

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

**Date:** Thursday 15 December 2016  
**Time:** 2.00 pm  
**Meeting Room:** Tasman Council Chamber  
**Venue:** 189 Queen Street  
Richmond

---

## Full Council

### AGENDA

---

#### MEMBERSHIP

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

(Quorum 7 members)

Contact Telephone: 03 543 8400  
Email: [hannah.simpson@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:hannah.simpson@tasman.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.tasman.govt.nz](http://www.tasman.govt.nz)



# AGENDA

**1 OPENING, WELCOME**

**2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Recommendation**

**That apologies be accepted.**

**3 PUBLIC FORUM**

**4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**5 LATE ITEMS**

**6 REPORTS**

6.1	Golden Bay Recreation Park Grandstand decision from Heritage New Zealand ..	5
6.2	Engagement and Consultation on the Annual Plan 2017/2018 .....	31
6.3	2017 Calendar of Meetings .....	47
6.4	Action Items - Previous Meetings .....	51



## 6 REPORTS

### 6.1 GOLDEN BAY RECREATION PARK GRANDSTAND DECISION FROM HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND

Decision Required

<b>Report To:</b>	Full Council
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	15 December 2016
<b>Report Author:</b>	Susan Edwards, Community Development Manager
<b>Report Number:</b>	RCN16-12-17

#### 1 Summary

- 1.1 The purposes of this report are for Council to officially receive the decision from Heritage New Zealand on Council's application to remove the grandstand at the Golden Bay Recreation Park; to provide an opportunity for key stakeholders to present their views to Council; and to seek a decision from Council on whether to act on the authority received from Heritage New Zealand to remove the grandstand.
- 1.2 Throughout this year, Council has received numerous reports on the issue of the grandstand at the Golden Bay Recreation Park. This report contains a summary of the decisions Council has made relevant to this matter, during the year.
- 1.3 Since the September meeting Council has received Heritage New Zealand's decision on our request for an authority to remove the grandstand. The decision is to grant Council authority to remove the grandstand. A copy of the decision is contained in Attachment 1 to this report.
- 1.4 The decision is subject to a 15 working day appeal period which expires on 12 December.
- 1.5 Just prior to this report being placed on the agenda we received notification of an appeal being lodged by the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust with the Environment Court. We have taken legal advice and are responding to the appeal and the other proceedings the Trust has initiated. As noted in para 4.14, it is possible that the appeal will be struck out on the grounds that the Trust has no right of appeal.
- 1.6 I recommend that Council makes its decision today subject to the outcome of any appeal or any ruling that the Trust or any other appellant does not have standing to appeal.
- 1.7 At its August meeting the Golden Bay Community Board recommended to Council that the Council not act to demolish the grandstand until the Council had the opportunity to receive the decision from Heritage New Zealand and recommended that Council allow the Grandstand Trust and other key stakeholders the opportunity to present their views to Council.
- 1.8 At its 22 September meeting Full Council agreed to advise the Board that the course of action they recommend is likely to be the course of action followed.

- 1.9 On 6 December, the Mayor, Cr Brown, Lindsay McKenzie and I meet with members of the Golden Bay Community Board, the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust, the Golden Bay A&P Association and the Golden Bay Shared Recreational Facility Committee Inc. to discuss the Heritage New Zealand decision to allow Council to demolish the grandstand. At the meeting, the key stakeholder groups (the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust, the Golden Bay A&P Association and the Golden Bay Shared Recreational Facility Committee Inc.) were invited to attend today's meeting and given 15 minutes each to present their views on the future of the grandstand. This invitation is in line with the Council's decision of 22 September 2016.
- 1.10 The purpose of the 6 December meeting was to discuss the thinking and hear any proposals from those in favour of retaining the grandstand, given that Council has been granted authority to demolish it. During the stakeholder meeting a range of matters were traversed, including the history of the project and decisions made in getting to this current point in time. The Grandstand Trust did not put forward any proposals for the grandstand at the meeting, despite prompts throughout the year about the urgent need to do so.
- 1.11 Council has the following options to consider with respect to whether to retain the grandstand or to demolish it:
- 1.11.1 Option 1: Demolish the grandstand in accordance with the conditions of the Heritage New Zealand authority, subject to the outcome of the appeal which has been lodged with the Environment Court by the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust or any other appeal or any ruling that the Trust or any other appellant does not have standing to appeal; and
  - 1.11.2 Option 2: Demolish the grandstand in a manner that enables the building to be re-built on an alternative site elsewhere; and
  - 1.11.3 Option 3: Retain the grandstand on its current location and demolish the newer additions.
- 1.12 The advantages and disadvantages of the options are outlined in section 5 of this report.
- 1.13 I recommend that Councillors review in-depth sections 6 (Strategy and Risks) and 7 (Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan) of this report.

## 2 Draft Resolution

### That the Full Council

1. receives the Golden Bay Recreation Park Grandstand decision from Heritage New Zealand report RCN16-12-17; and
2. receives the Heritage New Zealand decision authority number 2017/389: N26/308 for Council to remove the grandstand; and
3. agrees to demolish the grandstand in accordance with the conditions of the Heritage New Zealand authority and subject to a decision on:
  - (a) the appeal which has been lodged with the Environment Court by the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust;
  - (b) the standing of the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust to bring an appeal;
  - (c) any other relevant appeal or ruling.

### 3 Purpose of the Report

3.1 The purposes of this report are:

- 3.1.1 for Council to officially receive the decision from Heritage New Zealand on Council's application to remove the grandstand at the Golden Bay Recreation Park; and
- 3.1.2 to provide an opportunity for key stakeholders (Golden Bay Shared Recreation Facility Committee, Golden Bay A&P Association and Golden Bay Grandstand Trust) to present their views to Council; and
- 3.1.3 to seek a decision from Council on whether to act on the authority received from Heritage New Zealand to remove the grandstand.

### 4 Background and Discussion

#### *Background and previous decisions*

4.1 Throughout this year, Council has received numerous reports on the issue of the grandstand at the Golden Bay Recreation Park. The reports containing the most relevant background information to the decisions sought in this report are: RCN16-06-03 and RCN16-09-19.



- 4.2 Key background to the grandstand matter and the decisions Council has made to date are contained in the following paragraphs.
- 4.3 Active planning for a community recreation facility on the Golden Bay Recreation Park began in 2010. A user group called the Golden Bay Shared Recreation Facility (GBSRFC) Inc took the lead in planning and local fundraising, with the Council and Community Board taking a role in a working group. The new facility is being 80/20 Council/direct community funded. The building will be a Council asset.

- 4.4 Consultation has occurred at various stages in the project since before active planning for the project started in 2010, through until the Council's Tenders Panel let the contract for the new facility to Gibbons Construction on 13 October 2015. For details of the consultation undertaken, please refer to report RCN16-06-03 considered by the Full Council at its meeting on 9 June.
- 4.5 At the end of last year, concerns from some members of the Golden Bay Community arose about the proposal to remove the grandstand to make way for the new building and a carpark. Despite the clear understanding of the majority of those close to the project and what the consultation plans showed, it came as a surprise to some that the grandstand was to go. Efforts from a sector of the Golden Bay community to retain the grandstand were made and continue.
- 4.6 In March this year the Community Board asked the Council to call for proposals from the community to retain but relocate the grandstand. The Council was to consider any proposals before the end of August. Council advertised the opportunity to remove the grandstand in April 2016. No proposals were received. Advocates to retain the grandstand then began e-mailing, letter writing, and threatened legal action. The grandstand is a Council asset so Council should decide its fate taking into account the matters raised in this report and by the key stakeholders.
- 4.7 In June Council considered a report discussing the future of the grandstand. The report recommended that Council confirm that the grandstand be removed at the end of the local rugby season. The report noted that "this is not a case of saying that the arguments put forward for retaining the grandstand have no merit. Rather it's a case of making a choice when resources are limited. While it appears that the grandstand may have been constructed in 1899 and therefore qualifies as an archaeological site under Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, building the new facility and restoring the former Golden Bay County building should be the priority. Their combined cost is over \$5M and that will give the community best value in terms of its recreational needs and respect for its built heritage".
- 4.8 The Council passed the following resolution at the meeting:

**CN16-06-8**

**That the Full Council**

- 1. receives the Grandstand Removal report RCN16-06-03; and**
- 2. confirms that the grandstand building at the Golden Bay Recreational Park will be removed at the end of the 2016 rugby season to enable the clubroom and toilet facilities to be used until the end of the season; and**
- 3. notes that part 2 of this resolution is subject to the granting of an authority to modify or destroy the grandstand under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014; and**
- 4. declines the request to reinstate the southern stairs at the grandstand.**



- 4.9 The matter of the grandstand was again discussed by Council at its meeting on 22 September through the Chief Executive's report. This discussion followed a resolution from the Golden Bay Community Board, which was:

**GBCB16-08-4**

**That the Golden Bay Community Board**

1. **receives the Takaka Grandstand Report to Golden Bay Community Board: Report RGB16-08-07; and**
  2. **recommends to Council that no demolition order, in respect of the Grandstand, will be given until Full Council have had the opportunity to receive the Grandstand decision from Heritage New Zealand; and**
  3. **recommends that the Grandstand Group and any other significant stakeholder be given the opportunity to make a full presentation to Full Council as part of the meeting at which the Heritage decision regarding the Grandstand is received.**
- 4.10 The Chief Executive recommended that the Council advise the Board that the course of action they recommend is likely to be the course of action followed. The Council passed the following resolution:

**CN16-09-32**

**That the Full Council advises the Golden Bay Community Board that the course of action the Board seeks in relation to the demolition of the Takaka grandstand is likely to be the course of action Council takes.**



***Heritage New Zealand Decision***

- 4.11 Since the September meeting Council has received Heritage New Zealand's decision on our request for an authority to remove the grandstand. The decision is to grant Council authority to remove the grandstand. A copy of the decision is contained in Attachment 1 to this report.
- 4.12 At the time of writing this report the appeal period for the decision had not expired.

