

## Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2775217DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	15/08/2011
Author Name	Sue and Peter	Version	1

## Document Content

**To:** LGC  
**Cc:**  
**Date/time Received:** 15/08/2011 9:59:22 a.m.  
**Subject:** Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District

**From:** Peter Clausen  
1305 Dovedale Road, RD2, Wakefield  
Tasman

Date: 15 August

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

**I wish to oppose the amalgamation of Nelson City and Tasman District for the following reasons:**

**The report that was issued by the local government commission on 13 June 2011 is based on the StrategEase Ltd report.**

**1. It has been shown that this report has a number of errors based on the financial situation of both councils.**

**2. The people compiling this report failed to consult with either the local councils or the people of the region.**

**The evidence for this being that they did not visit the region either prior or during while filling out the report.**

**3. The Moutere - Waimea Ward, should the amalgamation go ahead, will have lost representation. This being the result of elected members being reduced from 3 to 2. The introduction of community boards are introducing a level of representation that already exists in our area with the local Residents Committee. The people on this committee have for a number of years run the local facilities at no cost and to introduce paid community board**

**members for this role is a waist of rate payers money and a lack of appreciation for the work that volunteers have done for many years.**

Last updated by Donald Riezabos on 15/08/2011 10:51 a.m.

## LGC Documents

### Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2784625DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Union of Nelson City and Tasman District		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	19/08/2011
Author Name	David Melville	Version	1

### Document Content

**To:** LGC  
**Cc:**  
**Date/time Received:** 19/08/2011 8:08:56 p.m.  
**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**

394

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.

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

**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**.

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

David Stuart MELVILLE  
Dovedale  
R.D. 2 Wakefield  
Nelson 7096  
Tel. 03-5433628

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 22/08/2011 09:25 a.m.



## Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	└─ 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2781805DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme Submission for the Draft Reorganisation Scheme		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	18/08/2011
Author Name	Herb Hesketh	Version	1

## Document Content

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	18/08/2011 2:42:58 p.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	Submission for the Draft Reorganisation Scheme

To Whom It May Concern,

I am hereby handing in my submission against the "Draft Reorganisation Scheme", dated the 13th of June 2011. I am against the scheme for a number of reasons, some of these are as follows:

- I believe that a union between the Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council is detrimental to the area if there is the expectation for more effective governance and decision making because the smaller rural areas could be seen as severely disadvantaged by the governance structure proposed by the "Draft Reorganisation Scheme" due to the fact that balance of voting power that is allocated to certain areas. The Tasman District covers a 14,812sq Km area which is as i believe it the largest single counseled area in the country, and the Nelson City covers 432sq Km area.
- In my view there are problems from both councils governing what they already do, so combining these two areas will add to the problems that already exist, it is difficult to see how a union will provide for these areas effectively and to the satisfaction to both sectors of these uniquely different communities, needs and views differing greatly between them.?
- With concern to the level of rates paid by Rural and Urban residences, if there is a Rural increase in rates, many of the residences will find themselves at a loss to finance?their lifestyles. Due to the fact that they will be paying more for community services that they do not or rarely use, such as footpaths, sewerage, museums, public toilets, street lighting, recycling, to name just a few, on top of the cost of travelling to the urban sectors to work, or to use any of the public services as well as an increased cost for fuel, road user charges wear and tear on vehicles and time taken to travel, where as the urban users who are the high users of these services need only walk to said services.
- I also have concerns for the smaller rural areas that already feel they are unheard being shunted even further into obscurity by the power balance being very one-sided advantaging the few with loud voices and ignoring or just not hearing the many who don't want to make a fuss as many rural residences do.

Thank you for your time!

395

Yours sincerely  
Herbert Hesketh

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 18/08/2011 03:04 p.m.

## Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2783138DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme LGCRe-organisationproposal02082011.doc		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	18/08/2011
Author Name	Heinz DE	Version	1

## Document Content

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	18/08/2011 8:40:50 p.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	LGCRe-organisationproposal02082011.doc

**Heinz Oertli Submission to Local Government Commission Draft re organization proposal for a union between Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council to form the Nelson-Tasman District Council.**

?

Although I have used the same format of submission that Joe Bell has done in his submission, I totally support the proposals he has come up with. I particularly want to support the concept of a deputy councillor (if Golden Bay only has one ? what happens if that person is sick / away for voting that is relevant to Golden Bay?)

Also I strongly support exploring the possibility of having a combined Nelson and Tasman Council and then separating out the District and Regional Council functions by establishing the Nelson ? Tasman District Council and the Tasman ? Nelson Regional Council (see "Other Options" No 2)

?

### **Introduction.**

The issue of a possible union between Nelson City and Tasman District has arisen many times over the past twenty years.

I have supported an independent study to collate information regarding such a proposal so that the proposition could be considered in an informed way.

I thank the Local Government Commission (LGC) for investigating this matter and having reported in a clear and understandable way.

396

The main effort now is to encourage residents of both Nelson and Tasman to become informed by reading the proposal and its associated reports.

This issue has suffered from polarization through ignorance and promotion of the status quo by those with a direct vested interest in maintaining this. There has been considerable opposition from some in Tasman District Council to the initiation of a proposal and to collating information to inform the debate.

Ignorance is not bliss and this issue will continue to be raised if it is not settled.

?

### **Other Options.**

I am concerned that the other options suggested during the previous submission round have not been investigated by the LGC.

I understand the Commission used a legal opinion supplied by Simpson Grierson dated 11 September 2008 regarding a proposal to abolish Kaikoura District Council and incorporate it into Hurunui District and whether the Commission could decide to incorporate Kaikoura into Marlborough District Council instead.

The legal opinion was that this would be beyond the LGC powers.

With respect, this issue is quite different to the two proposals put forward that suggested:

- 1) Separating Motueka and Golden Bay from Tasman District to form Motueka ? Golden Bay District Council. **Or**
- 2) Combining Nelson and Tasman Councils and then separating out the District and Regional Council functions by establishing the Nelson ? Tasman District Council and the Tasman ? Nelson Regional Council.

Neither of these options involved bringing another Council in as it did if Marlborough had been brought into the Kaikoura/Hurunui proposal.

Therefore, it is very hard to see why these options cannot be considered.

LGA 2002 Schedule 3 40 2(e) and 3 provide the opportunity for the LGC to consider other options such as the two outlined above.

It has been disappointing to read comments from Tasman Council vested interests complaining that the LGC has not considered other options.

Councils can put their own proposals forward for consideration without a petition under LGA 2002 Schedule 3 1(1) (a) and (2) (a).

That Tasman has not done so demonstrates that their complaints do not stand scrutiny.

Those submitters who did make suggestions for alternatives have at least made the effort by bringing them to the attention of the LGC.

?

### **Draft Proposal.**

Having read the proposal and associated papers I congratulate the LGC for its efforts.

I support the draft re-organisation proposal in principle as I believe it can lead to more responsive local governance.

However, there are two matters which require more consideration.

These are:

1)???? Delegations to Community Boards.

2)???? Remuneration for Community Board members.

?

### **Delegations.**

I believe the draft proposals do not go anywhere far enough in providing meaningful, budgeted, decision-making delegation to Community Boards.

?Delegation? means being able to make decisions which would otherwise be made by someone else.

For delegation to be efficient and cost effective it must at least be cost neutral or less cost, otherwise there is no point.

There is no reason not to grant delegations to the full extent as provided by law to those communities who wish to take them up. If we make lists of delegations there will be tasks omitted which can and should be delegated.

There also needs to be recognition of the difference between ?governance? and ?management? roles. This must be made clear.

Community Board members, like Councillors provide governance. They make decisions on budgets, priorities and policies within their Wards i.e. they do not need to manage Halls. They do need to ensure that Halls are properly managed by those responsible for doing this.

Attached as Appendix One, is a suggested Delegations model for Nelson ? Tasman District Community Boards.

?

## **Community Board Remuneration.**

The Strateg.Ease papers item 7.2 Democracy costs (p65-66) sets out suggested remuneration payments.

From personal experience I believe that the proposed payments for Community Board Chairs and members are unfair when compared with those proposed for Councillors.

When Tasman District Boards were formed in 1989 it was decided by Council that they were to be paid only 75% of their entitlement until such time that their role had been formulated. This situation has not been changed despite requests that it be reviewed. Councillor and community board member remuneration is too far apart. As a Community Board Chair I worked up to 60hrs per week.

I believe it is way past time for Tasman Community Board members to be receiving their full entitlement.

This would result in, at least, \$24,000 for Board Chairs and \$12,000 for members. This would lead to a proportionate reduction for Deputy Mayor and Councillor remuneration as the pool is adjusted.

With delegations, Community Boards will be relieving Councillors of local work. However, Councillors serving on Community Boards would deserve some additional recognition to those who are not appointed to Boards.

?

