

I hereby give notice that an extraordinary meeting of the Grey District Council will be held:

Date: Wednesday 2 June 2021
Time: 1:00 pm
Venue: Council Chambers, 105 Tainui Street, GREYMOUTH

Paul Morris
Chief Executive

FULL COUNCIL AGENDA

Members:

Mayor: Her Worship the Mayor Tania Gibson
Deputy Mayor: Councillor Allan Gibson
Members: Councillor Anton Becker
Councillor Rosemary Green
Councillor Peter Haddock
Councillor Murray Hay
Councillor Rex MacDonald
Councillor Patrick McBride
Councillor Timothy Mora
Kaiwhakahaere Francois Tumahai

Contact Telephone: 03 7698600
Email: Debbie.wilson@greydc.govt.nz
Website: <https://www.greydc.govt.nz/our-council/agendas-and-minutes/Pages/default.aspx>

The information in this document is provided to facilitate good competent decisions by Council and does in no way reflect the views of Council. Reports and recommendations contained in this agenda are not to be considered as Council policy until adopted.

ORDINARY MEETING OF THE GREY DISTRICT COUNCIL

to be held in the Council Chambers, Grey District Council, 105 Tainui Street, Greymouth on Wednesday 2 June 2021 commencing at 1:00 pm

A G E N D A

Please note: Afternoon tea will be available for elected members after submitters are heard.

Speakers during Council: Submitters to be heard – refer Agenda

COUNCIL IN OPEN MEETING

GENERAL BUSINESS AND TABLED ITEMS

Items not on the agenda for the meeting require a resolution under section 46A of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 stating the reasons why the item was not on the agenda and why it cannot be dealt with at a subsequent meeting on the basis of a full agenda item. It is important to note that late items can only be dealt with when special circumstances exist and not as a means of avoiding or frustrating the requirements in the Act relating to notice, agendas, agenda format and content.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (MEMBERS' INTERESTS) ACT 1968

Council members are reminded that if he/she has a direct or indirect interest in any item on the agenda be it pecuniary or on grounds of bias and predetermination, then he/she must declare this interest and refrain from discussing or voting on this item.

Table of Contents

[1]	APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS	4
[2]	LIST OF ACRONYMS	5
[3]	OVERVIEW	6
	3.1 PROCESS FOR THE MEETING	6
	3.2 LATE SUBMISSIONS	6
[4]	LONG TERM PLAN 2021-2031 – CONSULTATION DOCUMENT AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS ..	7
[5]	LONG TERM PLAN 2021-2031 – SUBMISSIONS TO BE HEARD AND RECEIVED	8
[6]	SUBMITTERS TO BE HEARD	12
[7]	SUBMITTERS NOT WISHING TO BE HEARD	13
[8]	ADJOURNMENT	16
	8.1 ADJOURNMENT TO DELIBERATE ON SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AND MAKE DECISIONS	16
[9]	KEY ISSUE 1 – EXTENSION OF KERBSIDE REFUSE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION	17
[10]	KEY ISSUE 2: NEW LIBRARY	21
[11]	KEY ISSUE 3: DELIVERY OF SPRING CREEK POOL SERVICE	26
[12]	KEY ISSUE 4: DELIVERY OF RUNANGA SERVICE CENTRE/COMMUNITY LIBRARY SERVICE	33
[13]	ADOPTION OF DRAFT REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY	40
[14]	ADOPTION OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT FEES	43
[15]	TRANSFER OF FLOODWALL ASSET TO THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL	47
[16]	OTHER FEEDBACK RECEIVED	50

[1] Apologies and Declarations of Interests

1 APOLOGIES

1.1

2 UPDATES TO THE INTERESTS REGISTER

2.1 Elected members to please advise if there are any changes to be made to the current Interests Register.

3 IDENTIFY ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN THE AGENDA

3.1 Notwithstanding that an elected member may declare an interest at any later stage in this Agenda (prior to taking part in the deliberation of a particular item) those items where an interest will be declared may wish to be disclosed now.

[2] List of acronyms

FS	Financial Strategy
IS	Infrastructure Strategy
K & C	Kerb and Channelling
LTP	Long Term Plan
ROC	Rough Order Costs
TIF	Tourism Infrastructure Fund
PGF	Provincial Growth Fund

[3] Overview

3.1 PROCESS FOR THE MEETING

- 1.1 Those submitters who have requested to speak to their submission will be heard on Wednesday 2 June from 1pm and this will take until approximately 3.30pm. Submissions from those who have not requested speaking rights will be worked through and any points clarified.
- 1.2 Each submitter will be given five minutes to speak to their submission.
- 1.3 Council members will be able to ask questions of clarification only at the end of the submitter's presentation. Council members will not enter into debates with submitters or make statements.
- 1.4 The intention is to consider all submissions before any decisions are made (or consideration given) on any changes to be made to the Draft Long Term Plan.
- 1.5 The deliberations and resolutions of Council will be adjourned to Thursday 3 June 2021 at 1pm.
- 1.6 Copies of the submissions, agenda and minutes will be publicly available online.

3.2 LATE SUBMISSIONS

There were no late submissions received.

[4] Long Term Plan 2021-2031 – consultation document and supporting documents

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 The LTP Consultation Document and Draft LTP were adopted by Council on 14 April 2021.
- 1.2 The consultation document was made available for consultation during the period of 15 April to 17 May 2021. The consultation document was advertised by newspaper, Facebook, website with advertised drop in sessions throughout the district.
- 1.3 The consultation document set out a number of questions around key issues and options proposed for Council's LTP and Council's proposals regarding the Revenue and Financing Policy, Infrastructure Strategy and Financial Strategy.
- 1.4 With respect to the submissions to be considered by Council, it is recommended that these should be considered within the context of Council's Financial Strategy and Council's vision and community outcomes.

[5] Long Term Plan 2021-2031 – Submissions to be heard and received

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of the following reports is to provide Council with background information, copies of the submissions received and suggested recommendations on the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan (LTP) consultation document and supporting information as well as the draft Revenue and Financing Policy, Infrastructure Strategy and Financing Strategy.
- 1.2 The consultation document set out a number of questions around issues and options proposed for Council's LTP and Council's proposals regarding the Revenue and Financing Policy, Infrastructure Strategy, and Financial Strategy.
- 1.3 The consultation document was made publicly available for consultation during the period of Wednesday 15 April 2021 to Monday 17 May 2021. The consultation was advertised by newspaper, website and Facebook. In addition, copies of the consultation document were distributed to organisations and individuals who requested a copy. Drop in sessions were held in the following areas:

Thursday 15 April 2021	5 - 7pm	Runanga School Hall
Monday 19 April 2021	5 - 7pm	Nelson Creek Hall
Wednesday 21 April 2021	5 - 7pm	Cobden School Hall
Thursday 22 April 2021	12 - 2 pm	Council Chambers
Tuesday 27 April 2021	6 - 7.30pm	Dobson Hall
Thursday 29 April 2021	5 - 7pm	Barrytown Settlers Hall
Wednesday 5 May 2021	5 - 7pm	Ahaura Community Hall
Thursday 13 May 2021	5 - 7pm	Camerons Hall

- 1.4 The consultation document set out a number of questions around key issues and options proposed for Council's LTP and Council's proposals regarding the Revenue and Financing Policy, Infrastructure Strategy and Financing Strategy.
- 1.5 Only submissions in writing have been included in the submission process.
- 1.6 This meeting is set to hear and receive the submissions. Council will consider and make their deliberation on all the information received on Thursday 3 June 2021 at 1pm.
- 1.7 All submissions should be considered within the context of Council's Financial Strategy and Council's vision and community outcomes. Council members will be able to ask questions of clarification only at the end of the submitter's presentation. Council members will not enter into debates with submitters or make statements.

- 1.8 The final LTP and Policy and Strategies (incorporating any changes) will be audited and then adopted by Council on Wednesday 30 June 2021.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Copies of the consultation document were made available to the public. The availability of the document and supporting documents were also advertised through newspaper, website and Facebook.
- 2.2 Members of the public provided their feedback through an on-line submission system, manually on the form enclosed with the consultation documents and by writing to or emailing Council.
- 2.3 Council's Engagement and Policy Facilitator was available to help individuals and groups make a submission to Council.
- 2.4 The feedback received related to the questions posed over key issues identified by Council as well as other general issues. The submissions form part of this Agenda.
- 2.5 At the meeting held Wednesday 2 June 2021, Council will hear from those people who wish to speak. Afterwards Council will adjourn and deliberate on Thursday 3 June 2021 and consider feedback received along with issues and options staff will prepare to assist with the deliberations.

3 LEGAL AND STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

- 3.1 All Councils are required by legislation to adopt a LTP and to review it every three years. The LTP sets out Council's activities, plans, budgets and policies and must be adopted before the beginning of the first year it relates to, having used a special consultative procedure (defined under the Local Government Act (2002)) to consult with the community.
- 3.2 Local authorities are required to develop a consultation document for the purpose of consulting with the community, as well as making publicly available the information that provides the basis for the preparation of the LTP. The purpose of a consultation document is to highlight the key consultation issues faced by Council over the next ten years.
- 3.3 The consultation document was prepared to meet all legislative requirements and to include sufficient information to inform the public about what is planned for the District and the key issues.
- 3.4 As part of the special consultative procedure Council must provide an opportunity for persons to present their views to the local authority in a manner that enables spoken (or New Zealand sign language) interaction between the person and the local authority. As part of the consultation process, this meeting is to allow submitters to speak to the Council about the points raised in their submission in person or via video or teleconference.

- 3.5 All written feedback and persons speaking to their submissions will be taken into consideration.
- 3.6 As a result of the submissions received, Council may direct staff to make changes to the final LTP before audit and adoption on 30 June 2021.

4 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

- 4.1 The consultation was made available for public consultation during the period 15 April to 17 May 2021.
- 4.2 Council has received 140 submissions. Of these, 29 submitters have asked to speak to Council on their submissions.

5 OTHER FEEDBACK

- 5.1 People commented on a range of topics that were not related to the proposals outlined in the consultation document or the relative policies/strategies. These are summarised further in this agenda.

6 COSTS AND FUNDING

- 6.1 Council will need to consider the financial implications of any points raised as part of its deliberations process before directing staff to make the suitable changes for the adoption of the LTP and related policies/strategies on 30 June 2021.
- 6.2 Council will need to consider the impact any decision will have on the Long Term Plan, Financial Strategy, Infrastructure Strategy and Revenue and Financing Policy.

7 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no policy implications for receiving the feedback.
- 7.2 Council is however consulting on its Revenue and Financing Policy, Infrastructure Strategy and Financial Strategy and will consider feedback on these as part of its deliberations process. As a result of this process Council may recommend changes to these policies before adopting the final policies on 30 June 2021.

8 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 8.1 There is only one practicable option, which is Council receives the submissions it has received as part of the public consultation process on the LTP and related policies/strategies.

9 NEXT STEPS

- 9.1 Council will consider all the submissions and any changes to the supporting information.
- 9.2 Council will adjourn after hearing all the submitters and reconvene to make their deliberations on Thursday 3 June 2021.
- 9.3 Any changes required to the LTP as a result of decisions made by Council will be made to the final LTP and related supporting documents and they will be submitted to Audit.
- 9.4 Once Audit sign-off has been received, the final LTP will be adopted by Council on 30 June 2021.

10 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR FULL COUNCIL

That Council hear and receive submissions on the Draft 2021-2031 Long Term Plan.

