1 Many submissions raised concerns about pedestrian cyclist conflict, both for off-road tracks and as part of our city transport network. Feedback indicates pedestrians feel at risk from fast-moving cycles, as well as intrusion or loss of sense-of-place, due to previously pedestrian-oriented spaces being used as cycle corridors. Nelson's higher than average active transport statistics and the continuing growth in commuter and recreational cyclists suggests this is a conflict that has potential to intensify. Suggestions proposed in submissions include pedestrians facing oncoming cycle traffic (rather than keeping to the left); having separate paths for cycling and walking; reserving some paths (particularly in the "front country") for walkers only; cyclists slowing to walking speed with interacting with walkers; facilitating a dialogue between cycling and walking groups on possible solutions.
 - 6.5.2 The solution is likely to be a combination of methods. In some places it may be appropriate to have separate paths for walkers and cyclists but it would be expensive to take this approach throughout the city. Having pedestrians face cyclists would only work on the widest paths as they would still have their backs to cyclists in the opposing direction, and the typical width of most shared paths requires all users to share the space. There is budget within the subsidised roading programme that can be drawn on to undertake education campaigns to promote appropriate behaviour in shared spaces.
 - 6.5.3 It is recommended that the first step is for Councillors to have a workshop, to discuss the breadth of issues in the cycling activity. This would provide the opportunity to discuss cycling in all variants across the city, and its impacts on others. Given the large numbers of active cyclists, the predictions of continuing increase, and the significant economic benefits being forecast from projects such as the Great

Taste Trail, it will be important to find appropriate infrastructural solutions for a growth in cycling. Equally this should not be at the expense of the even larger number of residents who walk regularly and want to feel safe while doing so on footpaths and walkways throughout the urban areas, and who are requesting access to some quiet off-road tracks.

- 6.5.4 A Council workshop could establish some principles, that could then be tested with stakeholders. These could then be the basis of a community conversation on shared paths to encourage a dialogue amongst users, help Council better understand the issues and jointly develop solutions. It will be important for NZTA to be engaged in this process as they are a significant funder in this activity. This could then be reported back to Council.
- 6.5.5 There was also a suggestion that Council's Cycling Strategy should be reviewed. However the role of cycling is now completely integrated into the Transport Asset Management plan as an essential element.
- 6.6 A number of submitters referred to the value there would be in some strategic thinking around the region's mountainbiking/off-road tracks. This has a relationship with the shared paths discussion. The Regional Cycle Forum (submission 196) suggested a strategic overview of off-road biking facilities with an initial focus on the Brook, Tanragee, Maitai and Fringed Hill area plus the foothills between Stoke and Richmond. The MTB Trails Trust (submission 144) also spoke in support of this at the hearings.
 - 6.6.1 Before any work is done on this, it would be appropriate for Council to consider whether it wishes to support the continuation of off-road cycling in all of these areas. Council will shortly be considering the Brook Reserve Management Plan, where it may again receive submissions on the conflict between different user groups in the Brook area.
 - 6.6.2 It would be useful to coordinate a number of stakeholders, including both councils, that are involved in off-road tracks and establish priorities for the future. It will take some time to coordinate all stakeholders and draw the information together. There is not sufficient capacity to add the development of a strategy to Council's work programme in 2015/16 unless this was prioritised over existing priorities, which is not recommended.
 - 6.6.3 It is therefore suggested that submitters be encouraged to choose a lead agency to facilitate the process and begin the process of pooling information and discussing common priorities, within any guidelines Council may establish. Once this work has been done Council could contribute modest funding for an external consultant to facilitate a session with officers from both councils and draw the material into a draft strategy for Council consideration.

Recommendations

THAT a Councillor workshop be held to discuss the cycling activity, both as a means of transport and for recreational activity, and its impacts on other users of shared paths and off road walking tracks;

AND THAT following the workshop, officers engage with key stakeholders from organisations such as Bicycle Nelson Bays, Greypower, Positive Ageing Forum, NZ Transport Agency, Tasman District Council, Nelson Marlborough District Health Board and others, such as Friends of the Maitai, for site specific issues, to investigate solutions to conflict between cyclists and pedestrians on Council's shared tracks and paths;

AND THAT the principles agreed in any workshop and subsequent community engagement be developed into policy to be reported back to Council by September 2015;

AND THAT a programme of work from that engagement be reported back to Council by November 2015;

AND THAT after feedback from the workshop, off road cycling stakeholders be encouraged to identify a lead agency to gather information for an off road track strategy, which establishes priorities within allocated budgets for agreed areas, with a Council contribution of up to \$10,000 towards costs.

- 6.7 Completion of the City to Sea route – Some submissions called for completion of the City to Sea cycling route, including for the flow-on benefits to the Great Taste Trail. The completion of the Coastal Route (Maitai to Airport/Railway Reserve) is included within the draft 10 year budget over the first four years. An application for Urban Cycleway Programme funds has also been made for the Coastal Route. The outcome of that application will be known in late June 2015.
- 6.8 The Regional Transport Committee decided that work on the Rocks Road Walking and Cycling Package should not be delayed until after the Southern Arterial had been investigated. The Committee noted that the two projects were complementary and that any timing impacts could be dealt with as variations to the Regional Land Transport Plan if necessary.

- 6.9 Maitai walkway between Collingwood and Nile – there were many submissions concerned about widening the path, mainly from those who valued the riverbank environment, enjoyed walking the path, and who worried it would become a busy and less attractive thoroughfare if widened.
- 6.9.1 This section of the walkway was identified in the Heart of Nelson Strategy (2009) and the Cycling Strategy (2006) as part of a key cycle corridor to connect the proposed Coastal Route with the central business district and residential areas in Nelson East. The upgrade to the walkway had been scheduled for 2014/15 but was not constructed due to community concern over shared path conflict and loss of amenity for the adjacent river edge environment. Given the level of community concern it would be appropriate to carry forward the \$600,000 funding for the project to 2015/16. Council could then review the project and consult with the community on how the values of the area can be maintained, as well as providing for a workable cycle corridor to achieve connections for the city.

Recommendation

THAT funding of \$600,000 for upgrading the Maitai Walkway between Collingwood and Nile Streets be carried forward to 2015/16

AND THAT Council review the project as part of its workshop on cycling, and gain feedback from stakeholders, before further consideration by Council in September 2015.

- 6.10 Bridge St – some submitters criticised the results of the upgrade while Uniquely Nelson supported the work thus far to improve Bridge Street. There are lighting improvements underway which will be completed by the end of June this year. Council also approved the upgrade of Fiddle Lane. Some funding is planned to be carried over into the 2015/16 year and a report will be coming to Council about options for using those funds.
- 6.11 Public transport – some submitters have requested improvements in the public transport system including reduced ticket prices, sale of concession tickets from more outlets and online, a bus service on public holidays and improvements in Stoke.
- 6.11.1 \$36,000 pa has been allocated to improve bus stops and associated facilities. Any reduction in fares would need to be fully funded by Council as the NZ Transport Agency funding level has been set by the Regional Land Transport Plan.
- 6.11.2 A bus service to cover a greater area of Stoke is proposed in the draft 10 year Plan. The exact route of this service is being finalised but it is likely to be a local figure 8 using Nayland Road and The Ridgeway connecting with the existing arterial bus routes on Main Road Stoke.

- 6.11.3 Council is part of a nationwide project to improve bus ticketing and trip monitoring which will include the ability to purchase tickets online. This is proposed to be commissioned in 2016. In the short term, Council and Nelson Coachlines (SBL) will engage with local businesses on the route to provide multi trip tickets at more outlets.
- 6.11.4 The bus currently operates a reduced service on the weekend to give a level of mobility without high cost as the focus since 2012 has been on encouraging mode shift, especially during week day peaks when the arterial network is operating near capacity. The bus service contract does not currently require SBL to operate on public holidays, however when it is likely to be economic SBL does run a service. This needs to be better advertised and understood by users to be effective. Officers will work with SBL to make any public holiday service more visible/known in advance. Gross operational costs are estimated at \$20,000 per annum to provide a service between Nelson and Richmond via Bishopdale and Tahunanui on public holidays. The contract is in place until 2018 but a variation can be proposed at any time.
- 6.11.5 There was also suggestion of “park and ride” facilities. A 2013 review of the bus service did not recommend a park and ride service. This is unlikely to be successful given the relatively short distances involved and the free or low cost all day parking in Nelson and Richmond.
- 6.11.6 Government funding for transport for beneficiaries: A question was raised (relating to submission 235) about transport subsidies for beneficiaries and whether these were available from Central Government. There are three schemes which provide this: Total Mobility (up to \$10 per taxi ride for those unable to use public transport and who are eligible); Super Gold Card (free public transport on scheduled services, running off peak and on weekends); and transport concessions for community services card holders (discounted fares for beneficiaries including pensioners and students. NBus applies). There may also be funding from the Accident Compensation Corporation when an accident results in the need for public transport use, and on a case by case basis, funding may be available from the Ministry of Social Development through hardship grants.
- 6.12 Maitai Walkway – there was some concern raised in submissions about increased flooding risk to the Maitai walkway, which might put the investment in the walkway at risk, and to the opposite bank. It is expected that in significant rain events the Maitai Walkway would be under water. This was taken into account in choosing the material for construction to ensure better resilience. The issue of how Council addresses flood protection planning for the Maitai River is programmed for 2015/16 through to 2021/22, commencing with modelling.
- 6.13 Council’s priority is to assess the river catchments in the central business district where risk to property is potentially high. To understand this risk the flood protection project will continue to build on recent modelling work undertaken to date on the Maitai river which has included modelling of the Q50 and Q100 flows. The next key step

is to engage with the community on the modelling, and what this tells us about risks for properties and businesses. The aim is to better understand what the Nelsonians value about the Matai and the level of risk that people are prepared to accept. The results from this will help determine the type and overall level of flood protection to be implemented at a later date.

- 6.14 Beatson Rd – Submission number 30 raised an issue that has been considered by Council previously, the “rat run” in Beatson Road and Scotia Street. The Works and Infrastructure Committee resolved on 5 May 2015 that a regulatory sign will be installed to ban through movements to mitigate the delay caused to Waimea Road from the “rat run”.
- 6.15 Pedestrian Crossing on Songer Street: The need for a pedestrian crossing in Songer Street was raised as a query. There has been no specific need identified, and officers would need to analyse the traffic environment before being able to provide advice.
- 6.16 Bus to Hira: Officers were asked how far the bus goes in the direction of Hira. Route 3 goes as far as Clifton Terrace School.
- 6.17 Parking in CBD – there was general support for the proposal to continue providing the first hour of parking for free although some submitters felt that use of cars should be discouraged. There was a suggestion that cost recovery shouldn’t exceed average increased incomes for businesses as a result of the change. One submitter wanted the free period reduced to a half hour and another suggested pay parking in Trafalgar Street with first hour free in Montgomery and Buxton Parks.
- 6.18 Most of those who commented felt the first hour free parking trial had a positive effect on the city and wished it to continue. Although there were suggestions for tweaking the way the scheme operates this is likely to confuse users for little gain and thus undermine the effectiveness of the scheme.
- 6.19 One submitter (463) suggested converting three central city carparks to pay as you exit. Through the Parking Strategy it was identified that it is preferable to upgrade pay and display meters with more ways to pay and technology such as extending stay via mobile phones rather than pay as you leave exit barriers.

Recommendation

THAT the first-hour-free parking in the central business district be confirmed, with one quarter of the revenue foregone to be allocated to the inner city commercial differential rate and the remainder funded by general rates.