Ideally, I would like to see an overhaul of the Electoral Act 2001 and only have Community Boards as 75% the elected members? with the Boards electing/appointing their Councillors and the collective Councillors electing/appointing their chair/mayor.

?

This would enable the best people to be selected for the jobs and avoid show pony presidential-style hype which surrounds some candidates at election time. It would also provide the opportunity for deputy councillors in the event of illness.

?

I am opposed to targeted rates on communities with Community Boards as a vehicle for exorbitant staff time costs and ask that these be abolished and have no part in the reorganization.

?

Provided there are more meaningful delegations and fairer remuneration for Community Board members I will vote in favour of the re-organization proposal.

?

I do wish to be heard preferably in Golden Bay.

?

**Heinz Oertli**

**18 August 2011**

?

**85 Tukurua Road**

**Tukurua**

**7172 Takaka**

?

?

**I also support the attachments enclosed which were also made by Joe Bell:**

1)???? Appendix of a suitable delegations model for Community Boards.

2)???? Copy of my rebuttal to the Tasman District Council attack on the Strateg.Ease Report.

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 19/08/2011 10:54 a.m.



**Meta Data Summary**

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2781647DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme		
	Nelson-Tasman Amalgamation Submission		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	18/08/2011
Author Name	Alison Nicoll	Version	1

**Document Content**

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	18/08/2011 1:24:02 p.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	Nelson-Tasman Amalgamation Submission

From : D.B.Nicoll,  
376 Hill St.,  
Richmond,  
Nelson.

Submission to the LGC re the proposed amalgamation of Nelson City & the Tasman District Council:

I am opposed to the amalgamation as proposed by the LGC. As follows:

1) The existing Nelson City & Tasman District Councils structure has been working reasonably well, bearing in mind the rural nature of the Tasman District and the ability of its councillors & administration to deal with the interests of the Community Boards, together with their local knowledge of the rural localities & their people.

On the other hand, the existing Nelson City councillors specialise in the requirements of the city and have little experience or knowledge of the rural localities and dealing with the Community Boards of the Tasman District.

2) Structure of the proposed Nelson-Richmond Community Board:

	Nelson Ward
5 representatives	
	Richmond Ward
3 representatives	

This gives a clear voting majority to the Nelson Ward which mainly involves the people of the City of Nelson.

3) In recent years there has been an obvious rivalry between the business interests of Nelson City & Richmond in who could attract the most people &

397

become the business & administrative centre for the region, with Richmond & the Tasman District acting as an independent entity.

4) The proposed structure of the Nelson-Richmond Community Board will disempower the people of Richmond in giving Nelson City the majority vote in any recommendations or delegated powers given to the Community Board. This could involve funding Nelson City projects such as the arts centre, the convention centre, the museum & Trafalgar Park sports ground development, with Richmond ratepayers money being channelled into Nelson City projects instead of development of facilities in Richmond. This cannot be said to better represent the nature & interests of the communities of the Richmond & Tasman Area.

5) Under the circumstances, as outlined above, the people of Richmond & the Tasman District cannot be expected to vote in favour of the proposed amalgamation.

Yours faithfully,

D.B.Nicoll.

## Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2783135DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme		
	Nelson/Tasman Proposal		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	18/08/2011
Author Name	Val and Geoff	Version	1

## Document Content

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	18/08/2011 8:53:39 p.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	Nelson/Tasman Proposal

We oppose any amalgamation of Nelson City and Tasman District. We can see no advantage for this amalgamation to the residents or ratepayers of Tasman. The large rural sector of Tasman will be disadvantaged being governed from Nelson City. Nelson looks no further than the Bishopdale Hills. We feel that the entire proposal has been initiated by Nelson businessmen who are disadvantaged by Nelson chaotic and expensive parking and fees. Richmond parking is paid from rates and we don;t want parking metres. We like Richmond as it is, it is very well governed with a fine community spirit.

Yours faithfully  
Geoff and Val Trow  
6 Shearer Terrace  
Richmond

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 19/08/2011 10:54 a.m.



Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4000-LGC Functions</li> <li>└─ 4200-Union, Abolition &amp; Constitution of Districts</li> </ul>		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2781650DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme		
	Fw: Nelson / Tasman Union		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	18/08/2011
Author Name	ednewport	Version	1

Document Content

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	18/08/2011 1:02:30 p.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	Fw: Nelson / Tasman Union

Submission to Local Government Commission on Nelson /Tasman Amalgamation

I have concerns that Community Boards have not worked that well . More definate proposals need to be made as to the rolls and responsibilities a Community Board has. We do not want a toothless tiger.