11 RECOMMENDATION:

[6] Submitters to be heard

1 SUBMITTERS SPEAKING TO COUNCIL

1.1 The following submitters wish to speak to Council (order of speaking subject to change). Copies of submissions are provided under separate cover and at page numbers listed below:

	Name of person(s) speaking	Organisation (if any)	Page No.s
1.	Ms Libby English Lyon/Ms Jo Coughlan	NZ Chinese Language Week	1-8
2.	Dr John Milligan	Foodbank Aotearoa New Zealand/Foodbank Canterbury	9-13
3.	Mr Richard Osmaston		14-15
4.	Mr Lou Hassik		16-17
5.	Mr Bruce Stewart		18-21
6.	Mr Michael and Mrs Jean Culling		22-24
7.	Mr Stephen Brassett	Future Leaders Greymouth	25-61
8.	Mr Paul Maunder		62-63
9.	Mrs Jackie Gurden	WC Wilderness Trail Trust	64-66
10.	Ms Marg Becker	Kaiata Community Centre	67
11.	Mr Austin and Mrs Annette Adams		68-69
12.	Mr Paul Berry		70-73
13.	Mr Ivan Wharerimu Iraia & Ms Julia Lavers	Westreap	74-77
14.	Mr Stewart Nimmo		78-90
15.	Mr Alex Woods		91-97
16.	Ms Jan Flinn		98
17.	Mr Keith Rusholme		99-103
18.	Mr Andrew Wright		104-105
19.	Mr Christopher McLoughlan		106-107
20.	Mr Paul Thomas		108-129
21.	Ms Kate Kennedy		130-131
22.	Ms Jo Hart (no longer speaking)		132-137
23.	Ms Lucina Brady (no longer speaking)		138-140
24.	Ms Cynthia Robins	Blackball Residents Association	141-143
25.	Ms Tealy Lynch	Greymouth High School	144-145
26.	Mr Sam Wedgood	Petition to Upgrade Spa	146-161
27.	Ms Katie Milne	West Coast Province, Federated Farmers of New Zealand	162-165
28.	Ms Mary Trayes		166
29.	Mr Jack O'Connor	Sport Canterbury	167-171

[7] Submitters not wishing to be heard

1 SUBMITTERS WHO INDICATED THEY DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

1.1 These submissions listed below are provided under separate cover.

	Submitter(s)	Organisation (if any)	Page No.s
1.	Rt Hon Sir Don McKinnon	NZ War Memorial Museum	1-2
2.	Ms Mary Flynn		3
3.	Mr Dwayne Detlaff		4-5
4.	Mrs Lorraine McCarthy		6-7
5.	Mr Rob Porte		8-9
6.	Mr Peter Watson		10
7.	Mrs Arianne McKenzie		11
8.	Mr Barry Blyth		12
9.	Mr Geoff Vincent		13-14
10.	Mrs Caryl Blyth		15
11.	Mrs H McIntosh		16
12.	Ms Sarah Ashby		17-18
13.	Ms Jessie Reid		19-20
14.	Mr Mark Reid		21
15.	Mr Michael Pinkerton		22
16.	Mr Nathaniel Fittock		23-24
17.	Miss Rebekah Fittock		25-26
18.	Mr Matthew Frost		27-28
19.	Mr Shaun Taylor		29
20.	Mr Tony McDonald		30-31
21.	Mr Michael Sears		32-33
22.	Mrs Sonia Back		34
23.	Mrs Catherine Fittock		35
24.	Mr Brian Pollock		36
25.	Mr Phillip Masters		37
26.	Miss Aimee Shaw		38
27.	Miss Vicki Beach		39
28.	Ms Debbie Crestani		40-41
29.	Mrs Cindy Buckman		42
30.	Ms Kim Odendaal	Westland Hospitality New Zealand	43-48
31.	Miss Sophie Baty		49
32.	Mr Brendan Marshall		50
33.	Mrs Denise McPaike		51-52
34.	Mr Gary Cowan		53
35.	Ms June Frankpitt		54
36.	Miss Levi Lord		55-56
37.	Mrs L Aynsley		57

	Submitter(s)	Organisation (if any)	Page No.s
38.	Mrs Olivia Marshall		58
39.	Mrs Patricia Butler		59
40.	Mrs Raelene Buchanan		60
41.	Mr Bruce Mathewson		61
42.	Ms Sandy Passant		62
43.	Mrs Tracy Pattison		63
44.	Mr Warren Buchanan		64
45.	Mrs Lesley Ashby		65-66
46.	Mr Shane Simon		67-68
47.	Mr Pavel Bares	Cancer Society	69-76
48.	Mrs Maree Awatere-Jones		77-78
49.	Ms Jo Jones		79
50.	Mrs Judy Marsh		80
51.	Mrs L B O'Donoghue		81
52.	Mrs Olive Summers		82
53.	Mr Robert Miedema		83
54.	Mr Steve Holmes and Ms Susan Gibson		84
55.	Ms Diana McMahon		85
56.	Mr Tony Mesman		86
57.	Ms Wendy Elwood		87
58.	Mr Jack Ewen		88-92
59.	Ms Raven Whatu-Joseph		93
60.	Mrs Cathy DeAth-Green		94-95
61.	Speaking (also included in speaking)	Greymouth High School	96-97
61.	Ms Rosie McGrath	Active West Coast	98-108
62.	Ms Alice Cardwell		109
63.	Mrs Pam Mathieson		110
64.	Miss Bernadette Burrell		111-112
65.	Mr Zane Smith & Ms Anne Ginty	Blackball Community LED Partnership Steering Group	113-116
66.	Mr Brendan Rogers		117
67.	Mr Brian Wood		118-119
68.	Mrs Cecil Teasdale		120-121
69.	Mr Chris Frogley		122-123
70.	Dr Cheryl Brunton	Community & Public West Coast	124-145
71.	Mr David Heine		146-147
72.	Mrs Deb Thomas		148-149
73.	Ms Deborah Griffiths		150
74.	Mr Eric Martini		151-153
75.	Mr Grant Crook		154
76.	Mrs Greer Crisp		155-156
77.	Mr Gregory John Smith		157-158
78.	Mrs Justine Donaldson & Mr Phillip Barnett	Grey District Mawhera Business & Promotions Assn	159-163
79.	Mr Jack O'Connor	Greymouth Athletic Club	164
80.	Mr Grahame Freeman	Greymouth Grey Power	165
81.	Mrs Heather Shaw		166-167

	Submitter(s)	Organisation (if any)	Page No.s
82.	Mr Jack Flood		168
83.	Mr Jacob Crook		169
84.	Mr James Ward		170
85.	Mrs Judy Hay		171
86.	Mrs Justine Donaldson	Greymouth Showcase Jewellers	172-173
87.	LL & DC Wehner		174
88.	Mrs Lesly Frogley		175
89.	Ms Lynette Heine		176-178
90.	Mr Mark Sims		179
91.	Mrs Nicola Rogers		180-181
92.	Mrs Pamela Mathieson		182
93.	Mrs Patricia Beck		183
94.	Mr Peter Ewen		184-188
95.	Mr Robert Pattison		189
96.		Runanga School Pupils	190-202
97.	Miss Ruby Thomas		203
98.	Ms Shirley Haisty		204-205
99.	Mr Kevan Hay		206
100.	Miss T Williams		207
101.	Ms Nicky Taylor	The Salvation Army Oasis - Christchurch	208-214
102.	Mrs Toni Sims		215-216
103.	Mrs Veronica Forman		217-218
104.	Mr Paul Veric	Water Safety New Zealand	219-229
105.	Ms Cindie Uddstrum	West Coast Equestrian Advocacy Group	230
106.	Mr William Mathieson		231
107.	Ms Cassandra Struve	Left Bank Art Gallery	232-233
108.	Ms Katrina Brown		234
109.	Mr Geoff Ball		235-237
110.	Mrs Karen Stewart	Petition On behalf of the Residents & Ratepayers of the Northern Ward	238-258
111.	Mr Paul Kearns	Public Service Association Te Pukenga Here Tikanga Mahi	259-265

[8] Adjournment

8.1 ADJOURNMENT TO DELIBERATE ON SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AND MAKE DECISIONS

1 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR HER WORSHIP

That Council adjourn to Thursday 3 June 2021 at 1pm to deliberate on submissions received and make decisions on the Long Term Plan 2021-2031, Draft Revenue and Financing Policy, Draft Financial Strategy and Draft Infrastructure Strategy.

2 RECOMMENDATION:

[9] Key issue 1 – Extension of kerbside refuse and recycling collection

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Council consulted on whether or not to extend the current kerbside refuse and recycling collection area to include properties which currently receive a refuse bag collection (approximately an additional 2,000 properties).
- 1.2 Extension of kerbside collection was the service people most requested during analysis of community feedback from the Resident Satisfaction Survey and Long Term Plan pre-engagement.
- 1.3 Council's preferred option is to extend the area.
- 1.4 It is expected the service will be operational for the expanded area from year 2.

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

- 2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Extend the area [PREFERRED OPTION]	56	53%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36% of submitters currently receive the service • 61% of submitters are outside of the current kerbside collection area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
Option 2 Don't extend the area, i.e. status quo	41	39%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% of submitters currently receive the service • 85% of submitters are outside of the current kerbside collection area • Balance of submitters did not supply address 		
No strong feelings either way	8	8%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% of submitters currently receive the service • 25% of submitters are outside of the current kerbside collection area • 50% of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
No response/blank	34	

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

3.1 Common issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions on this issue are as follows:

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suggest recycling stations instead of kerbside collection *• Extending waste collection helpful for people less mobile• Issue with getting bins to the kerbside, long gravel drive *• Unacceptable not in Dunollie already• More recycling is always good• Encourage reduce, reuse, recycle• Against the extra cost of the bins and the trucks break down the bins cannot be emptied by alternative means• Bins get blown onto the main highway *• Already recycle on my own without the bins• Do not extend because of cost and access issues• Can the bins be the other way around, i.e. rubbish in big bin and recycling in little bin• Hard for elderly to move bins• More education on what can be recycled and what happens to the recycling after it is collected• Include Moana and Te Kinga in extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments and feedback are noted.• The cost to establish a recycling station is approximately \$130,000, excluding operating costs. One has been established in Greymouth with government funding. At this stage, the recycling stations should be considered a trial until their success is determined. It is noted that there is potential for recycling stations to attract unwanted general rubbish dumping to the site, as well as disposal of recycling.• The refuse bin is smaller to encourage people to reduce their waste – there are no plans to change this.• Quick hitch gadgets are available to connect your wheelie bin to your vehicle tow bar for long driveways. They can be purchased from Council at a cost of \$20.00 inclusive of GST. There are advantages and disadvantages of bags versus wheelie bins. Wheelie bins can blow over in very strong winds. Likely to be an industry solution to this matter but has not been researched at this stage.

* More than one person expressed the same sentiment

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Extend the area; or
- 4.2 Don't extend the area (i.e. status quo).

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: EXTEND THE AREA

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 5.1 The increased service will cost Council an estimated additional \$362,000 per annum, which equates to an increase of around \$70.00 per annum to the existing refuse collection rate for properties new to the service.

5.2 Has been included in Council's proposed budgets and is Council's preferred option.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

5.3 Part of Council's core services.

ADVANTAGES

5.4 Complying with the wishes of the community determined through analysis of previous feedback.

5.5 Possible reduction in the amount of refuse going into the landfill.

5.6 Possible reduction in Government levies charged to Council based on waste tonnage. Note this has not been included in Council's budgets as the effect is unknown.

