



Notice of the Ordinary meeting of

Nelson City Council

Te Kaunihera o Whakatū

Date:	Thursday 25 May 2023
Time:	9.00a.m.
Location:	Council Chamber Floor 2A, Civic House 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson

Agenda

Rārangi take

Chairperson

Deputy Mayor

Members

His Worship the Mayor Nick Smith

Councillor Rohan O'Neill-Stevens

Cr Matty Anderson

Cr Matthew Benge

Cr Trudie Brand

Cr Mel Courtney

Cr James Hodgson

Cr Kahu Paki Paki

Cr Pete Rainey

Cr Campbell Rollo

Cr Rachel Sanson

Cr Tim Skinner

Cr Aaron Stallard

Quorum 7

**Nigel Philpott
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. For enquiries call (03) 5460436.

Karakia and Mihi Timatanga

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

There is no Public Forum

5. Confirmation of Minutes - 11 May 2023

5 - 21

Document number R27713

Recommendation

That the Council

- 1. Confirms the minutes of the meeting of the Council, held on 11 May 2023, as a true and correct record.***

6. Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

22 - 64

Document number R27506

Recommendation

That the Council

- 1. Receives the report Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions (R27506) and its attachments (839498445-14453 and 332184083-4780); and***

2. **Notes that additional savings of \$247,000 have been identified by Council officers in the period since the Consultation Document was released, enabling funding of the recommended decisions 3, 4 and 7 below; and**
3. **Approves amending the proposed Annual Plan 2023/24 in response to submissions, to provide a 7.2% inflation adjustment to the Community Investment Fund and organisations identified as supporting Nelson's communities of greatest need, at an approximate cost of \$44,000; and**
4. **Approves amending the proposed Annual Plan 2023/24 in response to submissions, to provide a 3.5% inflation adjustment to grants to other community organisations, facilities and Council Controlled Organisations and Council Organisations, at an approximate cost of \$183,000; and**
5. **Requests Council officers, in consultation with the Chief Executive and the Board of the Nelson Regional Development Agency, to prepare a report taking account of the financial challenges facing that agency due to the government COVID-19 support ending in June 2023 and a disparity of funding between Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council and considering how the agency can be refocussed and financed into the future; and**
6. **Delegates to the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Courtney and Councillor Brand with the support of Group Manager Community Services, and in consultation with the Nelson Festivals Trust, the investigation of the degree to which the Trust met its contractual obligations during the difficulties of COVID-19, the circumstances that led to the growth in its reserves, and the appropriateness or otherwise of the Trust using those cash reserves to help partially fund the 2023 Arts Festival given the acute budgetary pressures on Council and ratepayers, with the findings of this work to be reported back to Council; and**
7. **Approves amending the proposed Annual Plan 2023/24 in response to submissions, to provide an increase of funding in 2023/24 to Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance from \$20,000 to \$40,000, conditional on Tasman and Marlborough District Councils resolving likewise;**
8. **Approves the approach to Annual Plan 2023/24 submission responses included in the spreadsheet in Attachment 1 (839498445-14453); and**

9. ***Approves the changes to the proposed Annual 2023/24 resulting from Council decisions, corrections and timing changes as outlined at sections 5.43 to 5.46 of this report R27506; and***
10. ***Approves the budget carry forwards as set out in Attachment 2 (332184083-4780); and***
11. ***Confirms its intent to have an overall average rates increase of 7.2% in 2023/24.***

7. Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

65 - 91

Document number R27671

Recommendation

That the Council

1. ***Receives the report Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24 (R27671) and its attachments (1598046314-107); and***
2. ***Approves increasing the Annual Pile Mooring fee by 7.2% for 2023/24; and***
3. ***Confirms the approach to adopting the changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24, as contained in Attachment 1 (1598046314-107).***

Karakia Whakamutanga

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Minutes of a meeting of the

Nelson City Council

Te Kaunihera o Whakatū

Held in the Council Chamber, Floor 2A, Civic House, 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson on Thursday 11 May 2023, commencing at 9.02a.m.

Present: His Worship the Mayor N Smith (Chairperson), Councillors M Anderson, M Benge, T Brand, M Courtney, J Hodgson, R O'Neill-Stevens (Deputy Mayor), P Rainey, C Rollo, R Sanson, T Skinner and A Stallard

In Attendance: Group Manager Infrastructure (A Louverdis), Group Manager Community Services (A White), Group Manager Corporate Services (N Harrison), Group Manager Strategy and Communications (N McDonald) Team Leader Governance (R Byrne), Senior Governance Adviser (H Wagener) and Governance Adviser (K Libeau)

Apologies : Councillor K Paki Paki

Karakia and Mihi Timatanga

1. Apologies

Apologies

Resolved CL/2023/075

That the Council

- 1. Receives and accepts the apologies from Councillor K Paki Paki.**

Courtney/His Worship the Mayor

Carried

2. Confirmation of Order of Business

There were no changes to the order of business.

3. Interests

There were no updates to the Interests Register.

M20135

1

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Councillor Stallard noted for the record that prior to his appointment as a Nelson City Councillor he was part of a group opposing re-zoning in the Maitai.

Councillor Rollo noted for the record that a topic in the annual plan was infrastructure development on Bridge Street, his family owned property and he was employed on Bridge Street.

Councillor Sanson noted that her partner would be speaking to a submission.

4. Public Forum

There was no public forum.

5. Hearing of submissions on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document and the proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges

Document number R27635, agenda pages 4 - 155 refer.

Late submissions were received from:

- Peter Taylor - 361
- Deborah Holloway - 362
- Clare Williams - 363
- Debs Martin - Kotahitanga mo te Taiao Alliance – 364
- Duncan Henderson - Total Decorating - 366
- Madison Cumming-Power - 367
- Ru Collin - Brook Waimarama Sanctuary - 368
- Ellie Moyer - 369

5.1 Dan McGuire - 43

Dan McGuire spoke to the submission. He emphasised points in regard to a decline in people attending events within Nelson, businesses bypassing Nelson and establishing in Richmond, the hardships faced by people on low incomes and his belief that Council should not continue to fund the Nelson Regional Development Agency. He answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Brand joined the meeting at 9.08a.m.

5.2 Elizabeth Dooley – 42

The submitter did not attend.

5.3 Elizabeth Parkes – 46

Elizabeth Parkes spoke to the submission regarding an incident where her son was swimming at Tāhunanui Beach and got caught in a fishing line. She asked that Council consider this situation, given the importance

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

of public safety. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.4 Tilman Walk – 208

Tilman Walk spoke to the submission. He emphasised points on spreading out the flood damage cost over future years and the impact this would have on future ratepayers, the concept of a special levy for property owners of empty sections, the proposed allocation of \$606,000 towards the Maitahi Bayview Development, the fluoridation of Nelson's drinking water and the prospect of dedicated cycleways on Nelson's main roads to avoid accidents. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.5 Sean Walker – 54

Sean Walker spoke to the submission. He spoke about the impact lighting has on carbon emissions, wellbeing and climate change, wasteful lighting within the Nelson region and how this could be addressed, the absence of a lighting strategy in Nelson City Council's Annual Plan and retaining the ability to see the Matariki constellation. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.6 Bevan Woodward - Bicycle Nelson Bays – 64

The submitter did not attend.

5.7 Richard Sullivan – 184

Richard Sullivan spoke to the submission. He emphasised points in relation to Council concentrating more on making Nelson a better place to live including focusing on rates, spending and investment. He spoke to reducing rates to below the cost of living increase given the cumulative total of rates rises, Council working harder to cut back on inefficient spending, cutting any funding to tourism promotion. He also expressed his support for any increases in investment for inner-city living, encouraging more people and high productivity businesses in the central business district. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.8 Lindsay Wood – Resilienz – 112

Lindsay Wood tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5986) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised points in relation to climate change, the structure of the Annual Plan document, decarbonisation, the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, appropriately allocating resources and the Council's role in educating the public on climate change. He answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner left the meeting at 10:00a.m.

The meeting adjourned from 10.07a.m. until 10.16a.m.

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

5.9 R.T. Morris – 115

R.T. Morris spoke to the submission. He emphasised points on Nelson previously losing its status as a port of preference for a period of time and the loss of income this led to. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.10 Robert Stevenson – 212

This submitter did not attend.

5.11 Jenny Easton and Barb Robson - Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman – 120

Jenny Easton and Barb Robson tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5976), provided a presentation (1876279902-65), and spoke to the submission. They emphasised points on climate change, combining strategies on mitigation and adaptation, campaigns for promoting climate-friendly transport, the concept of a quarter-hour paradise, the use of electric vehicles alongside car-sharing and carpooling and fewer carparks in the city centre. They answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner returned at 10:43a.m.

5.12 Peter Kemp – 290

Peter Kemp tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5980) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised points relating to boating within the Nelson community and the increase of pile mooring fees at the marina. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.13 Noah Hosie – Nelson Surf Life Saving Club – 283 and 285

Noah Hosie of the Nelson Surf Life Saving Club presented in a personal capacity and as a representative of Nelson Surf Life Saving Club. He tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5983) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised points regarding the current issues faced by the Nelson Surf Life Saving Club working out of multiple storage locations, the desire for the Club to have better facilities and grow its membership and the statistics relating to the activities performed by the club. He answered questions from members on the submissions.

5.14 Tony Haddon – 320

Mr Haddon tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5987) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised points on the proposed \$606,000 budget for pre-planning work for the Maitahi Bayview development, funding for the proposed Kaka Valley subdivision, the river flooding scenarios. He answered questions from members on the submission.

The meeting adjourned from 11.09a.m. to 11.23a.m.

5.15 Faye Wulff – Community Arts Trust - 196

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Ms Wulff tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5982) and spoke to the submission. She thanked Nelson City Council for its continuing support over the past 25 years and emphasised points regarding the uncertainty of the Community Arts Trust's lease, the desire for a permanent location, the work they do with both young people and vulnerable people in the community and the Trust's goal of trying to turn lives around using art. She extended an invitation to the Mayor and Councillors to visit the Community Arts Trust premises and answered questions from members on the submission.

5.16 Gretchen Holland - 355

Gretchen Holland tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5981) and spoke to the submission. She emphasised points on allocating \$606,000 to undertake pre-planning work for the Maitahi subdivision, the allocation of costs between Council and the developer, the issues countrywide of building on floodplains, the impacts of flood damage and the current state of the Maitai river. She answered questions from members on her submission.

5.17 Giles Burton - 237

Giles Burton from Nelson Buskers Festival tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5984) and spoke to his submission. He thanked Council for previously funding the Nelson Buskers Festival and emphasised points on the change to the criteria for funding under the Summer Events programme, the positive feedback received from the public on the buskers' festival run in previous years and the inability to continue to run the event without Nelson City Council continuing its support of the festival. He answered questions from members on the submission.

Documents tabled by previous speakers at close of the morning session.

Attachments

- 1 1982984479-5986 Lindsay Wood - Resilienz - 112 - speaking notes
- 2 1982984479-5976 Jenny Easton and Barb Robson - Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman - 120 - speaking notes
- 3 1876279902-65 Jenny Easton and Barb Robson - Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman - 120 - presentation
- 4 1982984479-5980 Peter Kemp - 290 - speaking notes
- 5 1982984479-5983 Noah Hosie - Nelson Life Saving Club - 283 and 285 - speaking notes
- 6 1982984479-5987 Tony Haddon - 320 - speaking notes
- 7 1982984479-5982 Faye Wulff - 196 - speaking notes
- 8 1982984479-5981 Gretchen Holland - 355 - speaking notes
- 9 1982984479-5984 Giles Burton - 237 - speaking notes

The meeting adjourned from 12.00p.m. until 1.04p.m. at which time Councillors Rainey and Skinner were not in attendance.

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

5.18 Neil Deans – 235

Neil Deans spoke to the submission. He stated that he is the owner of a heritage property in the heritage precinct of The Wood that is at risk of flooding. He requested funding of a stormwater pumping system to reduce the flooding risk for Elliot Street and nearby streets at high tide during adverse weather events. He answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner joined the meeting at 1.06p.m.

5.19 Elizabeth Perrone – CCS Disability Action- 45

As Chair of the Nelson/Marlborough CCS Disability Action and in her personal capacity, Elizabeth Perone, tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5996 and 1982984479-5998) and spoke to the two submissions. As Chair of the Nelson/Marlborough CCS Disability Action, she emphasised points regarding Nelson/Tasman region's aging population that required a different focus from previous generations and proposed that an audit for the disabled community be done to identify barriers and priorities. In her personal capacity, she spoke about the need for yellow lines to be placed as a safety measure on the access way to Stoke Village. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.20 Stephanie Phillips – 293

Stephanie Phillips spoke to the submission. She emphasised the importance of the library project as a home for all residents and guests. She believed that the proposed budget was sufficient for scoping of suitable sites for the library and for high quality innovative public engagement for a truly transformative community library hub. She answered questions from members on the submission.

5.21 Peter Olorenshaw - Nelson Transport Strategy Group, (NELSUST) Inc – 326

Nelson Transport Strategy Group Spokesperson, Peter Olorenshaw tabled speaking notes (1982984479-6009) and spoke to the submission. He stated that the Council's Annual Plan proposal did not contain carbon accounting alongside the dollar cost accounting; every dollar spent should have a carbon cost associated with it. To counter the high rate of CO₂ emissions as a result of car-dependant transport choices and associated safety concerns, he proposed a series of measures to reduce dependency on cars, specifically the introduction of 30km/h zones that would create a cycle network. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.22 Glenys MacLellan – 234

Glenys MacLellan spoke to the submission. She emphasised her support for the proposed rates increase to avoid larger future increases. She commented on funding mechanisms available to the Council to deal with

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

the effects of climate change, drew attention to bracket creep relating to building permit thresholds and spoke about measures to encourage active modes of transport. She questioned the applicability of the use of depreciation as a suitable tool in the management of Council assets and proposed using funding contingencies based on a realistic assessment of the state of public assets and the cost of maintaining them. She answered questions from members on the submission.

5.23 John Fitchett - J&K Issue Family Trust – 232

John Fitchett - J&K Issue Family Trust tabled speaking notes (1982984479-6000) and spoke to the submission. He said he felt there was inequity in the proposed changes to the differential in the rates payable by the owners of commercial and residential properties with the same land value in the inner city. He requested that the current differential and Uniform Annual General Charges be retained. He answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Rainey joined the meeting at 2.04p.m.

The meeting was adjourned from 2.07p.m. until 2.13p.m.

5.24 Sarah-Jane Weir and Fiona Wilson - Nelson Regional Development Agency – 233

Nelson Regional Development Agency Chair, Sarah-Jane Weir and Chief Executive Fiona Wilson provided a presentation (1876279902-120) and spoke to the submission. They drew attention to the practical challenges Nelson Regional Development Agency faced due to the uncertainty of future funding, low investment in local economic development, changing expectations and an imbalance of funding across the region. They requested greater investment in local economic development and consideration of improvement of the Nelson Regional Development Agency funding model and they requested reconsideration of the proposed nil inflation increase. They answered questions from members on the submission.

5.25 Peter Taylor- 361

Peter Taylor tabled speaking notes (1982984479-5999) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised that the development of the Maitahi/Bayview subdivision would increase flood risk of Maitai River and felt that an integrated, efficient and less ad-hoc approach should be taken. He proposed that the funding currently proposed for the development be used for a catchment-wide flood risk study and that the Council ensure the provision of a comprehensive earthworks plan, an independent acoustic assessment and air pollution study and an integrated traffic management plan before proceeding with the development. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.26 Richard Brudvik – Whakatū Intellectual Capital Kohanga - 209

M20135

7

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Whakatū Intellectual Capital Kohanga Convenor, Richard Brudvik tabled speaking notes (1982984479-6001) and spoke to the submission. He highlighted the importance a well-planned library/ community hub as a transition to a knowledge economy. He proposed that an increase in funding beyond what was currently proposed be provided to enable engagement, property investigation, funding strategy development and a business case review. He answered questions from members on the submission.

The meeting was adjourned from 3.40p.m. until 3.45p.m.

5.27 Katharine Malcolm – 236

Katharine Malcolm spoke to the submission. She emphasised the importance on community libraries in addition to a central library. Regardless of their appearance, community libraries, mainly staffed by volunteers, are community hubs that contribute to mental health and reduce carbon emissions. They are best placed locally, within walking distance for people, specifically teenagers, young mothers, and the elderly. She answered questions from members on the submission.

Extension of Meeting Time

Resolved CL/2023/076

That the Council

- 1. Extends the meeting time beyond six hours, pursuant to Standing Order 4.2.***

Courtney/Brand

Carried

5.28 Ren Kempthorne – 279

Ren Kempthorne spoke to the submission. He emphasised the importance of retaining a green belt around the city that attracted insects and birds and gave city dwellers contact with nature. He opposed the Maitahi Bayview Development within the green belt and did not agree with the allocation of budget to this development. He answered questions from members on the submission.

The meeting was adjourned from 3.40p.m. until 3.45p.m.

5.29 Brendan Hickman, Drew Hayes and Leah Foster - Natureland Wildlife Trust – 219

Natureland Wildlife Trust Managing Director, Brendan Hickman, Trust Board Member, Drew Hayes and Manager, Leah Foster tabled additional information (1982984479-5995) and spoke to their submission. They explained the changing role of Natureland to showcase native taonga, provide population protection of endangered species, breed threatened native wildlife for release programmes and act as kaitiaki for animals on

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

behalf of local iwi. They emphasised the need for sustained funding and set out what could be achieved should the funding contribution by the Council be increased. They answered questions from members on the submission.

5.30 Gaire Thompson – 309

Gaire Thompson spoke to the submission. He opposed the allocation of funds to the library or the arts centre as there would be other Council facilities serving as places for the community to gather. He opposed the development of infrastructure to enable central city living due to the potential for social housing and the impact of that on commercial rates, parking availability and the blockage of drains by an increase in tree cover. He opposed the spending of funds on the use of te reo Māori and proposed that Our Nelson scrapped. He opposed the spending of funds on the purchase of the bus depot and any construction in Bridge Street. He believes the cost of strengthening the Stoke Memorial Hall was excessive. He considered that the spending and staffing at Council was a blowout and that spending at the airport was wasteful. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.31 Cleve Cameron - Big Street Bikers – 303

Big Street Bikers Managing Director, Cleve Cameron provided a presentation (1876279902-133) and spoke to the submission. He advised that Big Street Bikers install Locky Docks that provide secure lockup and charging facilities for ebikes. They propose the expansion of their Locky Docks system, presently located at supermarkets throughout the city, at no additional cost to the ratepayers. He explained that Big Street Bikers covers the costs through digital advertisements and sponsorship on the Locky Docks. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.32 Debs Martin - Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance - 364

Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance Programme Manager, Debs Martin tabled additional information (1982984479-5993) spoke to the submission. She highlighted the purpose of the strategy of the alliance, of which Nelson City Council was a member, to achieve outcomes through collective action while attracting and securing investment and enabling behaviour change. She set out recent achievements based on the leveraging of current funding contribution and explained future opportunities. She requested an increase to the proposed, ongoing funding. He answered questions from members on the submission.

Resolved CL/2023/077

That the Council

- 1. Receives the report Hearing of submissions on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document and the***

M20135

9

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges (R27635) and its attachments (839498445-14391-1, 839498445-14391-2 and 839498445-14406); and

- 2. Accepts the late submissions (1876279902-122) on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document and the proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24.**

Courtney/Sanson

Carried

Attachments

- 1 1876279902-122 Annual Plan 2023-2024 - Total Late Submissions**

Documents tabled by previous speakers at close of the afternoon session.

Attachments

- 1 1982984479-5996 Elizabeth Perrone - CCS Disability Action - 45 - speaking notes
- 2 1982984479-5998 Elizabeth Perrone - 45 - speaking notes
- 3 1982984479-6009 Peter Olorenshaw - Nelson Transport Strategy Group, (NELSUST) Inc - 326 - speaking notes
- 4 1982984479-6000 John Fitchett - J&K Issue Family Trust - 232 - speaking notes
- 5 1876279902-120 Fiona Wilson - NRDA - Submission 233 - presentation
- 6 1982984479-5999 Peter Taylor - 361 - speaking notes
- 7 1982984479-6001 Richard Brudvik - Whakatū Intellectual Capital Kohanga - 209 - speaking notes
- 8 1982984479-5995 Brendan Hickman - Natureland Wildlife Trust - 219 - tabled document
- 9 1876279902-133 Cleve Cameron - Big Street Bikers - 303 - Presentation
- 10 1982984479-5993 Debs Martin - Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance - 364 - tabled document

The meeting adjourned at 4.33p.m. and reconvened on Friday 12 May 2023 at 9.01a.m.

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Minutes of a meeting of the

Nelson City Council

Te Kaunihera o Whakatū

Reconvened in the Council Chamber, Floor 2A, Civic House, 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson on Friday 12 May 2023, commencing at 9.01a.m.

- Present: His Worship the Mayor N Smith (Chairperson), Councillors M Anderson, T Brand, M Courtney, J Hodgson, R O'Neill-Stevens (Deputy Mayor), K Paki Paki, P Rainey, C Rollo, R Sanson, T Skinner and A Stallard
- In Attendance: Group Manager Infrastructure (A Louverdis), Group Manager Community Services (A White), Group Manager Corporate Services (N Harrison), Group Manager Strategy and Communications (N McDonald) Senior Governance Adviser (H Wagener), Governance Adviser (K Libeau), Assistant Governance Adviser (A Bryce-Neumann)
- Apologies : Councillor M Benge

Karakia and Mihi Timatanga

Apologies

Resolved CL/2023/075

That the Council

- 1. Receives and accepts the apologies from Councillor Benge for attendance and Councillor O'Neill Stevens for lateness.***

His Worship the Mayor/Rainey

Carried

- 5.33 Andrew Spittal and Hemi Toia - CCKV Maitai Dev Co LP – 224

Andrew Spittal and Hemi Toia tabled speaking notes (1982984479-6003) and spoke to the submission. Mr. Toia explained that CCKV Maitai Dev Co LP were the entity that was driving development of the Maitai Valley. He emphasised points regarding Ngāti Koata's commitment to housing and developing housing to meet the needs of both Ngāti Koata whanau and the wider community. Mr. Spittal emphasised points regarding the \$606,000 earmarked for infrastructure spend and the financial

M20135

11

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

contributions from CCKV Maitai Dev Co LP towards the proposed development. They answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner joined the meeting at 9:18a.m.

5.34 Scott Gibbons - Gibbons Holdings Ltd – 225

The submitter did not attend.

Attendance: Deputy Mayor O'Neill-Stevens joined the meeting at 9:23a.m.

5.35 Ari Fon and Tibius Smit - Search and Rescue Nelson Inc – 246

Secretary of Search and Rescue Nelson, Ari Fon spoke to the submission. Mr. Fon emphasised points regarding the work Search and Rescue Nelson Inc. do in the community, including the recent increase in urban searches. He also emphasised the need for a fit for purpose location, potentially alongside the Nelson Surf Life Saving Club given the synergies between the two organisations and the current proposal to allocate expenditure for investigating new premises at Tāhunanui Beach. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.36 Steve Thomas on behalf of Graham Hill - Nelson Marina Berth Holders Association – 321

Steve Thomas tabled speaking notes (1982984479-6002) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised points regarding the proposed increases to the marina fees, support for the building of a sea sports facility at 305 Akersten St, and the proposal for a CCTV system but asked Council to consider installing gates on the docks as a security measure, ahead of the CCTV installation. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.37 Alastair Cotterill – 203

Alastair Cotterill spoke to the submission. He emphasised points regarding the Council keeping business owners informed of any changes in the city, his support of the 150-year anniversary book, his support of the proposed Maitahi development, his desire to see funding allocated towards a community board in the Tāhunanui-Stoke Ward and his volunteer work within the community. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.38 Ed Shuttleworth - Tasman Regional Sports Trust – 189

Tasman Regional Sports Trust Chief Executive officer, Ed Shuttleworth spoke to the submission. He emphasised points on how physical activity is essential to well-being, the programmes Tasman Regional Sports Trust currently run in primary schools and the inequity in sport participation, particularly amongst Māori, Pasifika, rural and children of

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

refugees/migrants. He answered questions from members on the submission.

The meeting adjourned from 10:04a.m. until 10:12a.m at which time Councillor Hodgson was not in attendance.

5.39 Stephen Todd and Emily McDonald - Federated Farmers of New Zealand – 218

Federated Farmers Nelson President, Stephen Todd and Federated Farmers Regional Policy Adviser, Emily McDonald spoke to the submission. They emphasised points regarding the proposed 7.2 per cent rates increase, the Uniform Annual General Charge and the equitableness of rates charges, the need for transparency over how rates were calculated, the gravel build-up within the region's rivers and the need for gravel extraction to reduce flood risk. They also emphasised wanting Council to ensure that contractual obligations were being met, particularly around roading which directly impacted on farmers and their vehicle maintenance costs. They answered questions from members on the submission.

5.40 Julie Catchpole - The Suter Art Gallery Te Aratoi o Whakatu – 197

The Suter Art Gallery Te Aratoi o Whakatu spokesperson, Julie Catchpole provided a presentation (1876279902-127) and spoke to the submission. She emphasised points relating to the issues and challenges faced by the Suter Art Gallery, requested that Council re-instate an inflation increase to their annual grant as was the case historically, the impacts of not obtaining an increase to the annual grant would have on the Suter Art Gallery and their desire to continue to deliver community outcomes. She answered questions from members on the submission.

5.41 Lucinda Blackley-Jimson and Belinda Wheatley - Tasman Bays Heritage Trust – 242

Tasman Bays Heritage Trust spokespersons, Lucinda Blackley-Jimson and Belinda Wheatley provided a presentation (1876279902-124) and spoke to the submission. They emphasised points regarding their role in the community with their outreach programmes, cost increases faced by the organisation, in particular the increase in the cost of exhibitions with the increase in the cost of freight, the current financial position of the organisation and the comparison between funding received from Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council with a 3.2 per cent increase in proposed funding from TDC compared to a zero per cent increase from Nelson City Council. They answered questions from members on the submission.

The meeting adjourned from 10:58a.m. until 11:12a.m.

5.42 Mary O'Brien - CCS Disability Action – 287

CCS Disability Action Access Co-ordinator for the Southern Region, Mary O'Brien spoke to the submission. She emphasised points regarding how

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Council can create an inclusive community, identifying and managing accessibility issues, allocating budget for an audit of accessibility- in particular, an audit of the Bridge St active transport corridor, opportunities within the proposed housing programme to house disabled people and the suggestion that Council look at the Lifemark system in proposed housing developments. She answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner left the meeting at 11:44a.m.

5.43 Scott Burnett - Forest and Bird – 199

Regional Conservation Manager of Forest and Bird, Scott Burnett tabled his speaking notes (1982984479-6004) and spoke to the submission. He emphasised points regarding the impact the rates rise will have on Nelson residents, future development zoning provisions, a caution of a reliance on engineering solutions for flood mitigation as opposed to natural solutions, encouraging continued and increased funding of both the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum and the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary, the desire to see a provision in Nelson City Council funding for a cat bylaw, support of the establishment of the Right Tree Right Place taskforce and the organisation looking to Nelson City Council to take a leadership position on forestry. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.44 Anne Rush - Make/Shift Spaces Inc – 351

Make/Shift Spaces Inc spokesperson, Anne Rush spoke to the submission. She emphasised points regarding a disappointment over the new library/community hub not progressing, the desire for any future site of the library to still incorporate a community hub, the need for the proposed central-city playground to be a destination in order to draw people into the city centre, the importance of the Nelson City Council arts and creativity strategy, the availability and affordability of arts venues within Nelson City and the importance of considering design when planning new buildings. She answered questions from members on the submission.

5.45 Chris Whitaker – 77

The submitter did not attend.

Attendance: Councillor Skinner returned to the meeting at 11:54a.m.

Documents tabled by previous speakers at close of the morning session.

Attachments

- 1 1982984479-6003 Andrew Spittal and Hemi Toia - 224 - speaker notes
- 2 1982984479-6002 Steve Thomas on behalf of Graham Hill - Nelson Marina Berth Holders Association – 321 - speaking notes

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

- 3 1876279902-127 Julie Catchpole - The Suter Art Gallery Te Aratoi o Whakatu – 197 - presentation
- 4 1876279902-124 Lucinda Blackley-Jimson and Belinda Wheatley - Tasman Bays Heritage Trust – 242 - presentation
- 5 1982984479-6004 Scott Burnett - Forest and Bird – 199 - speaking notes

The meeting adjourned at 11.55a.m. and reconvened at 1.03p.m.

- 5.46 Tony Stallard – 94

The submitter did not attend.

- 5.47 Lucy Charlesworth – 156

The submitter did not attend but provided speaking notes (1982984479-6006) that were distributed, that emphasised her opposition to any ratepayer funding being spent on anything that facilitates the rezoning and development of Kaka Valley.

- 5.48 Anna Fyfe - Multicultural Nelson Tasman Inc – 183

Multicultural Nelson Tasman Inc spokespersons, Marie Lindaya and Marie Bronsteter spoke to the submission. They emphasised the importance of ethnic communities having an inclusive and accessible multi-purpose community hub (which included a library). This should serve as a community hub/heart of the community that welcomed ethnic communities, particularly newcomers, and had the capacity for venue/room hire, a commercial kitchen, multi-purpose and adaptable spaces that could be used for dance classes/rehearsals, playgroups, community workshops and meetings and more. They also opposed the proposal not to increase funding for community groups and facilities to meet inflation. They answered questions from members on the submission.

- 5.49 Johny O'Donnell – 280

Johny O'Donnell tabled speaking notes (1982984479-6005) and spoke to the submission. He proposed to increase the rates beyond the current proposal and encouraged the Council to increase borrowing if it was necessary to achieve this. He summarised the challenges faced by Nelson and opposed all the proposed reductions in the budget, stating that such reductions and cuts moved the city backwards. Using the example of the Marlborough District Council through investment securing central government investment funding to complete the Blenheim library project, he proposed that the Council be more ambitious by increasing funding to civic infrastructure, community organisations and events to address the city's legacy of underinvestment. He answered questions from members on the submission.

- 5.50 Ru Collin – Brook Waimarama Sanctuary - 368

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Brook Waimarama Sanctuary spokesperson, Ru Collin provided a presentation (1876279902-129) and spoke to the submission. He highlighted the steady growth in the sanctuary's supporter base, the increase in visitor numbers and the associated improvement in visitor centre income. He provided an update on the progress and challenges regarding the completion of the visitor centre, the walking track network and the pest-proof fence and associated cost pressure relating to increased insurance premiums. He requested that the Council consider contributing financially to the promotion of the sanctuary as a key regional visitor destination, contributing to the annual fence track maintenance programme, contributing to the sanctuary's traffic management, and offsetting the loss to revenue due to inflation. He answered questions from members on the submission.

