



**Notice of the ordinary meeting of the
Community Services Committee**

Kōmiti Ratonga Hapori

Date:	Thursday 30 July 2020
Time:	10.00a.m.
Location:	Council Chamber, Civic House 110 Trafalgar Street Nelson

Agenda

Rārangi take

Chair	Cr Matt Lawrey
Deputy Chair	Cr Yvonne Bowater
Members	Her Worship the Mayor Rachel Reese
	Cr Trudie Brand
	Cr Mel Courtney
	Cr Kate Fulton
	Cr Judene Edgar
	Cr Brian McGurk
	Cr Gaile Noonan
	Cr Rohan O'Neill-Stevens
	Cr Pete Rainey
	Cr Rachel Sanson
	Cr Tim Skinner

Quorum: 2

**Pat Dougherty
Chief Executive**

Nelson City Council Disclaimer

Please note that the contents of these Council and Committee Agendas have yet to be considered by Council and officer recommendations may be altered or changed by the Council in the process of making the formal Council decision.

Community Services Committee – Delegations

Areas of Responsibility:

- Arts, Culture and Heritage
- Bylaws, within the areas of responsibility
- Cemeteries and Crematorium
- Community Centres and Halls, including Greenmeadows Community Centre, Stoke Memorial Hall and Tahunanui Community Centre
- Community Development, including youth issues, ageing issues and social well-being
- Community Festivals and Events
- Community Facilities, including public toilets
- Founders Heritage Park
- Heritage Facilities
- Heritage Houses and their grounds
- Libraries
- Sister City relationships
- Youth Council

Delegations:

The committee has all of the responsibilities, powers, functions and duties of Council in relation to governance matters within its areas of responsibility, except where they have been retained by Council, or have been referred to other committees, subcommittees or subordinate decision-making bodies.

The exercise of Council's responsibilities, powers, functions and duties in relation to governance matters includes (but is not limited to):

- Monitoring Council's performance for the committee's areas of responsibility, including legislative responsibilities and compliance requirements
- Developing, approving, monitoring and reviewing policies and plans, including activity management plans
- Reviewing and determining whether a bylaw or amendment, revocation or replacement of a bylaw is appropriate
- Undertaking community engagement, including all steps relating to Special Consultative Procedures or other formal consultation processes
- Approving submissions to external bodies or organisations, and on legislation and regulatory proposals

Powers to Recommend to Council:

In the following situations the committee may consider matters within the areas of responsibility but make recommendations to Council only (in accordance with sections 5.1.3 - 5.1.5 of the Delegations Register):

- Matters that, under the Local Government Act 2002, the operation of law or other legislation, Council is unable to delegate
- The purchase or disposal of land or property relating to the areas of responsibility, other than in accordance with the Long Term Plan or Annual Plan
- Unbudgeted expenditure relating to the areas of responsibility, not included in the Long Term Plan or Annual Plan
- Decisions regarding significant assets

1. Apologies

Nil

2. Confirmation of Order of Business**3. Interests**

3.1 Updates to the Interests Register

3.2 Identify any conflicts of interest in the agenda

4. Public Forum**5. Confirmation of Minutes**

5.1 11 June 2020

7 - 13

Document number M10929

Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Confirms the minutes of the meeting of the Community Services Committee, held on 11 June 2020, as a true and correct record.***

5.2 Extraordinary Meeting - 9 July 2020

14 - 16

Document number M11993

Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Confirms the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Community Services Committee, held on 9 July 2020, as a true and correct record.***

6. Chairperson's Report 17 - 18

Document number R18185

Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Chairperson's Report (R18185).***

7. Youth Council Update

8. Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room 19 - 28

Document number R18120

Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room (R18120); and***
- 2. Approves funding of up to \$30,000 from existing Community Partnerships budgets for hub facilities at the Male Room consisting of:***
 - Up to \$10,000 towards project planning, a feasibility report and consent fees; and***
 - Up to \$20,000 contribution towards build or install costs, with this portion contingent on partner or community funding to cover the residual costs; and***
- 3. Notes that Council's financial contribution to the Homeless Hub is capped at \$30,000, excluding staff time.***

9. Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening 29 - 61

Document number R17000

Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening (R17000) and its attachment (A2383503); and***

2. **Approves commencement of design for seismic strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall to 67% of the New Building Standard (Importance Level 3) and undertake basic improvements/maintenance as outlined in Option 2 of report (R17000); and**
3. **Notes that an application to the Provincial Growth Fund for \$500,000 has been sought for the work for strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall.**

Recommendation to Council

That the Council

1. **Approves the total allocation of \$1.2M in 2020/21 in capital expenditure for seismic strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall to 67% of the New Building Standard (Importance Level 3) and undertake basic improvements/maintenance, with the project to commence in 2020/21, subject to the success of the Provincial Growth Fund application, as set out in the table below;**

	Capex	Comment
2020/21	\$120,000	Existing
	\$458,000	Brought forward from 2024/25
	\$500,000	Potential Provincial Growth Fund (to be confirmed)
	\$120,000	Unbudgeted funding
	\$1.2M	Total 2020/21

and

2. **Notes that a successful Provincial Growth Fund application for strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall will also require a further commitment to \$440,000 of unbudgeted operating expenditure and \$420,000 of unbudgeted capital expenditure in 2021/22 to be considered for approval as part of the Long Term Plan 2021-31; and**

3. ***Agrees that, if the Provincial Growth Fund application for strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall is unsuccessful, Council will still proceed with the design work for the project, with physical works timing to be confirmed in the Long Term Plan 2021-31.***

Note:

- **Youth Councillors Sophie Wenink Smith and Resika Sapkota will be in attendance at this meeting.**



Minutes of a meeting of the Community Services Committee

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic House , 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson

On Thursday 11 June 2020, commencing at 10.08a.m.

Present: Councillor M Lawrey (Chairperson), Her Worship the Mayor R Reese, Councillors Y Bowater (Deputy Chairperson), T Brand, M Courtney, J Edgar, K Fulton, , B McGurk, Councillor G Noonan, R O'Neill-Stevens, P Rainey, R Sanson and T Skinner

In Attendance: Group Manager Community Services (R Ball), Group Manager Strategy and Communications (N McDonald), Governance Adviser (J Brandt) and Governance Support (K McLean)

Apologies : Nil

Karakia Timatanga

An opening karakia was given.

1 Apologies

There were no apologies.

2. Confirmation of Order of Business

The Chairperson noted that the meeting would receive the minutes from the previous meeting later in the meeting.

3. Interests

There were no updates to the Interests Register, and no interests with items on the agenda were declared.

4 Public Forum

3.1 The Salvation Army Nelson Tasman Bays - Housing First Project

Mr Jaap Noteboom and Ms Ros Vercoe presented on the Housing First Project, noting their contribution to housing the homeless during the

COVID-19 lockdown period, which saw 74 homeless people housed during this period. The project provided wrap around services in partnership with other organisations such as the Nelson Marlborough District Health Board (NMDHB), Te Piki Oranga and the Male Room.

Mr Noteboom and Ms Vercoe answered questions about solutions for housing homeless people post COVID-19, and the ongoing need for Housing First services in this region.

3.2 Soroptimist International Nelson Incorporated, Habitat for Humanity (H4H) and Community Action Nelson (CAN) - Lack of Emergency Housing for Women and Children

Ms Megan Riddell, Mr Nick Clark and Ms Joanna Thompson gave a presentation. They spoke about the assistance they provide to help women, children and vulnerable families and individuals into emergency accommodation, transition housing and long term housing solutions, noting the challenges they face in the Nelson area. They answered questions about working in collaboration with other groups.

3.3 Youth Health and Wellbeing Trust (Whanake Youth) - Stoke Community Hall

Lee-Ann O'Brien gave a Powerpoint presentation (A2401474). Esther Walters and Youth Councillor Nathan Dunn spoke in support of Whanake Youth.

Ms O'Brien answered questions about plans for Stoke, funding agencies Whanake Youth has contracts with and/or intends to apply to, and the number of Whanake Youth employees.

Attachments

- 1 A2401474 - Whanake Youth Powerpoint presentation to Community Services Committee 11Jun2020

Attendance: The meeting was adjourned from 11.46a.m. to 11.52a.m. during which time Councillor Skinner left the meeting.

4 Nelson Festivals Trust six-monthly Update (Agenda Item 7)

Brent Thawley, Board Chair, and Padma Naidu, Festival Director, from the Nelson Festivals Trust presented their six-monthly update with a PowerPoint presentation (A2400390). Mr Thawley noted that Nelson City Council funding for 2020/21 had been confirmed since the presentation was prepared.

Mr Thawley noted the impacts of COVID-19 and subsequent challenges such as substantial decreases to income and a fast changing environment.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner returned to the meeting at 12.02p.m.

Director Padma Naidu spoke about events currently in the planning for Nelson and answered questions about the Mask Parade, the Trust's human resources, and views about future large scale events.

The Deputy Mayor thanked Mr Thawley for stepping up as an arts advocate for the region during COVID-19.

Attachments

- 1 A2400390 - Nelson Festivals Trust presentation for Community Services Committee 11Jun2020

5. Stoke Community Hall – Lease (Agenda item 8)

Document number R13710, agenda pages 18 - 33 refer.

Principal Parks and Facilities Activity Planner, Andrew Petheram, presented the report.

Mr Petheram answered questions about the name of the facility, the site including the parking area, options officers had explored to find a suitable site, proposed lease charges, as well as past and future funding to activate this part of Stoke for young people.

It was noted that there was an error in the facility's name in clause 2 of the recommendation wording, which was subsequently corrected to read 'Stoke Community Hall'.

A correction to agenda page 20 was noted in section 4.5 of the report, which should refer to 4.4, not 4.5.1.