Community Boards may still miss communities of interest in the larger wards and may need to be addressed in a mini ward system.

There will need to be good faith on both sides to make Community Boards work effectively.

Rural wards have a lower population but farmers have very large rate bills with less representation on Council as to promote the needs of a rural community, and protect their businesses from poor decisions particuarly if a union with Nelson proceeds.

I recommend that the ward boulderries stay as they are well beyond the six year review.

Because of the importance of land based production to the region that rural /urban representation should be 50/50.

Greater use needs to be made of the UAGC to it's maximun, and targeted rates where a community receives the greatest benefit from a project.

I do not wish to be heard.

EW Newport .

399

273 Korere- Tophouse Rd RD2 Nelson 7072

17/08/2011

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 18/08/2011 01:51 p.m.

## Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2783495DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme submission opposing draft scheme for joining Nelson City and Tasman District		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	19/08/2011
Author Name	Barry Eaton	Version	1

## Document Content

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	19/08/2011 9:03:58 a.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	submission opposing draft scheme for joining Nelson City and Tasman District

To whom it may concern:

We oppose the entire scheme of joining Nelson City and Tasman District.

1. The new structure would be urban dominated.
2. Rather than simplify administration and lower costs, higher rates and increased complexity would be likely to result. In my former town of residence, an amalgamation of rural area with a city took place; as a result rates have radically increased and a large number of homes are for sale in the rural district (seeking to move outside the amalgamation area).
3. We live out in the sticks at Pearse Valley, yet would be linked with Nelson/Richmond cities, with which there is little in common and with people in Nelson making decisions on our area.
4. We support the present scheme where we have control over our own destiny.

Considerations:

If this scheme were to take place, it would be far more logical to include all Motueka Valley in the Motueka district.

Amalgamation of Nelson/Richmond/Wakefield would be a better alternative, and leaving the rest of the TDC as is.

As my Dad always said, "KISS" (keep it simply, sweetie); the proposal as outlined feels cumbersome and burdensome on the outlying areas.

thank you for your consideration.

Barry Eaton  
Janice Eaton  
62 Pearse Valley Road  
RD1  
Motueka 7196

03 5268777

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 19/08/2011 01:05 p.m.



## LGC Documents

### Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2762494DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme submission		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	05/08/2011
Author Name	Ashton & Anna Wood	Version	1

### Document Content

Managed Files (Read Only)	Date Last Modified	File Size
 2762494DA_stampa_girl_line_en.gif	5/08/2011 8:28:24 a.m.	45.3 KB

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	5/08/2011 8:28:24 a.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	submission

We are in favour of the amalgamation of the Tasman District and Nelson City Council .  
We do not wish to appear before the Commission hearing.

Ashton & Anna Wood

Converted Attachments Attachment stampa\_girl\_line\_en.gif converted to managed file stampa\_girl\_line\_en.gif)>

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 05/08/2011 09:24 a.m.



# LGC Documents

## Meta Data Summary

▼ Show Details...

Classification	4000-LGC Functions		
	L 4200-Union, Abolition & Constitution of Districts		
Folder	LGC-4200-5/5	Document ID	2783983DA
Title	Nelson City / Tasman District - Submissions on Draft Scheme Draft Re-organisation Proposal for Nelson-Tasman governance		
State of Publication	Received	Date Created	19/08/2011
Author Name	Dr Michael von Pupka Lipinski	Version	1

## Document Content

<b>To:</b>	LGC
<b>Cc:</b>	
<b>Date/time Received:</b>	19/08/2011 2:21:54 p.m.
<b>Subject:</b>	Draft Re-organisation Proposal for Nelson-Tasman governance

\*To Local Government Commission \*

\*PO Box\*\* 5362\*\*\*

\*Wellington\*\* 6145\*

\*info@lgc.govt.nz <<mailto:info@lgc.govt.nz>>\*

\* \*

\*Draft Re-organisation Proposal for Nelson-Tasman governance\*

Matters requiring more consideration include 1) Governance Partnership & Delegations, 2) Community Board remuneration , 3) Targeted Rates.and 4) Funding of Golden Bay Museum\*\*

\*1) Governance Partnership & Delegations\*

The draft proposals do not go far enough towards ensuring a governance partnership between Community Boards and Council, or meaningful, budgeted, decision-making delegations and consultation delegations to Community Boards.

There is no reason not to grant these to the full extent provided by law to those communities who wish to take them up.

\*Governance Partnership with Tasman District Council and/or Nelson-Tasman District Council\*

\* The Board to be involved in all planning meetings and workshops for Long Term Planning, Annual Planning and Strategic Planning of relevance to the Board for optimal board/council interaction.

? Pre-consultation with the Board on all decisions relating to planned work to be undertaken in the Ward. This may help minimise possible

future community conflict.

? Any issues within, or relevant to the Ward, should trigger contact/information sharing/consultation with the Community Board. The Board can then decide if any further engagement is necessary on the issue.

? Community Board chairs (or nominated representative) to be invited to attend and have speaking rights at full Council meetings when issues relevant to the Ward are discussed.

? Community board members to be invited to attend and have speaking rights on standing committees when issues relevant to the Ward are discussed.

? Community Board members to receive any Confidential Material and be privy to confidential items that relate to each member's portfolio.

? Community Board chairs (or nominated representative)\* to receive Confidential Material and be privy to confidential items that relate to the Ward.

? Community Boards to be consulted as contracts come up for renewal and, where applicable, to have the opportunity to recommend entering into contracts outside the Global contracts. Where there is opportunity for cost saving, it is preferred that local contractors do the work to enhance employment opportunities in the Ward. These reviews would be done in consultation with the relevant departmental managers, i.e., Engineering, Parks and Reserves, Environment and Planning.

\* Council has occasional one-off or smaller projects which should be offered locally where cost savings can be achieved for the same quality of work.

\* Where Community Boards can recommend money saving strategies we request to have the ability to re-assign these savings to use for other services within the Ward.

? Community Boards to be informed of notified consent applications and planning information which relate to the Ward

\* \*

**\*Specific\* Golden Bay\* Ward Delegations\***

This is not an exclusive list. Where tasks within the Ward can be allocated to the Board they should be.

? Takaka Market governance with the payments made to TDC passed to the board.

? Golden Bay Facility project. The board to continue to be the lead agency for proposals.

? Old Library site. Consultation for its re-development has been delegated to the Community Board

\* Footpaths. Consultation on, and decisions for, most appropriate safe walking access

\* Carparks. Consultation on, and decisions for, car parking issues as appropriate.

- \* Street Lighting. Consultation on and decisions for most appropriate lighting (or no lighting in order to preserve the night sky).
- \* Public toilets, including location of new toilets.
- \* Street signage and naming of roads, streets and parks
- \* Setting of appropriate speed limits.

#### Consultation Delegations

- ? Council Housing ? full consultation with board (in conjunction with appropriate community agency/panel).
- ? Early consultation if Council is considering purchase, or disposal of property in Golden Bay.
- ? The Board to advise Council of any strategic land purchase that would be of benefit to Golden Bay.
- ? Local bylaws for safety and good governance of Golden Bay.
- ? Infrastructure consultation for ongoing and new work.
- ? Annual River Plans (flooding, rivers etc)
- ? Port Taranaki. Board representation on any committee or board
- ? Small wharves. Consultation/collaboration DoC/TDC/community management committees.
- ? All decisions/work to be undertaken in Golden Bay to be pre-consulted with the Board
- ? Cemeteries including natural burial areas
  - \* Camping grounds.

#### \*2) Community Board Remuneration\*

Tasman Community Board members need to be paid their full entitlement ?? at least \$24,000 for Board chairs and \$12,000 for members. There needs to be a proportionate reduction for deputy mayor and councillor remuneration as the pool is adjusted. In addition, with the four main committees being committees of the full council, there is no need for separate chairpersons being paid extra. Their extra payments can also return to the funding pool. The mayor, as chair of the full council, should be chairing all meetings of the full council. When the mayor is unavailable, the duty falls to the deputy mayor.

With delegations, Community Boards will be relieving councillors of local work. Councillors serving on Community Boards will deserve some additional recognition to those who are not appointed to Boards.

#### \*3) Targeted Rate on Communities with Community Boards\*

Targeted rates on communities with Community Boards are used as a vehicle for exorbitant staff time costs. I ask that these targeted rates be abolished and have no part in the re-organisation.

4. In the case of an amalgamation the new council should provide the necessary funding for the Golden Bay Museum as an independly acting institution.

I \*do\* not wish to be heard.

Name: Michael von Pupka Lipinski

Address for service: 436 Bird Rd. Takaka 7183

Date: 19.August 2011

Last updated by Donald Riezebos on 19/08/2011 04:22 p.m.