5.51 Jacquetta Bell and Tom Kennedy - Friends of the Maitai – 109

Friends of the Maitai spokespersons, Jacquetta Bell and Tom Kennedy spoke to the submission. They believed there is a lack of adequate and timely information provided to them and to the public regarding the August 2022 flood recovery work. They were not opposed to the Maitahi Bayview subdivision on condition that their concerns about sediment and stormwater should be addressed and the ecology of the river be improved. They answered questions from members on the submission.

Attendance: Councillor O'Neill-Stevens left the meeting from 2.26p.m. until 2.28p.m.

5.52 Ali Boswijk - Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce – 332

Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce Chief Executive Officer, Ali Boswijk spoke to the submission. Although the Chamber acknowledged the current financial pressures faced by the Council and the need for prudent management, it supported ongoing funding for a stand-alone conference and performing arts centre. It further supported ongoing investment in and encouragement of growth of the city centre. This would encourage visitors to the city and support retail and hospitality business, that would also assist other businesses and attract and retain staff. She answered questions from members on the submission.

5.53 Ali Boswijk, Johny O'Donnell, Lydia Zanetti and Sarah Yarrow - Nelson Festivals Trust – 350

Nelson Festivals Trust Chief Executive Officer, Ali Boswijk and representatives, Johny O'Donnell, Lydia Zanetti and Sarah Yarrow spoke to the submission. They expressed concern that, in addition to not receiving any adjustment to the funding allocated to the Nelson Festivals Trust to compensate for inflation, there was a proposed reduction in the funding to the trust through the requirement to take funding from reserves. They believed this was based on a mistaken perception that the trust had built up reserves by not delivering Mask Carnivale in 2020. They explained that the Nelson Festivals Trust had used all Council funding provided every year to deliver the Nelson Arts Festivals.

Nelson City Council Minutes - 11 May 2023

Attendance: Councillor Stallard left the meeting at 2.45p.m.

They emphasised that a reduction in funding would impact the 2023 and 2024 Festivals by cuts to free community events, specifically the Mask Parade and Carnivale, prevented the delivery of the Pay What You Can ticketing option, delay recruitment of a Kaitiaki Māori role and jeopardise alternative streams of funding. They answered questions from members on the submission.

Documents tabled by previous speakers at close of the afternoon session.

Attachments

- 1 1982984479-6006 Lucy Charlesworth – 156 - speaking notes
- 2 1982984479-6005 - Johny O'Donnell - 280 - Speaker Notes
- 3 1876279902-129 Ru Collin - Brook Waimarama Sanctuary – 368 - presentation

Karakia Whakamutanga

There being no further business the meeting ended at 3.12p.m.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings by resolution on (date)

Resolved

REPORT R27506

Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To deliberate on the submissions received on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document.

2. Summary

- 2.1 Council consulted on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document, alongside consultation on the proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24, from 29 March to 30 April 2023. 45 submitters spoke at the hearings on 11 and 12 May 2023.
- 2.2 Council, having heard submissions must now consider the matters raised by the community and any new issues which have arisen that may impact on the Annual Plan.

3. Recommendation

That the Council

- 1. Receives the report **Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions (R27506)** and its attachments (839498445-14453 and 332184083-4780); and***
- 2. Notes that additional savings of \$247,000 have been identified by Council officers in the period since the Consultation Document was released, enabling funding of the recommended decisions 3, 4 and 7 below; and***
- 3. Approves amending the proposed Annual Plan 2023/24 in response to submissions, to provide a 7.2% inflation adjustment to the Community Investment Fund and organisations identified as supporting Nelson's communities of greatest need, at an approximate cost of \$44,000; and***

4. **Approves amending the proposed Annual Plan 2023/24 in response to submissions, to provide a 3.5% inflation adjustment to grants to other community organisations, facilities and Council Controlled Organisations and Council Organisations, at an approximate cost of \$183,000; and**
5. **Requests Council officers, in consultation with the Chief Executive and the Board of the Nelson Regional Development Agency, to prepare a report taking account of the financial challenges facing that agency due to the government COVID-19 support ending in June 2023 and a disparity of funding between Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council and considering how the agency can be refocussed and financed into the future; and**
6. **Delegates to the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Courtney and Councillor Brand with the support of Group Manager Community Services, and in consultation with the Nelson Festivals Trust, the investigation of the degree to which the Trust met its contractual obligations during the difficulties of COVID-19, the circumstances that led to the growth in its reserves, and the appropriateness or otherwise of the Trust using those cash reserves to help partially fund the 2023 Arts Festival given the acute budgetary pressures on Council and ratepayers, with the findings of this work to be reported back to Council; and**
7. **Approves amending the proposed Annual Plan 2023/24 in response to submissions, to provide an increase of funding in 2023/24 to Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance from \$20,000 to \$40,000, conditional on Tasman and Marlborough District Councils resolving likewise;**
8. **Approves the approach to Annual Plan 2023/24 submission responses included in the spreadsheet in Attachment 1 (839498445-14453); and**
9. **Approves the changes to the proposed Annual 2023/24 resulting from Council decisions, corrections and timing changes as outlined at sections 5.43 to 5.46 of this report R27506; and**
10. **Approves the budget carry forwards as set out in Attachment 2 (332184083-4780); and**
11. **Confirms its intent to have an overall average rates increase of 7.2% in 2023/24.**

4. Background

- 4.1 On 23 March 2023 Council adopted the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document, having decided to consult due to the significant variations proposed to the 2023/24 work programme as set out in the Long Term Plan 2021-31.
- 4.2 The consultation for the Annual Plan Consultation Document 2023/24 and proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24 were run alongside each other for one month, between 29 March and 30 April 2023. 361 submissions were received on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document. 45 people spoke to their submissions at hearings on 11 and 12 May 2023. Submission counts and comments in this report refer to submissions received and the late submissions which were accepted.
- 4.3 284 submissions were made by residents of Nelson, 68 from residents of Tasman and 9 were from people residing outside the Nelson/Tasman region. 81% of submissions were made online. A selection of proforma submissions were received, mostly relating to the Maitahi Bayview Development subdivision (Maitai Valley) and Infrastructure Acceleration Fund projects.

5. Discussion

- 5.1 Key topics raised in submissions and the recommended responses for Council's consideration are outlined below. Recommended responses to a range of matters raised by a smaller number of submitters are contained in the attached spreadsheet (Attachment 1).

Recovery from the August 2022 severe weather event

- 5.2 99 submitters supported funding the net cost of the recovery work over ten years. Reasons given for support included: spreading the cost to existing ratepayers; ensuring there is funding for Council core functions to continue; balancing the approach to make sure it is affordable to residents while responding to climate change. Many submissions also included support for completing recovery works in ways that increase resilience to future events.
- 5.3 13 submitters opposed this timeframe for the recovery work, with some feedback suggesting paying it off over a longer period. However, most of those who opposed the timeframe suggested paying it off over a shorter period to save on borrowing costs or to mitigate risks of another severe event/s occurring before it is paid off, particularly since due to climate change increased frequency of events is likely.
- 5.4 27 submissions gave a mixed response. Many submissions in response to this proposal covered a range of broader matters. Feedback included comments on:
 - 5.4.1 the importance of the recovery including strategic planning to consider climate adaptation, Regional Climate Change Risk Assessment (once complete), managed retreat, impacts of future

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

events, prohibiting future development in high-risk areas, and the effect of an Alpine Fault rupture

- 5.4.2 concern with replacing infrastructure in areas that will be vulnerable to future severe weather events or the impacts of climate change
- 5.4.3 concern about using hard engineering solutions for rivers as part of recovery works
- 5.4.4 the importance of protecting macroinvertebrate and fish habitat in the Maitai river when undertaking recovery works
- 5.4.5 a view that central government or insurance companies should fund a greater share of the overall cost.

Staff comment

- 5.5 Following a review of the submissions, staff consider that the ten-year repayment period remains the most appropriate timeframe. Paying off the cost over ten years strikes the right balance between not imposing immediate excessive costs and not deferring the costs for so long that there is a high risk of not paying this event off before the next major event occurs. For instance, paying off the estimated cost evenly over five years would require a \$6.8 million repayment in 2023/24, which would require an approximate further 5.9% rates increase to a total of 13.1% in 2023/24.

Reduction in spending on new library

- 5.6 88 submitters supported Council's proposal to reduce spending in 2023/24 on a new library with common reasons including: the risks associated with a riverside location (particularly from flooding); the need to thoroughly investigate the options; support for a central city hub rather than just a library; and that funding should be prioritised to critical infrastructure and flood recovery. Submitters also saw this as an opportunity for wider and improved consultation, and for a more logical proposal being developed.
- 5.7 32 submitters opposed the proposal to reduce spending on and delay construction of a new library. Reasons included: the community needing a new library which should be prioritised; the library being important to people experiencing hardship; support for a separate library rather than a community hub; opposition to the drastic cut in funding; the proposed future funding not being sufficient for a new library/hub; a desire to see the investigation better funded; support for the previous proposal and iwi partnership approach; and concern that the hub will compromise library needs. There was also concern that the project could drag on for many years.
- 5.8 14 submitters opposed allocating any funding. Reasons included: a new library not being needed or seen as a luxury in the current economic

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

environment; that a community hub is not required; and that the level of expenditure to do the investigation is too high.

- 5.9 24 submitters provided mixed responses. Comments included: wanting to see a civic centre included in the scope; wanting a new library undertaken in conjunction with Tasman District Council; a preference for several satellite libraries as well as a smaller central library; preference for a youth centre; wanting to see the funding redirected to existing community groups; consideration of other locations (e.g. museum); and saving money now is of no real interest on a project with a 50 year return.

Staff comment

- 5.10 Following consideration of the submissions, staff recommend no changes to the proposal as set out in the Consultation Document. Submissions were generally supportive, and the move will find favour with both those who were concerned about the size of the budget and those concerned about the riverside location. It is prudent for Council to continue working on an alternative approach as The Elma Turner Library is nearing the end of its optimal life.
- 5.11 This approach is consistent with the decision to strengthen the existing library and will allow further opportunity for community engagement on the project and the scope of what is needed. The \$200,000 expenditure in 2023/24 will help develop a greater understanding about suitable sites and community expectations for the community hub development, including a new library.

Infrastructure Acceleration Fund – infrastructure upgrade to unlock city centre living

- 5.12 114 submitters supported accelerating infrastructure upgrades in the city centre to enable central city living and to receive central government funding. Common reasons submitters supported the proposal included: support for making a vibrant city centre; making the area more accessible and people friendly; the transport benefits and improved safety; increasing intensification to avoid urban sprawl; affordable housing; and leveraging central government funding.
- 5.13 Some submitters identified matters that they wanted considered in the project or when subsequent city centre development enabled by the work takes place. The matters included mitigating disruptions to business caused by the project, good urban design and green spaces for residents/users, accessibility, mitigating climate impacts and natural hazards, and managing how a larger number of city centre residents would coexist with 'nightlife' businesses.
- 5.14 52 submitters opposed this proposed change. Reasons for opposition included: that developers should pay for this type of infrastructure upgrade; that funds should not be spent on upgrades in a cost of living crisis; lack of support for the Bridge Street Linear Active Transport Corridor concept; opposition to the loss of any car parking; concern

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

about the purchase of the bus depot site; concern about high emissions likely in the developments enabled; opposition to central city living in general; and concern that intensification could make the central city unsafe at night.

- 5.15 There were 30 submissions that gave a mixed response. Some gave conditional support only in certain circumstances. For instance, only upgrade if known repairs required, only if a Three Waters entity is implemented that would help fund the work, only instead of the Maitahi-Bayview Development progressing, or only if housing enabled was for older or younger people.

Staff comments

- 5.16 Staff recommend bringing forward funding for 2023/24 to initiate the city centre infrastructure upgrade project, as proposed in the Consultation Document. Prioritising budget for this work is an appropriate investment for the future and delivers good value for ratepayers as Council can leverage substantial Central Government funding. The growth portion of the projects will be collected via development contributions as per Council's policy. Accelerated three water upgrades will also have benefits for the wider Nelson catchment.
- 5.17 If budget is approved, staff will consider specific matters raised in submissions at the appropriate planning and project stages. Future communication and engagement with potentially affected business owners is a priority and the works are to be managed with the aim of minimising disruption. The approach for delivery of these works will be based on a dig once approach. At this stage, it is intended that the Haven Road Upgrade (Bridge – Rutherford) and the Bridge Street Upgrade (Rutherford – Collingwood) including three waters infrastructure will be delivered in one package however staged to consider the needs and impacts to the businesses/wider community. Design for the corridor has yet to be undertaken, and the comments in relation to parking, climate change and natural hazards, green spaces and good urban design provided from submitters will be considered as part of that process from 1 July 2023 onwards.

Maitahi Bayview Development subdivision (Maitai Valley) utilities and transport connections

- 5.18 140 submitters supported the proposal in the Consultation Document to allocate \$606,000 of funding in 2023/24 to undertake pre-planning work on the utility and transport connections to the proposed Maitahi Bayview Development subdivision (Maitai Valley). Reasons submitters supported the proposal included: support for development and the residential housing growth opportunities it provides near the central city; reduced urban sprawl onto the Waimea Plains; it is responsible to prepare for the possibility of construction starting; and Council co-ordination of development will lead to better community outcomes.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

- 5.19 122 submitters opposed the proposal for reasons including: not supporting the proposed development due to its detrimental impact on the Maitai River, wetlands, wildlife, amenity of the area, and neighbouring properties; community opposition to the plan change and subdivision; opposition to rates funding/subsidising infrastructure by a private developer; potential flooding in the area and for properties downstream; the development area being slip prone; increased traffic on Nile Street and Maitai Road making them dangerous; development providing the wrong type of housing; disruption from development; ongoing maintenance costs from the development; development increasing urban sprawl; there being ample sections available in Nelson already; a looming recession; and that the land should be turned into a regional park.
- 5.20 21 submitters gave mixed responses to the proposal. Reasons for this view were that support depended on the quality of urban design and the resulting built form; support if the traffic problems on Nile Street/Maitai Road and Clouston bridge were addressed; lower portion of the valley should be for flood detention; and only support if work happens after the outcome of the appeal.

Staff comments

- 5.21 Staff recommend no changes to the funding proposal as set out in the Consultation Document. Most of the submissions either in support or opposition relate to the subdivision proposal and whether it should proceed. These matters are outside of the scope of the Annual Plan proposal, were dealt with under the plan change, and will be subject to the outcome of the appeal to the Environment Court.
- 5.22 The matter for consideration through the Annual Plan process relates to whether Council should provide funding for the infrastructure pre-planning work. Some submissions were of the view that the developer should pay 100% of the cost. Other submitters supported provision of funding to enable the pre-planning work to proceed.
- 5.23 This pre-planning work will enable Council to improve its understanding of the infrastructure needs and associated costs of the work (for consideration in the Long Term Plan 2024-2034), and the cost split between the developer and Council. The developer will be responsible for servicing their proposed development. However, there are some services (external to the development) which Council will need to ensure are upgraded. There will be benefits to nearby areas of the city due to these upgrades and the Maitahi Bayview developer would not be expected to cover that portion of the cost.

Funding for external grants at 2022/23 levels

- 5.24 Council proposed to hold 2023/24 funding for a range of external grants at the same level as 2022/23. This included funding to community groups, facilities, Council Organisations and Council Controlled Organisations. 25 submitters provided specific feedback in opposition to

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

this proposal. Reasons included: negative impact on arts/culture/creative sector; reduction in opportunity for social cohesion and resilience; community organisations will need to make cuts which will impact services, projects and events for the community; community facilities (such as Nelson Centre of Musical Arts and Theatre Royal) that provide benefits to the community will be negatively impacted while still recovering from the impacts of COVID-19.

- 5.25 A number of Council Controlled Organisations submitted about the negative impact the move would have for their services and ability to deliver outcomes to the community. The Suter highlighted the compounding impact as it was still recovering from COVID-19 and the severe weather event. The Nelson Regional Development Agency highlighted the importance of economic development investment in times of economic challenge and its ability to leverage funding from central government and the private sector. The Tasman Bays Heritage Trust formally requested a 5% CPI (Consumers price index) adjustment for the Nelson Provincial Museum.

Staff comments

- 5.26 Council values and continues to support the organisations impacted by this proposal. However, their funding does need to be considered in light of the cost of living crisis facing ratepayers and households. It is a difficult trade off to make in the current economic circumstances. If the proposal was reversed and a CPI adjustment applied, an extra \$476,000 in rates revenue or an approximate further 0.5% rates increase would be necessary. Council may wish to consider applying some increase but not the full CPI adjustment and/or prioritising organisations supporting Nelson's communities of greatest need. Staff have found further savings since the release of the Consultation Document which would allow a 7.2% increase for the Community Investment Fund and organisations supporting the most vulnerable members of the community as well as a partial increase for other grants.
- 5.27 The Nelson Regional Development Agency is in a difficult position with Central Government destination management funding ending in June and the ongoing challenge of a mismatch in regional funding from councils. Council may wish to see more work done on how to prioritise the work programme of the agency and find a sustainable funding pathway.

Arts Festival funding

- 5.28 7 submitters, including the Nelson Festivals Trust, provided specific feedback in opposition to the proposed change to funding for the Arts Festival in 2023/24. The proposed change would involve funding to the Nelson Festivals Trust of \$409,000 with the remaining \$175,000 that Council would have contributed to come from reserves built up over recent years. Feedback included: the Trust has used all Council funding provided in COVID-19 disrupted years to deliver the festival – not to add to its reserves; the decrease will have a cumulative effect when combined with no adjustment for inflation; the Trust intends to use some

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

of its reserves in 2023 and 2024 to build up long-term sustainability of the organisation – this would mean the 2023 and 2024 festivals would require cuts to programming (especially free community events); less Council funding could jeopardise alternative funding streams or the Trust's financial position; and the importance of promoting arts and culture in the region.

Staff comments

- 5.29 Council has supported the festival over the course of its life and intends to continue to support the festival to grow. The funding proposal was developed by Council staff on the understanding the Trust has sufficient funds in its reserve and keeping the Nelson Festivals Trust as it was prepared.
- 5.30 However, the Trust in its submission and at the hearings expressed concerns about the requirement to use some of its reserves as part of core funding for the 2023 festival. Given the concerns and the lack of clarity about how the current situation arose, one option would be for a small group of councillors to work with staff, and in consultation with the Trust, to look into the issues that have been raised and return to Council with a recommended way forward. In the meantime, staff recommend that the funding for the Festival remain as proposed.

Funding for arts hub investigation

- 5.31 One submitter supported the proposed change to investigate opportunities for a new arts hub to support the arts sector and implementation of He Tātai Whetū – Whakatū Nelson Arts and Creativity Strategy. Their feedback was that there should be consideration given to repurposing an existing building. A submission also suggested that work should be progressed more quickly than an investigation. Four submitters opposed the proposed change and reasons included: the cost of doing the investigation; preference that funding to existing arts facilities be increased; that it is a 'nice to have' project; and a query whether private sector should provide entertainment instead.

Staff comments

- 5.32 Staff recommend no change to the \$100,000 allocation to progress the investigation. Council analysis of community arts facilities has identified potential gaps for Nelson and the investigation will provide greater understanding of any shortfall and what arts facilities are required. Commencing the investigation in 2023/24 is recommended because it is prudent to undertake preliminary work in the short term before committing any capital funding through the Long Term Plan 2024-2034 for projects of this nature that have long lead times.

Tāhunanui Surf Lifesaving and Sports Facility(ies)

- 5.33 9 submitters supported the proposed change to investigate opportunities for the development of a surf lifesaving and sport facility/facilities. Reasons included: investigations will provide a fit-for-purpose

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

evaluation; a facility would better support Surf Life Saving Club members and make Tāhunanui beach safer; support for a shared sporting facility for a mix of codes; Tāhunanui needs more good infrastructure with community focus. Feedback also suggested that due to projected sea level rise any new building should be relocatable. Two submitters opposed the proposed change due to the cost of the investigation or that it was a 'nice to have' project.

Staff comments

- 5.34 Staff recommend no change to the \$100,000 allocation to progress the investigation. Undertaking this work will allow an informed decision by Council of whether to proceed and the likely costs of a development. Sea level rise and the eastern migration of the Waimea Channel will be considered in the investigation.

Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance funding

- 5.35 Two submissions suggested increased funding for the Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance – the alliance requested an increase from \$20,000 to \$40,000 in 2023/24. Feedback included: the alliance addresses the significant conservation problem of a lack of a coordinated approach to conservation; additional funding would enable focus on critical fundraising for landscape projects of a similar size or larger to existing Jobs for Nature projects; and that the alliance's work will result in ongoing benefits to biodiversity and climate resilience, improved connection to nature through educational work, and conservation training and opportunities.

Staff comments

- 5.36 Council supports the efforts of Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance and recognises the benefits of their work to Nelson and Te Taihū region. The alliance has also requested the same level of increase in funding from Marlborough and Tasman District Councils. Staff recommend increasing funding from \$20,000 to \$40,000, conditional on Tasman and Marlborough District Councils also increasing their support to \$40,000.

Climate Change

- 5.37 12 submissions were received specifically on climate change. Feedback covered matters broader than the proposed changes for the Annual Plan, with the majority of feedback supporting stronger action on climate change. Feedback included: that more urgency in Council's response to the climate crisis is needed; that Council should carefully apply a climate lens to all work programmes; that Council and Tasman District Council should align their climate strategies and plans; that Council should support wider community behaviour change; that climate analysis on proposed changes should have been included; that the cost versus Nelson's contribution to emissions needed to be balanced; and support for Council's Te Mahere Mahi a te Āhuarangi Climate Action Plan and Climate Change Strategy.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

Staff comments

- 5.38 Feedback raised in these submissions would be more appropriately considered in the development of the next Long Term Plan, e.g. the suggestion to make climate change a Long Term Plan priority. Staff will take into account submitters' feedback in preparation of the Long Term Plan and will encourage submitters to provide their views when Council engages on that plan.

Transport

- 5.39 27 submissions were received related to Transport activity broadly and specific transport projects. Specific feedback on transport projects or changes identified in the Consultation Document included: opposition to deferring expenditure on public transport related to the design of the new bus hub for Millers Acre; support for the Streets for People projects; and support for the Transport Choices projects.
- 5.40 Broader transport-related feedback included support of active and public transport or requests that it be progressed more urgently (such as bus lanes or more commuter cycle trails) for safety and emissions reduction. Other feedback included: concern about using funds to pay for cycleways; queries about the bus service and subsidisation levels for bus passengers; support for the Southern Link; doubt that priority lanes would be effective; concern with current links between inner city and Tāhunanui and the Nelson Future Access Project; that car parking should be limited to encourage behaviour change; more should be done with services to North Nelson; a request for support for the installation of Locky Docks which allow charging of ebikes; and a request to progress a cycle/walking track from the Wakapuaka sandflats to The Glen.

Staff comments

- 5.41 Staff recommend no change to the proposals for public transport, Streets for People projects and the Transport Choices projects as outlined in the Consultation document. Staff see merit in investigating the Locky Docks proposal and will initiate contact with Big Street Bikers to see how this can be moved forward. In 2023/24 a number of projects are planned to improve safety at key intersections around Nelson, create separated cycleways, and improve public transport services which will help address many of the matters raised in feedback. Other matters, such as bus priority lanes, will be considered with the development of the next long term plan rather than next financial year.

Other matters raised in submissions

- 5.42 A range of other matters were raised by a smaller numbers of submitters. Staff have developed recommended responses to these specific matters for Council's consideration in Attachment 1. The attachment summarises the suggested responses for all matters identified as not requiring changes to what was proposed or that can be accommodated in existing work programmes. Any matters where staff

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

are recommending changes to what was proposed in the consultation material are covered in the body of this report.

Other changes since the Annual Plan 2023/24 consultation

- 5.43 Staff have identified some other changes required to the final Annual Plan 2023/24 relating to Council decisions, corrections and timing changes from what included in the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document and supporting information.
- 5.44 Aside from any new changes that might be agreed on through these deliberations, the carry forward of capital expenditure budgets as referenced in 5.46 and the other changes referenced in 5.41 have already caused some changes to the net debt and rates requirement. There are numerous small adjustments that mostly nett off, for example, the capital expenditure carry forwards do not increase overall debt level, just the timing of when debt is incurred. The major changes are summarised below.
- 5.45 Net debt is projected to increase by an additional \$8.3 million to \$207.9 million at June 2024. The major contributors to changes in debt are:
- 41 Halifax Purchase – \$970,000 increase to debt
 - 41 Halifax deconstruction and reinstatement to pavement – \$800,000 increase to debt
 - August 2022 severe weather event recovery, slip remediation 2022/23-2023/24 – \$8.2 million increase to debt
 - Increase in severe weather event recovery forecast costs 2022/23 – \$3.1 million increase to debt
 - Saxton Stage 4, additional costs due to May 2023 flooding - \$500,000 increase to debt
 - Increase scope adjustment from 10% to 15% - \$4.4 million reduction to debt.
- 5.46 The rates requirement for 2023/24 has decreased by approximately \$247,000. The major contributors to this change are:
- Visitor Information Service – Council approved an additional \$110,000 after the Consultation Document was released, this has now reduced to an \$84,000 increased rates requirement
 - Welcoming Communities Programme Project funding – \$20,000 increased rates requirement (project funding introduced for Annual Plan 2022/23 not included the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document)
 - Interest income from Nelson Tasman Regional Landfill Business Unit (NTRLBU) previously omitted by error – \$262,000 reduction in rates requirement
 - Reduction in expected external interest due to carry forwards and rise of scope adjustments to 15% - \$113,000 reduction in rates requirement

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

- Correction of other small errors - \$24,000 increased rates requirement.

Carry Forwards

- 5.47 Staff have reforecast the current year capital spend to 30 June 2023. The projected capital forecast is \$61.9 million excluding staff time, joint business units, vested assets and August 2022 severe weather event recovery budgets, with savings of \$3.2 million. Capital carry forwards requested of \$21.9 million are spread across years 3 - 4 of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 and are included in Attachment 2 for approval. \$8.3 million of these carry forwards were incorporated in the budgets contained in the Consultation Document and supporting information. Changes to scope adjustment are included in the forecast total but excluded from savings and carry forward totals.
- 5.48 \$18.9 million of the carry forwards are into the 2023/24 year and are included in the \$60.3 million capital programme for 2023/24 (excluding staff time, joint business units, vested assets and August 2022 severe weather event recovery budgets). Staff have considered the impact of the carry forwards and recovery on the deliverability of capital expenditure for 2023/24 and due to a number of factors, including external funding, cannot identify projects to defer. Therefore, the scope adjustment has moved from 10% to 15% recognising the challenge of delivery. Including the capitalised weather event budgets changes the capital programme for 2023/24 from \$60.3 million to \$77 million (excluding staff time, joint business units, vested assets and after 15% scope adjustment).

Overall rates approach for Annual Plan

- 5.49 87 submitters supported the steps taken to minimise the rates rise to an average of 7.2%. The main reasons included: the approach being a good attempt to strike the right balance between minimising impact on the community and delivering council services; the approach being reasonable in the economic circumstances; and it being necessary to maintain services.
- 5.50 31 submitters opposed the proposed approach. The large majority of them preferred no, or lower, rates rises. Feedback included: concerns that households will not be able to afford rates increases in a cost of living crisis; rates having already increased considerably; ratepayers' wages will not increase by the rate of inflation; further reductions should be found (e.g. in 'non-core areas'); basing rates on land value was unfair (particularly for ratepayers that may be lower consumers of Council services); that users of Council services should pay for the full cost of the service rather than ratepayers; and that rates should be higher to pay for essential infrastructure, implement Te Ara ō Whakatū plan more quickly, or funding to community groups.
- 5.51 There were also 30 mixed response submissions. Feedback included supporting the intent but not the steps taken to minimise the rates

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

increase; supporting the steps but feeling the rates increase is still too high; concern that trimming maintenance budgets could mean assets are not maintained or create more cost long term; concern whether funding will be sufficient for infrastructure development or important community facilities; and that the uniform annual general charge should be higher. Some submitters identified matters they wanted considered in the rating approach of introducing rates discounts to single occupancy homes or increasing rebate thresholds; that lifestyle block owners who commute to work and benefit from Council services should not have lower rates increases than residential ratepayers; and that a large reduction in operational spending long term will be detrimental.

- 5.52 Six submitters opposed the proposal to keep the commercial differential at the 2022/23 level instead of decreasing it by 0.5%. Feedback from those who opposed included: that paying commercial differentials are unfair on commercial users compared to residential ratepayers; that not decreasing the differential was an unjustified change from what was adopted in the Long Term Plan; that businesses are relying on the decrease in the differential next year; and the impact on small businesses and their profitability.

Staff comments

- 5.53 Staff recommend the average rates rise of 7.2% in 2023/24 as outlined in the Consultation Document. Council recognises the impact the cost of living crisis is having on the community and has avoided adding to inflationary pressures by raising rates above inflation. Equally a further reduction in rates revenue would negatively impact the delivery of Council's work programme and the services provided to the community. It is acknowledged, however, that the steps outlined in the Consultation Document to manage budgets will result in some difficult trade-offs in the 2023/24 year and beyond.
- 5.54 The commercial differential recognises the additional services that businesses receive, such as extra rubbish collection, street sweeping and events to attract visitors. Following consideration of the submissions, staff recommend keeping the commercial differential at the 2022/23 level as proposed. It will strike a suitable balance between commercial and residential ratepayers in the context of the cost of living increases impacting the community and spread the rates rise percentage increase more evenly. The Long Term Plan had also been clear that the decision to reduce the commercial differential by 0.5% would be considered annually.

6. Options

- 6.1 Council has options for each decision it makes in relation to submissions, including making no changes from what was proposed in the Consultation Document, increasing or decreasing funding, or approving new funding. Each decision will have rating or debt implications that will feed into the final Annual Plan. Council is required to adopt an Annual Plan for 2023/24 by 30 June 2023 so that it can strike the rates for that

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions

financial year and have in place a work programme ready to commence on 1 July.

7. Next steps

- 7.1 Staff will incorporate the Council's deliberations decisions into the Annual Plan 2023/24, prior to bringing it back to Council on 22 June 2023 for adoption and striking the rates. Following adoption final versions of the document will be published on Council's websites and made available to the public.

