
MINUTES
of the
FULL COUNCIL
DELIBERATIONS MEETING
held

9.30 am, Monday, 17 May 2021,

9.30 am, Tuesday, 18 May 2021,

9.30 am, Wednesday 19, May 2021 and

9.30 am, Friday 21 May 2021

at

Tasman Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond

- Present:** Mayor T King, Deputy Mayor S Bryant, Councillors C Butler, M Greening (via Zoom), C Hill, B Dowler, K Maling, C Mackenzie, D Ogilvie, T Tuffnell, A Turley, T Walker and D Wensley,
- In Attendance:** Chief Executive (J Dowding), Community Development Manager (S Edwards), Corporate Services Manager (M Drummond), Environment & Planning Manager (D Bush-King), Engineering Services Manager (R Kirby), Chief Information Officer (S Manners), Acting Strategic Policy Manager (J Neame), Executive Assistant to the Mayor (R Scherer), Executive Assistant – Community Development (T Fifield) and Executive Support Officer (G Drummond)
- Part Attendance:** Partner, Simpson Grierson (J Salter), Senior Policy Advisor (B Wayman), Policy Officer (S Hartley), Senior Policy Advisor (A Bywater), Policy Advisor (A Gerraty), Environmental Information Manager (R Smith), Community Relations Manager (C Choat), Graduate Policy Player (J Nguyen), Management Accountant (J Douglas), Finance Manager, M McGlinchey), Principal Legal Adviser (L Clark), Activity Planning Manager (D Fletcher), Senior Activity Planning Adviser (W Woortman), Environment Policy Manager (B Johnson), Community Partnerships Officer (G Alsop), Utilities Manager, (M Schruer), Activity Planning Adviser (D Bryant), Regulatory Manager, (A Humphries), Executive Assistant (C Ewing), Senior Legal Adviser (L Townsend), Senior Policy Planner – Natural Resources (D Worthy), Activity Planning Adviser – Water & Wastewater (H Lane), Executive Assistant (J Halsey), Transportation Planning Officer (C Scott), Activity Planning
-

Advisor – Transportation (D Bryant), Urban Growth Co-ordinator (J Deans), Communications Officer (T O’Connell) and Team Leader - Stormwater & Waste Management (D Stephenson), Property Service Manager (M Johannsen), Transportation Manager (J McPherson), Team Leader – Building Support (C Lynn), Building Assurance Manager (I McCauley), and Communications Officer (D Palmer).

1 OPENING, WELCOME

Mayor King welcomed everyone and outlined the process for the deliberations and set the scene for the meeting. He urged the Councillors to concentrate on making collective decisions that will benefit the District.

The Mayor opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Moved Cr Tuffnell/Cr Turley

SH21-05-7

That apologies for lateness from Councillor Butler be accepted.

CARRIED

3 REPORTS

3.1 Tasman’s 10-Year Plan Deliberations

Acting Strategic Policy Manager, Jenna Neame, introduced the deliberations programme and noted the significant number of submissions received on the Long Term Plan (LTP). She spoke about the short timeframe between the hearings and today’s deliberations meeting. She referred to section 25 in the report regarding the option for Councillors to raise other matters.

Mrs Neame referred to the two supplementary reports that were circulated to the Councillors on Friday, 14 May 2021. She also noted that any questions regarding supplementary report-2 would require the Council to move into a confidential session.

Jonathan Salter from Simpson Grierson provided a powerpoint presentation and advised the Councillors on their approach to decision making and deliberations for the Long Term Plan. Mr Salter noted his long history of working with councils and providing advice on their long term plans. Mr Salter referred to:

- LTP requirements – he noted that the LTP is an accountability blueprint and a key governance obligation for the Council.
- The purpose of a LTP, including integrated decision making, community outcomes, long term focus, a basis for accountability and a description of the activities of the local authority.
- Consultation as an essential input to LTPs, but noted there are several other inputs.
- LTP content is extensive and complex.
- Time pressures to meet all the requirements of the LTP, including audit.

- The Council's obligations required under Section 93B of the Local Government Act (LGA).
- The Council's obligations around planning, decision making and accountability.
- The principles relating to local authorities – Section 14 of the LGA.
- Financial management obligations.
- The principles of consultation.
- Legislative requirements, management advice, compliance, acting prudently and elected member obligations.
- The requirements for elected members to be faithful and impartial in their decision making to avoid predetermination and bias and to adhere to the requirements of the Code of Conduct.

In response to a question, Mr Salter spoke about the LTP consultation document as a statement of intent. He said the point of consultation is for the Council to hear what the community thinks and for the Council to respond to the community. He noted that the proposed statement of intent might change; there is always a possibility that something will come out of the consultation that is similar, but not quite the same as the choices proposed in the consultation document.

Responding to a question, Mr Salter spoke about intervening events that change the landscape from when the Council initially set out its consultation document. He said those events simply become part of the landscape during the development of the LTP and a council is not expected to restart a consultation process because of those events.

Mr Salter also noted that time constraints are an inherent part of any LTP process and the Local Government Act provides councils with the opportunity for decisions to be revisited in the future.

Responding to a question, Mr Salter said that the Waimea Community Dam is a unique project and that target rating for the project is acceptable.

Mr Salter spoke about the consultation process as a means by which people can express their views and preferences. However, he noted that their preferences don't determine the outcome. The Council's role is to find the best way forward, to consider all the options of any proposal and to make a decision on all of the relevant issues.

In response to a question, Mr Salter said that a LTP consultation document needs to be accessible and relatively simple and be able to direct people to supporting information.

Mr Salter was asked about the Council's obligations to act in a prudent manner. In response, Mr Salter said that prudence was about making judgements which are as well informed as they can be, reasonable under the circumstances that apply at the time. He said that prudence was also about managing the financial and legal risks in the best way the Council can ultimately, to ensure that the Council, as a whole, continues to be a "going concern".

The meeting adjourned at 10.35 am and resumed at 10.44 am.

Mrs Neame explained the order of resolutions that would be considered at the meeting. She also referred to two late submissions that had been circulated to the Council and noted that they had not been included in the deliberations report.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Turley

SH21-05-8

That the Full Council:

- 1. receives the Tasman's 10-Year Plan Deliberations RSH21-05-2 report; and**
- 2. notes that the Council has received all the written, verbal and late submissions on Tasman's 10-Year Plan, concurrent consultations, and supporting information.**

CARRIED

Choice 2 – Waimea Community Dam (WCD) allocation of additional irrigator capacity costs (Section 6)

Corporate and Governance Services Manager, Mike Drummond spoke to the report contained in the agenda which was taken as read.

Mr Drummond advised that if the Council wished to discuss Supplementary Report 2, it would require the Council to move into confidential session. Mr Drummond clarified the draft resolution which would mean that the Council would agree to a revised Option A to fund the cost overruns for the Waimea Community Dam.

Deputy Mayor Bryant moved the resolution contained in Supplementary Report 1 – Long Term Plan Deliberations, which was seconded by Cr Mackenzie.

Discussion ensued on the report and the resolution.

Cr Wensley, seconded by Cr McNamara moved an amendment to the resolution that the Council adopt Option D as set out in Choice 2 of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document as being the preferred option to fund the Waimea Community Dam cost overruns.

Mr Drummond noted that the draft amendment will require scrutiny of the resolution for any consequential changes. He also noted that Supplementary Report-2 contains advice around Option D.

Cr Mackenzie noted that she did not support the proposed amendment to the resolution. She said that is the Council's job to make the right decision. She spoke about the benefits of good water augmentation and said that not having a dam would not be better for the District. Cr Mackenzie noted her support for revised Option A in the draft resolution as it currently stands.