Councillor Noonan raised a Point of Order against Councillor Rainey who had stated that the discussion by Elected Members about the future use of the site was out of scope. Councillor Noonan noted this was a misrepresentation, as item 4.4 of the report referred to the development of a future youth park, therefore making it relevant. The Point of Order was upheld.

Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Stoke Community Hall - Lease (R13710) and its attachment A2351330; and***

2. ***Allocates the lease of the Stoke Community Hall to Whanake Youth for a period of three years starting July 2020; and***
3. ***Allows an extension to the lease for a further period of five years subject to Whanake Youth meeting the outcomes specified in the lease agreement.***

Fulton/Edgar

The meeting was adjourned from 12.59p.m. to 1.45p.m. during which time Councillor Rainey and Councillor Fulton left the meeting.

6 Public Forum continued (Agenda item 3)

Resolved CS/2020/012

That the Community Services Committee

1. ***Records a vote of thanks to Housing First and all organisations involved in supporting vulnerable populations with their housing needs in the Nelson region for their work during COVID-19.***

Her Worship the Mayor/Lawrey

Carried

6 **Apologies (Agenda item 1) continued**

Resolved CS/2020/013

That the Community Services Committee

1. ***Receives and accepts the apology from Councillor Rainey for early departure.***

Sanson/Bowater

Carried

7. **Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 2)**

7.1 12 March 2020

Document number M7762, agenda pages 6 - 14 refer.

Resolved CS/2020/014

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Confirms the minutes of the meeting of the Community Services Committee, held on 12 March 2020, as a true and correct record.***

Courtney/Edgar

Carried

8. Chairperson's Report (Agenda item 6)

Document number R18053, agenda pages 15 - 17 refer.

Councillor Lawrey presented his report, noting the significant changes the community had experienced moving through different COVID-19 alert levels. He noted positives, such as the Digital Heritage Festival which was still available on YouTube, and ongoing work to create a hub for housing the homeless.

Councillor Lawrey thanked officers for stepping up during COVID-19. A correction to the report was made, noting that Group Manager Community Services, Roger Ball, during his secondment as Nelson Tasman Group Controller, had assisted the National Civil Defence Controller in Wellington.

Attendance: Her Worship the Mayor left the meeting from 1.51p.m. to 1.54p.m. and Councillor Edgar left the meeting at 1.53p.m.

Discussion took place about the portacom unit that had been used to assist with housing the homeless during COVID-19. It was noted that if the portacom would continue to be used for the homeless post-COVID-19, replacement of the unit needed to be considered for its original use and that the delegation for this matter sat with the Sports and Recreation Committee.

Mr Ball answered questions regarding available funding for the hub through the Community Partnerships Fund.

Attendance: Councillor Edgar returned to the meeting at 2.11p.m.

Resolved CS/2020/015

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Chairperson's Report (R18053).***

O'Neill-Stevens/Courtney

Carried

9. Fees and Charges relating to Community Services

Document number R14833, agenda pages 34 - 41 refer.

Manager Parks and Facilities, Rosie Bartlett, and Financial Accountant, Margie French, presented the report. Ms Bartlett answered questions about the timeframe for increases for fees and charges.

Resolved CS/2020/016

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Fees and Charges relating to Community Services (R14833) and;***
- 2. Notes there are only Nil or CPI increases for Community Services fees and charges for activities included in Report 14833 commencing 1 July 2020.***

McGurk/Skinner

Carried

10. COVID-19 Update Report: Implications for Community Services

Document number R17018, agenda pages 42 - 47 refer.

Team Leader Arts and Heritage, Shanine Hermsen, presented the report. Manager Libraries, Sarina Barron, answered questions about library visits post-COVID-19. Ms Hermsen answered questions about plans for the upcoming Matariki celebrations in July 2020.

The Chairperson asked that thanks be expressed on behalf of the Committee to Nelmac for carrying out pall bearer duties for burials during the COVID-19 lockdown.

Resolved CS/2020/017

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report COVID-19 Update Report: Implications for Community Services (R17018)***

Noonan/Bowater

Carried

There being no further business the meeting ended at 2.42p.m.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings:

_____ Chairperson _____ Date



Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Community Services Committee

Held in the Council Chamber, Civic House , 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson

On Thursday 9 July 2020, commencing at 9.30a.m.

Present: Councillor M Lawrey (Chairperson), Her Worship the Mayor R Reese, Deputy Chairperson Y Bowater (Deputy Chairperson), T Brand, M Courtney, J Edgar, K Fulton, B McGurk, G Noonan, R O'Neill-Stevens and R Sanson

In Attendance: Chief Executive (P Dougherty), Group Manager Infrastructure (A Louverdis), Group Manager Environmental Management (C Barton), Group Manager Community Services (R Ball), Group Manager Corporate Services (N Harrison), Group Manager Strategy and Communications (N McDonald) and Governance Adviser (J Brandt)

Apologies: Councillors Rainey and Skinner

Karakia Timatanga

There was an opening karakia.

1. Apologies

Resolved CS/2020/018

That the Community Services Committee

1. Receives and accepts the apologies from Councillors P Rainey and T Skinner.

Courtney/Edgar

Carried

2. Confirmation of Order of Business

There was no change to the order of business.

3. Interests

There were no updates to the Interests Register, and no interests with items on the agenda were declared.

4. Public Forum

There was no public forum.

5. Chairperson's Report

There was no Chairperson's Report.

6. Mask Parade Plan Approval

Document number R18082, agenda pages 4 - 12 refer.

Ali Boswijk, Padma Naidu and Michaela Blackman, of Nelson Festivals Trust were in attendance to answer questions.

Manager Community Partnerships, Mark Preston-Thomas, presented the report, providing background on the matter.

Questions and discussion included:

- the Trust's desire to arrange an event before the end of the year
- the 30 October Parade would be a scaled down version
- funding from Creative NZ, which was contingent on a festival taking place and other possible funding sources
- economic impact and the effect of street closures for retailers and the Trust engaging with Uniquely Nelson
- reactivation of the CBD and the importance of a positive relationship with hospitality and retailers
- the cost of production in previous years
- the following day would be a rain day
- the number of schools involved and the strong support from schools
- any thought given to celebrate and acknowledge essential workers
- the intention to use local contractors and businesses and confirmation that artistes would be paid
- the amount of expenditure already committed, which was currently less than \$30,000
- possible economies in scheduling other events would mean closing the CBD for the weekend

- the Trust's need for clarity regarding funding.

Councillor Fulton, seconded by Councillor Courtney moved receipt of the report.

Resolved CS/2020/019

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Mask Parade Plan Approval (R18082) and its attachment (A2409656).***

Fulton/Courtney

Carried

Further questions and discussion included:

- vulnerability in the event of another COVID-19 outbreak
- volunteer availability
- the Trust's confidence in its ability to deliver the Parade and Carnivale
- this was an opportunity to try different things.

Attendance: Her Worship the Mayor Reese left the meeting from 10.46a.m. until 10.56a.m during debate on the matter.

Resolved CS/2020/020

That the Council

- 2. Approves the delivery plan for the Mask Parade and Carnivale described in attachment 1 (A2409656) of report R18082 with a funding allocation of \$100,000.***

Fulton/O'Neill-Stevens

Carried

Karakia Whakamutunga

There was a closing karakia.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 10.57a.m.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings:

_____ Chairperson _____ Date

Chairperson's Report

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update the Committee on areas that fall within the Committee's responsibilities.

2. Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Chairperson's Report (R18185).***

3. Background

Founders Heritage Park

- 3.1 Nelson's much loved heritage park was a very busy place during the school holidays with 2,680 visitors over the two weeks.

- 3.2 The highlights included:

- Park After Dark which was attended by 130 children and their parents;
- Inky Fingers drop-in sessions in the Nelson Mail Printery which attracted 220 children; and
- The holiday quiz which was completed by more than 500 children.

Ngā Toi Huatau - The Seasonal Arts

- 3.3 This collaborative project between arts organisation promises to be one of the real silver-linings of Lockdown.
- 3.4 Over 10 arts organisations have come together to design a winter programme of events to bring back life into our central city in the wake of Covid-19 starting with last Saturday's fabulous Te Matariki. Ngā Toi Huatau also sees MakeShift Spaces investing the city centre with the

Item 6: Chairperson's Report

renowned thespian Helen Moulder playing five different characters in *The Bicycle & The Butcher's Daughter*, a play that runs until mid-August.

- 3.5 We have the return of the Nelson Fringe Festival starting on 14 August and, as a result of last week's Extraordinary Community Services meeting, we have the Mask Parade and Carnivale to look forward to on Friday October 30.

Italians in the Wood

- 3.6 An 'Italians in the Wood' heritage panel was unveiled on Tasman St earlier this month with 70+ attending including the Italian Ambassador Fabrizio Marcelli followed by celebrations at the Italian Club. The panel recognises the centre of the Italian Community dating back to the 1860s when The Wood was full of market gardens and glasshouses. It was funded jointly by the Nelson City Council and the City of Nelson Civic Trust and includes excerpts from Karen Stade and Karen Price's history of Italians in Nelson – *Pasta, Prayers and Promise*.

Nelson Libraries

- 3.7 The recent school holidays saw an event/programme occurring every day at the Nellie Nightingale Library including the annual Starlight Stories featuring kids and staff in PJs.
- 3.8 Virtual NZ Music Month celebration in May which got embraced – every day during Lockdown in May staff used the library's Facebook page to share and promote NZ music – I'm told we have cool staff who know their music. Not only did these posts receive a warm welcome from the Nelson public but they also received some love from NZ musicians with Holly Smith and Fat Freddy's Drop sending the Library messages.
- 3.9 The post-lockdown period has seen an increased uptake of our digital collections with more Nelsonians embracing e-books and audiobooks. The uptake hasn't dropped off since the library reopened.
- 3.10 Nelson Knitters group that meets regularly at the library raised over \$500 in their latest sale and has recently donated hundreds of garments to the hospital, welfare organisations and early childhood centres.
- 3.11 The Year 13 History students from both Nelson Colleges visited Elma Turner Library to discover our heritage resources and online content.