Co-Author: Nicky McDonald, Group Manager Strategy and Communications

Co-Author: Nikki Harrison, Group Manager Corporate Services

Attachments

Attachment 1: 839498445-14453 - Approach to Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions responses [↓](#)

Attachment 2: 332184083-4780 - Capital budget carry forwards [↓](#)

Important considerations for decision making
Fit with Purpose of Local Government <p>The submissions on the Consultation Document are an input into Council’s decision making processes. They enable elected members to have an understanding on community views on the matters prior to Council deliberating and making decisions on what is included in the Annual Plan 2023/24.</p> <p>The consultation processes enable Council to democratically make decisions on behalf of its communities, and to consider its services, work programme and budgets in terms of the wellbeing of its community in the present and for the future.</p>
Consistency with Community Outcomes and Council Policy <p>The proposed changes to Council’s work programme as set out in the Consultation Document were considered to more appropriately align available resources to achieve its community outcomes compared to year three of the Long Term Plan 2021-31. The proposals recommended through this deliberations report have been made following consideration of community feedback and will help work towards Council’s community outcomes.</p>
Risk <p>Consultation has been carried out to determine the community’s views on the services, work programme and budgets for the Annual Plan 2023/24. Deliberating on the matters raised in submissions is considered low risk, as Council is following the correct process.</p> <p>There is a risk that Council will make decisions as part of the deliberations that are not supported by some stakeholders, however, Council can communicate the reasons for the decisions through the response letters to submitters and communications to the community, which will help mitigate this risk.</p>
Financial impact <p>The decisions Council makes on the submissions will determine the financial impact for the Annual Plan.</p>

Degree of significance and level of engagement

The proposals in the Consultation Document have been assessed against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as having a high degree of significance (refer to report R27506 to 9 February Council meeting). The consultation process undertaken reflects the high degree of significance of the decisions.

Climate Impact

The decisions in this report will impact on the ability of Council to proactively respond to the impacts of climate change now or in the future. Council's proposal to complete recovery work in ways that make the city's infrastructure more resilient and help reduce impact from future similar weather events reflects a climate impacts-focused response. The consultation process has allowed the community to provide feedback on Council's climate response activities as summarised in the report above. Council will continue to focus on its climate response and will consider climate change prioritisation and budgets in the development of the next Long Term Plan.

Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

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

Delegations

This is a matter for Council.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
1.1 Approach to rates	NA	Numerous submitters	148 submissions	See Council report
1.2 Recovery from the August 2022 severe weather event	NA	Numerous submitters	139 submissions	See Council report
1.3 Reduction in spending on new library	NA	Numerous submitters	158 submissions	See Council report
1.4 Infrastructure Acceleration Fund – infrastructure upgrade to unlock city centre living	NA	Numerous submitters	196 submissions	See Council report
1.5 Maitahi Bayview Development utilities and transport connections	NA	Numerous submitters	283 submissions	See Council report
1.15-Funding for external grants at 2022/23 levels	NA	Numerous submitters	25 submissions	See Council report
1.16-Social: Arts Hub investigation	NA	Several submitters	6 submissions	See Council report
1.21-Parks & Active Recreation: Tahunanui surf lifesaving and sports facility(ies)	NA	Several submitters	11 submissions	See Council report
1.14-Environment - Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance funding	NA	Several submitters	2 submissions	See Council report
1.28-Climate Change	NA	Several submitters	12 Submissions	See Council report
1.8-Transport	NA	Numerous submitters	27 submissions	See Council report
2.6-Govt funding as part of Three Waters Reform	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	Support 7 - I consider it is essential that spatial planning is carried out jointly with the Tasman District Council. Otherwise Nelson City Council ratepayers will risk having to pay an unfair amount on infrastructure and environmental quality will be compromised.	This project is a business case being undertaken jointly with Tasman District Council, collaborating on aspects of urban development.
2.6-Govt funding as part of Three Waters Reform	60	Andrew Dowdle	We must be open to entering into the Three Waters entities. Structure must change so lets be part of the solution and not hold back on being at the forefront and lead the way.	Council is continuing to liaise with the Government on the Three Water reforms, aiming for an outcome that will be the best for Nelson residents.
2.6-Govt funding as part of Three Waters Reform	189	Ed Shuttleworth for Tasman Regional Sports Trust	Government funded projects as part of the Three Waters Reform • Irrespective of the future of Three Waters, we strongly support the Te Ara ō Whakatū City centre play space project. Play is crucial for young people's learning, including cognitive, social, and physical development. Play is an outlet for creativity and experimentation that allows children to emulate what they see, try new things, practice skills, reduce fear of failure and to experience and manage risk. Changes to both the built and natural environments have reduced access to traditional play spaces, in many ways due to safety concerns, so it is encouraging that Council are proposing this significant development.	Thank you for your response. Your comments are some of the reasons behind Council's Te Ara o Whakatu City Playspace project. Within the recent Three Waters announcements, Government has confirmed the "Better Off Tranche 1" funding so the Playspace Project will proceed as planned.
2.6 Govt funding as part of Three Waters Reform (Better off Funding)	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	Uncertainty under three Waters - and "Better Off" payments	Council will receive Tranche 1 of Better Off Funding, but Tranche 2 has been withdrawn by the Government.
2.7-Infrastructure projects	15	Frans Dellebeke	Follow through on major projects and get them finished, as there has been little progress in Nelson for a long time.	Council continues to deliver major projects across all of Council activities including (but not limited to) the substantial works relating to the Rutherford Street stormwater upgrade, the Neale Park wastewater pumpstation upgrade, the Awatea Wastewater pumpstation upgrade (due for completion Aug 2023), the multi-million multi-stage Saxton Creek culvert upgrade (due for completion October 2023) and the upgrading of all services in Hastings Street which is the beginning of the full upgrade of services and road infrastructure in Washington Valley. Council undertakes approximately 40 million in capital works annually, and will continue to deliver major projects that are agreed through the Long Term Plan process.
2.7-Infrastructure projects	43	Dan McGuire	Millers Acre Building: For approximately three years this NCC owned building has been soaking up not only moisture, but a lot of your money. NCC must come clean and tell us what the enormous repair job is costing and more the point, how does NCC intend to recover the cost? As it stands, it would appear that to provide carparks that the city needs, it may have been better to demolish it!	Problems with the exterior cladding necessitated recladding works, following the technical consultant's advice. Council approved a sum of \$1.472M to remediate the cladding and associated work which includes a new drainage system and the replacement of windows. The work includes the following stages: Technical Assessment and Initial DesignBuilding consent for the investigation workInvestigation – including wrapping the building, cladding removal, and dry periodDetailed DesignPricing review, budget approval, procurement, and planningBuilding consent for the 2nd stageConcrete remediationCladding, drainage implementation, and window replacement From the early stage of the project according to the business case requirements, demolition was not an option. Other options were considered such as remediation only in specific areas, but it was not technically and financially feasible in the long term due to the extent of the damage. The previous Council thoroughly investigated the failure of the cladding system at Millers Acre prior to approving the remediation funding. It is primarily due to the poly-block cladding system which was used extensively throughout NZ at that time which has since proved susceptible to weather tightness failure therefore costs were not sought to be recovered. Income from the leases will contribute to the maintenance and debt costs over time.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.7-Infrastructure projects	112	Lindsay Wood for Resilienz Ltd	Still too much “business as usual” Without diminishing the significance of the August 2022 rain event, there is an abiding sense that the proposals in the Annual Plan are adopting a largely reactive “business as usual” approach to projects, even though they are in many cases to recover from that extreme weather event. Such an approach manifests itself as a lack of consideration of the LTP decarbonisation imperatives, an underwhelming approach to non-physical facets, and a failure to try to take account of key unfolding information on the climate crisis (such as in the IPCC AR6 SYR report and Cyclone Gabrielle), which may very well impact on consideration of “exceptions”. There are also instances of proposing to advance work that is of questionable urgency or questionable value for money.	The Long Term Plan 2021-2031 states that climate change is a “lens through which all work programmes are considered”. Council still has considerable work to do to embed climate change within all of its work programmes. The work to develop a Climate Change Strategy (which is currently underway) will help with this by setting the long term vision and direction for climate action by Council and the Nelson community and will guide prioritisation and funding decisions.
2.7-Infrastructure projects	115	R.T. Morris	NCC has a marked inability to manage publicly owned assets. Examples of this can be supplied.	Thank you for your submission, all publicly owned assets, have asset management plans that identify types and frequency of maintenance requirements based on agreed levels of service.
2.7-Infrastructure projects	218	Stephen Todd for Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Three Waters Infrastructure 19. Federated Farmers note that the Draft Annual Plan for 2023/24 indicates there are variations in the planned work programme for Water Supply, Wastewater and Sewerage, and Stormwater and Drainage activities. As rural landowners get no benefit from these Council activities, we expect rural landowners not to be charged any rates for these. 20. We expect that the Council will continue not to charge rural ratepayers for services that they do not get, such as public water supply treatment and connection, public wastewater disposal and treatment, stormwater drainage assets (expect where these form part of a road network used by rural communities) or kerbside collection of rubbish and recycling. In certain situations where ratepayers in rural areas do get the benefit of these services, we recommend the use of targeted rates and/or user pays charges for such properties. 24. We note that the Draft Annual Plan proposes roading infrastructure upgrades for urban areas. Farmers pay a considerable amount to the roading rate, and we wish to see additional value brought from the rate to Nelsons rural areas. While maintenance of unsealed roads is important, Federated Farmers encourages the Council to continue to improve and seal more of Nelson’s unsealed rural road network (excluding paper roads). Sealing improves road safety, reduces road damage from vehicle use and weathering, and improves rural connectivity which helps support rural communities. Rural local roads need to continue to be maintained to a reasonable standard to keep these social and economic lifelines. River Works 25. Feedback from our Federated Farmers members in the Nelson region have expressed concern regarding river works in light of climate change and the increased prevalence and intensity of flood events. River management is crucial for the protection of surrounding land, including farms, dwellings and townships. Federated Farmers members have reported that the rivers are visibly built up with gravel. It is crucial that gravel extraction is done where there is aggradation of riverbeds as this leads to increased flood risk. 26. Given the current additional demands on financial resources, such as flood recovery and future flood protection, Council needs to prioritise spending to focus on its core functions and the most fundamental needs of its community such as protection from natural hazards and bolstering community resilience. It is requested that Council increases its efforts to prepare for flood events including river works. Where possible, gravel extraction and river works by commercial entities and adjoining landowners should be facilitated and encouraged, so that the cost to ratepayers is minimised.	Council’s current rating policy states that you need to be connected to a Council Water or Wastewater service to be charged for these services. If rural properties do not have a connection to these services, they will not be charged for these services in the 2023/24 rating year. At present stormwater / flood protection charges are set on location basis as defined in Council’s Rating Resolution and the properties may or may not be rated accordingly. We acknowledge your support for a targeted rate/user charge in some circumstances where rural properties get a benefit. Council acknowledges concerns raised from those in the rural sector relating to river works. In the recent severe weather August 2022 event, notwithstanding no stormwater / flood protection rates being paid by the rural sector, Council assisted in the removal of gravel to restore many rural rivers to their courses and to maintain as far as possible river capacity. As part of that work a proposal to levy a stormwater charge to rural properties will be considered in the next LTP. It is also acknowledged that the damage to the rural roading network as a result of the August 2022 severe weather event was significant and will be considered through the next Transport AMP and LTP. Federated Farmers will have the opportunity to submit on this matter through the LTP process. We welcome further dialogue with you as we develop the next AMP. Council officers are currently reviewing consenting arrangements and considering applying for variations to relevant Council held consents to include a broader ability to undertake works in rural rivers and streams.
			27. A strong, reciprocal relationship between Nelson Council and stakeholders including Federated Farmers will be critical to ensure Nelson is able to be protected from future natural hazards. For this relationship to emerge, stakeholders need representation at the decision-making table. We recommend that the Annual Plan account for the need to adequately resource stakeholders.	<i>See above.</i>
2.9-Solid Waste	8	Peter Wall	Re-cycling:- 1. bring back soft-plastic facilities 2. enable plastic lids to be recycled - it's crazy excluding them. If the lid is on the container, surely it can get along the conveyor belt (although somehow the lid needs to get off at the end!)	The soft plastic recycling programme is an industry-led product stewardship scheme where producers take responsibility for their packaging. It is managed by the Packaging Forum (the industry group for packaging). We understand that the new Future Post factory in Blenheim, which can make use of these plastics, will be opening shortly. We are keeping in touch with the Forum to see how they are progressing with setting up new collection networks in Nelson, and we’ll be providing updates through Council channels as soon as more information becomes available. With respect to lids - the reasons we recommend not putting lids in your recycling bin are because lids can trap food and liquid in the container, which can contaminate recycling and add to the cost. Furthermore lids are usually too small and they tend to pop off and fall through sorting equipment, causing jams during processing. Lids are made of different materials from the container.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.9-Solid Waste	37	Dharan Longley	I would like to see NCC actively collaborating with local businesses to start recycling polystyrene. Mitre 10 are doing it, as are Hope Moulded Polystyrene. So where is the central collection centre for consumers to appropriately help this process? You could so easily set up a recycling bin at the Recycling Centre. I've been lobbying for this for some years and nothing has been done.	The ability to accept polystyrene for recycling is limited by the availability of local processing facilities, who are in turn dependent on an end market for the reprocessed material. The two local collectors can only accept very small quantities and neither operate polystyrene collection as an independent economic entity. To make this commercially viable a local/regional processor is required because polystyrene is bulky and lightweight it is extremely uneconomical to transport any significant distance. For longer distances transport emissions could easily outweigh the benefits in recycling the material. The recycling process itself also requires significant energy and the final result is a relatively low value product. It is not within the present plan for council to establish a processing site. However, if an entity establishes an economically sound business which processes polystyrene, (and producing a polystyrene product that could then be recycled again), Council would investigate whether there is an opportunity for polystyrene to be collected from kerbside as part of the recycling contract.
2.9-Solid Waste	73	Jill Ford	Finally organic waste - be good to have all households with council kitchen and garden waste collection and composting in very near future. There are already organisations doing this and it needs to be provided by council, as organic waste produces alot of methane!	Following the recent kitchenwaste trial further research is presently being conducted to determine the most appropriate method of collection and processing of kitchenwaste material. The final process of collection and processing will consider cost, convenience, and the collection and process emissions. In line with Ministry for the Environment guidance, the selected processing option may be composting, or it may be some other process that produces less emissions. However Nelson (and Tasman) have private companies that collect and compost garden waste on a user-pays basis and so council's plan is to supply residents with a kitchenwaste service rather than a general garden waste service. A lot of kitchenwaste is presently put in rubbish bags which goes to landfill where it produces methane. It is councils intention to reduce the amount of methane producing materials that go to landfill while not interfering with the existing garden waste collection companies.
2.10-Water Supply	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	I strongly support funding for fluoridation. Fluoridation is long overdue and its safety and effectiveness has been established through many years of use both in New Zealand and overseas.	Thankyou for your support of the Ministry of Health direction to fluoridate the Nelson City water supply.
2.10-Water Supply	37	Dharan Longley	Fluoridation of Nelson's Water I strongly oppose the fluoridation of Nelson's water, despite the central govt manadate forcing NCC and all local authorities to do so. This mandate is a flagrant violation of inalienable human rights, the cardinal principle of which is that we have the sovereign right to choose what we put into our own bodies. It is NOT any local or central government's role to do this. Please see the attached documents detailing why Nelson should reject this.	The decision to add fluoride to the drinking water has been made by the Director-General of Health, under the Health Act 1956, and is one that Council is required to accept and implement. You may wish to contact the Ministry of Health with your concerns.
2.10-Water Supply	42	Elizabeth Dooley	Broadly, yes, but I am concerned about how certain infrastructure repairs are managed. In Cleveland Terrace, we have just had a major waterpipe upgrade (outside my house). In the years since I have lived here, the pipe was repaired many, many times - more often as the years rolled by. It was even repaired twice in 2 days recently. I feel the decision not to replace the pipe caused too much expenditure to contractors. In other words I feel it was badly managed and we need an internal auditor to manage such expenditure.	The Cleveland Terrace watermain was replaced in 2009. Council renews water mains on a priority basis across the city working to available budgets and the demands of emergencies such as the August 2022 storm event.
2.10-Water Supply	109	Jacquetta Bell for Friends of the Maitai	Council first discussed the water quality enhancement from an aeration system back in 2015. It has taken a long time for this scheme to make its way into the budget process. We support the inclusion in the Annual Plan 23/24 of an additional \$300,000 for a total budget of \$1.5 million in 2023/24 to install an aeration system in the Maitai Dam.	Thank you for your support for the aeration of the Maitai Dam.
2.10-Water Supply	120	Jenny Easton for Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman	Water resilience between neighbouring councils. Strongly support linking the TDC and NCC water supply at Hill St north, which will increase the resilience of both councils to this important resource.	Thank you for your support for the work to link the TDC and NCC water reticulation.
2.10-Water Supply	145	John Glaisyer	I do not agree with the Three waters 'takeover' - I think it is best to keep our system. Expensive as it may prove to be in the long run. It is good at the moment and it is unnecessary to even consider adding fluoride to the potable water (though the latter is not much the council is able to do about it).	Council has made a number of submissions to Central Government about the proposed three waters reforms. We will continue to work hard to ensure government proposals are in the best interests of the community.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.10-Water Supply	329	Kura Stafford for Te Taihū Iwi Implementing Te Mana o Te Wai Project	<p>1.1 Te Taihū Iwi Implementing Te Mana o te Wai Project ('the Project') is a collaborative project to enable eight Te Taihū Iwi to participate and contribute to the National Policy Statement Freshwater Management Te Mana o te Wai ('NPSFM Te Mana o te Wai')</p> <p>2 The output from the Project will contribute to the eight Te Taihū Iwi priority outcomes to protect and enhance the health and wellbeing of waterways, te taiao, whānau, hapū and Iwi.</p> <p>3 The Project is important to ensure the relationship of the eight Te Taihū Iwi and their culture and traditions with their land, water, sites, wāhi tapu, valued flora and fauna, and other taonga are taken into account when a Council is making an important decision involving land or a body of water.</p> <p>4 The health and wellbeing of wai is significant to the eight Te Taihū Iwi in accordance with tikanga Māori including in relation to history, kaitiakitanga, mahinga kai, wāhi tapu, wāhi whakahirahira, waiora and customary protection of flora and fauna; and spiritual values.</p> <p>4.1 The aim of the Project is to support the eight Te Taihū Iwi capacity and capability building in order to participate and contribute to Council's decision-making processes and freshwater management.</p> <p>4.2 A key output of the project will be the collation and documentation of whānau values and aspirations for each of the eight iwi, to inform development of Te Taihū Iwi freshwater management policies and plans.</p> <p>4.3 The Project very important in that it will give effect to whānau intergenerational reciprocity aspirations/actions to ensure their tupuna waterways in Te Taihū, are healthy and well.</p> <p>4.4 The outcomes from the Project will contribute to Councils core function in plan development output: To participate and contribute to Marlborough, Nelson and Tasman Councils core functions for Plan development, to give effect to NPSFM Te Mana o te Wai.</p> <p>4.5 A Project Policy role is therefore crucial for the eight Te Taihū Iwi, to coordinate and integrate and develop eight Te Taihū Iwi freshwater management provisions to inform Councils core function Plan development for NPSFM Te Mana o te Wai.</p> <p>4.6 A Project Policy writer will also be able to identify where the iwi of Te Taihū have similar objectives, which will assist Councils in shaping eight iwi voices into the new Freshwater Plan.</p> <p>4.7 In 2022, the eight Te Taihū Iwi advised the Marlborough, Nelson and Tasman Councils that baseline funding of \$172,800.00 (\$57,800.00 each Council) was essential and necessary for the Project Policy role.</p> <p>4.8 In 2023, the Councils declined to fund the Project Policy role from their core RMA function operations budget for Plan development.</p> <p>4.9 Instead, the Councils directed the eight Te Taihū Iwi to make a submission to the Annual Plan process for funding for the 2024/2025 period. The NPFM Te Mana o te Wai is required to be implemented by Councils by December 2024.</p> <p>4.10 It is therefore very disappointing for the eight Te Taihū Iwi to be a submitter, cap in hand, to ask for RMA baseline funding, to assist Council's core RMA function Plan development.</p>	The involvement of Te Tau Ihu iwi in assisting the Council meet its obligations under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater is critical. In conjunction with Tasman and Marlborough councils we are keen to explore how we can facilitate participation, including assistance with resourcing.
			<p>4.11 The benefit of Councils RMA baseline budget for the Project Policy role contributes to the eight Te Taihū Iwi capacity and policy capability to develop eight Te Taihū iwi freshwater provisions;</p> <p>4.12 The benefit of Councils RMA baseline budget for the Project Policy role contributes to the eight Te Taihū Iwi capacity and policy capability to participate and contribute to Council's core RMA function Plan development and decision making processes of Councils.</p> <p>4.13 The Project Policy role budget is \$172,800.00.</p> <p>4.14 This submission request to Nelson City Council is for \$57,600.00.</p> <p>4.15 The eight Te Taihū Iwi would like to speak to this submission.</p>	See above.
2.11-Waste Water	67	Ian Williams for The Vic Public House and Burger Culture	We wish to raise strong objections regarding trade waste charges on page 20. We understand that category B customers includes all businesses in central Nelson. Our businesses are disproportionately affected by this because we generally consume larger amounts of water to operate our businesses, which is directly related to trade waste charges which we understand is assumed in billing at 80% of the water consumed. We do of course pay for what we use through metered water consumption. The proposed increase of 20% is an unacceptable increase on our overheads at a time when we are struggling to survive. A reasonable increase would be at the rate of 7.2% CPI.	Council understands this is a difficult time for many businesses in the community and the decision to increase tradewaste 'B' charges was one that was discussed at length. The costs of conveying and treating wastewater in the city have increased significantly as a result of COVID impacts and supply shortages and the new charges better focus the cost on the higher volume trade waste producers. As trade waste 'B' charges are directly related to the volume of water used Council would encourage careful monitoring of water usage and repairing any leaks as quickly as possible.
2.11-Waste Water	325	Zinnia Foster for Hospitality New Zealand - Nelson Branch	We wish to raise strong objections regarding trade waste charges on page 20. We understand that category B customers includes all businesses in central Nelson. Hospitality businesses are disproportionately affected by this because we generally consume larger amounts of water to operate our businesses, which is directly related to trade waste charges which we understand is assumed in billing at 80% of the water consumed. We do of course pay for what we use through metered water consumption. The proposed increase of 20% is an unacceptable increase on our overheads at a time when hospitality businesses are struggling to survive. A reasonable increase would be at the rate of 7.2% CPI.	Council understands this is a difficult time for many businesses in the community and the decision to increase tradewaste 'B' charges was one that was discussed at length. The costs of conveying and treating wastewater in the city have increased significantly as a result of COVID impacts and supply shortages and the new charges better focus the cost on the higher volume trade waste producers. As trade waste 'B' charges are directly related to the volume of water used Council would encourage careful monitoring of water usage and repairing any leaks as quickly as possible.
2.11-Waste Water	332	Ali Boswijk for Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce	We oppose the proposed increase of 20% for Trade Waste Charges Category B customers which we understand are all businesses in central Nelson. A reasonable increase would be at the rate CPI.	Council understands this is a difficult time for many businesses in the community and the decision to increase tradewaste 'B' charges was one that was discussed at length. The costs of conveying and treating wastewater in the city have increased significantly as a result of COVID impacts and supply shortages and the new charges better focus the cost on the higher volume trade waste producers. As trade waste 'B' charges are directly related to the volume of water used Council would encourage careful monitoring of water usage and repairing any leaks as quickly as possible.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.12-Storm water	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	I support the proposed stormwater upgrades, in particular for Tahunanui Hills. Stormwater upgrade design needs to factor in climate change, in particular sea level rise and increased rainfall intensity.	Thank you for your feedback on the proposed stormwater upgrades. The Tahunanui Hills stormwater upgrades are a high priority for Council, and the proposed programme will start with Days Track catchments in 2023 - 2024, and extend to other catchments over the next Long Term Plan. The stormwater upgrades are designed to achieve specific capacity standards in the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual, which include allowing for climate change to 2090. Both higher intensity rainfall and sea level rise are considered.
2.12-Storm water	225	Louise Devine for Gibbons Holdings Ltd	The plan appears to delay the Washington Road stormwater work - do not agree.	The Washington Road stormwater upgrade is part of a wider 3 Waters upgrade project that also includes roading improvements. The proposed delay in Washington Road works results from Transport planning and seeks to minimise the disruption in traffic flows that would occur if the St Vincent Street stormwater culvert renewal was implemented simultaneously with the Washington Road works. The Annual Plan allows for earlier implementation of the programme to renew the old St Vincent stormwater culvert that runs between Hastings Street and the outfall to the Saltwater Creek at Halifax Street bridge. It is proposed that St Vincent Street works progress in 2024/25 - 2025/26 (one year earlier than planned in the LTP 2021 - 2031), and Washington Road works follow on from that in 2026/27 - 2027/28.
2.12-Storm water	235	Neil Deans	We request that the Council allows money in the 2023-2024 Annual Plan to investigate, plan and cost placing a Stormwater pumping system in the network that pumps Elliott Street's Stormwater to operate at high tides and other times when necessary to reduce the flooding risk for Elliott Street and nearby streets. The project can then be put in the Long-Term Plan next year. See attached document.	Council acknowledges the drainage issues that occur in the area of The Wood West of Collingwood Street. This area relies on gravity drainage as it is not connected to The Wood Stormwater pumping station located at Neale Park. Investigations into extending the catchment area of the pumping station towards Trafalgar Street will be progressed under the Stormwater Strategy for Central Nelson which is due to be completed in 2023-24. It is anticipated that a stormwater upgrade project for The Wood will be considered for the Long Term Plan 2024 - 2034 programme.
2.14-Environment	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	The importance of the cost of living crisis is overstated in 2. I consider addressing the effects of human caused climate disruption and the biodiversity crises should be to the forefront of both the Council's thinking and Annual plans. This point should be replaced by reference to the climate and biodiversity crises. This would be consistent with the Nelson City Council already having declared climate change to be a crisis. It is crucial that these crises are forefront considerations in all Council policy and operational decision making.	Addressing the climate change and biodiversity crises are important priorities for Council. The Long Term Plan 2021-2031 states that climate change is a "lens through which all work programmes are considered". Council still has considerable work to do to embed climate change within all of its work programmes. The work to develop a Climate Change Strategy (which is currently underway) will help with this by setting the long term vision and direction for climate action by Council and the Nelson community and will guide prioritisation and funding decisions. The Strategy will set an emissions reduction target for Nelson's emissions and summarise how progress towards meeting this target will be monitored and reported on.
2.14 Environment	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	I strongly support a joint Nelson Tasman joint Regional Spatial Strategy. Any plan or policy will be more effective if it is coherent and consistent over time.	The Natural and Built Environment Bill and the Spatial Planning Bill are currently going through the parliamentary process. This legislation will require Nelson and Tasman councils to produce two new combined plans.
2.14-Environment	109	Jacquetta Bell for Friends of the Maitai	We support Council's stated mission to 'shape an exceptional place to live, work and play, and we particularly support the emphasis on the Community Outcome that 'Our unique natural environment is healthy and protected'. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on these issues. We look forward to the hearings.	Council's State of the Environment programme monitors the state of our rivers. The Healthy Streams, Sustainable Land Management and Project Mahitahi programmes are active in restoration planting, erosion management and community behaviour change programmes to improve freshwater outcomes.
2.14-Environment	120	Jenny Easton for Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman	Nelson Plan We support the operational expenditure on this important strategic work. We suggest that the public consultation for this critical Regional Policy Statement is developed using a form of participatory democracy, rather than just a consultation document as provided for in the Annual Plan. This document (pg 7) lists the three focus areas of the new council, and we suggest that the third focus " Reset of governance to be a cohesive and effective Council" be amended to include inclusive . This was lacking in the previous council, and it is even more important in these changing times when we are requiring a focus on reducing carbon emissions. Participatory democracy will provide a more informed and representative group of residents and ratepayers to have input into the Nelson Plan. This will enable the public to understand the risks we face, and the policies required to provide long term resilience.	Thank you for your submission. We acknowledge and agree that the Nelson Plan, and anything that emerges from the current review of the Resource Management Act, is important. Engaging with the Nelson community is an ongoing obligation and privilege to ensure we meet the needs and aspirations of the community in the best way we can.
2.14-Environment	199	Scott Burnett for Forest & Bird	2. Sedimentation 2.1. Nelson's estuaries and coastal environment continue to be impacted by sedimentation. This is predominantly from removal of land cover for pastoral farming, forestry and residential development. Forest & Bird call for stronger monitoring and enforcement in relation to sedimentation.	Nelson City Council has an existing broad-scale and fine-scale sediment monitoring programme across our estuaries. All earthworks consents are monitored for compliance. Most resource consent processing involving earthworks require geotechnical assessment and review. Council is investigating other mechanisms to ensure activity managers and developers adopt best practice methods to minimise the sedimentation risk.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.14-Environment	199	Scott Burnett for Forest & Bird	<p>4. Environmental funding support of other organisations</p> <p>4.1. Forest & Bird suggests further funding and support for the Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Alliance (KMTT), an Alliance of Top of the South Councils, DOC and Iwi. KMTT addresses the significant conservation problem of a lack of a coordinated approach to conservation identified in our National Biodiversity Strategy Te Mana o te Taiao and as a result of the current development of an implementation plan, will also attract national and international funding for project that will benefit the region.</p> <p>4.2. Forest & Bird supports increased funding of Tasman Environment Trust (TET) environment hub services. TET currently support in excess of 20 projects across Nelson & Tasman and provide an incredibly valuable service. There is a national trend toward larger scale conservation and restoration projects that attract significant investment to the region and create jobs. These projects require fundraising, financial management, monitoring and reporting expertise that the majority of community conservation projects are not set up for. TET has a proven track record for exactly this. We make the argument that NCC should see funding TET with the same lens they do the regional development agency – as a vehicle to attract investment to the region.</p> <p>4.3. Forest & Bird supports increased funding for the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum (NTCF) and believes that the NTCF adds significant value to Nelson. Particularly as a community voice in mitigation and adaptation conversations.</p> <p>4.4. Forest & Bird support increased funding of the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary because of the current and future value the sanctuary has for the region in terms of biodiversity and education/demonstration of what is possible and the contrast between a removal of browsers and predators and their presence elsewhere in the environment. Forest & Bird would like a clear plan for the Brook Campground developed that enables future development of the sanctuary.</p>	<p>4.1 Council fully supports the Kotahitanga mo te Taiao Alliance and \$30K has been budgeted to support the functioning of the Alliance, in addition to Council funding supportive collaborative projects under the Alliance (e.g. Project Mahitahi). 4.2 Council supports the role that TET has in Nelson-Tasman as a regional hub and has committed funding for 23/24 through the LTP to support TET's function as a regional conservation hub. 4.3 Council is greatly appreciative of the work the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum does and of the collaborative partnership between the Forum and Council. Council intends to continue funding the Forum through a grant in 2023/24. 4.4 Your support for the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary and desire for a campground plan has been noted.</p>
2.14-Environment	199	Scott Burnett for Forest & Bird	<p>5. Shorebird protections</p> <p>5.1. In response to recent coastal bird study's commissioned by NCC and TDC, Forest & Bird would like NCC to make a commitment in its Annual Plan for increased shorebird protections in Nelson District. This does not necessarily require significant additional funding as it should be covered by existing budgets but provides NCCC with an opportunity to raise the profile of this issue and educate the public about it.</p> <p>5.2. Forest & Bird would like to acknowledge constructive and collaborative work already underway, through a working group comprising NCC, TDC, DOC and F&B staff, looking at the issue of shorebird protections and possible responses including dog control bylaw review, signage, education, compliance and enforcement.</p> <p>5.3. Forest & Bird request provision is made in this annual plan for funds to identify off-lead dog exercise areas away from the coastal zone. Dogs have been controlled in the urban environment to the extent that the only option for many people to exercise their dog off-lead is in the coastal zone. In the past many of these estuary and beach areas appeared to hold little value and the impact of dogs upon coastal birds was not adequately recognised.</p>	<p>5.1 Council is working to increase the protection of shorebirds through its Nelson Nature programme. This includes habitat restoration, pest control and awareness interventions throughout the coastal zone. 5.2 Council will continue to work collaboratively with these groups to improve awareness and protection of shorebirds through whatever mechanisms we have available. 5.3 Council is continuing to build higher recreational users awareness, including dog walkers, of the ecological values of the coastal zone and the species living here. We have recently produced site signage to highlight the value of the Wakapuaka sandflats to Fernbird, with site signage also produced to highlight that dogs are prohibited from Oyster and Haulashore Islands. Council is also currently exploring options for proactive patrols to ensure Dog Control Bylaw compliance in areas of particular ecological importance. NB. The provision of off-lead areas (including making additional areas off-lead) is regulated through the Control of Dogs Bylaw and not subject to the Annual Plan process.</p>
2.14-Environment	199	Scott Burnett for Forest & Bird	<p>6. Cat control</p> <p>6.1. Forest & Bird would like to see provision of funding to develop a cat control bylaw. In recent years our understanding of the impact of cats on our wildlife has increased. As has the public's willingness to accept the need to control cats.</p> <p>6.2. The rationale for a bylaw is two-fold. First, domestic cats kill an exceedingly large number of native birds, lizards and invertebrates. A study in Dunedin showed that "predation by domestic cats dramatically reduced the population persistence" in native bird species. Second, microchipping of domestic cats would enable more effective control of feral cats.</p> <p>6.3. The bylaw would ideally include:</p> <p>6.3.1.1. Compulsory microchipping</p> <p>6.3.1.2. Inclusion of feral cats in Council's Pest Management Plan</p> <p>6.3.1.3. Compulsory cat registration</p> <p>6.3.1.4. A limit of two cats per household (registered breeders exempt)</p> <p>6.3.1.5. Compulsory neutering of cats (registered breeders exempt)</p> <p>6.3.1.6. The ability for Council to ban cats at certain developments to protect wildlife</p> <p>6.3.1.7. The phasing in of cat containment for all new cats (supported by the SPCA)</p> <p>6.3.1.8. Cats to be kept indoors at night. We understand that sections 145 and 146 of the Local Government Act 2002 allow for cat curfews</p>	<p>Council will be considering whether to progress cat management mechanisms at a Council workshop in June. Options to be discussed at this workshop include a bylaw through the Local Government Act or rules for pest cats through the Regional Pest Management Plan.</p>
2.14-Environment	326	Peter Olorenshaw	<p>Make Car Dealing an Industrial Activity. We ask for a change to make the city less focussed on cars by making car sales and fossil fuel selling petrol stations an industrial activity. This would free up a lot of inner city land for residential, retail, entertainment and hospitality uses. We note here that having retail destinations, all in close proximity increases the feeling of urbanity. Having almost half of the city taken up with car dealers, roads and parking, disperses the good bits of being in a city, making the city experience more diffuse. We suggest a graduated timeline for car yards and petrol stations to move out of 5 years. Perhaps their rates double every year as an incentive to move early rather than later</p>	<p>Changing the status of car dealer in the Nelson Resource Management Plan would require a plan change (none contemplated) and would not have retrospective effect to current activities as exiting use rights would apply.</p>