Cr Turley asked that the Council consider the advice received from Mr Salter.

It was agreed to move into committee to further discuss the options around funding of the Waimea Community Dam cost overruns.

5.1 Procedural motion to exclude the public

Moved Cr Hill/Cr Maling

SH21-05-9

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by

section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

1 Supplementary Report 2 - Long Term Plan Deliberations – Waimea Community Dam Options

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	<p>s7(2)(g) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)</p> <p>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</p>

CARRIED

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Dowler

SH21-05-100

That the Full Council agrees to allow Mr Jonathan Salter from Simpson Grierson to be present to provide advice to the Council during the confidential session of the Deliberations meeting on 17 May 2021. This will be done in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987:

- s7(2)(b)(ii) The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information; and
- s7(2)(h) The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.

CARRIED

The open meeting resumed at 12.12 pm.

In response to a question, Mr Drummond explained that the funding of interest on the shareholders' advances would be through WWL water supply charges. The allocation of the water charges and other costs is outlined in the Council's Revenue and Financing Policy.

Responding to a question, Mr Drummond estimated that the value of the irrigator shares was now probably between \$5,000-\$6,000 per share.

The meeting discussed the proposed amendment to the resolution.

Ms Edwards explained the outcome of the decision making if the vote was tied on the resolution.

Mr Drummond confirmed that the Council has a contractual obligation to meet the Waimea Community Dam cost overruns.

**Moved Cr Wensley/Cr McNamara
SH21-05-12**

That the Tasman District Council amends resolution 14 in supplementary report 1 – Long Term Plan Deliberations as follows:

- 14. agrees that if the contractual arrangements to give effect to revised Option A are not agreed by all parties by 1 June 2021 then the Council adopts **Option D** as set out in Choice 2 of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document as being the next best preferred option; and**

Cr Greening called for a division on the amendment to the resolution proposed by Cr Wensley.

Bryant	Against
Butler	Against
Dowler	Against
Greening	For
Hill	For
King	Against
Mackenzie	Against
Maling	Against
McNamara	For
Ogilvie	For
Tuffnell	Against
Turley	For
Walker	For
Wensley	For
LOST	

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.33 pm and reconvened at 1.35 pm.

Ms Edwards advised the Councillors that they would need to make an active decision for one of the options to include in the LTP regarding the cost overruns for the Waimea Community Dam.

Cr Hill proposed an amendment to the resolution supporting revised Option A but with the removal of point 14 from the draft resolution. Cr Mackenzie seconded the proposed amendment to the resolution.

Mr Drummond advised the Council that they would need to make their decision on the second preference option this week so that staff can prepare for any alternative option with associated rating implications. He also explained the number of parallel work streams required to prepare the documentation around the proposed options. He noted that Waimea Irrigators Limited (WIL) are also very aware of the time constraints for this decision.

Chief Executive, Janine Dowding advised the Council that they would still require a back-up resolution to revised Option A in case WIL don't accept the Council's decision and finalise negotiations..

The Mayor opened debate on the proposed amendment to the resolution in the supplemental report.

The Councillors discussed the removal of point 14 from the recommended substantive motion.

Responding to a question, Mr Drummond said that any additional cost increases for the Waimea Community Dam above the top of the risk range of a projected \$164 million, would need further discussion and agreement by the Council with the potential of a targeted rate being used to collect funding to cover any such additional cost increases.

In response to a question Mr Drummond referred to the diagram within the report which shows the flow of funds and how the arrangement is structured. He explained how the cost overruns are treated for each partner in the project.

In her right of reply, Cr Hill said that the proposed amendment provides clarity in the decision making.

Cr McNamara called for a division.

Moved Cr Hill/Cr Mackenzie

SH21-05-13

That the Tasman District Council deletes resolution 14 in supplementary report 1 – Long Term Plan Deliberations as follows:

- 14. agrees that if the contractual arrangements to give effect to revised Option A are not agreed by all parties by 1 June 2021 then the Council adopts Option A as set out in Choice 2 of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document as being the next best preferred option; and**

Bryant	For
Butler	For
Dowler	For
Greening	For
Hill	For
King	For
Mackenzie	For
Maling	For
McNamara	Against
Ogilvie	For
Tuffnell	For
Turley	Against
Walker	Against
Wensley	Against

CARRIED

The Councillors further discussed the substantive motion. It was suggested that revised Option A would lessen the burden on ratepayers and make it a more equitable approach for all parties.

The Mayor reminded the Councillors about why the Council decided to proceed with the Waimea Community Dam project. He noted that the project started as a water shortage solution enhanced by environmental improvements of the river, recognised iwi values and what the supply of water for future generations means to many of our residents and ratepayers.

He urged the Council to recognise the value of water for now and in the future and their responsibility to everyone, the whole community, this generation and our future generations, to make a collective decision.

In his right of reply Deputy Mayor Bryant spoke the benefits of a community dam and his belief that it is appropriate that the costs of that dam are shared.

Cr Greening called for a division on the substantive motion.

Choice 2 – Waimea Community Dam (WCD) allocation of additional irrigator capacity costs (Section 6)

**Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Cr Mackenzie
SH21-05-14**

That the Council, in response to hearing and considering submissions on the Proposed Long Term Plan 2021-2031:

- 1. receives Supplementary Report 1 – Long Term Plan Deliberations RSH21-05-04; and**
- 2. notes that the Council consulted on a range of options for funding the irrigators contribution to the cost overruns in respect of the Waimea Community Dam through the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document in Choice 2; and**
- 3. notes that the option proposed in this report (revised Option A) is a modified version of Option A in the Consultation Document; and**
- 4. agrees that it has a good understanding of the community's views and preferences on the options outlined in the Consultation Document and that those views and preferences provide a good basis for input into the decision making on revised Option A, noting that it is not inconsistent with some views expressed in submissions; and**
- 5. notes that revised Option A does not affect the general ratepayer any differently during the first five years of the Long Term Plan and improves the outcome for them in later years compared to Option A contained in the Consultation Document; and**
- 6. notes that revised Option A changes the mechanism for how the irrigators share of the cost overruns will be collected compared to Option A in the Consultation Document in a manner that is more acceptable to the Waimea Irrigators Shareholders and in a way that means the Council carries less debt on its balance sheet which is beneficial to all ratepayers; and**
- 7. notes that if the Council had to re-consult on revised Option A, it would not be in a position to finalise the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 on or before 30 June 2021 as required under the Local Government Act 2002 and this would delay the setting of the rates for the 2021/2022 financial year until the Plan was adopted; and**
- 8. agrees that given parts 4, 5, 6 and 7 above of this resolution, the Council will not consult the public further prior to making a decision on whether to proceed with the revised Option A or any of the other options in the Consultation Document; and**
- 9. notes that when considering the options for Choice 2 for inclusion in the Consultation Document in terms of the requirements of section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002, the Council decided that its preferred option to address the overall impact of the allocation of liability for the irrigators share of the cost overruns was Option A, which appropriately spread the liability for revenue collection across both the general rate and a targeted rate on properties with or supplied from an affiliated water take consent (irrigators); and**

10. agrees that the revised Option A would achieve the same split of liability for revenue collection across both the general rate and the irrigators, as was proposed in Option A, which is still considered appropriate for the current and future well-being of the community, notwithstanding that the irrigator share would no longer be collected through a rating mechanism; and
11. agrees that revised Option A is a reasonably practicable option now that the irrigators as represented by Waimea Irrigators Limited are willing to consider it, and as such the Council needs to consider it alongside the other options outlined in the Consultation Document; and
12. agrees to proceed with revised Option A for Choice 2 - Waimea Community Dam (WCD) allocation of additional irrigator capacity costs, subject to:
 - a. the formal agreement of Waimea Irrigators Ltd (WIL), Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd (CIIL) and Waimea Water Ltd (WWL) having followed due process to enter into the contractual arrangements by 4 June 2021; and
 - b. the execution of the final contractual agreements by all parties ; and
13. notes that the full Contractual Agreements will be considered for execution by the Council at the Full Council Meeting scheduled for 4 June 2021; and
14. authorises all external costs involved in negotiating these agreements, whether they proceed or not, be added to the current Waimea Community 'Sunk Cost ' Loan; and
15. if agreement on revised Option A is reached by 4 June 2021 agrees to incorporate the proposed changes (as modified for revised Option A), in the final Revenue and Financing Policy; and
16. instructs the Chief Executive to advise WIL, WWL, CIIL and Nelson City Council of the Council's decision.