5.7 Separation of refuse and recycling has a positive effect on the environment.

DISADVANTAGES

5.8 Increased cost for those new to the service.

WELLBEINGS

5.9 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 2: DON'T EXTEND THE AREA, I.E. STATUS QUO

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

6.1 If the service area is not extended, there is no anticipated increase for those on the current service beyond cost inflation of around 2%.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

6.2 Part of Council's core services.

ADVANTAGES

6.3 No increased cost for those new to the service.

DISADVANTAGES

- 6.4 Lower levels of satisfaction from those users not in the kerbside collection area.
- 6.5 People outside the collection area have to sort their own recyclables and take them to the disposal centres.
- 6.6 Increased costs to Council from increases in the waste disposal levy and emissions trading levy, which have been included in proposed budgets.

WELLBEINGS

- 6.7 This option does not meet any of the following community outcomes:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

7 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCILLOR TIM MORA

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council thanks the submitters for their submission.**
- 3. Council proceeds with the extension of the kerbside refuse and recycling collection area to include those properties currently on a bag collection service.**
- 4. This is to come into effect from year 2 of the LTP, i.e. from 1 July 2022.**

8 RECOMMENDATION:

[10] Key issue 2: New library

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Council confirmed its support in principle for a new library building in August 2019, as part of the Library and Museum Strategy. The matter was to be referred to the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan.
- 1.2 The existing library is undersized, outdated and does not offer much in the way of the services of a modern library.
- 1.3 Council's preferred option is to build a modern library on freehold land which meets the current and future needs of our community, i.e. meeting space, adequate staff space, sufficient space for housing and growing the collection (books, DVD's audio books, puzzles, magazines, newspapers etc), digital technology services and classes, children's programmes, community and social hub and connectivity of technology (e.g public computers, power points) etc.
- 1.4 Council consulted on whether or not to build a new library starting from year 5 of the Long Term Plan.
- 1.5 Estimated cost is \$14 million, including land, design, construction and fitout.

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

- 2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Building a new library [PREFERRED OPTION]	31	31%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 39% of submitters from greater Greymouth area • 52% of submitters from outside of greater Greymouth area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
Option 2 Do not build a new library	62	61%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18% of submitters from greater Greymouth area • 79% of submitters from outside of greater Greymouth area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
No strong feelings either way	8	8%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12.5% of submitters from greater Greymouth area • 50% of submitters from outside of greater Greymouth area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
No response/blank	38	

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

3.1 Common issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions on this issue are as follows:

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for meeting room big enough for small performances – Poetry Readings • Current library is sufficient; books dwindling; most things done on-line; people read e-books * • Stick to core business/essential services * • Key asset for the Coast; should be modernised; current library outdated and unfit for purpose; modern space essential for community * • Include exciting resources for kids, i.e. active play area, lego room • Use meeting spaces already available in town, e.g. Byte * • Do not build new library until there is enough money to do so • Libraries have evolved – now a place of active learning, community connection and creativity – support a library which will meet future needs of residents • Include some culture and history in the new building, e.g. museum * • Incorporate archival material • Library should be in or immediately adjacent to the CBD * • Against on grounds of rates increase; nice to have, not need to have • Very little detail provided for an informed decision • Why is the current library not fit for purpose with a 97% satisfaction (RSS)? • Revamp existing library – meeting space, increase staff area, rearrange books • Use WRC for holiday programmes, reading groups, digital literacy classes and device advice sessions • Include some history house objects in new PGF project, can the PGF project be in the old courthouse building; collaborate with Pounamu pathway • If build new library, will be another empty building in town • Grey District Library is a place that welcomes people regardless of their culture, social status, employment or otherwise, age, school, religion, or any other demographic; the place where people can engage in activities, use computers, get advice, read, have time out, stay dry, and learn. The library is a safe, welcoming space for all, and as such should be at the heart of our community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and feedback are noted. • Libraries have evolved – they are no longer just about the books but have a bigger focus on community connectivity. Inclusive social and digital access is very important. • Proposed library is in concept phase – if approved by Council, staff will obtain detailed designs and accurate costings before proceeding. • Council has signed a three year lease for History House museum pop-up, with two rights of renewal. There are no plans to include the museum in the proposed development but there may be opportunities to display some of our history as part of the fitout. • The intention is to have the new library within or as close to the CBD as possible. • Staff will be collaborating with the Pounamu Pathway project. The Pounamu Pathway have not yet announced where their development will go. • The proposed meeting space is to complement, not compete with, the existing meeting spaces in town. There are various needs – i.e. study, exams, free access for community groups, library events etc.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a need for rooms and workspaces that are attached to the library, that are free to the public and community groups | |
|---|--|

* More than one person expressed the same sentiment

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Build a new library, starting from year 5; or
- 4.2 Do not build a new library.

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: BUILD A NEW LIBRARY

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 5.1 The total estimated project cost is \$14 million, including land, design, construction and fitout.
- 5.2 The project will be funded from short term debt and rates. Council plans on borrowing approximately \$4.2 million, with the balance covered by rates.
- 5.3 The majority of debt will be repaid by the end of year 10.
- 5.4 This has been included in Council's proposed budgets and is Council's preferred option.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 5.5 Council is already providing library services and are committed to continuing to provide these into the future for the wellbeing of its community.
- 5.6 The proposed new library is an outcome from the Library and Museum Strategy 2019.

ADVANTAGES

- 5.7 A new library meets community requests for a modern and bigger library (per feedback from the Library and Museum Strategy 2019 feedback, 2020 Resident Satisfaction Survey and LTP pre-engagement).
- 5.8 Modern, energy efficient building with up-to-date technological capability.
- 5.9 The library will be a destination in its own right.

DISADVANTAGES

- 5.10 There is cost to the ratepayer to build a new library. This has been factored into the proposed rates increases in the Financial Strategy.
- 5.11 If Council proceeds, there will be another empty building in the CBD until another tenant is found.

WELLBEINGS

5.12 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 2: DON'T BUILD A NEW LIBRARY (I.E. STATUS QUO)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 6.1 Possible increased maintenance costs due to an ageing building. No increase has been allowed for this in the current budgets.
- 6.2 Under the proposed Financial Strategy, if Council opts to not fund the new library, then any rates funding planned for the building of the library will be redirected towards other expenditure, including the reduction of other Council debt.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 6.3 Council are already providing library services.
- 6.4 Not in line with findings of the Library and Museum Strategy, adopted by Council in August 2019, which identified that the current library is undersized per capita.

ADVANTAGES

- 6.5 Council does not need to fund a major project.

DISADVANTAGES

- 6.6 The library does not currently meet the needs to the community and may not meet the future needs of the community.
- 6.7 Limits services provided by the current library due to size and capacity restrictions.
- 6.8 Possible increase in maintenance costs due to age of the building and increased costs to keep up to date with technology.

WELLBEINGS

6.9 This option does contribute to any of the following community outcomes:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

7 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCILLOR MCBRIDE

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council thanks the submitters for their submission.**
- 3. Council approves the building of a new library, to start from year 5.**
- 4. Staff be asked to begin the planning process by identifying possible land.**
- 5. Staff to obtain quotes for inclusion in the 2024 Long Term Plan.**

8 RECOMMENDATION:

[11] Key issue 3: Delivery of Spring Creek Pool service

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Spring Creek Pool is a Council pool that underwent significant upgrades in recent years, including a roof, assisted by the hard work of fund raisers, sponsors and Council. This work was completed in late 2011.
- 1.2 In December 2020, Council formally received a report undertaken by Sport New Zealand in June 2020, called the West Coast Sport and Active Recreation Spaces and Places Strategy. This report revealed that West Coast has significantly better provision levels than the national average for Council pools and suggested rationalisation of ageing or low use facilities is required.
- 1.3 The Spring Creek Pool is only open during the summer period and patronage is generally low, even when the Westland Recreation Centre was closed for significant works.
- 1.4 Council's preferred option is to no longer provide the Spring Creek Pool service and instead hopes a community group or organisation will take it over, supported by an annual operational grant from Council.

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

- 2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Spring Creek Pool is no longer a Council provided service [PREFERRED OPTION]	25	24%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32% of submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) • 56% of submitters outside of Runanga area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
Option 2 Council continue to provide the Spring Creek Pool service, funded by a <u>targeted rate</u> on properties in Runanga/Dunollie/Rapahoe.	11	11%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 82% of submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) • 18% of submitters outside of Runanga area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
Option 3 Council continue to provide the Spring Creek Pool service, funded by the general rate (i.e. status quo)	63	61%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% of submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) • 25% of submitters outside of Runanga area 		

• 8% of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address		
No strong feelings either way	5	4%
• No submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie)		
• 60% of submitters outside of Runanga area		
• Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address		
No response/blank	35	

Note:

There was also a petition received from Residents and Ratepayers of the Northern Ward. A tally of the votes on this petition are as follows *:

- Option 1: Maintain present services at no additional cost to the ratepayers/residents = 179
- Option 2: Council continues to provide existing services to the Northern Ward and have a targeted rate increase to cover = 21
- Option 3: Council closes both assets and continues collecting increased rates as per their LTP = 0

** 15 of these voters also made separate submissions.*

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

3.1 Issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions on this issue are as follows, grouped into common themes:

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be run by Community by support of Council * • Runanga Pool could be run similar to Blackball • Additional costs for the Runanga School to bus children to the pool in town • Turn into an aquarium or other useful asset • Need to promote more, increase opening hours, more events and increase admission fee to increase revenue * • Happy to pay more in rates to keep it running • Where is the \$90,000 handed over from the fundraising committee? • Feels unused, costs more than the community gains • Pool needs to stay • Should be owned locally, no other suburb has a council owned pool facility • This would turn derelict without Council support • Fund Runanga pool with Runanga rates • Pool belongs to the Runanga community • Council needs to support local communities and keep these amenities operational • Decision belongs with the community • Runanga people cannot access the WRC without public transport; only two pools in the district and why not keep them both. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and feedback are noted. • Council’s preferred option is for a community group or organisation to take over the pool with an operational grant from Council to assist. This would allow the facility to remain open and available for the Runanga community. • It is acknowledged that the provision of pools is for community benefit and not for profit as pools generally do not make money. • The Westland Recreation Centre is considered to be Council’s main recreation facility and in keeping with the findings of the West Coast Sport and Active Recreation Spaces and Places Strategy, Council are opting to focus on one facility. • Other communities manage their own pools, i.e. Blackball, Ahaura etc. • Being a Council run facility, there are strict rules which need to be complied with under Pool Safe

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about a multiuse facility in the off season by adding a temporary floor covering • Maybe needs a spa pool • Swimming skills will reduce if pool is closed • Use parents on a roster to supervise the pool • Sometimes not open when it has been advertised as open; playground is a disgrace and has been out of action too long • If pool closes, can Runanga have a community van to take people into town in pool • Support community led development in Runanga • Runanga a high deprivation area – some households have no car and median income lower than NZ median • Spring Creek Pool only costs \$60K to run and is only 7km from town – close WRC and keep Spring Creek open 	<p>regulations, i.e. certified lifeguards, water testing etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other communities have established a community-based transport service, e.g. Blackball, which could be an option for this community. Alternatively, the West Coast Regional Council is responsible for public transport - a submission could be made for consideration by the Regional Land Transport Committee. • Council staff would be available to support community led development in the Runanga community.
<p>What are the costs to run the WRC pool versus Spring Creek pool?</p>	<p>Operational costs for running of the Spring Creek Pool and WRC pool were provided to the Grey Star and are as follows (rounded to the nearest thousand and exclusive of GST and overheads):</p> <p>EXPENSES</p> <p><i>Spring Creek:</i> Staff (including training) \$27,500 Electricity - \$8,500 Insurance - \$10,000 Pool Treatment - \$4,000 Repairs, maintenance & operations - \$7,000 Commissioning and decommissioning at start and end of season - \$3,000 TOTAL - \$60,000</p> <p><i>WRC pool only:</i> Staff & contractors (including training) - \$400,000 Electricity (third share of building cost) plus coal for boiler - \$180,000 Insurance (third share of building cost) - \$44,000 Pool Treatment - \$60,000 Repairs, maintenance (reactive and preventative) & renewals - \$60,000 Operations costs including advertising, communications etc - \$8,000 Annual boiler and shutdown maintenance - \$25,000 TOTAL - \$777,000</p>

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<p>REVENUE: 2019/2020 revenue - \$248,241 WRC pool (approx. 32% of opex) and \$2,954 Spring Creek (approx. 5% of opex) 2020/2021 year to date - \$276,289 WRC pool (approx. 35% of opex) and \$2,179 Spring Creek (4% of opex)</p> <p>Excludes capital works on both pools, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof repairs – WRC • Replacement flooring – WRC • Replacement roof – Spring Creek • Water heater – Spring Creek

* More than one person expressed the same sentiment

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Spring Creek Pool is no longer a Council provided service;
- 4.2 Council continues to provide the Spring Creek Pool service, funded by a targeted rate on properties in Runanga/Dunollie/Rapahoe; or
- 4.3 Council continues to provide the Spring Creek Pool service, funded by the general rate (i.e. status quo).