Author: Matt Lawrey, Chairperson

Attachments

Nil

Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To confirm Council support and contribution for the development of a homeless hub at the Male Room.

2. Summary

- 2.1 Social agencies have identified a need to support the homeless community by providing a 'hub' with bathroom, computer and laundry facilities, with the Male Room as a preferred location.
- 2.2 The project is led by the Male Room. Mr Philip Chapman from the Male Room will be in attendance to answer questions.
- 2.3 The Male Room has requested Council assistance with planning and feasibility, followed by a contribution to the build or install costs for a portacom, or alternatively modification to the existing premises.
- 2.4 An earlier proposal to relocate a Council portacom from Tāhunanui now appears more complicated due to the impact on the Tāhunanui sporting codes. The options suggested are to purchase a new portacom or modify the existing premises. The Male Room favours and intends to progress the new portacom option.
- 2.5 This report proposes that Council makes a \$30,000 commitment to planning and build costs to be sourced from existing Community Partnerships budgets. Costs above this would be sourced by the Male Room from other funders and/or community fundraising.

3. Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room (R18120); and***
- 2. Approves funding of up to \$30,000 from existing Community Partnerships budgets for hub facilities at the Male Room consisting of:***

Item 8: Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

- ***Up to \$10,000 towards project planning, a feasibility report and consent fees; and***
- ***Up to \$20,000 contribution towards build or install costs, with this portion contingent on partner or community funding to cover the residual costs; and***
- 3. Notes that Council's financial contribution to the Homeless Hub is capped at \$30,000, excluding staff time.**

4. Background

- 4.1 Prior to the COVID-19 lockdown, there were an estimated 50 to 100 people living rough in Nelson Whakatū. While collaborative activities by Housing First, Salvation Army, the Male Room, the Ministry for Housing and Urban Development (MHUD) and the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) have placed many in alternative accommodation, there will be a significant and continuing need to provide facilities for the homeless for the foreseeable future.
- 4.2 The need for facilities for those living rough has been prioritised by agencies. Placing the hub at the Male Room is preferred to other locations as it creates opportunities by the Male Room to provide social supports and interventions alongside the hub facilities. There are opportunities to either:
- (a) move an existing portacom from the Tāhunanui playing fields; or
 - (b) purchase and install a new portacom; or
 - (c) modify the existing Male Room building; or
 - (d) do nothing.
- 4.3 The Male Room does not have the required building or project management expertise and has requested Council support with planning, consents, and a feasibility report. As project lead, the Male Room is eager to engage other agency and community funders to contribute to the build costs. Initial estimates of project costs are up to \$90,000 depending on the option chosen, and there appears to be an appetite from other funders to contribute.
- 4.4 Initially it was considered that financial support to a project of this nature could be considered under existing officer delegations and budgets. However due to changes in scope and cost, and to ensure there is Council support for such an initiative, this matter has been brought to the Committee for a decision.

5. Discussion

The hub

- 5.1 During the COVID-19 emergency a homelessness work stream was established, initially under the umbrella of the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, and with significant investment from partner agencies and community groups. Despite significant numbers of homeless now being accommodated at motels, the interagency group considers providing hygiene and social supports at the Male Room is crucial as this meets a different need to motel accommodation and provides an opportunity for the Male Room to provide wrap-around support services.
- 5.2 Providing bathroom facilities for the homeless at locations such as the Montgomery Square Superloo is not recommended due to impacts on other users and the lost opportunity to provide the social interventions available at the Male Room.
- 5.3 This project is being led by the Male Room, which will be providing social support for the homeless who visit. Consequently, it is proposed that Council should support the Male Room rather than directly manage the project, however the Male Room does not have the expertise to project manage an infrastructure project of this nature and is looking to Council for support. This project differs from and complements the upcoming Habitat for Humanity work at the former Suburban Club as Habitat for Humanity is focused on providing houses rather than meeting the needs of the chronically homeless and providing wrap-around services.
- 5.4 The vision from the Male Room is to establish a unit to be named 'Whare Haumaru' (A safe haven, risk free). Whare Haumaru is linked with the Housing First initiative, providing rapid housing and wrap around supports for people experiencing long-term homelessness. The approach is aimed at supporting vulnerable and isolated people, through a coordinated and well supported system using a recovery approach, assisting clients in engaging with their peers and with professionals, inevitably resulting in improved outcomes for the homeless.
- 5.5 Council support for project management does not pre-empt the need to obtain any necessary Council consents or permits. The Male Room would need to apply to Council for any consents and permits in the usual way. Council's assistance via the Community Partnerships team, with funding for project management would assist the Male Room in meeting this.
- 5.6 The proposed hub is for both men and women. The Male Room works with female clients and isn't an exclusively male service.

Portacom v building modifications

- 5.7 The four options for the Male Room are to utilise the existing Tāhunanui portacom, purchase a new portacom, modify the existing building or do nothing. These are described below.

Item 8: Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

5.8 **Option 1 – Utilise the existing Tāhunanui portacom.** While initial indications were that this portacom could be installed at minimal cost, further investigations estimate costs of around \$50,000 (excl GST) to move and install the existing facility. The costs are predominately due to site preparation and service provision such as water and electricity in what is considered to be a difficult site. A detailed breakdown and estimate would be prepared as part of the feasibility plan. Under this option the portacom would be owned by Council and provided to the Male Room for a peppercorn lease.

5.9 The \$50,000 estimate (excl GST) is based on:

- Coordination activities – \$4,572
- Other consultancy costs – \$4,650
- Actual works – \$17,200

Subsequent to the original estimate, costs were updated to include;

- A foundations estimate increase as piles are likely to be needed +\$1,000.
- Installation of a window to portacom +\$5-7,000.
- A 25 square metre deck is required to access three sides +\$8,200.
- Plumbing work costs have increased due to the water main being under a concrete stair and ramp +\$1,500.
- A fire rated wall is required on the rear wall of the portacom +\$2,500.
- Improvements to some fire protection features are required, which will incur cost and could require an annual Building Warrant of Fitness.
- Small contingency of \$3,500

5.10 The Tāhunanui portacom is extensively used by sports teams as follows:

- Consistent use by five men's senior football and two senior rugby teams during the winter for games and practice sessions. Occasional use by football division two and three.
- Summer weekday use by the American Football League.
- Training sessions by the Tāhunanui football senior women's team, and weekend games for the women's and youth modified games.

5.11 It is important to provide separate changing facilities for men's and women's teams. If the current portacom was removed, feedback from

Item 8: Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

Tāhunanui Football is that it would request a replacement facility before next season to avoid tensions between the rugby and football codes.

- 5.12 The Tāhunanui portacom was purchased to serve as a temporary changing facility while the Greenmeadows Community Centre was under construction. Once Greenmeadows was completed the portacom was relocated to the Tāhunanui reserve where it was used to resolve changing room tensions between rugby and football. The portacom was never identified as surplus, however it was considered as a possible solution for a more urgent need to provide facilities for the homeless.
- 5.13 Consequently officers do not recommend moving the Tāhunanui portacom due to the impact on sports groups and the potential costs of installing replacement facilities.
- 5.14 **Option 2 - Purchase and install a new portacom.** The Male Room is considering the option of purchasing a new portacom for installation at their premises. The approximate cost of a new portacom is \$40,000 (excl GST) plus transport and delivery, based on the previous portacom design. This would bring the total project costs to an estimated \$90,000 (excl GST) for this option. The Male Room would own the portacom in this scenario. Option 2 is preferred by the Male Room.
- 5.15 **Option 3 – Modifications to the existing Male Room building.** Given the increasing costs of purchasing and installing a portacom, the Male Room also considered a modification or extension to their existing building. This will require a site assessment from an appropriately qualified builder or drafts person and permission from the building owner, Kāinga Ora.
- 5.16 After consideration the Male Room decided that an extension to the existing building was not the right option for their clients and have favoured further investigation into the portacom options.
- 5.17 **Option 4 – do nothing.** Either the Male Room decides not to continue with the project, or rely totally on community and other agency funding, meaning no further support from Council will be required.
- 5.18 Option 2 is the recommended option from officers, as it has no impact on Tāhunanui sports groups and is preferred by the Male Room based on what would best suit their clients.

Investment and partner support

- 5.19 A feasibility report is required to enable the Male Room, Council (and any other funders) to move forward and confirm a preferred option. It is recommended that Council fund this feasibility, compliance and planning work up to \$10,000 to allow the project to progress in a robust and timely manner.
- 5.20 The Male Room will engage with community and agency funders once a preferred option and costing have been selected. Officers have been in

Item 8: Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

liaison with partners and initial indications are that MHUD and Kāinga Ora may consider funding.

- 5.21 There has also been interest in supporting the project from local Rotary Clubs.
- 5.22 Housing First has previously indicated it could consider assisting with staffing.

Budget

- 5.23 It is recommended that Council contribute \$10,000 to the planning, feasibility and consent costs, with the remainder \$20,000 to the build costs contingent on the residual build costs being met by other funders and/or community fundraising. Council's total financial contribution would therefore be up to \$30,000.
- 5.24 The budget is to be sourced from the existing Community Partnership Fund budget for the current financial year. This fund is to support community social development, for 'Community Partnership Projects' where there are opportunities for Council to partner and support the work of community groups to focus on community wellbeing.

6. Options

Option 1: Agree to contribute up to \$30,000 towards the Homeless Hub – preferred option	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'Kick starts' fundraising by the Male Room and encourages commitment by other agencies.• Limits Council's exposure to cost over-runs.• Helps to advance a project to relieve pressure on homelessness issue.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Council contribution could be inadequate.• Lost opportunity to use the funding to support community activities in other ways.• Could create an ongoing expectation of Council support.
Option 2: Increase Council contribution to the Homeless Hub	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'Kick starts' fundraising by the Male Room and encourages commitment by other agencies.• Helps to advance a project to relieve pressure on homelessness issue.• Reduce the need for community fundraising

Item 8: Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost opportunity to use the funding to support community activities in other ways. • Could create an ongoing expectation of Council support. • A higher level of Council funding from existing budgets will impact on resourcing for other Community Partnerships projects.
Option 3: Decrease Council contribution to the Homeless Hub	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost saving to Council. • Opportunity to use the funding to support community activities in other ways.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a greater reliance on other funders. • Fundraising time extended before the install can commence.
Option 4: Do nothing	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost saving to Council. • Opportunity to use the funding to support community activities in other ways.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a greater reliance on and could discourage other funders. • Difficulty for the Male Room to continue the project. • Reputational risk as Council has already indicated support.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 The issue of homelessness in our community has been in the spotlight during COVID-19 and there is an opportunity working with other agencies to reinforce positive moves towards housing and supporting homeless people. This project has been identified as a practical option for Council to offer support to a highly vulnerable and marginalised population.
- 7.2 Supporting the community sector in this project will enable the homeless community to best access much needed services and support for long term positive change.
- 7.3 The project is led by the Male Room and relies on the commitment of funding from other partners following a feasibility report, to fund and support the development of a hub on the Male Room site. The Male Room favour the purchase a new portacom. This report proposes that

Item 8: Providing a Homeless Hub at the Male Room

Council steps forward to make a substantial commitment to support the project.

8. Next steps

- 8.1 Council funds a feasibility report to determine estimates for installing a new portacom.
- 8.2 Based on the option chosen by the Male Room, the Male Room will engage other funders. Council to provide remaining funding up to the \$30,000 cap when the project is fully funded.
- 8.3 Once the facility is installed, the Male Room will provide social services alongside the hub facilities.
- 8.4 The Committee will be kept informed of progress via the quarterly report.

Author: **Scott Tambisari, Community Partnerships Adviser**

Attachments

Nil

Important considerations for decision making
1. Fit with Purpose of Local Government This decision enables Council to continue to assist activities and groups that support community wellbeing and vulnerable communities by contributing to the development of a Homeless Hub.
2. Consistency with Community Outcomes and Council Policy This project supports Community Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our communities are healthy, safe, inclusive and resilient• Our Council provides leadership and fosters partnerships, a regional perspective, and community engagement
3. Risk There is a risk that the project may not be fully funded through the partnership model. This is mitigated as the project build will not start until there is a firm commitment from project partners, and Council's total contribution is capped. The feasibility report may uncover issues that make the project unviable due to complexity or cost.
4. Financial impact This project has a one-off Council contribution cost and a commitment of ongoing officer in kind support through to the end of the project from the existing Community Partnership Fund project budgets.
5. Degree of significance and level of engagement This matter is of low significance to the community as the project will impact only on the small homeless community. Therefore engagement has been with relevant agencies and non-government organisations.
6. Climate Impact This report will have no impact on the ability of Council to proactively respond to the impacts of climate change now or in the future.
7. Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process No engagement with Māori has been undertaken in preparing this report.

8. Delegations

The Community Services Committee has the following delegations to consider homelessness

Areas of Responsibility:

- *Community Development, including youth issues, ageing issues and social well-being*
- *Community Facilities, including public toilets*

Delegations:

- *The committee has all of the responsibilities, powers, functions and duties of Council in relation to governance matters within its areas of responsibility, except where they have been retained by Council, or have been referred to other committees, subcommittees or subordinate decision-making bodies.*

REPORT R17000

Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide an update to elected members and confirm the preferred approach for the Stoke Memorial Hall so that design can commence in 2020/21 as budgeted for.

2. Summary

- 2.1 The Stoke Memorial Hall is earthquake prone and is currently closed. A business case has been prepared looking at the different options for the building.
- 2.2 This report presents options and makes a recommendation for the strengthening approach and level of improvements required.
- 2.3 An application has been made to the Provincial Growth Fund (PGF) for funding to support the project.
- 2.4 This report seeks to bring the budget forward and increase the total amount in the budget so that, if Council is successful with the PGF application, the project can proceed, while taking advantage of external funding and providing economic benefits to the Nelson community.

3. Recommendation

That the Community Services Committee

- 1. Receives the report Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening (R17000) and its attachment (A2383503); and***
- 2. Approves commencement of design for seismic strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall to 67% of the New Building Standard (Importance Level 3) and undertake basic improvements/maintenance as outlined in Option 2 of report (R17000); and***

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

3. ***Notes that an application to the Provincial Growth Fund for \$500,000 has been sought for the work for strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall.***

Recommendation to Council

That the Council

1. ***Approves the total allocation of \$1.2M in 2020/21 in capital expenditure for seismic strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall to 67% of the New Building Standard (Importance Level 3) and undertake basic improvements/maintenance, with the project to commence in 2020/21, subject to the success of the Provincial Growth Fund application, as set out in the table below;***

	Capex	Comment
2020/21	\$120,000	Existing
	\$458,000	Brought forward from 2024/25
	\$500,000	Potential Provincial Growth Fund (to be confirmed)
	\$120,000	Unbudgeted funding
	\$1.2M	Total 2020/21

and

2. ***Notes that a successful Provincial Growth Fund application for strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall will also require a further commitment to \$440,000 of unbudgeted operating expenditure and \$420,000 of unbudgeted capital expenditure in 2021/22 to be considered for approval as part of the Long Term Plan 2021-31; and***
3. ***Agrees that, if the Provincial Growth Fund application for strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall is unsuccessful, Council will still proceed with the design work for the project, with physical works timing to be confirmed in the Long Term Plan 2021-31.***

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

4. Background

- 4.1 The Stoke Memorial Hall was assessed in 2014 as being 24% of New Building Standard (NBS) at Importance Level 2 (IL2). The building, being less than 34% NBS, was deemed to be an Earthquake Prone Building. The Earthquake Prone Building Notice required that the building be strengthened or the hazard removed by 2029.
- 4.2 Budget was allocated through the Long Term Plan 2018-28 for strengthening of the Hall in 2024/25, at a cost of \$458,000. This report identifies that this amount is inadequate for the amount of work required.
- 4.3 The building was closed on 29 March 2020 and users were relocated to other facilities that were a mixture of Council-owned and private. Council approved in March 2020 unbudgeted expenditure in order to pay the difference in the rental rates at other facilities in the interim.
- 4.4 A workshop was held with elected members in June 2020 to discuss future options.
- 4.5 Potential external funding is available through the Provincial Growth Fund (PGF). Council has made an application and if successful, the PGF would potentially provide a grant of up to \$500,000. Council would need to pay for the remainder. The PGF criteria requires Council to move 'at pace' with the project, with the intent to provide jobs and economic activity to the region as soon as possible. The announcement of the PGF funding opportunity came as Council was underway with deliberations on the Annual Plan 2020/21, so was not considered during Annual Plan.
- 4.6 Officers will provide a verbal update on the application at the meeting if further information is available.
- 4.7 This report seeks to bring the budget forward and increase the total amount in the budget so that if Council is successful with the PGF application, the project can proceed in a timely way as required.
- 4.8 If the application is successful, physical construction work will need to commence in 2020/21. If the application is not successful, it is recommended the work still be carried out, with finalisation of dates to be confirmed in the Long Term Plan 2021-31.

About the Hall and users

- 4.9 The Stoke Memorial Hall, on Main Road Stoke, was built in the early 1950s as a memorial to soldiers killed at war. It was constructed using community volunteer labour. A memorial plaque is set into the stone surrounds of the adjacent memorial gates (separate from the building) and there are plaques with names on them within the Hall.
- 4.10 The Stoke Memorial Hall has local community significance though is not heritage or locally listed in the Nelson Resource Management Plan and is not currently proposed to be listed in the Nelson Plan. Some members of

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

the community have, in the past, expressed the desire to retain the Hall, but other members of the community have also expressed a desire to stop using ratepayer funding to support the Hall.

- 4.11 The Hall is a bookable venue, managed under contract.
- 4.12 When the Greenmeadows Centre/Pūtangitangi opened, the majority of Stoke Memorial Hall users stayed at the Hall because the regular activities require a wooden floor and high ceiling that Greenmeadows Centre/Pūtangitangi does not have.
- 4.13 The Hall was being used regularly by 10 groups prior to its closure in March 2020 with other one-off bookings on top of this. In 2018/19, the Hall had 1,850 hours of use from events and bookings, which equates to approximately 35 hours per week. The revenue from the use of the Hall is approximately \$23,000 per annum.
- 4.14 Regular users and one-off users that had booked already were relocated to other venues, not all of which are Council owned. The costs of hire for these other facilities are often comparable for user groups. Council subsidised the hire costs at other venues for six months where the costs were higher.
- 4.15 The table below lists the regular users and where they moved to when the Hall closed in March 2020. The Hall was also used by one-off users.

User	Facility they have moved to
Dancing group (early Monday evenings)	Stoke Methodist Hall
Badminton (later Monday evenings)	Nayland College
DSS Disco (monthly)	Greenmeadows Centre/ Pūtangitangi
Kendo (Tuesday evenings)	Jack Robins Stadium
Badminton (Tuesday mornings)	Richmond Badminton Hall
Badminton (Wednesday evenings)	Cancelled
Ballroom and Latin American dance (two sessions on Thursdays)	Enner Glynn Hall
Pretty Smart Sale (monthly)	Hope Hall
Bingo (from Stoke Community Hall)	Greenmeadows / Pūtangitangi Centre

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

Feedback about the Hall

- 4.16 \$120,000 for design was put into the draft Annual Plan 2020/21, and later confirmed through the final Annual Plan 2020/21 when it was adopted in June. There were eight submissions to the Annual Plan 2020/21 that discussed the Stoke Memorial Hall. Submitters raised a range of issues and concerns both in support of and opposing the expenditure and/or development for a variety of reasons.
- 4.17 These Annual Plan submissions are attached to the report at Attachment One (A2382193) for information.
- 4.18 All users were re-located when the building was closed. The users have provided feedback that they support the building being strengthened. Some users thought there was a need for improvements, but other users were content using the Hall as it was.
- 4.19 Users were contacted recently to see whether they would want to return to the Stoke Memorial Hall in the future. They are generally very keen to return to the Hall once it has been strengthened.
- 4.20 Many users from the Stoke Memorial Hall were unable to re-locate to the Greenmeadows Community Centre/ Pūtangitangi because of the requirement for the timber floor, high ceiling and/or stage for the activities they hold in the Hall, features that are not available in the Greenmeadows facility.
- 4.21 Clearly users of the Hall find it suits their needs and others such as the Celtic Band, which is not currently a user, have expressed an interest, if the Hall was more acoustically treated, to make this their home.
- 4.22 Feedback from the Council workshop in June 2020 was that elected members valued the Hall, recognised the community association with the Hall and considered it was an asset that they wished to retain, but sought further information about the various options available.

Seismic Rating and strengthening required

- 4.23 Peer review of the seismic assessment was undertaken in 2019 and recommended the Hall be considered as Importance Level 3 (IL3) under the Building Act, due to its size and potential occupancy of over 300 persons.
- 4.24 This resulted in the lowering of the prior indicated percentage seismic performance level which was based on Importance Level 2 (IL2).
- 4.25 The Hall is now determined likely as having a 17% rating against NBS, lower than the 24%, previously determined in 2014 reporting. Although a full revised Detailed Seismic Assessment has not been undertaken, the design for the strengthening will take the IL3 assumption and current building capacity/performance and design a solution that meets 67% of the NBS. The design to be completed will need to consider a greater level of strengthening required than would be required under IL2.

5. Options discussion

Option 1: Seismic strengthening

- 5.1 If the building is retained, it must be strengthened to at least 34% NBS by 2029 at the latest. This will remove the current Earthquake Prone Building notice. It is however preferred that the building be strengthened to a greater level, above 67% of NBS, to reduce the risk to occupants during a seismic event and to provide some margin if standards increase again in the future.
- 5.2 As such, if the Hall is to reopen, a significant investment would be required, with an approximate cost of \$1.2M to strengthen the building to 67% of the NBS, including 40% contingency.
- 5.3 The strengthening option would likely include the following, although the exact details and best method of strengthening will be determined through the design process:
 - 5.3.1 New foundations against the existing column foundations to the exterior and interior of the building
 - 5.3.2 New reinforced concrete columns to the outside face of the existing concrete columns
 - 5.3.3 Remove masonry infill panels and replace with lightweight timber walls
 - 5.3.4 Additional bracing and connection strengthening.
- 5.4 In addition \$100,000 has been allowed for asbestos removal/management of the soffit and roof space as part of the strengthening. Although a survey has been undertaken, there is a risk that more asbestos is present than expected and additional work may be required to address it.
- 5.5 If the building was strengthened to 34%, it would likely require securing the infill panels only and would cost approximately \$800,000 including contingency.
- 5.6 If the building was strengthened to 50%, it would likely require a similar solution to the 67% solution, but without the interior foundation improvements. It would cost approximately \$1.08M including contingency.
- 5.7 Because of the design of the building, it is unlikely to be possible to strengthen to 100% or greater of the NBS, without a significant amount of work and cost. Based on this, the early cost estimates and concept designs for strengthening work from the consultant have not provided a 100% NBS (IL3) design option.
- 5.8 Improvements for fire and accessibility will be required when the strengthening occurs, regardless of the other maintenance items.

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

- 5.9 Once strengthened, the Hall can re-open and continue to make income from users.
- 5.10 The Returned and Services Association (RSA) has provided a letter in support of Council's PGF application for the Hall's strengthening.
- 5.11 Officers support strengthening the building to 67% NBS (Importance Level 3), with the specific solution dependent on the outcomes of the design and any further investigations.
- 5.12 A 40% contingency has been applied to the estimates.
- 5.13 The option of strengthening to 67% (NBS) only is shown in the options table in section 7 as Option 1.

Other maintenance and renewals

- 5.14 If the building is being strengthened, there is a variety of other work that could be done at the same time to take advantage of the Hall being closed, and economies in building and design work and other costs such as scaffolding.

Option 2: Seismically strengthen and undertake basic improvements/maintenance (preferred option)

- 5.15 Maintenance was deferred at this Hall for a period while the future was uncertain. There are a number of items requiring work.
- 5.16 It is considered that the following items are required as basic maintenance, as a minimum. Option 2 is therefore a combination of seismic strengthening (Option 1 above) and the work below.
- Roof painting and basic leak fixes (opex)
 - Window maintenance and minor repairs (opex)
 - Painting exterior walls (opex – note, some will be required regardless following strengthening)
 - Painting interior walls and ceiling (opex – note, some will be required regardless following strengthening)
 - Rewiring and new switch board (capex)
 - Toilet upgrade (modernise, some new fittings) (capex).
- 5.17 It is expected that these items will cost approximately \$860,000 including design and contingency, although this is a high level estimate that may vary when design is completed. These costs exclude strengthening.
- 5.18 Included in this is \$100,000 has been allowed for asbestos removal/management as part of the basic maintenance/improvements.

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

This is in addition to the asbestos costs for the strengthening. The areas with asbestos include the vinyl flooring and bathroom partitions.

- 5.19 There are some improvements required following a barrier free assessment to make the Hall more easily accessed for all members of the community that would also be considered in this option.
- 5.20 This work enables the Hall to be used again as a community Hall, but does not make any significant improvements to it or change how it can be used. Some items may need more work in the future if there are decisions on upgrades and improvements in addition to what is there already.

Option 3: Seismically strengthen and renew elements of the Hall

- 5.21 This option addresses the renewal of elements that are known to be required or that users have suggested over the years. This item has more detailed renewals of the items listed below. Option 3 is therefore a combination of Option 1 and the following:

- Replace roof
- Insulate roof
- Painting exterior walls
- Painting interior walls and ceiling
- Renew ceilings
- Replace floorings (vinyl and carpet)
- Provide acoustic treatment to walls
- Refurbish and renew worst condition windows to Hall
- Install heating and ventilation
- New toilets and showers and re-configure the area
- Timber flooring repair and re-varnish
- Commercial kitchen

- 5.22 It is expected that these items will cost in the order of \$2.7M (capex) including design and contingency. This cost would be on top of the strengthening required. A commercial kitchen is arguably the least necessary addition and without this feature, the estimated cost would be around \$2.5M.

- 5.23 This report does not recommend Option 3, but instead Option 2, which enables Council to ensure the building can continue to be used and that

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

the work is an improvement to the existing building, but that no additional, more significant renewals take place.

Option 4: Deconstruction

- 5.24 There is an option not to strengthen and to instead deconstruct and use the space for another purpose, which is shown in the table below as Option 4.
- 5.25 There is a heritage significance to members of the community that would be lost with this option, although there is an option of retaining the façade.
- 5.26 Building removal costs have not been quoted but are expected to be high because of the presence of asbestos. On top of the building removal costs, there would be an additional level of investment in order to retain the façade or prepare the space for another use. Other costs could include structural work to create a park-like area. Both of these options remove the earthquake risk of the building. If the Committee prefers deconstruction, officers will need to report back with more specific costings. Further consultation would also be required.
- 5.27 Deconstruction of the Hall would remove the ongoing costs of the contract, management of the facility, maintenance and renewals over the Hall's life, but would also limit the opportunity for future revenue.
- 5.28 In terms of users and meeting community demand, this option would be supported by some members of the community who have submitted against future expenditure at the Stoke Memorial Hall, however it would leave some members of the community unable to carry out activities within community halls in Stoke and instead having to travel further for their activities.
- 5.29 While there has been support for the retention of the Hall in the past by some, there are concerns over any significant investment in the facility, noting there is Greenmeadows Centre/ Pūtangitangi around 200 metres up the road.

6. Budget considerations

- 6.1 Budget of \$458,000 was allocated through the Long Term Plan 2018-28 for strengthening of the Hall in 2024/25. This report identifies that this amount is inadequate for the amount of work required.
- 6.2 Budget of \$120,000 was allocated in the Annual Plan 2020/21 for design, in recognition of the need to bring forward the design work for the project.
- 6.3 The table below shows cost estimates for the recommended option, Option 2:

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

Item	Cost estimate	
Option 2: Strengthening and basic improvements/maintenance		
<u>Strengthening</u>	<u>Capex</u>	<u>Opex</u>
Total – strengthening (includes design, strengthening, asbestos estimate and contingency)	\$1.2M	
<u>Basic improvements/maintenance</u>		
Opex (includes design, maintenance, asbestos, contingency)		\$440,000
Capex (includes improvements and contingency)	\$420,000	
Total – basic improvements/maintenance	\$420,000	\$440,000
<u>Total cost of the project (recommended)</u>		
Total (Strengthening and Basic improvements/maintenance)	\$1.62M	\$440,000

- 6.4 The following sets out the budget implications and requirements to support the preferred option, option 2.

What	Budget (Capex)	Budget (Opex)
Existing budget in 2020/21 (for design)	\$120,000	
Existing budget in 2024/25 (required to be brought forward to 2020/21)	\$458,000	
Council funding required, in addition to what is already budgeted in 2020/21 and 2024/25	\$1.04M	\$440,000
Amount potentially available from the PGF for the strengthening	\$500,000	
Total amount Council needs to fund for the work, depending on the success of the PGF	\$540,000- \$1.04M	\$440,000

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

6.5 Note that those items above are high level cost estimates only, and will be refined as the design is completed and the costings confirmed. As a result, a large contingency has been applied to account for the fact that only high level estimates have been provided at this stage and that asbestos in the building could add to the costs.

6.6 In summary, \$120,000 is already allocated for design and \$458,000 can be brought forward from 2024/25. Council needs to commit an additional \$1.5M from what is budgeted in order to carry out the work, noting that up to \$500,000 of this is potentially available from the PGF.

6.7 The cost to Council of the project will range from \$1.5M to \$2M depending on the amount of PGF funding awarded, if any.

Timeframe

6.8 For a usual Council project of a similar scale, the process would be design (year 1, i.e. 2020/21) and then construct in a different year (i.e. 2021/22 or other future year).

6.9 If the PGF application is successful, Council will need to move 'at pace' on the project, and there will be an expectation that physical construction will commence as soon as six months from the date that the funding is awarded (i.e. by January 2021). Council's Capital Projects team has confirmed that this faster timeframe to complete design and start physical work is achievable. It would mean that some of the physical construction budget (the strengthening) would need to be in 2020/21 and the rest (other maintenance/renewal work) in 2021/22.

6.10

	Capex	Opex	Comment
2020/21	\$120,000		Existing
	\$458,000		Brought forward from 2024/25
	\$500,000		Potential Provincial Growth Fund (to be confirmed)
	\$120,000		Unbudgeted funding
	\$1.2M		Total 2020/21
2021/22	\$420,000	\$440,000	Unbudgeted funding
Total	\$1.62M	\$440,000	Total both years

6.11 If PGF funding is not successful, Council can still carry out the design in 2020/21 based on the preferred option in this report, with funding and

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

timing of physical construction to be confirmed in the Long Term Plan 2021-31.

- 6.12 Given Council already has a large capital programme it has committed to in 2020/21 and this project would be adding to it, there is a risk that adding to the work programme could reduce Council's ability to deliver elsewhere.
- 6.13 If the project was to be allocated through the Long Term Plan 2021-31, this impact would be weighed up against all other projects that are being considered for delivery.

7. Options summary

- 7.1 The options are discussed in more detail below. The preferred option is Option 2.

Option 1: Seismically strengthen only and reopen	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The building can be reopened fairly soon (2021/22).• The facility is retained and the community continue to have a space that can be utilised by various groups.• Can recover up to 20% the cost of the work from revenue through increasing fees and charges in line with the Revenue and Financing Policy (though this will be over a long period).• Users get to return to the Hall reasonably quickly.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The strengthening cost could increase due to unforeseen items and would be confirmed once design is completed.• Opportunity to improve the Hall is not realised.• User charges would need to increase in order to cover the costs and users may not return to the Hall if they are satisfied with their new locations.• Construction is not currently in the work programme for 2020/21.
Option 2: Seismically strengthen and undertake basic improvements/maintenance and reopen (preferred)	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The building can be reopened fairly soon (2021/22).• The facility is retained and the community continues to have a space that can be utilised by various groups.

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maintenance needs of the Hall and exterior maintenance are undertaken with the work so prevents future disruption and may provide economy of scale (access in place etc.). • Can recover up to 20% the cost of the work from revenue through increasing fees and charges in line with the Revenue and Financing Policy (though this will be over a long period). Fees will need to increase more than just option 1. • Greater level of upgrades such as acoustic treatments could be done in the future.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strengthening and other costs could increase due to unforeseen items. • User charges would need to increase more than under option 1 in order to cover the costs and users may not return to the Hall if they are satisfied with their new locations. • Construction is not currently in the work programme for 2020/21.
Option 3: Seismically strengthen and renew elements of the Hall and reopen	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building can be reopened fairly soon (2021/22). • The facility is retained and the community continues to have a space that can be utilised by various groups and the space provided is an improved space that may attract new or additional users. • The maintenance needs of the Hall and exterior maintenance are undertaken with the work so prevents future disruption and may provide economy of scale (access in place etc.). • Can recover up to 20% the cost of the work from revenue through increasing fees and charges in line with the Revenue and Financing Policy (though this will be over a long period). Fees will need to increase more than just option 1 and 2.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost could increase due to unforeseen items.

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users may not return to the Hall if they are satisfied with their new locations. • User charges would need to increase more than option 2 in order to cover the costs. Users may not be keen to pay increased costs to cover the cost of the work so may not return. • Potentially some duplication with Greenmeadows/Pūtangitangi. • Construction is not currently in the work programme for 2020/21.
Option 4: Deconstruction and repurpose the site	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This provides the lowest physical cost option. • The work could be completed reasonably quickly. • Provides potentially a different asset and a space for community to come to and enjoy. • Allows for future development of space to meet needs. • All users have been able to find temporary homes in the meantime, so there are suitable community spaces for users in the region, although the alternative spaces are not necessarily the preference of the users. • Reduction in ongoing opex for costs associated with the Hall.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of the Hall may be unpopular with some members of the local community. • The loss of a Memorial Hall • Loss of revenue from hire • Cost to undertake work cannot be recovered. • Will require investment to develop the desired final use of the space. • Some users will need to find a permanent new home. • The construction is not currently in the work programme for 2020/21. • Communications about the Stoke Memorial Hall closure did not mention permanent closure of the hall

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 The Annual Plan 2020/21 allows \$120,000 for design of the Stoke Memorial Hall strengthening solution. Design can commence when Council has confirmed the preferred option.
- 8.2 Once completed, physical construction can commence.
- 8.3 If the PGF application is successful, construction will need to start within six months of being awarded, so by early 2021.

9. Next Steps

- 9.1 Commence design.
- 9.2 Confirm PGF funding and inform Council.
- 9.3 Inform users about the project's development.
- 9.4 Provide updates to the Committee through quarterly reports.

Author: Jane Loughnan, Parks and Facilities Asset Planner

Attachments

Attachment 1: A2382193 Annual Plan 2020/21 submissions related to the Stoke Memorial Hall [↓](#)

Important considerations for decision making
<p>1. Fit with Purpose of Local Government</p> <p>This decision enables Council to commence design of the preferred option in order to strengthen the building and meet the timeframes in the Building Act.</p> <p>Having a functioning hall provides activities for wellbeing close to the local community.</p>
<p>2. Consistency with Community Outcomes and Council Policy</p> <p>Providing community venues contributes to the Community Outcomes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our infrastructure is efficient, cost effective and meets current and future needs• Our communities have access to a range of social, educational and recreational facilities and activities
<p>3. Risk</p> <p>There is a risk that the design process identifies additional expenditure required that wasn't considered up to this point.</p> <p>There is a risk that some members of the community do not want money spent on this Hall, given Greenmeadows Centre/Pūtangitangi was built so recently.</p> <p>There is a risk that users that have re-located to other venues may prefer their other venue and not return to the Stoke Memorial Hall.</p>
<p>4. Financial impact</p> <p>The decision to proceed with this option has financial impacts. Some of the costs may be able to be provided by the PGF funding, if successful.</p> <p>With the increased costs of the building, it is likely that the user charges for the building will need to increase in order to keep the facility in line with the Revenue and Financing Policy targets.</p>
<p>5. Degree of significance and level of engagement</p> <p>This matter is of medium significance because it affects some users directly and other members of the community because of the ongoing financial costs of the decision. Feedback was received through the Annual Plan.</p> <p>Users of the Hall will be kept informed of progress.</p>

6. Climate Impact

The decision to strengthen, rather than demolish the building, reduces the impact of the building to landfill. However, there is a continued operating impact of the building into the future of carbon emissions related to electrical outputs.

Through the strengthening, where items are replaced, they will be replaced with low carbon impact equivalents e.g. lighting and heating.

7. Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

No engagement with Māori has been undertaken in preparing this report.

8. Delegations

The Community Services Committee/Subcommittee/Council has the following delegations to consider community halls and the Refinery.

Areas of Responsibility:

- *Arts, Culture and Heritage*
- *Community Centres and Halls, including Greenmeadows Community Centre, Stoke Memorial Hall and Tahunanui Community Centre*
- *Community Festivals and Events*

Delegations:

- *Monitoring Council's performance for the committee's areas of responsibility, including legislative responsibilities and compliance requirements*

Powers to Recommend (if applicable):

- *Unbudgeted expenditure relating to the areas of responsibility, not included in the Long Term Plan or Annual Plan*

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #22908

Mr Don Bartkowiak

Nelson 7011

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		<p>I'm not sure if the new councillors are aware but a new community facility has just been built up the road as replacement for Stoke Memorial Hall. This new facility has come at a significant cost and will now require funding to run on an ongoing basis. Stoke Hall is now surplus to requirements and no longer needed.</p> <p>I recall at the time of consultation for the new facility, it was sold to the community as a replacement for the Memorial Hall. So, I expected that facility would be shut down. It is not clear in the AP document why the Memorial Hall needs to be improved or maintained. What will it be used for? This facility should be closed down and demolished (or whatever solution will incur the least cost for ratepayers on an ongoing basis). I see a Stoke Hall Remediation was planned in 24/25 but the LTP was developed as the Greenmeadow's Centre was still in development and completion uncertain. It's up and running now so the Stoke Hall isn't needed. Keeping this facility should not be a priority, either use the savings to reduce rates a slightly or reallocate the funding to a priority of greater need, I can't imagine the argument to retain this facility considering all the other priorities that Council would like to undertake.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19 Rates, Debt and Affordability		<p>I support no rates increase for the 20/21 year but don't believe council funding for core programmes (eg infrastructure, parks, etc) should be reduced at all given the importance to the community (socially and economically). Cuts to council programmes are not the answer and not sustainable long term. The funding shortfall can be covered by taking on more debt (especially considering debt is cheap right now and will be for the near future). Paying off this debt can be managed in future years. The LTP will need to address what council programmes looks like in the future (especially as a downturn is likely and income will likely reduce).</p>