Bryant	For
Butler	For
Dowler	For
Greening	Against
Hill	For
King	For
Mackenzie	For
Maling	For
McNamara	Against
Ogilvie	Against
Tuffnell	For
Turley	Against
Walker	Against
Wensley	Against

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 2.55 pm and resumed at 3.20 pm.

Staff presented a draft resolution on the alternative option and the Mayor called for a vote.

Moved Cr Wensley/Cr Ogilvie

SH21-05-15

That the Full Council instructs staff to bring to the deliberations meeting on 18 May 2021 a fully worded resolution to give effect to the Council's position that if the contractual arrangements to give effect to revised Option A are not agreed by all parties by the scheduled Full Council meeting on 4 June 2021, then the Council considers Option D of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 2031 consultation document to be the preferred option.

CARRIED

Choice 1 – Homes for our community (Section 5)

Mrs Neame introduced the report which was taken as read. She was supported by Policy Advisor, Brylee Wayman, Environmental Policy Manager, Barry Johnson and Activity Planning Manager, Dwayne Fletcher.

Responding to a question, Mr Fletcher agreed that because of the high growth in Richmond, there is a real tension between the need for new housing and the affordability for the Council to bring forward infrastructure projects. He noted that stormwater infrastructure is an integral part of the proposed development in Richmond South that also requires a significant amount of land acquisition.

In response to a question, Mrs Neame confirmed the staff are concerned that the Nelson City Council growth projections are low for the next three years and that is putting increased pressure on development in Tasman.

Ms Wayman confirmed that Council has defined the Richmond urban area to include Motueka, Māpua, Wakefield and Brightwater.

Responding to a comment, Mr Fletcher said that if Tasman District Council shoulders a disproportionate amount of growth it will impact on all of our communities. We need to allow growth in stages to ensure that we have the infrastructure in place.

Mr Johnson also noted the potential impacts on productive land due to housing expansion in the District, which will be made worse if Tasman District Council has to pick up the overflow demand from Nelson.

In response to a question, Mr Fletcher agreed that it is unlikely that any future development will occur on the seaward side of State Highway 60 in Motueka. That means that some deferrals will need to be lifted to provide for growth in Motueka.

The inclusion of planned growth in the Lower Moutere area included in the Future Development Strategy was discussed, in particular relating to growth on what some considered to be highly productive land. Mr Johnson noted that staff are planning to engage with the community on the options for that growth.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Tuffnell

SH21-05-16

That the meeting be extended to consider the remaining items on the agenda.

CARRIED

In response to a question, Mr Fletcher said that there is an issue with “binding” future landowners to provide social housing in any development. Mr Johnson suggested that the Council could include a provision about inclusionary zoning which could mean that the zoning for the land is changed to allow high density housing.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Turley

SH21-05-17

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to proceed with Option A contained in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document for Choice 1; and**
- 2. notes that the feedback received on growth and development will also be considered as part of the review of the Future Development Strategy and the development of the Tasman Environment Plan; and**
- 3. notes staff will continue working with Nelson City Council to encourage more housing supply in Nelson; and**
- 4. declines to advance stormwater and wastewater growth projects in Richmond South.**

CARRIED

Choice 3 – A new company model for Nelson Airport and Port Nelson (Section 7)

Mr Drummond presented the report which was taken as read. He noted that the Council has four options to consider. He spoke about the long term advantages for the Council of the recommended option.

Mr Drummond noted that the proposal requires the approval of both shareholders and the staff at Nelson City Council had recommended Option C. Nelson City Council will vote on this issue on Thursday, 20 May 2021.

In response to a question, Mr Drummond said that the IRD tax binding ruling was clear that there would be no adverse tax implications with the transfer of the two entities into a holding company for Option A.

Responding to a question, Mr Drummond stated that another port buying into Port Nelson could not occur without the approval of the joint shareholders.

Cr McNamara, supported by Cr Greening, foreshadowed an amendment to the resolution to reflect the status quo. Cr McNamara suggested that there is no clear evidence that there will be a huge benefit for the recommended option and expressed the view that there was insufficient information on the proposal available to the public during the consultation process.

Mr Drummond said that there had been information on the proposal for a holding company in the LTP Consultation Documents and the supporting information. The Council had ample opportunity to examine the financial implications of this proposal.

Mayor King suggested that there had never been a better time to consider the options and the benefits to both companies in accessing savings for them. He said that the benefits to the shareholders should be the Councillors primary concern.

Cr McNamara called for a division.

**Moved Cr Mackenzie/Mayor King
SH21-05-18**

That the Full Council:

- 1. notes that the consultation required, under section 56 of the Local Government Act 2002, to establish a council-controlled organisation occurred concurrently as part the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document process; and**
- 2. agrees to the establishment of a council-controlled organisation to act as a holding company for Nelson Airport and Port Nelson; and**
- 3. agrees that Option C is the Council's preferred option under Choice 3; and**
- 4. notes that shareholder agreement is required in order to proceed with any option other than the status quo; and**
- 5. agrees to authorise the Mayor to vote the Council's shareholding in the Nelson Airport Limited and Port Nelson Limited to give effect to parts 2 and 3 above of this resolution; and**
- 6. subject to Nelson City Council passing similar resolutions:**
 - a. instructs the Chief Executive to advise Nelson City Council, the Board of Port Nelson Limited and the Board of Nelson Airport Limited of the Council's decision; and**
 - b. requests the Chief Executive in conjunction with Nelson City Council to engage with the Boards to develop a detailed plan for the establishment of the Holding Company and the transition from the current arrangements; and**
- 7. notes that updates on the establishment of the Holding Company will be reported back to the shareholding councils through the Joint Shareholders Committee.**

Bryant	For
Butler	For
Dowler	For
Greening	Against
Hill	For
King	For
Mackenzie	For
Maling	For
McNamara	Against
Ogilvie	For
Tuffnell	Against
Turley	For
Walker	Against
Wensley	For
CARRIED	

The meeting adjourned at 4.45 pm and the Mayor invited Councillor Hill to close the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting reconvened on Tuesday 18 May 2021 at the Tasman District Council, Richmond at 9.30 am

OPENING, WELCOME

Mayor King opened the meeting with a karakia. He noted that staff had drafted a new resolution for the Council's approval regarding the funding of the dam cost overruns Waimea Community Dam, if the contractual arrangements to give effect to revised Option A are not agreed by all the parties by the 4 June Council meeting. This new resolution was drafted in response to the request by Council the previous day.

The meeting moved into confidential session.

Moved Cr Hill/Cr Maling SH21-05-19

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

1 Supplementary Report 2 - Long Term Plan Deliberations – Waimea Community Dam Options

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	<p>s7(2)(g) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)</p> <p>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</p>

CARRIED

The meeting resumed in open session at 10.00 am.