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: SPRING CREEK POOL IS NO LONGER A COUNCIL PROVIDED SERVICE

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 5.1 Council has allowed for an annual operational grant of \$30,000 to support a community group or organisation to take over the pool.
- 5.2 Divesting of the pool is Council's preferred option.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 5.3 Council currently has two swimming pools for a district of around 13,000 people – this decision aligns with the findings of the West Coast Sport and Active Recreation Spaces and Places Strategy to divest of low usage facilities.

ADVANTAGES

- 5.4 Rationalisation of the swimming pool assets owned and managed by Council.
- 5.5 If a community group or organisation within Runanga take over the pool operations, the community will have a facility that is run by the community for the community, which potentially could have more suitable operating hours and increased activities.

5.6 Runanga community members will become skilled in the running and operation of a pool facility.

DISADVANTAGES

5.7 If there is no community group or organisation willing and able to take over the pool, Runanga will lose a community facility.

WELLBEINGS

5.8 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 2: COUNCIL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE SPRING CREEK POOL SERVICE, FUNDED BY A TARGETED RATE

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

6.1 The annual cost of providing the service, including Council overheads, is approximately \$86,000.

6.2 If this was spread over the 650 ratepayers in the Runanga/Dunollie/Rapahoe area, it works out to be approximately \$160 per annum inclusive of GST to the rates accounts of those properties. This would take the overall rates increase above that set in the financial strategy of 9.99%. This could be achieved by reducing the Contestable Grants Fund, which would be reduced from \$40,000 to \$25,000, and removing the Mayoral and Elected Members Discretionary Fund. A further reduction in operational expenditure of \$40,000 would need to be made from proposed budgets to reduce the rate increase set in the financial strategy.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

6.3 Retaining the Spring Creek Pool service is against the findings of the West Coast Sport and Active Recreation Spaces and Places Strategy, received by Council in December 2020.

6.4 It is not considered financially prudent for Council to operate two aquatic facilities when an over-supply has been identified.

ADVANTAGES

- 6.5 The Runanga community get to retain their pool.
- 6.6 The ratepayers considered to benefit most from the service pay for the service via a targeted rate.

DISADVANTAGES

- 6.7 The additional cost may be unaffordable.

WELLBEINGS

- 6.8 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

7 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 3: COUNCIL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE SPRING CREEK POOL SERVICE, FUNDED BY THE GENERAL RATE, I.E. STATUS QUO

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 7.1 Council has not allowed for the operation of the Spring Creek Pool in its budget. It only allowed for an operational grant of \$30,000.
- 7.2 The annual cost of providing the service, including Council overheads, is approximately \$86,000.
- 7.3 This option would mean an increase in the general rate of approximately \$1.70 per ratepayer, taking the overall rates increase above that set in the financial strategy of 9.99%. This could be achieved by reducing the Contestable Grants Fund, which would be reduced from \$40,000 to \$25,000, and removing the Mayoral Discretionary Fund. A further reduction in operational expenditure of \$40,000 would need to be made from proposed budgets to reduce the rate increase set in the financial strategy.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 7.4 Retaining the Spring Creek Pool service is against the findings of the West Coast Sport and Active Recreation Spaces and Places Strategy.

7.5 It is not considered financially prudent for Council to operate two aquatic facilities when an over-supply has been identified.

ADVANTAGES

7.6 The Runanga community get to retain their pool.

DISADVANTAGES

7.7 All ratepayers are paying for two aquatic facilities, one of which traditionally has low patronage.

7.8 May set a precedent for Council in the future to retain facilities deemed surplus.

WELLBEINGS

7.9 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

8 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCILLOR GREEN

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council thanks the submitters for their submission.**
- 3. Council proceed with divesting from operation of the Spring Creek Pool, to come into effect after 1 July 2021.**
- 4. Council staff work with any interested community group or organisation to take over the facility, aided by an annual operational grant from Council.**

9 RECOMMENDATION:

[12] Key issue 4: Delivery of Runanga Service Centre/Community Library service

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Changes to the services provided from the Runanga Service Centre have prompted a review of the relevance of the service. These changes include the disestablishment of taking bill payments in March 2019 and the phasing out of cheques from June 2021.
- 1.2 The Runanga Service Centre also acts as a NZ Postal Agency.
- 1.3 The Runanga Service Centre is open for weekday mornings only. The building is ageing and incurring increasing maintenance costs. Customer patronage has been declining over the years for Council transactions.
- 1.4 There is no other community in the Grey District able to access a service centre therefore there is a question of fairness and equity about levels of service provided by Council.
- 1.5 Council offices and the Grey District Library are less than 10km away and a lot of transactions are now undertaken online, therefore Council's preferred option is to close the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library and dispose of the building.

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

- 2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Runanga Service Centre/Community Library is no longer a Council provided service and the building is disposed of. [PREFERRED OPTION]	32	30%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% of submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) • 56% of submitters outside of Runanga area • Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
Option 2 Council continue to provide the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library service, funded by a targeted rate on properties in Runanga/Dunollie/Rapahoe.	27	26%

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 63% of submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) 33% of submitters outside of Runanga area Balance of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
Option 3 Council continue to provide the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library service, funded by the general rate (i.e. status quo)	39	37%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 77% of submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) 13% of submitters outside of Runanga area 10% of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
No strong feelings either way	7	7%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No submitters from affected area (i.e. Runanga, Rapahoe, Dunollie) 57% of submitters outside of Runanga area 43% of submitters from outside of Greymouth or did not supply address 		
No response/blank	34	

Note:

There was also a petition received from Residents and Ratepayers of the Northern Ward. A tally of the votes on this petition are as follows *:

- Option 1: Maintain present services at no additional cost to the ratepayers/residents = 179
- Option 2: Council continues to provide existing services to the Northern Ward and have a targeted rate increase to cover = 21
- Option 3: Council closes both assets and continues collecting increased rates as per their LTP = 0

** 15 of these voters also made separate submissions.*

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

3.1 Common issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions are as follows, including officer comments.

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENT
Run by the community with support of Council *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council staff would be available to support the Runanga community to look at options for taking over this facility, along with the library.
Lack of transport: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of public transport for community to Greymouth * Council should pay for the children from Runanga to use the transport Close Runanga Service Centre but provide shuttle bus into Greymouth weekly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other communities have established a community based transport service, (e.g. Blackball), which could be an option for this community. Alternatively the West Coast Regional Council is responsible for public transport - a submission could be made for consideration by the Regional Land Transport Committee.
Don't want to lose the post service, post office is a necessity *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be another business in Runanga which could take over the

	postal agency contract upon agreement with NZ Post.
<p>Good for the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library is good for the elderly • Asset for the residents • Lose safe place by taking this away • Social and information hub where anyone can come to get help • Get help for personal forms • Do not get rid of as aging demographic • Is needed – maybe combined with Miners’ Hall • Dispose of building with proceeds to Runanga community and the library going to the Miners’ Hall • Actively managing the library with sessions and classes instead of just manning • Relocate to the new community hall when it opens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council acknowledges that the service centre is important to the community and notes the comments. • Council staff would be available to support the Runanga community to look at options for taking over this facility, along with the library.
No other suburb has a service centre; should not be the responsibility of all ratepayers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council agrees and does not have the capacity to offer these in all suburbs and communities in the Grey District.
Civil Defence operation run from here *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runanga Service Centre is currently identified as the civil defence operation centre for Runanga but the building is not fit for purpose in the long term. West Coast Emergency Management are investigating other options.
Why lack of maintenance on the service centre?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an ageing building and costs are rising to keep the building in an adequate condition. • Some maintenance has been carried out within the last three years to the veranda area. It is agreed further maintenance work is needed but the extent will depend on the fate of the building.
Bring back the bill payment service – service centre will then be better utilised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability for Council to take bill payments at part of our service centre was removed by New Zealand Post when the NZ Post Centre in Greymouth was closed.
Mobile bus with books, takes payments and has digital classes – across the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is a great idea which has some merit. Comments noted with thanks and will be taken into consideration.

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Runanga Service Centre/Community Library is no longer a Council provided service and the building is disposed of;

- 4.2 Council continues to provide the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library service, funded by a targeted rate on properties in Runanga/Dunollie/Rapahoe; or
- 4.3 Council continues to provide the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library service, funded by the general rate (i.e. status quo).

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: RUNANGA SERVICE CENTRE/COMMUNITY LIBRARY IS NO LONGER A COUNCIL PROVIDED SERVICE AND THE BUILDING IS DISPOSED OF

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

5.1 Council has not allowed for continuing to provide the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library from 1 July 2021 and this is Council’s preferred option.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL’S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 5.2 Provision of office and library services are part of Council’s core services.
- 5.3 Council has proposed in the Draft LTP to close the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library as the main office and Grey District Library are less than 10km away.

ADVANTAGES

- 5.4 Provides the Runanga community with an opportunity to run its own community centre and library.
- 5.5 Provides a Runanga business with the opportunity to work with NZ Post and maybe run the postal service.
- 5.6 Cost saving for Council.
- 5.7 Consolidation of Council services.

DISADVANTAGES

5.8 Decrease in service offered to the Runanga, Dunollie and Rapahoe community.

WELLBEINGS

5.9 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 2: COUNCIL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE SERVICE, FUNDED BY A TARGETED RATE ON PROPERTIES IN RUNANGA/DUNOLLIE/RAPAHOE

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 6.1 The annual cost of providing the service, excluding staff costs, is approximately \$17,000 plus an allowance of \$5,000 per year for building maintenance makes an annual cost of \$22,000.
- 6.2 If this was spread over the 650 ratepayers in the Runanga/Dunollie/Rapahoe area, it works out to be approximately \$40 per annum inclusive of GST to the rates accounts of those properties.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL’S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 6.3 Provision of office and library services are part of Council’s core services, however Council chooses to provide these services from Greymouth.
- 6.4 Continuing with the service is against Council’s intention to divest from it as part of the draft LTP.

ADVANTAGES

- 6.5 The Runanga community get to retain their service centre and community library.
- 6.6 The ratepayers considered to benefit most from the service pay for the service via a targeted rate.

DISADVANTAGES

- 6.7 The additional cost may be unaffordable for the community.

WELLBEINGS

- 6.8 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

7 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 3: COUNCIL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE SERVICE, FUNDED BY THE GENERAL RATE (I.E. STATUS QUO)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 7.1 Council has not allowed for the operation of the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library in its budget from 1 July 2021.
- 7.2 The annual cost of providing the service, excluding staff costs, is approximately \$17,000 plus an allowance of \$5,000 per year for building maintenance makes an annual cost of \$22,000.
- 7.3 This option would mean an increase in the general rate of approximately \$2.80 per ratepayer, taking the overall rates increase above that set in the financial strategy of 9.99%.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL’S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 7.4 Provision of office and library services are part of Council’s core services, however, Council chooses to provide these services from Greymouth.
- 7.5 Continuing with the service is against Council’s intention to divest from it as part of the draft LTP.

ADVANTAGES

- 7.6 The Runanga community get to retain their service centre and community library.

DISADVANTAGES

- 7.7 The cost is borne by all ratepayers with only a subset of the community getting the benefit.

WELLBEINGS

- 7.8 This option does not contribute to the following community outcomes:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

8 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCILLOR PATRICK MCBRIDE

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council thanks the submitters for their submission.**
- 3. Council confirms its intention to close the Runanga Service Centre/Community Library, effective from 1 July 2021 (or as close as practicable once appropriate arrangements have been made).**
- 4. Council staff work with any interested parties to enable them to run their own community library.**

9 RECOMMENDATION:

[13] Adoption of Draft Revenue and Financing Policy

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Council made changes to its Revenue and Financing Policy, which outlines sources and levels of funding for Council activities.
- 1.2 Key changes include:
- Removal of the rural fire activity as we are no longer involved in this.
 - Change to the way the funding splits are described – now in percentage bands rather than a set percentage. The policy provides “funding bands” for how each activity is funded, i.e. amount of rates, subsidies, users fees, borrowing and other.
 - Priority order added for funding of capital expenditure.
- 1.3 The draft Long Term Plan and supporting documents have been prepared based on the proposed amended policy.

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

- 2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Agree with the proposed changes	23	31.1%
Option 2 Do not agree with the proposed changes	24	32.4%
No strong feelings either way	27	36.5%
No response/blank	66	

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

- 3.1 Issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions are as follows, including officer comments.

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENT
Funding splits – was clear before – new seems confusing	Council’s new financial strategy allows for current debt to be repaid over a shorter period of time, and for capital projects to be funded via funds set aside prior to the project commencing. This is a change from the old policy where

projects were funded via loans therefore incurring finance costs. By allowing for funds to be put aside for future capital projects overall operating costs moving forwards are reduced as rates are not being used to cover interest payments on loan funding as well as the actual costs of capital projects.

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 The draft Long Term Plan and supporting documents (required by legislation) have been prepared based on the proposed draft policy. Therefore there is only one practicable option, which is to comply with legislation and adopt the proposed draft policy.
- 4.2 If Council chose not to accept the proposal, the Long Term Plan would require extensive rework to ensure compliance with the Financial Strategy and it would be unlikely that the 30 June deadline for adoption of the Long Term Plan would be met.

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: ADOPT THE AMENDED REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

- 5.1 The draft Long Term Plan and supporting documents have been prepared based on the proposed amended policy.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL’S STRATEGY/POLICY

- 5.2 Yes.

ADVANTAGES

- 5.3 Council will be able to adopt the LTP within strategic deadlines.

DISADVANTAGES

- 5.4 Some members of the public are not happy with the amended policy.

WELLBEINGS

- 5.5 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical

Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCILLOR BECKER

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council adopt the Draft Revenue and Financing Policy.**

7 RECOMMENDATION:

[14] Adoption of Resource Management Act fees

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Council is required by legislation to consult on fees which are set under the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 1.2 Council included the proposed planning and charge out fees in the Consultation Document.
- 1.3 Our current fees do not comply with the funding requirements for this activity under our Revenue and Financing Policy, therefore there have been some significant increases to the planning and charge out fees to meet the funding requirements of this activity under our Revenue and Financing Policy. It is noted that the fees listed are deposits only and anything owing above this will be invoiced based on actual costs incurred.
- 1.4 The fees for 2021/2022 are as follows:

Administration - Charge Out Rates

	2020/2021 fee including GST	Proposed 2021/2022 fee including GST	increase
Management/CEO	\$178.00	\$200.00	12.40%
Engineers	\$143.00	\$160.00	11.90%
Engineering Assistants/Officers	\$114.50	\$140.00	22.30%
Planners	\$143.00	\$160.00	11.90%
Building Officers	\$143.00	\$160.00	11.90%
Environmental Health Officers	\$137.50	\$160.00	16.40%
Compliance Officer	\$121.50	\$160.00	31.70%
Animal Control Officer	\$121.50	\$140.00	15.20%
Administration/Customer Service Officers	\$86.00	\$120.00	39.50%
Maintenance Officer		\$60.00	NEW

Fees and actual time hours are recoverable from applicants and exacerbators

Planning

	2020/2021 fee including GST	Proposed 2021/2022 fee including GST	increase	
All fees listed are Deposits. Balance of charges will be charged at the rates specified.				
Subdivisions				
Boundary Adjustments	<i>deposit only</i>	\$471.50	\$684.00	45.10%
Non-notified (2 - 5 lots)	<i>deposit only</i>	\$800.00	\$1,160.00	45.00%
Non-notified (6 - 10 lots)	<i>deposit only</i>	\$1,529.00	\$2,217.50	45.00%
Non-notified (11+ lots)	<i>deposit only</i>	\$2,077.00	\$3,012.00	45.00%
Public notification - subdivision	<i>deposit only</i>	\$1,329.50	\$1,928.00	45.00%
s224 - without inspection	<i>deposit only</i>	\$306.00	\$444.00	45.10%

Planning

		2020/2021 fee including GST	Proposed 2021/2022 fee including GST	increase
s224- with one inspection	<i>deposit only</i>	\$471.50	\$684.00	45.10%
s226 certificate	<i>deposit only</i>	\$598.50	\$868.00	45.00%
Other certificates (e.g. s223)	<i>deposit only</i>	\$172.50	\$250.50	45.20%
Esplanade reserve reduction/waiver	<i>deposit only</i>	\$556.00	\$806.50	45.10%
Reapproval lapsed consent	<i>deposit only</i>	\$598.50	\$868.00	45.00%
ROW/Easement amendments	<i>deposit only</i>	\$422.00	\$612.00	45.00%
Land Use Consents				
Hazardous substances	<i>deposit only</i>	\$666.00	\$966.00	45.00%
Signs	<i>deposit only</i>	\$598.50	\$868.00	45.00%
Relocated buildings	<i>deposit only</i>	\$471.50	\$684.00	45.10%
Bulk & locn/recession plane/setback	<i>deposit only</i>	\$507.50	\$736.00	45.00%
Heritage	<i>deposit only</i>	\$471.50	\$684.00	45.10%
Non-rural/residential activities	<i>deposit only</i>	\$1,000.50	\$1,451.00	45.00%
Utilities	<i>deposit only</i>	\$598.50	\$868.00	45.00%
Vegetation clearance	<i>deposit only</i>	\$556.00	\$806.50	45.10%
Sub-sized lots	<i>deposit only</i>	\$933.50	\$1,354.00	45.00%
Limited Notification - Land Use*	<i>deposit only</i>	\$933.50	\$1,354.00	45.00%
Public Notification - Land Use*	<i>deposit only</i>	\$1,397.00	\$2,026.00	45.00%
* Notification fee is in addition to deposit for consent type				
Plan Changes				
District Plan Changes - major	<i>deposit only</i>	\$14,992.50	N/A	
District Plan Changes - minor	<i>deposit only</i>	\$7,500.50	N/A	
Other				
Designation/Heritage Order	<i>deposit only</i>	\$3,027.00	\$4,389.50	45.00%
Alteration of designation	<i>deposit only</i>	\$1,213.50	\$1,760.00	45.00%
Certificate of compliance	<i>deposit only</i>	\$306.00	\$444.00	45.10%
s357 objection	<i>deposit only</i>	\$459.00	\$666.00	45.10%
Consent variation - non-notified	<i>deposit only</i>	\$416.00	\$603.50	45.10%
Consent variation - notified	<i>deposit only</i>	\$793.00	\$1,150.00	45.00%
Permitted boundary activity (s87BA)	<i>deposit only</i>	\$306.00	\$444.00	45.10%
Deemed permitted activity (s87BB)	<i>deposit only</i>	\$479.50	\$695.50	45.00%
Outline Plan	<i>deposit only</i>	\$306.00	\$444.00	45.10%
Comments on Draft Applications/Pre application advice (note first HALF HOUR free then staff hourly rates)		staff hourly rates	staff hourly rates	
Consultants/Peer Review		\$198/hour (not more than)	\$202/hour (not more than)	2.00%
Legal advice		\$396/hour (not more than)	\$404/hour (not more than)	2.00%
Hearings - Commissioner		\$1,665/day (not more than)	\$1700/day (not more than)	2.10%
- Facilities		\$208.50/hour (not more than)	\$213/hour (not more than)	2.20%
Monitoring Levy	<i>flat fee paid upon granting of land-use consent</i>	\$135.00	\$150.00	11.10%
Resource Consent Monitoring of Conditions		staff hourly rates	staff hourly rates	

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Agree with the proposed fee changes	23	31.9%
Option 2 Do not agree with the proposed fee changes	23	31.9%
No strong feelings either way	26	36.2%
No response/blank	68	

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

3.1 Issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions are as follows, including officer comments.

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENT
Query the substantial increase in fees	The reason for the increase was included in the consultation document and can also be found in the Background above.
Against significant increase in Resource Management Act fees	Feedback noted.

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 The fees were adjusted to comply with our Revenue and Financing Policy – therefore there is no option but to adopt them.

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: ADOPT THE FEES

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

5.1 The budgets for the Draft 2021-2031 LTP were prepared based on the proposed fees.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

5.2 Complies with our Revenue and Financing Policy.

5.3 The Draft LTP was prepared in accordance with the Revenue and Financing Policy.

ADVANTAGES

5.4 Meets legislative and policy requirements.

DISADVANTAGES

5.5 Some users may not be happy with the increases.

WELLBEINGS

5.6 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold
Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCILLOR ANTON BECKER

That -

1. The report be received.
2. Council adopt the planning and charge out fees for 2021/2022.

7 RECOMMENDATION:

[15] Transfer of Floodwall Asset to the West Coast Regional Council

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Greymouth Floodwall is a strategic asset which is currently under the ownership of the Grey District Council due to a historical decision.
- 1.2 Currently all costs are paid by the West Coast Regional Council, including insurance, maintenance, and renewal costs. They also rate for the floodwall and make all operational decisions with regards to it.
- 1.3 It is not considered practicable for the asset to remain on our register given we have no direct financial or operational control over it.
- 1.4 It is therefore logical to formally transfer ownership of the structure to the Regional Council.
- 1.5 There is a Joint Floodwall Committee set up to help manage the asset - Grey District Council has representation on this committee. The asset transfer will not change this arrangement. No conflicts of interest regarding the proposed transfer have been identified. There are no financial implications for Grey District Council as currently, it is just a line in our accounts as an asset.

2 COMMUNITY VIEWS

- 2.1 The following is a breakdown of the submissions received on this issue. It is noted that this was not a vote and therefore is not binding. The result should not be considered a view of the community but rather the collated view from those who made a submission.

OPTION	RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Option 1 Agree with the transfer [PREFERRED OPTION]	41	52.6%
Option 2 Do not agree with the transfer	18	23%
No strong feelings either way	19	24.4%
No response/blank	62	

3 OTHER FEEDBACK

3.1 Issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions are as follows, grouped into common themes and including officer comments.

ISSUE/FEEDBACK	OFFICER COMMENT
Don't hand the floodwall asset to Regional Council – Will they rate for it?	Currently all costs are paid by the West Coast Regional Council, including insurance, maintenance, and renewal costs. They also rate for the floodwall and make all operational decisions with regards to it.

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 There is only one practicable option and that is to transfer ownership of the asset from the Grey District Council to the West Coast Regional Council.

5 ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS – OPTION 1: TRANSFER THE ASSET

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/COSTS

5.1 The floodwall is currently a line in our accounts as an asset (valued at \$6.6 million). Transferring the asset to the West Coast Regional Council will not have any operational financial implications but it will have an impact on our balance sheet by way of a reduction in total asset value.

ALIGNMENT WITH COUNCIL'S STRATEGY/POLICY

5.2 Proposed to occur in year one of the Draft LTP.

ADVANTAGES

- 5.3 The West Coast Regional Council have financial control over the asset.
- 5.4 Grey District Council will continue to have representation on the Joint Floodwall Committee set up to help manage the asset.

DISADVANTAGES

5.5 None identified.

WELLBEINGS

5.6 This option meets the following community outcomes as highlighted:

Vision: Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District			
Economic	Social	Cultural	Environment
Strong	Safe	Proud	Bold

Diverse	Inclusive	Unique	Practical
Sustainable	Connected	Inter-connected	Resilient
Prosperous	Enabled	Vibrant	Strategic

6 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR HER WORSHIP

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council formally transfer the floodwall asset to the West Coast Regional Council in year one of the LTP.**

7 RECOMMENDATION:

[16] Other feedback received

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Submitters commented on other issues outside of the key issues being consulted on as part of the Draft 2021-2031 Long Term Plan.
- 1.2 Submissions have been collated into themes and officer comments provided as necessary.

2 FEEDBACK

- 2.1 Issues raised/feedback received as part of the submissions are as follows, grouped into common themes and including officer comments.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
Amalgamate Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Coast Regional Council should be amalgamated with the other Councils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nathaniel Fittock (23-24) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a local government commission decision. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be advised this is a Local Government Commission decision.
Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want Council to state ongoing importance and value of the arts in promoting our community's wellbeing; want Council to utilise Arts Strategy in is planning once developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Left Bank Art Gallery (232-233) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council supports the arts through its support of the Left Bank Art Gallery, as well as offering funding opportunities through the Contestable Fund, the Signage, Interpretation and Public Art Fund and Creative Communities. Council hopes to support the arts sector more in the form of an Arts Strategy, if funding is approved for the development of this. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Blackball Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want to work with Council on planter boxes Want to work with Council on roadside mowing, carpark maintenance, garden maintenance and toilet/shower cleaning contracts Would like to maintain the garden by toilet Would like user pays for the carpark, shower, BBQ's and wifi, with money going to community Finish projects as per TIF funding – BBQ's and bike stands to be installed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blackball Community Led Partnership Steering Group (113-116) Blackball Residents Association Trust (141-143*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some TIF funded items are yet to be installed, namely cycle stands, wifi and a BBQ. It is understood the community is now going to fund a shelter of their choice for the BBQ. Work has been held up due to many other high capital projects being approved in the last 12 months. Notwithstanding this, the aim is to have the remaining items installed before Labour Weekend 2021. No budget has been provided for the new projects listed, although it is noted

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of streetlight and signage by carpark • Community installing new playground – can this be covered by Council’s insurance? • MOU to occupy the triangle land area owned by GDC 		<p>that the group may be intending to fund some of these initiatives themselves where the facilities are not Council owned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appear to be two community groups interested on carrying out maintenance work in Blackball. Work could be bundled in to one package and offered as a tender? In the future this could include the toilet cleaning contract when it comes up for renewal. • Council needs to provide policy direction on user pays outside the LTP process. If user pays is introduced, the first call on revenue could be to offset Council costs with any profits going to the community for other community projects. • Such an approach could be used to fund security lighting at the new carpark in the future. • Council’s is unable to add insurance cover for outside organisations/assets outside its ownership to its policy. • The triangle of land recently transferred from government ownership to Council is for the purpose of and legalised as road given that the area provides access to houses, through traffic and pedestrians, with network utilities under the land. It is suggested that the community group develop a proposed layout for the activities they are proposing for

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Council's consideration outside the LTP process on the basis that any additional future uses of the land does not compromise the underlying purpose of the land. Once a proposed layout is confirmed, Council could also consider a Licence to Occupy for some of the land.</p> <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted. 2. Council advises that it can provide support where appropriate for the Blackball initiatives, however no further budget is available from Council to undertake additional enhancements in the Blackball community. 3. Council notes that the Blackball community wishes to tender to undertake the maintenance work in Blackball and staff will notify the Blackball community when the maintenance work is open for tender. 4. Council advises that all maintenance contracts must be undertaken on the same basis as all Council contracts and all legal obligations fulfilled by the tenderer.
Bridges/Trucks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large trucks increasing • Ensure roads, bridges and infrastructure are adequately repaired or maintained, now and into the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce Stewart (18-21*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases in the heavy vehicle limit have been identified in the Infrastructure and Roading Activity Management Plans and has been identified and has been accounted for

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>in our renewal and maintenance plan on our districts bridges.</p> <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
CBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDC work with Mawhera to tidy up CBD • Tidy up Smith Street area • Many non-compliant earthquake prone buildings in CBD • Hopefully no bright, tall flowers at Smith St/Tainui Street roundabout due to safety issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geoff Ball (235-237) • Active West Coast (98-108) • Michael & Jean Culling (22-24*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is currently working with the CBD Redevelopment Forum on initiatives within the Greymouth CBD. • Mawhera Incorporation, in addition to others, is part of this forum and all parties are working together. • With regards to the roundabout by Tainui Street, it is presumed the submitter it talking about the entranceway project. Council staff are working closely with NZTA and KiwiRail to ensure any enhancements meet their strict safety requirements. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address climate change – work with central government and other West Coast agencies • Consider effects of climate change • Pleased to see Council is planning for effects of climate change • Think prudently before continuing efforts like extending rock works at Cobden beach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active West Coast (98-108) • Bernadette Burrell (111-112) • Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) • Public Service Association (PSA) (259-265) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change is a key focus of our long term planning and we will work together with central government and regional agencies. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council advises climate change is a key focus over the coming years and we will collaborate with regional and national agencies on this matter.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
Community Preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage Council to increase community preparedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback noted with thanks and it will be passed on to West Coast Emergency Management. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The feedback will be passed onto West Coast Emergency Management.
Cycle/Pathway from Rapahoe to Greymouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe cycle/pathway from Rapahoe, Runanga to Greymouth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Service Association (PSA) (259-265) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NZTA Waka Kotahi looking after the highway which runs from Rapahoe to Greymouth. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council will pass this feedback onto NZTA Waka Kotahi.
Dog Registration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is dog rego so high? Get nothing for it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maree Awatere-Jones (77-78) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dog registration fees go towards a 24 hour service to deal with both dog and stock control issues. Uncontrolled dogs not only present a nuisance but also a threat, as is evidenced by the high incidence of dog attacks on humans and other animals. Council deals with incidents on a user pays basis as much as possible and dog registration fees pay for the balance of the dog and stock control services delivered. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be provided a copy of the officer comments.
Drop Off Zone - CBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drop off zone outside coast optometrist for elderly or parents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June Frankpitt (54) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of a drop off zone could be considered in this area as part of the proposed overall CBD Parking Strategy

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>which is proposed to be carried out in the next few months.</p> <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will take this request into consideration as part of the CBD Parking Strategy which is being carried out shortly.
Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GDC should encourage private investors, developers and businesses Biggest challenge is leasehold land Many non-compliant earthquake prone buildings in CBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geoff Ball (235-237) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback noted. Council are working closely with Mawhera Incorporation as part of the CBD Redevelopment Plan. Council's involvement with earthquake prone buildings is a regulatory one and the decision regarding those buildings is the responsibility of the building owner. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted.
Drowning Prevention and Water Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Safety NZ – highlight need for drowning prevention and water safety – not just in pools but also freshwater and vessels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Safety NZ (219-230) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drowning prevention and water safety are key focus areas of the Westland Recreation Centre team. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted.
Dumping Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dumping costs too high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alex Woods (91-97*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concerns of the submitter are noted. The landfill costs reflect the true costs of developing and operating a RMA compliant landfill and also include waste levies and emission trading scheme levies. These levies are imposed to discourage waste to landfill

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>and encourage consideration of recycling alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illegal dumping is a regulatory matter with different aspects being managed between the district and regional councils. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
Error in Consultation Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error – Blackball not connected to Town water supply as stated in the Consultation Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Maunder (62-63*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for raising the error in the consultation document where Blackball water supply is mistakenly referred to as being connected to Greymouth. We apologise for this error. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council apologises for the error.
Freedom Camping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and strengthen appropriate regulations for freedom camping and create infrastructure cost support for the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westland Hospitality NZ (43-48) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council’s current bylaw is in line with national freedom camping legislation and we work to ensure the appropriate infrastructure is in place. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
Funding Requests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for Chinese Language Week • Funding for NZ Museum and Visitor Centre in France • West Coast Wilderness Trail Trust Funding of \$10,000 • Foodbank – Funding Request for \$45,000 a year • WestReap for Learner Licencing Programme in Grey District - \$14,280 for 90 drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Zealand Chinese Language Week (1-8*) • New Zealand War Memorial Museum (1-2) • West Coast Wilderness Trail Trust (64-66*) • WestREAP (74-77*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has the Contestable Grants Fund available for funding for projects which align with our vision of being a Thriving, Connected and Resilient Grey District. • All funding requests received via the LTP are directed to this fund, which opens for applications in July 2021. Details can be found on our website.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future Leaders Greymouth Programme - \$10K or more (in the past have supported \$10K and \$5K last year due to budget cuts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greymouth Future Leaders – Inspiring Stories Trust (25-61*) Foodbank Aotearoa NZ (9-13*) 	<p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council declines the requests for funding and refers submitters to the Contestable Grants Fund.
Gambling Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council have a focus on reducing the harm caused by gambling – policy review due August 2021 Suggest this form part of LTP consultation as needs to be reviewed every three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active West Coast (98-108) Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) Salvation Army (208-214) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will note the interest and will be touch with interested stakeholders when it is time to review the policies. Council does not intend to align the review period with the creation of the LTP. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council will note the interest and be touch with interested stakeholders when it is time to review the gambling policies.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of heritage in the 10 year plan; loss of heritage buildings, i.e. History House and Harbour Board building; how do heritage buildings fit into our future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stewart Nimmo (78-90*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage buildings, heritage sites and items of significance throughout our district are detailed in Council’s District Plan and/or listed with the New Zealand Heritage trust. The District Plan and Heritage New Zealand set rules around what can be done with these items. Council’s District Plan is currently being reviewed and amalgamated to form One District Plan for the region. Heritage items will be dealt with as part of this process for the district as a whole.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is yet to make final decisions on the future of the History House and Harbour Board Buildings but it is likely they will be divested due to the costs involved in upgrading them to current standards. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
History House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History House pop up needs to be open 7 days a week – not just targeted at train visitors – use volunteers if it is a cost issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lucina Brady (138-140*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The museum pop up is not just for the train visitors – it is for our community and any visitors to our district. It is currently open three days a week and these opening hours will be reviewed before summer, with a view to extending them. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opening hours for History House pop up museum will be reviewed before summer.
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage more housing to be built 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebekah Fittock (25-26) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is acknowledged that there is a housing shortage in Greymouth, however Council has no plans to be involved in property development. • There are rules and regulations to be complied with regarding housing development and staff can provide any assistance required. • It is also noted that some changes as a result of the Te Tai O Te Poutini One