4.13 Council agreed not to appeal the decision at its meeting on 1 December 2016, as follows:

**CN16-12-3**

**That the Full Council**

1. receives the A&P Association's Request for the Takaka Grandstand Stairs to be Re-Instated report RCN16-12-01;
2. notes that the grandstand building has received an initial engineering assessment of “potentially earthquake prone” with a “provisional rating of 31% of new building standard”; and
3. notes that the decision of Heritage New Zealand that the grandstand can be removed is still subject to an appeal period of 15 days from Monday 21 November 2016; and
4. declines the request dated 28 October 2016 from the Golden Bay A&P Association to reinstate the stairs to the grandstand at the Golden Bay Recreation Park, whether or not the decision of Heritage New Zealand is that the grandstand can be removed once the appeal period has elapsed; and
5. agrees not to appeal the conditions contained in the Heritage New Zealand authority number 2017/389: N26/308 for Council to remove the grandstand.

4.14 The guidance for applications made to Heritage New Zealand states that “only parties who are **directly** affected by the proposed activity can appeal the authority decision...The *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* does not define what a ‘directly affected party’ is, but the Environment Court determined the following: A directly affected party includes:

- any person with a proprietary interest in the land,
- the applicant for the authority that is the subject of the appeal,
- Tangata Whenua or Moriori (Chatham Islands) who are linked to the site through their ancestry, or
- other persons without a proprietary interest in the land such as children and grandchildren being directly affected by a proposal to dig up a grandparents grave.”

4.15 Given the guidance above, it is unlikely that an appeal by anyone with standing will be received during the appeal period.

4.16 Council is requested to formally receive the Heritage New Zealand decision at this meeting.

4.17 Just prior to this report being placed on the agenda we received notification of an appeal being lodged by the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust with the Environment Court. As noted in para 4.14, it is unlikely that the Trust has standing to appeal the heritage NZ decision. We have already taken legal advice and are responding to the appeal and other proceedings that the Trust has initiated. Those proceedings seek an enforcement order constraining the Council from demolishing (among other things) the grandstand and also a declaration that we have failed in our consultation obligations under the Local Government Act 2002.

4.18 I recommend that Council makes its decision today subject to the outcome of any appeal or any ruling that the Trust or any other appellant does not have standing to appeal.

***Reasons why grandstand needs to be removed from its current site***

- 4.19 There are a number of reasons why we consider that the grandstand needs to be removed. These reasons were outlined in report RCN16-06-03 to the Full Council meeting on 9 June. They include:
- the ongoing costs associated with retaining the grandstand on site (e.g. ongoing maintenance, pan charges, electricity charges);
  - the potential costs of seismic upgrade of the grandstand, including what impact the possible removal of the squash courts, toilets and rugby clubroom would have – estimated cost in excess of \$580,000 (consultants estimate);
  - provision of carparking occupied by the grandstand and required for the grandstand if it stays;
  - disability carparks – this matter has had to be resolved already to enable the building to be used for the A&P Show in January 2017;
  - stormwater drainage issues;
  - aesthetics;
  - access and public safety;
  - impact of grandstand on function room use;
  - fire rating of the grandstand; and
  - financial implications for the new Facility if the clubroom underneath the grandstand is to be retained.
- 4.20 Also, Council may decide that it needs to further consult the community before any decision is made to retain the grandstand. The consultation undertaken to date has been based on the grandstand being removed.
- 4.21 If the grandstand is to be retained, it will impact on the completion of the contract for the new Facility (e.g. completing carparking). The carparking is part of the building consent requirements. While we may be able to get a temporary certificate of public use (CPU) for the A&P Show on 21 January 2017, due to carparking being provided for the Show on an adjacent landowner's property, we may not be able to get a longer term CPU or a code compliance certificate for the building to enable it to be opened for public use until the carparking is completed.
- 4.22 Other matters the Council would need to consider are whether it would be better to build a new purpose built grandstand elsewhere at the Park, if there is a demonstrated need.

***Presentation by key stakeholder groups***

- 4.23 On 6 December, the Mayor, Cr Brown, Lindsay McKenzie and I meet with members of the Golden Bay Community Board, the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust, the Golden Bay A&P Association, Heritage Golden Bay, Golden Bay Museum Society and the Golden Bay Shared Recreational Facility Committee Inc. to discuss the Heritage New Zealand decision to allow Council to demolish the grandstand. At the meeting, the key stakeholder groups (the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust, the Golden Bay A&P Association and the Golden Bay Shared Recreational Facility Committee Inc.) were invited to attend today's meeting and given 15

minutes each to present their views on the future of the grandstand. This invitation is in line with the Council's decision (CN16-09-32) of 22 September 2016.

- 4.24 Our understanding is that each of the groups will take up the offer to present their views to Council.

***Outcome of stakeholder engagement on 6 December***

- 4.25 In an email to the Grandstand Trust on 2 September 2016 (Attachment 2), Mayor Kempthorne outlined that there were two scenarios depending on the Heritage New Zealand decision. The first was that Heritage New Zealand allows the destruction of the grandstand. The second was that Heritage New Zealand requires the grandstand to be retained but allows its alteration. Three "alteration" scenarios were outlined in the email.
- 4.26 The email concluded by stating "I hope that this sets out my thinking and provides you with a steer i.e. the Save the Grandstand team needs to develop its thinking and planning in the event that the grandstand is authorised to go, just as we are doing if it has to stay."
- 4.27 The purpose of the meeting on 6 December was to discuss the thinking and proposals of those in favour of retaining the grandstand, given that Council has been granted authority to demolish the grandstand.
- 4.28 During the stakeholder meeting a range of matters were traversed, including the history of the project and decisions made in getting to this current point in time. There was a lot of discussion about what has happened in the past.
- 4.29 The Grandstand Trust did not put forward any proposals for the grandstand at the meeting.
- 4.30 The meeting discussed the opportunity for "salvage" of the grandstand materials. Discussion ensued on the possibility of the grandstand being demolished in a manner that would enable the grandstand to be erected at an alternative location, with the cost of the demolition falling on Council and the cost of re-erecting and upgrading the grandstand elsewhere to be paid for through community fundraising.
- 4.31 The discussion did not conclude on a particular site for re-erecting the grandstand, although the grandstand supporters suggested that an alternative site at the Recreation Park would be desirable.
- 4.32 While the fact that there would be additional costs incurred for the careful dismantling of the grandstand was noted, no one had any indication of what those costs may be. I have subsequently asked for an estimate of those costs to be provided by the contractor building the new facility, if it is possible to supply such an estimate. The estimate will be provided at the meeting, if it is received in time.

<b>5 Options</b>
------------------

- 5.1 Council has the following options to consider with respect to whether to retain the grandstand or to demolish it:
- 5.1.1 Option 1: Demolish the grandstand in accordance with the conditions of the Heritage New Zealand authority, subject to the outcome of the appeal which has been lodged with the Environment Court by the Golden Bay Grandstand Trust or any other appeal or any ruling that the Trust or any other appellant does not have standing to appeal; and

- 5.1.2 Option 2: Demolish the grandstand in a manner that enables the building to be re-built on an alternative site elsewhere; and
- 5.1.3 Option 3: Retain the grandstand on its current location and demolish the newer additions.
- 5.2 Option 1 – the advantages of option one are that this option would have the least cost to Council and ratepayers, it would be the easiest option to achieve, it would enable the new Facility to be open at the earliest time. Some organisations and members of the public will be happy with the decision to remove the grandstand. The disadvantages of this option are that the grandstand will not be available for use by spectators in the future, any heritage values that the grandstand has will be lost (although an archaeologist will be present during the demolition to record any heritage information) and there will be some organisations and members of the community that will be unhappy with the decision.
- 5.3 Option 2 – the advantages of this option are that there is a possibility that any heritage values of the grandstand may be able to be retained by re-erecting and upgrading the building on an alternative location and some members of the community will be happy with the decision to provide the opportunity for the grandstand to be relocated, while others will be happy for the building to be removed from the Recreation Park. The disadvantages of this option are that:
- 5.3.1 there will be additional costs in dismantling the building carefully to enable it to be re-erected, which may need to be borne by Council; and
- 5.3.2 there is uncertainty that the building will have sufficient integrity to be re-erected; and
- 5.3.3 an alternative location will need to be found for the building; and
- 5.3.4 an organisation will need to agree to pay for the re-erection of the building and its ongoing maintenance costs (unless Council agrees to fund these aspects of the work). There is uncertainty as to whether another organisation could raise the funds needed for this work; and
- 5.3.5 there will be additional time required to do this work; and
- 5.3.6 the additional time is likely to lead to delays in the new Facility being completed and open for use; and
- 5.3.7 Council resources and project management consultants will be needed to continue working on the project; and
- 5.3.8 the history of the grandstand being connected to the Recreation Park and the A&P Show will be lost.
- 5.4 Option 3 – the advantages of this option are that any heritage values of the grandstand may be able to be retained if funding was made available for the upgrade of the building, some organisations and members of the public will be happy with the decision to retain the grandstand, the grandstand will be available for use at future A&P Shows and events (if it is upgraded), and the connection between the grandstand and the Recreation Park and Shows will be retained. Under this option the squash courts, toilets and rugby clubrooms would be demolished. The disadvantages of this option are the cost estimated at upwards of \$580,000 by consultants and the other matters outlined in paras 4.19 – 4.21 above. If the grandstand is to be retained, it would remain closed to the public until funds to upgrade it are secured and the upgrade completed.