Ms Edwards explained the new draft resolution for Council's consideration, which gives effect to the request made by the Council on the previous day.

The Councillors continued to debate the various options to manage the cost overruns for the Waimea Community Dam in the event that the contractual arrangements to give effect to revised Option A are not agreed by all parties by the 4 June Council meeting. Cr Greening expressed his concern about the resolution.

Cr Walker called for a division.

Moved Cr Wensley/Cr Ogilvie**SH21-05-21**

In the event that the contractual arrangements to give effect to the revised Option A for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 are not agreed by all parties by the scheduled 4 June 2021 Full Council meeting, that the Full Council:

1. notes that the Council consulted on a range of options for funding the irrigators contribution to the cost overruns in respect of the Waimea Community Dam through the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document in Choice 2; and
2. notes that Council must make provision in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 to fund the irrigators share of the cost overruns on the Waimea Community Dam and that the Council does not have time to re-consult on further options if it is to be in a position to finalise the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 on or before 30 June 2021 as required under the Local Government Act 2002 and this would delay the setting of the rates for the 2021/2022 financial year until the Plan was adopted; and
3. notes that Council has undertaken substantial negotiations with Waimea Irrigators Ltd (WIL), Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd and Waimea Water Ltd, to address the cost overruns funding shortfall, including developing the revised Option A which is WIL's decision to accept or reject; and
4. agrees that Council has a good understanding of the community's views and preferences on the options outlined in the Consultation Document and that those views and preferences provide a good basis for input into the decision making on the default option should revised Option A not proceed; and
5. agrees that Council considers Option D is the preferred default option if revised Option A does not proceed due to:
 - a. it was one of the options consulted on through the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 Consultation Document and that it received wide support in the submissions received through that process; and
 - b. that while Option D will increase the irrigator contribution when compared with revised Option A particularly for irrigators with a small shareholding in WIL, Council considers this is a more appropriate option than the general ratepayers picking up that portion of the costs on a long term basis; and
6. notes that Council, through any mechanism, does not have the ability to recover costs from WIL shareholders proportionate to their shareholding, and has therefore reverted to an available targeted rating option; and
7. if Option D proceeds, agrees to include in the final Revenue and Financing Policy the matters needed to give effect to Option D.

Bryant	Against
Butler	For
Dowler	Against
Greening	For
Hill	For
King	Against
Mackenzie	Against
Maling	Against
McNamara	Against

Ogilvie **For**
Tuffnell **For**
Turley **For**
Walker **For**
Wensley **For**

CARRIED

Choice 4 – Responding to Climate Change (Section 8)

Acting Strategic Policy Manager, Jenna Neame, gave a summary of today's proceedings. She said in the original LTP Deliberations Report, tables 12 and 13 set out what the modelled rates revenue increases and net debt were going to be if the resolutions contained in the report were passed. She highlighted that the position has changed with revised Option A being passed and to bear in mind, that depending on the 4 June 2021 decision, the numbers won't be exact. Tables 12 and 13 were circulated to Councillors.

Under revised Option A in the tables contained in the supplementary report, the rates revenue increases are less.

Mrs Neame said that any decisions that Councillors make throughout the deliberations meeting will have an impact to those numbers.

Mrs Neame presented the report and noted that mixed feedback had been received in terms of the submissions.

Mrs Neame noted one complexity in the report in regard to Warmer Healthier Homes which makes reference to the Chief Executive Officer's update report to Full Council – the reason this has occurred is because staff were already in a position of recommending that the Council fund \$20,000 from this financial year's budget. In the meantime a submission was received from Warmer Healthier Homes requesting \$60,000 and staff recommended that it can proceed this financial year within the existing budget, therefore having no impact on the LTP budget.

Councillors discussed the fiscal envelope and spending priorities. It was noted that the Long Term Plan process has presented a number of opportunities to discuss debt and rates implications.

A discussion ensued about the Warmer Healthier Homes programme and the difference that this makes to our community.

Regarding Option A, concerns were raised that the LTP potentially contains inadequate funding to reduce Council's emissions to the extent required to meet our targets. Policy Adviser, Mrs Gerraty, said that we have not yet completed a baseline emissions inventory, but that this is on the work programme. She explained that we do know, from Nelson City Council's inventory, that our largest emissions sources are likely to be landfills and wastewater treatment plants.

Some Councillors noted a preference for Option B.

Councillors recognised the work of the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum.

Discussion noted that climate change is important and that we need to do a lot more work over the next three years to put ourselves in a better position to have a viable alternative programme in the next LTP.

It was noted that we are waiting on further direction from central government around climate change in terms of tools and the ability to influence the broader emissions in the region.

**Moved Cr Tuffnell/Cr Maling
SH21-05-22**

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to proceed with Option A for Choice 4; and**
- 2. agrees to provide a \$40,000 grant to Warmer Healthier Homes Te Taiuhu Trust as a contribution towards their home insulation programme for qualifying homes in Tasman District to be funded from the existing 2020/2021 budget for implementation of the Tasman Climate Action Plan; and**
- 3. notes that by providing a grant from 2020/2021 budgets it will have no financial impact on the final LTP 2021-2031; and**
- 4. notes that in the CEO's update report to Full Council (20 May 2021 meeting), staff have also recommended a grant to Warmer Healthier Homes Te Taiuhu Trust of \$20,000, as an additional contribution towards the Warmer Healthier Homes insulation programme for qualifying homes within Tasman District, to be funded by the 2020/2021 budget for implementation of the Tasman Climate Action Plan; and**
- 5. notes if the Council passes Resolution 2 above, and Resolution 2 in the CEO's Update Report to Full Council on 20 May 2021, it will provide a total grant to Warmer Healthier Homes Te Taiuhu Trust of \$60,000 in 2020/2021; and**
- 6. notes that no further budget provisions will be provided in the LTP 2021-2031 for Warmer Healthier Homes; and**
- 7. notes the additional information provided by Tasman Environmental Trust requesting a one-off funding contribution in Year 1 of between \$20,000 to \$50,000 towards the Blue Carbon 'Core and Restore' research project; and**
- 8. declines to provide funding to the Tasman Environmental Trust for the Blue Carbon 'Core and Restore' research project; and**
- 9. declines to grant the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum a contribution of \$160,000 per year in Years 1 to 3; and**
- 10. notes that, in addition to the above, a large number of submitters on Choice 4 requested that the Council do more and/or invest more in its climate change response, with financial implications ranging from staff time only through to several millions of dollars; and**
- 11. declines to allocate additional funding to the suggested actions referenced in the preceding resolution.**

CARRIED

A morning tea adjournment was taken from 10.43 am to 11.00 am.

Revenue and Financing Policy (Section 9)

Finance Manager, Matt McGlinchey, Corporate Services Manager, Mike Drummond and Mrs Neame were in attendance.

Cr Greening proposed an amendment to the resolution to retain the current debt and rates caps.

Cr Hill left the meeting at 11.05 am.

Cr Greening gave a right of reply and said we seem to be engineering a society for a community who doesn't live here and increasing rates by ratepayers who can't afford it.

Cr Greening called for a division.

Moved Cr Greening/Cr McNamara

That the Full Council agrees that the current debt cap of \$200 million and rates cap of 3% is maintained.

Bryant	Against
Butler	Against
Dowler	Against
Greening	For
Hill	Absent
King	Against
Mackenzie	Against
Maling	Against
McNamara	For
Ogilvie	Against
Tuffnell	Against
Turley	For
Walker	Against
Wensley	Against

LOST

Cr Hill returned to the meeting at 11.07 am.