A2382193

Printed: 20/04/2020 12:42

Page AP29

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #23051

Miss Kahurangi Hippolite

Nelson 7011

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	01 Climate Change		I object to our Marae been used as a evacuation site due to its proximity to the hills and trees and vegetation across the road but also because of the high congestion levels of the amount of vehicles coming into and out of the Central business area and residential homes on the hill and township when an emergency happens like the fires last year
NCC - Strategy and Communications	02 Sustainable Transport Culture		To obtain a Sustainable Transport Culture would take alot of time and co-ordinated planning between various stake holder groups, transport, climate etc. Nelson does not have easy access in or out of the Central business district from any direction by road and the fire on the Hills last year saw how bad it was for those emergency vehicles to get to the location because of congestion and people leaving there workplaces to rush home because they could see this big smoke rising towards the city. Maybe we need water taxis which is a bit far fetched but we do need helicopters right now. Another far fetched option is a tunnel or two but realistically if you are not prepared to look to the future and spend money then you are just going to put a short term band aid on a problem until it gets even worst
NCC - Strategy and Communications	03 Housing Intensification and Affordability		Building only on existing blocks of land owned by the Council is not a long term solution let alone a short term one. These and changing zones are risky options. I believe building on existing council lands should be a given so I hope future Councillors do not stop this process from continuing. Nelson has a chance to do something different if only people think outside the square. Invest in and support more smaller affordable working type accommodation in the suburbs rather than in the city which require less use of vehicles but can use public transport instead. Bring in other stakeholders like iwi or other big businesses to the table.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	05 City Centre Development		It is sad to see our inner city becoming more like a ghost town than a thriving one but that's what is happening at the moment. There have been some

A2382193

Page AP186

Printed: 17/04/2020 07:09

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening: Attachment 1

			small successes like the concerts held at Trafalgar Park and the Mako rugby games. There used to be Friday night shopping in Stoke and Nelson but not anymore. There needs to be a central area in the central business district but there isn't one, maybe it needs a big fountain in the middle of town who knows, just throwing it out there.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	07 Transport		This is a big topic and all else leads to it. We need to try and keep the city area less congested with less vehicles on the road other than emergency vehicles. How, other than essential or emergency vehicles, all other means into the city and out should be via, scooters, bikes, bicycles, bus or walk
NCC - Strategy and Communications	08 Cycling		There should be as many cycle lanes throughout the city and suburbs
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		As much as I have fond memories of this hall, its purpose has sadly been eroded over the years. Can I just say that I would be very disappointed if this site becomes another rest home, we have alot already in our district. We probably need a skate park but I am not sure if that would be an ideal place for one. We already have enough white elephant buildings in Stoke that are mostly sitting vacant most of the time. Needs better planning and consultation with residents other than the elderly who are very well catered for.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	18 Parks and Active Recreation		Other than the vandalism I have read about for some of our parks and recreation I believe Tahuna has become more congested in the summer months than any other time of the year and with the new skate park this has made it even more so. By the way I have no objections to the skate park, it is needed. Saxton Park is starting to become encircled with new residential homes so you won't be able to have big crowds there not too far in the future. Stoke has the park for sports but it doesn't really have anything like Tahuna in terms of a play area, the old one was dismantled so no central area for the kids and young teens.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19a Do you support the proposed zero percent rate rise for 2020/21	Yes, I support 0% rates rise	I am not a ratepayer but I would support it at this time of a pandemic for those who are. I would also support a Council who would consider taking a pay cut like our Prime Minister and other Ministers and Councillors around the country to help during this time.

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #23086

Mr Lawrence Marwick

President

Nelson Badminton

Nelson 7040

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		Please see attached

A2382193

Printed: 21/04/2020 03:49

Page AP213

23086-1



Nelson Badminton Association
P O Box 1120
Nelson

14th April 2020

Rosie Bartlett
Nelson City Council
P O Box 645
Nelson

Dear Rosie

I am writing on behalf of Stoke Morning, City Morning and Stoke Evening Badminton Clubs in support of retaining a Hall in Stoke to play Badminton.

The School Halls are not suitable for morning badminton, nor is Saxton Stadium which has high windows which let the light in, causing sight problems with the shuttle.

Badminton is a low impact sport which can be played safely by all generations. The Stoke Memorial Hall plays a big part in the Stoke community which shows in how much use the Hall gets.

Yours sincerely

Lawrence Marwick
Nelson Badminton President



A2382193

Page AP214

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #24128

Mrs Belinda Wheatley

Nelson 7010

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	04 Maitai River Precinct (Includes the new library development)		<p>I strongly support the development of the Maitai River Precinct. I would like to see greater use of the area around the Trafalgar Centre. The Makete Po (Maori Night Market) with live music and food was excellent. Providing gas BBQs like the ones at Tahuna Beach would encourage people to stay and play.</p> <p>The Maitai Bowling Club at Kinzett Terrace is an under-utilised Council asset. This could be a great youth centre with sport courts and access to the sea. It could also be an excellent reserve with native planting to reduce the impacts of climate change and coastal erosion.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	01 Climate Change		<p>I strongly support climate change action, and would like to see reduced car use in the city centre. The majority of car parks in the city centre should be for people with limited mobility and a disability car park permit. Other people should be encouraged to walk or bike in our city. Council should consider a car parking building near the city centre as an alternative to city centre car parking spaces.</p> <p>Planting more trees in the city will provide shade from the sun, shelter from rain, and absorb noise. We need to replace all single rubbish bins in the city with rubbish and recycling bins that can take landfill, glass and other recycling - particularly at our high profile Saturday market.</p> <p>Single use plastic should be restricted or banned - If it can't be reduced, reused, repaired, rebuilt, refurbished, refinished, resold, recycled or composted, then it should be restricted, redesigned or removed from production.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	05 City Centre Development		<p>The top of Trafalgar Street area has been a huge success. I strongly support extending the pedestrian-only area of Trafalgar Street from Hardy Street to Halifax Street. Nelson is famous for arts and heritage - we could use a trail of artwork, sculpture and heritage stories / items of interest to encourage people to walk and linger in our city centre.</p>

A2382193

Page AP263

Printed: 01/05/2020 11:50

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening: Attachment 1

NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		I do not support any investment in the Stoke Memorial Hall. The recent investment in Stoke has been huge, and the Greenmeadows development should be able to accommodate any functions provided by the Stoke Memorial Hall.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	11 Wastewater		I strongly support further work on the Neale Park Pump Station. The odour is unpleasant for residents, and is not a suitable welcome for visitors arriving in Nelson from the North (often via the Picton ferry). It is also near the Skate Park and does not contribute to a healthy environment for children and young people.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	03 Housing Intensification and Affordability		<p>I strongly support housing intensification in the city centre, and converting second storey (and above) commercial buildings to residences. Having lived in large city centre internationally, and living in The Wood area now, noise is a key consideration. Traffic in the city centre must be reduced to limit noise. Late night hospitality businesses and residences do not generally work well in close proximity.</p> <p>I have concerns about the concept of a housing reserve, which sounds like a ghetto.</p> <p>We need to ensure we protect our heritage buildings as they make Nelson beautiful and unique, and contribute to our sense of belonging. The redevelopment and reuse of heritage buildings can be a sustainable solution to address housing intensification and affordability.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	06 Lifting Council Performance		<p>It would reassure Nelson residents if Council performance was shared in a way that was easily understood. Key performance indicators and benchmarking could achieve this e.g. time to process consents by NCC compared to other Councils, percentage of waste going to landfill by NCC compared to other Councils, etc.</p> <p>Civic House is no longer fit for purpose for Council staff. In this post-Covid world and need for social distancing, Council staff should continue to work at home where possible. Nelson city centre has many ground floor buildings that could be used by Council staff instead of Civic House. Staff in Civic House are not easily accessible or visible. Civic House should be sold for redevelopment as city centre apartments. With the money from the sale, Council could rent or purchase ground floor office buildings in the city centre and reduce the appearance of Nelson as a city in decline.</p>

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #24146

Mr Darren Meer

Nelson 7010

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	08 Cycling		Good, keep encouraging. Do the bike to work promotion more frequently. More cycle paths and shared paths please, can't have too many.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	09 Parking Strategy		Make it free everywhere in town with a 2 or 3 hour maximum. Copy Richmond, it works.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	10 Water Supply		No fluoride, no chlorine. Continue with maintenance works.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	12 Stormwater and Flood Protection		Forget the 100 year planning, it is no more than guesswork. Let people make their own choices/risk at their own expense. Or be consistent, raising new houses in the Wood but continuing as normal in the Town Centre smacks of hypocrisy.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	14 Environment		Encourage local action and the big picture will take care of itself. Stop trying to nanny us. Stop trying to create fear to then tax it. Sack the Climate expert, not needed, more waste of ratepayer money.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		Re open it, allow people/groups to use it at their own known risk. Do NOT let the Council spend any money, repairing or replacing, they have a dismal track record with projects of this size.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19 Rates, Debt and Affordability		How sad that the Mayor was "hugely disappointed" at the idea of a rates freeze. Sorry but they need to be frozen or reduced this year. If the Council could avoid its millions in overspends we could all enjoy a rates reduction. Please stay away from the big projects that are clearly beyond this Councils capability and stick to core business. 1 or 2 years focussing on core infrastructure will be good for the people the environment and the city in general. Even pay down some debt.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19a Do you support the proposed zero percent rate rise for 2020/21	Yes, I support 0% rates rise	Should be a reduction.