## 6 Strategy and Risks

- 6.1 Council has changed its approach to its financial and asset management strategies. These changes are set out in the Long Term Plan 2015-2025 (LTP). While it is early days there is good evidence that the strategy is achieving its financial objectives based on rates and debt levels.
- 6.2 Investment in community facilities was acknowledged to have been at a high level in the past. The Golden Bay Community Recreation Facility remained a priority. Others projects were deferred.
- 6.3 Council is advised to adhere to its strategy. If there is to be a departure through agreeing additional funding towards the grandstand, then any investment in the grandstand should be assessed against other calls to bring spending forward.
- 6.4 A decision on the future of the grandstand carries risks either way it goes. The financial risks of retaining it as well as the risks to the new Facility which are covered in this report. There is a risk of further appeals against Heritage New Zealand's decision to authorise the grandstand's removal. There is also a risk that a decision to confirm the removal of the grandstand could be further challenged, as could a decision to retain the grandstand by those people in the community who want the building removed.
- 6.5 Other key risks include:
- 6.5.1 reputational risks as a result of supporting or failing to support the GBSRF and/or the petitioners; and
  - 6.5.2 being seen as a vacillating unreliable principal to a contract; and
  - 6.5.3 that the opening of the new Facility may be delayed if the grandstand stays in its current location, as the carparking required to meet the conditions of the building consent will not be constructed. This may delay the ability to use the new Facility; and
  - 6.5.4 the risk of fire transfer between the grandstand and the new Facility should a fire break out, due to the close location of the grandstand and the new Facility; and
  - 6.5.5 if Council agrees to allow re-erection of the grandstand at an alternative location (if this is feasible) there is the risk that the community group responsible may not be able to raise sufficient funds to undertake the work and to do any seismic upgrade required for the building to be used; and
  - 6.5.6 litigation.
- 6.6 It is councillors' role to make fact and value based judgements in such circumstances and your duty is to consider the best interests of the district when you do.

## 7 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan

- 7.1 Over the years there has been a great deal of consultation on the Golden Bay Community Recreation Facility project, which included the removal of the grandstand. It has been contained in Council's Long Term Plans since at least 2009. In the Draft Annual Plan 2014/2015 Council proposed removing the project from the work plan. Following strong support from the Golden Bay community for the project, Council decided to put the project back into the final Annual Plan.

- 7.2 The feasibility study for the new Facility project undertaken in February 2013 noted that “The feasibility study confirmed the need for the facility, that it was supported by the community and that it should be operationally viable. The feasibility study noted that the new facility would replace the aging grandstand and clubrooms at the Golden Bay Recreation Park”.
- 7.3 Since the early beginnings of the project, the concept plans have shown that the grandstand would no longer be on the site.
- 7.4 Much of the consultation on the project has been undertaken by the local Golden Bay Shared Recreation Facility Committee (GBSRFC), which includes representatives from many of the groups that use the Recreation Park. Consultation on the Facility project, including its location on the Park, had been undertaken with local sporting clubs and the wider community (e.g. at Golden Bay A&P Shows).
- 7.5 In 2014 Council (itself) also undertook a wider community consultation exercise on the concept plans for the new Facility. The Facility design and location largely conforms with the concept plans consulted on at that time.
- 7.6 The Council should have been able to rely on all the consultation that has been undertaken for its decision making processes. The people currently expressing concern over the grandstand removal had the opportunity to engage in the consultation processes undertaken but did not do so.
- 7.7 The decision to remove or demolish of the grandstand was subject to the granting of an authority to modify or destroy the grandstand under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, which was received by Council.
- 7.8 Here is a recap on the Council’s legal obligations in relation to planning, decision making and accountability.
- 7.9 Consultation that the Council undertakes must –
- 7.9.1 provide persons affected or interested in the decision with reasonable access to relevant information;
  - 7.9.2 encourage people to present their views and provide a reasonable opportunity for them to do so;
  - 7.9.3 give clear information about the purpose of the consultation;
  - 7.9.4 receive views with an open mind;
  - 7.9.5 leave a clear record of the decisions;
  - 7.9.6 provide processes for Maori.
- 7.10 It is up to the Council to decide the extent to which these principles are observed in any circumstances taking into account the extent to which the current views and preferences of persons who will or may be affected or have an interest in the decision are known to the Council. So there is no legal obligation to consult in this case and as you will know, there is no obligation to take a position that is advocated to you – even one that has majority support.
- 7.11 There are other factors that the Council must have regard to when deciding on the extent to which it will comply with the decision making provisions in the Local Government Act. They include the principles in S14 of the Act, Council’s resources and the extent to which the nature of the decision, or the circumstances in which it is taken allow the Council the scope to consider options, or the views and preferences of persons.

7.12 Among the S14 principles that are relevant here are –

- 7.12.1 Openness
- 7.12.2 The views of all communities
- 7.12.3 Your (strategic) priorities and desired outcomes
- 7.12.4 Collaboration with other bodies
- 7.12.5 Prudent stewardship of resources
- 7.12.6 Effective future management of assets.

7.13 While you can never be sure, the law as it now stands and the extent of consultation undertaken by the Council, GBSRFC and the Community Board involvement should give you confidence that your decision is beyond successful challenge.

7.14 Even if it could be successfully argued that the removal of the grandstand was not explicitly consulted on, there can be no doubt now that that is the proposal.

## **8 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications**

8.1 The financial implications of the options are outlined in section 5 above as part of the analysis of the options. The costs of option 2 are not currently known.

## **9 Significance and Engagement**

9.1 The decisions being sought in this report are of moderate significance overall in the Golden Bay area, but of low significance in the rest of the district. As noted above, Council has already consulted extensively and it has a good understanding of the views of the groups that seek to retain the grandstand through the consultation it has undertaken. You are also hearing from the three key stakeholder groups at today's meeting. I consider that further consultation is not required prior to making a decision to demolish the grandstand. However, if Council wishes to consider retaining the grandstand, it may wish to consult the community, as it is a change from previous proposal consulted on.



Issue	Level of Significance	Explanation of Assessment
Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?	Moderate in Golden Bay, low in the rest of the District	There are some members of the public in Golden Bay that have a high degree of interest in this matter, whether the decision is to remove the grandstand or retain it. There does not seem to be much interest in the matter from elsewhere in the district. However, if the costs of this project increase, it could get much wider interest.
Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?	High	The decision to demolish the grandstand will mean that the building will be removed permanently.
Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)	Low	The grandstand is not a strategic asset in Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
Does the decision create a substantial change in the level of service provided by Council?	Low	The removal of the grandstand will mean that people will not be able to view the A&P Show or games at the Recreation Park from a grandstand. There will be some limited viewing of the Park from the mezzanine floor of the new Facility.  This matter does not affect Council's stated levels of service.
Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?	Low	The decision to remove the grandstand has been budgeted, therefore, it will not impact on budgets. However, if the Council decided to retain the grandstand it would have budgetary implications.
Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?	No	
Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?	No	
Does the proposal or decision involve Council exiting from or entering into a group of activities?	No	

**10 Conclusion**

- 10.1 It is sufficiently clear from the consultation material and information that has been in the public domain that the grandstand was to be removed. Even if that is not accepted by some people, it would be incredible if anyone argued that they do not know now.
- 10.2 It is also possible that some may argue that the Council has not explicitly decided to remove or demolish the grandstand even though it is provided for in the contract.
- 10.3 There is no need to consult on the decisions as in the past year the issue has had a major airing in the community and the feedback from that further informs your decision.
- 10.4 If you wish to give weight to any of the different community views and preferences, then that should favour the views of the GBSRFC. That is because they are Council's funding partner, represent the users and those most affected, have undertaken much of the consultation and are the body that is assisting Council to achieve its priorities and outcomes for community facilities in Golden Bay.
- 10.5 Council is therefore advised to confirm that the grandstand is to be demolished, as per option 1 in this report.

**11 Next Steps / Timeline**

- 11.1 The next steps will be dependent on the decision made at the meeting and the outcome of the appeal to the Environment Court by the Grandstand Trust.