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.14-Environment	326	Peter Olorenshaw	Townhouse Donut required around the CBD - We presently have standard or low density residential zones surrounding our Higher density Inner City zones: we have a missing middle density. This needs to be changed to creating a townhouse zone in inner residential zones. A townhouse zone donut that while allowing only a maximum of 3 stories high, allow 2 story high side walls touching neighbours, allows each townhouse their own patch of ground to grow a few herbs, plucking greens or dwarf fruit trees. We think there is a huge unmet demand for especially considering the paucity of local examples. While the new Nelson Plan may eventually allow this, we have been waiting years for it and it is stalled again. We therefore ask you to allow it to be done quickly within the existing plan by making it easier to get Resource Consents to build 2 stories high up to the side boundaries in this townhouse zone. By having Resource Consents approved more regularly, quickly, cheaply and easily would get action on this intensification. We ask for Resource Consents to be given under the existing plan at no cost for waiving the minimum site area per dwelling and maximum site coverage for areas within 1.5km of the Nelson cathedral and 1km of Stoke city centre as long as an Outdoor Living Court is provided.	Council is about to notify a major housing plan change, the development of which has had several opportunities for community input. Nelsust Inc are welcome to submit when the details are released.
2.14-Environment	326	Peter Olorenshaw	Allow "Partitioning" of houses into 2 Smaller Houses Now. We think this is the nearest thing to a silver bullet we have for allowing increased density with no additional load on infrastructure, minimal resources required and at very low cost. Again while the coming Nelson Plan may eventually allow this, we can't wait years for its implementation. For areas further out than the above mentioned 1.5km from the Cathedral, 1.0km for the centre of Stoke, we suggest that other rules such as daylight into neighbours, boundary setbacks etc are complied. To really boost the uptake of this we request you stipulate zero development contributions be payable as long as the number of bedrooms is unchanged, the water usage for the two dwellings combined, is no more than the average single residential property and any extension to roof area is provided with a stormwater detention tank.Housing Affordability is a stated goal of the Annual Plan. See the appendix for a worked real world example is fully costed at \$116,000 for an additional dwelling created through partitioning, radically less than a new building and at a radically low carbon cost.For neighbours, what is actually the difference to having a family of 5 with 3 teenagers in a 4 bedroomed house and two couples living in the same building but partitioned in half?More information: Currently building a second dwelling is controlled in the Nelson Resource Management Plan under Residential rule REr.23 Minimum Site Area and REr. 24 Site Coverage and Outdoor Living Court are defined in rule REr.27.The water incoming is measured by the water meter, but the water in also determines the water out into the sewer. By controlling the amount of water coming into the property, the amount of load in the sewer can also be controlled. If no additional infrastructure is required why should any development contributions be payable?	Council is about to notify a major housing plan change, the development of which has had several opportunities for community input. It does include provisions relating to increasing housing density, Nelsust are welcome to submit when the details are released.
2.14-Environment	326	Peter Olorenshaw	Tiny House Areas on Flood/Liquifaction prone land - Low lying or Liquifaction prone land that is problematic to allow permanent housing on, could be used for Tiny House Clusters. These Tiny Houses are built on trailers so are easily moved in the event of an earthquake or if sea level rise occurs at the upper end of projections. There is some infrastructure requirements such as additional sewerage lines that need to be installed, but we would suggest that roads do not need to be built (the very people interested in Tiny houses built very close to the town centres are the very ones least likely to have a motor vehicle, and if they do, vehicles can be parked in the periphery.	Council is about to notify a major housing plan change, the development of which has had several opportunities for community input. It does include provisions relating to liquefaction prone land, Nelsust are welcome to submit when the details are released.
2.14-Environment	326	Peter Olorenshaw	Create Disincentives for Workplace Parking - Institute a Workplace Levy on Parking. It is inconsistent to levy car commuters for parking in suburban streets, but not charge other car commuters for car commuting. This is where workplace parking levies come in. The money raised must be ring fenced into giving people improved options of avoiding the levy ie on better buses, bus lanes, protected cycle paths. Richmond should be encouraged to do the same and it seems things are changing there that free parking should be seen as a right - someone is paying for it - either your supermarket in terms of increased cost of grocery items or employers in terms of not being able to pay employees so much as they have to squander land for parking.	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development has removed the Council's ability to control the numbers of on-site parking spaces required so no legal basis would exist to impose the suggested levy.
2.18-Social: Nelson City Council 150th Year Anniversary Book	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	I support the proposed NCC anniversary book. I have copies of both Jim McAloon's Nelson a regional history and Hilary and John Mitchell's Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka (Volume 1). I find both of these books useful and note that the former in particular would be improved by an update.	Thank you for your support on the proposed publication to commemorate Nelson City Council's 150th anniversary. \$125,000 has been allocated towards this project and Council are excited to work with relevant authors and/or researchers to deliver a publication which continues the legacy of the two previous publications commission by NCC to celebrate the 50 year and 100 year anniversaries but to also add to the wider published historical research you have mentioned in your submission.
2.19-Social: 3 Halifax Street building (the Refinery) seismic strengthening	351	Anne Rush for Make/Shift Spaces Incorporated	3 Halifax Street building (the Refinery) seismic strengthening-Arts Hub Investigation Agree with this allocation. But we do have a concern in that we have already contributed to a recent consultation round on some aspects of this. Intrasturcture for the arts is essential and our community is changing.The consultation proposed needs to widen its lens to consider the growing ethnic diversity of our community and their needs. For an example refer to the following research :- ' SHARED COMMUNITIES- WAKATU NELSON- Arts, culture and heritage- Engagement with Nelson Migrant and Former Refugee Communities. August 2022 Funded by ManatūTaonga Ministrtr for Culture and Heritage- Te Urungi Innovating Aotearoa'	Council is committed to enhancing the vibrancy of our city, creating a unique 'Nelson' identity and stimulating our economy through the arts, primarily through the new He Tatai Whetu Arts Strategy and action plan. To support this, Council is investigating potential future use of existing buildings such as the Halifax Street site for use for arts activities and has allocated funding towards this. Council also recently undertook a gaps analysis and identified following arts community feedback a need for facilities such as a black box theatre and community arts hub which could be utilised by our diverse community. A budget of \$100,000 has been allocated to scope building requirements, location, current facilities (including Halifax St) that could be repurposed for a community arts centre along with how it could be used and managed. Council would then use this information to inform a future decision for investment into future arts facilities of this nature.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.20-Social: general	43	Dan McGuire	Archives: This very valuable entity is currently at Isel Park but there is an agenda to shift it to a site beside the present regional museum in Trafalgar Street. Without plans or specifications, wild figures and development costs have been reported in the media which obviously are meaningless. The best solution is to improve and upgrade the existing accommodation at Isel Park. NCC already owns a lot of property in the city that does not contribute to the rate take. This situation must be reversed.	Thank you for your submission, your feedback is important. The facility at Isel Park currently holds the Nelson Tasman regional heritage collection, which has been valued at \$20 million, holding 200,000 objects, 1.2 million photographs and 150,000 original documents. Unfortunately the building in which these all sit has been identified as having reached the end of its useful life and not suitable to safely house the region's collection. The new Archives, Research and Collections (ARC) facility will preserve the regional collection for future generations; care for the collections in an efficient climate controlled facility; maximise Council's investment into the Nelson Provincial Museum; generate best value for, and best use by, the community; provide appropriate taonga viewing facilities; enhance operating potential and reduce operating inefficiencies; and consolidate all operations and activities onto one site. The Tasman Bays Heritage Trust, which is managing the project, is working with Council staff to keep Council updated on plans for the new facility as they progress. Council has the opportunity to review the plan, including all costs, before it provides funding. Council allocated \$3.165 million for the ARC project in its 2021-2031 Long Term Plan.
2.20-Social: general	72	Dianne Scott	Before spending any more money on developement near the Maitai River, please look at all available historical buildings in Nelson and see if some of them can be preserved by using them for Council facilities. We have lost way too many of our historical buildings.	As part of Councils planning process when needing new locations to deliver services, existing heritage and other buildings are considered in terms of suitability, location, current ownership and need for refurbishment and earthquake strengthening alongside a new build. Wherever possible, Council will look at using Nelson's heritage buildings whenever they may be suitable.
2.20-Social: general	110	Marianne Palmer	Finally, we have no idea if there are any plans for Nayland Pool in the Draft Annual Plan or not, but we wish to say that we sincerely hope this remains an outdoor pool. Please don't cover it in. We love swimming there and do so regularly but wouldn't bother if you detracted from its natural beauty and our enjoyment of it by covering it in. The season needs to be extended also, to Easter and a bit beyond. We have checked with Thorndon Outdoor Pool in Wellington and the beautiful outdoor pools at St Claire in Dunedin (both of which we use where we visit our family in these cities) and they all remain open further into the year than Nayland Pool does. Nelson is a hotter, sunnier place than both Dunedin and Wellington so why does the pool have to close so soon? It's crazy!	With regard to your comments on the Nayland Pool, there are no changes in the annual plan consultation document regarding our swimming pool facilities. Investigation work is currently underway regarding future investment in our pool facilities and consultation will be undertaken in March/Apil next year as part of the upcoming Long Term Plan 2024-34. The length of the season at Nayland Pool is regularly reviewed, however any extension of the time at the end of the season has to be carefully balanced not just with the weather but also the demand.
2.20-Social: general	214	Lucinda Jimson for Tasman Bays Heritage Trust Nelson Provincial Museum	RE: Submission to the Nelson City Council by Tasman Bays Heritage Trust, requesting retention of the financial commitment towards the construction of Nelson Provincial Museum's new ARC (Archives, Research and Collections) Facility in the Long Term Plan 2021-2031. Tēnā koutou I am writing on behalf of Tasman Bays Heritage Trust Nelson Provincial Museum to formally request the retention of Nelson City Council's financial commitment of \$3.165m towards the construction of the Museum's new ARC Facility in your Long Term Plan 2021-2031. As you are aware, Tasman Bays Heritage Trust is the CCO Nelson Provincial Museum, the regional museum of Nelson Tasman. Nelson Provincial Museum holds one of the strongest regional collections in New Zealand. Recently valued by Dunbar Sloane at \$20 million, the collection comprises approximately 200,000 objects, 1.2 million photographs (including the UNESCO inscribed Tyree Studio Collection) and 150,000 original, rare and one-off paper documents (manuscripts, maps, books etc) that provide a unique and personal insight into our region's rich history. One of the Museum's core functions is to preserve and protect these treasures for our current and future generations, and to make them increasingly accessible to the public including manawhenua iwi. As has been discussed with the Joint Shareholders Committee over many years, the current Research Facility, located in Isel Park in Stoke, is at the end of its natural life and is no longer able to house the Nelson Tasman region's collections in a safe and culturally appropriate way. As far back as 1995 the Nelson Provincial Museum's Storage Requirements Report identified storage capacity as having "reached a critical point with no space to expand for adequate safe storage of the existing collections." Overall, the Isel Park building is no longer adequate for its use as a research facility with public access and has a limited functional life. The building is 50 years old, and will not meet rising earthquake standards (33% NBS) The building leaks and is at risk from flooding from Poorman's Valley Stream in a significant rain event The park setting contributes risk from insect damage, falling trees and isolation overnight The current facility does not meet conservation storage and care standards, lacks efficient air-conditioning and sufficient insulation and is hard to maintain required temperature and humidity controls as well as lighting. It also has inadequate electrical infrastructure. The building is too small to house all of the collections The building does not allow for sufficient space for staff or visitors to connect with taonga and collections Public areas for use of collections are ad-hoc, cramped, and lack accessibility for visitors with disabilities. Staff workspaces are inconvenient and inappropriate. The cold, dark and isolated working conditions are inadequate for staff health and wellbeing.	We appreciate that any decision taken by Council can have an impact on an organisation like the Tasman Bays Heritage Trust (TBHT), and for that reason, we thank you for your feedback. Council is committed to investing in the long-term heritage of the Tasman and Nelson region, and continues to support the TBHT in its vision, outcome, and goals. Council is fully in support of the new Archives, Research and Collections (ARC) facility, and is looking forward to working with the team at the museum in bringing this project to life. Funding needs to be considered in light of the increasing financial pressures facing ratepayers and households and Council does not wish to add to the burden with an average rates rise above the 7.2% rate of inflation. The same inflationary pressures, along with other impacts like the August 2022 severe weather event, are also driving up costs at Council. Council has had to make many difficult decisions regarding trade-offs for the 2023/24 year. It has had to carefully manage its internal budgets, external grants, and spread costs, like those from the August 2022 severe weather event, over multiple years. We are focussed on seeking value for money for ratepayers, while still investing for the future and maintaining key community services.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
			<p>The proposed ARC (Archives, Research and Collections) Facility</p> <p>The new ARC Facility will enable us to preserve the collection for the next generation in climate-controlled facilities, provide appropriate taonga viewing facilities for iwi, and a place for all members of the community to access and connect with their heritage. It will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the long-term heritage needs of Tasman and Nelson are able to be met Care for the collections in efficient, appropriate facilities Maximise councils' investment into the Nelson Provincial Museum Generate best value for and best use by the community Enhance operating potential and reduce operating inefficiencies Bring all staff together in one location in suitable working conditions Consolidate all operations and activities onto one site <p>The Trust is extremely appreciative and grateful for Nelson City Council's long-standing commitment of \$3.165million to support the construction of the new ARC (Archives, Research and Collection Facility) in the Long Term Plan.</p> <p>This commitment was recently reiterated by Mayor Nick Smith when he acknowledged this project as "a major project for our region that we need to keep progressing forward" – Mayor Nick Smith 27/4/23 (social media).</p> <p>Tasman District Council has likewise committed the sum of \$3.2million in their LTP.Progress on the ARC Facility</p> <p>A Joint Shareholders Working Group was charged with looking at the optimum location for a new build. The prime location was identified as a site in Church Street adjacent to the Museum. The Trust subsequently purchased this site, with Joint Shareholders approval, with funds from capital reserves.</p> <p>The Archives, Research & Collection (ARC) facility project is progressing well since the onboarding of the lead architect and design team in September & October 2022. Key achievements include refinement of the concept design, review and confirmation of collection space requirements, peer reviews of climate condition requirements, confirmation of preliminary design, and application for Resource Consent.</p> <p>The project is governed by a strong Project Control Group (PCG) consisting of Trustees Brendon Silcock and Derek Shaw, supported by external advisors John Hambleton and Ian MacLennan, both of whom are highly experienced in public works projects.</p> <p>Tasman Bays Heritage Trust (TBHT) is extremely grateful to both Nelson City and Tasman District Councils for the funding commitments in their Long-Term Plans which provides over half of the total budget. A Fundraising Plan has been developed and includes the Strategic Goal, Objectives, Targets and Actions to obtain the remaining funds required. Applications and Expressions of Interest have been lodged for significant funds with both Lotteries and the Ministry of Culture and Heritage. Both funds require the resource consent application to be approved before they can be formally submitted.</p>	See above.
			<p>The Fundraising Plan has two key phases – Non-Public and Public. For the Non-Public phase, prospective donors with high affinity (engagement, commitment to the museum) and high capability (have the funds to donate) have been identified and relationships are being cultivated. The Fundraising Subcommittee engaged a creative marketing agency to provide fundraising marketing materials. This Non-Public phase of the campaign will actively involve Board members and will leverage the current 'Morimoritia Ngā Taonga Tuku Iho Treasured: Objects of Mana and Significance' exhibition, a showcase of some of the outstanding taonga and objects in the Collection. The Public phase of the fundraising campaign will be launched after building consent has been obtained, and major grants and donations received.</p> <p>Submission</p> <p>The Trust is extremely grateful for the commitment of \$3.165million by Nelson City Council towards this extremely important regional project. The Trust respectfully submits that this funding be retained as scheduled in the Long Term Plan.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss any aspect of this submission, please contact me at the below address.</p>	See above.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.20-Social: general	237	Giles Burton for Nelson Buskers Festival	Proposal to fund Nelson Buskers Festival 2024 in the Annual Plan Nelson Buskers Festival [NBF] has been a much-loved part of Nelson City Council's Summer Events programme for many years, bringing world-class acts to Nelson Whakatū streets to entertain locals and visitors. The 2023 event was watched by more than 5,000 people in Nelson, across three main streams. The 'circle' shows at the Top of Trafalgar Street, the Family Variety shows on the Church Steps, and the 'Adult' Cabaret shows at The Boathouse. The buskers also played to another 1,000 or so people at the Māpua Wharf performances, not supported by NCC. For many years, NBF has been funded as a core event in the Summer Events programme, delivered by an external contractor for the NCC Events Team. Sadly, the Festival no longer fits the revised remit for funding as a NCC Summer Event. This proposal is for the Nelson Buskers Festival to be granted funding from the Annual Plan. If included in the 2023/24 Annual Plan, we would then apply for the Nelson Buskers Festival to be included in the Long Term Plan. Since 2016, Giles Burton / Three Bridges Productions Ltd has been contracted to deliver the Buskers Festival, and would like to continue organising what we think is a great community event. A quick overview NBF brings five acts to Nelson, to perform over one weekend in January. The acts are selected from the best performing around the world, and always include one from New Zealand. We work closely with Auckland Buskers Festival, sharing acts to help with travel costs. The Festival has three main elements. • 'Circle' shows at the Top of Trafalgar Street, where each act does a full 35 – 45 minute show. These run from Thursday to Saturday during the day. Koha. • Family-friendly variety shows on Saturday and Sunday evenings, where each act performs a 20 – 25 minute highlight routine. These are held either on the Church Steps at the top of Trafalgar Street, or on Fairfield Park. Koha. • 'Adult' cabaret shows on Thursday and Friday nights at The Boathouse, in which the acts perform 15 – 20 minutes of R18 material. Ticketed. In recent years we have also taken the circle shows to Mapua Wharf on Sunday, partially sponsored by TDC Creative Communities Scheme. The performers are not paid by NBF, rather they collect a Hat at the outdoor events and take a share of the ticketing revenue from The Boathouse shows. NBF provides accommodation for the acts as well as technical support and a financial contribution towards travel. Budget Having delivered NBF for several years now, Three Bridges has a good understanding of costs. The 2023 Festival cost \$47,825 (ex GST). [Budget attached.] This was a little over the budget of \$45,000 due entirely to an increase of over 400% in road closure costs because of regulatory changes. Realistically the budget for 2024 is \$50,000 (ex GST). This figure is based on NBF still receiving some support from within NCC, for example inclusion in the Summer Events Guide to help with marketing, and the use of NCC equipment for the weekend. Three Bridges hopes to get sponsorship and in-kind help from other sources, but it is unlikely the Festival could go ahead without significant funding from NCC or some other funding body. Creative New Zealand is not considered an option, as no buskers festival around New Zealand has been funded by CNZ. A significant part of the expenditure is returned to the Nelson Community. The largest cost is staffing who are all local people. Other expenses are accommodation, technical equipment hire, waste management and promotion, for all of which we use local staff and companies. NBF also brings people into town who support local cafés, restaurants and other businesses.	The issues you raise regarding Council's support for the Buskers Festival relate to operational decisions by officers, rather than decisions for the 2023/24 Annual Plan which is dealing with variations to what was proposed in the Long Term Plan 2021-31. Council continues to fund community events at similar levels to previously via Nelson Events Fund and also through events directly delivered by Councils Events Team. You are welcome to apply for Council funding through the Nelson Events Fund, administered for Council by the Nelson Regional Development Agency (https://www.nelsontasman.nz/meet/event-funding/) Any requests to secure long term funding for specific events (such as the Buskers Festival) would need to be considered via the Long Term Plan which will be developed and consulted on in early 2024.
			Survey During the 2023 Festival, we carried out a survey of what the audience thought of the event. Nearly 96% of responders rated their satisfaction as high or very high, with 92% saying they would 'absolutely' recommend the event. Although the event is aimed mainly at locals, 17% of the survey respondents where from outside Te Tau Ihu, with a similar percentage from Tasman. Comments included: • "It is my favourite community event." • "Thanks so much, loved it. So empowering. So inclusive for the children. More please." • "A wonderful event!" • "We stumbled across this event after a dinner out and after 2 min, we couldn't Leave and stayed the whole night. Great for the community!!!!" • "Amazing!!!! We absolutely loved it! Please come back again!" • "A perfect all-ages event for staging in an ideal crowd- and performer- friendly setting. Thanks NCC!" Three Bridges Productions hopes that this proposal will be looked on favourably, to ensure the future of an event that brings great joy to the many people who have witnessed the jaw-dropping performances brought to the community by the Nelson Buskers Festival. Thank you. Attachments: NBF Budget NBF Survey results	See above.
2.20-Social: general	297	Jacinda Stevenson	Also, I'd like to query why Tahunanui Community Hub has had its funding from NCC reduced by half, from \$20000 to \$10000 when we are the one suburb in Nelson that houses the majority of not only Emergency and Social housing residents in many of our motels. In a suburb which already has many high needs residents, with absolutely no explanation.	Funding for the Tahunanui Community Hub has previously been provided via the Community Investment Fund, which continues to be supported through the annual plan with funding of \$345,000, with funding allocated by a community panel who have the very difficult job of making funding decisions with the value of applications received being up to 400% of the available funding. Advice on how to access this funding can be obtained from Councils Community Contracts Advisor, along with suggestions on avenues for alternate funding.
2.20-Social: general	368	Ru Collin for Brook Waimarama Sanctuary	Refer to presentation	The Brook Sanctuary is an important asset for Nelson, and a key visitor destination. We encourage you to continue your work with the Nelson Regional Development Agency on initiatives that will help grow attendance to the Sanctuary, and we endorse your idea of encouraging people to use sustainable transport to get there. Council continues to support the work you do, however funding needs to be considered in light of the increasing financial pressures facing ratepayers and households. Council does not wish to add to the burden with an average rates rise above the 7.2% rate of inflation. The same inflationary pressures, along with other impacts like the August 2022 severe weather event, are also driving up costs at Council. Council has had to make many difficult decisions regarding trade-offs for the 2023/24 year. It has had to carefully manage its internal budgets, external grants, and spread costs, like those from the August 2022 severe weather event, over multiple years. We are focused on seeking value for money for ratepayers, while still investing for the future and maintaining key community services.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.23-Marina activity changes	233	Fiona Wilson for Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA)	NRDA also supports the Marina Masterplan and Saxton Cricket Oval upgrades. The Marina Masterplan provides a platform for growth in the marine industry. As outlined in the Regional Economic Briefing6 the Blue Economy is a competitive advantage for the region. The Marina Masterplan reinforces this advantage and provides an opportunity to enhance our marine offerings as a region. Saxon Cricket Oval is a nationally recognised cricket venue which is currently underutilised. Investments into the Oval (and the supporting infrastructure) can ensure national events take place in Nelson. As noted above, in order to be an attractive place to live and work, we need events and vibrancy. This includes a wide spectrum of events, including sport.	Council would like to acknowledge the ongoing support from the NRDA for our development plans and aspirations for the economic enhancement of the Nelson region through the blue economy. We appreciate the relationship and look forward to working together for the benefit of our city.
2.24-Saxton Field Oval drainage	233	Fiona Wilson for Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA)	NRDA also supports the Marina Masterplan and Saxton Cricket Oval upgrades. The Marina Masterplan provides a platform for growth in the marine industry. As outlined in the Regional Economic Briefing6 the Blue Economy is a competitive advantage for the region. The Marina Masterplan reinforces this advantage and provides an opportunity to enhance our marine offerings as a region. Saxon Cricket Oval is a nationally recognised cricket venue which is currently underutilised. Investments into the Oval (and the supporting infrastructure) can ensure national events take place in Nelson. As noted above, in order to be an attractive place to live and work, we need events and vibrancy. This includes a wide spectrum of events, including sport.	Thank you for your support of the Marina Masterplan and Saxton Cricket Oval upgrades.
2.25-Parks and Active Recreation – general	46	Elizabeth Parkes	PUBLIC SAFETY AT TAHUNANUI BEACH Between Christmas and New Year just gone I was shocked to see several people fishing in the sea immediately adjacent to the changing rooms/cafe/children's playground. In January a relative of mine swimming in that area did not notice fishing lines until he swam into one. The hooks did not catch him in the face or other vulnerable place; nevertheless, it was alarming. The potential for injury was great. Imagine if a hook had gone into his eye! My understanding is that fishing is permitted at the "back beach". I don't have a problem with that. I shall be grateful if the Council would - prohibit fishing along the entire "front beach" area, - erect signs stating such, and - publicise the fact on the NCC website and in the Council's "Our Nelson" fortnightly newspaper. Thank you. SWIMMERS AND FISH HOOKS ARE NOT A GOOD MIX!	Thank you for bringing this safety matter to our attention. It is uncommon for people to be fishing along this section of beach and it is possible it was a visitor from out of Nelson. Given this is such a rarity, we don't feel signage or further publicity is warranted. We will keep a watching brief on this and if reports of the activity increase we will take further action.
2.25-Parks and Active Recreation – general	189	Ed Shuttleworth for Tasman Regional Sports Trust	As managers of some of Nelson City Council's key sport and recreation facilities we see the direct impact of annual fees increased for the hireage and use of community facilities. The increases to court hire charges at Saxton Stadium and other venues' hire fees for the coming year will have a direct impact on participants as these increases will need to be passed on by sports codes and venue users to cover these extra costs. Additionally, the timing of notification and commencement of these charges (July 1) cause issues for sports codes as these come into effect part way through the winter season when budgets have already been set and registrations levies already advised for the season. These increases doubly affect participants who have already been hit with general rate increases in a time when cost of living is rising rapidly. This may quite likely have an impact on facility usage which will subsequently reduce facility income levels for Council - a catch 22.	Annual fees and charges increases for sports clubs are not presented in the annual plan consultation document. Contact was made separately about these changes and concerned clubs can discuss any concerns further with council officers.
2.25-Parks and Active Recreation – general	300	Wendy Hunter	Support council working with Ngati Koata to ensure long term access to recreation in particular mountain biking	Thank you for your support for working with Ngati Koata on ensuring long term access to recreation.
2.25-Parks and Active Recreation – general	309	Gaire Thompson	* I am sure that the Stoke Memorial hall could be strengthened to 34%or better for a lot less than has been suggested and should be done and available for public use.	There are no changes to the Stoke Memorial Hall in the Annual Plan Consultation Document, investigation is currently underway into the future plans for Stoke Memorial Hall and consultation will be undertaken as part of the LTP 2024-34.
2.25-Parks and Active Recreation – general	319	Paul Tunnicliff for Waahi Taakaro Golf Club	See submission.	No changes to the Waahi Taakaro Golf Course or the Golf Shop are being considered in the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation document. All feedback to maintenance or project work related to the golf course is greatly appreciated, like the Maitai Recreation Hub, however the time sporting clubs spend providing feedback to council is not reimbursed and this is consistent with stakeholders who represent sporting clubs. The increase to \$78,548.91 as a retainer is set to meet the minimum wage requirements . Any changes to staff hours required, clarification of the terms of the contract and the role of the Waahi Taakaro Golf Shop compared to the role of the Waahi Taakaro Golf Club should be discussed with the appropriate council officers.
2.25-Parks and Active Recreation – general	326	Peter Olorenshaw	Trees in Every Street - As we densify our urban areas, large trees are no longer appropriate on our sections. Shrubs and small trees yes, but we must move to the situation of having our large trees in parks but also on every street. While we recognise challenges with having trees in paved areas they are not insurmountable with permeable paving and careful species selection Having trees on streets is a paradoxical traffic safety measure: Whist it is safest if a car can't crash into a rigid object like a tree, the very fact that trees line a street means the appropriate speed we will subconsciously drive at will be lower and so ends up safer. Stockholm tree pits are a method of allowing trees to grow under paving in "structural soils". We ask for an ongoing budget to plant trees in streets, so eventually every street has trees in them.	Your comments have been noted.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.26-Corporate: Civic House seismic strengthening	351	Anne Rush for Make/Shift Spaces Incorporated	OTHER PROPOSED CHANGES TO 2023-24 Pg 24 Civic House refurbishments and seismic strengthening Please consider some artistic and design inputs into the planning of the refurbishments at the beginning of the project rather than a 'pick and plonk' afterthought. The new arts strategy could inform this.	A number of factors will be considered in a development project for staff accommodation, including cultural and artistic design considerations.
2.27-Corporate: financial	27	Stephen Wynne-Jones	Penalty on unpaid rates I oppose the increase in penalty interest rate on late payment of rates. Nelson City has an older population. Many ratepayers are asset rich but are on low incomes. Penalties are effectively hitting many when they are down.	Council recognises that some of the Nelson residents are facing a cost of living crisis due to recent high inflationary pressures which also caused Reserve Bank NZ to increase interest rates in an effort to bring down the rate of inflation to an acceptable level. High interest rates mean Council's cost of borrowing is also higher and this caused the increase in penalty interest rates. We understand the pressure that higher penalty interest rate causes and there are certain ways that the Council can help ratepayers who are struggling with their rates. For example; you could set up payment plans to pay off your rates over the year and that way you could avoid paying penalties. Government has also established a rates rebate scheme to support low income ratepayers on the cost of their rates. The income levels and rebate amount (each year) is set by the Government.
2.27-Corporate: financial	30	Benjamin Gass	Hi Team, Can someone in council please enlighten me on what social and corporate percentages actually are and what this expenditure is used for as outlined in the "pie" graph of the 23/24 Annual Plan and why are both in Operating and Capital expenditures. These combined are large budget costs? I can find no reference in the consultation documents relating to these expenditures in the budgets. Look forward to receiving a reply. Cheers Benjamin Gass	Thank you for your submission. Social and Corporate refer to 2 of the Council's 11 activities as laid out in the LTP 2021-31. The operating expenditure graph shows that 10% of Council's planned operating expenditure for 2023/24 including internal interest and other charges are in the Corporate activity; this is a dollar value of \$19.2 million and that 11% of Council's planned operating expenditure for 2023/24 including internal interest and other charges are in the Social activity; this is a dollar value of \$19.7 million. These figures come from the Funding Impact statements for the respective activities and include depreciation. The capital expenditure graph shows that 7% or \$5.1 million is planned to be spent in the Corporate activity and that 6% or \$4.3 million is planned to be spent in the Social activity. A full breakdown of these capital expenditure projects are disclosed in the "Summary of Capital Expenditure over \$100,000 in any one year". This information is available in the Supporting financial information to the Annual plan 2023-24 Consultation document. (https://shape.nelson.govt.nz/download_file/4291/1224)
2.27-Corporate: financial	33	Wei Siew Leong	I am angry that Council is stating figures like a '20% increase rise' when inflation is running at 7%. I think you have made the words look like a 7% rise is 'cheap' in comparison to the flagrant overspending you were intending. As you are very well aware, no one is getting more for their dollar. And making it look like you're caring about how much is being spent when actually you're keeping up with inflation is disrespectful. My household spending has had to cut back on things I shouldn't have to at my age and stage. I can no longer afford health insurance, I have increased my excess on my house insurance and I have cut out on other discretionary expenditure such as holidays to accommodate the 10% rise in rates and other prices that I have experienced since I moved to Nelson in 2021. The rates rise is in fact the steepest rise I've not been able to control in addition to mortgage rates. It's not ok to keep on raising rates. You got a nice rate rise when you revalued everyone's properties last year. Are you going to value them back down now that prices are not what they were?	Council understands this is a difficult time for many ratepayers in the community and the decision to increase the current fees and charges by 10% to 20% was not one that Council considered lightly. This is to ensure that costs to provide certain services are paid by the users who directly benefit from those services, and to allow those activities to keep up with compounded inflation. The inflationary pressures, along with other impacts like the August 2022 severe weather event, are driving up costs at Council. However, we did not want to add to the burden faced by our community by increasing the overall rates rise by more than the mid-year rate of inflation. Council has had to make a number of trade-offs for the 2023/24 year to balance rates affordability with delivering infrastructure and services that meet community expectations and our projected growth. This will help us manage budgets and seek value for money for ratepayers, while still investing for the future and maintaining key services. For the last year (2022/23) rate increase was 5.4%, which was below the rate of inflation at that time, the exact amount that your rates change depended on several factors, including the 2021 revaluation of your property. Land values in Nelson have increased substantially over the past three years, and some properties have increased more than others. Although for some properties, rates last year increased by more than the average increase of 5.4%, Council's income does not increase by the same percentage. Rather, the land revaluations reallocate the proportion of Council's annual income paid by each ratepayer.
2.27-Corporate: financial	43	Dan McGuire	Very bad decision that needs to be reviewed: Under the previous mayor, councillors voted for Nelson ratepayers to accept liability for any debt incurred by a combined port-airport entity. It was hoped by those who opposed this arrangement that the current council would revisit the decision, but so far there has been no review. The cost of new infrastructure for the port and airport should be borne by the port-airport entity itself. Any bad decisions that have consequences should not fall on the homes of ratepayers.	Thank you for your feedback on the Infrastructure Holdings Limited.
2.27-Corporate: financial	50	Mark Holmes	Seems reasonable, but maybe be more assistance for those eligible for rates rebates.	Rates rebate scheme was established by the Government to support low income ratepayers on the cost of their rates and the income levels and rebate amount (each year) is set by the Government. In addition to this scheme, Council offers rates postponement scheme to provide older ratepayers with more options and flexibility. It lets older ratepayers decide how best to manage their finances and also gives older ratepayers the opportunity to stay in their houses for longer. Please refer to page 304 of the 2021-31 Long Term Plan for more details. In addition to those schemes, there are different rates remission policies as well to provide support for different rate payers as per the Rates remission policies mentioned on page 295 to 303 of the 2021-31 Long Term Plan.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.27-Corporate: financial	67	Ian Williams for The Vic Public House and Burger Culture	We have a very strong objection to the proposals regarding commercial differential rates on pages 30 and 31. We note that in the long-term plan it was agreed that the commercial differential would be reduced by 0.5% per annum in the first three years of that plan, and then an ongoing review. It is unacceptable that in this annual plan there is a change of policy, which appears to be totally unjustified. Nelson businesses (and hospitality in particular) are relying on this burden being reduced over time, as was promised by the previous council and set in the long term plan. In fact this was a hard-won battle by the business sector with previous Councils. The justification for this in the annual plan is illustrated as "The commercial differential recognises the additional services that businesses receive, such as additional rubbish collection, street sweeping and events to attract visitors." We would challenge this: (i) there is no additional street cleaning, just the basic, which in itself has not been well executed if done at all over the last few years; (ii) there is no special rubbish collection for businesses as far as we are aware, and we all pay for our own private collections of rubbish; (iii) events are enjoyed by the whole population and not just a benefit to businesses. Managing and maintaining a clean, vibrant and welcoming city for residents and visitors is a basic function of Council, and not something for which businesses should be paying a premium.	The decision to reduce the commercial differential in the Long Term Plan 2021-31 was worded as 'Council will continue to reduce the proportion of rates collected from commercial properties by 0.5% per year (to be reviewed annually) for the first three years of the 2021/31 LTP'.
2.27-Corporate: financial	68	Curtis Moore	Rates rises, a new community hub, infrastructure upgrade, storm recovery, housing in the CBD all contribute to a more robust and bustling Nelson which is what we all want. It all costs money, as most things do. However, not spending it means wallowing downhill until no residents or visitors want to be here anymore. So, I think while we're still doing well is a good time to pick up and move forward with our current momentum.	Thank you for your support for Council's steps to minimise the rates rise. Council has decided to set an overall average rates rise of 7.2%. Council recognises that Nelson is facing a cost of living crisis. The same inflationary pressures, along with other impacts like the August 2022 severe weather event, are driving up costs at Council. However, we did not want to add to the burden faced by our community by increasing the overall rates rise by more than the mid-year rate of inflation. Council has had to make a number of trade-offs for the 2023/24 year to balance rates affordability with delivering infrastructure and services that meet community expectations and our projected growth. This will help us manage budgets and seek value for money for ratepayers, while still investing for the future and maintaining key services.
2.27-Corporate: financial	108	Colin Ratcliffe	Sell the council owned buildings that are not being used. (A lot of those purchases was money wasted)	The 2021-31 Long Term Plan (LTP) included an asset sale proceeds budget from 2022/23 at \$1.5m uninflated every second year. The 2023/24 Annual Plan has not amended this LTP decision. Work continues to assess the Strategic Property portfolio to identify assets that may be surplus to requirement.
2.27-Corporate: financial	108	Colin Ratcliffe	Is the housing "thing" really a Council responsibility?? What will \$32 million achieve? -----and here we go again \$3 million for initial design and engagement. Sounds like another Labour Govt announcement.	Housing is a complex issue, for which solutions involve multiple parties, including central government, local government, community housing providers and developers. A third of all submissions to Council on the last Long Term Plan were on housing. In those submissions the community urged Council to do more on intensification, particularly in relation to density in the city centre. There was support for Council to use its own property and invest in infrastructure to support and enable housing. The Bridge Street Linear Active Transport Corridor project gives effect to this community feedback by investing in infrastructure to enable housing and working with central government to fund it.
2.27-Corporate: financial	112	Lindsay Wood for Resilienz Ltd	Why does much important financial data not appear in the consultation document? Working through the multiple pages of financial analysis in the supporting document, the very first group in the "SUMMARY OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURE OVER \$100,000 IN ANY ONE YEAR" includes reference to the purchase of 25-27 Bridge Street (the bus depot) for \$2,632,500 which is shown as additional to anything previously planned. Even though a word search in the main consultation document for "Bridge" gets nine hits, eight of which refer to "Bridge Street" not one refers to the above purchase. A search for "Franklyn" get no hits, and yet a \$1.4m allocation is proposed additional spending on "Waimea Road Franklyn Street intersection improvement." The list goes on. For example are the Montgomery Square toilets so bad that we really need to commit almost \$800,000 in unplanned expenditure to their renewal? (Yet another item that did not appear on the main consultation document). What do you expect citizens to read into this anomalous approach to consultation? Whichever way it is looked at, the answer does not seem to be good.	You have also asked in point 6 of your submission about transparency and why the purchase of 25-27 Bridge Street, the upgrade of the Montgomery Square Toilets and the Franklyn Street/Waimea Road projects were not in the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document. The decision to purchase 25-27 Bridge Street, Nelson, was made by Council over a year ago on 10 May 2022, therefore, it is not relevant to this Annual Plan consultation. The Council decided on 14 June 2022 to carry forward the funding for the Montgomery Street toilet upgrade as part of the Annual Plan 2022/23 adoption report. The Franklyn Street/Waimea Road project is in the Nelson Future Access Study, Nelson Regional Land Transport Plan and Long Term Plan 2021-31. The design for the project was to be undertaken in the 2022/23 year and staff were intending to complete the design during 2022/23 at the time the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document was prepared. However, since then the work has not been able to be completed and the \$100,000 for the design work is being carried forward into the 2023/24 year. There is \$1.5 million for construction of the intersection work in subsequent years. I hope this clarifies why these projects were not in the Consultation Document. In terms of your general question on why not all the financial data appears in the consultation document, the content is driven by the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.
2.27-Corporate: financial	184	Richard Sullivan	Oppose any airport runway extension. To make Nelson a better place to live means not taking away recreation space for pavement. To encourage greater tourism (i.e low paid low productivity jobs) at the expense of local amenity is madness.	This is not within scope of the Annual Plan and is a matter for Nelson Airport Limited.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.27-Corporate: financial	209	Richard Brudvik for Whakatu Intellectual Capital Kohanga	There are harmful impacts of a non-inflation-adjusted funding for the city. How we have prudently grappled with these? Rates are only one important economic factor in our economy.	Council values and continues to support the work of our community groups, however funding for community groups needs to be considered in light of the increasing financial pressures facing ratepayers and households. Council does not wish to add to the burden with an average rates rise above the 7.2% rate of inflation. The same inflationary pressures, along with other impacts like the August 2022 severe weather event, are also driving up costs at Council. Council has had to make many difficult decisions regarding trade-offs for the 2023/24 year. It has had to carefully manage its internal budgets, external grants, and spread costs, like those from the August 2022 severe weather event, over multiple years. We are focused on seeking value for money for ratepayers, while still investing for the future and maintaining key community services. One of the trade-offs is not applying CPI to grants to community groups.
2.27 Corporate Finance	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	<p>Stopping of the annual reduction in differential between Commercial and Residential rating</p> <p>This is a change from the 10 Year Plan, and Council has full power to depart from the suggestion set out in the ConsultingDoc, and retain the 0.5% reduction for the 23/24 year</p> <p>By way of background: over a decade ago, Council brought in a scheme which provided that the Commercial area should pay 25% of the total General Rate: and additional Commercial "differentials" were added to the General Rate charged to achieve that split. There was no "rating justification" for the 25% - but nobody contested the decision in Court. Over more recent years, the Land Value of Residential property increased much faster than Land Value of Commercial land (especially in the CBD), and so that differential increased to a stage where the General Rate was several times the Residential General Rate. The craziness of the position was partially realised by Council about 5 years ago, and the 10 Year Plan provided that the 25% of total rates would be reduced by half a per cent each year. That reduction meant that in the current Financial Year the Commercial rates were set so as to realise 22.6 % of the total General Rate. Even then the differential in 2022/23 was such that Inner City Commercial (vacant or occupied) paid a General Rate 4.57 times the Residential General Rate - based on Land Value</p> <p>In this year's ConsultDoc, Council proposes cancelling that half a per cent per year reduction - see p 30-31 of the ConsultDoc</p> <p>As a result Council proposes that Inner City Commercial (occupied or vacant) will have to pay the Residential Rate - plus a differential of 379%. In other word nearly 5 times the Residential Rate: and I emphasise that the General Rate is always based only on Land Value.</p> <p>As to effect, please look at this table of two properties I have an interest in.</p> <p>My home is behind the Cathedral and has a high Land Value; and my Trust owns a commercial property in the CBD. The figures are:</p> <p>Commercial Property Residential Property Land Value \$620,000 Land Value \$1,360,000 General Rate \$9,883 General Rate \$4,667</p> <p>In other words, the Commercial property pays about double the General Rates that my Residential property pays - even though the Residential property (Land Value) is worth more than twice as much : that is crazy.</p> <p>The only stated ground for such proposal to stop the lowering of the differential is at p 30 & 31 of the Co nsult Doc</p> <p>"council has assessed the relative rating contributions to find a suitable balance between commercial and residential properties in the context of cost of living increases and impact on residential ratepayers" and "council's proposal will spread the rates rise more evenly and result in less variation in the percentage increase for commercial and residential properties"</p>	<p>Council has a policy to collect a set percentage (22.6 in 2022/23) of total rates from commercial rates and this was consulted on when we did the 2021-31 Long Term Plan. The commercial differential recognises the additional services that businesses receive, such as extra rubbish collection, street sweeping and events to attract visitors. The percentage collected has been decreased by 0.5% per annum for the last five years to reduce the burden on the commercial sector. The Long Term Plan outlined that Council would, subject to an annual review, continue to reduce the proportion of rates collected from commercial properties by 0.5% per year for the first three years. Council has assessed the relative rating contributions to find a suitable balance between commercial and residential properties in the context of the cost of living increases and impact on residential ratepayers. The council's proposal around maintaining 2023/24 commercial differential at the same level as 2022/23, where 22.6% of total rates are collected from commercial rates is based on that assessment. If Council were to continue to reduce the commercial differential by 0.5% this would result in 22.1% of total rates being collected from commercial rates. Council's proposal will spread the rates rise more evenly and result in less variation in the percentage increase for commercial and residential properties.</p>
			I do not accept those suggested grounds. As noted elsewhere in this Submission, the Residential General Rate (single unit) increases by 7.96 % (from 34.323 cents to 37.058 cents per \$100 of Land Value) whereas the Inner City Commercial General rate (single unit or vacant) increases by 11.38 % (from \$1.59411 to \$1.77553 per \$100 of Land Value). In other words the Inner City Commercial increase percentage is 54 % greater than the Residential Rate increase.	See above.
2.27 Corporate Finance	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	Also, the whole statutory theory of rates is that (in Nelson) they are based on land value - and not on "ability to pay"	The reason for a residential property in the inner city area to be charged residential general rates whereas another property of same land value (whether used for commercial purpose or vacant) will be charged the inner city commercial differential is because, they are used for two different purposes of which rating treatments are different. The rating units in the inner city zone are available for commercial use and will be treated as such until they become residential. Residential rating units in commercial rating areas are charged the residential general rate. Properties that are both residential and commercial pay a percentage of commercial and residential rates. The residential general rate is not differentiated by property location. Council is intending to review it's rating policy as part of the next Long-Term Plan.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.27 Corporate Finance	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	Please do not treat this Submission by saying something like "this is a possible problem: we will consider it over the next 12 months". This has to be resolved now (i.e. before the end of June) for I submit that Council simply has no legal authority to fix its differential rates in that manner for the coming year. I am prepared to discuss this Submission in detail with Council's lawyers prior to the oral Hearings.	Over the past few years, Council has progressively reduced the UAGC from 15% to 11% of total rates (excluding the water annual charge and water volumetric charge) in 2022/23, as its focused investment in three waters infrastructure has increased the overall fixed charges, and therefore the impact on lower value properties. In response to the 2023/24 increase in three waters fixed charges, Council proposes to lower the UAGC to \$320 (8.7% of total rates) for 2023/24. This also helps to spread the rates increase more equitably, resulting in less variation in the actual rates increase for individual properties. Council carefully considered a number of scenarios of moving UAGC to different ratios but the requested scenario as per your SR2317697 is not one of them.
2.27 Corporate Finance	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	I submit that the present definition is grossly unfair - especailly to small commerical allotements that have more than one shop: for example a small commerical property with a few shops pay several UAGCs whereas a hotel/motel with tens of residential units pay only one UAGC. I accept that it is possibly not the appropriate time to fully consider that aspect as part of the Annual Plan, but I submit that the Annual Plan should foreshadow a re-consideration of the definition within the next 12 months.	Council currently has a rates remission policy for separately used or inhabited parts of a commercial rating units less than 20m2. This policy gives relief from the uniform annual general charge and wastewater charge for very small separately used or inhabited parts of commercial rating units referred in your submission.
2.27-Corporate: financial	234	Glenys MacLellan	Personally I do not think the IFRS system now required for Councils is the right one for them, particularly in regard to public asset management. E.G. Depreciation is a tax tool for taxpaying incorporated entities, Councils need to be looking at their public infrastructure through a realistic lens of what state the asset is in, how long has it been there, is it likely to fail in its entirety, where all the high cost repairs are likely to be, what magnitude of costs will need to be covered and by whom for replacement, etc. Funding the historic cost doesn't do this and public asset renewal is never less than the historic cost. Forward funding contingencies based on realistic assessment of public assets' needs that Councils will have to fund/find funding for would be much more useful along with funding options. Thinking that things will eventually go back to any previous normal is totally misguided. New ways of thinking and doing are needed and we needed to start decades ago, we are way behind where we need to be. It's time for action.	Thank you for your submission and we understand your concerns mentioned above. Our infrastructure team performs periodic condition assessments to understand the state of our infrastructure assets which helps us to drive/manage our assets maintenance programmes. Also the Infrastructure assets are revalued every year to address the risk of depreciation being not sufficient to fund the asset in the future. For the last year (2022/23) rate increase was 5.4%, which was below the rate of inflation at that time, the exact amount that your rates change depended on several factors, including the 2021 revaluation of your property. Land values in Nelson have increased substantially over the past three years, and some properties have increased more than others. Although for some properties, rates have increased by more than the average in the 2022/23 rating year, Council's income does not increase by the same percentage. Rather, the land revaluations reallocate the proportion of Council's annual income paid by each ratepayer.
2.27-Corporate: financial	249	Shane Drummond	I oppose the plan to stop reducing the percentage that Commercial ratepayers have to pay in respect of the total General Rate. It is grossly unfair to shops and commercial users to pay such large differentials in addition to the Residential Rate I oppose the idea that Residential users living in the Commercial Zone should only pay Residential rates instead of the relevant Commercial General Rates which are nearly 5 times higher	Thank you for your submission. The extra charges levied to commercial ratepayers recognizes the additional services that businesses benefit from Council funding such as car parking, rubbish and street cleaning and funding events to attract visitors to the region etc. The percentage collected has been decreased by 0.5% per annum for the last five years to reduce the burden on the commercial sector. The Long Term Plan outlined that Council would, subject to an annual review, continue to reduce the proportion of rates collected from commercial properties by 0.5% per year for the first three years. Council has assessed the relative rating contributions to find a suitable balance between commercial and residential properties in the context of the cost of living increases and impact on residential ratepayers. Council proposes that in 2023/24 the commercial differential is maintained at the same level as 2022/23, where 22.6% of total rates are collected from commercial rates. If Council were to continue to reduce the commercial differential by 0.5% this would result in 22.1% of total rates being collected from commercial rates. Council's proposal will spread the rates rise more evenly and result in less variation in the percentage increase for commercial and residential properties. At present residential rates are levied to all residential rating units regardless of their location. Council will be reviewing its rating options as part of its next Long-Term Plan.
2.27-Corporate: financial	309	Gaire Thompson	*I am very concerned at the increase in our debt to \$199.6m	We understand your concern however this is similar to the LTP 2021-31 debt level of \$192 million. The impacts of August 2022 severe weather event has meant that Council has had to borrow more money to fund the recovery costs and this has meant reprioritisation of some capital projects. The estimated cost of recovery work in 2023/24 is about \$11.5 million (excluding any recovery funding from other sources). This will be on top of the \$20 million we are forecasting to spend on recovery work in 2022/23. Although the Council is getting some government funding and insurance claims to fund the recovery work, it is not fully subsidised which will increase our debt level. The debt to revenue ratio of 119% at 30 June 2024 is still well within the LTP2021-31 cap of 175%.
2.27-Corporate: financial	309	Gaire Thompson	* I am also very concerned that the \$12m that the council received from the sale of its pensioner cottages is just being given away in lump sums rather than just the interest return being given to these projects.. *	The Council has divested its community housing portfolio (142 bedsits and units) to Kāinga Ora with final settlement occurring in March 2021. Council agreed to establish a Housing Reserve using the proceeds of the divestment (\$12 million). The Housing Reserve has been established on the basis that its purpose would be 'to work with and support partners who have the ability to deliver social and affordable housing solutions for the community'. The Housing Reserve is a contestable grants fund open to community housing providers and iwi trusts.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.27-Corporate: financial	325	Zinnia Foster for Hospitality New Zealand - Nelson Branch	We have a very strong objection to the proposals regarding commercial differential rates on pages 30 and 31. We note that in the long-term plan it was agreed that the commercial differential would be reduced by 0.5% per annum in the first three years of that plan, and then an ongoing review. It is unacceptable that in this annual plan there is a change of policy, which appears to be totally unjustified. Hospitality businesses in particular are relying on this burden being reduced over time, as was promised by the previous council and set in the long term plan. In fact this was a hard-won battle by the business sector with previous Councils. The justification for this in the annual plan is illustrated as "The commercial differential recognises the additional services that businesses receive, such as additional rubbish collection, street sweeping and events to attract visitors." We would challenge this: (i) there is no additional street cleaning, just the basic, which in itself has not been well executed if done at all over the last few years; (ii) there is no special rubbish collection for businesses as far as we are aware, and we all pay for our own private collections of rubbish; (iii) events are enjoyed by the whole population and not just a benefit to businesses. Managing and maintaining a clean, vibrant and welcoming city for residents and visitors is a basic function of Council, and not something for which businesses should be paying a premium.	Thank you for your submission. Although it is true that council had planned to reduce the commercial differential by 0.5% every year, as per Page 249 of 2021-31 LTP, this is subject to Council's annual review. This year Council decided not to do that to reduce the pressure on residential rate payers. As you mentioned in your submission, this recognizes the additional services that businesses benefit in particular such as funding events to attract visitors to the region. Council has assessed the relative rating contributions to find a suitable balance between commercial and residential properties in the context of the cost of living increases and impact on residential ratepayers.
2.27-Corporate: financial	332	Ali Boswijk for Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce	We oppose the proposed changes to the commercial differential rating system. In the current long term plan the commercial differential is set to be reduced by 0.5% per annum for first three years. Ninety three percent (93%) of business in the Nelson Region are small businesses employing less than ten people many of which are being impacted by the current economic pressures. In a recent business confidence survey conducted by the Chamber 87% stated that profitability was being impacted by the increased cost of doing business.	Council has assessed the relative rating contributions to find a suitable balance between commercial and residential properties in the context of the cost of living increases and impact on residential ratepayers and have not reduced the commercial differential this year. This will be reconsidered in the LTP 2024-34.
2.29-Economic Development	28	David LYTTLE	Council needs to focus on the provision of core services and cut all needless spending. Core services are water, roads, sewerage and rubbish.	Council's purpose is to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of the community in the present and in the future, as stated in the Local Government Act 2002. Certainly providing water, roads, sewage and rubbish services is a key role of Council and one of our eight Community Outcomes includes ensuring our infrastructure is efficient, cost effective and meets current and future needs.
2.29-Economic Development	11	David Haynes	Reasonable hash of the 2023/24 plan. Presume there's no contingency fund for Murphy's Law?	The August 2022 severe weather event has meant that our emergency fund is overdrawn and for affordability reasons the severe weather event will be repaid over a 10 year period.
2.29-Economic Development	43	Dan McGuire	Cawthron Institute: This organisation has been, and is a major asset to Nelson and for that matter, the whole country but the issue of who should pay for the major realignment of infrastructure surrounding what was to be Cawthron's new HQ must now be confronted. At the same time, entities not paying rates must also be a topic for consideration around council tables. NCC owns many properties that do not pay rates.	Council is required to levy rates under the provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 Council. Schedule 1 of this Act lists properties that are deemed to be non-Rateable, however the Act also requires property owners of non-rateable land to pay rates for services provided like water and wastewater services. Council owned properties like carparks and Civic House all pay full rates while the legislation states Council owned properties used as a reserve or playground or for games and sports, public hall and swimming baths are deemed to be non-rateable.
2.29-Economic Development	67	Ian Williams for The Vic Public House and Burger Culture	Context for our Hospitality Businesses, The Vic Public House and Burger Culture The hospitality industry has been disproportionately and severely affected by the impact of Covid over the last three years. Government restrictions had a huge impact on our ability to trade. We also lost a high proportion of our business while borders were closed to visitors. Whilst life is almost back to normal, the impact we continue to face is: High wage inflation exacerbated by immigration settings and staff shortages (could yet be worsened by proposed FPA Agreements) Large rises in all our costs Severe shortages of chefs and managers impacting on our ability to operate at full capacity Rent increases and/or normal rents resumed Resumed paying outdoor dining rents to NCC from 1 December 2022 Paying back government loans, private loans and IRD accumulated debt I trust that Nelson City Council will understand the pressures on my businesses in keeping our costs down, and the need to operate in an attractive and vibrant city. Our industry is essential to the local economy in supporting tourism as well as the needs of locals, and to support city conferences and events around the year.	Council recognises the pressure that businesses in the hospitality sector are under. The impacts from closed international borders, staffing shortages, inflation and the current financial climate are challenging the viability of businesses in this core sector. Council looks forward to working with partners such as Uniquely Nelson, Nelson Regional Development Agency and the Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce to support the sector, including by activating our city centre to attract visitors.
2.29-Economic Development	209	Richard Brudvik for Whakatu Intellectual Capital Kohanga	I am particularly chagrined that our investment in economic development is woefully low. In the face of some of the most significant economic challenges in the country; the lowest wages, some of the most unaffordable housing, and some of the lowest productivity in the country, we should be actively investing in the economic development work required to turn this around. Council's capital expenditure investment in economic development projects is 0% and its operational spend sits at 2%, as per your own annual plan consultation documents. This is acceptable on what level? Resuscitating what was does not have the same benefit as creating value for the future. Are your priorities future focused?	Council owned properties like carparks and Civic House all pay full rates while the legislation states Council owned properties used as a reserve or playground or for games and sports, public hall and swimming baths are deemed to be non-rateable.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.29-Economic Development	233	Fiona Wilson for Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA)	<p>Introduction: Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA)</p> <p>NRDA is the regional development agency for the Nelson Tasman region¹. Our mission is to unlock the economic potential of Nelson Tasman to enable our people and places to thrive. We do this by leading inclusive and regenerative economic development, supporting our businesses and by shaping and amplifying our profile to attract people, business, and investment to the region. NRDA is a combined Economic Development Agency and Regional Tourism Organisation. NRDA is a Council Controlled Organisation, owned by the Nelson City Council, with funding contribution from Tasman District Council. NRDA operates under a three year Statement of Intent and within the strategic framework of the ten-year, 2021-2031 Nelson Tasman Regeneration Plan (Project Kōkiri 2.0).</p> <p>NRDA supports Council to deliver economic wellbeing and development, to enhance the sustainable economic vitality of the Nelson Region. In doing so, our functions and activities also impact cultural, social and environmental wellbeing. NRDA leads the oversight, delivery and reporting of the Nelson Tasman Regeneration Plan. All NRDA activity aligns with this Plan. This includes investment attraction, regional profiling, business advice, sector support, including blue economy and visitor economy, and supporting regional skills and workforce development.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to submit on the Nelson City Council Annual Plan Consultation Document 2023/24. We would like the opportunity to speak to our submission during Council's hearing process. Our key request in this submission is urging Council not to reduce investment in economic development in a time of economic challenge, which is the effect of Council's proposed zero inflation on NRDA funding for 2023/24.</p> <p>Feedback on Draft Annual Plan</p> <p>Our challenging economic context</p> <p>Our region faces significant economic challenges, many of which have worsened since the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan was developed. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest average wage - 22% below NZ average • Third worst home affordability - Our average home is 9.6 times average income in the region compared to a national average of 8.72 • Low Productivity - 21% below NZ average <p>¹ Nelson Regional Development Agency Ltd Constitution. Adopted by Nelson City Council 17 December 2015 ² Infometrics Regional Economic Profile: https://ecoprofile.infometrics.co.nz/Nelson-Tasman/StandardOfLiving/Housing_Affordability</p>	<p>Council appreciates the economic challenges and living pressures that you have highlighted and notes the low business and consumer confidence, which has been taken into account in the 2023-24 Annual Plan. As you have highlighted, Council's relationship and support to the NRDA is important for improving the region's productivity in ways that will alleviate these challenges. Ensuring the City remains attractive and liveable is a key way we can provide sustainable employment for the sectors that drive our economy. We look forward to working with the NRDA to make those employment opportunities ones that will be of added value, lift productivity, and increase wages. We acknowledge that housing affordability is a key driver in enabling the region to be able to provide such employment, and as such Council is supporting significant housing developments such as the Infrastructure Accelerator Fund upgrade to unlock city centre living.</p>
			<p>NRDA welcomes the recognition in the consultation document of current economic headwinds, challenges and cost of living pressures, and the importance that these challenges are heard and understood by Council when developing the annual plan. In addition to our regional economic challenges (and opportunities), Council's planning for 2023-24 is in context of low business and consumer confidence³, ⁴.</p> <p>As a significant employer, consumer and community leader, Council can support confidence, lead investment, support the community and provide an environment which enables and promotes economic development. In facing debts and deficits, a critical area which Council can also impact to counter negative economic outlook, is through its support of NRDA's work to improve productivity growth through enabling investment and innovation, to support business and skills growth, and to encourage people and businesses to live, work and invest in the region.</p> <p>Keeping Nelson liveable</p> <p>NRDA supports the recognition in the document of the importance of keeping Nelson liveable. Having and promoting a liveable city, with a dynamic economy, employment opportunities, and a vibrant events and arts scene, is a key part of the mix needed for Nelson to continue to be a place where people want to live and invest.</p> <p>Housing affordability, low productivity and wages, a constrained workforce, lower skills and qualifications and limited career pathways⁵ are all challenges to retaining and attracting skills and talent to the region. NRDA's efforts are focussed on these challenges and on strengthening the long-term attractiveness of Nelson – to promote the region as a place to live and work, to support increased productivity and to provide tools to support businesses to recruit talent.</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	7	Neil Lindsay	Keep up the good work on this and all the best for the rest of the process.	Thank you for taking the time to let us know that you support the Council's plans for 2023/24.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	13	Jaimie Barber	Your questions are seeking too narrow an answer i.e. they're leading questions. You should be seeking wider views and opinions.	Council invites feedback from the community in a number of ways, including submission on the Annual Plan, which allows for General Comments as noted on the submission form. The Annual Plan is an exceptions document with a limited number of changes from what was already consulted on through the Long Term Plan 2021-31. An opportunity for the public to provide feedback on a wider range of Council activities and services will be through the next Long Term Plan consultation in 2024.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	43	Dan McGuire	THINGS YOUR COUNCIL DOESN'T WANT TO TALK ABOUT: The examples in the dubious production known as Live Nelson only identity what NCC wants you to consider. Its constant attempts to put a positive spin on agendas without a word of the colossal calamities that have occurred over the last twelve years is more than a little annoying.	The Our Nelson issue delivered to households in Nelson on 29 March led with a four page spread outlining the key changes identified in the Annual Plan Consultation Document. We do want to focus our community feedback around these changes, as these are the most significant changes being considered in this year's Annual Plan. Nelsonians are welcome to submit on other matters, but it's important that we gather feedback that is relevant to the issues that are on the table. The Annual Plan is an exceptions document, which looks at what is proposed to change from the previous Long Term Plan. The scope for next year's Long Term Plan will be much broader and that will be reflected in the communications that Council puts out in Our Nelson.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	43	Dan McGuire	Let's start with the new CEO: I am told that he lives in Mapua and will be travelling each day to City Hall in a ratepayer funded vehicle. This is in spite of the fact that NCC has a climate emergency policy which is primarily designed to reduce vehicle numbers – mmmh!	In response to your comment regarding Nigel Philpott's commuting arrangements I wish clarify that he travels to work in his own electric vehicle, which is not funded by the Council. Nigel is very aware of environmental impacts and to this end, after purchasing his home in Mapua installed a 10 kw solar system that returns more than half of the energy generated back into the grid making his household a net producer of power. All of these actions are very much in keeping with Council's declaration of a climate emergency.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	43	Dan McGuire	Levies Paid to Local Government NZ: This is an issue that probably few people knew about but Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) has become a conduit for government of any colour to load up councils with wellbeing policies and legislation that we can do without. Nelson now needs to debate the merits or otherwise of this organisation. Auckland's mayor, Wayne Brown, has made a strong stand on this issue.	Local Government New Zealand supports and advocates for councils across the country, and ensures local issues are considered in national agendas and decision making. Council believes being a member of LGNZ delivers value in terms of the advocacy work it does on behalf of members, as well as the learning and development opportunities it provides for our staff.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	43	Dan McGuire	Paid Un-elected Appointees: I believe there are seven unelected people sitting around NCC tables who are seldom, if ever, heard of, paid by you to make decisions that suits their paymasters (councillors and executive staff). What's more, you can contact a councillor but there is no way of contacting these closeted appointees. You will no doubt be wondering how people get these jobs. Mayors have that role so you can imagine that appointees wouldn't want to bite the hand that feeds them. I am not opposed to people being asked to assist councillors with specific issues on a case by case basis but to appoint them permanently is guaranteed to see them become pawns in the hands of manipulative mayors. Most importantly, the cost of employing these people would make interesting reading.	Nelson City Council, like many councils, periodically appoints members to its committees. This can occur for a variety of reasons – particular subject matter expertise may be required, or it may be recommended best practice to have independent members (for example, the Office of the Auditor-General strongly recommends that an Audit and Risk Committee have independent members including the Chair). The recruitment and remuneration of appointed members is guided by policy, and the appointment must be approved by resolution of Council in a formal meeting. Appointments are for a fixed term, as under the Local Government Act 2002 most committees are disestablished at the end of a triennium (the three year period of a Council). The policy outlines the current honoraria levels for appointed members which are: External committee chair - \$16,000 plus tax per year External committee member - \$12,840 plus tax per year External subcommittee chair - \$10,000 plus tax per year External subcommittee member - \$7,000 plus tax per year Nelson City Council also currently has taskforces which are non-decision making working groups able to progress a particular piece of work towards a decision of Council. Some taskforces have external participants who are subject matter experts on the topic the taskforce has been established to address. If external participants on taskforces are paid this is through contractual agreement rather than receiving an honorarium. Council considers that the ratepayer receives good value for the experience and expertise appointed members contribute.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	43	Dan McGuire	Replant in Natives: The area of council land in the Maitai Valley that was logged just prior to the storm in August should be replanted in natives. That area is too steep to sustain logging without considerable erosion resulting. Why did the mayor appoint another committee to look into this? That smacks of the same sort of emphasis on constant process by the previous mayor, which cost ratepayers many millions of dollars.	On 9 February 2023, following the recommendation in the Mayors report, Nelson City Council established the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce to consider the future of Council-owned plantation forestry. The choices between the existing rotational planting of Pinus radiata, alternative exotic species or permanently re-establishing in native forests – is complex, requiring good technical advice and consideration of differing priorities. The taskforce will provide recommendations to Council so any change in policy can be included in consultation on the Long-Term Plan 2024-34.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	92	Peter Lole	Compliments on a comprehensive document with clear communications.	Thank you for your support and taking the time to let us know.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	108	Colin Ratcliffe	Forest. I am not sure if this is the appropriate place to comment, but If the main problem with Council forestry is "slash" it is possible that in years to come Government will introduce some further control to alleviate this problem. Also any alternative species plantings will take many more years than pines to produce a significant result relating to co2 absorption.	A review to consider the future of Council-owned plantation forestry is underway with the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce. Council has already, as part of the Marden Valley harvesting, been using methodologies that will limit the formation of slash. This will be considered further on all future commercial harvesting operations. Council will consider the outcome of the ministerial inquiry into forestry slash in the North Island on improving the rules around forestry and managing forestry slash. The improved methodology currently been used on the Marsden Valley harvesting utilises a new felling machine, a Timberpro TL 775D. With this machine trees are cut, lifted, and slowly lowered to the ground. At this slower speed, trees aren't at risk of breaking when they fall, which makes for a much cleaner harvest with less slash left behind. Any slash that is produced will also be recovered where possible and turned into biofuels or landscaping products. The taskforce will consider the technical advice and differing priorities, including sequestration of carbon, between the existing rotational planting of Pinus radiata, alternative exotic species or permanently re-establishing in native forests.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	145	John Glaisyer	Good luck to the whole of the council in whatever they are able to achieve so that the people of Nelson and visitors can see what a good place we live in.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	199	Scott Burnett for Forest & Bird	<p>7. Forestry</p> <p>7.1. Forest & Bird commends Nelson City Council for launching its Right Tree Right Place forestry review.</p> <p>7.2. Pine plantation forestry has lost its social license in the wake of recent weather events across New Zealand which have highlighted the inadequacy of the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification scheme (greenwashing6) to adequately protect the environment from unacceptable pine forestry industry impacts such as erosion, sedimentation, slash, and wildings.</p> <p>7.3. Clear-fell harvesting has always externalised it's environmental impacts and our changing climate is making the risks and impacts greater. Clear-fell harvesting of steep slopes is no longer environmentally or socially appropriate.</p> <p>7.4. Top of the South councils are all engaged in pine forestry on their lands as a revenue generating activity. However, councils are also a regulatory and compliance agency, and this causes an issue of the gamekeeper also being a poacher. Forest & Bird would like to see Nelson City Council take a leadership position in role modelling responsible land stewardship in relation to its forestry operations because we cannot expect the industry to improve without the regulator leading by example. To this end Forest & Bird suggests:</p> <p>7.4.1. Nelson City Council seek to reduce risks by taking a catchment approach to harvesting to reduce the risk of erosion, slash and sedimentation during rainfall events. A catchment approach would see a staged approach to harvesting to reduce the area of slopes bare at any one time.</p> <p>7.4.2. Nelson City Council to stop clear-fell pine harvesting on steeper slopes and transition to alternatives, such as permanent native forest for carbon income.</p> <p>6 Salmond, A. (2023). Forestry firms should honour their promises. Newsroom. Retrieved from: https://www.newsroom.co.nz/ideasroom/forestry-firms-should-honour-their-promises</p> <p>7.4.3. Nelson City Council take a leadership role in exploring alternative harvesting techniques such as the line harvesting method, soon to be trailed in the Branch Valley in Marlborough.</p>	<p>As you have noted, the future of Council-owned plantation forestry is being reviewed by the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce. The taskforce will consider the technical advice and differing priorities, including sequestration of carbon, between the existing rotational planting of Pinus radiata, alternative exotic species or permanently re-establishing in native forests. Council has already, as part of the Marden Valley harvesting, been using methodologies that will limit the formation of slash. This will be considered further on all future commercial harvesting operations. Any slash that is produced will also be recovered where possible and turned into biofuels or landscaping products. Council will consider the outcome of the ministerial inquiry into forestry slash in the North Island on improving the rules around forestry and managing forestry slash.</p>
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	<p>Sale to Kainga Ora?</p> <p>There is no statement (in the ConsultDoc or elsewhere) as to what is happening in respect of Council's proposal in 2021 to sell valuable CBD properties at "under value" to I Council spent a large sum on the theoretical public "consultation" and subsequent matters, and I assume (from the silence) that those negotiations are at an end, and that the consultation/legal costs are dead money. However (whatever the position) the current situation should be disclosed in the ConsultDoc</p> <p>Assuming the possible sale to Kainga Ora is at an end, the relevant properties in Achilles Avenue and Rutherford Street should be sold - thereby reducing Council's debt load by some millions of dollars</p>	<p>Council is actively working with Kainga Ora on the social and affordable housing development for 69 to 101 Achilles Ave and 42 Rutherford Street. Council's decision to sell those properties to Kainga Ora was subject to a number of conditions, and work undertaken to date is aimed at satisfying those. Key to achieving that is the need to bring on board a development partner(s) for the affordable housing. Council and Kainga Ora are still committed to bringing this project to fruition to provide up to 175 social and affordable homes for Nelsonians.</p>
2.31 Other Feedback not covered above	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	<p>Sundry Surplus Properties bought for 'strategic purposes that have not been realised</p> <p>Properties that spring to mind include:</p> <p>Three properties in Haven Road which have been owned for over 10 years and cost over \$3.5 million, and have been substantially empty. Last year's income/expense details are</p> <p>250 Haven Road</p> <p>258 Wakefield Qy</p> <p>236 Haven Road</p> <p>expenses of \$321< expenses of \$50k expenses of \$77k</p> <p>nil income nil Income</p> <p>Council refuses to disclose income</p> <p>252 Wakefield Quay: Bought 9 years ago with annual expenses of over \$19k, and Council refuses to disclose income received</p> <p>19 Halifax Street bought over 2 years ago for well over Rating Valuation; has annual expenses of over \$35k, and no income</p> <p>Properties in Achilles Ave bought over 25 years ago at a cost of \$335k. Currently incur expenses of very nearly \$50k pa, and Council refuses to disclose income received</p> <p>Properties in Achilles Ave bought over 10 years ago at a cost of well over \$3 million; currently incur expenses of over \$102k pa, and Council refuses to disclose rentals received</p> <p>42 Rutherford St bought over 25 years ago at cost of \$7351<. Currently incurs costs of over \$1551< pa, and Council refuses to disclose rentals received. (Note "other expenses" - excl rates interest and depreciation - totalled over \$1301< last year and over \$91k the previous year: what could they be for?)</p> <p>The SBL property at 25-27 Bridge Street - recently bought for very nearly \$3 million: with no end use agreed.</p> <p>I am sure that there are many more: if only someone would investigate</p>	<p>The 2021-31 Long Term Plan (LTP) included an asset sale proceeds budget from 2022/23 at \$1.5m uninflated every second year. The 2023/24 Annual Plan has not amended this LTP decision. Work continues to assess the Strategic Property portfolio to identify assets that may be surplus to requirement. Regarding Point 6 of the submission: In May 2022, Council agreed to purchase the SBL site at 25/27 Bridge Street. Significance of the unbudgeted decision was considered by Council at the time of the decision as 'low'.The current Nbus contract with SBL expires on 1 July 2023, the vendor required use of the building until 1 July 2023. SBL requested the delayed settlement date of 1 July 2023 and Council agreed.The adopted Annual Plan 2022/23 provided for the funds to be split over the two years to reflect the settlement date agreed.</p> <p>There was no requirement to consult in the 2023/24 Annual Plan as the decision had been made fully in 2022/23 and the funds were committed.</p>