- 6.20 Disabled Parking: During the hearings a request was made (submission 20) for more disabled parking, particularly on Trafalgar Street near Farmers and on the opposite side of the road. Council has received such requests before but for parks opposite the State Cinema.
- 6.20.1 Issues with providing disabled parking spaces increase with angled parking: eg wheelchair users working behind the vehicle in live traffic, if they have a rear mounted wheelchair carrier or a rear wheelchair loading van. The greater width of accessibility bays also needs to be considered and the need for kerb cut downs. There are disabled parking spaces at the northern end of Trafalgar where the speed environment is different and bollards protect the rear of the vehicles. Otherwise these spaces are located in Council's parking squares.
- 6.20.2 As part of the implementation of the Parking Strategy, officers are investigating what can be provided by way of disabled parking in combination with the build-outs close to intersections on Trafalgar Street. This work would be funded from the Parking Strategy Implementation budget.
- 6.21 Suter Gallery: The submission presented by The Suter (submission 304) sought more parking to be made available near the gallery, including angle parking, and the possibility of having a bus stop nearby. It was commented that there was previously a popular minibus service in the central business district and questioned if this could be restarted. Officers understand the minibus service was a precursor to the bus service and was used to test demand for a service which was eventually part funded by NZ Transport Agency. The current service is more comprehensive. The existing Brook bus route runs within 220m of the Suter Gallery along Collingwood Street. This is a hail and ride route so passengers can be set down close to the Bridge Street intersection. Officers will talk further with Suter Gallery staff to understand their challenges around parking in this area.
- 6.21.1 Southern Arterial – A number of submissions commented on the Southern Arterial (now known as the Nelson Arterial Investigation). The investigation is a central Government initiative and is being funded within the Government's Regional Accelerated Roading Programme. Submitters should be advised that this is not something Council can make a decision on at this point.
- 6.22 Retaining walls: A question was asked about whether retaining walls could have spaces for plantings rather than be all concrete. It is critical to ensure that the design of retaining walls is "fit for purpose". Where appropriate, the use of crib walls or gabion walls which allow for planting can be considered. However, in situations where strength is the main criteria, solid concrete is the appropriate material. While plants could be used in some circumstances with solid concrete walls, maintenance costs would need to be considered including the corrosive aspects of plant material. Officers consider that where appropriate, the use of planting spacing can be considered.

- 6.23 Montreal Road extension to Princess Drive – Submission 477 from Adcock Properties Ltd requests Council to undertake the Montreal Road extension to Princess Drive or agree to enter into a private development agreement (PDA) to share the costs of the formation of this road on a fair, proportional basis.
- 6.24 Infrastructure projects internal to a development site are not projects that are funded by Council or that development contributions are collected for. The connection of Montreal Road to Princess Drive is required in order to ensure the interconnectivity of the existing roading network in this central city location. The intersection of Montreal to Princess Drive requires significant work beyond the development site, and beyond what is considered fair and reasonable to be imposed as a condition of subdivision consent. This is a similar project to work Council is undertaking on upgrading the Ridgeway and Marsden Valley intersection.
- 6.25 The site is located in an area of Victory that is close to shops, schools, services, passenger transport, open space and is in an area of lower value land that could offer greater housing choice and affordability. The developer’s representative is at this stage unable to advise what the costs are of the intersection formation of Montreal Road and Princess Drive outside of the internal development roading costs. The developer’s representative advises that the earliest the developer could start developing the site would be in 2016/17 as resource consent and engineering design have not been completed.
- 6.26 Council could decide to include the Montreal Road and Princess Drive intersection in Councils transportation projects, however given the uncertain nature of the costs and timing it is considered that officers should be directed to work with the developer to explore the costs associated with the intersection construction and the developers timing and report back to Council at the Annual Plan with any recommendations.

7. Water Supply

- 7.1 Atawhai reservoir – one submission (no 477) asked about a new reservoir for Atawhai and investigations into the location for a new large water reservoir(s) in the wider Atawhai area are underway from 2014 to 2016. The Bayview site suggested is close to Walters Bluff and not ideally located. Purchase of a suitable lot is anticipated in 2017/18 with construction programmed for 2021/22-2022/23.

8. Wastewater (Category 3 of submissions)

- 8.1 The Wakatu Incorporation submission (435) asked that a comprehensive wastewater plan for Nelson be developed. This is a component of the Infrastructure Strategy which guides the work programme for all three water utilities. Sea level rise is considered within this. The Infrastructure Strategy builds on asset management plans, which have used data and modelling to forecast future requirements. Officers agree that factors such as climate change and

population growth deserve increased analysis, to ensure robust planning for the future of the wastewater activity over a longer time period.

- 8.2 Choices made to date have recognised potential issues and sought to provide flexibility for Council in future; the recent investment in the Corder Park pump station recognises that if the Nelson North Wastewater Treatment Station was to be decommissioned, the pumps would still be used – albeit pumping wastewater in a different direction.

9. Stormwater (Category 4 of submissions)

- 9.1 There were a number of submissions relating to stormwater issues, many dealing with specific locations. These are dealt with below. Naturally residents are concerned about such issues as they impact on their own properties. It will also, however, be important when communicating on these issues with the community, to reinforce the message that flooding will continue to occur no matter how much work Council does to improve the network. It is not possible to make Nelson a flood-free city and the community needs to be prepared for, and able to respond to, flooding events.
- 9.2 Council is aware that reducing the flood risk to residents and businesses to the same standard in all stormwater catchments may not be affordable or appropriate. A design level for example of a 1 in 100 year event for high commercial areas may not be the right response for a rural area. Council has to balance priorities between different activities, as well as balancing competing priorities within the stormwater activity. There will always be a tension between design, risk factors and cost. In the next 10 years Council is focussing primarily on the Little Go, Brook, York and Maitai waterways.
- 9.3 Stormwater/flood protection projects – The Wakatu Incorporation submission urged Council to develop a comprehensive stormwater plan for the city. This is a component of the Infrastructure Strategy which guides the work programme for all three water utilities. Sea level rise is considered within this. The Infrastructure Strategy builds on asset management plans, which uses data and modelling to forecast future requirements. Officers agree that factors such as climate change and population growth deserve increased analysis, to ensure robust planning for the future of the stormwater activity over a longer time period.
- 9.3.1 Stormwater capacity in Toi-Toi and Emano Streets (submission no 13) - this site is being reviewed in 2014/15. Upgrading of Ariesdale Tce/ Thompson Tce stormwater is proposed for 2018/19 and upgrading of Emano and Murphy Streets stormwater is currently programmed for 2026-2031. Council has no data to suggest there is a problem with either stormwater or sewer pipes in the area that will not be addressed through maintenance. Any bigger issues would be investigated as they occur. Any major upgrade would be addressed at the same time as stormwater or roading works are programmed.

- 9.3.2 Stormwater on Nelson Golf Club land (submission 10) - properties are low-lying, with ponding resulting from high tides and stormwater from an adjacent open channel. A piped driveway on the Golf Club site may contribute to the ponding by slowing the outflow. There are no current plans to upgrade this area.
- 9.3.3 234-240 Nile St, stormwater in private right of way (submission 32) - Council does not have a stormwater drain in this right of way. Council is currently upgrading trunk mains in Nile Street to reduce flood risk to the wider area. Work on lateral drains will follow on at some stage in the future, likely beyond 2025. Council will further investigate this issue and address through the trunk main upgrade if necessary to address any urgent problem.
- 9.3.4 14 Fifeshire Crescent, (submissions 297 and 454) – Work is currently underway at 12 Fifeshire Crescent to reinstate the retaining wall which will again see the road restored to his original width. The excavation for the new retaining wall shows no evidence of widespread water seepage into the cut face. This aside, a project to upgrade the stormwater between Victoria and Fifeshire Crescent is scheduled to commence with design in 2015/16, with resource consenting to follow in 2016/17 and construction in 2017/18. While it is not possible to bring any of this work forward to the current financial year to coincide with the retaining wall work, Council will be carrying out some investigation and remedial works on root intrusion areas in the current financial year.
- 9.3.5 16 Fifeshire Cres (submission 143) has requested the project be brought forward. The submitter has mistaken the dates for this project as upgrading starts in 2015/16. Only some limited investigation work is being undertaken in 2014/15. It is not recommended to carry out design and construction in a single year.
- 9.3.6 Wakapuaka Flats drainage (submission 280) - Investigations into future stormwater and flood protection options are being undertaken through the development of the Nelson Plan. Flood modelling information has and will help inform the process, including stakeholder engagement which has already commenced. At this stage funding for upgrading design is included in 2025/26-2026/27.
- 9.3.7 Jenkins Stream, Beatson Rd to Waimea Rd (submission 381) - preliminary investigation of this issue is underway in the current year. The response will depend upon level of risk to buildings, costs and the environmental effects considered through the necessary resource consent process. The wider Jenkins Stream upgrading is programmed for 2025/26-2033/34 unless the investigation reveals a need to act earlier or finds no response is required. If an earlier response is needed the matter will be brought back to Council.
- 9.3.8 Atmore Tce (submission 431) - there are no plans to install additional stormwater to Atmore Terrace in this Long Term Plan period. Options for the resident include detaining stormwater from their house at the

house site and from their drive at different points along the drive and trickle this into the open ditch on Atmore Terrace over time.

- 9.3.9 Bayview Subdivisions Limited, Dodson Valley & Oldham Creek (submission 473) - the Oldham Creek investigation and upgrading is programmed for 2025/26 -2028/29.
- 9.3.10 11 Tahunanui Drive, request to pipe an adjacent open drain (submission 478) - this work is programmed for 2015/16-16/17.
- 9.3.11 Airlie Street stormwater (submissions 539 and 413) – this project is programmed for 2016/17-2018/19. The proposal is to upgrade the stormwater only at this stage to address the flooding issues from December 2011. No kerb and channelling will be undertaken.
- 9.3.12 Arapiki Road (submission 422) - The project upgrades existing stormwater pipes from Towai Street through to Arapiki Stream. This is to address inundation issues from the South of Arapiki Road rather than from Arapiki Road itself. Work is scheduled as follows: 2018/19 design, 2019/20 resource consent, 2020/21 and 2021/22 construction. It may not be possible to install kerb and channel to the street. The re-timing was part of the work to balance the budgets and smooth the debt requirements.
- 9.4 Drain Clearing: Officers were asked, as a result of Long Term Plan hearings, whether there were better ways of communicating with residents to encourage them to clear their drains. Multiple channels are used to impart messages, which are determined by the message type, message importance, and the target audience.
 - 9.4.1 Social media and media releases (for print reproduction) are currently used for “drain clearing” public notices, which do have excellent reach to date. Radio could be used if the budget was available, though it is recommended that multiple messages are imparted if this channel is used.
 - 9.5 Update on Days Track/Grenville Tce: Officers were asked for an update on temporary stormwater and sewage piping. This work has been carried forward into the next financial year 15/16. It is subject to landowner negotiations so there is an element of uncertainty over timing.

10. Flood Protection (Category 5 of submissions)

- 10.1 Saxton Creek – There was a request, to prevent Wakatu Estate from being flooded in extreme stormwater events, for the upgrading of Saxton Creek to commence at the sea first and move upstream. There was also a request that if this was not going to happen that as a minimum the existing stormwater culverts under Main Road Stoke be included in any staging of works planned in the next three years.

- 10.1.1 The project is composed of two stages:
- Stage A - Champion Road to Main Road Stoke;
 - Stage B - Main Road Stoke (including the culverts under Main Road Stoke) to the sea.
- 10.1.2 The current staging (ie Stage A) as proposed in the Consultation Document and previously approved in the 2014/15 Annual Plan is to upgrade Saxton Creek over the next three years starting upstream at Champion Road and working down towards Main Road Stoke.
- 10.1.3 Stage B is set to follow with modelling, design and consenting commencing in 2018/19 and construction progressing in 2022/23 and 2023/24.
- 10.1.4 Work to commence upstream and work towards the sea has been largely dictated by the work of Tasman District Council (TDC) upgrading their culvert in Champion Road and the severe flooding experienced by residents in the upper reaches of the catchment in April 2013. Work on Stage A is well advanced.
- 10.1.5 Stage A is further divided into 3 sub-stages:
- Stage 1 - Upper reaches adjacent to Champion Road (affecting two large land owners);
 - Stage 2 - Middle reaches between stage 1 and stage 3 encompassing a large number of land owners; and
 - Stage 3 - Lower reaches on Council owned land including an enlarged detention basin adjacent to the Main Road Stoke culvert within Saxton Field which will assist with smaller storm events.
- 10.1.6 Progress to date on these three stages is as follows:
- Stage 1 - Finalisation of agreements with the 2 land owners (including Wahanga) and resource consents lodged. In addition Council recently approved essential gravel trap works to be included in the already awarded TDC tender to upgrade their stormwater culvert underneath Champion Road. Work on this is to commence shortly.
 - Stage 2 - Discussions with landowners are ongoing;
 - Stage 3 - Design and resource consents have been secured.
- 10.1.7 With respect to the request to progress with the culverts underneath Main Road Stoke - upgrading these culverts in isolation or part of Stage A is not recommended given the greater urgency to protect upper areas where the creek is under capacity across private land covering Stage B. These culverts need to be included as part of the work proposed under Stage B.

- 10.1.8 No work (modelling, design, consultation or consenting) has commenced on Stage B and is complicated by the fact that part of the stream is a buried culvert across private land and the creek itself passes under SH6 (administered by the NZ Transport Agency).
- 10.1.9 With respect to prioritisation of works, officers agree that commencing at the sea moving upstream is technically the best solution. However, rather than stop work on Stage A (and recognising the work already progressed on this stage to date), it is prudent to concurrently progress Stages A and B to achieve the best outcome for Council, the residents and commercial properties. This approach will also go a long way to showing goodwill to those between Main Road Stoke and the sea;
- 10.1.10 Subject to the quantum of the capital programme for 2015/16, and in order to maintain continuity for the project as a whole, the following is proposed:
- Bring modelling, consultation, design and consenting for Stage B forward from 2018/19 - 2019/20 to 2015/16 - 2016/17. This work would need to be handled externally and an extension to existing consultant appointments would be necessary. This would be in line with Council's procurement policy. This work would be undertaken in time to inform the development of the next LTP;
 - Continue with the completion of Stage 1 of Stage A (noting that the gravel trap work is to commence shortly);
 - Continue to negotiate with residents in Stage 2 with the aim of securing agreements and progressing construction in Year 2;
- 10.1.11 In order to achieve economies of scale and ensure no conflict between multiple contractors, it is preferable for one contractor to undertake the entire works proposed under Stage A. It is therefore proposed to advertise for the physical works contract in 2015/16 for the entire Stage A (as separable portions for each of stages 1, 2 and 3 giving Council the flexibility it needs) between Champion Road and Main Road Stoke. This will allow works to commence on Stage 1, whilst negotiations and agreements are finalised with Stage 2 residents. This fits in with the three year staging as allowed for in the draft 10 year budgets.

Recommendation

THAT Council confirms its intention to upgrade Saxton Creek, to a 1 in 100 year design level, as a two staged project as detailed below:

- ***Stage A: Champion Road to Main Road Stoke;***
- ***Stage B: Main Road Stoke (including the culvert under Main Road Stoke) to the sea;***

AND THAT funding for modelling, consultation, design and consenting for Stage B be brought forward from 2018/19 - 2019/20 to 2015/16 - 2016/17 in the amounts of \$100,000 and \$80,000 respectively, to enable work to be completed that will inform the development of the next LTP with respect to construction of Stage B;

AND THAT Council note that existing consultants, as allowed for by Council's procurement policy, will be used to commence this work;

AND THAT Council approve the advertising of a single physical works tender for all three stages of Stage A such that Stage 1 can be completed in 2015/16, noting that work on the gravel trap will be commencing shortly as part of the TDC culvert contract;

AND THAT Council note that officers will continue to work towards securing agreements with residents of Stage 2 (Stage A) to enable physical works to continue in 2016/17.

- 10.2 Poormans Stream – Several submissions raised the issue of flooding at Poormans Stream opposite the fire station. Some design work just for the culvert on Main Road Stoke is being carried out in 2014/15, which will advise the appropriate solution. However no physical works are planned until upgrading of the full stream occurs, proposed for the period between 2025 and 2031.
- 10.3 Hazards Committee – a submission suggested a committee be established to advise on proposed hazards before granting permission to build in new areas. This is currently achieved through the Nelson Resource Management Plan process.
- 10.4 Requirements to elevate new buildings – submission 38 suggested houses should be raised to cope with flooding. If the new building is situated within a flood path, flood or inundation overlay, or on an identified low lying site within the Nelson Resource Management Plan then it must meet the minimum ground and floor level requirements as set out in Council's Land Development Manual. The Manual is based on the requirements as set out in the New Zealand Building Code (surface water in an event (2% probability of occurring annually) shall not enter buildings). New flood modelling, for example in the Maitai catchment, has recently provided Council with updated information about the flood hazard for this area which is further influencing floor level requirements.

11. Environment (Category 6 of submissions)

- 11.1 Nelson Nature – there has been very significant and enthusiastic support for the Nelson Nature project with only a few submissions concerned about the level of funding. There was a request that Nelson

Nature have clear goals, monitoring and reporting and that it respects tikanga Maori (submissions 433 and 435) – these are all aspects of the project that are being addressed in the planning phase. Some submissions linked Nelson Nature with the Brook Sanctuary but there are no works proposed within Brook Sanctuary as part of Nelson Nature. However aspects of Nelson Nature (specifically the Halo Project) will complement the work of the Brook Sanctuary.

Recommendation

THAT funding for the Nelson Nature project of \$500,000 in 2015/16 rising to \$717,000 in 2018/19 be confirmed.

- 11.1.1 Landfill – Submission 453 from Rasamibe Co Ltd sought relief from costs associated with excavation of contaminated material from building sites and disposal at the landfill. The submitter noted that through the process of identifying HAIL (Hazardous Activities and Industries List) sites many more residents were likely to face these issues. They asked that Council reduce the amount it costs to dump residentially contaminated soils within the landfill.
- 11.1.2 Where HAIL material is shown to be contaminated and is removed from a site, it must be disposed of in an appropriate way at an approved landfill. In the case of York Valley, contaminated material must be tested and comply with the York Valley resource consent. The existing Council landfill policy on the acceptance of HAIL material is that where it complies with the landfill consent requirements it will be accepted at normal landfill charges.
- 11.1.3 Provided the tested material meets the landfill acceptance criteria and is below the National Environment Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil (NES) Recreational levels then the material may be used as topsoil finished surface, capping material (if within 600mm of the surface - any deeper and the landfill acceptance levels only apply) or daily cover.
- 11.1.4 Volumes of HAIL material in excess of 25m³ will require a resource consent under the NES for disturbance and removal. The cost of disposal of excavated contaminated soil to remediate land on a typical residential property could exceed \$50,000. To provide relief Council could accept the material at a reduced charge (\$15 per tonne excluding GST would cover the cost of managing the material at the landfill), noting that any material that does not comply with the NES Recreational Standards will remain the owner's obligation to remediate before disposal to landfill.
- 11.1.5 Most of the soil received at the landfill from HAIL sites is suitable for use as landfill construction material and, based on the tonnages of contaminated soil received over the past year, is likely to all be able to be used as cover material. Therefore implementing the relief measures would not affect available airspace at the landfill.

- 11.1.6 This submission has raised a valid point about more residents needing to deal with HAIL remediation. Officers will also consider the situation of landowners remediating smaller volumes and what relief measures could be provided.

Recommendation

THAT contaminated material from sites classified as being on the Hazardous Activities and Industries List and requiring resource consent for excavation be accepted, once any required remediation has occurred, at a cost of \$15 per tonne.

- 11.2 Woodburners –there were submissions requesting Council to allow clean burning woodfires (submission no 5, 286, 391, 467) and to better enforce existing wood burners that are smoking (submission 19). Council is reviewing the Nelson Air Quality Plan and will consider any changes to wood burner controls as part of that process. Council does enforce rules about excessively smoky chimneys/flues when it is aware of a particular address being a problem. In response to submission 19, burning of plastic, garden waste and wood with a moisture level >25% is banned.
- 11.2.1 Submission 35 suggested subsidies for insulation should be limited to residents in first homes or on low incomes and implementation of a local Warrant of Fitness program to improve damp homes. The eligibility criteria is set by EECA and it is limited to low income residents (along with other requirements), i.e. you must have a Community Services Card to qualify. If landlords meet the criteria they would receive funding and this is not something Council can influence. A number of agencies including Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) are considering residential Warrant of Fitness programmes. It would be prudent for Council to see what is implemented nationally, rather than using resources to develop a parallel system. Targeted gains can be made in the meantime through the Warmer Healthier Homes Nelson Tasman project.
- 11.2.2 It was also suggested that Council used a targeted rate at higher than market interest rates under the Clean Heat Warm Homes scheme. The Clean Heat Warm Homes scheme actually provided a targeted rate that was interest free and Council also waived repayment to homeowners who received a rates rebate to reduce the burden on those on a very low income. We believe the submitter is in fact referring to the interest charge of 6.5% on the Solar Saver scheme. This is an interest rate fixed and set for the 10 year period.
- 11.3 Nelson 2060 – is Nelson’s sustainability strategy for the next 50 years. The strategy acknowledges we all need to work together in a different way to create a future we all want. Contributions towards Nelson 2060 include: biodiversity incentives; Project Maitai/Mahitahi; walking and cycling initiatives, environmental education, state of the environment monitoring and reporting requirements.

- 11.4 Climate change – there were a number of submissions urging Council to do more to prepare for and combat climate change. There are a number of initiatives Council already has underway, such as its active transport projects, that address these issues but clearly the range of work needs to be better communicated. Progress on Nelson Airport’s solar farm is an example of a project which could also be communicated.
- 11.4.1 Brook Sanctuary – Various submitters raised the matter of the felling of trees to erect the predator fence at the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary. A question from the hearings is related to the number of trees that came down to make way for the fence. The Sanctuary Trust provided excerpts from its Resource Consent to demonstrate that all work was compliant with the consent (see Attachment 8). However, Council should appreciate the construction of the fence is a regulatory matter, and not for commentary at deliberations.
- 11.5 Following a condition assessment of the Old Railway Iron Bridge (which is in the area leased by the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary Trust), provision of \$53,000 was made in 2014/15 to address the deck replacement, which was deemed to be required. This deck renewal was also to look at the potential to cater for more recreational users, but the main criteria was to renew the bridge deck. However further structural assessment found that the bridge was safe for a maximum of two people and that the bridge deck did not require replacement (the bridge is appropriately signed). During the assessment, some minor maintenance work was identified and this work will be undertaken in October 2015 (to fit around the upland bully mating season).
- 11.5.1 The lease signed between the Trust and Council makes no commitment by Council to the Trust to repair, replace or maintain any structure in the leased area (this bridge included).
- 11.5.2 The Trust has indicated its desire for the bridge to be able to carry more people to reflect the potential increase in number of users that could visit the Sanctuary on completion of the fence. Officers suggest that now the bridge is deemed safe it would be appropriate to ascertain the usage and need for the bridge to carry more people before expending funding on increasing the carrying capacity. The budget provision was to address the bridge deck which is no longer required.
- 11.5.3 The Trust has requested that the unspent money be carried over to 2015/16 and be considered as part of other works, including going towards a new bridge the Trust is planning to build. This is for Council to determine.

Recommendation

THAT funding not be allocated at this time for an upgrade to the Old Railway Iron Bridge;

AND THAT health and safety requirements be addressed through appropriate signage limiting numbers on the bridge at any one time.

- 11.6 Submissions Nos 467 and 466 (Olorenshaw and Hall) resulted in a variety of queries. A query was raised on the monitoring of PM levels. Council is currently monitoring PM 2.5 levels in Airshed A. Mr Olorenshaw has asked about establishing a better understanding of distances travelled for school commuting. It is agreed this would be useful data however this could be difficult to undertake. Officers are interested in working with Youth Council and possibly the Ministry of Education, to establish regular statistical collection on this in the future. In response to whether Council has a sea level strategy, this will be considered as part of the Nelson Plan review (Coastal Area). There was a question about current impediments to 2nd dwellings on the same title. The Plan permits a second dwelling as long as it meets minimum site area/coverage requirements for the zone.
- 11.7 Freedom Camping: Concerns were raised by submitters, with questions arising from oral submissions, about freedom camping including that freedom campers should be using campsites. Council had a bylaw in place that covered freedom camping prior to the introduction of the Freedom Camping Act in 2011. The Act's starting point is that freedom camping is allowed unless there are reasons for it not to be, and councils are required to have areas where this is enabled.
- 11.7.1 While a bylaw could be developed, there would have to be reasons to justify this above and beyond stipulations in the Act designed to prevent impact on the environment/community. Under the Nelson Resource Management Plan, the central business district is not an area where freedom camping is excluded, and it is considered that this is an appropriate place for the activity to take place. It encourages freedom camping to occur where there is less disruption likely to residents, and also has a benefit to inner city safety by having people in the area at night. In 2013, Council decided not to introduce a new bylaw to manage freedom camping, but instead decided to use the existing suite of statutory, regulatory, operational and public awareness tools to manage the effects of the activity in Nelson.
- 11.8 Local Music: It was asked that local music be used on Council phone lines while waiting for calls to be answered. Officers will undertake to source some local Nelson music via CDs for use on phones.
- 11.9 Waimea/Rutherford Business Association – Submission 194 from the Waimea Road Business Association raised an issue about their cluster of businesses not being considered a business hub in the Heart of Nelson Strategy. The work on business hubs was undertaken in the 2012 Urban Centres Study which contributed to the Heart of Nelson Strategy. This report was a technical report of experts contracted to undertake research by Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council. It is not possible for Council to retrospectively amend this report, which the submitter acknowledged. However the report will

not determine how business hubs are assessed in the Nelson planning process. The Nelson Plan (the combined Resource Management Plan and Regional Policy Statement) will consider a range of information when planning for growth and development.

12. Social (Category 7 of submissions)

- 12.1 Home Insulation – As part of the changes proposed to the Community Assistance Fund Council allocated \$100,000 of the funding released to a partnership with Canterbury Community Trust (CCT) in 2015/16 for home heating. The funding is to assist homeowners to improve insulation and heating. At hearings, the CCT outlined that work underway in 2014/15 is already providing measurable health benefits for recipients of assistance.

Recommendation

THAT an allocation of \$100,000 of partnership funding with the Canterbury Community Trust for home insulation be confirmed for the next three years.

- 12.2 Community Assistance – The proposed cut to the Community Assistance Fund attracted 30 submissions opposing reduction, including a collective submission from Community and Whanau representing its members. The overall thrust of submissions was a request that funding remain at no less than current levels, and that overhead costs are reduced by Council simplifying and improving its administration process. Many of the submissions also suggested they would like to be more involved with setting priorities and outcomes and that the process needed to be a more community-led development approach. The history of the Community Assistance Fund is outlined below.
- 12.2.1 Nelson City Council has been providing assistance to community organisations for many years through a variety of mechanisms such as funding agreements, one-off grants, rates remissions, intermediary loans, and community leases and licences.
- 12.2.2 In 2004 Council developed a Community Assistance Policy to give direction to the future allocation of community assistance. The policy formalised procedures for allocating support to community organisations. It based the allocation of funds on three significant activity areas of recreation and leisure: culture, heritage and arts; social development; and an “other” category. The policy made contracts and one-off grants contestable through a process where applicants competed for a set pool of funds.
- 12.2.3 In 2009 the Community Assistance Policy was reviewed. Changes were made to streamline the assessment and approval process, and to improve accountability. Categories were removed so that applications competed against each other on the basis of the contribution they made to Council’s community outcomes and how well they met other criteria of the policy.

12.2.4 The amount of funding allocated to community groups per year varies. With the removal of fund categories in 2009 there was one overall funding pool instead of separate allocations for the three categories. The budget was not consolidated until 2011/12 when the three budget categories were merged into one. This was to streamline budget reporting as allocations no longer fitted neatly into the three categories.

12.2.5 The amounts in the table below reflect the contestable community assistance grant budget allocated per year from 2009/10 to present.

Table 1: Community assistance contestable grant budget allocations

2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
\$416,374	\$436,284	\$493,302	\$485,300	\$421,949	\$388,700

- In 2011/12 the fund was increased by 10% in the Annual Plan, from \$436,284 to \$485,000;
- In 2011/12 there was an additional grant of \$8,000 for Victory National Forum in addition to the \$485,302 for community assistance grants;
- In 2013/14 there were additional grants allocated through the Annual Plan: \$20,000 for Victory Community Health for a swimming pool upgrade and \$20,000 going to Stoke Bowling Club for storm water replacement;
- In 2014/15 there were additional grants allocated of \$70,000 to Arts Council Nelson and \$15,000 for the Refinery;
- A breakdown of community assistance funding by code/allocation is attached (see Attachment 3).

12.2.6 Some submitters drew comparisons to other councils, but it is difficult to do this with any accuracy. The contestable funding allocated to community grants varies by council. There are various methods of allocating funding and often councils provide additional operating grants or funding agreements over and above contestable funds.

12.2.7 In addition to the contestable community assistance funding pool, Nelson City Council provides funding or has operational budgets allocated within the Social activity for older adults, youth, education and accessibility support. This amount is not calculated into the value of community assistance, but the estimated value is \$250,000.

12.2.8 The table in Attachment 3 outlines a comparison of a selection of councils, however it is important to note the varying funds and amounts. Those listed are generally the contestable fund, not operational grants or other agreements. The amount allocated per head of population is hard to compare because this only considers

contestable community grants, where often councils provide additional support.

- 12.3 Officers have begun a review of the process for allocating Community Assistance, based on Council's guidance that the new approach should include officers working in the community alongside groups, helping to build partnerships and supporting them to look for alternative sources of funding.
 - 12.3.1 Some submitters identified the Biodiversity Forum as a model worth replicating in relation to social issues. This may be an appropriate response, at a different time. Council is not developing a new strategy. Rather, Council has clearly signalled that it wishes to invest more and differently in the community capacity building activity. There is a good networking and information sharing opportunity through Community and Whanau meetings.
 - 12.3.2 One suggestion from submitters at the hearings is to limit applications to the Fund to social projects and not to include environment, arts, heritage, events or sports projects in its coverage. This would mean more of the funding pool is available to community groups providing social services. This suggestion has merit, although Council would need to understand that the social development activity can be difficult to 'shoe horn'. An example would be that supporting sports groups with uniform costs should not be the norm from this fund; but that you can support community capacity building through sports activities in some communities, eg boxing in Victory. Understanding the outcomes sought is very much part of Council's reasoning for having greater officer involvement.
 - 12.3.3 Another frequent suggestion was to retain some capacity for small grants through a contestable fund, perhaps operated along the lines of COGS (Community Organisation Grants Scheme). Understanding the whole of the community funding picture would have great value. It is recommended that Council start by involving other key funding partners in discussions around strategic outcomes and how to cooperate to achieve the greatest impact. This could include the Nelson Marlborough District Health Board, the Canterbury Community Trust, the Ministry of Social Development, the Department of Internal Affairs and Tasman District Council. This discussion should not be limited to any grant type/size in the first instance.
 - 12.3.4 Submissions also suggested there would continue to be a need for some level of contestable fund to provide for small grants that are relied upon by some groups, for example Community Art Works and Neighbourhood Support both receive \$10,000 and the Nelson Tasman Housing Trust emergency housing and bond bank work receives \$8,200. The Canterbury Community Trust submission supported this when it recommended not cutting funding without a transition plan to support the groups that were most reliant on Council support. Officers have assessed the existing grants and believe an amount of \$50,000 would meet this need.

- 12.3.5 It should be noted that the following amounts are already committed to existing contracts and will be in addition to the annual allocation decided by Council.

2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
\$150,930	\$92,690	\$42,130

Recommendation

THAT an annual allocation of \$150,000 be approved in the Long Term Plan 2015-25 for Community Assistance, noting the need to transition to that level over the first three years of the Plan in order to meet existing commitments to ongoing agreements;

AND THAT officers meet with representatives of other funding agencies (including Nelson Marlborough District Health Board, Canterbury Community Trust, Ministry of Social Development, Department of Internal Affairs and Tasman District Council) to understand strategic outcomes for community funding in Nelson;

AND THAT of the \$150,000 allocation a maximum sum of \$50,000 be set aside for a contestable grants fund for small-scale projects.

- 12.4 An associated issue is raised in submission 359 from the Nelson City Brass band which has received funding from Community Assistance in the past - most recently a \$15,000 contract which required performances at some civic events. The proposed changes to the Fund may mean the band does not receive funding. It is recognised that the band makes a useful contribution at civic events, and it is recommended that officers have discussions with the band and agree a level of funding within the community support activity. This is broadly in alignment with the 'officers understanding community need' approach.
- 12.5 Arts Festival – the majority of submissions were in agreement with the idea of an independent governance structure being established for the Nelson Arts Festival. Submissions felt such an arrangement would have benefits for artistic control and fundraising.

Recommendation

THAT an independent governance structure be established for the Nelson Arts Festival with transfer of operations to occur in time for the new entity to be responsible for the 2017 Arts Festival.

- 12.6 There was, however, much less support for the idea of alternating every second year with a local festival. There was concern that lack of an annual offering would undermine the brand and questions were raised about the demand for local content. The suggestion made in submissions that decisions about festival frequency and content should be left to the new entity once it is established seems a sound one.

Recommendation

THAT the issue of frequency of the Nelson Arts Festival be left for the new independent governance structure to determine.

- 12.6.1 Some submissions felt the Masked Parade and Opera in the Park should be managed by the new entity rather than Council. There is a good argument that the Festival, Masked Parade and the Readers and Writers Week should all be managed together. They are part of a shared programme and can share infrastructure and operational requirements with resulting cost savings. Opera in the Park, however, does not necessarily belong in this cluster. There are advantages to Council in having a strong Nelson City Council brand for the event and a control over programming and costs. Opera could be retained by Council, although this would not prevent contracting out its management.

Recommendation

THAT the Masked Parade and Readers and Writers Week be transferred with the Nelson Arts Festival to an independent governance structure.

- 12.6.2 Council needs to indicate what level of budget will be provided to the new independent governance structure to assist with delivery of the Nelson Arts Festival, Masked Parade and Readers and Writers Week. The proposal in the Consultation Document was for funding to continue at current levels and to be reviewed after the Trust is established. Given that the Trust will only take over full operations in time for the 2017 Festival it would seem reasonable to maintain the funding currently in the 10 year budget and to reassess at the next Long Term Plan.

Recommendation

THAT the allocation in the draft 10 year budget for the Nelson Arts Festival, Masked Parade and Readers and Writers week be confirmed at current levels.

- 12.7 Events – A number of submissions requested funding for events. These are a mix of community events and those with wider economic benefit potential.

- 12.7.1 Funding for events is an issue that Council discussed in Long Term Plan workshops, particularly in relation to the review of the Events Fund criteria. One of the suggestions arising from that review was to look at different types of events (community, sports tournaments, “national growth” potential etc) and also at the different lifecycle stages of events when determining funding allocation. There is more work to be done in this area once the Economic Development Services review is complete.
- 12.7.2 There was a consistent request from groups and individuals involved in the LTP pre-consultation for Council to develop an Events Strategy and to look again at how the Events Fund operates in light of that strategic thinking. There was also interest in tackling wider issues such as event coordination, venues management, marketing, ticketing etc. Council could commission a piece of work to develop an Events and Venues Strategy that would more clearly articulate desired outcomes and better align current activities and resourcing. For this work to fit with planning timelines it would need to be available for Council consideration by November 2015.
- 12.7.3 For these events which have requested financial support from Council it would be difficult to allocate funding at this stage in a manner that does not disadvantage other events that may have hoped to apply via Community Assistance or the Events Fund. Given the strategic work needed on events and the economic development services review underway, Council could consider relaxing the criteria for the Events Fund for one year only. Funding requests could be considered through that process. The Events Fund could be asked to use its available 2015/16 budget, after existing and expected applications are accounted for, to support these events as appropriate based on community attendance, support from other partners, track record, economic impact, development potential.

Recommendation

THAT for the 2015/16 year only, the Events Fund criteria be relaxed to allow support to be given to community events and that organisers be encouraged to direct applications to that process.