**12 Attachments**

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Heritage NZ decision                             | 19 |
| 2. | Email from Mayor Kempthorne re Takaka Grandstand | 29 |



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA

S:\Archaeology\Archaeological Authorities

21 November 2016

File ref: 2017/389  
11013-049

Tasman District Council  
Private Bag 4  
RICHMOND 7050  
Attn: Susan Edwards  
Community Development Manager

Tena koe Susan

**APPLICATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY UNDER HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA ACT 2014: Authority no. 2017/389: N26/308, Golden Bay Recreation  
Park, 2032 Takaka Valley Highway, Takaka Valley**

Thank you for your application for an archaeological authority which has been granted and is attached.

In considering this application, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga notes that you wish to demolish the grandstand at Golden Bay Recreation Park and undertake development for a new community recreation facility and its associated car parking in Takaka Valley. This activity will affect a recorded archaeological site. The Golden Bay Grandstand has been a gathering-space for recreation and civic events for more than 117 years.

Although the grandstand has been extensively modified and added on to over the years, it still possesses important social and historical values. The proposed demolition of the building will remove the remaining archaeological and associated values that are retained within the structure.

We appreciate the consultation you have undertaken with Manawhenua Ki Mohua, who have indicated that they neither oppose or supports either side of the grandstand discussion.

Please inform the approved archaeologist and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Office of start and finish dates for the work.

An appeal period from receipt of decision by all parties applies. Therefore this authority may not be exercised during the appeal period of 15 working days or until any appeal that has been lodged is resolved.

If you have any queries please direct your response in the first instance to:

Christine Barnett  
Regional Archaeologist  
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Wellington Office  
PO Box 2629, Wellington 6140

Phone (04) 494 8323 Email [Archaeologist1CR@heritage.org.nz](mailto:Archaeologist1CR@heritage.org.nz)

Yours sincerely



Pam Bain  
Senior Archaeologist

cc: Tasman District Council  
Attn: Susan Edwards  
via email at [susan.edwards@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:susan.edwards@tasman.govt.nz)

cc: Deb Foster  
via email at [mamakunelson@xtra.co.nz](mailto:mamakunelson@xtra.co.nz)

cc: Manawhenua Ki Mohua  
via email at Bev Purdie [bpurdie1902@gmail.com](mailto:bpurdie1902@gmail.com)

cc: Planning Manager  
Tasman District Council  
via email at [susan.edwards@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:susan.edwards@tasman.govt.nz)

Pursuant to Section 51 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga must notify TLAs of any decision made on an application to modify or destroy an archaeological site. We recommend that this advice is placed on the appropriate property file for future reference.

cc: Ministry for Culture and Heritage  
via email at [protected-objects@mch.govt.nz](mailto:protected-objects@mch.govt.nz)

Pursuant to Section 51 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014

cc: NZAA Central Filekeeper  
c/o DOC, WELLINGTON  
Attn: Nicola Molloy  
via email at [nmolloy@doc.govt.nz](mailto:nmolloy@doc.govt.nz)

cc: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist, Christine Barnett

cc: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Central General Manager, Claire Craig

cc: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Maori Heritage Advisor, Dean Whiting



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA

## **AUTHORITY**

### **Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014**

**AUTHORITY NO:** 2017/389

**FILE REF:** 11013-049

**DETERMINATION DATE:** 21 November 2016

**EXPIRY DATE:** 21 November 2021

**AUTHORITY HOLDER:** Tasman District Council

**POSTAL ADDRESS:** Private Bag 4, RICHMOND 7050

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:** N26/308

**LOCATION:** Golden Bay Recreation Park, 2032 Takaka Valley Highway, Takaka Valley

**APPROVED ARCHAEOLOGIST:** Deb Foster

**LANDOWNER CONSENT:** Completed

**This authority may not be exercised during the appeal period of 15 working days or until any appeal that has been lodged is resolved.**

#### **DETERMINATION**

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga grants a general authority pursuant to section 48 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 in respect of the archaeological described above, within the area specified as Pt sec 1, Sec 22 Takaka District Block X, Waitapu SD. NN75/221 Nelson Registry to Tasman District Council for the proposal to demolish the grandstand building at Golden Bay Recreation Park and undertake development of a new community recreation facility, infrastructure works and associated car parking at Golden Bay Recreation Park, 2032 Takaka Valley Highway, Takaka Valley, subject to the following conditions:

#### **CONDITIONS OF AUTHORITY**

1. The authority holder must ensure that all contractors working on the project are briefed by the approved archaeologist on the possibility of encountering archaeological evidence, how to identify possible archaeological sites during works, the archaeological work required by the conditions of this authority, and contractors' responsibilities with regard to notification of the discovery of archaeological evidence to ensure that the authority conditions are complied with.

2. The authority must be exercised in accordance with a Demolition and Building Recording Methodology Management Plan to be prepared prior to the start of works and approved by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, and any changes to the plan require the prior written agreement of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.

This plan should be developed by the approved archaeologist, the Tasman District Council Project Manager and the demolition contractor in order that the archaeological elements of the project can be carried out in conjunction with the demolition process to allow for efficient and effective archaeological site recording.

3. All earthworks that may affect any archaeological sites must be monitored by an archaeologist approved by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
4. Any archaeological evidence encountered during the exercise of this authority must be investigated, recorded and analysed in accordance with current archaeological practice.
5. The buildings at Golden Bay Recreation Park, 2032 Takaka Valley Highway, Takaka Valley must be investigated, recorded and analysed prior to their demolition to document and recover information about their construction, alteration and use through time. This is to be undertaken to a minimum standard of Level IV recording as defined in Guidelines for the Investigation and Recording of Buildings and Standing Structures (Archaeological Guideline Series No. 1).
6. The authority holder must ensure that if any possible taonga or Maori artefacts, or sites of Maori origin are encountered, all work should cease within 20 metres of the discovery. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist must be advised immediately and no further work in the area may take place until they have responded.
7. That within 20 working days of the completion of the on-site archaeological work associated with this authority;
  - a) An interim report outlining the archaeological work undertaken must be submitted to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist.
  - b) Site record forms must be updated or submitted to the NZAA Site Recording Scheme.
8. That within 12 months of the completion of the on-site archaeological work, the authority holder shall ensure that a final report, completed to the satisfaction of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, is submitted to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist.
  - a) One hard copy and one digital copy of the final report are to be sent to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist.
  - b) Digital copies of the final report must also be sent to: NZAA Central Filekeeper; Nelson Provincial Museum; Manawhenua Ki Mohua

Signed for and on behalf of Heritage New Zealand.



**Nicola Jackson**  
**National Heritage Policy Manager**  
**Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga**  
**PO Box 2629**  
**WELLINGTON 6140**

Date *21 November 2016*



**ADVICE NOTES****Contact details for Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist**

Christine Barnett  
Regional Archaeologist  
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Wellington Office  
PO Box 2629, Wellington 6140

Phone (04) 494 8323 Email [Archaeologist1CR@heritage.org.nz](mailto:Archaeologist1CR@heritage.org.nz)

**Current Archaeological Practice**

Current archaeological practice may include, but is not limited to, the production of maps/ plans/ measured drawings of site location and extent; excavation, section and artefact drawings; sampling, identification and analysis of faunal and floral remains and modified soils; radiocarbon dating of samples; the management of taonga tuturu and archaeological material; the completion of a final report and the updating of existing (or creation of new) site record forms to submit to the NZAA Site Recording Scheme. The final report shall include, but need not be limited to, site plans, section drawings, photographs, inventory of material recovered, including a catalogue of artefacts, location of where the material is currently held, and analysis of recovered material.

Please note that where one is required, an interim report should contain a written summary outlining the archaeological work undertaken, the preliminary results, and the approximate percentage of archaeological material remaining *in-situ* and a plan showing areas subject to earthworks, areas monitored and the location and extent of any archaeological sites affected or avoided.

**Rights of Appeal**

An appeal to the Environment Court may be made by any directly affected person against any decision or condition. The notice of appeal should state the reasons for the appeal and the relief sought and any matters referred to in section 58 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. The notice of appeal must be lodged with the Environment Court and served on Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga within 15 working days of receiving the determination, and served on the applicant or owner within five working days of lodging the appeal.

**Review of Conditions**

The holder of an authority may apply to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for the change or cancellation of any condition of the authority. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga may also initiate a review of all or any conditions of an authority.

**Non-compliance with conditions**

Note that failure to comply with any of the conditions of this authority is a criminal offence and is liable to a penalty of up to \$120,000 (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, section 88).

**Costs**

The authority holder shall meet all costs incurred during the exercise of this authority. This includes all on-site work, post fieldwork analysis, radiocarbon dates, specialist analysis and preparation of interim and final reports.

**Assessment and Interim Report Templates**

Assessment and interim report templates are available on the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga website: [archaeology.nz](http://archaeology.nz)

**Guideline Series**

Guidelines referred to in this document are available on the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga website: [archaeology.nz](http://archaeology.nz)

**The Protected Objects Act 1975**

The Ministry for Culture and Heritage (“the Ministry”) administers the Protected Objects Act 1975 which regulates the sale, trade and ownership of taonga tūturu.

If a taonga tūturu is found during the course of an archaeological authority, the Ministry or the nearest public museum must be notified of the find within 28 days of the completion of the field work.