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.31 Other Feedback not covered above	232	John Malcolm Fitchett for J&K Issue Family Trust and self	<p>No update on whether the Spatial Plan from 2021 is being progressed, or discarded</p> <p>I am puzzled (and disappointed) that there is no clear statement in the ConsultDoc as to the status of the 2021 Spatial Plan. As already noted, citizens were told in 2021 that that was only "a vision" and would be consulted on at a later date.</p> <p>No such subsequent consultation has taken place, but one sees in the 2022 Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy a statement "the Nelson City Spatial Plan will provide a clear framework for investment in public realm improvements in the urban core to support a growing residential population".</p> <p>That sums up my concerns as to Council informal "consultations". It says it is "consulting" in respect of a vision -without any costings or detail - and then adopts that "vision" and the public has no input as to the costings and detail</p> <p>If a part of the Spatial Plan - e.g the 2021 Linear Park under the 2023 new name of Bridge Street Active Transport Corridor is being progressed (with or without adequate consultation) then that should be clearly stated; similarly, if parts of the Spatial Plan have been discarded, that should also be disclosed</p>	<p>Council engaged with the community on plans for the city centre for a period of approximately four months prior to the formal consultation on the proposed Spatial Plan which ran from 30 August 2021 – 1 October 2021. Council received 332 submissions, 80% of which were in favour of the proposed Plan. Te Ara o Whakatu was adopted by Council in December 2021. Further information is available on Shape Nelson http://www.nelson.govt.nz/building-and-property/city-development/city-centre-programme-plan-3/ Bridge Street Linear Active Transport Corridor (renamed from Linear Park in Te Ara o Whakatu) as a concept was consulted on in Te Ara o Whakatu. Further consultation and engagement with affected businesses, property owners and community groups will be undertaken as part of the progression of the project through the design and implementation/construction phases. No parts of Te Ara o Whakatu have been discarded.</p>
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	238	Doug Saunders-Loder for New Zealand Federation of Commercial Fishermen	<p>The New Zealand Federation of Commercial Fishermen (Federation) is a national organisation representing the interests of small-to-medium fishers across New Zealand. These fishers are significant contributors to the country's economic well-being and food security, supporting jobs/the seafood sector in regional Aotearoa and putting kaimoana on tables nationwide. The Federation works to ensure these hardworking Kiwis are supported at the local level, with council policies that ensure they can work in a coastal environment that is safe and conducive to a healthy, sustainable blue economy. The Federation welcomes the opportunity to submit to Council's Annual Plan 2023/24, and is doing so to support fishers in the region and to provide feedback from an industry body that is committed to supporting New Zealand's seafood sector and the environmental, economic, and community benefits it provides to the country's coastal regions. In March 2023, the Federation surveyed its members to gather qualitative and quantitative data on the effects of land-based activities and severe weather events on the marine environment, fishing and their businesses. The survey had a short lead-in time to allow the Federation to include the results in this submission. Twenty fishers from across New Zealand participated in the survey, and the Federation is confident the sample size is representative based on the conversations we have with fishers on a daily basis as they inform us about what they are seeing and experiencing on the water. Seventy-five percent of fishers "strongly agree" that the quality of water where they fish is worse after heavy rain or storms, due to silt, slash or other debris rubbish, describing long plumes of sediment or potentially hazardous logs in the water. Furthermore, 50 percent "strongly agree" and 20 percent "agree" these levels of silt, slash and other debris have had a negative financial impact on their business. This includes fishers active in the Challenger Region, which encompasses the Marlborough Sounds, Tasman and Golden Bays, and the West Coast. In light of these results, the Federation is advocating for Council to use this engagement period to prioritise budget and staff hours to developing a holistic, integrated management approach to land- and marine-based activities that fall under Council's authority in its subsequent Annual Plan 2023/24 and upcoming Long-Term Plan, including (but not limited to) forestry, agriculture, stormwater/wastewater management, and ecosystems management, to ensure that the effects of land-based activities do not impact our rivers, estuaries and coastal waters. The Federation also supports Nelson City Council's commitment to reviewing its regulatory role under the National Environment Standards for Plantation Forestry. The Federation is encouraged by Council's internal assessment to ensure it has the appropriate tools to evaluate its own 700 hectares of plantation forestry and the 70,000 hectares of private forestry across the region. The Federation is looking forward to the opportunity to consult on the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce's recommendations to Council about land use in the region to ensure there is an appropriate balance of economic interest for forestry and the blue economy, public recreation, and environmental stewardship on both land and in Nelson's coastal waters.</p>	<p>As you have noted, the future of Council-owned plantation forestry is being reviewed by the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce.</p> <p>Council has already, as part of the Marden Valley harvesting, been using methodologies that will limit the formation of slash. This will be considered further on all future commercial harvesting operations. Any slash that is produced will also be recovered where possible and turned into biofuels or landscaping products. Council will consider the outcome of the ministerial inquiry into forestry slash in the North Island on improving the rules around forestry and managing forestry slash.</p> <p>The taskforce will consider the technical advice and differing priorities, including sequestration of carbon, between the existing rotational planting of <i>Pinus radiata</i>, alternative exotic species or permanently re-establishing in native forests. Your request to consult with the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce will be relayed to the taskforce chair.</p>
			<p>The Federation strongly believes it is one of Council's essential responsibilities to dedicate resources to maintaining this natural taonga. Council must invest in a far more wide-reaching, holistic "mountains to sea" policy approach in its annual and long-term planning. Council needs to think more pragmatically about how the needs of the environment and the needs of the community and local economy and take a more structured leadership role in ensuring everyone's activities are having a necessary, long-term positive impact. Council should give proper regard to land-based effects on coastal rights and interests in fishing (and maintaining the environment that supports this activity), rather than treating these interests as a free good that can be eroded without consideration or compensation. Approaches cannot be scattergun - they need to be resolved from the top in a collaborative, "mountains-to-sea" manner.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	262	Rita Symns	<p>Families and young children need somewhere nice to live. Children (nor adults) do not want high rises buildings. No gardens in these, no birds etc.) (No privacy) (short answer).</p>	<p>Nelson's housing crisis affects all ages and sizes of households, in particular older singles and couples are overrepresented in those who are in unsuitable housing or have housing affordability issues.</p> <p>Intensification of the city, when designed properly can accommodate all types of household sizes. The Council and government investment in the Bridge Street Linear Active Transport Corridor and city centre play space involves significant improvement to amenity, recreation, access to services/schools/workplaces, active transport and outlook all designed to ensure city centre living is well supported. This is only one part of Council's housing initiatives and while high rise living may not be suitable for all, it does address one area of demand in the housing spectrum. Nelson needs more of all types of housing at an affordable price if the housing crisis is to be addressed.</p>