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>District Plan may be positive for more housing to be built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff are collaborating with various agencies in support of solutions for the housing issues in the Grey District. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council notes it is not intending to be involved in property development. The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrading infrastructure should be a key focus New infrastructure or projects should not be built at the expense of deferring infrastructure maintenance Water infrastructure sometimes repaired many times, instead of permanent repairs or replacement Support intention to address deferred renewals Support for increased debt to fund infrastructure and services Prior Council's use of available government subsidies to complete infrastructure in communities throughout our district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruce Stewart (18-21*) Denise McPaike (51-52) Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) Public Service Association (PSA) (259-265) Paul Berry (70-73*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback noted with thanks. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted.
Jellyman Park Carpark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jellyman Park upgraded against NIWA advice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jack Ewen (88-92) Peter Ewen (84-188) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NIWA report at the time arrived <u>after</u> the work was complete. There was, at the time, strong support for both the development of the new parking area by the new toilets and also

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>sealing the <u>existing</u> lower Jellyman Park carpark area.</p> <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted. 2. Submitters be advised that the NIWA report was received after the Jellyman Park carpark was upgraded.
<p>Kaiata Drop In Session</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for having a local meeting but some people didn't like this type of meeting, plus it was a shame Kaiata didn't have a meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael & Jean Culling (22-24*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff developed the drop in style of meeting for members of the community have discussions with Council in a safe and informative environment. • Council had a meeting in Dobson, Greymouth and Cobden and felt that all of these were accessible for Kaiata residents. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback noted with thanks. 2. The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
<p>Kaiata Water & Sewer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How come the sewerage and water pipes were not put in at the same time? • Was it legal and fair for Council to vote yes for the sewer and water connections when the area voted against? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael & Jean Culling (22-24*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for both projects were obtained at separate times and from separate government organisations, meaning it was not possible to perform both sets of works concurrently. • Fairness of Council decisions is a governance matter. Council's obligations are to take into consideration the communities views as well as legislation and long term wellbeing of the community when making decisions.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be provided a copy of the officer comments.
<p>Liquor Licence Applications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full electronic copies of liquor licence applications on social media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanks for the feedback – it will be noted and taken into consideration as a future improvement. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted.
<p>Living Wage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for Council to become an accredited Living Wage Employer and extend living wage to Council staff Council ensure there is adequate budget to support pay equity settlements and claims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Service Association (PSA) (259-265) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback on the living wage is noted with thanks. Market, affordability, economic factors and legislative requirements are all taken into to considerations when setting Council's budgets for the future. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council is not considering moving to the Living Wage at this stage.
<p>Local Alcohol Policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a joint West Coast Local Alcohol Policy Wider hospitality industry would like the process of LAPs to be either repealed or significantly amended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Westland Hospitality NZ (43-48) Active West Coast (98-108) Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council considers the default hours in the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 to serve the District well and a formal Policy will not improve matters any, given the cost involved and threat of industry challenge. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council is not intending to develop a West Coast Local Alcohol Policy at this time.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
Parks and Tracks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of existing parks and tracks; Sport Canterbury interested in creating new walking and cycling tracks Want more walks to go on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sport Canterbury West Coast (167-171*) Grey High Students (144-145*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no plans to create additional walks at this time. Staff will note the interest and will be touch with interested stakeholders when it is time to undertake a review. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council notes it has no intention to review existing walking and cycling tracks and parks or create new ones at present due to other priorities. Council will note the interest and be touch with interested stakeholders when it is time to do so.
Planning Considerations	<p>Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide cycle lanes/infrastructure when doing road renewals or town development projects Consider equestrian users in planning considerations when designing trails; use multi purpose wording, i.e. not cycleways but cycling, walking and bridleway pathways Develop plans for safe routes to work, recreation and education More prominent cycle-parks, especially in CBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active West Coast (98-108) Public Service Association (PSA) (259-265) West Coast Equestrian Advocacy Group (230) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback noted with thanks. Staff will take this feedback into consideration. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted. The submitter be advised that these issues will be taken into consideration in future planning.
Playgrounds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessibility audits on playgrounds and parks Shade review on playgrounds Dixon Park could do with an upgrade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cancer Society (69-76) Active West Coast (98-108) Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) Levi Lord (55-56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An annual inspection of all playground equipment is carried out. Some playground equipment has been provided and specifically caters for people with disabilities at Dixon Park. When playground equipment is due for replacement, accessibility concerns will be taken into consideration.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While Council is aware of the shade review, no funding has been provided in the LTP for the providing of shades. Signage to remind users to cover up will be considered as future improvements are made to our facilities. • Approximately \$70,000 is budgeted each year for renewal of playground facilities across all its sites. While this is for renewal of existing equipment, the approach is to assess what are the latest modern equivalents. From time to time community groups also raise funds for new facilities where there has been an identified need. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council advises there is no funding available for additional shade to be provided in playgrounds. 2. Council will consider the installation of signage reminding users to cover up as part of future improvements. 3. Council advises that there are no immediate plans to upgrade Dixon Park and that playground equipment is upgraded/renewed as budgets allow.
<p>Private Swimming Lesson Cost</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private lessons cost to be lowered for disabled children • Disagrees with increase in fees for private swimming lesson costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwayne Detlaff (4-5) • Sarah Ashby (17-18) • Alice Cardwell (109) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market, affordability, economic factors and legislative requirements are all taken into considerations when setting Council's budgets for the future. This

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>includes the fees for private swimming lessons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council will consider how to implement a concession for disabled children and in the interim, staff are happy to help patrons with applications for funding from other organisations to help cover the costs of these lessons. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted. 2. Submitters be provided with a copy of the officer comments. 3. Staff be asked to look at options for price concessions for disabled children and private swimming lessons.
Population Decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest Grey District becomes a refugee centre to avoid population decline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Maunder (62-63*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback noted with thanks, <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
Productivity Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consideration to be given to implementing Productivity Commission report findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westland Hospitality NZ (43-48) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback noted with thanks. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
Public Toilets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New public toilet Kaiata • New public toilet Moana • More toilets in Greymouth, fix toilets in Greymouth • New toilet for Karoro domain • ANZAC park toilet upgrade - is no longer fit for purpose and should be upgraded/replaced as a priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaiata Community Centre (67*) • Grey High Students (144-145*) • Active West Coast (98-108) • Greymouth Athletic Club (164) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New toilets have been established in recent years in identified tourist "hotspots" such as Cobden foreshore, Blaketown foreshore, Blackball and Rapahoe. All of these sites have been established with significant funding assistance from Central Government and Council then funds the ongoing operation and maintenance through

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport Canterbury (167-171*) 	<p>general rates. Each facility costs between \$24,000 to \$26,000 per year to operate and maintain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further public toilets are planned at this stage except for ANZAC park. • Anzac Park toilets are scheduled to be upgraded in year one of the LTP. • With regards to Kaiata, public toilets are available in Greymouth, a distance of about 4 km away. The community playground has been established in front of the Community Hall and perhaps an option would be to investigate if the public toilets in this facility could be modified so that they could be used 24/7. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council declines to establish additional public toilets at this time. 2. Council advises that the upgrade of Anzac Park toilets is scheduled for year one.
<p>Rapahoe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formed footpaths • No piped stormwater drains • No plan for improvement in Rapahoe in next 10 years • No mention of sewer connection in next ten years – a proposal existed in Council’s plan two decades ago • Want Council to plan for a Rapahoe sewerage system before cost becomes too high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judy Hay (171) • Keith Rusholme (99-103*) • Austin & Annette Adams (68-69*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has not currently included any changes to the level of services provided in the Rapahoe area. • If infrastructure projects in Rapahoe were to be included in the LTP council would need to remove other planned infrastructure projects from the current plan. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p>

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			1. Feedback received and noted.
Rate Air BnB's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where premises operating as a business they should be rated as such, i.e, Air B&B Ensure rates are collected appropriately from short term rental accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Westland Hospitality NZ (43-48) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Businesses operating from a residential property need to comply with Council regulations, e.g. hairdresser, including building and access regulations. The portion of property being used for commercial purposes will generally be subject to commercial rates. Council does not currently have a separate rate for Air BnB's. Issues such as Air BnB's will be considered as part of the next rating review. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council will consider issues such as rating Air BnB's as part of the next rating review.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
Rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive • Increases are a joke, unaffordable • Unaffordable • Elderly and low-income families will struggle with proposed rates increases • Fairer system for rates, i.e. lower land value properties pay less than higher land value properties • Keep rates burden down • Happy for increase in rates, provided money is used wisely which appears to be the intention • Negative impact on some residents of Blackball • Increases reduces if we lift the threshold for the rates rebate • Rates rise will impact elderly and people on fixed incomes • Commended on the increase in the UAGC • Reduce rates rise in year 1 • Stop using ratepaying funding for the port as a non-significant piece of infrastructure – should be self-funding • Remove library development from the plan and the rates bill will be significantly less • Support for increased debt to fund infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Maunder (62-63*) • Nathaniel Fittock (23-24) • Rebekah Fittock (25-26) • Shaun Taylor (29) • Tony McDonald (30-31) • Westland Hospitality NZ (43-48) • Blackball Residents Trust (141-143*) • Bruce Stewart (18-21*) • Maree Awatere-Jones (77-78) • Robert Miedema (83) • Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) • Federated Farmers of NZ (162-165*) • Judy Hay (171) • Keith Rusholme (99-103*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rates increase has been set to achieve all our Council's planned services and projects. The planned increase also addresses Council's priorities, i.e. deferred renewals, saving for projects and putting money into our reserves. • The rates rebate scheme is run by central government and they set the maximum rebate and threshold levels. • Over the life of the plan Council aims to make the Port as self-sufficient as possible. By year 10 of the LTP, there will no longer be loan funding to supplement operational expenditure. It is unlikely that the Port will survive without ratepayer funding. The Port facility is a strategic asset for the region and therefore Council must manage the facility as prudently as possible and rates funding is required to continue to operate the asset. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
Refuse Disposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfill for sewer/stormwater separation material • Approved landfill site for asbestos material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alex Woods (91-97*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a compliant landfill that accepts all types of waste except hazardous waste (with some exceptions), Council does not differentiate based on the type of material.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some contractors have established their own clean fill sites and can therefore offer lower costs. Council has obtained resource consents at a cost of \$37,000 to establish a RMA compliant clean fill adjacent to the main landfill at McLean's and has allowed \$100,000 for its establishment in Year 1 of the LTP. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council declines the request to establish an approved landfill site for asbestos material.
Register of Community Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinated register of services that are available – i.e. meeting rooms, transport; identify gaps; district wide initiative – build connection and resilience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lynette Heine (176-178) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council produces the Clubs and Organisations Booklet, which is available online. Council relies on members of the clubs and groups to keep this updated. This register does not extend beyond these boundaries, however with collaborative partners and outside funding, it is possible for this to be included in the future. A Family Services Directory is available for support services at: https://family.services.govt.nz <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Reserve Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has multiple reserve funds put aside – why are they not being used? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael & Jean Culling (22-24*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of Council's reserves funds are set aside for specific