**Moved Cr Dowler/Cr Mackenzie
SH21-05-23**

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees that the Revenue and Financing Policy will need to be amended to give effect to the option that the Council agreed to proceed with for Choice 2 (Waimea Community Dam (WCD) allocation of additional irrigator capacity costs); and**
- 2. agrees to incorporate the proposed changes, as modified by Resolution 1 in the final Revenue and Financing Policy; and**
- 3. notes that staff will recommend the Revenue and Financing Policy for adoption as part of the final Long Term Plan 2021-2031 on 30 June 2021.**

CARRIED

For Rates Remissions Policy (Section 10)

Mrs Neame said that staff recommended that no changes be made to the Rate Remissions Policy.

**Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Cr Wensley
SH21-05-24**

That the Full Council:

- 1. notes the comments made by submitters on the draft Rates Remissions Policy; and**

2. **agrees that no changes be made to the Rates Remissions Policy prior to the Council considering it for adoption; and**
3. **notes that staff will recommend the Rates Remission Policy for separate adoption to the final Long Term Plan 2021-2031 on 30 June 2021.**

CARRIED

For Development and Financial Contributions Policy (Section 11)

Mrs Neame and Activity Planning Manager, Dwayne Fletcher were in attendance.

In reply to a question, Community Housing Providers (CHP) aren't exempt from development contributions but they may receive a remission.

Cr Wensley left the meeting at 11.10 am.

There was a discussion about:

- CHPs – you don't have to be registered to gain the exemption but you need to be nominated in the policy;
- land use categories and Household Units of Demand. It was noted that the broad land use categories (industrial, commercial and retail) cover a lot on what happens in Tasman;
- the gross floor area is common for all development types – that definition is the same definition used in the National Planning Standards for environmental planning purposes;
- trip generation information is different to the carparking requirements that we had in the Tasman Resource Management Plan and we have been under requiring development contributions from commercial developments in the past.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Hill

SH21-05-25

That the Full Council:

1. **notes the comments made by submitters on the draft Development and Financial Contributions Policy; and**
2. **instructs staff to add Te Āwhina Marae and Mohua Affordable Housing Trust to the list of Community Housing Providers; and**
3. **agrees to introduce a Warehousing land use transport assessment rate of 0.3 Household Units of Demand (HUDs) per 100m² of gross floor area; and**
4. **agrees to introduce a Retirement Village transport assessment rate of 0.3 HUDs per unit; and**
5. **declines to include discounts for temporary stormwater detention; and**
6. **notes that staff will recommend the Development and Financial Contributions Policy for separate adoption to the final Long Term Plan 2021-2031 on 30 June 2021.**

CARRIED

For Long Term Plan Rating Map Changes (Section 12)

Mrs Neame and Team Leader - Stormwater & Waste Management, David Stephenson were in attendance.

There was a discussion about the zone of benefit for the Waimea Community Dam. It was noted that the zone of benefit deals with the public good component of the dam and therefore there is not a strong rationale to move the current boundaries from where they were set. Mr Drummond said the individual submitters have had a response from staff around the rationale for their properties being included in the zone of benefit. Councillors requested a copy of the response that was sent to the submitters.

Mr Drummond said it's important to remember that the zone of benefit rate is not directly related to the ability to access water from the dam. It's about the wider benefits and the public good component.

There was a discussion about a Torrent Bay property during the submission process; the landowner felt their property didn't border the coast but they get all the benefits of bordering the coast. Staff assessed the location of the property is in Zone A not in Zone B for rating purposes. It was noted there is an esplanade reserve in front of all the properties at Torrent Bay.

Cr Mackenzie declared a conflict of interest in that she has property affected by the rate.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Tuffnell

SH21-05-26

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to amend the Refuse – Recycling Rating Area Wakefield map as proposed in Attachment 2 to this report; and**
- 2. agrees to amend the Refuse – Recycling Rating Area Moutere map as proposed in Attachment 2 to this report; and**
- 3. agrees to amend the Stormwater Urban Drainage Rating Area Wakefield map as proposed in Attachment 2 to this report; and**
- 4. agrees to amend the Stormwater Urban Drainage Rating Area Richmond map as proposed in Attachment 2 to this report; and**
- 5. declines to amend the Torrent Bay Rating Area A map.**

CARRIED

For the Long Term Plan and the Transportation Activity Management Plan (Section 13)

Activity Planning Advisor – Transportation, Drew Bryant, Transportation Planning Officer, Clare Scott, Mr Fletcher and Mrs Neame were in attendance.

Discussion ensued on:

- public transport routes and services and priority bus lanes;
- lack of footpaths/cycleways in some areas and distribution of funds for these across the District;
- liability if someone gets hurt on a pedestrian crossing;
- concerns around health and safety on public roads;
- landscaping in subdivisions and the maintenance costs to the ratepayers;

- transportation and climate change; and
- accommodating all modes of transport.

A lunch adjournment was taken from 12.35 pm to 1.28 pm

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Cr Butler

SH21-05-27

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to increase the public transport budgets from 2023/2024 to allow for increasing the frequency of all urban public transport services during weekdays to 30-minutes; and**
- 2. agrees to increase the public transport budgets from 2023/2024 to allow commencement of the new regional public transport routes during weekdays, being four return trips per day to Motueka/Māpua and six return trips per day for Brightwater/Wakefield; and**
- 3. notes that the changes agreed in Resolutions 1 and 2, are made on the basis that additional funding is secured from non-rates sources and the associated revenue lines are increased to the same extent; and**
- 4. notes the uncertainty surrounding the Council's funding from the National Land Transport Fund; and**
- 5. agrees that due to time constraints, no changes will be made to the Transportation Activity Management Plan budgets upon Waka Kotahi advising the Council of its final funding decision.**

CARRIED

For the Long Term Plan and the Coastal Asset Activity Management Plan (Section 14)

Mrs Neame, Mr Fletcher and Mr Bryant were in attendance. Mrs Neame said in regard to the Māpua Boat ramp, a number of the submissions came via a proforma form and when staff contacted people who wished to speak, quite a few didn't realise they were signing a submission.

Cr Tuffnell left the meeting at 1.36 pm.

There was discussion regarding the Māpua Boat ramp and whether to provide funding for the ramp in the LTP. Councillors discussed the following topics:

- the suitability of the old boat ramp for launching boats;
- that the Māpua community should have the opportunity to launch their boats and the funding should be brought forward;
- there is land on Aranui Road/Tahi Street that is zoned commercial that Council could sell which will also leave plenty of greenspace for car parking;
- whether we are enabling both a regional boat ramp and a boat ramp for Māpua or swapping one out for another;
- the Māpua Boat Club have their own concept with costings;
- regarding the Regional Boat Ramp Study – the intention is to assess the needs and identify options, including the potential of upgrading multiple already existing boat ramps rather than building a new ramp;

- by developing the commercial area at Māpua Wharf, the Council has made it more difficult for the bigger boats to get in and out; and
- it would have less impact on greenhouse gas emissions in terms of users travelling further to their closest boat ramp.

Cr Wensley returned to the meeting at 1.49 pm.

Cr Tuffnell returned to the meeting at 1.52 pm.

Staff advised the following in relation to the Regional Boat Ramp Study:

- if the Council's intention is to provide a facility in Māpua that provides for a number of uses, not just for the Sea Scouts, then a more generic resolution may be appropriate;
- the Regional Boat Ramp Study will be completed later this year and will include indicative costs;
- that they are consulting with iwi there will be a final recommendation within a couple of months, which will then come to the Council;
- they will engage with other stakeholders, including Tamaha Sea Scouts; and
- staff expect that the Council would need to have a strong leadership role in this project, given it's on Council land and it's a very sensitive site in terms of the contamination and other services.