Breaches of this requirement are an offence and may result in a fine of up to \$10,000 for each taonga tūturu for an individual, and of up to \$20,000 for a body corporate.

For further information please visit the Ministry’s website at <http://www.mch.govt.nz/nz-identity-heritage/protected-objects>.



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA

## **APPROVED ARCHAEOLOGIST**

### **Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014**

---

AUTHORITY NO: 2017/389

FILE REF: 11013-049

APPROVAL DATE: 21 November 2016

---

This approval may not be exercised during the appeal period of 15 working days, or until any appeal that has been lodged is resolved.

---

#### **APPROVAL**

Pursuant to section 45 of the Act, **Deb Foster**, is approved by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga to carry out any archaeological work required as a condition of authority 2017/389, and to compile and submit a report on the work done. Deb Foster will hold responsibility for the current archaeological practice in respect of the archaeological authority for which this approval is given.

Signed for and on behalf of Heritage New Zealand.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'NJ'.

**Nicola Jackson**  
**National Heritage Policy Manager**  
**Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga**  
**PO Box 2629**  
**WELLINGTON 6140**

Date *21 November 2016*



**Tara Fifield**

---

**Subject:** FW: Takaka Grandstand

**From:** Richard Kempthorne  
**Sent:** Friday, 2 September 2016 11:29 a.m.  
**To:** 'jmpearson@ts.co.nz' <jmpearson@ts.co.nz>  
**Subject:** Takaka Grandstand

Hello Jill

Thank you to you and Jane for coming to see me and Lindsay on Wednesday. We undertook to set out how we see things. Firstly, I hope that you can now see that it would be counterproductive if Council rescinded its resolution. Whatever happens, Heritage NZ approval is needed and its best that everyone knows, sooner rather than later, how they view the grandstand and what they will authorise being done to it.

Here are some possible scenarios –

1. Heritage NZ allow its 'destruction'. Presumably they will only do so if the grandstand is considered to not have heritage values that warrant its retention in any form. In that case there would be no heritage rationale for the Council to retain the grandstand. It is likely that in this scenario the grandstand and its associated structures would be demolished. I assured you that it won't be a case of the Heritage NZ report arriving one day and the bulldozer the next under this scenario. I've undertaken that the Council will be formally advised of the Heritage NZ authorisation first. Under this scenario also, if the community wants to save the grandstand, let's say shift it for future restoration, notwithstanding the lack of heritage values, a viable community-led proposal will be needed. Planning for that needs to start now. That is because under this scenario the priority will be getting the rec centre consented to open and if that means getting the grandstand removed that is what will happen.
2. Heritage NZ allows its 'alteration'. There are several possibilities here. Heritage NZ may not authorise any alterations at all, may authorise the removal of the post 1900's additions, may authorise the relocation of the grandstand after the removal of those additions or may not authorise its relocation even after those additions are removed. I cannot usefully speculate what could happen under each and every scenario. What I can say is that if Heritage NZ allow the grandstand to be removed then that is what the Council is likely to do for the reasons that have been set out before. We'd certainly need to engage yourselves, the A&P Society, the GBSRC(Inc) and the Community Board in the decision making on that. In the event that the grandstand is required to stay, with or without its associated structures, the Council has some rethinking to do, which we have begun. We'd certainly need to engage all four groups in that situation as well.

I hope that this sets out my thinking and provides you with a steer i.e. the Save the Grandstand team needs to develop its thinking and planning in the event that the grandstand is authorised to go, just as we are doing if it has to stay.

Kind regards

Richard Kempthorne



**6.2 ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION ON THE ANNUAL PLAN 2017/2018**

Decision Required

<b>Report To:</b>	Full Council
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	15 December 2016
<b>Report Author:</b>	Alan Bywater, Senior Policy Advisor
<b>Report Number:</b>	RCN16-12-18

**1 Summary**

- 1.1 The Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) requires councils to consult on their Annual Plans if there are changes for the corresponding year in the relevant Long Term Plan (LTP) that are significant or material. If this is the case a consultation document needs to be produced and a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) carried out.
- 1.2 The proposed Annual Plan for the 2017/2018 year contains reductions in the levels of rates income and lower debt than was set out for this year in the Long Term Plan (LTP) 2015-2025. In addition, there are changes to the capital programme as a result of a number of factors. However, the majority of these changes are in the timing of projects which have already been consulted on through the LTP 2015-2025.
- 1.3 For the reasons outlined in this report, the changes being made to the Annual Plan are considered to be neither significant or material. Therefore, I recommend that the Council adopt an informal communication/engagement process similar to that undertaken for the Annual Plan 2015/2016.

**2 Draft Resolution****That the Full Council**

- 1. receives the Engagement and Consultation on the Annual Plan 2017/2018 report RCN16-12-18; and**
- 2. agrees that the proposed changes to the work programme, debt levels and rates for 2017/2018, compared to those set out year 3 of the Long Term Plan 2015-2025, are not significant or material; and**
- 3. agrees not to produce an Annual Plan Consultation Document for 2017/2018; and**
- 4. instructs staff to prepare a less formal communication/engagement process for the rates and services for 2017/2018, and as a means of seeking early input from the community for changes to be considered in the LTP 2018-2028; and**
- 5. notes that a final Annual Plan and rates resolution will be brought to a Council meeting in May 2017 for consideration and adoption; and**
- 6. notes that a report and Statement of Proposal will come to Council in February 2017 outlining the proposed Schedule of Charges for 2017/2018.**

**3 Purpose of the Report**

3.1 This report is to:

3.1.1 brief you on the consultation requirements for the Annual Plan; and

3.1.2 obtain approval to undertake an informal communications and engagement process with the community on the services we are currently delivering, the 2017/2018 work programme, and rates.

**4 Background and Discussion**

4.1 As a result of changes made in 2014, the Act now only requires councils to consult on their annual plans if there are changes from the corresponding year in the relevant Long Term Plan (LTP) that are *significant or material*. It should be noted that councils can elect to produce a consultation document and carry out a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) even if there are no significant or material changes.

4.2 The intention of the changes was to achieve efficiencies through providing flexibility to councils in the way they consult and to improve the consultation on Annual Plans.

4.3 Last year Council decided that there were few changes to the proposed works programme for 2016/2017 year and that the changes to rates and debts improved Council's and ratepayers' financial position. Council considered that these changes were not significant or material and determined not to produce a consultation document. Communication and informal consultation was carried out.

4.4 At a workshop on 30 November 2016, Council discussed the changes in rates, debt level and the capital programme for the 2017/2018 year. The key points covered at the workshop were:

4.4.1 the proposed total rates income to be collected for 2017/2018 will be lower than that set out in the LTP 2015-2025; and

4.4.2 the proposed debt level for 2017/2018 will be lower than that set out in the LTP 2015-2025; and

4.4.3 there are a number of changes between the capital programme for the 2017/2018 year as set out in the LTP and the proposed capital programme in the Annual Plan 2017/2018.

**4.5 Rating Changes**

4.6 The revenue for rates proposed in the Annual Plan 2017/2018 will be lower than year 3 of the LTP 2015-2025 by between \$2 million to \$3 million depending on the final decisions made by Council.

4.7 As discussed at recent workshops, the incidence of rates does not fall evenly and the impact on individual rate payers will vary across the district and across property types.



**Debt Changes**

- 4.8 The debt level in the proposed Annual Plan 2017/2018 will be lower than the forecast debt for the same year in the LTP 2015-2025, with the actual level to be determined by the final decisions made by Council.
- 4.9 The Financial Strategy in the LTP 2015-2025 sets a limit to external debt of \$200 million. Debt for the 2017/2018 year is forecast to be well within this limit.
- 4.10 In the LTP 2015-2025 Council also set out its intention to reduce net debt from a projected \$168 million in 2015 to \$120 million in 2025. The changes in the debt level for 2017/2018 in the Annual Plan are consistent with this intention.
- 4.11 Council has communicated lower debt levels to the public over the last couple of years. In the Annual Report 2015/2016 debt levels were reported at \$129 million, lower than the Annual Plan forecast of \$173 million. Similarly, a lower debt of \$166.4 million was forecast in the Annual Plan 2016/2017.

**Changes to the Capital Programme**

- 4.12 There are a number of proposed changes to the capital works programme in the Annual Plan 2017/2018. Changes to this programme are generally more likely in the third year of an LTP cycle due to the time lag between the adoption of the LTP and the year concerned.
- 4.13 Overall the proposed capital programme for 2017/2018 will be higher than the programme signaled in the LTP 2015-2025 for the corresponding year.
- 4.14 This change in the overall capital budget is made up of:
- carryovers from previous years (i.e. projects and capital expenditure scheduled to have taken place prior to the 2017/2018 year, now taking place in that year); and
  - projects being deferred or requiring less capital in the 2017/2018 year than anticipated; and
  - projects that are either new, brought forward or require more capital than was anticipated in the 2017/2018 year.
- 4.15 A significant proportion of the change to the capital programme is the result of carryovers (i.e. it is for projects consulted on and adopted in the LTP 2015-2025 for which the timing of delivery has changed).

**Levels of Service Changes**

- 4.16 The levels of service set out in the LTP and those that we are working to achieve are unchanged.
- 4.17 Council will no longer be reporting on rural fire levels of service as a consequence of changes to legislation nationally.

<b>5 Options</b>
------------------

## 5.1 Options:

5.1.1 Option 1 - prepare a consultation document for the 2017/2018 year and undertake a section 82 engagement process under the Act.

5.1.2 Option 2 - prepare an informal consultation/engagement plan focusing on the key messages on the rates, debt and capital work programme, and focus on LTP communication. **Preferred option.**

5.1.3 Option 3 - not carry out any engagement or consultation for the 2017/2018 year on the basis that the changes from the corresponding year in the LTP2015-2025 are not significant or material.

Features	Option 1. Consultation document.	Option 2. Informal communication/engagement process with no consultation document  This is the recommended option	Option 3. No consultation/engagement process
Engagement	LGA Section 82 consultation process i.e. Council would consult via the development of a consultation document and SCP.  Submissions would be sought and the public offered the opportunity to present their views at hearings.	Communication/engagement would be carried out focused on the rates, debt level and changes to the capital programme, although without the production of a consultation document or formal submissions and hearings.	No consultation process or public engagement would be carried out.
Final Annual Plan and rates Adoption	By the end of June 2017	Proposed to be by the end of May 2017	Proposed to be by the end of May 2017
Advantages	It would provide members of the public an opportunity to provide feedback on the	Provides Council the ability to communicate the changes in the 2017/2018 year and provide the public with an opportunity to provide feedback without using	Lowest cost option with least impact on councillor and staff time.

	<p>Council's proposed changes for the 2017/2018 year.</p> <p>Unlikely to be a legal challenge to this option. Also provides an early opportunity for the public to inform the preparation of the LTP 2018-2028.</p>	<p>resources to develop a consultation document or hold hearings when they are not required.</p> <p>Also provides an early opportunity for the public to inform the preparation of the LTP 2018-2028.</p>	
Disadvantages	<p>Resources and time required to develop a consultation document and enable the opportunity for public feedback.</p>	<p>There is a small possibility of a legal challenge to our assessment that there are no "significant or material" changes proposed to year three of the LTP.</p> <p>Some members of the public who are used to making formal submissions to Council might be disappointed.</p>	<p>No opportunity provided for members of the public to comment on the Annual plan 2017/2018.</p> <p>Higher risk of legal challenge on the grounds that the changes are significant and/or material by someone concerned that they cannot share their views with Council.</p> <p>No early opportunity for the public to inform the preparation of the LTP 2018-2028.</p>

## 6 Strategy and Risks

- 6.1 2016/2017 was the first year that local authorities have had the option of not consulting on a Draft Annual Plan. The meaning of "significant or material differences" in terms of this change to the LGA has not been tested in court.
- 6.2 If you decide not to produce a consultation document for the Annual Plan 2017/2018 you must still adopt a final Annual Plan and rates by the end of June 2017.
- 6.3 If you decide to not proceed with an Annual Plan Consultation Document, there is a small possibility that a member of the public might challenge the assessment that there are no "significant or material differences from the content of the Long Term Plan" for 2017/2018.
- 6.4 Some members of the public might also consider that the proposed lower rates and debt levels are an opportunity to add new projects to Council's work programme. Others might

prefer that Council remove some projects or services. Similarly, some members of the public may have comments about the changes to the capital programme.

- 6.5 Staff consider that it is unlikely that there would be a successful legal challenge to an annual plan process where the levels of service are largely unchanged, most of the larger changes to the work programme are in the timing of projects that have already been consulted on, and where debt levels and proposed rates are lower than forecast.

## **7 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan**

- 7.1 If Council determines that the changes between the 2017/2018 year in the LTP and the Annual Plan 2017/2018 are either significant or material, we are required to prepare a consultation document and carry out a SCP.
- 7.2 However, if Council determines that the changes between the 2017/2018 year in the LTP and the Annual Plan 2017/2018 are not significant or material, we have the option of either carrying out informal engagement and communication, or not consulting at all.
- 7.3 If you agree with our assessment of the significance and materiality of the changes from the LTP 2015-2025 (in Attachment 1), then you could adopt option two and instruct staff not to prepare a consultation document.
- 7.4 There are also a number of fees and charges that require consultation under separate legislation, for example Resource Consent fees. We will bring a report to the February Council meeting on the Schedule of Charges, together with a Statement of Proposal for Council's consideration.

## **8 Consideration of Financial or Budgetary Implications**

- 8.1 As noted above the proposed budgets show a lower rates increase and lower debt than previously expected for 2017/2018. The total capital expenditure programme is also different to what was proposed in year 3 of the LTP, but the majority of change is the result of changes to the timing of projects.
- 8.2 There are savings to Council by not producing a consultation document and carrying out a SCP process. These savings include the costs of formal hearings, printing costs, responding to submissions and advertising. Overall the theme in this report is that the costs in preparing and consulting on a consultation document, which has no significant or material matters, outweigh the benefits of such a process.
- 8.3 There would however still be some costs if Council chooses the informal communication and engagement process set out in option two, but these would be lower than for option one.

## **9 Significance and Engagement**

- 9.1 The significance and materiality of the changes in the Annual Plan 2017/2018 have been analysed in Attachment 1.
- 9.2 As well as these points you should also consider section 78 of the Act. This section states that *a local authority must, in the course of its decision-making process in relation to a*

*matter, give consideration to the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter.*

- 9.3 Submissions to our Annual Plans and Long Term Plans in recent years have generally supported lower rates increases. Many submissions to the LTP 2015-2025 were strongly in favour of the new Financial Strategy which proposed lower debt levels and lower rates increases than in previous years.
- 9.4 Although some members of the public might wish to have changes made to the services and work programme for 2017/2018 the LTP process was robust and the public had an opportunity to make submissions at that time.

## **10 Conclusion**

- 10.1 Council undertook a robust process in developing the Long Term Plan 2015-2025. The programme of work for 2017/2018 is in line with what was determined in the LTP (albeit with a number of timing changes). Changes to the capital works programme, lower rates and lower debt than forecast in the LTP will be provided for in the Annual Plan 2017/2018. We do not consider these changes to be significant or material.
- 10.2 The 2014 changes to the Act provide you with an opportunity to undertake a communication and engagement process with the public on Council services and the outcomes that we are working towards, without producing a consultation document and carrying out a SCP.

## **11 Next Steps / Timeline**

- 11.1 That staff come back to you in early 2017 to confirm the budgets for 2017/2018 and with a communication/engagement plan.
- 11.2 Engagement with the public would be undertaken in March/April 2017, and the final Annual Plan and rates resolution adopted in May 2017.

## **12 Attachments**

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Significance and Materiality Assessment, Annual Plan 2017/2018 | 39 |
|----|--|----|



## Analysis of Significance and Materiality for the proposed changes to year 3 of the Long Term Plan 2015-2025

### Capital works programme

Proposed change: The total cost of the programme is proposed to be higher in 2017/2018 than compared with the level forecast in year three of the LTP. The majority of this difference is accounted for in carry forwards. Effectively this is work in the capital programme that was scheduled in the LTP to have been completed before the 2017/2018 year but for one reason or another has been delayed. The change from the LTP for this work is one of timing only. In addition, there are a number of projects being delayed or requiring less funding in the 2017/2018 year. There are also a number of projects that are new (i.e. that were not listed in the LTP) or have been brought forward.

The change to the capital programme consists of a number items that have been brought forward or of new work (i.e. not listed in the LTP 2015-2025 for the 2017/2018 year). The major items (over \$300,000) are as follows:

- Storm water land designations of \$2.5m brought forward as a result of either the earlier need of the land to enable development or because the landowners concerned are developing requiring us to purchase the land
- Poutama drain – new \$500,000 for extra width and dig out to accommodate denser development than previously anticipated.
- Lower Queen Street wastewater pipe – \$175,000 to respond to development taking place in the area.
- Motueka water treatment plant - \$350,000 to provide the ability to chlorinate the water supply when necessary for the Recreation Centre and Parkers Road.
- Water main Richmond West – increase of \$310,000 to extend the length of the pipe.
- Water main Bateup Road - \$300,000 brought forward to respond to growth.
- 183 Queen Street – urgent remedial work (\$500,000) as building condition is compromised and there is a need to meet obligations to the tenant.
- Mapua Wharf - urgent remedial work (\$357,000) as building condition is compromised and there is a need to meet obligations to the tenant.

The change to the capital programme also consists of a number of items that were programmed in the LTP 2015-2025 but will no longer take place in 2017/2018. The major items are as follows:

- Rivers – reduction of \$200,000 to reflect healthy surplus which can be called on in the case of any emergency events.
- Roading - Motueka Town Centre renewal \$840,000. Project deferred due to delays completing the Richmond Town Centre project and limited capacity.
- Storm water - Richmond deviation bund drainage \$970,000 reduced to \$150,000. Project deferred one year for consenting and land purchase.
- Storm water - Middlebank Drive pipe \$1.3m deferred as Borck Creek drain not yet ready to receive the storm water. Project to be further considered in the LTP 2018-2028.
- Water - Wakefield water supply project reduced from \$3.67m to \$0.4m for design only. The project has been delayed by one year.
- Solid waste – \$450,000 in reductions to reflect expenditure brought forward into the 2016/2017 year.



	<b>Level of Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Materiality</b>
Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?	<p>A large portion of the change in the capital programme consists of projects that were consulted on and included in the LTP 2015-2025, but are taking place at a later date. For most of these the level of public interest will be low, particularly as there is little or no ability at this point to achieve them to their original timeline.</p> <p>There are projects requiring additional capital in 2017/2018 as a result of growth in the District. These will be of high interest to the developers involved, but have lower general public interest.</p> <p>There are also a number of projects requiring less capital expenditure in 2017/2018 than anticipated in the LTP 2015-2025. For a number of these this is because the timing of the projects have changed.</p> <p>With some exceptions, we are proposing to deliver on largely the same programme as was consulted on as part of the LTP 2015-2025, however the timing of some projects have been delayed.</p>	On the face of it the change in the capital works programme between year 3 of the LTP and the Annual Plan 2017/2018 looks material. However, given that the changes have largely come about from a change in the timing of various projects, the materiality is low.
Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?	No. The change is mainly in the timing of projects with most being unavoidable delays caused by a range of factors. Low significance.	No. See comment on significance.
Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)	No. Low significance.	N/A

Does the decision create a substantial change in the level of service provided by the Council?	The levels of service are not affected by the changes to the capital works programme.	No changes to the levels of service so not material.
Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?	The change in capital the expenditure is largely the result of carryovers from previous years. This means that less has been spent in previous years and as a consequence more funds will be spent in the 2017/2018 year.	Not material. The change is largely one of the timing of expenditure.
Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?	No. Therefore, of low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?	No. Therefore of low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal or decision involve Council exiting from or entering into a group of activities?	No. Therefore of low significance.	N/A
Knowledge of the views and preferences of persons who will or may be affected by the decision.	Council has already consulted on this work programme as part of the LTP 2015-2025 process. There was general support for the capital works programme and Infrastructure Strategy, as long as debt levels were kept as low.	N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	The proposed changes to the capital works programme are of low significance and not material. This applies to the individual changes and also to all changes totalled together.	

<b>Rates</b>		
Proposed change: the proposed total rates income to be collected for 2017/2018 will be lower than what was proposed in the LTP for 2017/2018 (\$73.029m).		
	<b>Level of Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Materiality</b>
Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?	<p>Low significance</p> <p>Whilst the public will be very interested in the rates level, the intention is to collect less rates income than was proposed in the LTP 2015-2025 means the decision will be of low public interest. There will be some interest by some members of the public in the lower increase in rates. The Financial Strategy in the LTP 2015-2025 established a target to limit increases in rates to a maximum of 3% per annum plus growth. In this case the rates increase will be in well below this target. There were very few comments about debt levels in the informal feedback to the Annual Plan 2016/2017. In the consultation on the LTP 2015-2025 there was significant support for Council's plans to maintain rates rises below 3%, with a number of others seeking further reductions in rates.</p>	Not material. The change results in a smaller increase in rates than previously forecast.
Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?	No. The decrease in rates for 2017/2018 will not significantly impact on the funds required to provide services in future years. The Council will revisit rates levels as part of the LTP 2018-2028. Low significance.	Not material. The change is for one year's rates only.
Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)	No. Low significance.	N/A

Does the decision create a substantial change in the level of service provided by the Council?	No. Levels of service are not affected by the reduction in rates revenue. Low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?	<p>The proposal is to reduce the amount of rates income to be collected in the 2017/2018 year. As the movement is a reduction, the proposal is not considered to be significant.</p> <p>The reduction in rates does not affect Council's ability to carry out its activities or deliver the LOS in the LTP 2015-2025.</p> <p>Low significance.</p>	<p>Not material. For most rate payers there will be only a very modest increase in rates and at a level lower than signalled in the LTP 2015-2025.</p> <p>The change in rates has only a minor effect on debt (which is also forecast to be lower than proposed in the LTP 2015-2025).</p>
Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?	No. Therefore, of low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?	No. Therefore of low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal or decision involve Council exiting from or entering into a group of activities?	No. Therefore of low significance.	N/A
Knowledge of the views and preferences of persons who will or may be affected by the decision.	Council has already consulted on rates as part of the LTP 2015-2025 process. There was general support for the Financial Strategy and keeping rates as low as possible. The change proposed is to reduce the size of increase in the rates compared with that signalled in the LTP for the corresponding year. Rates in the Annual Plan 2016/2017 are lower than for the corresponding year in the LTP. There were few comments	N/A

	on the reduction of rates through the informal engagement process undertaken for the Annual plan 2016/2017.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The proposed changes to the amount of rates to be collected is of low significance and not material.	

<b>Debt</b>		
Proposed change: debt as at 30 June 2018 (the end of the 2017/2018 financial year) is now forecast to be lower than was contained in the LTP. The LTP forecast debt of \$193m at the end of the 2017/2018 financial year. The Annual Plan 2018/2028 forecasts debt at that time to be at a lower level.		
	<b>Level of Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Materiality</b>
Is there a high level of public interest, or is decision likely to be controversial?	<p>No. We are proposing to deliver lower debt than consulted on as part of the LTP 2015-2025. The consultation on the LTP 2015-2025 indicated that the public wants Council to prudently manage debt. The change proposed is in line with this desire from the public.</p> <p>The reduction in debt signalled in the Annual Plan 2017/2018 is in addition to the reduced debt signalled in the previous Annual Plan. There was little comment on debt levels in the public feedback on the Annual Plan 2016/17.</p> <p>Low significance.</p>	Debt is expected to be lower than forecast in the LTP for the corresponding year. A proportion of this reduction in debt will have taken place in the 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 years. The change is not considered material.
Is there a significant impact arising from duration of the effects from the decision?	Only in a positive sense. Lower debt, and with the lower interest rates we are now experiencing, results in lower interest costs and lower rates. Reducing debt now provides increased capacity for the Council to borrow at a future date should it need to do so. Low significance.	No. See comment on significance.
Does the decision relate to a strategic asset? (refer Significance and	No. Low significance.	N/A

Engagement Policy for list of strategic assets)		
Does the proposal, activity or decision substantially affect debt, rates or Council finances in any one year or more of the LTP?	Only in a positive sense. Lower debt, and with the lower interest rates we are now experiencing, results in lower interest costs and lower rates. Low significance. The Financial Strategy in the LTP 2015-2025 set a key goal to reduce debt from \$168m in 2015 to \$120m in 2025	Not material. See comment on significance.
Does the decision involve the sale of a substantial proportion or controlling interest in a CCO or CCTO?	No. Therefore, of low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal or decision involve entry into a private sector partnership or contract to carry out the deliver on any Council group of activities?	No. Therefore of low significance.	N/A
Does the proposal or decision involve Council exiting from or entering into a group of activities?	No. Therefore of low significance.	N/A
Knowledge of the views and preferences of persons who will or may be affected by the decision.	Council consulted on debt as part of the LTP 2015-2025 process. There was general support for the Financial Strategy and keeping debt as low as possible. As noted above the Annual Plan 2017/2018 is indicating that debt will be at a lower level than anticipated for the corresponding year in the LTP. There were few comments on the level of debt in the feedback to the Annual Plan 2016/2017.	N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	The proposed change to the level of debt is of low significance and not material.	

**6.3 2017 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS****Information Only - No Decision Required**

<b>Report To:</b>	Full Council
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	15 December 2016
<b>Report Author:</b>	Hannah Simpson, Governance Support Officer
<b>Report Number:</b>	RCN16-12-19

**1 Summary**

- 1.1 Attached for your information is the calendar of 2017 meetings of Council, its Committees, Subcommittees, Joint Committees, Community boards and Annual Plan / Long Term Plan Workshops.
- 1.2 Invariably meetings are moved, added or deleted throughout the calendar year and Councillors and the public are encouraged to refer to Council's website for the most up to date calendar of Council meetings. Councillors will also receive notification through the weekly Councillor Update, which gives details of Council meeting commitments for the following week.
- 1.3 In addition, the electronic meetings calendar will also be kept up to date. Councillors can access this outlook meetings calendar through their electronic devices.
- 1.4 Council are not required to adopt the schedule of meetings. This is for Councillors information only.

**2 Draft Resolution****That the Full Council**

1. receives the 2017 Calendar of Meetings report RCN16-12-19.