A2382193

Page AP283

Printed: 04/05/2020 11:37

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening: Attachment 1

NCC - Strategy and Communications	20 Fees and Charges		Need to be more transparent. More fixed fees rather than at the behest of Council Officers who make site visits (building) ad hoc and presumably when they need to show a bit more income.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	02 Sustainable Transport Culture		<p>Need a Park and Ride between Richmond Racecourse and Trafalgar Centre Nelson. Get rid of the buses and replace with smaller vans, run these on continuous loops, like in many South East Asian countries. Thailand for example. Service to Atawhai is rubbish, no evening service.</p> <p>Replace buses with small vans, run more frequently, continuous loop, and for longer hours. Add a Park n Ride Richmond Showgrounds to Trafalgar Park. Stop wasting money on the Southern Link idea. Encourage car pooling, cycles etc.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	04 Maitai River Precinct (Includes the new library development)		We do NOT need a new library, current one is perfectly fine and I say that as a regular user. Maitai Precinct, enough overspending already. Leave as it is now. Will never be a jewel due to Countdown building and also the way the wind blows in/through.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	05 City Centre Development		The City Centre is dying. Needs free parking like Richmond. Needs to be brighter, not cheapened with raggy tea towels.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	06 Lifting Council Performance		Guarantee a living wage to all employees. Decrease wages at the top of the hierarchy to offset pay rises at the 'bottom' of the organisation. Employ more competent people at the top. Why hasn't the Group Manager of Infrastructure been sacked for the gross overspends?? Where is accountability for performance at the top, seems to be lacking. Stop the bullying that seems to be a regular complaint within the Council.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	01 Climate Change		No need at all for a Climatorium. This should be central government responsibility. Concentrate on doing the local things effectively, recycling, encouraging clean activities, etc. Continue with no waste events etc.

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #24294

Mr Dennis Goodman

Nelson 7011

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	07 Transport		Please look at introducing bus lanes to ensure transport into Nelson city is more effective by public transport than by private motor vehicle. Maybe also consider funding public transport costs from general rates. Please also work in closely with TDC to ensure effective public transport is available from their population centres (outside Richmond) into Nelson City. Should a fast commuter ferry operation, like the one across Wellington Harbour, be considered from Motueka to Nelson?
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		The new Greenmeadows Centre should not be considered an alternative to the Hall. If the existing hall cannot be economically brought up to meet current earthquake requirements then a new, multi-purpose, hall should be built. Nothing grandiose - just a simple, functional, hall.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19a Do you support the proposed zero percent rate rise for 2020/21	Yes, I support 0% rates rise	Conditional support on there being no deferred maintenance, and that non-essential new projects can be delayed a year without any significant negative effects on the city.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	18 Parks and Active Recreation		I'd like to see the leashing of dogs be made compulsory on all our walkways and footpaths. However, there also needs to be additional unleashed dog socialising areas in addition to the one at the back beach. One possible location would be on land north east of the road from Atawhai out to the Boulder Bank if it can be acquired/purchased.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	03 Housing Intensification and Affordability		The revitalisation of our central city area depends on there being a higher density population in the area. Please look at more infill housing, but also low-rise apartment blocks - both new buildings and the conversion of existing ones that are no longer fit for their original purposes. It is also necessary to keep a good proportion of these accommodations affordable i.e. around or under Nelson's median house price.

A2382193

Printed: 06/05/2020 04:27

Page AP589

NCC - Strategy and Communications	07 Transport		Please seriously consider a new route, or re-routing NBus route R2, to include Nelson Airport. This can be achieved by making R1 the primary route between Nelson and Richmond. R2, going via the airport would be a major secondary route. Also, please consider evening public transport options into the city, to attract people to cafes, cinemas, events etc. Possibly hourly along the lines of the Late Bus service - operate 7-11pm.
-----------------------------------	--------------	--	--

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #24302

Mr Gaire Thompson
Managing Director
Thompson Property Group

Nelson 7040

Speaker? True

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	01 Climate Change		<p>I am against the unnecessary knee jerk reaction of the climate change Emergency and the allocation of \$900,000 of rate payer funds including the Port Company Dividend. what I can see is a lot of money being wasted on feel good projects and meetings generating a lot of hot air and very little else.</p> <p>I also question the trendy move to EVs as not economic because of the higher cost and depreciation as the batteries age. No account is being taken of the environmental damage done producing and disposing of the batteries. Neither is it fair that currently these vehicles don't pay road tax, a situation that must be corrected soon.</p> <p>controlling excessive run off is an issue that needs attention and can be assisted by where possible recycling the rain water where possible. We have 2/ 25000liter underground tanks buried in our front garden.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	02 Sustainable Transport Culture		<p>Councillors must remember that we are a spread out and hilly city that has a high proportion of elderly citizens who rely on their cars to get around not to mention the young families trying to shop.</p> <p>I don't support spending money on replacing the current parking machines with the electronic ones as used in Wellington and Christchurch which are not simple to use and require your vehicles registration number.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	03 Housing Intensification and Affordability		<p>one way to help would be to keep development levies and permit costs at a reasonable level.</p> <p>I have changed my mind over selling the pensioner houses now that I see that rather than reducing our debt the money is going to soon be squandered on supporting new initiative's..</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	06 Lifting Council Performance		<p>I believe that there needs to be increased output from staff, who then simplify things rather than creating more work. With an extra 23.2 extra staff</p>

A2382193

Printed: 06/05/2020 05:01

Page AP617

Item 9: Stoke Memorial Hall Strengthening: Attachment 1

			<p>last year why do we need a further 8 new staff this year at a cost of \$600,000 last year on going and \$75,000 this year.</p> <p>I am pleased to read that the \$1.34m upgrade of offices in Civic House has been deferred. the Council should remain there as have spent a lot on it over the years, Forget building a new ivory tower.</p> <p>I don't support the rush to the living wage, which equates to what a junior lawyer may get after 5 years of study and paying off a large student loan. Far better for the government to adjust the tax. So easy for to be spending other peoples money.</p>
NCC - Strategy and Communications	05 City Centre Development		not enough detail re the proposed inner city park which had better not take away car parks.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	09 Parking Strategy		I don't favour the current proposal of reducing the car parking in Trafalgar Street and widening the footpaths. it is not Wellingtons Golden Mile where the footpaths are lucky to be as wide as ours are currently.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		it appears to me that by the estimates provided we are being taken for another ride by the engineers and contractors.
NCC - Strategy and Communications	12 Stormwater and Flood Protection		re Modlers pond I would like more detail of what is proposed as believe it should be retained and flushed with salt water regularly.with salt water from high tides
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19 Rates, Debt and Affordability		<p>I am pleased to see that the debt is to be less than projected.</p> <p>I would like to see a change to make it easier to get a credit for commercial properties where they have a water leak'</p> <p>Commercial Differential.</p> <p>at 23.6% of total rates this is totally out of line particularly with the current situation for retail which has not been easy for some time and in Nelson City rates are far higher than Richmond which adds to the drift in that direction. a reduction of .05% does not go any where far enough to correct what has been an anomaly for many years particularly as the number of residential rating units has increased significantly in comparison to the number of commercial units which would have been lucky to have changed.</p>

Submission Summary

Annual Plan 2020/21 Consultation - Submission #24326

Mr Peter Olorenshaw

Nelson 7010

Speaker? False

Department	Subject	Opinion	Summary
NCC - Strategy and Communications	19 Rates, Debt and Affordability		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	01 Climate Change		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	03 Housing Intensification and Affordability		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	17 Stoke Memorial Hall		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	18 Parks and Active Recreation		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	15 Development Contributions		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	20 Fees and Charges		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	21 Building		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	05 City Centre Development		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	11 Wastewater		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	10 Water Supply		Please see attached
NCC - Strategy and Communications	12 Stormwater and Flood Protection		Please see attached

A2382193

Printed: 07/05/2020 09:03

Page AP666

24326-1

From: Peter Olorenshaw
Sent: Wednesday, 6 May 2020 4:16 PM
To: Submissions
Subject: Personal Submission on Nelson Annual Plan 2020-21
Attachments: Submssn NCC Ann Plan 202021 PeterO.pdf

Hi there
Please find my **personal** submission on the Nelson Annual Plan. Could you please acknowledge receipt?
Cheers
Peter

Peter Olorenshaw Architect
Registration #2575

24326-1

SUBMISSION to the Nelson City Council

Annual Plan 2020/21

From:

Peter Olorenshaw Architect

Maitai Valley

Nelson 7010

**Note: Page 1 of 18 of submission
24326 included in this
attachment only**

1.1 Council Spending as an Economic Stimulus for the Region: The council should be wary of cutting back on spending at a time when really a stimulus package will be necessary post Covid-19. So rather than the council reducing the 3.7% rates rise, when people such as superannuitants, people in essential services and those able to work from home have not suffered a decrease in income, the council should instead expand the rates rebate scheme, going further into debt to do this (interest rates are very low, these are exceptional times)

1.2 Council Spending Should Reviewed for Climate Change as well as Covid

At the same time as wanting to stimulate the local economy, we must be really wary of wasting money on things that will have a negative effect on either Climate Change Mitigation or Adaption and poor stimulatory effect on the local economy.

Below is a table of some things I've identified that really seem much less urgent now, resulting in savings of \$4.8m. To be spend on other things suggested further in this submission.

Item	Savings (\$000)	Comment
Elma Turner Library extension and relocation	725	Surely \$613k has not already been spent on this - Assume 500k unspent from last year. Spending unnecessary as we have got used to reading things online during the lockdown, Existing library OK.
Book buying for library	200	Saving from halving for above reasons
Millers Acre Toilet upgrade	717	for more tourists? - there won't be more tourists for years if at all
Lions Toilet	875	As above
Stoke Hall remediation -	200	does this really need to be done when there is the newly completed Stoke Community centre just up the road?
Maitai MTB Hub	500	A nice to have (and I'm a keen mountainbiker)
Modellers Pond	90	Infill with flax rather than concreting
Wakapuaka Sandflats Esplanade	270	Will be inundated with sea level rise
Tahuna Beach to Great Taste Walkway	239	Will be inundated with sea level rise
Seafeld Terrace Reinstatement	1,000	\$1.2m budgeted for this road that is climate vulnerable, suggest do minimum gravel road
Total Savings	\$4,816	