Cr Bryant left the meeting at 2.09 pm.

Mr Drummond said in regard to restrictions about selling part of our landholdings in the Māpua area, the Council previously resolved not to sell the land until the outcome of the current waterfront review was received. The proceeds of the sale were to be used for the repayment of the loan for the cost of remediating the land (that loan amount has come down over the years because it's been funded by a District wide rate each year). Mr Drummond said in the past, he has advised the Council that the land is more valuable in a large block for development rather than broken up into smaller blocks.

In response to a question, Ms Edwards said that we can use Reserve Financial Contributions (RFCs) to fund development on the land.

It was noted that we need to allocate a source of funding in the LTP. In the absence of another funding mechanism, the default would be that the \$700,000 would increase the peak debt in 2025.

Ms Edwards outlined the process around the use of the RFC fund.

There was discussion that the project be funded from the Moutere-Waimea Ward Reserve Financial Contributions account. If we fund the project from RFCs, the net debt level will increase.

Cr Bryant returned to the meeting at 2.34 pm.

Cr Wensley, seconded by Cr Turley recommended an amendment to resolution 1 below to add:

to be funded from the Moutere-Waimea Ward Reserve Financial Contributions account.

The mover and seconder of the resolution agreed to the amendment being added to the original motion.

Mr Drummond clarified that RFCs can be utilised for a project, you can't borrow them and then return them. There is a substantial amount of funds in the Moutere-Waimea Ward RFCs account.

Moved Cr Tuffnell/Cr Turley

SH21-05-28

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to advance the funding for New Tasman Bay Boat Access Facility of \$700,000 (excluding inflation) to \$50,000 in 2021/2022, \$50,000 in 2022/2023 and \$600,000 in 2023/2024, for the purpose of providing a new boat ramp facility at Waterfront Park in Māpua to be funded from the Moutere-Waimea Ward Reserve Financial Contributions account; and**
- 2. instructs staff to engage with the Tamaha Sea Scouts concerning their future requirements and how they may be incorporated into this project and also engages with other stakeholders; and**
- 3. notes that the Council's contribution towards the boat ramp is capped at \$700,000 (excluding inflation), or at two-thirds of the total project cost, whichever is the lesser amount; and**
- 4. requests that at least one-third of the project costs is funded from a community contribution; and**
- 5. acknowledges that the necessary statutory processes will need to be followed prior to the project proceeding; and**
- 6. acknowledges that the Regional Boat Ramp Study, currently underway, should still proceed; and**
- 7. acknowledges that the funding to implement the recommendations of the Regional Boat Ramp Study will need to be considered through a future Long Term Plan process; and**
- 8. notes under Section 80 of the Local Government Act 2002, that the decision is inconsistent with the Māpua Waterfront Area Masterplan, the reason for the inconsistency is to respond to community requests and that the Council will amend the Plan at its next review.**

CARRIED

For the Long Term Plan relating to Economic Development and Tourism (Section 15)

Cr Maling declared a conflict of interest as he is a trustee of the Nelson Tasman Business Trust (NTBT) and left the meeting at 2.40 pm.

There was a discussion about inflation.

It was noted that the Murchison Visitor Centre is currently closed but they would like the \$15,000 budget to remain in the LTP and if they don't reopen next year they would return the funds.

It was suggested that NTBT ask successful businesses help fund the service they receive from the NTBT.

Some Councillors noted they would like to see the NRDA's funding capped.

Cr Ogilvie, seconded by Cr McNamara recommended an amendment to resolution 6 below to add to parts 2–6 the words:

excluding inflation.

The amendment was agreed to by the mover and seconder of the resolution and added to the original motion.

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Cr Hill

SH21-05-29

That the Full Council:

- 1. notes and declines the request for increase funding from the Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA); and**
- 2. agrees to increase funding of the Nelson Tasman Business Trust by \$10,000 per year to \$25,000 per year, excluding inflation; and**
- 3. agrees to amend the Motueka i-Site budget to \$40,000 per year excluding inflation; and**
- 4. agrees to amend the Takaka Visitor Centre budget to \$30,000 per year excluding inflation; and**
- 5. agrees to amend the Murchison Visitor Centre budget to \$15,000 per year excluding inflation; and**
- 6. agrees to amend the NRDA budget so that it commences at \$325,000 per year excluding inflation.**

CARRIED

Cr Maling returned to the meeting at 2.59 pm

The meeting adjourned at 3.00 pm and Cr Hill closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting reconvened on Wednesday 19 May 2021 at the Tasman District Council, Richmond at 9.30 am

OPENING, WELCOME

Cr Mackenzie opened the meeting with a karakia.

Mrs Neame gave an outline of today's proceedings. She said Councillors were sent information yesterday on the rating situation under Option D (for Waimea Community Dam overruns). The rates revenue increases are the same as for original Option A, it is the rating incidents that shifts under Option D, not the total rates.

For the Long Term Plan relating to Māori Events, Facilities, Engagement and Partnerships (Sections 16 and 17)

Mrs Neame, Mrs Gerraty and Community Partnerships Officer, Gary Alsop, were in attendance.

It was noted that Te Āwhina Marae is used by the whole District (except for Golden Bay as they have their own marae) so it is unfair to fund it fully from Motueka RFCs. It was recommended that an addition to resolution 2 be made to add "from the Motueka and Richmond Ward Reserve Financial Contributions accounts".

Mayor King arrived at the meeting at 9.41 am.

Cr Greening left the meeting at 9.43 am.

The Council discussed the funding of \$50,000 for the marae development.

In terms of the marae redevelopment, the development contributions and building/resource consent fees would apply as per normal. Staff don't recommend a waiver.

Moved Cr Wensley/Cr McNamara

SH21-05-30

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to provide a grant to Te Āwhina Marae of \$50,000 in 2021/2022 as a contribution towards the marae redevelopment; and**
- 2. notes that the grant to Te Āwhina Marae will be equally funded from the Motueka and Richmond Ward reserves financial contributions accounts; and**
- 3. agrees to include funding of \$35,000 per year for three years from 2023 to 2026 for 0.5 FTE Events Coordinator for kapa haka and Te Matatini; and**
- 4. agrees to endorse, and for staff to assist with, the Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka Māori Cultural Council application to the MBIE Regional Events Fund.**

CARRIED

Mrs Neame said it's important to note that as much as Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira's request has merits, it is a challenging request for Council to consider acknowledging that there are eight other iwi. It was noted there is a large amount of work relating to some of the significant changes of legislation that are going to involve iwi (through the three waters reform, resource management reforms, current work programme etc). Mrs Neame said \$200,000 per year for 10 years has been allocated around building capacity for iwi to engage in Council processes as well as \$30,000 per year to fund the Iwi Environmental Policy Working Group.

The Council discussed the need for central government to help fund iwi involvement in the work councils undertake. The Local Government review is likely to increase iwi involvement in councils' work.

In response to a question, the Chief Executive said the regional councils have allocated over \$20 million collectively in their Long Term Plans for iwi capability building.

Councillors acknowledged the work that the Mayor, Chief Executive and staff are undertaking with iwi.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr MacKenzie

SH21-05-31

That the Full Council:

- 1. notes the request from Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira to fund them at least \$100,000 per year; and**
- 2. notes the importance of engaging with iwi and that the Council has an obligation to engage with nine different iwi; and**
- 3. declines to add additional budget for an individual iwi Trust on the basis that it is currently not feasible to do for all other eight iwi.**

CARRIED

**For the Long Term Plan and the Reserves and Facilities Activity Management Plan
(Sections 18, 19 and 20)**

Mrs Neame, Ms Edwards and Mr Alsop were in attendance.