**3 Attachments**

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Tasman District Council 2017 Meetings Calendar | 49 |
|---|----|





Tasman District Council Annual Calendar of Meeting Dates for 2017 v1

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
MON					1 Positive Ageing Possible Resource Consent Hearing							
TUE					2 Possible joint RTC workshop							
WED			1 Motueka Aerodrome Advisory Group		3 Citizenship Ceremony						1 Regional Pest Management	
THU		2 Full Council followed by Cycle Trail Workshop	2 Engineering Full Council - adopt AP Consultation Document		4	5 Environment & Planning					2 Community Development	
FRI					5 Annual Plan Hearing				1 AAA			3 Possible Resource Consent Hearing
SAT				1 New Years Day	6			1 New Years Day	2			4 Possible Resource Consent Hearing
SUN				2 New Years Day	7			2 New Years Day	3			5 Possible Resource Consent Hearing
MON	6 Day after New Years Day	6 Waitangi Day	6 Possible Resource Consent Hearing Developers Forum	8 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	8 Annual Plan Hearing	5 Queens Birthday	7 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	7 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	4 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	6 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	4 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	4 Possible Resource Consent Hearing
TUE	7 New Years Day (Observed)			4 Motueka CB	9 GB Community Board Motueka CB Public Forum		4 Motueka CB	8 Creative Communities	5 Motueka CB Public Forum		7 Joint Committee	5 Creative Communities
WED		8 Council Workshop - Annual Plan	8 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	5 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	10 Annual Plan Hearing		5 Regional Pest Management	6 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	6 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	6 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	6 Council Workshop	6 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan
THU		9 Environment & Planning	9 Audit & Risk	6 Community Development	11 Full Council	8 Full Council - draft AP document	6 Engineering	10 Community Development	7 Full Council	8 Engineering	9 Environment & Planning	7 Community Development Community Grants
FRI					12 Annual Plan Hearing Commercial Committee		7 AAA	11 Commercial Committee			10 Commercial Committee	8 AAA NRSBU
SAT				8 New Years Day	13		12	12	9		11	9
SUN				9 New Years Day	14		13	13	10		12	10
MON		15 Resource Consent Hearing	15	10	15 TBFree	12 Possible Resource Consent Hearing	14 Positive Ageing	14	11	15	11	11 Developers Forum
TUE		14 GB Community Board Council Workshop - Annual Plan	14 GB Community Board Motueka CB Public Forum	11 GB Community Board Joint Shareholders / CDEM & Creative Communities	16	13 GB Community Board Motueka CB Public Forum	15 GB Community Board Motueka CB	15	12	16	14 GB Community Board Joint Shareholders / CDEM	12 GB Community Board Motueka CB
WED			15 Council Workshop - Draft Plan Change (Richmond Housing Choice)	12 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	17 Mapua Waterfront Advisory Group	14 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	16 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	16 Mapua Waterfront Advisory Group	13 Citizenship Ceremony	17 No meetings this week	15 Mapua Waterfront Advisory Group	13 No meetings this week
THU		18 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	16 Environment & Planning	13 Engineering	18 Community Development followed by Community Grants Audit & Risk	15 Community Awards Subcommittee	17 Environment & Planning	14 Engineering	14 Audit & Risk	17 No meetings this week	16 Full Council	14 Full Council
FRI			17 Rural & Provincial (16th & 17th) State Highway Liaison	14 Good Friday	19	16 Rural & Provincial (16th & 17th) State Highway Liaison	18	18	15 State Highway Liaison NRSBU	17 Zone 5 & 6 Meeting	15 Rural & Provincial (16th & 17th)	15 State Highway Liaison
SAT				20	20	17	19	19	16		18	16
SUN				21	21	18	20	20	17		19	17
MON		20 Positive Ageing		18 Easter Monday	22 Council Workshop - Annual Plan	19 Regional Transport Ctee		21	18	20		18 No meetings this week
TUE		21 Council Workshop - Annual Plan Motueka CB		19	23	20 Port Tararua Advisory Group		22	19	21 Motueka CB Public Forum	20 Port Tararua Advisory Group	19 No meetings this week
WED		22 Citizenship Ceremony Mapua Waterfront Advisory Group	22 Regional Pest Management Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	19 No meetings this week	24 Council Workshop - Annual Plan Motueka Aerodrome Advisory Group	21 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	20 No meetings this week	23 Council Workshop Motueka Aerodrome Advisory Group	20 Council Workshop - Long Term Plan	22 Council Workshop	21 Motueka Aerodrome Advisory Group	20 No meetings this week
THU		23 Community Development	23 Full Council	20	25 Engineering	22 Full Council - Adopt Annual Plan	24 Environment & Planning	21 Community Development	19 Full Council	23 Full Council	22 Engineering	21 No meetings this week
FRI		24 Commercial Committee			26	23 NRSBU		24 Community Awards Ceremony		24		23 No meetings this week
SAT				22	27		25	25	22		24	22
SUN				23	28		26	26	23		25	23
MON		27 Possible Resource Consent Hearing		24	29	26 Developers Forum	28 LGNZ Conference 24th & 25th	25 Positive Ageing Developers Forum	23 Labour Day	27 Positive Ageing Regional Transport Ctee	26 Christmas Day	25 No meetings this week
TUE		28 Port Tararua Advisory Group		25 ANZAC Day	30	27 Motueka CB	29	26 Port Tararua Advisory Group Motueka CB	24	28 Motueka CB Public Forum	27 Boxing Day	26 No meetings this week
WED			29 Council Workshop	26 Regional Pest Management Council Workshop	31 Council Workshop		28 Citizenship Ceremony Council Workshop	27 Possible Regional Pest Management Hearing	25	29 Citizenship Ceremony	28 No meetings this week	27 No meetings this week
THU				27 Environment and Planning		29 Community Development Audit & Risk	31 Full Council	28 Community Grants	26 Full Council - Adoption of AR	30 Audit & Risk	29 No meetings this week	28 No meetings this week
FRI			31 Zone 5 & 6 Meeting		30		31	29	27 Zone 5 & 6 Meeting		30	29 No meetings this week
SAT				29	31		32	30	28		31	30
SUN				30			33	31	29		32	31
MON	31 Nelson Anniversary								30			31
TUE												32

Printed 28 October 2015. Please refer to [www.tasman.govt.nz/cc-anc/council-meetings/calendar-of-council-meetings/](http://www.tasman.govt.nz/cc-anc/council-meetings/calendar-of-council-meetings/) for the most recent information.



**6.4 ACTION ITEMS - PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Information Only - No Decision Required**

<b>Report To:</b>	Full Council
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	15 December 2016
<b>Report Author:</b>	Hannah Simpson, Governance Support Officer
<b>Report Number:</b>	2016-12-20

**1 Summary**

1.1 Attached, for Councillors information, is a list of the action items from previous meetings of Full Council and a status update on those items.

**2 Draft Resolution**

**That the Full Council**

- 1. receives the Action Items - Previous Meetings report RCN16-12-20.**

**3 Attachments**

- 1. Action Sheet - Previous Meetings 53



## Action Sheet – Full Council as at 15 December, 2016

Item	Action Required	Responsibility	Completion Date/Status
Meeting Date 30 June 2016			
CN16-06-18 Slippery Road Land Sale	Conclude the sale of Council land at Slippery Road, and allocate proceeds as noted in the resolution.	G Cooper	Underway – with legal counsel and the Property Group to complete boundary adjustment work to satisfy the legal requirements of our purchase and sale agreement.
Meeting Date 27 October 2016			
Council Appointments	Report back in the new year on the process for appointing independent members to Council committees.	L McKenzie, M Drummond	A report will come back to Council in the new year.
Elected Member's Remuneration	The Remuneration Authority to approve the remuneration of the Chairs of the Audit & Risk and Commercial committees being 1.1 x a Councillor's base salary.	Governance Officer	Underway – application went on 2016-11-30.
MBIE / Crown Minerals / Block Offer Process	Staff to report back on the block offer process.	D Bush-King	Completed. A report was provided to the Environment & Planning Committee on 2016-11-16.
Freedom Camping	Staff to feedback on whether additional funds had been allocated to Compliance for enforcement of the bylaw.	A Humphries / D Bush-King	Completed. This was reported back to the Environment & Planning Committee on 2016-11-16.
Meeting Date 10 November 2016			
Appointment of Acting Chief Executive	Advise the Environment & Planning Manager of his appointment as Acting Chief Executive.	L McKenzie	Completed. A report also went to Full Council on 2016-10-11.
Draft Delegations Register	Report the Delegations Register to 9 February 2017 meeting.	L McKenzie / Governance Officer	Underway.
Health & Safety Indicators and Monitoring	Advise the Audit & Risk Committee of the Council's request relating to a corporate risk management framework.	M Drummond / J Crannes	Completed. A report went to Full Council on 2016-12-01.
Waimea Community Dam	Provide the Northington Partners report (Waimea Community Dam Economic Cost of the No Dam Alternative) to Councillors.	Mayor	Completed.
Meeting Date 1 December 2016			

## Item 6.4

Item	Action Required	Responsibility	Completion Date/Status
Public Forum (162 Thorp Street)	Staff to respond to Veronica Dugdale's query re construction of a shed at 162 Thorp Street.	D Bush-King	Completed. A letter was sent to Ms Dugdale on 2016-12-01.
Charging for Responding to LGOIMA Requests	Staff to implement a method for recording time spent on 'formal' LGOIMA requests.	A Bywater	Underway.
Mayoral Relief Fund	Staff to dissolve the Mayoral Relief Fund Tasman / Nelson charitable trust.	M Drummond	Underway.
Diligent Software	Book a second training session on Diligent Boardbooks for Councillors early in 2017.	H Simpson	Underway – request made of Diligent with dates proposed late January / early February.
Policy on Rates Remissions	Report back on likely impact of the Policy on Council's ability to achieve objectives of NPS on Urban Development Capacity in time for this to be consulted on ahead of LTP 2018-2028.	D Bush-King	Underway.
Capital Repairs to Commercial Property	Include a report back on return on investment for Commercial Property in reports from Commercial Committee to Full Council.	G Cooper / M Drummond	

## Attachment 1