- 12.7.4 If this recommendation is adopted, submissions seeking event support (namely the Kite Festival, Jazz and Blues Festival, the Fringe Festival, the Adam Chamber Music Festival) could be referred to this fund.
- 12.8 Light Nelson – Council’s Consultation Document made a specific proposal on this event and so it needs consideration through the Long Term Plan process. Submissions support the proposed funding level of \$150,000 for an event every second year. Light Nelson has proved hugely popular with the Nelson community and has potential to grow into an iconic event. It is now at the point of needing significant support to put the organisation on a more professional footing. Discussions have been on the basis that Council support would be to provide base funding for the event and this would be partnered by

private sponsorship for individual light installations. Given its potential for growth and providing an off-season focus for the city it is appropriate that funding come from the Events Fund pool.

- 12.8.1 At the hearings there was also discussion about whether there might be a Council property that could serve as a permanent workshop space for Light Nelson. Subsequent discussions reveal that workshop space is not needed at this time, as it would raise additional issues.

Recommendation

THAT the funding for Light Nelson of \$150,000 over each two year period for base/partnership funding be confirmed, noting that this will be funded from the Events Fund budget.

- 12.9 Submission 199 from Showcase Nelson invites further discussion on a partnership to promote events in Nelson. Some of the areas to be further explored would be what research is needed (and whether Council can provide any existing research that would be helpful) and how particular events might fit with Events Fund criteria.

- 12.10 At this stage all that is sought is a possible contribution from Council to market research. It is understood there are other (possibly four) investors who would assist with funding this. In keeping with Council's partnership approach it would be appropriate to offer this on a match funding basis - the Special Economic Fund could be used to contribute an amount up to \$10,000

Recommendation

THAT up to \$10,000 from the Special Economic Fund be made available as match funding to Showcase Nelson for market research.

- 12.11 Te Matatini 2025 – the Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka a Maui Maori Culture Council (submission 449) requested funding from Council for the Te Matatini Kapa Haka competition to assist Nelson in attracting the event in 2025. The Te Matatini Festival involves over 1,600 elite Kapa Haka performers and attracts audiences of more than 50,000 over its four day duration. The host must demonstrate, two years in advance, that it has \$350,000. It is this sum that the organisers are seeking a contribution to.

- 12.11.1 This is a significant hosting opportunity for Nelson and the size of the event brings economic benefits not just for this city but for the Top of the South. As funding is not required for some years it would be appropriate for Council to note its support for the event and to hold discussions with the organisers about fundraising and levels of support needed. Officers will seek an economic impact report, hopefully available from a recent festival, to inform Council's consideration of future funding. The organising committee will be encouraged to submit their funding request to the next Long Term Plan.

- 12.11.2 The submitter mentioned Saxton Field as the preferred venue although Trafalgar Park could also be considered as it will bring visitors to the heart of Nelson. The Trafalgar Centre would provide an indoor option as well as a support base for catering etc. However the logistics of traffic and parking at Trafalgar Park would need to be worked through.

Recommendation

THAT Council endorse the bid by Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka a Maui Maori Culture Council to host the Te Matatini Kapa Haka Competitions in 2025 and to consider an appropriate level of support during development of the Long Term Plan 2018-2028.

- 12.12 Arts Funding – submissions supported funding for Arts Council Nelson (ACN) to keep the Refinery open, and for its continued development as a community art space. There was some concern about the decrease in funding for the Public Art Fund but also support for encouraging match funding. ACN requested additional funding (amount not specified) to top up Creative Communities Funding. This is an option but it might be better to focus on making the new process of commissioning public art via an ACN-managed process a success before investing in other arts promotion funding. The Creative Communities Fund is also a central government initiative and Council may wish to invest any new funding for the arts in processes that have a more local brand.

Recommendation

THAT Arts Council Nelson be allocated \$30,000 in each of 2015/16 and 2016/17 to develop the Refinery as a community art space.

- 12.13 Nelson Marlborough Rescue Helicopter Trust (submission 268) – This is a request for permanent ongoing funding from Council. An amount is not specified but the Trust has received \$18,500 p.a. for the last four years through community assistance (\$74,000 in total from 2011/12 – 2014/15). The main purpose of the contract was to support the Trust to meet regulatory compliance.
- 12.13.1 From inquiring with other councils it appears that generally helicopter trusts do not receive line funding from local authorities although there are exceptions (Auckland Council allocated \$450,000 in 2014/15 through its Regional Amenities Funding Board). Most such trusts have service agreements, primarily with the Accident Compensation Corporation, but also Police Search and Rescue, Maritime New Zealand and District Health Boards who contract for rescues or patient transport. There are also some major community sponsors including Lions, NZ Community Trust and Pub Charities.

- 12.13.2 As this is a regional service officers checked contributions from other top of the south councils. Marlborough District Council provides an annual operational grant of \$10,000 and Tasman District Council provided \$2468.75 in 2014/15 which was a community grant for specific equipment.
- 12.13.3 This service is not sufficiently central to Council business to justify permanent line funding. However it may be appropriate to continue to provide community grants for particular projects that can be prioritised against other calls on the Fund. This is an organisation that has had limited funding from neighbouring councils. If Tasman and Marlborough were to continue funding, perhaps Nelson could also. Officers could hold discussions with those authorities and encourage an application to the remaining, small grants fund.
- 12.14 Nightingale Library Memorial – The Guardians of the Nightingale Library (submission 208) have requested Council make funds available for refurbishing and extending the library. The cost to complete the renovation as scoped in 2014 is \$278,000. The Nightingale bequest stands at \$140k so significant additional funding would be needed.
- 12.15 It is difficult to justify additional ratepayer funding for this project as a library project in light of continued low usage figures and the higher needs (and demand for) other library services such as in Stoke. It should also be noted that while the \$278,000 includes fitting out the new spaces (ie carpet, lighting etc) it does not include the extra library equipment that would be needed such as a new counter, extra shelving, furniture, stock. This could add \$30,000 to the costs of the refurbishment. A substantial refurbishment is also likely to raise expectations amongst current users for better services particularly increased opening hours. However earlier analysis of the future of the library undertaken for the Nelson Public Libraries Strategic Plan suggested the challenge in growing library usage in that location was that much of the Tahunanui library demand was met during trips to Stoke for shopping or by patrons who worked in town and used the Elma Turner library.
- 12.16 If the library were to be considered to have the wider purpose of a community house or hub then further investment might be worthwhile to develop those community spaces. However it would be preferable to engage the local community in a conversation about such an option and whether developing the library in this way would be in line with community aspirations for Tahunanui.

Recommendation

THAT provision be made within the 10 year budget for an additional \$138,000 of funding for refurbishment of the Nightingale Library Memorial and development as a community hub, should engagement with the Tahunanui community confirm this as a preferred location.

- 12.17 Isel and Melrose Heritage Houses – the submission from Melrose House Society (233) encourages Council to continue supporting the house. Council is responsible for the exterior of the house including paint and general maintenance. There are sums of between \$3,000 and \$9,000 per year available for maintenance and a larger sum of \$90,000 in 2015/16 and 2016/17 most of which is for painting of the exterior (identified as necessary in the last condition report).
- 12.17.1 There is a detailed submission (288) from the Isel House Charitable Trust, requesting a \$15,000 grant to complete repointing, a \$19,000 grant for a conservation and a tourism development report and that the house be developed as a significant heritage destination. It also requests Isel House be realigned within the Council structure to sit with other heritage assets such as Broadgreen House, a matter that has been referred to the Chief Executive for consideration.
- 12.17.2 The budget line for building work for Isel House sits within the Community Property Asset Management Plan. There appears to be an increase in the cost of work completed by Nelmac, meaning that there are insufficient funds for completion of the brink repointing. It is important to complete the repointing work and it would seem reasonable to supplement the annual maintenance budget with this one-off additional amount. With respect to a Conservation Plan and Tourism Development Report it would be useful for Council to have a combined plan to manage heritage park areas with heritage facilities within in them rather than an plan isolating parks from facilities, and from other parks. Similarly a combined tourism development plan that covered all Council heritage facilities within the Heritage AMP would assist in developing business plans for each heritage house, and how they could be marketed collectively yet retain individual characters.
- 12.17.3 The submission drew parallels to Olveston in Dunedin as a model for Isel House. Olveston receives 25,000 visitors a year and only requires \$26,000 of its \$600,000 annual operational budget from council. It is run under a business model and is assisted by the 75 cruise ships a year which visit Dunedin and help to position it on the international tourist circuit. So while that model might be difficult to replicate certainly exploiting the unique character of each heritage house to create revenue is important to help offset ongoing costs.
- 12.17.4 The question of conservation plans was raised. A conservation plan exists for the house, but not for gardens. Officers consider that the garden and the house need to be considered as one entity in order to attract visitors, and also as planning for one aspect impacts upon the other.
- 12.17.5 For the year to December 2014 Isel House had visitor numbers of 2345. Adaptive reuse is an approach that has worked well elsewhere to increase visitors, and is supported by Heritage New Zealand as a way of sustainably managing historic heritage. The Heritage Activity Management Plan discussed the need for Isel, and other Heritage Houses, to have a business plan which included adaptive reuse so that use of the building was a primary goal. This would provide better

outcomes for the cost of maintaining the asset. To achieve this, it is likely that funding will need to initially be invested. There is \$3000 in the 10 year budget per Heritage House to undertake planning for future use of the buildings. This will be an opportunity to further the discussion between Council and the Isele House Charitable Trust on the points in the submission.

Recommendation

THAT \$15,000 be allocated in 2015/16 to complete repointing of Isele House;

AND THAT the other funding requests from the Isele House Charitable Trust be considered and discussed as part of the process of developing business plans as provided for in the draft Heritage Activity Management Plan.

- 12.18 Kodak sites: During oral submissions, and included in a written submission (No 484), there was a suggestion of Kodak Sites being located around the city. These are markers/signs showing visitors where good photographic positions are located. Council has a low sign policy as part of the Nelson Resource Management Plan to limit visual clutter in the environment. There are tourist wayfaring signs in place, and this is considered to be sufficient as choosing the position of sites would be a very subjective decision.
- 12.19 Live Nelson: The above submitter also raised an objection to "Live Nelson", prompting a query about the cost of this service. The budget for Live Nelson in the 14/15 Financial Year was \$115,000. This was inclusive of print and digital production. It is proposed that the budget is reduced in future.
- 12.20 Youth and Community Trust: Officers were asked to advise of the relationship between Council and the Youth and Community Trust. A Councillor (currently Cr Acland) is a representative on the Board of the Trust. From 2008, the Trust has received a \$100,000 contract which, for the first three years, covered building costs including heating. Once the Trust moved from its New Street address the contract has continued and now covers salaries and funding for recreational programmes. The Trust also currently receives two community assistance grants: one for mentoring of 18-20 year olds, and one for provision of emergency housing for youth.
- 12.21 Albion Square: Officers were asked for an update on Albion Square in relation to Heritage Nelson. Heritage Nelson wish for a management plan to be formulated for Albion Square and want Council to lead this. Albion Square is not Council owned land but is owned by Department of Conservation (DOC). DOC may not be averse to Council taking ownership of this land, but as this is a place of national significance it is appropriate that it remains as a central government asset. Council has offered to collaborate with DOC in the preparation of a management plan, by way of financial contribution and staff resource but DOC has not been able to allocate resource to this project so far.

- 12.22 Stoke Library - One submitter found Stoke Library to be small, cramped and difficult to access for caregivers with small children. Stoke library had a refurbishment in 2012 which created more space than it had previously. But it is fair to say that it is constrained by being a small library (hence the planned extension).
- 12.23 Smokefree Policy: A question was asked as to what is our current policy in relation to smoking and what restrictions can Council enforce. Currently there is no smokefree policy in place. Council passed a resolution in January 2009 supporting "in principle" a proposal by the Nelson Marlborough District Health Board (NMDHB) to make sports grounds and playgrounds smoke free. NMDHB agreed to provide funding for installing signs in playgrounds, but this funding was not forthcoming. When signs are due for replacement in playgrounds and sports grounds, smoke free signs are being installed and most now have these.
- 12.23.1 A policy on smoking in specified public places could be developed, but this would involve voluntary compliance and education for example through signage. The only way to enforce what would be a "ban" would be through a bylaw. Enforcing a bylaw over many open parks would be difficult and expensive to carry out, and may also contradict the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act. Active enforcement is necessary for a bylaw to be effective.
- 12.24 Museum Storage: A question was asked about why the previous Long Term Plan had improved collection space and the current proposal does not. Officers advise that the Museum conducted a Strategic Review which has identified that simply increasing storage space does not address the key issues facing the Museum. The Isel location is not now the Trust's preferred development location and the Trust needs to consider over the next 12 months what it's physical development needs really are.
- 12.25 Housing Strategy: Following the presentation from the Nelson Tasman Housing Trust (No 220), questions were asked about Council's housing strategy and the administration of the EECA Clean Heat Warm Homes programme. Council does not have an overall Housing Strategy as a previous Council decision decided to include work on housing within the Social Wellbeing Policy. Work in the area of housing is done across business units, and has included desktop research on matters such as affordability, current research by Otago University students on housing preferences, and work being progressed on the Housing Accord. The housing work will come together more cohesively as part of the Nelson Plan. Officer advice on the administration of the programme is that there is limited administration work involved at this stage to hand to the Trust, but if other opportunities were to arise where outsourcing officers' time was appropriate, this could be considered.

13. Parks and Active Recreation (Category 8 of submissions)

- 13.1 Greenmeadows Facility – submissions generally supported development of the new facility and were interested in continued engagement with current and potential users.

Recommendation

THAT funding of \$5.6 million in 2015/16 and 2016/17 of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 for a new facility at Greenmeadows reserve be confirmed.

- 13.2 Rutherford Park development – a number of submissions have questioned the cost and appropriateness of the proposed play space in this location. It should be noted that only half of the proposed \$614,000 of funding is additional, while half is transferred from existing budgets for new playgrounds. It is also planned to seek partners to provide additional funding to make this an innovative playground appropriate to the Council’s vision for Rutherford Park.
- 13.2.1 There were also concerns about groups occupying buildings in Rutherford Park. The public consultation process that was undertaken prior to the adoption of the Rutherford and Trafalgar Parks Reserve Management Plan in 2010 identified Rutherford Park as a valuable reserve close to the central business district and surrounding the Trafalgar Centre, available as an open public events space not restricted by community buildings. No provision for the Highland Pipe Band is included in the Development Plan but discussions are ongoing about alternative accommodation for the Band.
- 13.2.2 It is proposed that Community Art Works and the Smallbore Rifle Club remain at the Park in the meantime as they too look for alternative accommodation. The Rutherford and Trafalgar Parks Development Plan provides for the removal of these two buildings to create areas of outdoor event space adjacent to the Trafalgar Centre and close to the central business district and an open attractive park environment. It is proposed that the buildings remain in the short term with the road rerouted around them. This will move the road closer to the walkway for a stretch of approximately 30 meters. Representatives of the Nelson branch of the Institute of Landscape Architects have suggested that this could be mitigated by modifying the road at this point to a “shared transition space” involving paving on a widened road area. This has a rough order of costs estimate of \$150,000 additional funding.
- 13.3 The Rutherford Kindergarten submitted a request that consideration be given to its being located in Rutherford Park. One of the policies for Rutherford Park in the Rutherford and Trafalgar Parks Reserves Management Plan states that new leases will be avoided and will only be agreed where there is a strong benefit to broad public use. Although this is something that could be considered at the time the

Plan is revised, it is unlikely that this would be considered to be an appropriate use of public amenity land.

Recommendation

THAT funding of \$614,000 in 2016/17 of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 for a play space in Rutherford Park be confirmed.

- 13.4 Petanque – the Nelson Petanque Club (submission 22) has requested permanent premises. This is included in the Rutherford and Trafalgar Parks Development Plan 2013 and is scheduled for development during the proposed works for 2015/16.
- 13.5 Marina – there has been significant opposition to the proposed increase in fees from marina users. There were suggestions that administration costs could be reduced to make the marina cheaper to operate. The issues of the unused office and impounded boats were also raised.
- 13.5.1 A decision on use of the 'old marina office' will not be made until such time as the Akersten Street development plan has been completed for the entire marina area. As far as the sale of impounded boats goes, one is in the hands of the court registrar as we seek a court order to allow its sale. Council will receive funds from the sale to cover unpaid monies. The other impounded boat is considered unlikely to be seaworthy.
- 13.5.2 Some submitters have said the services/facilities at the marina are not adequate or comparable to other similar marinas. The rubbish from the marina is collected three times per week and recycling is collected weekly. There are two blocks of toilets, one at Vickerman St and one at Akersten St, providing a total of five men's toilets and four women's. There are a total of 9 pay showers split between these two locations (including three disabled). Council has not been made aware of any particular problems beyond regular maintenance requirements.
- 13.5.3 A submitter has queried the process and the tender for managing the marina. The tender for the marina was evaluated in relation to the delivery of services as specified in the tender document, and the contract appointed accordingly.
- 13.5.4 There were also concerns about the build up of silt which was affecting access of boats to the harbour. There is a project spanning two financial years to undertake maintenance dredging in the marina. Council is to manage the depth of the Marina to Port Nelson gazetted depths. Originally dredging was planned to commence in 2014/15 but Port Nelson identified efficiencies (and cost savings) to be gained if the work was delayed until 2015/16 to coincide with dredging it is undertaking.
- 13.5.5 The 4% pa year on year rise is to bring the fees more in line with similar facilities, and will enable the repayment of more debt within the marina account (\$1.9 million over the 10 year period). Even with

this increase fees will be 30% below similar facilities in Year 10. The current balance of Marina debt is \$6.5m which will increase when the hardstand (or any other capital improvement) is incurred (there is \$2.9 million capital expenditure in the marina account over the LTP period).

- 13.5.6 Submitters suggested that the rise in fees might lead to empty berths at the marina, noting there were already some empty berths. The question of empty berths is complicated by the fact there is more demand for some berth lengths than others so there can be demand in some areas and empty berths in others. Some berths are also kept free to accommodate visitors which leads to empty berths in winter when visitor numbers fall. Those berths can't be allocated to permanent berth-holders as they need to be free again in summer.
- 13.5.7 A map showing the actual area of the Marina is attached as Attachment 5. All marina activities including the hardstand are within the ring-fenced marina account.
- 13.5.8 Waikawa and Picton are both 100% full, and Havelock is sitting at around 80% occupancy. Tarakohe increased fees by 50% a year ago and this has resulted in empty berths (14 of 61 are available).

A comparison of costs at Nelson Marina with others is as follows:

	Nelson	Waikawa	Havelock (wooden)	Havelock (concrete)	Picton	Tauranga
10M	\$2852	\$4313	\$3357	\$4590	\$4804	\$5040
12M	\$3385	\$5581	\$4471	\$5508	\$5765	\$5400
14M	\$4186	\$7896	\$5498	\$7038	\$7324	\$7200
18M	\$4986	\$9900	\$5969	\$8509	\$8789	\$10,800
20M	\$5520	n/a	n/a	\$9547	\$9766	\$14,400

- 13.5.9 For short term users, the following figures at Nelson and Waikawa apply:

Nelson		Waikawa	
Vessels under 18m	18-30 per day	Vessels under 12m	24 per day
18 – 20 m	45 per day	12-15 m	30 per day
Over 20 m	4.50 per m per day	15-20 m	50 per day
		Over 20	POA

- 13.5.10 The marina fees at Picton and Havelock have the same fee structure as Waikawa and have not increased in the last 5 years. This model is that the Council rate is per berth by length of boat plus deposit plus a development levy per metre of boat. The development levy is to support capital works.

- 13.5.11 There has been a suggestion to reinstate the NCC Marina committee (Nelmac, Council staff, berth holders). The NCC Marina Committee is referred to in the bylaw to regulate live aboard numbers in conjunction with the Marina supervisor. Officers are not aware of any official agreement between Council and berth holders.
- 13.5.12 Officers were asked for an indication of what the 4% increase in marina fees over the coming ten years would equate to. A table is attached as Attachment 6 which shows the relative costs compared to what they are now for the next ten years.
- 13.5.13 Some submitters were of the view that Council had made a resolution in the 2011/12 Annual Plan to permanently keep marina fee increases at the level of inflation. At the meeting to consider submissions to the 2011/12 Annual Plan Council resolved to link increases to the consumer price index for a single year only:

THAT marina fees for 2011/12 increase by the Consumer Price Index.

- 13.5.14 Another issue raised was the development levy which is payable upfront as a one-off fee of \$160 plus GST per metre of boat. This issue needs further investigation by officers.
- 13.5.15 Given the number of issues raised through submissions it would seem that to fully investigate and resolve concerns, and to give Council the information necessary to make a decision on future marina rates, that a Marina Strategy should be developed as a priority. The rates increase for 2015/16 could be kept at the rate of inflation until the Strategy is complete and has been considered by Council.

Recommendation

THAT Council notes the need for a Marina Strategy to fully address the issues raised by submitters, including the appropriateness of the development levy;

AND THAT the marina fees for 2015/16 be increased by the rate of inflation until such time as a Marina Strategy is developed and consulted on.

- 13.5.16 Submissions supported the inclusion of funding to complete the hardstand in the Long Term Plan.

Recommendation

THAT funding of \$1.54 million for provision of an area for hardstand in 2016/17 be confirmed.

- 13.6 Sea Sports Facility – there was support in submissions for the proposal to allocate funding for a facility to accommodate the growing number

of sea sports clubs operating at the marina. It should be noted that this funding is not within the marina account but in regional facilities.

Recommendation

THAT the allocation of \$578,000 in 2016/17 and 2017/08 for a shared sea sports facility at the marina be confirmed.

- 13.7 Natureland - In the original proposal submitted through the RFP process for Natureland in 2013, Selby/Rutledge (Natureland Wildlife Trust) identified an estimated \$175,000 operating budget annually from Council with an additional \$150,000 capital expenditure investment over two years. After negotiations, the agreement was settled at \$200,000 annual operating budget plus \$200,000 capital expenditure over five years of the agreement. The operating budget allocation for Natureland has been around \$200,000 since 2011/12, which is before the lease with Natureland Wildlife Trust was agreed.
- 13.8 Through the Long Term Plan submission, Natureland Wildlife Trust is now requesting an increased operating budget of \$250,000 per annum plus \$500,000 capital. The Trust noted the state of disrepair the park was in at transfer and that there are outstanding improvements needed that were unexpected when taking over the operation. The perimeter fence for example will cost \$50,000 to replace which is not part of the long term improvement plan, but rather, an inherited maintenance issue. Nelson City Council's capital investment has been leveraged and significant improvements made, however further investment is required to realise the long term development plans.
- 13.9 In comparison, other organisations supported by Council are provided with operational funding to varying degrees; the Brook Wildlife Sanctuary is budgeted to receive \$69,500 from year one of the Long Term Plan; The Suter Art Gallery \$109,866 from year three of the Long Term Plan for maintenance; the Nelson School of Music \$124,726 and Theatre Royal \$135,119 annually for operating costs; and Arts Council Nelson \$70,000.
- 13.10 The current operational allocation in the draft 10 year budget is \$200,000 in 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18, \$150,000 in 2018/19 and \$100,000 per annum thereafter. There is also a capital grant in the draft 10 year budget in years 1 through 3 at \$79,000, \$20,000, and \$20,000 respectively.

Recommendation

THAT the operational allocation provided to support the Natureland Wildlife Trust be confirmed at \$200,000 in 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18, \$150,000 in 2018/19 and \$100,000 per annum thereafter and no additional capital grant beyond existing amounts be allocated.

- 13.11 Kohatu Motorsport Park – this was the project that attracted the most submissions (110 in total). The development costs are expected to be between \$9 and \$25million depending on how extensive. The initial funding request is for \$150,000 spread over the first three years of the LTP.
- 13.11.1 A project such as this would normally go first to the Regional Funding Forum for assessment as to whether it qualifies as a regional project and, if so, what funding split might be appropriate. As this has not happened it would be appropriate to take into account the views of Tasman District Council from its Long Term Plan deliberations, particularly given the facility would be near Tapawera. Officers will provide a verbal update at the meeting on what decisions Tasman District Council has made regarding the motorsport park.
- 13.11.2 An economic impact report for the park is attached (see Attachment 4). The report has not been peer reviewed and when asked on this point, the submitter did not believe it necessary to have a peer review of their report at this stage.
- 13.12 Surf Lifesaving Clubrooms – submissions 14 and 407 support building of a new surf lifesaving clubrooms at Tahuna beach. This is an issue that has been raised in previous Long Term and Annual Plans but the request for a dune location has been problematic. The Tahuna Beach Reserve Management Plan states that there should be no permanent structures in the Coastal Management Area and that there should be a proven future demand for any facility. There would be a need to also address resource management issues through a consent process.

Recommendation

THAT Council note that if it chooses to make a decision that is significantly inconsistent with the Reserve Management Plan it would need, in keeping with section 80 of the Local Government Act 2002, to clearly identify the inconsistency, the reasons for it and any intention to consequently amend the policy or plan;

AND THAT the Surf Lifesaving Club be advised that a new clubrooms on the dunes at Tahuna Beach is not in keeping with Council policy for the reserve and not supported.

- 13.13 Gondola – the consultation document noted Council’s support in principle of the project. There were a mix of views expressed in submissions. There is no decision to be made for the Long Term Plan at this stage. The Nelson Cycle Lift Society proposal for a gondola has been fed into the draft Reserve Management Plan for the Brook Reserve. The draft Plan will be considered by Council next month, and this will include consideration of the desirability or otherwise of a Gondola (or any other tourist infrastructure in the locality).

- 13.14 Saxton Lift – A question was raised at hearings (submission 462) about the Saxton Lift, which has never worked properly, and why a refund had not been sought from the manufacturer. Design, fundraising and construction of the stadium was managed by the Saxton Stadium Society not Council. It is understood that for cost saving reasons a cheaper lift was installed. Because the lift was purchased from China, and is out of warranty, it now cannot be serviced.
- 13.15 Artificial Turf: Sports Tasman raised the issue of funding for an artificial turf either at a sportsground or as a collaborative project on school grounds. This suggestion has arisen before but officer advice continues to be that Nelson has adequate sports grounds to meet current needs. Weather conditions in Nelson over winter are favourable and prolonged ground closures rare. In future an artificial ground in the central city, possibly in collaboration with a school, and one at Saxton Field may be required but officers believe they are a low priority at this time.
- 13.16 Marsden Valley Logging Debris: A question was raised about forestry debris in Marsden Valley and its potential impact on flooding. Officers advise that there are two main problems: the debris forms a “birds nest” in gullies on the cleared land, dams the storm flows and lets go when the flows pond enough water behind it; and debris gets into the stream channel and blocks culverts and bridges.
- 13.16.1 Some of the problems during flooding in 2013 were directly attributed to forestry debris blocking culverts.
- 13.16.2 For the first matter, the rules in the Nelson Resource Management Plan are not sufficient to prevent these debris dams. The standard in the Plan on this is: RUr.25.1 c) no vegetative debris is positioned where it may dam or divert any river or stream or adversely affect instream habitats.
- 13.16.3 Council relies heavily on a proactive clearing routine for larger culvert intakes on the streams and rivers we look after. Council is also upgrading some of the most blockage prone intakes to make them bigger and add trash racks to keep the debris from blocking intakes.
- 13.17 Tahuna sports facilities - the Sport Tasman presentation at the hearings (submission no. 272) referenced a proposal for a Sportsville-type shared facility at Tahuna that was in the 2012 Annual Plan but since removed. It seems that the reference was to an earlier proposal by Surf Lifesaving which catered for rugby, touch and general users of the reserve. It was proposed to be located where the existing changing rooms are and take their place. No funding for the proposal was included in the Annual Plan although discussions continued with Surf Lifesaving on options.
- 13.18 Playground for Tasman Heights – A question was raised at hearings concerning whether there were plans for a playground to be built at Tasman Heights (submission 448). While there are playgrounds in the area that fit within current policy of within 800 m, it is recognised that

a playground in this area would be desirable. A future subdivision in this area would involve a piece of land being contributed as a playground, and officers have had discussions with the developer on this matter. The timing of construction will depend on the rate of subdivision and availability of suitable flat land. Currently the site is too steep for a playground.

- 13.19 Submission from Nelson Football Club (No 367) – Three matters were raised following the submission from the Nelson Football Club: the adequacy of maintenance arrangements at Neale Park; whether there is a plan to upgrade the Victory showers; and requesting an update on the shared clubrooms with the darts club.
- 13.19.1 The Football Clubrooms at Neale Park are in prime condition. It is interpreted that this first part of the query relates to the grounds. The sportsgrounds are built over an old “tip” site and are therefore constantly in need of levelling. While other grounds could potentially be dug over and relaid, this is not possible in this instance as the result would still be an uneven site. Council does proactively manage this however, with levelling regularly taking place.
- 13.19.2 Officers understand that the primary issue with the Football Club and the Darts Club relates to the liquor licence. There are options for an alcohol licence for the clubrooms. In a shared facility, clubs could occupy separate parts of a building and a club licence could then be issued subject to fulfilling application criteria. Second, if the clubs each occupied the space at separate times, the clubs would need to establish a separate society that would hold the licence. It would then need to be established how costs/income would be shared, what rules would be used etc. This information has been supplied to the Football Club.
- 13.19.3 The showers at Victory Park belong to the Cricket Club. Officers understand that they have been recently upgraded.
- 13.20 Sale of Land under Rugby Club Rooms: Submission 443 raised a query on supposed plans to sell land under the rugby clubrooms next to Trafalgar Park.
- 13.20.1 A resolution from the Policy and Planning meeting on 18 July 2013, was that after 2020 the Highland Pipe Band, Marist Club, Nelson Rugby Club and Nelson Rugby Union buildings be renewed on an annual basis only. The resolution did not involve a sale of the land. Renewing the leases only on an annual basis allows the options for the buildings to be removed should Council decide to proceed with developing the area as per the Rutherford and Trafalgar Parks Development Plan.
- 13.21 MOU between Nelson Basketball and Saxton Stadium Trust: (Sub 299) Officers were asked whether Council signed the MOU for gear at Saxton and at Trafalgar Centre. The agreement is between Nelson Basketball and the Saxton Stadium Trust, not with Council.

13.22 Cawthron Park - a number of submitters referred to an area they called "Cawthron Park" and there appeared to be confusion as to its exact location. An area of more than 1000 hectares was gifted to Council in the 1960s by Thomas Cawthron. It is located beyond the Brook catchment in the headwaters of the South Branch of the Maitai River and the Roding River. A map is attached (see Attachment 7).

14. Economic (Category 9 of submissions)

14.1 Lions Tour - Submissions both opposed the bid for a match (mainly on the grounds that the investment wouldn't provide sufficient return) and supported it. There was also a suggestion that Tasman District Council should contribute.

14.2 Council has received support for the Lions bid from the Economic Development Agency and Nelson Tasman Tourism. Economic analysis of the 2005 Lions tour showed significant economic benefit generated by the tour (additional foreign exchange earnings of \$131.0m which flowed through the New Zealand economy and generated a total GDP impact of \$135.2m). At the regional level, the Rugby World Cup Games hosted in Nelson generated regional GDP of \$9.9m.

14.3 Council needs to advise the New Zealand Rugby Union about support for a bid, before its Board meeting on 27 May where a decision about venues will be taken.

Recommendation

THAT the New Zealand Rugby Union be advised that Nelson City Council wishes to continue with its bid for the hosting of a match in the 2017 British and Irish Lions tour under the terms advised in December 2014.

14.4 Waimea Community Dam – submissions contained a mix of opposition and support for the Dam. It was suggested that a Water Care Services Holding Company would be a better structure and while this is certainly a possibility it is a decision for the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee and Tasman District Council. Other issues raised by submissions will be the subject of the resource consent. At this stage there is no decision to be made for the Long Term Plan. The economic impact report is attached (see Attachment 9).

14.5 Nelson Enterprise Trust – the Trust provides loans to businesses in the Nelson region and has been supported by Council through an interest free loan. The Trust has requested (in submission 2) an increase to the existing \$25,000 interest free loan. This is a low-risk way for Council to support businesses and it may be appropriate to increase the loan. At the hearings it was indicated that a doubling of the loan was desirable.

Recommendation

THAT the interest free loan to the Nelson Enterprise Trust be increased from \$25,000 to \$50,000 and extended for a three year period through to July 2018.

- 14.6 Education - Submission 499 from the Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology (NMIT) promotes education and training, and suggests NMIT be considered a strategic partner with Council in the Long Term Plan. The Chief Executive has had discussions with NMIT's Chief Executive; he would like to see Council engage with them and other education providers on how to ensure best value for the education sector from Council's investments, and equally, how to ensure best outcomes for the community from students participating in education in Nelson. There is much happening at NMIT that the wider community could participate in and benefit from, and similarly, Council makes significant investment in infrastructure and activities that may be able to be better targeted for supporting NMIT and other education providers. No funding is required in the first year of the LTP - rather, support is sought for staff time to be allocated for engagement with the education sector. This fits with Council's partnership approach, and is likely to have benefits for all parties.

Recommendation

THAT Council officers engage with the Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology and other education providers to develop a partnership strategy.

- 14.7 Education Nelson Tasman –submission 89 requests \$35,000 in 2015/16 to develop international education business in the region and more funding in the next two years if successful. Members of the group have collectively raised \$27,000 which is less than the amount requested from Council and perhaps not in keeping with the spirit of the partnership approach, although at the hearings, the submitter suggested this had increased to \$30,000. However this is a positive initiative with the potential for economic returns to the city. It would seem appropriate for this project to be funded via the Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency (EDA), which has put forward the request. Officers could progress this through a discussion with the EDA of the support needed and where this might fit within its other funding priorities. If Council needed to provide additional funding support to Education Nelson, it could do this through the special economic initiatives funding.

Recommendation

THAT Council officers enter into discussions with the Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency as to ways of supporting the Education Nelson Tasman initiative.

- 14.8 INSPIRE festival – submission 445 from the Ministry of Inspiration sought Council support for the annual INSPIRE festival held at the NMIT. The festival is currently aimed at local youth development but has aspirations to attract visitors from outside Nelson and to expand its offering to cater to adults. The Ministry of Inspiration also wishes discuss a city-owned venue space for a Science Innovation Exploratorium. Past applications to Community Assistance and the Events Fund have been unsuccessful. The festival requests \$50,000 per annum. This is an event which doesn't quite fit into any of Council's categories, and yet adds to its activities in youth, community, economic, education and tourism sectors. It is suggested that the Chief Executive be tasked to discuss this with NMIT as part of the partnership strategy, and that the Chief Executive consider it within her delegated authority to allocate events funding.
- 14.9 Nelson Airport: There was a submission (No. 442) requesting that Nelson Airport become an international airport. Advice was sought from the Chief Executive Officer at Nelson Airport who noted that Whilst specifically the concept of Trans Tasman flights is not in the next phase of planning, the runway length will be considered for domestic expansion during our Master Plan process. Rotorua Airport, mentioned by the submitter, ceased international flights in April even with several million dollars of council support being made available to ensure their viability. With a combined population under 100,000 and Wellington literally 20 minutes away, there is not a feasible solution for Nelson at this time.

15. Corporate (Category 10 of submissions)

- 15.1 Working with iwi - Submissions 227 and 435 raised issues about Council's relationship with iwi and how that is recognised in the Long Term Plan. Council and iwi at both governance and operational levels are acutely aware of the need to develop a constructive and enduring way to work together. Conversations have begun on how to find a constructive way of working together and those conversations will continue. At an operational level the Nelson Plan Iwi Working Group has enabled Council staff to work through resource management matters with all iwi. One of the issues raised was the need to remunerate for work undertaken and in the case of the Nelson Plan iwi are paid an hourly rate for the work they do. Council staff have offered, and will continue to offer, to work collaboratively with any iwi that are seeking Government funding for particular projects to benefit Nelson.
- 15.2 Stormwater and Flood Protection Rate – the proposed change in this rate generated many opposing submissions. Council's rationale in proposing the change was to ensure that those who have more to protect pay a higher proportion of the rate. It also reflected the fact that under a fixed charge, all ratepayers pay the same amount, irrespective of whether it is a large commercial site with all hard surfaces, or a small residential unit with limited hard surface.

- 15.2.1 Submission 440 suggests that the Council didn't follow advice, principles and policies in proposing this change and did not fully access the alternatives. Council conducted a series of workshops considering rating and Revenue and Financing Policy issues and engaged Thomas Consulting to assist with reviewing these policies, with reference to other rating jurisdictions. The submitters' proposal to use GIS to develop a rating system based on stormwater generation by individual rating units is an interesting one, but would have practical challenges. GIS does not contain this data and it would require a meter at the property to measure the data on runoff.
- 15.2.2 There was also a query on whether Council could assess stormwater rates more accurately as per actual impacts. Again, whilst this may produce the greatest equity, it would be very time consuming work to undertake. The use of the code for stormwater on the rates invoice was questioned including a query on what other councils use. Councils all use their own systems for denoting the stormwater component on a rates invoice. Legal advice previously received by Council is that it should not be directly referring to "stormwater" but it could be timely to revisit this opinion. It is within the power of Council to determine if it wishes to simplify/change the current rating code used.
- 15.2.3 Submission 579 suggested that those who have paid for specific and effective stormwater control in their developments should not be subject to the Stormwater Rate. Current Council policy is that the stormwater rate is payable by all ratepayers other than the rural rating categories and residential properties east of Gentle Annie saddle. The stormwater rate that Council has established is not solely for the provision of stormwater services in any specific street but to meet the cost of stormwater and flood protection to the whole city.
- 15.2.4 The proposal to alter to a variable charge based on capital value also meant that utilities would make a greater contribution to the activity. Further examination shows that aside from Council itself, \$28,000 more would be spread across utilities ratepayers.
- 15.2.5 Comments from submitters at the hearings reflected a belief that if Council reverted to the fixed charge per rating unit, the rates increase would be significantly less. Council's investment in stormwater is proposed to increase significantly across the whole of the activity over the 10 years and this has an unavoidable impact on rates, equalling 15% in year one. The tables provided in Attachment 9 show clearly that there will be a significant increase for ratepayers regardless of the charging mechanism chosen. The reasons behind this increase will need to be communicated well.

Recommendation

THAT the Stormwater and Flood Protection Rate be split so that 50% is a fixed charge per rating unit and 50% a variable charge based on the capital value of the rating unit.

OR

THAT the Stormwater and Flood Protection Rate is a fixed charge per rating unit.

- 15.3 Annual Water charge: a number of submissions were concerned about the way in which water connection charges are proposed to be billed. There were concerns from two body corporates (with only one water meter servicing the complex) who believed that they would end up paying more than one annual charge under the new invoicing system. This is not the case; staff have spoken to these submitters after the hearings to clarify this.
- 15.3.1 The proposal to move the annual water charge is based on legal advice that if an amount is known at the start of a rating year it should be on the rates assessment.

Recommendation

THAT the annual charge for a water connection be shown as an annual charge on the rates assessment.

- 15.4 Waste water rates remission – submission 275 requested a remission of waste water charges for all but one unit at 6 Rotherham Street. The storage units at 6 Rotherham Street are on unit titles and therefore each unit is a rating unit under the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act and they therefore receive a separate rates account. Each rating unit has access to a shower and toilet facility and therefore under Council's current rating policy each rating unit pays a commercial waste water charge. The commercial waste water charge was reduced as from 1 July 2014 to \$101.50 from the 2013/14 rating year charge of \$374.90 as a result of Council reviewing waste water charges for commercial properties with multiple charges. Officers have approached the submitter to discuss the matter, and he accepts the limitations within the rating system. An alternative would be for Council to introduce a pan charge – an option which it has previously discussed and rejected.
- 15.5 Water charges in Nelson South - The Consultation Document included the proposal to change how residents in Nelson South, near the boundary with Tasman District Council, are charged for water. The changes include Nelson City Council purchasing water in bulk from Tasman District Council and then supplying and charging these residents on the same basis as all other Nelson residents. One submission (279) commented on this matter and was in support. The Council has already delegated authority to the Chief Executive to finalise, with Tasman District Council, an Engineering Services agreement that includes this change. This document is ready for signing.

Recommendation

THAT Council agree to purchase water in bulk from Tasman District Council and charge Nelson South residents for water used noting that the Chief Executive will sign the Engineering Services Agreement with Tasman District Council as previously delegated.

- 15.6 Rates due date - The consultation document proposed moving rates instalments dates from the 27th day of August, November, February and May to the 20th of those months (or next business day) in line with generally accepted business practice and to assist Councils cashflow. Given that Council does not penalise ratepayers will put a payment plan in place and offer the facility to spread rates using direct debits, the proposal is still valid.

Recommendation

THAT Council resolve to move the rates instalment dates from 27th August, November, February and May to 20th August, November, February and May (or the next business day) from the 2015/16 rating year.

- 15.7 Rating of home-based businesses – Submission 342 was concerned about inconsistency in how home based businesses are rated. The submitter runs a B&B and is charged 50% commercial and 50% residential due to the fact they are taking eight paying guests. A nearby property was said to be run as a business but not rated for commercial activity. In fact it is allowable to run a business from a residential property as a home occupation as long as the property is primarily used as a residential property and at least one person lives on the site. Otherwise the owners will need to apply for a resource consent for the non residential activity.
- 15.7.1 Officers confirm the property quoted by the submitter is running a home based business but it is being correctly rated as it is a residential property.
- 15.7.2 Change to the rating basis does not increase or decrease funding in itself. The total rating income does not change. Multipliers in the commercial rate acknowledge the expenditure incurred by Council in supporting the business environment.
- 15.7.3 The Motel Association's submission 325 raised a further question about holiday home rentals which it felt should be rated on a commercial basis. Queenstown is the only Council that officers are aware of that rates holiday houses as commercial. Queenstown has visitor accommodation targeted rates and requires a resource consent to rent out a property. Other councils advise that they have considered rating holiday homes but have not pursued the policy due to the challenges in, and administration costs of, establishing and maintaining an accurate database.

- 15.8 Economic Development Services review: One submitter (no. 464) asked about the process for letting the tender on the Economic Development Services review. Process was a closed call for expressions of interest as allowed for under Council's Procurement Policy. Martin Jenkins was the successful tenderer. A copy of the Terms of Reference is attached (see Attachment 11).
- 15.8.1 The submitter also commented that the Nelson Regional Economic Development Agency (EDA) stood to lose \$191k. The EDA has closing equity of over \$350,000 as of 31 December 2014. The Board has recognised that there is an opportunity to draw down some of those funds to advance additional projects in 2015/16 rather than seeking additional funding from the Councils.
- 15.9 Rental charges for street stalls/food carts: One submitter (no.294) asked for a decrease in rent charged for street stalls/food carts in the CBD. The annual rental charges for 2014/15 were in a range of \$3,079 to \$6,108 (excluding GST). For 2015/2016, with a CPI increase of 0.1%, the annual rental charges range from \$3,544 to \$7,032 (excluding GST). The matter of street stalls was considered recently at the Works and Infrastructure Committee meeting, which resolved that a formal review of the policy should be undertaken.
- 15.10 Wakatu Incorporation: In its submission, Wakatu Incorporation have advised that there is an error in the draft plan stating there is no Maori freehold land in the city. This has been checked with QV and officers advise that the submitter is correct as there are three assessments in the far north of the city.
- 15.11 Rates: in response to a submitter (No 463), a question was raised on seeking a comparison of how commercial rates have changed over time, and how these compare with TDC. It is difficult to make comparisons between the two councils for reasons as follows:

NCC	TDC
Rate on land value	Rate on capital value
Limit use of targeted rates	Use targeted rates for many services
Commercial differentials on the general rate	Have no differentials on any rates
Rates change depending on property use and location	All rates the same per capital dollar
Three commercial levels for rating	No commercial general rate

- 15.11.1 NCC and TDC also have different revaluation dates so comparing properties of a similar value in the rating records would also mean not comparing properties of the same value at the same revaluation date.

16. Resource Consent Fees and Charges

- 16.1 Given submissions were mainly silent on the fees and charges changes it is proposed to adopt them as they stand.

Recommendation

THAT the Resource Consent and Resource Management Act Planning Document Fees and Charges under the Resource Management Act 1991 for 2015-16 be adopted as detailed in Attachment 1 to Report A1317553;

AND THAT the Resource Consent and Resource Management Act Planning Document Fees and Charges apply as from 1 July 2015 until such time as they are varied or amended by Council;

17. Financial Policies (Revenue and Financing Policy, the Funding Impact Statement (Rates) and the Rates Remission Policy)

- 17.1 These policies were consulted on concurrently with the Consultation Document and need to be approved for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2015-25.

Recommendation

THAT the Revenue and Financing Policy, the Funding Impact Statement (Rates) and the Rates Remission Policy be adopted as detailed in Attachments A1323785, A1323806 and A1323787 to Report A1317555.

18. Infrastructure Strategy

- 18.1 The Infrastructure Strategy was released with the Consultation Document as supporting information. The Local Government Act 2002 (Schedule 10, section 9) requires that a long term plan include a local authority's infrastructure strategy. Programmed modelling and analysis work will be used for further development of the Strategy. Council will actively consider potential impact on infrastructure from climate change as part of its asset management plan process and future reviews of the Infrastructure Strategy.

Recommendation

THAT the Infrastructure Strategy be adopted as detailed in Attachment A1250365 to Report A1317555.

19. Financial Strategy

- 19.1 The Financial Strategy, outlining Council's financial strategy for the next 10 years, was released with the Consultation Document as supporting information. The Local Government Act 2002 (Schedule 10, section 9) requires that a long term plan include a local authority's financial strategy.

Recommendation

THAT the Financial Strategy be adopted as detailed in Attachment A1328267 to Report A1317555

20. Other matters

- 20.1 The spreadsheet in Attachment 1(A1353191) covers other issues raised in submissions with suggestions of how to respond.

21. Options

- 21.1 Council is required to adopt a Long Term Plan 2015-25 by 30 June 2015. It has options for each decision it makes in relation to submissions but it needs to determine the 10 year work programme in time for adoption by the end of the current financial year.

22. Alignment with relevant Council Policy

- 22.1 Once the Long Term Plan 2015-25 is adopted there will be a process to align other Council policy, particularly its asset and activity management plans, with the Long Term Plan.

23. Assessment of Significance against the Council's Significance Policy

- 23.1 Adoption of the Long Term Plan 2015-25 is a significant matter and consultation has been carried out in a manner required by Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

24. Consultation

- 24.1 The Consultation Document, the Revenue and Financing Policy, the Funding Impact Statement (rates), the Schedule of Charges (Resource consent fees and charges) and the Rates Remission Policy were all consulted on as required by legislation via a special consultative procedure or consultation under section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

25. Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

- 25.1 A pre-consultation hui with iwi and mata waka was held on 22 September 2014 led by the Mayors of both Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council at which priorities in the two 10 year plans were outlined. Iwi and mata waka were asked about their priority

issues and how they wished to interact with the process. Another opportunity for iwi and mata waka to meet with both Mayors was a meeting to which they were invited on 7 April 2015.

26. Conclusion

- 26.1 It is recommended that Council consider matters raised in submissions and amend the draft 10 year work programme as appropriate.

Nicky McDonald
Senior Strategic Adviser

Attachments

- Attachment 1: Spreadsheet of other matters raised in submissions [A1353191](#)
- Attachment 2: Community Assistance funding breakdown [A1354077](#)
- Attachment 3: Community Assistance – comparison to other councils [A1354078](#)
- Attachment 4: Economic impact assessment – Kohatu Motorsport Park [A1358090](#)
- Attachment 5: Map of marina [A1358177](#)
- Attachment 6: Marina costs [A1351910](#)
- Attachment 7: Map showing the location of Cawthron gifted land in the Brook [A1354997](#)
- Attachment 8: Extracts from Brook Sanctuary Resource Consent [A1358294](#)
- Attachment 9: Waimea Community Dam Economic Impact Report [A1358299](#)
- Attachment 10: Stormwater/Flood Protection Rates Increase [A1358304](#)
- Attachment 11: Economic Development Services review Terms of Reference [A1272431](#)