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wants transparency of reserve fund expenditure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruce Stewart (18-21*) Paul Berry (70-73*) 	<p>purposes, e.g. Disaster Recovery, Airport runway resealing, Area Infrastructure Reserves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reserve funds are used when required for those purposes, in this plan reserve funds are being used for airport runway resealing and replacement of Information systems within council to lessen the impact on ratepayers. Reserve funds are reported on in Annual Reports. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
<p>Road/Footpath Maintenance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Been waiting six weeks for repair in Walker Street Roads sometimes not being repaired correctly and there have been accidents due to this Road patch repairs instead of fixing the entire issue Road repairs taking too long Poor/lack of maintenance of roads and footpaths in Runanga Hill in Hall-Hones Street, Runanga dangerously slippery Broken footpath in Mills Street, Runanga Access road to Rapahoe Beach and start of Point Elizabeth Walkway needs repair Minimal roading works done in Rapahoe, no stormwater channelling and open drains Maintain footpath in Ballance Street, Runanga – vegetation/weeds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lorraine McCarthy (6-7) Bruce Stewart (18-21*) Jack Ewen (87) Greer Crisp (155-156) Public Service Association (PSA) (259-265) Paul Berry (70-73*) James Ward (170) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council will follow up on specific areas mentioned in the submissions. There has been little need to extend footpaths due to a static population, although a new footpath was installed by Council along the state highway in Rapahoe for safety reasons. Maintenance and replacement of footpaths has taken place over the 30-year time frame stated by the submitter. There is an ongoing issue with lichen, moss and mould on foot paths. To some extent this is caused by lack of foot traffic however, it is also because of the moist temperate climate. In recent times Council has been using a high temperature – high pressure water blaster to effectively

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> McGhie's Hill, 200m south of Moonlight Bridge – has issues with ice and visibility and needs attention for safety reasons Footpath extension –end of Ballance Street to Coal Creek Falls 		<p>remove these build-ups. The work will be prioritised alongside other areas of the District and within available budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven Mile Creek bridge is about to be replaced on the access road to Point Elizabeth Walkway. No assessments have been done on the need for stormwater channelling for Rapahoe township. A Needs Assessment has not been done for a footpath in Balance Street although rough order current cost estimate would be between \$45,000 (chip seal) and \$85,000 (concrete). The open drains are regularly maintained. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted. Council decline the request to extend the footpath at the end of Balance Street due to other budget priorities. Submitters be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Roadside Litter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better and regular collection of roadside litter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bernadette Burrell (111-112) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have allowed for the current level of service in the LTP budgets. Where Council is responsible for the road it will follow up with its contractors to ensure performance in this area. Council will also raise this matter with NZTA with respect to the highways. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p>

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council will follow up with contractors for local roads. 2. The feedback will be passed onto NZTA Waka Kotahi with regards to state highways.
Rubbish Bins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More rubbish bins – Countdown, Warehouse, town, bike tracks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey High Students (144-145*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter appears to be asking for more recycling stations. The one being created at Preston Road is estimated to have a final construction cost of around \$130,000 and this excludes annual maintenance and operating costs. • Notwithstanding, Council has a commitment to establish another facility in a tourist hotspot area. It is suggested that these new facilities be treated as a trial to assess its usage and deployment in other areas. • Council also notes there are more rubbish bins similar to those in the CBD to be installed shortly. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Runanga Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runanga water needs to be sorted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christopher McLoughlin (106-107*) • Lou Hassik (16-17*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council cannot proceed with commissioning the Runanga water supply as the Ministry of Health will not approve a Water Safety Plan without the use of chlorination. • Runanga will remain connected to Greymouth water supply while Council awaits the outcome of the Three Waters review.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted. 2. Submitters be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
<p>Smokefree Policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smokefree policy – extend to include no vaping in public places • Endorsement of Smoke Free Aotearoa 2025 • Signage on Council owned buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active West Coast (98-108) • Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To include “no vaping” into the existing Smokefree Public Places Policy will require a policy change. At the moment the policy is based on voluntary compliance therefore there are no plans to review the policy at this stage. • Staff note that the Outdoor Dining Policy includes no vaping and has found this to have a positive effect on smoking at outdoor dining spaces where Council leases the spaces. • Staff are happy to work with the necessary agencies on ensuring adequate smokefree signage is installed. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council notes the Outdoor Dining Policy includes no vaping and appears to work well. 2. There are no plans to review the existing Smokefree Public Places Policy at this time.
<p>Stormwater Drains, Paroa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade stormwater drains in Paroa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey High Students (144-145*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drains that run through culverts under the main road in the Paroa area are a matter for NZTA as the road manager for state highways. This request can be passed on to NZTA.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council will pass this feedback onto NZTA Waka Kotahi.
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council be a leader in honouring the Treaty and take a bicultural lens to future decision making and actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport Canterbury West Coast (167-171) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council have an MOU with its local iwi and work collaboratively to ensure councils decisions take into account all local iwi cultural considerations. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted.
Three Waters Reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those who contributed to Grey Valley Community Sewerage Scheme become shareholders. • Have a ten year sunset clause if you have a compliance on-site waste water system. • The focus on stormwater in the plan be removed as the three waters review will see the asset moved to central government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alex Woods (91-97*) • Paul Berry (70-73*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is awaiting the outcome of the Three Waters Reform. • Council was required to prepare the LTP on the basis that Three water Assets were to remain the responsibility of council over the life of the plan. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submitter be advised that Council is awaiting the outcome of the Three Waters Reform.
Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runanga has unexploited tourism potential • More tourist attractions, stuff to do in town, e.g. rugby stadium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jo Hart (132-137*) • Grey High Students (144-145*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for the feedback – it will be passed on to the West Coast Tourist Promotion Agency, Development West Coast. • Whilst nice to have, Council is generally not able to fund large tourist attractions such as rugby stadiums due to other funding priorities. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p>

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevant feedback will be passed onto Development West Coast.
Trees in CBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the trees in the CBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has a Historic Trees Register which had specialist input and was consulted on and adopted as part of the District Plan. The mature trees in the CBD were mostly planted as part of road reserve beautification and landscaping work over 20 years ago but are not protected. • There is the option for these trees to be considered in the new Te Tai o Poutini Plan. • Council must balance the needs of adjacent building owners, the health of the tree and safety concerns for road users where trees are in public spaces. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback received and noted. 2. The submitter be provided with a copy of the officer comments.
Upgrade Rooding, Eastern End of Koe Street, Moana	<p>Upgrade rooding at eastern end of Koe Street, Moana:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cul de sac offset turning head to be formed, extending the sealed area by only 10-12m, with vehicle crossings and suitable drainage being provided. • Council undertakes maintenance to the open drain, removes existing trees and provides suitable planting to the southern side of the open drain, within the road reserve, to make maintaining the area easier 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Holmes & Susan Gibson (84) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The responsibility for construction and maintenance of access ways and vehicle entrances (to Council standards) sits with the benefiting property owner (refer Legislation and Case Law). • The drainage channel referred to is part of the watercourse network for the township. The responsibility for safety around watercourses and open drains

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water flow is undercutting the bank that will likely cause collapse at some time 		<p>rests with parents and caregivers if they have safety concerns for children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the trees may be perceived as a nuisance, unless they are a safety concern there would appear to be no real reason for Council to remove them. Council could consider allowing them to be removed by others provided safety measures were put in place for those doing the work. The slumping issue will be looked into. The creation of a cul-de-sac could be a pragmatic approach. Funding for this work has not been allowed in Council budgets and therefore money would need to be found elsewhere. A cost estimate to do the work consisting of extending the seal and extending the kerb and channel in the form of a cul de sac is around \$52,000. This could be justified by reducing maintenance costs over the long term. In order to complete this work funding from the non-subsided roading budget would need to be allocated by delaying other planned works. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council will look into the slumping issue. Council declines the request to build a cul-de-sac at the eastern end of Koe Street due to other budget priorities.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
<p>Upgrade Spa Pool at WRC with Jets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade spa pool at WRC with jets. Facilities Supervisor advised pump required would cost approximately \$20,000 (supported by a petition said to be signed by 242 people) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sam Wedgood & others (146-161*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanks for the submission. It would be great to have a spa at the WRC. However, the cost quoted covers the pump only and not installation and additional operational costs. The current hot tub was designed for circulation of water only, like the other pools. To install new jets would require the removal of tiles and installation of the pump etc. This would cost significantly more than \$20,000. There is no money in the budget to fund this. Other things to take into consideration with regards to spa pools are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chlorine levels need to be higher, between 3.5 to 8.0 ppm, as more chlorine is lost due to bubbles/evaporation. Higher operational and material costs due to requirement for daily TDS level tests and daily backwashes. UV readings would need to be done every two hours (not currently part of water testing schedule). Additional cost for staff time. Due to the above considerations, this is not considered to be a priority project for the WRC at this point in time. <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council declines to fund the request due to other priorities and the increased operational costs involved.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
West Coast Food Security Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with West Coast Food Security network to improve food security on West Coast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active West Coast (98-108) Community & Public Health West Coast (124-145) Foodbank Aotearoa (9-13*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff note the issue with interest and will engage with the local network as necessary. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council notes the issue with interest and advises staff will engage with the local network as necessary.
WRC Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rust visible in several floor areas at WRC pool – proper maintenance needed to avoid expensive future repairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matthew Frost (27-28) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These concerns will be looked into. A maintenance programme has been developed to look after this important asset for our community. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter be thanked for their concerns and advised they will be looked into.
Youth Development Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth Development Strategy – Active West Coast can assist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active West Coast (98-108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will note the interest and will be touch with interested stakeholders when it is time to create a Youth Development Strategy. <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council will note the interest and be touch with interested stakeholders when it is time to create a Youth Development Strategy.
Basic Operating System (Money)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underlying assumption in the LTP that all is fine operating with within the constraints of what council can do within its restraints of time resources, money and energy. Council actually has a greater responsibility to look at the possibility of doing whatever we need to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard Osmaston (14-15*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback is noted with thanks <p>Suggested recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted.

ISSUE	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	SUBMITTER/S (PAGE NO.S)(* SPEAKING SUBMITTER)	OFFICER COMMENTS
	have to do which may include abandoning money the root of every problem we face.		
Non-core Activities included in the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's inclusion non-core activity projects in the plan in favour of including core activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Berry (70-73*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback is noted with thanks <p><i>Suggested recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received and noted.

3 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 There is only one practicable option, which is to receive and note the feedback received, along with staff comments and recommendations for discussion and decision making.
- 3.2 Due to the nature of this report, the customary format headings are not followed.

4 SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION FOR FULL COUNCIL

That -

- 1. The report be received.**
- 2. Council thanks the submitters for their submission.**
- 3. Council considers the submissions received against staff comments and suggested recommendations provided.**
- 4. Council notes the feedback received and individual decisions adopted by Council are noted below:**

5 RECOMMENDATION: