

Submission to the Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District.

From: Marci Rowe, and family members, and Ben Wybourne
649 Tutaki Sth Rd,
R.D 3 Murchison
19/8/11

To: Chief Executive Officer
Local Government Commission
PO Box 5362

We wish to submit in opposition to the current draft scheme as a whole on the following basis:

- The surveys undertaken at this point appear to be incomplete, with some inaccuracies
- As a result of this, we think that much work is still left to be done on this proposal, and we oppose any premature decision that would not reflect the best interests of all the affected communities
- We see no specific provisions for Nelson Youth and Rural Youth in the proposal, these provisions are vital for our regions
- We think a regional authority would represent our community more successfully, although we are supportive of the current Tasman District Council
- We have a wonderful tourism industry here in trout fishing, with talented hosts and guides, with absolutely no mention made in this proposal.
- We feel that the profit made from the industries in the outlying areas of Nelson would be taken by the Nelson "Super Council" and very little funding/effort/duty of care would go back into the areas providing the services.

We would like to speak to our submission,
Thankyou,

Marci Rowe
Contact 03 5239911

Donald Riezebos

From: Devin Gallagher [rubybay@me.com]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 3:45 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission on Nelson Tasman Amalgamation.

Dear Sirs,

I am short on time so kindly pardon this brief and unrefined submission.

Management of any organization is made more difficult with too many decision makers. It is a commonly documented fact that the optimum number number of employees for any person to manage is five. Generally speaking most successful institutions limit the Board of Directors to 7. The point here is that quite a few of the more difficult decisions that TDC and NCC have had to make often get compounded by the sheer numbers of councilors that staff are having to serve and respond to. Hence my difficulty in trying to understand how 16 councilors are likely to result in an efficient governance structure.

May I suggest the following: A total of seven councilors

represent (preferably with ward boundaries balancing rural and urban)	5 councilors each elected from the ward they
Commission	1 councilor elected by a Community Boards
Associations Commission	1 councilor elected by a Community

Each councilor shall appoint a single volunteer to represent their "ward" at sub committees ie Strategic Policy, Planning & Environment Commission, Engineering Commission, Parks & Reserves etc

Each of NCC and TDC's villages and/or towns would be given the opportunity to decide if they wanted to be governed by a elected Board or a volunteer association. One representative from each would serve on the respective Commission. No area would have the option of being served by both and Association and a Board.

It is important that there is a clear chain of responsibility for decision making.

It is paramount that small communities and the neighborhoods (which are the building blocks of bigger towns) retain their individuality and character. Any system of governance fails if you disenfranchise the individuals within it. Voluntary contributions of residents time are part of the fabric that "makes" successful communities.

Many of the problems that exist today were caused by a lack of clarity of responsibilities and too many cooks in the kitchen. It would be helpful if the new structure simplified the management and clarified the purpose. It is hard to imagine that management by 16 councilors will improve the situation for staff or the public.

If you would like to discuss this submission further please contact me at 03 540-2320 or by email.

Kind Regards

~Devin

Devin Gallagher
32 Broad Sea Ave

#253

Ruby Bay, Mapua 7005
03 540-2320

Donald Riezebos

From: Richard King [raking@ts.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 3:29 p.m.
To: LGC
Cc: Richard King
Subject: Nelson/Tasman Amalgamation Submission

To Whom it may concern

I wish to record my support for the Local Government Commission proposals for amalgamation of Nelson City and Tasman District Councils

Richard King

112b Grove St
The Wood
NELSON 7010

#254

Donald Riezebos

From: Brenda Foulsham [foulsham@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 3:04 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Nelson Tasman Local Government Submission

93 Fairfax Street
MURCHISON 7007

19 August 2011

Chief Executive Officer
Local Government Commission

Dear Sir or Madam

I strongly oppose the proposed amalgamation of Nelson and Tasman District Councils.

In my opinion it will not be for the betterment of the rural community. We only have to take a look at the recent drama with the lack of an effluent dump in the Nelson council region and that they believed they should not be responsible for one. People seem to be very short sighted in that the farming in the whole Nelson/Tasman region benefits all of us including providing employment for many people in one way or another in both Nelson City and the Tasman District.

From what I have read there seems to be no details supplied with this proposed amalgamation as to what the rates for our properties will be under the new scheme. We, as the rate payers need to have all this information prior to amalgamation. I look at it similarly to going on a holiday; I need to know the proposed costs up front, which is how most people operate.

There is no doubt in my eyes that Rural people understand Rural situations far better than someone living in a town. If there is amalgamation there will very likely be very few Rural representatives on the council. To not have rural representatives on the Council would be to the detriment of our community.

I do believe that the Councils need to work along together and there could be some savings in doing so. Nelson and Tasman need to work together to ensure that we are enticing visitors to the region covered under both Councils as this can only be productive for both regions.

Brenda Foulsham

#255

Donald Riezebos

From: Amy Brooke [a-m@amybrooke.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 2:50 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission opposing Nelson and Tasman amalgamation

To the Local Government Commission.

Submission on the proposal to amalgamate the Nelson and Tasman City Councils.

Please note that my husband, Dr Peter Brooke and I, **oppose the proposed amalgamation.**

There was never a grassroots movement from either Nelson or Tasman residents to combine these councils, and I believe that majority of residents of both these districts are against this proposal.

It has been very much the personal ambition of the present Nelson mayor, Aldo Miccio, who had considerable difficulty, even under an extended time frame, in gathering the 10,000 signatures needed to put the proposal to the commission.

Mr Miccio's reason was initially repeatedly stated to be that there would be distinct advantages in amalgamation, **particularly centring round the savings in rates paid by Nelson city ratepayers.**

Unfortunately, Mr Miccio has very probably been a disappointment to many Nelsonians who voted for him, as apparently, his word cannot be relied upon. Not only has he been reported, publicly, incredibly enough, as stating that he should not be held to commitments he made prior to his election, but he has on several occasions now contradicted his earlier statements, promising ratepayers "\$5 million in savings per council per year."

Mr Miccio has since reneged from this and similar statements, and has not answered questions about the considerable costs involved in buying out council chief executives with multi-year contracts, let alone the redundancy costs and all those others involved, which must accumulatively amount to many millions of dollars, in establishing a completely new organisation.

In these difficult economic times, when so many are losing jobs and having difficulty making ends meet, there is no genuinely acceptable advantage for people from amalgamation, if the chief reason initially advanced, that of savings to ratepayers, has now been abandoned.

An amalgamation which costs the residents of these districts more, rather than less, is a nonsense.

The chief reason apparently now for a proposed amalgamation which is going to cost ratepayers more, not less, as Mr Miccio so irresponsibly claimed, is simply empire-building. Advancing nebulous suggestions that both councils combined will be able to undertake more, plan more, borrow more, is simply pie in the sky. These are *not* the chief responsibilities of councils, answerable to ratepayers.

Moreover, there is now a tacit admission that amalgamation is actually going to cost ratepayers more. If so, this proposal is not justified.

Moreover, when one takes the local out of local government, precedents show us that the results are a larger, more bureaucratic organisation, less responsive to individuals and to the areas taken under its umbrella.

In addition, the community of interest has been ill-thought-through. For example, there is no community of interest at all in the proposed combining of Hira, Richmond and Nelson areas - each

256

with quite distinct characteristics.

Others have already made it plain that the councils are quite able to work together more effectively - and have objected that this particular proposal was not also advanced for consideration by the Local Government Commission - as it is one without the massive costs of amalgamation.

Auckland has been ill-served by its own recent, supposedly forward-thinking reforms which have more than ever removed the decision-making from Aucklanders - and even from the councillors themselves - as with the racist move to set up an independent, non-elected, but ratepayer-funded advisory body of part- Maori individuals.

There should be no room in any democratic organisation for special rights on the basis of race. There has, throughout history, been no better democratic principle than the equal rights of and respect for all, regardless of colour, or gender, race or creed.

In New Zealand we have been moving in these worrying, divisive directions for some time, but it does not excuse them.

Please note our submission against this proposal.

Mrs Amy J. Brooke
Dr Peter S. Brooke

Amy Brooke

www.100days.co.nz

Visit my home-page and children's literature website: www.amybrooke.co.nz

www.summersounds.co.nz

<http://brookeonline.livejournal.com>



Donald Riezebos

From: Mark [mark@drycrust.com]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 4:18 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission opposing Nelson and Tasman amalgamation

To the Local Government Commission.

I wish to register my opposition to the amalgamation of Nelson City and Tasman District Councils under the proposed scheme put forward by the Local Government Commission and currently being considered by the residents and ratepayers of the two Councils.

My opposition to the plan is based on;

1. Costs.

It is my understanding that there will be no savings made by the two Councils and that rates in the Tasman District will increase regardless of promises to the contrary made by the supporters of the proposed amalgamation.

2. Representation

A centralisation of political decision making is not, in my opinion, serving the best interests of local communities, the individuals in those communities nor of the rural communities as a whole.

3. Community Boards

The delegated powers the boards will have, I believe, are not significantly different from those the two in Tasman currently have.

Secondly, the proposed five community board structure with just one board representing the "community" of Richmond, Nelson and Hira, inadequately gives genuine community representation across the proposed region.

4. Name

The proposed name of the proposed district takes away none of the ambiguity when it come to marketing the region as a single destination

5. Co-operation

A new Council structure will not remedy the personality conflicts that have in the past hindered the smooth working relationship between Council and Community Boards and between the two Councils working together on shared service projects.

The proposed amalgamation proposal as it stands, does not in my opinion, provide a solution to better governance of the region.

Please note my submission against this proposal.

**Mark Raffills
3 Orion Street
Collingwood**

LS2 #

Donald Riezebos

From: r.nuttall [r.nuttall@slingshot.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 9:27 a.m.
To: LGC

To
Local Government Commission
Re
Proposed union of Nelson / Tasman Local Government Authorities.

I wish to state my strongest opposition to the above proposal.

The previous amalgamation of councils that created the now Tasman district council failed to make the changes that were presented as improvements in cost saving and services to the ratepayer.

The rate take in the old Waimea district increased by 25% the first year of amalgamation.

The Waimea ratepayer assets were shared between the amalgamated councils. This created additional year by year extra costs on the old Waimea ratepayers.

Pre-existing council boundaries were altered and this disturbed and in some instances alienated previous communities of interest.

Rural ratepayers have been burdened with rising costs with little or no improvement in services. Rural road servicing and repair has deteriorated since amalgamation as the council no longer owns their own repair and maintenance services. Often decision making as to roading requirements and timing of repairs or maintenance is now decided by urban or city dwellers in either council or private companies now employed by council. Previously such decisions were made by council staff employed by the earlier rural councils and these staff members lived and recognised the priorities of the district.

Here and elsewhere it has been proven that amalgamations involving diverse districts of interest, city/urban and rural areas; such unions have created serious problems with the rural areas being alienated to the advantage of the city areas.

It is not possible, nor is it a requirement of the rural ratepayer to have all the council services that are required by the city dweller. Nor is it realistic for the rural dweller to have the same restrictions on them as those placed on the city or urban dweller. Nor should these diverse groups be required to subsidise each other and this situation has proven to be inherent where unions have taken place.

Nelson and Tasman councils have various interests in common where ownership and services are shared. This sharing of interests are being carried out in a responsible manner and there is no reason for this sharing of interests to be used as an excuse for amalgamation.

As I see it, the present presentation of the proposed union of Nelson and Tasman councils has, has my view and that of many others, been presented and handled in a extreme amateurish way. When first presented by the Mayor of Nelson in the media the majority understood it to be a simple search where all avenues for improved communication, services and costs to the ratepayers would be investigated and would a union between the two councils improve these situations. When the petition failed to produce the numbers required, for some reason a time extension was asked for and granted. During this extension the Nelson Mayor begged for people of Tasman to sign the petition so that the investigation could go ahead purely to investigate public opinion. This was presented totally different when the Mayor of Nelson sort the right from the LG Commission to an amalgamation investigation.

258

Many suggested improvements have been implied and then contradicted by the next statement.

Just one example.

It has been stated that Tasman is overburdened by loans, followed by the statement that by amalgamating the councils, the loans can be increased. Such confusing and contradicting statements or suggestions are not what the voter requires if a the commission expects the voter to make an informed decision.

In my view the “Strateg.Ease' consultant report” fails horribly in its accuracy and I’m sure is an embarrassment to the commission who paid good money for it. Costs which will eventually be another burden past on to the ratepayer.

Is this how money will be spent should a union take place?

In the papers presented to the public by the commission at no point has a perceived existing problem been identified, followed by a proven solution.

All that has been presently presented are possibilities, that may achieve subject to how councils might in the future handle a situation. This means nothing positive, indeed the writers have nothing positive to present in amalgamating the councils.

Suggestions of fewer staff is once again a fallacy, as the past has proven that not only are the original staff numbers maintained, but staff numbers are increased as with the combined staff a new middle management is created.

Also past experiences have proven that the larger the council, the greater number of staff, the greater the barrier between ratepayer and council and with is a loss in democracy.

The majority of councils that have amalgamated have seen much higher rate increases than those that have remained in their stand alone situation.

Many elected council representatives have found it hard to represent their districts after amalgamation. This is especially noticeable where diverse areas of interest such as Nelson and Tasman have been amalgamated.

It is impossible here to present fully the proven disadvantages in the union of councils of this size and diverse interests. One can only presume that those promoting this union are doing so to enhance their own interests, rather than considering the good of the communities in which they now live.

This amalgamation of councils is not isolated to New Zealand but has been forced upon councils in many countries.

While investigating amalgamations I have found few cases of satisfaction and where amalgamations have been considered to be successful they have been a union between communities of like interest.

If any amalgamation was to be seriously considered then a union between the urban districts of Nelson and Richmond would have been promoted.

I therefore wish it recorded that I oppose any amalgamation between Nelson and the Tasman district council.

**R Nuttall
Eden Rd
RD2
Upper Moutere**

Donald Riezebos

From: David & Jan Morgan [dejrmorgan@farmside.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 1:21 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: LGC proposal for Nelson Tasman amalgamation

We wish to register our support for the proposal for amalgamation of Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council as proposed by the Local Government Commission.

1. We support the proposed structure.
2. We particularly endorse the increased delegated powers to Community Boards.
3. We support the Capital Value rating system.

We do not wish to make a submission in person.

David and Jan Morgan
103 Parapara Valley Rd
RD2 Takaka
03 524 8331

#259

Donald Riezebos

From: judy price [judydownundernz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 2:04 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission for amalgamation of nelson and tasman Districts councils.

Chief Executive Officer
Local Govt. Commission
Wellington.

Dear Sir

I am forwarding the following in response to the draft provided to ratepayers of the proposed Scheme for the amalgamation and reorganisation between the Nelson City and Tasman District Councils,

There are numerous flaws and clouded distortions in the Statement of Advantages and Disadvantages provided for public perusal, too many to itemise. I have far better uses for the considerable quantity of A4 paper that would be required to reply in depth. Therefore I have forwarded the following.

Yours

Judith Price

23 Hampden St
Murchison
TASMAN
Telephone: 03 523 9983

I would be interested in attending a Commission Hearing if held in Murchison.

Judy Wallman, a professional genealogy researcher in southern California, was doing some personal work on her own family tree. She discovered that Congressman Harry Reid's great-great uncle, Remus Reid, was hanged for horse stealing and train robbery in Montana in 1889. Both Judy and Harry Reid share this common ancestor.

The only known photograph of Remus shows him standing on the gallows in Montana territory:

On the back of the picture Judy obtained during her research is this

inscription:

'Remus Reid, horse thief, sent to Montana Territorial Prison 1885, escaped 1887, robbed the Montana Flyer six times. Caught by Pinkerton detectives, convicted and hanged in 1889.'

So Judy recently e-mailed Congressman Harry Reid for information about their great-great uncle Harry Reid:

Believe it or not, Harry Reid's staff sent back the following biographical sketch for her genealogy research:

260

"Remus Reid was a famous cowboy in the Montana Territory . His business empire grew to include acquisition of valuable equestrian assets and intimate dealings with the Montana railroad. Beginning in 1883, he devoted several years of his life to government service, finally taking leave to resume his dealings with the railroad. In 1887, he was a key player in a vital investigation run by the renowned Pinkerton Detective Agency. In 1889, Remus passed away during an important civic function held in his honor when the platform upon which he was standing collapsed."

NOW THAT's how it's done, Folks!

That's POLITICAL SPIN

Gordon Wilcock
Wilcock Truck Painters Ltd
108a Hayton Road
Sockburn
Christchurch

Ph 03 343 2001
or 021 230 7610

Donald Riezebos

From: Freedom Camping [freedomcamping13@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 2:21 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Nelson Tasman reorganisation

firstly, I do not 'submit' on this issue as the transitive use of this word is way to close to the intransitive meaning for my liking, and i prefer to only lay down when I sleep

however as a resident of Mohua I have an opinion to share with you as you go through this process

i do not wish to speak at a hearing

in the next version of the reorganisation scheme the community boards must have all responsibilities for activities in their area delegated to them as a matter of course along with the funds to action them

it is then up to each community board to decide which of those delegations they cannot manage due to insufficient resources or skills

the standard version where those in power and at a distance decide what control they will release is feudalistic and i believe we are well beyond that

council for broad governance only and local boards for management inside the community

thank you for taking so much time away from your garden to read these submissions and debate the detail, i'm going back to mine now to ensure my family has food this coming summer

naku noa

antony hodgson
mohua

261

Donald Riezebos

From: Shackleton Family [shackfamily@slingshot.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 2:44 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission re: Nelson / Tasman

To the Chief Executive Officer

I believe that the Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council should be re-united into one region. I also believe this unified council should be known as the Nelson District Council. We are historically the Nelson Region!

The two larger towns in our region; Richmond and Nelson; are geographically so close that it is not possible to separate them in many ways, particularly in regard to the amenities their residents use/share. I imagine there is an opportunity here also for smaller towns/areas to have stronger representation.

Ultimately I feel the long term financial benefits will be improved and am not concerned about my personal rates going up or down somewhat if Nelson can be a stronger player nationally and feel a stronger regional pride in a united Nelson region once again. Nelson Region could be a bigger fish in the New Zealand pond instead of a couple of minnows!

I would be happy to speak at a commission hearing if required though I cannot at the moment present any facts or figures to back up any of my thoughts and feelings. I am just proud to be born and raised in Nelson and include many parts of the region as my playground growing up! I don't want to feel alienated from those places any more by these imaginary council boundaries.

Thank you

Joy Shackleton (Mrs)
144 Parkers Road
Tahunanui
Nelson

(03) 548 5134

#262

Donald Riezebos

From: Victoria Davis [moonbow@goldenbay.net.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 18 August 2011 5:45 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: submission on Nelson Tasman Amalgamation proposal

My name is Victoria Davis and I have lived in Golden Bay since the Golden Bay since GB County Council days, which would incidentally be my first choice for our seat of local government if that were a possibility. I have worked in the health and tourism sector and I have been the cycle advocate spokesperson for Golden bay for decades.

I would like to speak to my submission, preferably in Golden Bay.

My contact is by return email or
PO Box 92
Takaka 7142
ph 03 525 9298

Thank you for considering our submissions with such diligence so far.

I have four main concerns

1. the delegations to the Community Boards

- need to be substantially increased
- appropriate increases in remuneration of board members need to follow this
- funding to enable projects to take place need to be allocated
- we need to avoid the current "you can't have cycle ways in Golden Bay because we need them in Richmond where they would benefit more people"
- I would like to see %'s set for Golden Bay to have some of every budget and discession enabled [ei. like instead of getting funding for a building facility, we might decide as a community to create a cycle way with bridges.]
- The delegated authorities need to be in place permanently, the idea of them being easy to phase out later is not desire able

2. the possible loss of "local"

- this is well covered in Tara Forde's [who has served as a Motueka CB member] submission
- services like simple road maintenence NEED to be totally in Golden Bay , under GBCC we used to ring the office and any slip, broken sign, fallen tree would be dealt to by a LOCAL contractor, that very day, so not the case now!
- for a healthy community, people need to feel part of it and having a sense of belonging to something different and unique, that makes up who you are is important
- Golden bay wants to maintain our own style and value of the environment that is essential to our tourism industry

3. the workings of the representative process

- I would like to see STV voting
- I would like to see definite representation on council by CB chairs [of a stand in representative if chair is not available]
- I would like to see a process set up to allow for people who want or need to leave council, can do so with others moving into that space instead of by-elections
- I would like to see a robust ombudsman process for anyone feeling wronged by the council [ei., like the current decision by TDC not to protect residents who are exposed to higher than normally allowed noise levels from motocross]
- I would like to see a mandatory un bias reporting of all meetings and clear notices of submissions processes
- I endorse Joe Bell's submission which covers this subject in detail

4. a dream list

- I would like to see a mandatory non bias reporting of all meetings and clear notices of submissions processes and meetings

#263

I would like to see encouragement for women and young people [who are currently underrepresented on local councils to the detriment of fair decision making processes] to stand for office

Schools be involved in consultations, making kids feel that they belong and teach them how to participate in local government, such as how to make submissions

Golden Bay be totally acknowledged as a separate identify within the region, being proudly different and enabled to stay different [ie not be forced to have street lights and curb and channels urban designs that stifle our quant country environment. We would rather not have to fight with council imposing over the hill solutions to our problems as we have experienced with TDC.

Donald Riezebos

From: Green MPs Nelson [greenmps.nelson@parliament.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 6:14 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission to Local Govt Commission re Nelson/Tasman amalgamation

Submission to Local Government Commission re Nelson/Tasman Amalgamation.

Joanna Plows
17A Mt.Pleasant Avenue, Nelson 7610
Phone : 548 1574
Email : hein@kinect.co.nz

While I see Nelson and Richmond sharing many common assets/issues, I am concerned for the well-being of the more rural areas of Tasman.

Their issues are different and under amalgamation, I would like assurance of their ability to be heard. For example, Community Boards must be provided with the necessary amount of administrative and governance funds/support they require.

This needs to come from the general rate not a targeted rate.

I would definitely like to see more dialogue and sharing of transport costs between Nelson and Richmond. This applies especially with the new proposed Public Transport Plan and express service in morning and afternoon between the 2 towns.

I would like to see the introduction of a Maori Ward for more inclusive representation especially of issues directly affecting Maori.

More encouragement of Youth involvement and civil education.

Acknowledgement that there is a large number of older people in the Nelson/Tasman region who are on fixed incomes and may not be able to afford rate increases.

With increasing awareness of climate change issues, I would like to see acknowledgement of learning to live within our means and within the region's capability of providing -

More community gardens and areas to grow food and 'open orchards'.

#264

Donald Riezebos

From: Vicky Melville [vicky.melville@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 8:05 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

Submission on Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

18 August 2011

Dear Sirs,

I am opposed to the proposed 'union' as I do not believe that it is in the best interests of rural Tasman. I would prefer to see the Tasman District Council retained and for it to continue to work closely with Nelson City Council – a situation which currently works well for most major projects.

I am unconvinced that there will be genuine costs savings as a result of the amalgamation.

I am concerned that the proposed new Community Board for Moutere-Waimea will add an unnecessary level of bureaucracy with additional and needless expenditure to undertake work which is currently done, at least in my community, by local people volunteering through local community groups and organisations.

In the event that amalgamation proceeds, it is my belief that the new body should be called the **Tasman-Nelson District Council** to reflect the fact that Tasman has a larger population than Nelson, that it is a much larger land area and that Nelson's economy depends to a large extent on primary industries in Tasman.

I wish to be heard.

Yours faithfully

Victoria Jane MELVILLE
Dovedale
R.D. 2 Wakefield
Nelson 7096
Tel. 03-5433628

#265

Donald Riezebos

From: NoCatchem [nocatchem@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 8:51 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission on amalgamation

19/08/2011

We am totally apposed to the proposed amalgamation of Tasman District and Nelson City Councils.

We live in the Lakes Murchison Ward (TDC).

In 2007 the local Government Commision, in their infininte wisdom, reduced our councillors from 2 to 1 PLUS increased the area. You then gave that councillor to Richmond.

Obviously your present representation model is only temporary, to try to get support for this ill concieved waste of money and time. The rural rate payers will loose out. GUARANTEE!!!

Phillip & Fiona Borlase
30 Borlase Ave
Lake Rotoiti
RD2
Nelson 7072

#266

Donald Riezebos

From: Susan Sutherland [susuth@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Saturday, 20 August 2011 9:12 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Amalgamation of Nelson City and Tasman District Councils

Submission on the Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the union of Nelson City and Tasman District
from:- C.M.Susan Sutherland, 11 Waimea West Road, Brightwater, 7022

1. On reading the papers on the Commission's Draft Organisation Scheme and their Findings and Decision, I am struck by the Commission's thoroughness in its researching and consideration of all aspects of the situation.

2. I have to admit to some personal prejudice, based on:-

a) My experience of Amalgamation as a Local Council employee both before and following the 1965 Greater London reorganisation in England. An efficient and locally focussed small Borough (Shoreditch) became swallowed up in a larger centralised system with Hackney and Stoke Newington. The resulting loss of direct control of local services was accompanied by frustrating battles with the overwhelmed central offices, who had no personal contact with, or interest in, the local ratepayers. I have never seen or heard of any reports comparing costs of services before and after, but presumably there have been some studies done. I would be very surprised if they showed any cost savings. In attempts to keep communication alive, it seemed necessary to spend (or 'waste') hours of staff time on travel to and from meetings and on reading reams of paper with circulated Minutes, to name just two of the additional and obvious extra costs.

b) My experience as a ratepayer since 1989 in Tasman District, where on the whole services are efficient and where the Councillors and staff are able to be approached with concerns (though this has been less so in recent years since computers have actually de-personalised communication). Tasman's public meetings to discuss, for example, the allocation of water and augmentation schemes on the Waimea plain have been well attended, interesting and of value.

3. I am opposed to the Draft Organisation Scheme on the grounds

- a) That it seems unnecessarily complicated, in its attempt to "fix something that isn't broken".
- b) That the present problems with outlying areas feeling neglected will only be compounded when the two main urban areas are joined to form one overpowering Community (8/1).
- c) That the proposed 'Powers' of the Community Boards are of derisory importance. There is no improvement to the present system, especially with respect to Golden Bay and its problems with the present T D C. All important decisions will still be centralised, and it seems very likely that even statutory delegated powers will be sidestepped as happens now.
- d) That, while no doubt essential if Amalgamation went ahead, the transition period and its interim committee are of nightmare quality.

4. Finally, a study of the Decision paper and the main points made in submission and at hearing (Appendix A) resulted in my rejection of the points in favour of the proposal. I was only in agreement with the key points made against the proposal (pp.25-26).

#267

Donald Riezebos

From: Ian Barker [ianpb@ihug.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 9:56 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission. Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District.

Dear Commissioners,

Please accept this short submission on two matters.

1. I wish to urge that you amend the proposed constitution to provide for the name of the new region to be the "Nelson District Council"

Reason for submission. I believe that common usage both locally and New Zealand wide will evolve in a very short time to use the short version which is the name of the old province which originally covered this part of New Zealand.

2. I wish to particularly support sections 6,7,8,9 and 10 of the Draft Scheme.
(Organizational Structure.)

Reason. I believe your proposed organizational makeup will provide for a participative, open and importantly democratic system where communities of interest will be represented and heard by their community boards, their ward representatives and the Regional Council. A further reason, is that, I oppose any suggestions to establish race based community boards or wards. There are 7 iwi in the area and members of these iwi who reside within the boundary are outnumbered by non iwi Maori. (Mata Waka) Based on reported processes in other places decision making becomes stretched, cumbersome and inefficient with separate Maori wards or community boards. Also as the electors for any Maori wards or boards are likely to be those on the Maori rolls, the many Maori on the general roll would not be represented. The Nelson City Council has and has had Maori elected at large as Councillors and has had a Maori Mayor.

I do not ask to be heard but I am very willing to attend should you so wish.

Regards,
Ian Barker.
Nelson City Councillor.

Sent from my iPad

#268

Donald Riezebos

From: John & Ruth Thomson [jdrthomson@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 10:54 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: submission

Dear CEO,

I wish to register my concerns regarding the amalgamation of Nelson and Tasman Councils.

I am against this amalgamation as I see diminishing representation for the rural areas especially Murchison and more so the Maruia area. As representation is based on population these areas are never going to be represented fairly and would eventually lose it altogether.

The proposed Community Board system for Murchison will not work. A community is "a group of people living in one district." St Arnaud, Murchison Maruia Tapawera is not one district. They are distinctly different. They do not share any existing services. They have nothing to do with each other and travel between Murchison and St Arnaud is limited. Please remember Murchison extends south another 60 km.

I urge you to please take this into consideration.

Yours faithfully
Ruth Thomson (Mrs)
ph 03 5238982

269

From: R Holden [russellholden@ihug.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 11:32 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Submission on the Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council Amalgamation Proposal

Submission on the Proposal for a Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

The Local Government Commission has provided details on the scope of the new entity under an amalgamation of Tasman District Council, (TDC), and Nelson City Council, (NCC), based on the size and Community Board structures of; Tauranga City Council, Dunedin City Council, and the Palmerston North City Council.

I am unsure as to how the operations of a large urban authority, such as these three, compares in any way to a unitary authority with regional responsibilities, in addition to meeting the mix of needs of distinct urban, and rural communities. The requirements of the proposed new union are clearly vastly more comprehensive than the functions of Tauranga City Council, Dunedin City Council, or Palmerston North City Council. Such a comparison is flawed and misleading.

To provide a more accurate estimate of size and ongoing staffing and operating costs, I request the Commission takes the following range of factors into consideration and provides the details to the ratepayers of TDC and NCC to better inform the decision makers;

- Size and scope of the district to be covered
- Provision of services to be supplied, as a large unitary authority with a mix of urban and rural responsibilities.
- Determine the upcoming needs of the respective communities, i.e. Capital works as programmed in the respective LTCCPs of each Council
- A likely timeframe to blend the two organisations into one.
- Estimate of amalgamation costs to complete the merger.

In furnishing this information the Commission would provide a clearer understanding of both the size and scope of the new Council, and give a more accurate picture of future costs. Ratepayers will then be in a stronger position to better judge all merits of the proposal.

Kind regards
Russell Holden

Donald Riezebos

From: Julia Melville [jkmelville@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, 19 August 2011 11:32 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

Chief Executive Officer
Local Government Commission
PO Box 5362
Wellington 6145

18 August 2011

Dear Sir,

Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

I am writing with regard to the above.

I am aware that the Commission has been unable to consider what might be the BEST option for the Tasman and Nelson communities, by the wording of Mr Miccio's petition and the provisions of the Local Government Act. As such, one cannot help but wonder whether what the Commission has proposed is, indeed, the best option available. This raises concerns that the suggested benefits of the proposed amalgamation might not be the best available, and that some of the 'disadvantages' identified by the Commission, notably that relating to 'perceived loss of democracy' could be better dealt with under a different organisational structure.

Whilst I am confident that the Commission has undertaken its task appropriately, this does **not** necessarily lead to confidence in the outcome of the process.

In recognition of the fact that I am only able to submit on the Draft Reorganisation Scheme as notified, I wish to raise the following matters:

s1(1). Commencement

See below re name.

s2(1). 'one district to be known as Nelson-Tasman District'.

The Commission apparently provides no rationale for the name of the new district. In view of the fact that Nelson owes much of its current prosperity to the rural hinterland I submit that the name should be **Tasman-Nelson District**. Not only would this recognise the importance of the primary industry sector but ensure that the rural communities are not forgotten in what will be, inevitably, a council dominated by representatives of urban populations and interests. I am aware that Nelson City Councillors have suggested that an amalgamated council should simply be the "Nelson District Council", with the rationale that 'if Wellington and Porirua were joined, it would not be the Wellington-Porirua Council' (apologies for not having the direct quote from the Nelson Mail, week of the 8th of August 2011). I would like to point out that Tasman is of far greater area and slightly greater population than Nelson and there is in my opinion no reason why 'Nelson' should have priority. Any amalgamated council could perfectly well be the 'Tasman Council', but assuming that will not be accepted by the powerful in Nelson, see below.

S2(2) The name of the council should be **Tasman-Nelson District Council**.

#271

3. Boundaries

The proposed seaward boundary is supported.

4(1)(2). Regional government.

Name to be changed to Tasman-Nelson Region.

7 Membership

The proposal for 16 councillors and 1 mayor is based on the 'proposals in relation to community boards and the powers and delegations to the boards'. I do not support the proposals made for community boards (see below).

The Moutere-Waimea ward should have 3 elected councillors.

9 Community Boards

I do not support the proposals made for community boards. In particular I can see no advantage in a community board being established for Moutere-Waimea where I live. The proposed delegations are largely irrelevant and the Dovedale Residents' Committee (volunteers) currently handles local issues and liaises closely with both council staff and elected councillors. To add a new layer of bureaucracy seems to achieve nothing other than increase expenditure. I would prefer that the number of councillors for the Moutere-Waimea Ward be increased from 2 to 3 and the community board for the area not be established. I believe that this will allow for greater participation in the democratic process than what is currently proposed.

10 Powers of community boards

See above. A number of the matters listed in the Schedule are irrelevant to my community and almost all of the remaining matters are currently handled by the residents' committee. I see no justification for the establishment of a community board for Moutere-Waimea and wish there to be 3 councillors for the ward, rather than the 2 currently proposed.

21 Resource Management Act (1)(2)(3)(4)

Name to be changed to Tasman-Nelson District Council.

I am concerned about the lack of transparency and information available regarding the costs of amalgamating the councils. A little publicised consideration is that the Tasman and Nelson computer systems are not compatible. Auckland spent \$576 million upgrading for the super city and there has been no indication what would need to be spent here. There have likewise been no real figures about the costs of redundancies and training of staff, and how many ex-employees would likely be rehired as consultants.

In summary, I do not support the proposed amalgamation. In the event that the amalgamation proceeds, I wish to be represented by 3 elected councillors, rather than 2 councillors and a 'community board'.

I wish to be heard.

Yours faithfully

Julia Katherine MELVILLE
1261 Dovedale
R.D. 2 Wakefield
Nelson 7096
Tel. 03-5433628

Donald Riezebos

From: hanne bjorklund [bjorklund@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Saturday, 20 August 2011 6:38 p.m.
To: LGC
Subject: proposed amalgamation between the Tasman District and Nelson City.

Hanne Bjorklund
294 Old Coach Road
Upper Moutere 7173

TDC Valuation Roll Number: 19380 67100

Saturday, 20 August 2011

Chief Executive Officer
Local Government Commission
PO Box 5362
Wellington 6145
Email: info@lgc.govt.nz

Dear Sir / Madam

I oppose the proposed amalgamation between the Tasman District and Nelson City.

1/ Signatures in support of an amalgamation were obtained in response to unsubstantiated promises of post amalgamation savings in administrative costs and a subsequent reduction in rates.

2/ Proponents of the proposal are unable to state precisely how the vote getting savings promises will be achieved. They are also unable to state how a united council will be able to better administer the Tasman District. Until they are able to do so, all votes cast in their favour were based on false information and should be declared invalid.

3/ Contrary to the claims of pro-amalgamationists, it is a well known fact that the bigger the bureaucracy the greater the unit cost, with an ensuing reduction in the efficiency of service.

4/ Rural, export income producing ratepayers will be disadvantaged through being rated to pay for city luxuries.

5/ The proposed rural boundary lines fragment several communities of interest.

6/ The Nelson Millennium Performance Centre is unaffordable for Nelson. The average Tasman District income is well below the national average and few would be able to make use of Nelson's Millennium Extravaganza in spite of having to pay for it through their rates.

7/ Only a minor portion of whatever tourism income might be derived, will reach the Tasman District.

8/ An amalgamation with Nelson will have a detrimental effect on the Tasman Districts export income earning capacity.

I wish to speak to my submission.

#272

Hanne Bjorklund

Chief Executive Officer
Local Government Commission
PO Box 5362
WELLINGTON 6145

Email info@lgc.govt.nz

RE; Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

Submission From:

Paul Heywood

I am a second generation Orchardist of 51 years experience living in Dehra Doon Road, Riwaka.

I was the Nelson Director of The New Zealand Fruitgrowers Federation representing Nelson fruitgrowers from 1978 to 1993. The position included National responsibilities that involved collective determination on behalf of all fruitgrowers in New Zealand.

I wish to express support for to proposed union of Nelson City and Tasman District because I believe our future should be driven as a whole region combining the GDP of the Region with the urban areas of the Region. Long term planning based on the best interest of the whole Region must pervade any other individual selfish reasons.

The current proposal to retain the ward structure is essential to ensure representation with the rural areas compared with the highly populated urban areas; I suggest that Nelson City area should also be structured the same way.

It is crucial to have the Head Office situated in Richmond to demonstrate the new Regional driver that is essential to achieve the new regional perspective and belonging.

#273

Submission to Local Government Commission 19 August 2011

I live in Richmond. I am a businessman who travels on an almost weekly basis to other parts of New Zealand. I am in my early 60s and have lived in areas that have been successfully amalgamated into larger councils. For example: Riccarton and Lyttelton, now part of the Christchurch City Council, Whitby now part of Porirua City Council.

I support amalgamation of the TDC and Nelson Councils.

I have lived in this region for 11 years and have felt a strong sense of frustration at the lack of united vision for the entire region covered by the 2 councils. We lack facilities in the region that other communities of a similar have.

The reasons I think amalgamation should proceed for the following reason which are in part a subset of the commissions finding which were also included in my original submission in 2010:

1. The combined area of Tasman District and Nelson City is best recognised as a single community of interest. High growth in Richmond and Nelson means that the existing boundary between Nelson City and Tasman District is increasingly artificial. There is increasing cross-boundary use of council and non-council services and facilities. There is inter-dependence of 'urban' and 'rural' communities within the Nelson-Tasman area.
2. Local government needs to be accountable to the regional community as a whole rather than the communities of the district and the city. The proposal will allow for a single decision-making structure for the region, which will result in consistency of approach and timeliness of decision-making. Currently there are delays in decisions being made for the region as a whole and the quality of decisions is affected by the two councils working independently but needing to reach consensus.
3. Planning that recognises the region as one environmental, economic and social unit should be occurring so that priorities can be established for meeting the long-term needs of the region.
4. One planning and asset management framework will enable a consistent administration and funding approach across the region for infrastructure, waste, transport, community and regulatory services. There will be opportunities to provide better service delivery and reduce costs through having single contracts for services for the whole region and by rationalising the infrastructure to support services. There is the potential for procurement advantages.
5. The proposal will enhance the overall financial capacity of local government in the area. This will enable, for example, greater flexibility to develop infrastructure appropriate to present and future community needs and respond to emergencies. There may be ongoing

operational savings as a result of having one, rather than two councils. It will be more cost-effective to prioritise on a regional basis.

6. The proposal will enable the better parts of the two existing councils to continue. Having a regional focus will improve organisational culture and job satisfaction by removing an existing (artificial) focus on inter-council relationships. It will give the opportunity to pick 'best of breed' systems and department processes
7. The proposal to centre the councils offices in Richmond is an excellent decision as it will be geographically closer to the centre of the regions population development which likely to be around and beyond Richmond than Nelson City.

To confirm: I support the amalgamation of the TDC and Nelson councils.

I would like to meet the commission and speak about my submission. My day time contact phone is 03 544 5584 or 027 208 3199.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stuart Macann', written in a cursive style.

Stuart Macann

8 Angelus Avenue

Richmond