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	279	Ren Kempthorne	Please don't block the screen with 'Shape Nelson'. In 'Our Nelson' the info on the proposal 5 above is printed in white on black background and scarcely legible.	Thank you for your comments on Shape Nelson and Our Nelson. We agree that having contrast between text and background is important and our design principles allow for that. We are unclear about the specific concern you have with the Our Nelson document and would welcome further information on this from you. Please email kim.grade@ncc.govt.nz with further information, as she would like to address this matter for the future.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	282	Karen Jordan	It would be useful to see standards of service performance in light of the operational budget cuts (and given the acknowledgement that in constraining the rate increase, operational service may degrade). Understanding where and by how much performance degrades (without putting in a big overhead to capture the information and hence add to the burden) would be helpful. The leadership statements and objectives of collegial and cohesive working together for the benefit of Nelson is extremely positive and welcome.	Staff report quarterly to the Audit, Risk and Finance Committee on Performance Measures contained in our Long Term Plan 2021-31. Whilst Council is still expecting to meet the key targets as outlined in the Long Term Plan, the changes referred to in the Annual Plan consultation document relate to issues like Council contractor's response to services potentially taking longer. Council felt some reduction in service standards and frequency was warranted in order to keep rates rises down.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	288	Janet Tavener	I understand that there is a proposal to build another housing development in the Maitai Valley at Orchard Flat. I would like to suggest that the council purchases this land to ensure that it can remain reserve land in perpetuity for the benefit of all Nelson residents.	Thank you for your comment on the housing development at Orchard Flat. Council is not actively looking to purchase land for reserve in this area and will rely on reserves coming through as part of any subdivision development, if it proceeds.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	309	Gaire Thompson	*The council shouldn't be pandering to Maori for so many things that affect all citizens and visitors. Very pleasing to see the signage welcoming visitors to Nelson now in English as well as Maori.	We acknowledge your comments relating to Council's support of te reo Maori language. Council has legal obligations under various pieces of legislation to work with and consult with Maori. Council is committed to strengthening partnerships with iwi and Maori of Te Taihū and our Community Outcomes include that our communities have opportunities to celebrate and explore their heritage, identity and creativity.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	309	Gaire Thompson	* Our Nelson should be scrapped and the money saved would save ratepayers close to 1% I believe. The other news media would be only too happy to hopefully provide a balanced coverage on any worthwhile items.	Our Nelson does not cost anywhere near 1% of rates to produce. As a method of communications, the cost of producing Our Nelson compares favourably to the cost of print advertising and is used in conjunction with other methods of communication, including engaging with Nelson's media. Our most recent communications survey shows that the population prefer to have a variety of methods to receive Council information, with Our Nelson being particularly popular with those aged over 65 with 73% saying they read
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	311	Melenie Parkes	Overall Nelson and the world are facing challenges: post-pandemic economies facing inflation and cost of living pressures, impacts from climate change, a significant housing shortfall, political polarity, etc. But Nelson cannot fixate looking backward on recovery response or austerity measures that will hold us back. Nelson needs to remain competitive to attract the kind of people (talent) and investment to build Nelson's future. Cities and regions across New Zealand are in competition to attract people, business, and visitors. Council needs to look forward and be bold! If Nelson does not step up, other cities certainly will be bold and we will be left behind. I am concerned Nelson is already moving backward, losing the Science-Technology development at the Port and Council's decision not to move forward with a new library development.	Council recognises the importance of ensuring we attract talent and investment into the region and works closely with key stakeholders to ensure we are seen positively by visitors, investors, international students and migrants. We work closely with the Nelson Regional Development Agency (NRDA) which is the Regional Tourism Organisation and profiles the region both nationally and internationally. As you note, the loss of the science and technology hub is a blow but Council will be investigating opportunities for the development of a new community hub, including a library, in or close to the city centre.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	314	Susan Ledingham	Community development, both infrastructure and services, that is intended for the public good is FAR MORE important in times like now, when sectors of the community are struggling with rising costs and we are experiencing great levels of hardship and more signs that social cohesion is being eroded.	Council values and continues to support the work of our community groups, however increasing funding for community groups needs to be considered in light of the increasing financial pressures facing ratepayers and households. Council does not wish to increase rates at above the 7.2% rate of inflation. The same inflationary pressures, along with other impacts like the August 2022 severe weather event, are also driving up costs at Council. Council has had to make many difficult decisions regarding trade-offs for the 2023/24 year to balance rates affordability with delivering infrastructure and services that meet community expectations and our projected growth. This will help us manage budgets and seek value for money for ratepayers, while still investing for the future and maintaining key community services. One of the trade-offs is not applying CPI to grants to community groups.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	325	Zinnia Foster for Hospitality New Zealand - Nelson Branch	We trust that Nelson City Council will understand the pressures on hospitality in keeping our costs down, and the need to operate in an attractive and vibrant city. Our industry is essential to the local economy in supporting tourism as well as the needs of locals, and to support city conferences and events around the year.	Council appreciates the pressures that the hospitality sector has experienced over the last few years. It will continue to support businesses by providing services such as street cleaning (extra funding added for Upper Trafalgar St in 2023/24), supporting events that attract visitors, and unlocking city centre living. Council is also focused on ensuring the City remains attractive and livable as one key way we can provide sustainable employment for the sectors that drive our economy.

Item 6: Deliberations on the Annual Plan 2023/24 submissions: Attachment 1

Category	No.	Name	Submitter comments	Draft response to submitter
2.30 Other feedback not covered above	326	Peter Olorenshaw	Seek Reimbursement From Forestry for costs of clearfelling above water pipeline necessitating new bridge for and a new section of pipe, a new cycle/walk bridge. Its is quite clear that this clear felling and he resultant slash and gully erosion took out the pipe and cycle trail. If this area was in mature native bush it is most unlikely this damage to infrastructure would have occurred. It is not fair that ratepayers pick up the tab for clear felling profit making damaging our infrastructure.	A review to consider the future of Council-owned plantation forestry is underway with the Right Tree Right Place Taskforce. The recent harvesting of the Maitai block has been replanted in grass and will not be replanted in pine. The harvesting of this block unfortunately happened just before the August 2022 weather event and that resulted in the slip and the damage to the raw water pipeline. In addition, the pending Marsden Valley harvest (due to commence in May) will also not be replanted back in pine and will be planted in grass as a temporary measure pine pending the outcome of the taskforce review. This harvesting will also use new methodologies that will significantly reduce the formation of slash and this will be considered further on all future commercial harvesting operations. Council will also consider the outcome of the ministerial inquiry into forestry slash in the North Island on improving the rules around forestry and managing forestry slash. We have submitted insurance claims for the footbridge and pipeline.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	332	Ali Boswijk for Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce	We support the areas of of immediate focus. Given the significant role that Council has as an investor in the region, we strongly support the focus on being cohesive and effective. Efficiency and robust decision-making are essential. We also fully support the intent to work closely with Tasman District Council for greater regional collaboration and strategic alignment. See submission.	
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	351	Anne Rush for Make/Shift Spaces Incorporated	ABOUT MAKE/SHIFT SPACES Make/Shift Spaces Incorporated is part of a global movement to re-use, re-invigorate and represent un-used spaces in our city- vacant shops, building sites, and walls. Make/Shift works with artists, creatives, community and special interest groups to fill spaces with vibrant installations and activity. Make/Shift also focuses on story telling that has resonance to Whakatū Nelson. Our placemaking initiatives involve engagement with a variety of people and communities, and creates a better atmosphere in our city. Property owners see the value in having activity and vitality in, or on their properties making them desirable prospects to potential tenants. Make/Shift Spaces is making Nelson an incubator for new thinking, ideas and actions that challenge and inform our civic environment in the 21st century. Make/Shift Spaces presently acts as the co-ordinator of the Shared Communities Consortium funding applications to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage Make/Shift Spaces Inc. is a NGO with charitable status that has a three year contract with NCC for \$83 360 (excl GST)1 July 2022- 30 June 2024 Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to this NCC Annual Plan 2023-24. We have made the below comments on areas in the NCC Annual Plan 23-24 we feel are important. Make/Shift Spaces Incorporated appreciates the issues our city faces with the August flood event, and the aspiration to be prudent with budgets by postponment of certain projects. Make Shift Spaces Inc. has accutly observed the rhythms and activity in the city since its formation in 2019. The delaying of the civic projects like the library/ community centre is dissappointing, but we believe should use the extra time wisely to plan an exceptional and visionary plan for our city.	Council would like to acknowledge the wonderful mahi Make/Shift has undertaken since its launch in 2019, to create a more vibrant and welcoming city by repurposing spaces that would otherwise lie empty. You have delivered great value for the funding Council has provided and have developed opportunities for our creative community through the partnerships you have built with property owners. The Shared Communities research that Make/Shift is supporting has significant potential to remove barriers for our migrant communities to celebrate their cultures and to enrich the creative life of the whole city. We hope the value of your project is recognised with the central government funding it deserves.
2.30-Other Feedback not covered above	351	Anne Rush for Make/Shift Spaces Incorporated	PARTNERSHIP WITH MĀORI AND IWI -He Waka Hourua Pg 27 MSS endoses this strategy.. Our city needs and will be better off in addressing this long term imbalance.	Your support for Council's commitment to strengthening partnerships with the iwi and Māori of Te Taihuhu is appreciated. The \$500,000 Council funding for the Te Taihūtanga Design and Identity Project is one of the exciting opportunities in this space, using a truly iwi-led process and involving all Ngā Iwi o Te Taihuhu.

Staff have reforecast the current year capital spend to 30 June 2023. The projected capital forecast is \$61.9 million excluding staff time, joint business units, vested assets and Aug 2022 flood recovery budgets, with savings of \$3.2 million. Capital carry forwards requested of \$21.9 million are spread across years 3 - 4 of the Long Term Plan 2021/31 and are included in attachment 2 for Approval. (Changes to scope adjustment are included in the forecast total but excluded from savings and carry forward totals.)

Line No.	CAPEX Carry Forward Report	2022/23 Operating Budget	Forecast 2022/23	Savings / (Overspend) 2022/23	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 3 2023/24	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 4 2024/25
1	Grand Total	86,497,925	61,862,400	3,150,337	18,907,587	3,034,434
2	Corporate	7,274,143	4,810,705	62,014	1,624,048	959,016
3	1015 Members Expenses	27,810	0	30,900	0	0
4	Elected Members' Devices	30,900	0	30,900	0	0
5	1504 Civic House	2,871,559	628,716	(49,368)	1,560,994	959,016
6	Civic House Refurbishment	413,263	11,787	0	401,476	0
7	Civic House Roof Cladding	711,124	0	0	0	711,124
8	Detailed Seismic Assessment review	25,000	27,289	(2,289)	0	0
9	Civic House roof and structure	0	47,079	(47,079)	0	0
10	Civic House Ceiling Tiles	1,447,892	53,982	0	1,146,018	247,892
11	Floor 1 upgrade	13,500	0	0	13,500	0
12	1540 Forestry	505,800	377,182	128,618	0	0
13	Marsden Forest Roding	0	60,623	(60,623)	0	0
14	Maitai Bridge	181,302	0	181,302	0	0
15	Roding Bridge	324,498	316,559	7,939	0	0
16	2530 Administration	1,887,380	1,828,412	(48,136)	63,054	0
17	Computer Hardware - Client devices	83,430	147,000	(63,570)	0	0
18	Computer Hardware - Network Devices	210,050	213,000	(2,950)	0	0
19	Mobile Devices and Headsets	55,000	75,000	(20,000)	0	0
20	Parking Enforcement mobile devices	16,485	0	16,485	0	0
21	IT Infrastructure Hosting Investigation	566,500	510,000	56,500	0	0
22	Asset Management System enhancements	103,000	20,000	33,000	50,000	0
23	Data Warehouse enhancements	28,840	10,000	18,840	0	0
24	Intranet Replacement Project	13,762	5,000	8,762	0	0
25	Aerial Photography and LiDAR	16,480	27,250	(10,770)	0	0
26	EDRMS Replacement	215,368	279,559	(64,191)	0	0
27	EDRMS Upgrades	20,600	0	20,600	0	0
28	Core Systems enhancement	296,733	355,000	(58,267)	0	0
29	Capital: Comp: S/ware: NCS	43,054	30,000	0	13,054	0
30	Meeting / Agenda / Action Mgmt System	45,990	27,110	18,880	0	0
31	Nmap upgrade	27,475	28,930	(1,455)	0	0
32	IRIS Next Gen	164,671	164,671	0	0	0
33	Parks & Active Recreation	8,551,191	6,864,606	515,316	977,527	0
34	3505 Public gardens	471,786	472,356	(4,715)	0	0
35	Renewals: Furniture	7,861	7,576	285	0	0
36	Isel park bridge upgrade	0	5,000	(5,000)	0	0
37	3520 Neighbourhood Parks	2,784,518	2,504,273	677	151,155	0
38	Capital: Furniture	10,707	12,047	(1,340)	0	0
39	Capital: Fences and Walls	10,990	20,120	(9,130)	0	0
40	Upgrade: Structures	84,500	0	0	84,500	0
41	Reserve Development Programme	11,962	10,000	1,962	0	0
42	Grove Street Reserve Extension	144,185	135,000	9,185	0	0
43	Atawhai Reserve Improvements	66,655	0	0	66,655	0
44	3530 Conservation Reserves	76,509	28,627	0	30,000	0
45	Renewals: Accessways/Car Parks	33,384	3,384	0	30,000	0
46	3531 Landscape Reserves	621,266	597,338	(19,000)	30,300	0
47	Capital: Signs	22,619	2,619	0	20,000	0
48	New Plant and Equipment	41,000	60,000	(19,000)	0	0
49	Walkway link from the Wood (Cambria St) to Stanley Whitehead	10,300	0	0	10,300	0
50	3532 Esplanade & Foreshore Reserves	1,183,603	890,721	0	267,916	0
51	Growth: Furniture/Signs	854	3,982	(3,128)	0	0
52	City to Maitai Hub track	286,044	15,000	3,128	267,916	0
53	3540 Walkways	139,740	146,356	360	0	0
54	Tahuna Beach to Great Taste Trail (airport)	125,360	125,000	360	0	0
55	3590 Sports Parks	420,711	302,204	0	126,100	0
56	IT hardware renewals	5,495	995	0	4,500	0
57	Saltwater Cr bridge (Haven Rd - Traf Park)	80,000	59,900	0	20,100	0
58	Sportsground lighting improvements	51,500	0	0	51,500	0
59	Capital: Minor Development	103,000	53,000	0	50,000	0
60	3653 Trafalgar Centre	94,022	65,550	0	30,000	0
61	Trafalgar Centre storage solution	30,000	0	0	30,000	0
62	3654 Saxton Field Stadium	15,534	9,356	6,578	0	0
63	Saxton Stadium Renewals	10,109	4,396	5,713	0	0
64	Basketball hoops	6,865	6,000	865	0	0
65	3655 Saxton Oval Pavilion	10,345	15,738	(5,713)	0	0
66	Saxton Oval renewals	784	6,497	(5,713)	0	0
67	3657 Golf Course	44,884	3,624	0	43,000	0
68	Renewals: Furniture	8,102	3,102	0	5,000	0
69	Renewals: Services	30,426	426	0	30,000	0
70	Renewals: Accessway/carparks	8,499	499	0	8,000	0

Line No.	CAPEX Carry Forward Report	2022/23 Operating Budget	Forecast 2022/23	Savings / (Overspend) 2022/23	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 3 2023/24	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 4 2024/25
71	3673 Pools	184,341	116,010	0	75,581	0
72	Riverside Pool water heating system renewal	70,581	45,000	0	25,581	0
73	Renewals: Minor Assets	133,900	83,900	0	50,000	0
74	3695 Play Facilities	616,005	545,244	604	18,000	0
75	Renewals: Play Equipment	34,467	16,467	0	18,000	0
76	Bayview reserve playground	466,604	466,000	604	0	0
77	4040 Marina	1,351,916	822,079	536,200	0	0
78	Water Sports Building	536,200	0	536,200	0	0
79	4069 Saxton Field	557,231	366,350	325	205,475	0
80	Capital: General Development	49,325	0	325	49,000	0
81	New cycle/path development	356,475	200,000	0	156,475	0
82	Social	7,824,650	4,012,289	980,597	1,954,810	1,098,842
83	3820 Founders Park	763,606	139,595	0	690,599	0
84	Collection Store	701,524	45,000	0	656,524	0
85	Energy centre venue development	54,075	20,000	0	34,075	0
86	3830 Historic Cemeteries	28,255	16,636	60	12,300	0
87	Renewals: Accessways/Car parks	12,360	0	60	12,300	0
88	4005 Nelson Library	3,240,883	2,184,358	988,988	0	0
89	Detailed Seismic Assessment review	42,000	66,754	(24,754)	0	0
90	Renewals: Specialised Lib Equip	17,997	23,000	(5,003)	0	0
91	Renewals: Furniture & Equipment	50,992	40,000	10,992	0	0
92	Capital: Furniture & Equipment	5,990	1,164	4,826	0	0
93	Book Purchases: Periodicals	40,840	32,840	8,000	0	0
94	Capital: Audio/Digital	33,191	28,000	5,191	0	0
95	Elma Turner Library Extension/ Relocation	1,200,000	116,388	1,083,612	0	0
96	Library Ceiling strengthening	1,674,076	1,767,952	(93,876)	0	0
97	4010 Stoke Library	2,308	493	1,925	0	0
98	Furniture & Fittings renewal	2,473	548	1,925	0	0
99	4015 Nellie Nightingale Library Memorial	45,821	8,065	0	41,200	0
100	Nightingale roof repair	41,200	0	0	41,200	0
101	4020 Marsden Valley Cemetery	160,960	172,978	(15,000)	0	0
102	Capital: Minor Development	14,851	29,851	(15,000)	0	0
103	4025 Crematorium	58,816	51,566	4,624	0	0
104	Renewal: Plant & Equipment	61,920	57,296	4,624	0	0
105	4030 Toilets (Free)	86,441	42,300	0	48,711	0
106	Toilet Renewals Program	95,711	47,000	0	48,711	0
107	4031 Toilets (Charge)	123,934	66,721	0	62,000	0
108	Montgomery Sq Toilet renewal	122,000	60,000	0	62,000	0
109	4055 Community Properties	1,183,718	103,703	0	100,000	1,098,842
110	Refinery Gallery EQ strengthening	1,298,842	100,000	0	100,000	1,098,842
111	4061 Maitai Camp	1,351,019	459,917	0	1,000,000	0
112	Maitai Camp capital improvements	1,524,403	524,403	0	1,000,000	0
113	Transport	13,008,821	7,183,579	(36,848)	5,818,818	104,628
114	5001 Subsidised Roading	8,716,737	3,987,943	2,255	4,896,958	0
115	WC 224 Atawhai and Whakatu Cycle path Renewals	35,000	0	0	35,000	0
116	WC 212 Sealed Road Resurfacing	2,152,671	1,500,000	0	652,671	0
117	WC224 Cyclepath Renewals	180,879	50,000	0	130,879	0
118	WC 213 Drainage Renewals	225,640	50,000	0	175,640	0
119	WC216 Trafalgar Centre Footbridge	253,554	70,000	0	183,554	0
120	WC215 Structure replacement	309,255	12,000	2,255	295,000	0
121	WC225 Renewals: Footpaths	1,453,125	320,000	0	1,133,125	0
122	WC 341 Minor Improvements	53,213	1,936	0	51,277	0
123	WC 341Z Toi Toi/Vanguard intersection upgrade	50,000	0	0	50,000	0
124	WC 324 Nelson Future Access Study	293,404	14,337	0	279,067	0
125	WC 341Z Waimea Road / Hampden Street intersection upgrade	307,000	150,000	0	157,000	0
126	WC 341L Waimea Road Franklyn Street intersection improvement	100,000	0	0	100,000	0
127	WC 341 Seafeld Terrace Road Re-instatement	46,898	4,400	0	42,498	0
128	WC341 Domett St Upgrade	200,000	10,000	0	190,000	0
129	WC341L Selwyn Place Pedestrian Crossings	192,341	0	0	192,341	0
130	WC341W Widen Main Road Stoke Shared Path	60,000	0	0	60,000	0
131	WC341L Traffic calming to support speed reduction	180,000	100,000	0	80,000	0
132	WC341Z St Vincent Street Toi Toi Street raised roundabout	96,100	30,000	0	66,100	0
133	WC341Z Nile Tasman Roundabout raised platform	100,000	30,000	0	70,000	0
134	WC341W Quarantine Road Bridge Footpath (at Bolt Rd)	420,500	37,800	0	382,700	0
135	WC341 W Stoke Youth Park ped refuge	150,000	0	0	150,000	0
136	WC341 W Andrew Street crossing	10,000	0	0	10,000	0
137	WC452 NFAS Washington Road	89,334	3,720	0	85,614	0
138	WC341W Railway Reserve Lighting	541,807	300,000	0	241,807	0
139	WC341W St Vincent St cycleway crash reduction	38,575	890	0	37,685	0
140	WC 341W Bayview Cycle Refuge	125,000	80,000	0	45,000	0
141	5002 Unsubsidised Roading	1,422,373	932,180	(46,492)	387,642	104,628
142	Heritage panel renewal	3,508	0	3,508	0	0
143	Structures replacement	163,000	15,000	0	148,000	0
144	Land Purchase	19,999	371	0	0	19,628

Line No.	CAPEX Carry Forward Report	2022/23 Operating Budget	Forecast 2022/23	Savings / (Overspend) 2022/23	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 3 2023/24	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 4 2024/25
145	Davies Drive Connection Study	85,000	0	0	0	85,000
146	Road Drainage Improvements	207,745	50,000	0	157,745	0
147	Railway Reserve Lighting	0	50,000	(50,000)	0	0
148	Airport Bus Improvements	281,897	200,000	0	81,897	0
149	5030 Roothing Properties	9,416	5,508	4,120	0	0
150	Renewals - 6 Totara	2,060	0	2,060	0	0
151	Renewals - 8 Totara	2,060	0	2,060	0	0
152	5560 Public Transport	716,618	231,058	3,269	534,218	0
153	WC 531 CBD interchange	300,000	50,000	0	250,000	0
154	WC531 Bridge Street Bus interchange	208,218	100,000	0	108,218	0
155	WC 532 Bus Shelter Lighting	10,000	6,731	3,269	0	0
156	WC532 PT Minor Improvements	276,000	100,000	0	176,000	0
157	Environmental Management	2,543,741	1,433,126	3,854	327,851	871,948
158	4502 Monitoring The Environment	664,573	354,888	13,854	316,352	0
159	Renewals: Monitoring Equipment	266,900	548	0	266,352	0
160	Plant & Equipment	248,772	198,772	0	50,000	0
161	Healthy Streams	158,854	145,000	13,854	0	0
162	4508 City Development	1,475,760	669,830	0	11,499	871,948
163	Streets for People	847,210	400,000	0	0	447,210
164	CBD Enhancements	724,738	300,000	0	0	424,738
165	Pop up Park	11,499	0	0	11,499	0
166	4720 Navigation Safety	310,000	315,000	(10,000)	0	0
167	Renewal: Boat/Trailer	340,000	350,000	(10,000)	0	0
168	Wastewater	10,292,805	9,573,560	(19,036)	633,050	0
169	6405 Wastewater	10,292,805	9,573,560	(19,036)	633,050	0
170	Wastewater Pipe Renewals	134,378	145,000	(10,622)	0	0
171	Rutherford St (Little Go Stream) Renewal	626,356	615,000	11,356	0	0
172	Manhole replacement	51,500	71,857	(20,357)	0	0
173	Collingwood St Sewer renewal Manuka to Bronte	755,800	605,000	0	150,800	0
174	Pipe Renewals - Wolfe Street	1,000,000	800,000	0	200,000	0
175	Rising/swallows renewals	3,913	4,000	(87)	0	0
176	Atawhai Rising Main - Stage 1	250,000	120,000	0	130,000	0
177	Flow meter renewals	30,900	37,944	(7,044)	0	0
178	NWWTP Wetlands Plant renewal	257,500	132,500	0	125,000	0
179	Climate Change - Emissions Reduction Strategy Implementation	77,250	50,000	0	27,250	0
180	Washington/Hastings to Paru Paru PS Capacity Improvements	7,718	0	7,718	0	0
181	Stormwater	18,099,227	12,802,651	830,582	4,574,500	0
182	6510 Stormwater	18,099,227	12,802,651	830,582	4,574,500	0
183	Haven/St Vincent Culvert renewal	2,000,000	1,000,000	0	1,000,000	0
184	York Terrace	149,553	118,000	0	31,553	0
185	Stormwater Network Models	97,400	90,000	7,400	0	0
186	Capital: Poynters Cres	41,200	0	41,200	0	0
187	Washington Valley Stormwater Upgrade	4,254,447	2,340,000	0	1,914,447	0
188	Capital: Mount St / Konini St	9,200	5,000	4,200	0	0
189	Tahunanui Hills Stormwater Catchment 4 - Bisley Ave	584,831	284,831	0	300,000	0
190	Cawthron Crescent	213,676	215,000	(1,324)	0	0
191	Rutherford Stage 1 - Stormwater Upgrade	7,241,234	6,450,000	791,234	0	0
192	Tahunanui Hills Stormwater Catchment 3 - Days Track	978,500	50,000	0	928,500	0
193	Ariesdale/Thompson Tce	52,368	11,158	41,210	0	0
194	Strawbridge Sq Stormwater improvements	51,550	65,862	(14,312)	0	0
195	Vanguard Street LOS	499,000	149,000	0	350,000	0
196	Bisley Avenue	72,100	22,100	0	50,000	0
197	Centennial Park pump station outfall and stormwater Treatmen	775,974	775,000	974	0	0
198	Koura Road Detention Dam LOS	0	40,000	(40,000)	0	0
199	Water Supply	6,830,080	5,324,273	456,489	1,132,983	0
200	7005 Water Supply	6,830,080	5,324,273	456,489	1,132,983	0
201	Water Treatment Plant Renewals	159,650	109,650	50,000	0	0
202	Renewals: Headworks	118,450	68,450	50,000	0	0
203	Washington Valley Water Renewal	174,148	10,000	0	164,148	0
204	Nayland Rd - Aldinga to Songer	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
205	Renewals: Misc Pipes & Fittings	20,600	15,000	5,600	0	0
206	Pump Stations - Renewals	56,650	42,000	14,650	0	0
207	Renewals: Commercial Meters	164,800	202,341	(37,541)	0	0
208	Residential Meters renewals	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
209	Water Meter Replacement	20,600	15,637	4,963	0	0
210	Capital: Atawhai Res & pump Ma	175,000	0	0	175,000	0
211	Headworks Upgrades	355,350	255,350	100,000	0	0
212	Capital: Pressure Reduction	56,650	26,650	30,000	0	0
213	Capital: Ridermains	66,950	644	66,306	0	0
214	Capital: Backflow Prevention	180,250	189,890	(9,640)	0	0
215	Capital: Atawhai Trunkmain	101,500	0	0	101,500	0
216	Pressure Enhancement	50,000	20,000	30,000	0	0
217	Fire Flow Upgrades	51,500	0	51,500	0	0
218	Water Loss Reduction Programme	154,500	133,000	21,500	0	0

Line No.	CAPEX Carry Forward Report	2022/23 Operating Budget	Forecast 2022/23	Savings / (Overspend) 2022/23	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 3 2023/24	Carry Forward to/(back from) Year 4 2024/25
219	Natural Hazards Risk Remediation	184,151	150,000	34,151	0	0
220	WTP Fluoride Dosing	60,000	55,000	5,000	0	0
221	Capital: Atawhai No.2 Reservoir	259,105	120,000	0	139,105	0
222	Dam Upgrades	913,230	360,000	0	553,230	0
223	Flood Protection	12,040,822	9,825,166	357,369	1,864,000	0
224	6520 Flood Protection	12,040,822	9,825,166	357,369	1,864,000	0
225	Channel Bank Renewal	90,900	30,000	60,900	0	0
226	Trafalgar Park and Hathaway Tce	41,200	30,000	11,200	0	0
227	Maitai flood management	255,500	255,000	500	0	0
228	Coastal Inundation Modelling	76,000	50,000	26,000	0	0
229	Brook Stream fish passage	56,200	6,807	49,393	0	0
230	Jenkins & Arapiki (airport) - Flood Protection	113,389	103,389	0	10,000	0
231	Saxton Creek upgrade	77,439	55,000	439	22,000	0
232	Minor Flood improvement prgm	121,200	60,000	61,200	0	0
233	Murphy Street	100,000	60,000	0	40,000	0
234	Maire Stream Upgrade Stage 2	51,500	0	1,500	50,000	0
235	Saxton Creek Stage 4 Upgrade	11,589,992	9,889,992	0	1,700,000	0
236	Orphanage Stream - bunding Saxton Road East	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
237	Brook Stream Catchment Improvements	169,554	40,000	129,554	0	0
238	Inventory of Urban Streams	196,283	200,000	(3,717)	0	0
239	Upgrade Urban Streams	82,400	40,000	400	42,000	0

REPORT R27671

Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To deliberate on the submissions received on the proposed changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24.

2. Summary

- 2.1 Council consulted on proposed changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24 alongside consultation on the Annual Plan 2023/24 Consultation Document from 29 March to 30 April 2023. Forty-eight submissions were received, and five submitters spoke at the hearings on 11 and 12 May 2023.

Council, having heard submissions, must now consider the matters raised by the community and any new issues which have arisen that may impact on the Schedule of Fees and Charges.

3. Recommendation

That the Council

- 1. Receives the report **Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24 (R27671)** and its attachments (1598046314-107); and***
- 2. Approves increasing the Annual Pile Mooring fee by 7.2% for 2023/24; and***
- 3. Confirms the approach to adopting the changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24, as contained in Attachment 1 (1598046314-107).***

4. Background

- 4.1 Council's fees and charges for 2023/24 have been reviewed and most are increasing by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 7.2% which is within the

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

Chief Executive's delegation to approve. On 9 February 2023, Council adopted a Statement of Proposal for changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24 that required consultation. The proposed Schedule that went out for consultation is contained in Attachment 1.

- 4.2 The consultation for proposed changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges and the Annual Plan Consultation Document 2023/24 were run alongside each other for one month, between 29 March and 30 April 2023. Of the 48 submissions received on the proposed Schedule of Fees and Charges, 47 submissions were made by residents of Nelson, 0 from residents of Tasman and 1 was from a person residing outside the Nelson/Tasman region. 100% of submissions were made online. Five people spoke to their submissions at the hearings on 11 and 12 May 2023.

5. Discussion

- 5.1 Key topics raised in submissions and the recommended responses for Council's consideration are outlined below.

General feedback

- 5.2 Some of the submissions were generally supportive of the proposed changes, with comments that the proposals seemed reasonable and agreed the majority of the fees and charges should be covered by those receiving the benefit. Some submitters disagreed with proposing any increases above CPI and asked Council to be conscious of the current state of the economy and the ongoing financial impacts of the August 2022 severe weather event. One submitter also suggested more assistance for those eligible for rates rebates.

Charges under the Resource Management Act 1991

Resource consents processing and monitoring hourly charge out rate

- 5.3 Four submissions were received on the proposals for administration of resource consents and other activities. One submitter suggested any new subdivisions be fast-tracked and the red tape removed. Another submitter's view was that Council needed to employ or train more planning staff to reduce the reliance on outsourcing work to consultants.
- 5.4 One of the submissions was made on behalf of a farming organisation and noted that many activities farmers seek resource consents for are proposed to increase. While generally supportive of a user-pays regime, their view was that it should be put in the context of the many aspects of farming activity becoming more regulated and requiring resource consents. An approach was suggested where Council recovered consent costs from its ability to levy additional charges for actual and reasonable costs on each consent application. This would give applicants an opportunity to scrutinise the costs and ensure they represented fair fees for farming activities.

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

- 5.5 The same submission also opposed the proposed increase to the hourly charge-out rate, with comments that one of Council's reasons for the proposed increase, outlined in the Statement of Proposal, that 40% of staff time is not chargeable to resource consent applicants, was inequitable and not transparent. It was suggested that Council revise the resource management charges to reflect the expertise and time spent processing each resource consent application.

Environmental monitoring and science charge

- 5.6 One submission opposed the proposal to remove the charge for discharge to land or water of less than 20m³ per day.

Staff comment

- 5.7 Following consideration of the submissions, staff recommend increasing the fees under the Resource Management Act as proposed in the Statement of Proposal. The proposed increase of 16% for resource consent processing and monitoring hourly charge-out rate would improve the recovery rate from applicants and consent holders and reduce the requirement on rates.
- 5.8 The environmental monitoring and science charge has a minimal effect on the income used to offset the cost of the environmental monitoring and science activity and the income received is less than the cost of administration. Therefore, staff recommend revoking the charge.
- 5.9 In response to the submitter's comment on fast-tracking sub-divisions and removing red tape, staff note that the current priority is the processing of consents for the recovery from the August 2022 severe weather event. All other consents are processed as quickly as possible while ensuring appropriate assessments are undertaken.
- 5.10 In response to the submitter's comment on Council employing or training more planning staff, there is a nation-wide shortage of planners, so without the internal capacity, Council will continue to need to engage external consultants to assist with processing consent applications.
- 5.11 In response to the submission on resource consents for farming activities, staff are proposing the increase of 16% to recover up to 50% of the total costs of providing the resource consents services, as the current fees and charges would only recover 31% of expected costs.

Fees and charges under the Navigation Safety Bylaw

- 5.12 Seventeen submissions were received on the proposed amendments to fees and charges under the Navigation Safety Bylaw. Some were in support of the changes, but many were opposed, with general feedback asking that the fees not be increased above CPI. Some feedback commented that the proposed increases did not reflect improvements in the services provided by the Nelson Marina.

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

- 5.13 One submitter asked that Council reduce the marina and hardstand expenditure and suggested using the boat valuation to set fees for permanent moored boats, as is done with properties, or to have a higher per metre fee as the boat size increases.

Staff comment

- 5.14 Staff acknowledge the difficult financial climate for many, including those who use the Nelson Marina services. However, the Marina is a business which is also facing increased costs. Staff have focussed on increasing efficiencies and decreasing overheads, but fixed costs, such as power, insurance and interest rates, continue to increase. The fees proposed to increase over CPI are for areas where staff have assessed that a greater proportion of costs ultimately need to be passed on to those using the service.

Annual licence fee for marina berths, pile berths, commercial berths and live aboard fees

Feedback opposed the proposed increases in annual licence fees, commenting that increases could make it unaffordable for those who are on low to average incomes and noted that Nelson wages, and the value of boats in the Nelson Marina, are lower compared to other cities. Because of these factors, many did not think there should be an increase over CPI.

- 5.15 One submitter agreed with most of the amendments but disagreed with increasing the live aboard fee by 10%, suggesting reducing it to a 5% increase to reflect the security and general sense of community those who live aboard provide to the Marina.

Staff comment

- 5.16 Following consideration of the above feedback, staff recommend only increasing the "Annual Licence Pile Mooring" fee by 7.2%, as opposed to the 10% increase proposed in the Statement of Proposal. With the strong feedback that a 10% increase would likely not be feasible for many who currently pay this fee, as they are on low incomes, staff see an increase by CPI as a reasonable adjustment to the original proposal.
- 5.17 Staff recommend increasing the live aboard fees by 10% as proposed in the Statement of Proposal, which would allow the Marina to keep up with the inflation over the previous two financial years.

Visitor rate

- 5.18 Submitters noted the value visiting boats bring to the Nelson economy. Although feedback didn't specifically comment on the proposed 20% increase in visitor rate fees, one submitter suggested a longer-term visitor rate be established, based on a price per month rather than a daily or weekly fee. Another submitter suggested discounts be given to visiting boats that stay longer than a week or month or for yachts where nobody lives aboard.

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

Staff comment

- 5.19 Following consideration of the submissions, staff recommend increasing the berth fee visitor rate by 20%, as proposed in the Statement of Proposal. In response to the suggestion of a longer-term visitor rate, Council currently assesses applications for an extension over three months during the winter period.

Public boat ramp fee

- 5.20 Feedback on the public boat ramp fee supported the proposed increase as a fair reflection of the services and facilities provided, with one submitter suggesting a bigger increase to better reflect the true recovery of the cost of the service.

Staff comment

- 5.21 Following consideration of the submissions, staff recommend changing the public boat ramp fee as proposed in the Statement of Proposal. Although submitters commented that this was a minor increase, it is recommended that Council sticks with incrementally increasing the fee to \$15 over the next few years, rather than a one-off substantial increase.

Fees and charges for burials and cremation activities under the Urban Environments Bylaw

- 5.22 One submission was received on the proposed 20% increase to fees and charges for both cemetery and crematorium activities, which includes plots, internments, cremation and chapel hire. The submitter opposed increasing burial plot and burial interment fees for adults and children, commenting that with funeral costs increasing these fees should remain at the existing rate.

Staff comment

- 5.23 Following consideration of the above submission, staff recommend increasing the burials and crematorium fees by 20% as proposed in the Statement of Proposal. While staff acknowledge the community is seeing increased costs across many sectors, including funeral costs, a 20% increase would bring cost recovery closer to the targets outlined in Council's Revenue and Financing Policy and ensure a disproportionate burden did not fall on ratepayers.

Fees under the Food Act 2014

- 5.24 Five submissions were received on fees under the Food Act 2014, and all of these opposed the increase. Feedback included comments that the proposed fees were too high, particularly for small businesses, and that the increase was not justified and should be capped at 7.2%.
- 5.25 One submitter opposed the increase to the "amendment to registration" fee, stating they had been charged \$85 to change their address details and that the cost was not justified, particularly for those who only do

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

food vending part time and do not have high paying regular jobs. The same submitter also opposed the increase in the “registration food control plan” fee, arguing that for a small business it was already very hard to absorb those costs.

- 5.26 The same submitter suggested making the fees low so complying didn’t come at such a high cost and for making sure fees were clear and transparent so vendors knew what to expect and could plan accordingly.

Staff comment

- 5.27 Following consideration of the submissions, staff recommend increasing the fees under the Food Act 2014, as proposed in the Statement of Proposal. Staff acknowledge the challenges the hospitality sector has faced with the disruptions of COVID-19. However, the proposed increases are still assessed as improving the current allocation of costs between food business owners and ratepayers and that the fees would better cover the actual costs for the service.

Fees under the Building Act 2004

- 5.28 One submission on the proposed changes to fees under the Building Act 2004 noted that the cost of building has increased substantially and would like to see a “cost of building CPI” raise in the brackets applied every three years.

Staff comment

- 5.29 After consideration of the above submission, staff recommend changing the fees under the Building Act 2004 as proposed in the Statement of Proposal. The fees for 2022/23 were increased by CPI, but staff consider the proposed fees for 2023/24 more fairly reflect the actual costs incurred by Council in line with the Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy and that more costs sit with the building consent applicant than on ratepayers.

6. Options

- 6.1 Council has options for each decision it makes in relation to submissions, including making no changes to what was in the Statement of Proposal, increasing or decreasing fees, or removing fees. Each decision will have implications for projected income and feedback into rating implications for the final Annual Plan.

7. Next Steps

- 7.1 Staff will incorporate the Council’s deliberations decisions into the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24, prior to bringing it back to Council on 22 June 2023 for adoption. Following adoption final versions of the schedule will be published on Council’s websites and made available to the public by 1 July 2023.

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

Author: Ailish Neyland, Policy Adviser

Authoriser: Dennis Bush-King, Group Manager Environmental Management

Attachments

Attachment 1: 1598046314-107 - Proposed changes to the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24 [↓](#)

Important considerations for decision making
Fit with Purpose of Local Government <p>The submissions on the Statement of Proposal are an input into Council's decision making processes. They enable elected members to have an understanding of community views on the matters prior to Council deliberating and making decisions on the Schedule of Fees and Charges for 2023/24.</p> <p>The recommendations in this report assist to better allocate the cost of delivering services between users and ratepayers, helping to promote social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.</p>
Consistency with Community Outcomes and Council Policy <p>The recommended changes to fees and charges assists with achieving the stated funding outcomes in the Long Term Plan, and are aligned with the following community outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our unique natural environment is healthy and protected• 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.
Risk <p>If proposed changes are not approved, the income generated from fees and charges may not cover actual costs incurred and result in a financial shortfall. It is also likely to lead to far greater increases in the future. Increasing fees and charges by too high a level however could result in dissatisfaction by those impacted by the increase.</p>
Financial impact <p>The proposed increases in charges will better enable costs for the services to be met in the medium to long-term at an appropriate proportion between applicants/consent holders and ratepayers. The changes outlined will better meet the Revenue and Financing Policy requirements.</p>
Degree of significance and level of engagement <p>Staff assess the proposals outlined in this report as being of medium significance as they include increasing fees and charges above 7.2%, any new fees or removal of fees and those where the Resource Management Act and Food Act require formal consultation through a special consultative procedure.</p>

Item 7: Deliberations on the Schedule of Fees and Charges 2023/24

Consultation occurred for these matters in accordance with the required statutory purpose in parallel with the consultation for the Annual Plan 2023/24.

Climate Impact

The proposal in 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.

Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

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

Delegations

This is a matter for Council.

Proposed schedule of fees and charges changes for 2023/24

Please note all charges listed in this schedule are GST inclusive unless otherwise stated.

Resource Management Act 1991

Resource Consent Processing and Monitoring, Designations, Plan Changes, all other activities under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) will attract an initial charge (deposit) payable at the time of lodging an application as per Section 1 below.

Where the cost of processing the consent is not fully covered by the initial fixed charge (deposit), additional charges will be applied (under Section 36(5) of the RMA). Only additional charges can be objected to under Section 357B of the RMA.

Section 2 below lists the various methods of how costs may be charged to a consent.

1. Initial fixed charges (deposits)

	Activity	Current Charge	Proposed charge
1.1	All activities (other than listed below)	\$1575	\$1860
1.2	Subdivision 1-3 lots	\$1575	\$1860
	Subdivision 4 plus lots	\$2625	\$3095
1.3	Bore permits; Certificate of Compliance; Change of consent notice; Culverts, weirs and other minor structures on the bed of watercourses; Existing Use Certificate; Extension of lapsing period; Fast track consents (controlled status only); Fences; Flats Plan update and check; Outline Plan approvals; Relocate building; Removal or trimming of trees listed in the Nelson Resource Management Plan (supported and carried out by a suitably qualified arborist); Right of Way approval; Signs; Simple consent process; Transfer/part transfer of Permits	\$525	\$620
1.4	Issue of a notice confirming a boundary (or a marginal or temporary) activity is a permitted activity (no additional charges or refunds apply)	\$505	\$595
1.5	NOTIFIED APPLICATIONS: Additional charges for applications requiring notification/ limited notification. (This charge must be paid prior to notifying the application and is in addition to the initial charge paid when the application is lodged).	\$7345	\$8665
1.6	Removal of trees listed in the Nelson Resource Management Plan that are confirmed in writing by a qualified arborist (level 5 NZQA or equivalent), as diseased or a threat to public safety.	No charge	No charge

1598046314-107

	Activity	Current Charge	Proposed charge
1.7	Heritage Buildings: Non-notified application to conserve and restore heritage building, place or object listed in the Nelson Resource Management Plan.	No charge	No charge
1.8	Private Plan changes (Note: Council's policy is to recover 95% of the costs involved for the whole process from the applicant).	\$10,490	\$12375
1.9	Heritage Orders	\$3670	\$4330

1.10 Where an application involves multiple consents the initial charge is payable at the higher rate plus \$255.00 for each accompanying application.

1.11 Where all or part of any initial charge (deposit) is not paid at application time, the Council reserves the right to not process that application.

2. Costs Charged to a Consent (less the initial fixed sum of money paid in accordance with section 1 above)

	Details	Current charge	Proposed charge
2.1	Council Staff – all staff time inclusive of overhead component associated with processing and assessing applications.	\$170 per hour	\$197 per hour
2.2	Hearings Panel Charges:		
	- per Councillor as Commissioner (rate set by Remuneration Authority)	\$80 per hour	\$93 per hour
	- Councillor as Chairperson (rate set by Remuneration Authority)	\$100 per hour	\$116 per hour
	- Independent Commissioner (requested by applicant)	Cost	Cost
	- Independent Commissioner (requested by submitter)	Cost less Councillor rate (applicant pays the Councillor rate)	Cost less Councillor rate (applicant pays the Councillor rate)
	- Independent Commissioner(s) required for expertise or due to conflict of interest issues	Cost	Cost
2.3	Legal advisors and consultants engaged by Council, or reports commissioned, after discussion with the applicant, to provide expertise not available in-house under s.92(2) RMA.	Cost plus administrative charges	Cost plus administrative charges
2.4	Experts and consultants engaged by Council to undertake assessment of an application where the complexity of the application necessitates external expertise, or where resource consent processing is required to be outsourced due to conflict of interest issues (this is not a s92(2) RMA commissioning).	Cost plus administrative charges	Cost plus administrative charges
2.5	All disbursements, such as telephone calls, courier delivery services, all public notification costs, postage for notified applications and document copying charges.	Cost plus administrative charges	Cost plus administrative charges

1598046314-107

	Details	Current charge	Proposed charge
2.6	Consultants engaged by the Council where skills are normally able to be provided by in-house staff or when Council staff workloads are unusually high.	\$170 per hour	\$197 per hour
2.7	Urban Design Panel reviews a proposal before a resource consent application is lodged (except for circumstances identified in 2.8 below).	No charge	No charge
2.8	The applicant agrees (as per 2.3 above) to the Urban Design Panel reviewing the proposal after a resource consent application is lodged; or	Cost plus administrative charges (an estimate of costs is available on request)	Cost plus administrative charges (an estimate of costs is available on request)
2.9	Where the applicant requests under s357AB independent commissioner(s) for an objection under s357A(1)(f) or (g), the applicant will meet the costs for that hearing.	Cost plus administrative charges	Cost plus administrative charges

Monitoring Charges

- 2.11.1 If monitoring is required, a one-off charge of \$197.00 will be invoiced as part of the consent cost. Any extra work that is required to monitor compliance with the consent conditions will be charged at the hourly charge out rate for Council staff in 2.1 above and separately invoiced.
- 2.11.2 Monitoring charges associated with review of information required to be provided by a condition of resource consent will be charged for at the appropriate hourly charge out rate for Council staff or actual cost for specialist consultant.
- 2.11.3 Where the applicant is required or authorised to monitor the activity, the Council's costs in receiving and assessing the monitoring information will be charged directly to the consent holder at the appropriate hourly charge out rate for Council staff or actual cost of the specialist involved.
- 2.11.4 Where permitted activity monitoring is able to be charged under legislative provisions (such as the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry), the time taken by Monitoring Officers will be invoiced at the hourly charge out rate for Council staff in 2.1 above.
- 2.11.5 Where annual monitoring is required up to half an hour of staff time per year, a higher initial monitoring fixed fee up front may be charged, or the consent may identify regular intervals when monitoring charges will be invoiced calculated on anticipated staff time multiplied by a stated number of years for these types of consents.

1598046314-107

Administration Charges

	Item/Details	Current charge	Proposed charge
2.12.1	Insurance levy – for each resource consent.	\$30	\$30
2.12.2	Street naming and numbering (costs of reporting to Hearings Panel and advising all statutory agencies).	Council hourly charge out rate in 2.1 above	Council hourly charge out rate in 2.1 above
2.12.3	Street numbering – application for alteration.	\$130	\$150
2.12.4	Documents for execution – removal of building line restrictions; easement documents, caveats, covenants and other documents to be registered with LINZ presented after subdivision processed or where not associated with a subdivision application.	\$185	\$210
2.12.5	Certificate under Overseas Investment Act.	\$405	\$445
2.12.6	Confirmation of compliance with the Nelson Resource Management Plan for NZ Qualifications Authority.	\$405	\$445
2.12.7	Confirmation of compliance with the Nelson Resource Management Plan for alcohol licence applications.	\$75	\$85
2.12.8	Section 357 Administration charge.	\$335	\$390
2.12.9	Private right-of-way – review against existing names and advising all statutory agencies where appropriate.	\$335	\$390
2.12.10	Authentication report for small-scale solid-fuel burning appliance or open fire.	\$125	\$140
2.12.11	Removal of designation.	\$320	\$370
2.12.12	Swing Mooring annual charge (monitoring costs are additional, refer 2.10.3 above).	\$80	\$90
2.12.13	Transfer of Consents to new owner (S.135(1)(a), S.136(1), S.136(2)(a), or S.137(2)(a) Resource Management Act)	\$250	\$295
2.12.14	Claiming a swing mooring the Council removed from the Coastal Marine Area that did not have a coastal permit	\$315	\$365
2.12.15	Claiming a vessel that was towed and hauled out of the Coastal Marine Area as it was tied to a non- consented mooring that was uplifted	Cost for tow and haul out	Cost for tow and haul out

1598046314-107

Discount for Late Consents

- 2.13.1 Where statutory processing timeframes have not been met a discount of 1% of the total of the administrative charges imposed for every working day on which the application remains unprocessed beyond the time limit, up to a maximum of 50 working days will apply.

3. Invoicing

- 3.1 Where processing costs exceed the level of the initial charge (deposit), monthly invoices for any additional charges may be sent to the applicant.
- 3.2 Annual swing mooring charges shall be due on 1 December. The initial payment is due within 30 days of the mooring being installed. Moorings installed 1 December to 1 June will incur the full annual charge. Moorings installed from 1 June to 30 November will be charged half of the annual charge. The Council reserves the right to agree to other arrangements in writing.
- 3.3 The Council has no obligation to perform any action on any application until the charges for the action have been paid in full; such payment will be required by the 20th of the month following invoice.
- 3.4 Where any interim invoice is disputed, work on processing the application will be stopped until the matter is resolved at the discretion of the Manager Consents and Compliance.
- 3.5 The option of monthly invoices only, in lieu of initial charges, may be available on strict credit conditions as follows:
- The consent process, or Council involvement in the project, is likely to extend over a period in excess of 6 months; and
 - The total amount for invoices is likely to exceed \$5,000; and
 - The applicant is in good financial standing with a satisfactory credit record and agrees to abide by the Council's usual credit terms or
 - The applicant is a regular customer of the Council's Resource Consents Business Unit, is in good financial standing with no record of unpaid invoices, who agrees to pay each and every invoiced charge by the 20th of the month following the date of issue of the invoice.

Any disputes relating to an invoiced charge must be resolved after the invoice has been paid. Failure to meet these criteria will result in the option of monthly invoices, in lieu of initial charges plus monthly invoices being withdrawn.

The decision on whether to waive the required charge and institute a system of monthly invoicing shall be made by the Manager Consents and Compliance or Group Manager Environmental Management, having regard to the above criteria.

4. Pre-Application Charges

Detail	Charge
Pre-application discussion with staff on feasibility of a proposal that may not proceed to resource consent.	First half hour – no charge. Additional time charged on an hourly basis at the Council charge out rate as per 2.1.

5. Resource Management Planning Documents

Copies of Plans	Cost
Nelson Resource Management Plan - Text (hard copy)	\$150
Nelson Resource Management Plan - Maps (hard copy)	\$150
CD ROM – combined Nelson Resource Management Plan and Nelson Air Quality Plan – updated annually in Spring	\$15 annually
Nelson Resource Management Plan - hard copy updates issued as required	\$25 annually for text \$25 annually for maps
Nelson Air Quality Plan	\$50
Land Development Manual	\$100

1598046314-107

Annual Environmental Science and Monitoring Charges

Annual charges shall be due on 1 October or on the 20th of the month following the date of invoicing, whichever is the later, unless otherwise agreed in writing by Council. No charge will apply when a consent is deemed by the Council as not currently given effect to and the ability to give effect is not currently present.

In the case of consents for temporary or short-term activities, charges shall only apply once the consent is given effect to, and only for the year/s the activity occurs, until the activity is completed, and not from the date of issue of the consent.

Activity	Existing charge	Proposed charge from 1 July 2023 (7.2% CPI increase rounded down)
Air discharge - small (eg abrasive blasting; commercial wood-fired pizza ovens)	\$60	\$64
Air discharge - medium (appliances <1000kW)	\$400	\$428
Air discharge - large (appliances >1000kW)	\$600	\$643
Discharge to land or water <20m3/day	\$60	Recommend charge is revoked
Discharge to land or water 20 -100m3/day	\$400	\$428
Discharge to land or water >100m3/day	\$600	\$643
Gravel/sand extraction <2000m3/annum	\$60	\$64
Gravel/sand extraction 2000m-10,000m3/annum	\$300	\$321
Gravel/sand extraction >10,000m3/annum	\$400	\$428
Quarry/other earthworks	\$150	\$160
Earthworks from subdivision	\$150	\$160
Forestry/woodlot harvest <100ha	\$60	\$64
Forestry harvest >100-200ha	\$100	\$107
Forestry harvest >200ha	\$200	\$214
Works in river/stream bed	\$150	\$160
Water take surface water <5 l/s, or groundwater <100,000m3/year	\$60	\$64
Water take surface water 5-25 l/s, or groundwater 100,000 - 200,000m3/year	\$200	\$214
Water take surface water >25 l/s - <60 l/s, or groundwater > 200,000 m3 - <400,000m3/year	\$700	\$750
Water take surface water >60 l/s, or groundwater > 400,000 m3/year	\$1,000	\$1,072
Coastal consents (other than takes or discharges)	\$100	\$107
Dredging	\$200	\$214

1598046314-107

Food Act 2014

Activity	Current charge	Proposed charge
New Registration Food control plan	\$267 initial fee Plus \$170 per hour after the first 1½ hours	\$300 initial fee Plus \$187 per hour after the first 1½ hours
New Registration National programme	\$170 initial fee Plus \$170 per hour after the first hour	\$204 initial fee Plus \$187 per hour after the first hour
Renewal	\$85 initial fee Plus \$170 per hour after the first ½ hour	\$102 initial fee Plus \$187 per hour after the first ½ hour
Amendment to Registration	\$85 initial fee Plus \$170 per hour after the first ½ hour	\$102 initial fee Plus \$187 per hour after the first ½ hour
Voluntary suspension	\$85 initial fee Plus \$170 per hour after the first ½ hour	\$102 initial fee Plus \$187 per hour after the first ½ hour
Verification	\$170 per hour	\$187 per hour
Compliance	\$170 per hour	\$187 per hour
Monitoring (where there is compliance)	No charge	No charge

1598046314-107

Fees under the Navigation Safety Bylaw

Fee	Description	2022/23 fee	Proposed 2023/24 fee
Marina Berths			
Annual Licence	Fee per metre LOA of vessel or part thereof per annum, or berth size, whichever is the greater (GST excl).	\$255	\$280.50 (10% increase)
Annual Licence Pile Mooring	Per metre LOA of vessel (GST excl).	\$154.00	\$165.01* (7.2% increase) <i>*Amendment to what was in the Statement of Proposal, which was a 10% increase at \$169.40.</i>
Temporary Berth	Per metre LOA of vessel, or part thereof per day. The charge applies only to those waiting for an imminent permanent berth. No living aboard allowed. No long term availability (GST excl).	\$1.30.00	\$1.56.00 (20% increase)
Multi-Hull	Multi-hull vessels in designated berths will be charged at 1.5 - 2.0 x single berth rate for a vessel of the same size, plus GST. The applicable rate will be determined by the Marina Supervisor on length and width of vessel or berth whichever is the greater.	1.5 - 2.0 x single berth rate	1.5 - 2.0 x single berth rate (No change to definition, but single berth rate has increased by CPI)
Commercial Recreational Berths			
Commercial Recreational Berths	A commercial or charter berth or storage park, if provided, shall be charged at a rate per metre (GST excl).	\$411.00	\$452.10 (10% increase)
Live Aboard Charges			
Live Aboard Charge	Per month plus annual mooring fee to licensed live-aboard vessels (excl GST).	\$165.00	\$181.50 (10% increase)
Marina Berths – Visitor Rates			
Less than 14 metres:	Per day (incl GST)*	\$33.00	\$40.00 (20% increase)
14 metres to 18 metres	Per day (incl GST)*	New Charge	\$55.00
18 metres - 20 metres:	Per day (incl GST)*	\$50.00	\$60.00 (20% increase)
More than 20 metres	Per metre of vessel per day (incl GST).	\$5.00	\$5.00 (No change)
Multi-hulls	Charged at 1.5 - 2.0 x single berth visitor Rate (incl GST).	1.5 - 2.0 x single berth	1.5 - 2.0 x single berth (No change to definition, but single berth rate has increased by CPI)
*Surcharge	Surcharge per person, per day,	\$5.00	\$5.00

1598046314-107

	will apply where a vessel is carrying more than two persons over the age of ten years. The surcharge will apply only to the additional persons carried.		(No change)
Public Boat Ramp			
Annual Launching Permit, valid until 30 June			
	1 July – 30 June (incl GST)	\$105.00	\$125.00 (20% increase)
	1 Oct - 30 June (incl GST)	\$96.00	\$105.00 (20% increase)
	1 Jan – 30 June (incl GST)	\$83.00	\$90.00 (20% increase)
	1 Apr – 30 June (incl GST)	\$71.00	\$78.00 (20% increase)
Casual use	Per launch, pay at meters (incl GST)	\$5.00	\$6.00 (20% increase)

Fees under the Urban Environments Bylaw

Cemeteries

Burial Plots	2022/23 Fees	2023/24 (Proposed increase of 20%)
Adult Plot	\$2,486	\$2983
Child Plot (1 – 12)	\$1,355	\$1626
Infant Plot - up to 1 year including stillborn	No charge	No change
Ash Plots		
Lawn Ash Plot	\$676	\$811
Standard Ash Plot (up to two urns)	\$755	\$906
Family Ash Plot (up to eight urns)	\$1,355	\$1,626
Plaque Only Plot	\$286	\$343
Burial Interments		
Adult Burial	\$1,084	\$1,300
Child Burial (1-12 years)	\$620	\$744
Infant burial (up to 1 year including stillborn)	\$300	\$360
Disinterment	\$3,014	\$3,617
Reinterment	\$1,279	\$1,535
Ashes Interments		
Ash Interment	\$234	\$281
Ash Interment - Double	New fee	\$393 (70% of double interment)
Ash Disinterment	\$234	\$281
Weekend additional fee on any plot (Sat and Sun, 10am – 2pm)	\$229	\$275
Additional Fees		
Out of District- Non-Nelson Resident (Burial Plot)	\$1,733	\$2,080
Out of District – Non-Nelson Resident (Ash Plot)	\$603	\$724
Weekend Burial	\$263	\$316
Weekend Ash interment	\$229	\$275
Public Holiday – Ash Interment	\$297	\$356
Public Holiday – Burial	\$679	\$815
Late fee p/hr -	\$299	\$359

1598046314-107

Transfer of interest: For transfer of interest in any purchase of exclusive right of burial in any plot.	\$151	\$181
Approval of installation of plaque: Plaques are to meet the Council's specifications and bylaws.	\$91	\$109
Records: Genealogical Research - the first hour is free, thereafter a single charge per hour is due.	\$77	\$92

Crematorium

	2022/23 Fees	2023/24 (Proposed increase of 20%)
Hire		
Adult Cremation	\$684	\$821
Oversize Casket cremation	\$891	\$1,069
Child Cremation (1-12 years)	\$548	\$658
Infant Cremation	No charge	No change

Additional Cremation Fees	2022/23	2023/24 (Proposed increase of 20%)
Out of Hours - Adult Cremation	\$137	\$164
Out of Hours - Child Cremation	\$70	\$84
Saturday - Adult Cremation	\$137	\$164
Saturday - Child Cremation	\$70	\$84
Sunday or public holiday - Adult Cremation	\$343	\$412
Sundays or public holiday - Child Cremation	\$136	\$163
Chapel Hire - Service (30 minutes to 2 hours)	\$326	\$391
Chapel Hire - Committal (up to 30 minutes)	\$66	\$79

Building

All applications are subject to the following fees:

1. **Deposits are non-refundable** as listed in the following tables. Payment is due upon application. Where costs incurred are not fully covered by the deposit, additional charges will be applied at the hourly rate. Deposit includes system fee.
System fees based on value of work: Provider will increase system fees to:
 \$132 from \$125 as of 30 June 2023
 \$80 for up to \$10,000 – was \$75
 \$132 for \$10,001 to \$600,000 – was \$125
 \$264 for over \$600,000 – was 250
2. **Upon granting of building consent** - additional costs will be invoiced and must be paid prior to issue of a building consent. These include specialist fees, staff time at hourly charge out rate above deposit, plus estimated inspections fees, all levies and development contributions as applicable.
3. **Before issue of code compliance certificate** – all costs will be reconciled against payments made and the difference will be invoiced, to be paid prior to code compliance certificate issue.

Development Contributions - Building consents may also incur development contributions, see website information:

www.nelson.govt.nz/developmentcontributions

The table below applies to all applications: commercial, residential, new, alteration and additions		
Building Consent Value of Work	Deposit 2022/23	Proposed deposit 2023/24 Plus system fee increase
Up to \$5,000	\$787	\$900
\$5,001 to \$10,000	\$1,049	\$1,198
\$10,001 to \$20,000	\$1,752	\$1,998
\$20,001 to \$50,000	\$2,549	\$2,904
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$2,790	\$3,178
\$100,001 to \$200,000	\$3,252	\$3,703
\$200,001 to \$400,000	\$4,196	\$4,775
\$400,001 to \$600,000	\$5,245	\$5,967
\$600,001 to \$800,000	\$6,294	\$7,157
\$800,001 to \$1,200,000	\$7,343	\$8,359
\$1,200,001 to \$4,000,000	\$7,868	\$8,956
\$4,000,001 or more	\$9,966	\$11,340
Amendment to issued building consent	\$450	\$515
Minor variation	\$84	\$95

Levies - fixed and required under Building Act 2004 - fee based on value of work Note: An amendment that adds value to the original consent may cause it to incur (additional) levies.		
	2022/23 levy fees	2023/24 proposed Levy fees
BRANZ Levy - Building Research Association New Zealand Levy where estimated value is \$20,000 and over	\$1.00 per \$1,000	No change
MBIE Levy - Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment Levy where estimated value is \$20,444 and over	\$1.75 per \$1,000	No Change
Insurance Levy - where estimated value is \$20,000 and over (capped at value of \$10,000,000)	\$1.60 per \$1,000	\$1.72 per \$1,000
QA Levy - Quality Assurance/Building Consent Authority Levy - where estimated value is \$20,000 and over	\$3.15 per \$1,000	\$3.38 per \$1,000

Hourly charge out rates for staff, meetings, and external contractors	Per Hour	
	2022/23 proposed hourly chargeout rates	Proposed 2023/24 hourly chargeout rates
Building Control Administrators and Residential Building (Technical) Officers	\$172	\$187
Commercial Building (Technical) Officers (includes any commercial meeting with customer/project managers etc.)	\$210	\$225
Any other meeting with Building Unit Staff or Duty Building Officer - chargeable after first 30 minutes.	\$172	\$187
External contractors or specialists engaged by Council	At cost	At Cost
Debt recovery Applicant shall be liable for all costs incurred by Council as a result of debt recovery. In making an application to Council you agree to abide by the Council Debtor Terms and Conditions: http://www.nelson.govt.nz/assets/Our-council/Downloads/working-with-council/customer-accounts/Debtor-Terms-Conditions.pdf	Hourly rate	Hourly rate

Minor Works	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Swimming pool fencing application	\$472	\$506
Solid fuel burner/Space heater	\$450	\$482
Inbuilt burner/heater requiring extra cavity inspection	\$625	\$670

1598046314-107

Demolition work	\$661	\$709
Marquee – Private/Residential > 100m2	\$399	\$428
Marquee Any size in place for more than one month, commercial/ private	\$661	\$709
Express Service for Commercial Marquees (less than 20 working days' notice)	\$1,385	\$1,574
Swimming Pool Application	\$1,101	\$1,180
Bathroom Alterations including wet area shower	\$1,254	\$1,344
Proprietary Garage (value under \$20,000)	\$1,747	\$1,873
Any Relocated dwelling	\$2,444	\$2,727

Works for which a building consent is not required	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Notification of Exempt Work - Schedule 1 (except clause 2) No assessment by Territorial Authority, filed on Property File One-off fixed fee	\$267	\$286
Application for Discretionary Exemption – Schedule 1 (2) only Requires Territorial Authority assessment and decision.	\$336	\$382
Unauthorised building works report (works prior to 1991) to file	\$267	\$286

Certificate of Acceptance (COA)	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
In addition to an application fee of \$1,194 , the following costs will be applied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any applicable fees (including processing, inspections, administration at current hourly rates) and levies that would have been payable had building consent been applied for BEFORE carrying out the work Any specialist input, where applicable, will be charged out at cost. All building work completed without a building consent or exemption will require a COA. If a COA is not applied for, a Notice to Fix will be issued.	\$1,050 At current rates At cost	\$1,194 At current rates At cost
Notice to Fix (NTF) and Other Enforcement	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Notice to fix (each) issue	\$545	\$584
Other notices (each) issued under Building Act 2004	\$184	\$197

1598046314-107

Section 124 notices for Dangerous or Insanitary Buildings (except where issued as a result of a natural disaster)	\$545	\$584
Building Officer time and monitoring of notices issued	Hourly rate	Hourly rate

Registration of Documents with Land Information New Zealand	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Section 73 Building Act 2004	\$477	\$542
Section 75 Building Act 2004	\$477	\$542
Removal of section 73 or 75 (or equivalent under Building Act '91)	\$477	\$542

Other Services Provided by the Building Unit	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Project Information Memorandum (PIM) Only required if the PIM application is not part of a building consent application	\$320	\$364
Compliance schedule - New	\$420	\$477
Compliance schedule - Amendment	\$262	\$295
Building Warrant of Fitness (BWof) renewal	\$189	\$205
BWof back flow preventer only Any additional time to review 12A forms at hourly charge out rate	\$52	\$56
BWof audit	\$189	\$215
Swimming pool barrier audit	\$189	\$205
Determinations, lapsing consents, extension of time, code compliance decision	Hourly rate	Hourly rate
Certificate for public use (CPU)	\$425	\$480
CPU extension of time	\$640	\$700
Minor variation	\$84	\$90
Amendment to issued building consent	\$450	\$490
Building code clause modifications or waivers e.g., B2 Mod-Durability	\$199	\$225
Historic building consent - file review	\$250	\$270
Certificate of compliance (District Licensing Agency) Building code compliance assessment for fire safety and sanitary facilities in a building, prior to an alcohol license application	\$168.00	\$190

1598046314-107

Commercial report of Monthly Building Consents Issued - Annual Fee	\$273.00	\$310
Commercial report of Monthly & Mid-monthly Building Consents Issued - Annual Fee	\$577.00	\$650

Earthquake Prone Buildings	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Application for Exemption, for an Earthquake Prone (EQP) Building	\$650	\$697
Application for Extension of time for Heritage Earthquake Prone Building	\$650	\$697
Assessment of information related to a Building's EQP status	\$650	\$697

Land Information Memorandums (LIMs)	2022/23 deposit	Proposed 2023/24 deposit
Residential	\$315	\$338
Commercial	\$483	\$518
Multiple titles charged at hourly rate	Hourly rate	Hourly rate
Proposed LIM Cancellation Fee – New Fee made up of EIL charges \$81.33, Administration time and Finance processing time to provide refund	New fee	\$123

Environmental health licence fees

Licence and Activity Fees	2022/23 \$ if paid on or before 31 July	Proposed 2023/24 \$ if paid on or before 31 July	2022/23 \$ if paid after 31 July	Proposed 2023/24 \$ if paid after 31 July
Hairdressers	\$170	\$205	\$204	\$245
Offensive trades	\$255	\$305	\$306	\$365
Camping grounds	\$283	\$340	\$340	\$405
Funeral directors	\$178	\$215	\$235	\$280
Transfer of registration	\$79 per transfer	\$95 per transfer	\$79 per transfer	\$95 per transfer
Inspection of non-commercial support base	\$79 per inspection	\$95 per inspection	\$94 per inspection	\$112 per inspection
Animal control (other than dogs) time taken at hourly charge out rate	\$170 per hour	\$187 per hour	\$170 per hour	\$ 187 per hour
Processing site marine contingency plans	\$170 per hour	\$187 per hour	\$170 per hour	\$ 187 per hour
Pollution response – hourly charge out rate - disbursements	\$170 per hour	\$187 per hour	\$170 per hour	\$ 187 per hour

1598046314-107