Council noted the request for a museum storage facility based in Motueka.

In response to a question about declining the additional funding for the Motueka and Golden Bay Museums, Council increased the funding through the last LTP and the staff recommendation is solely on the basis of keeping the rates increases down.

There was a discussion about smoke alarms and that it was important to fund these. It was agreed that wording be added to resolution 1 below noting that funding will be made available from within existing budgets to cover the request for smoke alarms.

It was noted that the essence of the Museum's application was storage. They have a lot of artefacts in four garages and sheds they rent. They have highlighted the old library as an option for their storage and because of the location and size, it would be suitable.

Resolution 3 was amended replace "declines" to "notes" and adds "and that this request will be considered as part of 2. above".

Resolution 1 was amended to add "annual" operating funding.

In response to a question about not putting \$156,000 in the LTP to complete the seismic upgrade work on the Library, Council may fund it through alternative revenue ie selling a building. It was noted that the Museum has said if they were to use it, then they would raise all the funds.

**Moved Cr Ogilvie/Cr Turley
SH21-05-32**

That the Full Council:

- 1. declines the request to provide additional annual operating funding for the Golden Bay Museum and notes that funding will be made available from within existing budgets to cover the request for smoke alarms; and**
- 2. notes that the future use of the existing Motueka Library will be the subject of a further report to the Council and does not need to be considered as part of this Long Term Plan process; and**
- 3. notes the request to make the existing Motueka Library available for the Motueka and District Historical Association and that this request will be considered as part of 2. above; and**
- 4. declines the request to make a financial contribution to the Le Quesnoy Museum and Visitor Centre in France; and**

CARRIED

There was a discussion on the Motueka Swimming Pool:

- if we bring the project forward there will be an impact on the debt peak;
- Ms Edwards said once the feasibility study is done it is likely that the project will cost more than what is in the budget. One of the reasons that the pool construction funding

was placed in Year 4 of the new LTP was so the Council can reconsider whether to increase the funding through the next LTP process in 2024;

- Mr Drummond said there are a number of items that the Council is proposing to bring forward in terms of the timing in the LTP that will impact on the peak debt number. If operational costs for the pool are included it will impact on the actual rates required to run the Council's operations;
- there is inflation included in the \$3.3 million because it's not being proposed until Year 4;
- discussion occurred on the \$50,000 cost for the feasibility study – Council staff have previous feasibility studies which can inform the work for the new study;
- the Council will own and run the pool;
- the scope is being proposed by the Motueka Pool Committee; and
- the Motueka community are invested in this pool and they have already gained some of the community funding needed for the project.

Moved Cr Ogilvie/Cr Walker

SH21-05-33

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to amend the timing of the business case for the Motueka Pool so that it can be undertaken in 2021/2022, one year earlier than proposed; and**
- 2. agrees to change the Motueka Pool budget from \$150,000 in 2022/2023 to \$50,000 in 2021/2022 and \$100,000 in 2022/2023; and**
- 3. notes and declines the request to increase the capital budget for the Motueka Pool to \$3,650,000; and**
- 4. notes that the business case will consider and present a recommended capital budget for the Motueka Pool which can be incorporated through a future Annual Plan or Long Term Plan if required.**

CARRIED

Moved Cr Ogilvie/Cr Walker

SH21-05-34

That the Full Council agrees to bring forward the construction of the Motueka pool to 2023/2024.

CARRIED

In response to a question, the Golden Bay Grandstand is funded from the District Facilities Rate. A contribution from the community will be sought towards the project but it is unlikely to be the full one-third normally required for District Facilities Rate funded projects. It won't make any difference to the debt peak, as the current and proposed funding dates are both before the debt peak.

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Cr Butler

SH21-05-35

That the Full Council:

1. agrees to bring forward \$60,000 for resurfacing the tennis courts in Māpua from 2024/2025 to 2022/2023; and
2. declines to amend the budget and timing of the Brightwater/Wakefield Community Facility; and
3. agrees to advance the budget for the Golden Bay Grandstand so that the full Council contribution of \$900,000 is available in 2021/2022.

CARRIED

A morning tea adjournment was taken from 11.12 am to 11.25 am

There was a suggestion that we may need to look at how District Facilities Rate are apportioned in the future to see how it can fund other facilities. This needs to be considered alongside use of Reserve Financial Contributions (RFCs) funding. Currently Saxton Field is largely funded through the Shared Facilities Rate.

There was a discussion about the use of RFCs.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Tuffnell

SH21-05-36

That the Full Council:

1. receives the information tabled at the meeting on recommendations SRC21-05-04 from the Saxton Field Committee in relation to the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 submission; and
2. accepts the recommendations of the Saxton Field Committee in SRC21-05-01; and
3. agrees to amend the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 budgets as follows:

PowerBudget Budget Entry for Community Facilities Activity For April													
	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	LTP	
	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	Input	
	Y1-Y30	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	Plan	
												Comments	
4	Grand Total	15,925,812	925,712	894,059	806,016	795,297	777,091	815,891	583,341	1,306,191	1,188,691	1,288,341	0
5	Revenue	-2,892,359	-342,245	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	-87,745	0
6	20011002 SF Recreates	-48,140	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532	-1,532
7	20010201 SF - NCC CARPES Contribution - TDC Assets	-472,890	-238,237	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790	-3,790
8	200102101 MELBORNE CONTRIBUTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	200102102 SF - NCC Maintenance Contribution - TDC Assets	-2,471,319	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487	-82,487
10	Expense	13,121,743	192,497	974,304	893,761	882,542	867,346	899,899	666,646	1,368,436	1,248,836	1,339,886	0
11	2002400 SF Maintenance Costs (General) (50%)	2,708,199	281,894	284,384	282,898	282,334	283,959	285,384	284,955	287,393	284,955	287,393	0
12	2002404 SF Operations Contract (Stadion) (50%)	1,886,774	195,429	201,278	200,231	198,514	214,924	192,924	192,924	192,924	192,924	192,924	192,924
13	2002406 Saxton Field - Grounds Maint	4,807,743	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589	163,589
14	2002501 SF Electricity	42,583	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340
15	2002504 SAXTON FIELD GRAHAT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	20025401 SF Tree Planting (Alliance & Champion) (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	20025402 SF Alliance Dream development (50%)	1,204,193	0	0	0	180,000	0	40,000	14,185	380,000	200,000	450,000	Joah, lean funded 20 years
18	20025403 SF Alliance Track Resource (50%)	199,039	19,039	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	179,000	0	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
19	20025404 SF General Development (50%)	708,000	25,782	132,792	101,282	83,782	112,782	3,792	12,792	23,792	218,792	1,792	Joah, lean funded 20 years
20	20025407 SF Hoody (50%)	440,000	27,000	0	0	19,000	0	229,000	0	200,000	0	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
21	20025408 SF Netball Courts (50%)	110,000	0	0	10,000	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
22	20025409 SF Cricket Block Renewal (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
23	20025410 SF Oval Development (50%)	410,000	19,000	188,000	0	0	0	0	12,000	177,000	0	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
24	20025411 SF Seaton Stadium (50%)	140,000	10,000	0	130,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
25	20025412 SF Seaton Pavilion (50%)	281,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38,000	289,000	0	Joah, lean funded 20 years
26	20025413 Saxton Maintenance Costs (General) (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	20025414 Saxton Field Operations Contract (Stadion) (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	New Current Assets	790,000	816,000	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800
29	20091002 SF Velodrome Shade Sail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	20091001 SF Furn & Fittings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	20091002 SF BMX Track development	170,000	170,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	200910000 Saxton Development	220,000	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800
33	2009200 Saxton Field Roading	400,000	336,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34													
35													
36													
37													
38													
39													
40													
41													
42													
43													
44													
45													
46													
47													
48													
49													
50													
51													
52													
53													
54													
55													
56													
57													
58													
59													
60													
61													
62													
63													
64													
65													
66													
67													
68													
69													
70													
71													
72													
73													
74													
75													
76													
77													
78													
79													
80													
81													
82													
83													
84													
85													
86													
87													
88													
89													
90													
91													
92													
93													
94													
95													
96													
97													
98													
99													
100													

CARRIED

For the Long Term Plan and the Environmental Management Activity Management Plan (Section 22)

Mrs Neame, Environmental Information Manager, Rob Smith and Environment & Planning Manager, Dennis Bush-King were in attendance.

Councillors acknowledged the Tasman Environment Trust and Project DeVine who do an amazing job.

Moved Deputy Mayor Bryant/Cr Butler

SH21-05-37

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to increase funding for Project DeVine from \$25,000 per year to \$35,000 per year; and**
- 2. notes the \$10,000 increase per year for Project DeVine will be incorporated within the proposed Environmental Management budgets meaning there are no associated rates revenue changes; and**
- 3. notes and declines the \$75,000 funding request from Tasman Environment Trust for community conservation hub services.**

CARRIED

For the Long Term Plan in relation to Other Matters (Sections 23 and 24)

Mrs Neame added a point of clarification to paragraph 23.5 of the report where the Mohua Blue Penguin Trust requested funding for a fence to protect the penguin colony from dogs. It was to also protect the penguins from people, protect scientific equipment and an eco-tourism opportunity.

In response to a question, Mr Drummond said the matter of fencing an area of the port in ensuring dogs don't get access to the penguins will be part of the amended development plan as will potential funding.

Mr Manners spoke about how we can protect Council computer devices, anti-virus protection and keeping our back-ups safe.

Cr Wensley left the meeting at 11.45 am.

Mrs Neame outlined the staff initiated budget changes listed in Attachment 3 and noted the accounting updates and corrections listed in Section 24.

In response to a question, the Motueka wastewater project is being deferred because there is sufficient capacity in the pipe to service through until the expected future relocation of the wastewater treatment plant.

In response to a question, the construction of the Berryfield intersection needs to happen during the summer period – the design is largely finished.

Moved Cr Maling/Cr Mackenzie

SH21-05-38

That the Full Council:

- 1. agrees to the staff initiated budget changes listed in Attachment 3 to this report; and**
- 2. notes the accounting updates and corrections listed in Section 24; and**
- 3. notes that staff will include a new Forecasting Assumption regarding the recently announced Local Government Review for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031.**

CARRIED

There was a discussion about stormwater in Motueka. Mr Woortman said primarily in Motueka east there is stormwater flooding however it is considered to be nuisance flooding (the depths are quite shallow) so to put a large investment in Motueka east, is not cost effective. There will be a workshop on 5 August 2021 to discuss these matters.

Cr Ogilvie moved a new resolution asking that \$10 million be set aside as a placeholder for stormwater in Motueka once the Catchment Management Plan is finalised. Cr Ogilvie's proposed change to the resolution lapsed for want of a seconder.

There was discussion around progressing the streetscape in High Street – it would take about a year to do the consultation and design and another problem is that the Council is relying on Waka Kotahi's subsidy.

It was noted that a submitter submitted that the Regional Transport Committee should include a representative to cover environment and sustainability issues. Mr Fletcher said there are currently vacancies for two advisory roles on the Committee.

It was noted that with our proposed \$240 million net debt with a 5% interest rate is \$12 million a year and 8% is around \$19 million a year.

Moved Cr Mackenzie/Cr Dowler

SH21-05-39

That the Full Council:

- 1. acknowledges that there are some requests and proposals raised in the submissions that are already covered in the Activity Management Plans and, therefore, associated changes do not need to be included in the final Long Term Plan 2021-2031 to address these proposals; and**
- 2. acknowledges that there have been a number of requests and proposals in submissions that have not been addressed by specific decisions as a result of this report; and**
- 3. agrees not to make provision in the final Long Term Plan 2021-2031 for a number of requests and proposals made in submissions, in light of their funding implications, the relative priority of those matters and activities in the context of the Council's overall work programme, or that the Council is of the view that they are not in the best interests of the Tasman community; and**
- 4. notes that staff will, subject to some changes, recommend the Schedule of Fees and Charges and the activity management plans for separate adoption to the final Long Term Plan either on or before the 30 June 2021 Full Council meeting.**

CARRIED

Moved Cr Ogilvie/Cr Hill

That the Full Council:

1. rescinds part 1 of resolution SH21-05-30, as follows:
 - “1. declines the request to provide additional operating funding for the Golden Bay Museum and notes that funding will be made available from within existing budgets to cover the request for smoke alarms; and”
2. agrees to contribute an additional \$25,000 per year to each of the Golden Bay Museum and Motueka Museum and \$10,000 per year to the Murchison Museum from the Museum Rate; and
3. notes that funding will be made available from within existing budgets to cover the request for smoke alarms.

LOST

For Preparation of Final Documents

Mrs Neame said that the next steps will be the 4 June 2021 meeting where the Council will consider the final decision on the Waimea Community Dam funding. Staff are also intending to bring the final Rates Remission Policy and Schedule of Fees and Charges for adoption and to bring back the decision on the financial strategy limits.

Moved Cr Mackenzie/Cr Tuffnell

SH21-05-40

That the Full Council:

1. **notes that the decisions made at this meeting will be included in the final versions of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031, the Rates Remission Policy, the Development and Financial Contributions Policy and other supporting documents; and**
2. **agrees to staff making other appropriate changes to transform the supporting information into a final Long Term Plan for adoption.**

CARRIED

3.2 Draft Schedule of Fees & Charges 2021/2022

Mrs Neame, Policy Officer, Sandra Hartley, David Stephenson, and Courtenay Lynn, Team Leader – Building Support were in attendance.

In response to a question, charity stores would be registered charities to receive the \$500 annual grant for waste disposal.

There was a discussion around extending the proposed cemetery fees to 0-12 years instead of 0-5 years and this was added to the resolution.

In response to a question, staff don't see a direct connection between fees and charges and illegal dumping.

Moved Cr Hill/Deputy Mayor Bryant

SH21-05-41

That the Full Council:

- 1. receives the Draft Schedule of Fees & Charges 2021/2022 Deliberations Report RSH21-05-3; and**
- 2. agrees in principle to include grants to reuse and second hand stores in the Waste Minimisation Grant scheme included in the Waste Management and Minimisation Activity Management Plan;**
- 3. agrees that grants to charity stores could include a contribution up to the value of 20% of a store's waste disposal fees, capped at \$500 per store, on the condition that the store supplies data to the Council on the waste minimisation activities of the store, and that the proceeds of the store are for a charitable purpose;**
- 4. agrees to amend the charging methodology for residential building consents from a time based charging to a fixed fee based on the value of the building work as per Attachment 1; and**
- 5. agrees to rename "Property Rates Printout" to "Property Rates Printout and Electronic File"; and**
- 6. agrees that the proposed cemetery fees for the 0-5 years range is extended to 0-12 years.**

CARRIED

The Mayor thanked everyone for their input over the last three days of deliberations.

The meeting concluded at 12.54 pm.

Date Confirmed:

Chair: