



A G E N D A

Council

**Thursday
24 July 2014
commencing at 9.00 am
RSA Memorial Rooms - Harihari**

His Worship the Mayor, M.T. Havill (**Chairperson**)
Deputy Mayor P.M. Cox
Cr. J.H. Butzbach, Cr. M.S. Dawson, Cr. D.G. Hope, Cr. A.R. Keenan,
Cr. L.J. Martin, Cr. M.D. Montagu, Cr. C.A. van Beek



COUNCIL MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL BE HELD IN THE RSA MEMORIAL ROOMS, MAIN ROAD, HARIHARI ON THURSDAY 24 JULY 2014 COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM

Tanya Winter

Council Vision

"Westland will, by 2030, be a world class tourist destination and have industries and businesses leading through innovation and service."

This will be achieved by:

- *Involving the community and stakeholders*
- *Having inspirational leadership*
- *Having expanded development opportunities*
- *Having top class infrastructure for all communities*
- *Living the '100% Pure NZ' brand*

"Westland, the last best place"

Chief Executive

18 July 2014

Purpose:

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as prescribed by section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is:

- (a) To enable democratic local decision-making and action, by and on behalf of, communities; and
- (b) To meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses

1. MEMBERS PRESENT AND APOLOGIES:

1.1 Apologies

1.2 Register of Conflicts of Interest

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

2.1 Confirmation of Minutes of Meetings of Council

2.1.1 Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 26 June 2014

(Pages 5 - 23)

3. BUSINESS:

3.1 Mayor's Report

A verbal update will be provided by Mayor Havill.

3.2 Update from Councillors

3.3 Plan Change 7: Managing Fault Rupture Risk in Westland

(Pages 24 - 39)

3.4 RSA Working Group and Request to Build a New War Memorial

(Pages 40 - 45)

Morning Tea at 10.30am

4. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE 'PUBLIC EXCLUDED SECTION'

Resolutions to exclude the public: Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

Council is required to move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

4.1 Public Excluded Minutes of Meetings of Council 26 June 2014

4.2 Major District Initiative (MDI) Fund Process

Lunch at 12.30 pm at the Pukeko Tearooms, Main Road, Harihari

The general subject of the matters to be considered while the public are excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Item No.	Minutes/ Report of	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
1.	Public Excluded Minutes of Meetings of Council	Confirmation of May Public Excluded Council Minutes.	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7.	Section 48(1)(a)
2.	Major District Initiative (MDI) Fund Process	Major District Initiative (MDI) Fund Process	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7.	Section 48(1)(a)

Next Meeting: 28 August 2014 - Ordinary Council Meeting (Council Chambers)

MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL, HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 36 WELD STREET, HOKITIKA ON THURSDAY 26 JUNE 2014 COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

His Worship the Mayor, M.T. Havill (**Chairperson**)

Deputy Mayor P.M. Cox

Cr. J.H. Butzbach, Cr. M.S. Dawson, Cr. D.G. Hope, Cr. A.R. Keenan, Cr. L.J. Martin, Cr M.D. Montagu, Cr. C.A. van Beek (from 9.19 a.m.).

1.1 Apologies

Cr van Beek (for lateness).

Staff In Attendance

T.L. Winter, Chief Executive; G. Borg, Group Manager: Corporate Services; V. Goel, Group Manager: District Assets; J. Ebenhoh, Group Manager: Planning, Community and Environment; D.M. Maitland, Executive Assistant, D.B. Blight (for part of the meeting) and R.A. Beaumont (for part of the meeting).

1.2 Register of Conflicts of Interest

The Register of Conflicts of Interest was circulated and no amendments were noted.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

2.1 Confirmation of Minutes of Meetings of Council

2.1.1 Ordinary Council Meeting - 22 May 2014

Moved Deputy Mayor Cox, seconded Cr Montagu and **Resolved** that the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting, held on the 22 May 2014, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

2.1.2 Extraordinary Council Meeting - 28 May 2014

Moved Cr Butzbach, seconded Cr Martin and **Resolved** that the Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting, held on the 28 May 2014, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

2.1.3 Extraordinary Council Meeting - 12 June 2014

Moved Cr Dawson, seconded Cr Hope and **Resolved** that the Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting, held on the 12 June 2014, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

2.2 Minutes and Reports to be received

2.2.1 Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of the Council Meeting held on Thursday 22 May 2014

(Refer Public Excluded Minutes).

3. PUBLIC FORUM:

Moved Deputy Mayor Cox, seconded Cr Butzbach and **Resolved** that Council suspend Standing Orders for the Public Forum section of the meeting only.

The following members of the public were in attendance at the meeting:

3.1 Nancy Prangnell and Anne Routhan – Regarding the Pioneer Memorial Statue.

Mrs Prangnell tabled a petition to Council signed by 439 signatories and spoke in support of the Pioneer Memorial Statue being repaired and remaining in its present location. Mrs Prangnell also tabled a memo from the Department of Internal Affairs on how Councils should make decisions.

Mrs Prangnell suggested that lighting on the statue may assist in preventing vandalism.

Mrs Routhan spoke in support of the Pioneer Memorial Statue being repaired and remaining in its present location. Mrs Routhan spoke about the steps being removed from the statue which may assist in preventing vandalism.

His Worship the Mayor thanked Mrs Prangnell and Mrs Routhan for their presentations to Council.

3.2 Elizabeth Sandford and Max Dowell – Regarding the Pioneer Memorial Statue.

Ms Sandford and Mr Dowell advised they were representing Hokitika's Goldrush 150th Committee and sought clarification regarding the previous Council resolution on the 27 February 2014 that \$10,000 be made available to generate further funding to undertake the relocation and restoration of the Pioneer Statue. They further advised that the statue needs urgent work to be completed in time for the 150th Celebrations in December 2014.

His Worship the Mayor thanked Ms Sandford and Mr Dowell for their presentations to Council.

3.3 David Verrall - Regarding the Pioneer Memorial Statue.

Mr Verrall spoke in support of the Pioneer Memorial Statue being moved from its present location and how essential it is that the statue is repaired and it has to be safe. Mr Verrall sought clarification as to whether the Pohutukawa tree has a protection order.

Cr van Beek attended the meeting at 9.19 am.

His Worship the Mayor thanked Mr Verrall for attending the meeting and his presentation to Council.

3.4 Raymond Lee and Karen Wafer, Kumara Residents.

Cr Montagu introduced Mr Lee and Ms Wafer to the meeting.

Mr Lee and Ms Wafer relayed concerns regarding the following items:

- Fourth Street –the absence of stormwater kerb and channel. Fourth Street is a gravel street, the road is not straight and there is a dust problem in the summer months.
- William Stewart Bridge –refuse being dumped under the bridge.
- Kumara Water Supply – the residents were not notified of changes in their water supply.

4. **BUSINESS:**

The following items were taken out of order to the Agenda Papers.

4.2 **Mayor's Report**

A verbal update was provided by Mayor Havill regarding the following items:

- The Rural Provincial Meeting on the 5-6 June 2014 attended by the Deputy Mayor, Chief Executive and Mayor Havill.
- NZTA and Road Funding Proposals Presentation on “one-network”.
- The 2014-2015 Annual Plan Process.
- The Mayors and Chairs Meeting attended by the Chief Executive and Mayor Havill. Noted the West Coast is a recipient for the rebuilding of Grey Hospital. Congratulated the West Coast District Health Board on securing the funding for the project.
- A Regional Economic Strategy has been developed which is underpinned by mining, farming and tourism so that the West Coast does achieve some modest growth. Mayor Havill is talking to Mawhera Incorporation, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and Landcorp.

Moved Mayor Havill, seconded Cr Martin and **Resolved** that the Mayor's verbal report be received.

4.3 **Update from Councillors**

The following verbal updates were then provided by Councillors:

i) **Deputy Mayor Cox**

- The Local Government Rural Provincial Sector Meeting
 - Discussion regarding Rural Broadband
 - Risk and Probability – Alpine Fault
 - Reducing risk through building codes
 - Fostering economic activity

- Freedom camping. Suggests responsibility to be put onto the campervan companies and banning all vans that do not have facilities. DOC and WCRC should invest in dump stations.
- Pacific Islands – mentoring role with limited resources.
- Derelict houses – include a definition in the Building Act. Insanitary Building Policy to respond in a timely manner.
- Mayoral Forum, working through the legislation.
- Mackenzie District Council talked about dust problems.
- Attended the Westland Wilderness Trust Meeting. Operators were concerned the trail was incomplete. Paul Schramm has a database of 6,000 wanting to ride the trail this summer. Funds for the Taramakau Road/Rail Bridge. Signage is required on the Taramakau Bridge. A 50 metre suspension bridge hopefully running by summer. Grade 4 from Hokitika to Ross. Marketing to be taken over by Tourism West Coast and funded by both Councils.

ii) **Cr Martin**

- Heritage Hokitika Meeting – Pioneer Statue (security and restoration). No stance on relocation.
- Upgrade the Hudson and Price Memorial – corner of Revell Street and Gibson Quay (working with Council staff) and gave an update on what the 150th group is achieving and the event in December.
- Another meeting with DWC regarding the spin-off with the Luminaries.
- Concerns about the recent flooding from some business owners and the effects of that and whether there are any issue arising, i.e. blocked drains and leaves building up.
- Agfest.

iii) **Cr Butzbach**

- Enterprise Hokitika – marketing plan for the town, Love Hokitika Market Friday 4 July in Weld Street area between 2-4pm. They have permission to close the road.
- Websites and their brochures, brand and videos. Talking with Tourism West Coast and Tourism New Zealand and other bike agencies to get the Hokitika message out there. Signage – discussion about the Hokitika entrance sign. The beach access sign.
- Meeting regarding The Luminaries – organised by Development West Coast.
- Joint effort to go to the Canterbury A. and P. Show.

- Spring Challenge – they are using members to open their shops while people are here.

iv) **Cr Keenan**

- Colleen Freitas received a QSM. Asked that Council recognise that.

Moved Cr Keenan, seconded Cr Butzbach and **Resolved** that Council write a letter of congratulations to Colleen Freitas on her recent QSM Award.

- Cleaning up after the windstorms.
- Financial Prudence Webinar on predictability, affordability and essential services. The Westland Ratepayers and Residents Association – slippery footpaths and flooding outside Ellerys.
- Very slippery near the Countess; that needs looking at.
- RSA are moving forward with their fundraising efforts.
- Heritage Hokitika meeting on the 24 June 2014.
- Cass Square Cenotaph.
- Council readdress this issue (Pioneer Statue) with a view to revoking the resolution and giving reassurance to community groups who are preserving our heritage values.
- Ross Cemetery concerns.

v) **Cr Montagu**

- Ross Cemetery concerns.

vi) **Cr Hope**

- Ross Cemetery concerns.
- Haast School has rolled out ADSL Broadband during the month – attended the opening.
- Marketing potential for one of those carriers to service the largest cellphone gap in the country. The Haast rural fire brigade – interested in seeing what cellphone coverage we may be able to tack on for this infrastructure. Neils Beach will be covered. Haast Junction, Okuru and some of the other very small areas are currently not covered.
- Early Childhood Centre to be built in Franz Josef.
- Met with Carol London and Malcolm MacRae regarding the South Westland Cycle Trail.
- Attended a Regional Transport Committee Meeting.

- Talking with the Chief Executive and Mayor Havill regarding St Johns building a facility in the Haast Township.

vii) Cr van Beek

- Attended a public meeting in Kumara concerning the Chinese Gardens and the use of Kumara Endowment Fund.
- Attended the Westland Wilderness Trust Meeting with Deputy Mayor Cox.
- CCS meeting.
- Kawhaka Bridge.

Moved Cr Dawson, seconded Cr van Beek and **Resolved** that the verbal reports from Councillors be received.

4.1 Presentations to Council

i) Westroads Ltd

Durham Havill (Chairman), Graeme Kelly (General Manager), Peter Cuff (Director), Maurice Fahey (Director) and Bryce Thomson (Director) of Westroads Ltd attended the meeting and gave a presentation to better inform Council of their asset to enable Council to make informed decisions around the table to achieve common goals.

The meeting adjourned at 10.44 am and reconvened at 11.17 am.

ii) West Coast Regional Council – West Coast Regional Policy Statement Review 2014.

Andrew Robb (Chairman) and Mike Meehan (Planning & Environment) of the West Coast Regional Council attended the meeting and made a presentation regarding the West Coast Regional Policy Statement Review 2014.

4.7 District Plan Review

The District Planner attended the meeting and spoke to this report.

Moved Cr Montagu, seconded Cr Martin and **Resolved** that:

- A) Council approves that the District Plan review proceeds as a rolling review, to be completed by 2022.
- B) Council confirms the priorities for the District Plan review as set out in the table below:

Year	Priority Topic	Additional topics
2014	Current proposed Plan Change 7 (subject to approval at July meeting)	Update of noise provisions
2015	Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features	Minor corrections and amendments Sign rules
2016	Coastal Environment and response to New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Cultural Values- Maori Perspective Heritage Provisions
2017	Utilities – Powerlines / Telecommunications	Transport General Rules
2018	Protecting significant native vegetation and biodiversity	Natural Hazards Use of surface water
2019	Rural Environment – including subdivision and mining	
2020	Aviation – Hokitika, Franz Josef, Fox and South Westland	
2021	Townships Reviews	
2022	Townships Reviews	

4.4 Adoption of 2014-2015 Annual Plan and Appendix 1: 2014/2015 Annual Plan

The Group Manager: Planning, Community and Environment spoke to this report.

Moved Cr Dawson, seconded Cr Butzbach and **Resolved** that the 2014/2015 Annual Plan be adopted.

Cr Hope, Cr Keenan, Cr Montagu, Cr van Beek recorded their votes against the motion.

4.5 **Rates Resolution 2014-15**

The Group Manager: Corporate Services spoke to this report.

Moved Deputy Mayor Cox, seconded Cr Dawson and **Resolved** that:

1. Council instructs the Chief Executive to strike the Rates in accordance with the Annual Plan 2014-15.
2. Pursuant of Section 23 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, Council adopts the rates for the financial year commencing on 1 July 2014 and ending on 30 June 2015 as follows, subject to the following amendment: *Removal of the extra line at Item "7. Rural Commercial – Commercial Properties in a Rural zone except those in Glacier Towns Small Holdings Commercial":*

General Rate [Section 13].

A rate per dollar on the land value of each rateable property. This will be a differential rate dependent on the underlying zoning of each property as denoted in the District Plan or the location of the property.

1. Rural General – Properties 10 Hectares or larger zoned Rural.
2. Small Holdings – Properties less than 10 Hectares zoned Rural, except those in Hokitika Zone 1 or Glacier Towns Small Holdings.
3. Hokitika Zone 1 – Properties less than 10 hectares, within 5 kilometres of the boundary of Hokitika township, zoned Rural.
4. Hokitika Zone 2 – Properties in Kaniere which are within the Small Settlement zone
5. Rural Townships – Properties in Kumara, Arahura, Ross, Harihari, Whataroa, and Haast which are within a Tourist, Small Settlement or Coastal Settlement zone.
6. Small Settlements - Properties at Lake Kaniere, Kokatahi, Okarito, Okuru, Neils Beach, Hannah's Clearing and Jackson Bay which are within a Tourist, Small Settlement or Coastal Settlement zone.
7. Glacier Towns - Properties in Franz Josef/Waiau, Franz Alpine Resort and Fox Glacier which are within a Tourist or Residential zone.
8. Rural Commercial – Commercial Properties in a Rural zone except those in Glacier Towns Small Holdings Commercial.
9. Commercial in Rural Residential – Commercial Properties in a Tourist, Small settlement or Coastal Settlement zone except those in Glacier Towns Commercial.
10. Glacier Towns Commercial – Commercial Properties in Franz Josef/Waiau, Franz Alpine Resort and Fox Glacier which are within a Tourist or Residential zone.

11. Glacier Towns Small Holdings –Properties between the southern boundary of Lake Mapourika and the Fox River which are less than 10 hectares in size, except for those properties within the Glacier Towns.
12. Glacier Towns Small Holdings Commercial - Commercial properties between the southern boundary of Lake Mapourika and the Fox River, except for those properties within the Glacier Towns.
13. Hokitika 1-6 units – Residential properties in Hokitika except those in Hokitika Beachfront.
14. Hokitika Beachfront – Residential properties that bound the sea on Revell Street and Beach Street in Hokitika.
15. Hokitika Commercial – Commercial Properties in Hokitika.

The appropriate rate will be charged on the rateable land value as assessed by our valuation provider, Quotable Value, each year.

Uniform Annual General Charge [Section 15]

A uniform annual general charge to be levied as a fixed amount per rating unit.

Where more than one property is owned by the same Ratepayer, the properties are contiguous, and are utilised as a single property, then only one UAGC in total will be assessed.

Similarly, where an adjoining leased area is utilised as part of the parent property, then only one UAGC in total will be assessed. This reassessment is reliant on property owners satisfying Council that they meet the relevant criteria.

Tourism Promotions [Section 16]

A Targeted Rate to fund Tourism Promotions, charged as follows:

1. Four differentials are applied on a Uniform basis to Commercial Properties, determined by ranges of Capital Values
 - a. Over \$10 million
 - b. \$3 - \$10 million
 - c. \$1 - \$3 million
 - d. \$0 - \$1 million
2. A Targeted Rate applied on a Uniform basis to all other ratepayers.

Targeted Rates [Section 16]

Waste Management

1. Waste minimisation activity is budgeted to be self-funding. As such no Waste Management rate charged on a uniform basis will apply.
2. A targeted rate per dollar on the capital value of each rateable property as follows:

- a. Waste Management (Commercial). Properties whose General Rate is either Commercial, Commercial in Rural Residential, Hokitika Commercial, Glacier Town Commercial, or Glacier town Small Holding commercial
- b. Waste Management (Rural). Properties whose General Rate is Rural General.
- c. Waste Management (Small Holdings). Properties whose General Rate is Small Holdings, Hokitika Zone (1), or Glacier Towns Small Holdings.
- d. Waste Management (Urban). Properties whose General Rate is Rural Towns, Small Settlements, Residential within the previous Hokitika Borough or Hokitika Zone (2).

The appropriate rate will be charged on the rateable capital value as assessed by our valuation provider each year. A waste management rate will not be charged on utilities where a differential general is not charged.

Refuse Collection

Targeted rates set on a uniform basis will apply in the following areas to fund Hokitika and rural refuse collection services.

The rate will be charged on each rateable unit where rubbish collection is available in Hokitika; and in the area from Kumara Township in the north to Ross township in the south, including Kaniere Township.

Water Charges

Targeted rates applied on a uniform basis according to a scale of charges; and commercial metered water to fund the cost of water supplies.

1. Treated Water in Rural Townships – Ross, Harihari, Whataroa, Franz Josef/Waiau & Fox Glacier.
2. Untreated Water in Rural Townships – Kumara, Arahura, Harihari untreated, Whataroa Rural, Haast.
3. Treated Water in Hokitika and Kaniere.

Commercial properties will be charged a targeted differential rate if not separately metered. An unconnected rate of 50% of the connected charge will be charged on any property where a water supply is available but is not connected.

Kokatahi Community Rate

A targeted rate to fund projects in the Kokatahi community, applied as follows:

1. A Kokatahi Community targeted rate set on a uniform basis on each property in the Kokatahi/Kowhitirangi area which has a general rate uniform annual general charge.
2. A Kokatahi Community Rate per dollar on the land value of each rateable property.

The rate will be charged on the rateable land value of each property in the Kokatahi/Kowhitirangi area from Geologist Creek in the north to Hokitika Gorge in the south and the Kaniere/Kowhitirangi Road from Nesses Creek onward.

Sewerage Charges

A targeted rate set on a uniform basis to fund the costs of sewerage disposal in Hokitika, Kaniere, Franz Josef/Waiau, Fox Glacier and Haast.

1. A sewerage charge per property for Residential Properties.
2. A sewerage charge per pan or urinal for Commercial Properties.

The rate would be charged on each rateable unit connected to the sewerage disposal system provided by Council. An unconnected rate of 50% of the connected charge will be charged on any property where Council sewerage disposal is available but is not connected.

Kaniere Sewerage Capital Contribution

A targeted rate to recover the capital cost of the Kaniere sewerage system. The rate has been assessed as a capital contribution of \$4,907 per property on a table mortgage basis over 25 years from 1 July 2000. The interest rate is re-assessed periodically and is currently 7%. The balance outstanding on a property may be paid in part or full at any time, and the repayment completion date re-calculated accordingly.

The rate will be charged on each property able to be connected to the Kaniere sewerage system which has not already completed payment of the capital contribution.

Glacier Country Promotions

Targeted rates to fund Glacier Country Promotions Officers made up of:

1. A Glacier Country rate set on a uniform basis for each property in the Glacier region which has a general rate uniform annual charge, but has not been commercial rated.
2. A Glacier Country Commercial rate set on a uniform basis on each commercial rated property in the Glacier region
3. A Glacier Country Promotions Rate per dollar on the land value of commercial rated properties.

These rates will be levied on all rateable properties in the area from Lake Mapourika in the north to the Ohinetamatea River in the south.

Hokitika Area Promotions

A targeted rate set on a uniform basis to be levied on each Hokitika Commercial ratepayer. The purpose of this rate is to fund the annual payment toward costs associated with the Promotions Officer employed by Enterprise Hokitika.

Ross Swimming Pool

A targeted rate to fund 75% of the cost of operating the Ross swimming pool. The rate will be charged per dollar on the land value of every rateable property in the town of Ross.

Hannah's Clearing Water Supply Capital Repayment

A targeted uniform charge to recover the capital cost of providing individual water supply systems to Hannah's Clearing properties. The rate will be \$575 per annum and the amount to be recovered will be the actual cost per property plus 6% interest on a table mortgage basis plus GST. The interest rate will be re-assessed periodically.

The rate will be charged on each property provided with a water supply system which has not already completed payment of the capital cost.

Rates Summary

The General and Targeted Rates to be collected by Council for the year and the revenue generated from each are as follows. These figures are GST inclusive.

DESCRIPTION	LAND VALUE \$	2014/15 rate per unit of measure	RATE STRUCK
General Rates			
Rural General	779,516,000	0.0017054	\$1,329,360
Small Holdings	150,609,600	0.0024728	\$372,425
Hokitika Zone 1	51,422,000	0.0029773	\$153,099
Hokitika Zone 2	23,925,900	0.0058753	\$140,571
Rural Townships	34,770,000	0.0046457	\$161,531
Small Settlements	52,634,000	0.0030948	\$162,889
Glacier Towns	35,481,500	0.0042303	\$150,098
Rural Commercial	7,143,000	0.0025508	\$18,220
Commercial in Rur Res	4,999,000	0.0053332	\$26,661
Glacier Towns Commercial	37,097,000	0.0049178	\$182,436
Glacier Towns Small Holdings	19,861,500	0.0034379	\$68,281
Glacier Towns SH Commercial	5,502,000	0.0041253	\$22,698
Hokitika Res 1	100,038,500	0.0108618	\$1,086,603
Hokitika Res 2	2,996,000	0.0173789	\$52,067
Hokitika Res 3	246,000	0.0206375	\$5,077
Hokitika Res 4	233,000	0.0249822	\$5,821
Hokitika Res 6	306,000	0.0249822	\$7,645
Hokitika Beachfront	13,119,000	0.0088453	\$116,042
Hokitika Commercial	38,290,000	0.0118339	\$453,118
	1,358,190,000		4,514,641
Uniform Annual General Charge	5,538	\$ 506.53	2,805,188
	Capital Value		
Emergency Management Contingency Fund	2,284,837,500	0.0000000	0
Tourism Promotions			
All Commercial Properties with capital value:	Rating Unit		
Over \$10 million	3	\$ 3,176.02	\$9,528
\$3 - 10 million	11	\$ 1,588.01	\$17,468
\$1 - 3 million	74	\$ 635.20	\$47,005
\$0 - 1 million	201	\$ 317.60	\$63,838
All other ratepayers	5249	\$ 4.76	\$25,006
			\$162,846
Total General Rate (incl GST)			\$7,482,676
Total General Rates (excl GST)			\$6,506,674

DESCRIPTION	Capital Value /Rating Units	2014/15 rate per u.o.m	RATE STRUCK
Targeted Rates			
Waste Management			
Waste Management rate - uniform	5,538	\$ -	0
Waste Management (Commercial)	305,954,000	0.0014869	454,934
Waste Management (Rural)	929,671,500	0.0000595	55,353
Waste Management(Small Holdings)	430,033,900	0.0004256	183,035
Waste Management (Urban)	633,271,600	0.0003419	216,547
Hokitika Refuse Collection	1,581	\$ 285.68	451,659
Rural Refuse Collection	1,337	\$ 265.18	354,548
Total Waste Management Rates			\$1,716,076
Water Supply			
Rural Township Untreated Water			
Domestic		\$ 390.31	
(unmetered) Commercial		\$ 650.52	
Unconnected		\$ 195.15	
Rural Township Treated Water			
Domestic		\$ 520.40	
(unmetered) Commercial		\$ 895.09	
Unconnected		\$ 260.20	
Hokitika/Kaniere Water			
Domestic		\$ 520.40	
(unmetered) Commercial		\$ 895.09	
Unconnected		\$ 260.20	1,372,032
Hannah's Clearing Capital	13	\$ 575.00	7,475
Total Water Rates			\$1,379,507
Metered Water Charges			\$1,322,500
Sewerage Rate			
Connected		\$ 219.90	
Unconnected		\$ 109.95	\$832,498
Kaniere Sewerage Capital	66	\$ 382.51	25,246
Total Sewerage Rates			\$857,744
Kokatahi Community Rate			
Levy	218,928,000	0.0000210	4,600
Per Unit Rate	181	\$25.41	4,600
Total Kokatahi Community Rate			\$9,200
Glacier Country Promotions			
Levy	42,909,500	0.0008710	37,375
Per Unit Non-Commercial Rate	396	\$ 48.16	19,073
Per Unit Commercial Rate	76	\$ 240.82	18,302
Total Glacier Country Promotions			\$74,750
Hokitika Area Promotions			
Per Unit Rate	134	\$ 334.70	44,850
Total Hokitika Promotions			\$44,850
Ross Swimming Pool			
Levy	8480000	0.002684116	\$22,761
Total Ross Swimming Pool Rates			\$22,761
Total Targeted Rates (incl GST)			\$5,427,388
Total Targeted Rates (excl GST)			4,719,468
General Rates (excl GST)			6,506,674
Total Rates (excl GST)			\$11,226,143

Rating by Instalments and Rates Penalties

The Council provides for 2014/2015 rates to be paid in four instalments with a 10% additional charge added to the current instalment rates remaining unpaid on the penalty dates.

	Final date for payment	Penalty date
Instalment 1	31 August 2014	1 September 2014
Instalment 2	30 November 2014	1 December 2014
Instalment 3	28 February 2015	1 March 2015
Instalment 4	31 May 2015	1 June 2015

A further 10% will be added to all rates and additional charges remaining unpaid on 1 July 2014 and a further 10% will be added to any rate to which the additional charges referred to above is added and remains unpaid at 1 January 2015.

Early Payment of Rates

A discount of 2.5%, calculated on the Total Annual Rates, will apply when all due rates are paid in full, together with any outstanding rates and penalties from prior years, by the due date for payment of the first installment being 31 August 2014.

Cr Keenan and Cr van Beek recorded their votes against the motion.

4.6 Rates and Debtor Write Offs

The Group Manager: Corporate Services spoke to this report.

Cr van Beek requested that the Councillors be provided with the schedule of rates and debtor write-offs.

Moved Cr Hope, seconded Cr Dawson and **Resolved** that Council approve the write off of the amount of rates debtors totaling \$33,304.75, including GST.

Cr Cox and Cr Martin recorded their votes against the motion.

4.8 Extension of Roding Maintenance Contract

The Group Manager: District Assets spoke to this report.

Moved Cr Montagu, seconded Deputy Mayor Cox and **Resolved** that the current Roding Maintenance Contract be extended on the existing terms and conditions for a further period of 12 months expiring on 30 June 2015.

4.9 Insurance Renewals

The Group Manager: Corporate Services spoke to this report.

Moved Cr Montagu, seconded Cr Butzbach and **Resolved** that Council instruct the Chief Executive to renew insurance cover for 2014-15 in accordance with the proposal from Crombie Lockwood.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTION

Moved Cr Montagu, seconded Cr Butzbach and **Resolved** that Council confirm its Seal being affixed to the following document:

5.1 Warrant of Appointment: Sweta Sharma

Purpose

To act in the Westland District as:

- An Officer pursuant to Section 174 of the Local Government Act 2002;
AND
- An Authorised Officer (Litter Control Officer) pursuant to Section 5 and Section 6 of the Litter Act 1979; AND
- An Officer under the Westland District Council Bylaws.

The meeting adjourned at 12.27 pm and reconvened to 1.46 pm.

6. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE 'PUBLIC EXCLUDED SECTION'

Moved Cr Martin, seconded Cr Butzbach and **Resolved** that Council exclude the public in accordance with Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 at 1.46 pm.

Council is required to move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

6.1 Public Excluded Minutes of Meetings of Council

6.2 Allocations Committee for Sport New Zealand Rural Travel Fund

6.3 Judging of Trustpower Community Awards

The general subject of the matters to be considered while the public are excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Item No.	Minutes/ Report of	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
1.	Public Excluded Minutes of Meetings of Council	Confirmation of May Public Excluded Council Minutes.	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7.	Section 48(1)(a)
2.	Report to Council	Allocations Committee for Sport New Zealand Rural Travel Fund	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7.	Section 48(1)(a)
3.	Report to Council	Judging of Trustpower Community Awards	Good reasons to withhold exists under Section 7.	Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

No.	Item	Section
6.1.& 6.2.	Protection of privacy of natural persons/organisations.	Section 7(2)(a)
6.3.	Protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or is the subject of the information.	Section 7(2)(b)(ii)

Moved Cr Dawson, seconded Deputy Mayor Cox and **Resolved** that the business conducted in the “Public Excluded Section” be confirmed and the public be readmitted at 2.07 p.m.

MEETING CLOSED AT 2.07 PM.

Confirmed by:

Mike Havill
Mayor

Date

Next Meeting:

24 July 2014 - Ordinary Council Meeting (RSA Rooms, Harihari)

Report



DATE: 24 July 2014

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: District Planner

PLAN CHANGE 7: MANAGING FAULT RUPTURE RISK IN WESTLAND

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval to extend the timeframe in which to undertake the plan change process for plan change 7, which will reach its two year deadline on 24 August 2014.
- 1.2 This issue arises from Council's obligations under the Resource Management Act (RMA) which require Council to make a decision on a proposed plan change within two years of its notification. Councils have the ability under Section 37 of the RMA to extend this timeframe if they wish.
- 1.3 Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision set out in the Long Term Plan 2012-22. The matters raised in this report relate to those elements of the vision identified in the following table.

Vision's Objectives	Achieved By
Involving the community and stakeholders Having inspirational leadership Having expanded development opportunities Having top class infrastructure for all communities Living the '100% Pure NZ' brand	The District Plan is a key document to assist Council to achieve its vision. The proposed plan change has been notified for submissions and further submissions and also involved consultation prior to notification. The intent of the proposed plan change is to increase the resilience of the Westland District, in particular Franz Josef/ Waiau to fault rupture risk, and provide certainty around the way that

	Council will utilise the hazard information it holds. Through discouraging development within fault rupture hazard areas, the Council is increasing the likelihood that buildings and infrastructure located outside these areas remain operational post-earthquake rupture.
--	--

- 1.4 This report concludes by recommending that Council approves to extend the time to issue a decision on Plan Change 7 for two years.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Schedule 1, Part 1, 10 (4) (a) and (b) of the RMA are set out below:

(4) The local authority must —

(aaa)

- (a) give its decision no later than 2 years after notifying the proposed policy statement or plan under clause 5; and*
- (b) publicly notify the decision within the same time*

- 2.2 Schedule 1, Part 1, 1 (2) also sets out that:

(2) Where any time limit is set in this Schedule, a local authority may extend it under section 37.

- 2.3 Section 37A states that the following matters that must be considered by Council when deciding whether or not to extend time frames:

37A (1) A consent authority or local authority must not extend a time limit or waive compliance with a time limit, a method of service, or the service of a document in accordance with section 37 unless it has taken into account —

- (a) the interests of any person who, in its opinion, may be directly affected by the extension or waiver; and*
- (b) the interests of the community in achieving adequate assessment of the effects of a proposal, policy statement, or plan; and*
- (c) its duty under section 21 to avoid unreasonable delay.*

- 2.4 Proposed Plan Change 7 was notified on 24 August 2012, meaning that the Council is required to make a decision on the Plan Change prior to 24 August 2014, or is required to extend the timeframe.

- 2.5 The Plan Change sought to identify a “General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone” throughout the entire District, and a “Franz Josef Fault Rupture

Avoidance Zone” within Franz Josef and the surrounding area. Rules are inserted into the District Plan that mean that new buildings, extensions, and intensification of activities within buildings within the two Fault Rupture Avoidance Zones are noncomplying activities. In the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone, there is the ability to provide further information on the specific location of the Alpine Fault on the specific site and the location of the proposed building in order for those activities to be controlled.

- 2.6 The basis of the Plan Change was the two GNS reports provided to Council in October 2010 and 2011:

“Langridge, R; Ries, W. 2009. Mapping and fault rupture avoidance zonation for the Alpine Fault in the West Coast region, GNS Science Consultancy Report 2009/18. 47p.”

“Langridge, R.M; Beban, J.G 2011. Planning for a safer Franz Josef – Waiau community, Westland District: considering rupture of the Alpine Fault, GNS Science Consultancy Report 2011/217 61p.

The two reports predict that an Alpine Fault rupture occurring along the Alpine Fault will cause 8-9 metres of horizontal and 1-2 metres vertical movement, along with associated ground deformation.

- 2.7 The Plan Change received 21 submissions, eleven of which were from residents of Franz Josef. These submissions were summarised, and notified for further submissions on 19 April 2013. Nine further submissions were received.
- 2.8 The submissions ranged in scope and opinion. A number of submissions supported the Council addressing the hazard issue within the District, others sought clarification on types of activities that could occur as of right within the rural area, or sought specific provision for heritage buildings or farm buildings. Those who opposed the plan change raised concerns about whether the Council had adequately considered the effects that the plan change would have on Franz Josef township, whether buildings could be strengthened or designed to be able to withstand a fault rupture event and therefore continue to operate from within the identified fault rupture avoidance zone. A number of submissions sought support from Council and central Government to fund the relocation out of the proposed fault rupture avoidance zones, and a wider consideration of all hazards present in Franz Josef.
- 2.9 A number of submitters had sought technical assistance from planning or legal firms in order to make their submissions.

3.0 CURRENT SITUATION

- 3.1 The next step in the plan change process is to proceed to a hearing, in which independent commissioners hear and considers the plan change proposal. Council staff would like to pre-circulate the planning report and provide notice of the hearing time significantly in advance to allow sufficient time for submitters to obtain advice. It is not possible therefore for a decision to be made on the proposed plan change prior to the 24 August deadline.

4.0 OPTIONS

- 4.1 The options being considered in this report are not about whether Plan Change 7 should be approved or not, as the Resource Management Act specifies that this decision should be made following a hearing of submissions by commissioners. The options at this point are instead about whether the two-year deadline should be extended, to allow for the hearing process to occur. A decision to not extend the deadline, or a decision to withdraw the plan change, would pre-empt any decision on whether to approve Plan Change 7, as it would effectively send it back to “Square One” without proceeding to a hearing.
- 4.2 Option One: Extend timeframe under Section 37 of the Resource Management Act.
- 4.3 Option Two: Withdraw the plan change if Council believes this proposed change should not proceed to a hearing.
- 4.4 Option Three: Don’t extend timeframe, which means staff will be required to re-notify the plan change for submissions and further submissions if the Council wishes to continue with the proposed changes.

5.0 SIGNIFICANCE AND CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Proposed Plan Change 7, as a change to the District Plan, is a document of high importance, and the proposed plan change has a substantial impact on the affected landowners and their surrounding communities, especially within Franz Josef. The decision of whether or not to extend the timeframe however, is considered to be of low significance.
- 5.2 Consultation was undertaken prior to the notification of the plan change, and the plan change has followed the Schedule 1 process of the RMA. There has not been specific consultation on the decision to extend the timeframes in which to issue a decision on this plan change.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS (INCLUDING FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS)

Extend timeframe

- 6.1 Council staff have received feedback from Franz Inc. that expresses dissatisfaction with the time taken for Council to progress the plan change, as this is seen to leave landowners in “limbo” and unable to make informed decisions about their future investments. It is also noted that Franz Inc. does not support the plan change in its current form.
- 6.2 It is considered that extending the timeframe to proceed to a hearing on the plan change will allow Council, through the delegated commissioners, to adequately hear and assess the submissions on the plan change, and to reach a decision about whether or not to adopt the proposed provisions into the District Plan. This will then provide certainty to landowners to make decisions, which will address Franz Inc’s concerns about landowners being in “limbo.”
- 6.3 Proceeding to a hearing will mean that submitters will be able to address their submissions, and in some cases, utilise the expert advice that they have engaged. If the plan change is not extended, the plan change will require re-notification, which means that all submitters who will wish to continue to be involved in this plan change will either have to reassess their positions and provide a new submission, or re-submit their original submission. This process will then be repeated through the notification of further submissions. It is considered that extending the timeframe will respect the time and resources that submitters have already spent on this process.
- 6.4 The plan change hearing is the correct format to consider the adequacy of the plan change, and whether the Council wishes to proceed with the plan change.
- 6.5 The Council is also aware of further proposed research projects that are seeking to strengthen the resilience of communities such as Franz Josef to the risk of hazards. A decision from Council on how it intends to manage the risk of fault rupture within the district will assist in this study as it forms part of the response to natural hazard risk faced by that community.
- 6.6 It is considered that progressing with the plan change is in the best interests of the landowners affected by the plan change, and those that submitted on the plan change. Continuing to a hearing will continue with Council’s assessment of the effects of the plan change. The matters for consideration under section 37AA (a) and (b) are therefore met.

- 6.7 There are no penalties or adverse repercussions for Council from central government if it chooses to extend the deadline.

Withdraw plan change

- 6.8 A Council has the ability to withdraw a plan change at any stage prior to the change becoming operative if there are no appeals, or prior to the hearing of any appeals. This is the outcome sought by submitters who oppose the plan change, including Franz Inc. A number of submitters have sought that the plan change is withdrawn until Council can provide an “all hazards” approach to define where development should occur within Franz Josef and also financial assistance to those who are located within areas identified as being subject to hazard.
- 6.9 It is noted however, that the plan change has been drafted as a response to the new information on the land that is predicted to deform in an Alpine Fault rupture event, and, in the view of staff, reflects best practice. The plan change provides additional certainty to landowners that have land that is likely to deform in an Alpine Fault event, rather than leaving hazard management as a case by case assessment at building stage. Through discouraging development within the Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone, over time the risk to residents and visitors to Westland District will be reduced and the communities therefore will become more resilient.
- 6.10 If the Council chose to withdraw the plan change, it is likely that staff would have to redraft an amended plan change to provide for the management of hazard risk within these areas, given the probability of an Alpine Fault earthquake and fault rupture has been stated as being 20% in the next 30 years, with associated catastrophic effects on the community. It is the view of staff that in order for Council to perform one of its specified functions under the Resource Management Act:

Section 32

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district

(b) the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of—

(i) the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards;

and as a method to achieve the purpose of the Act:

Section 5

(2) In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while -

it is necessary to undertake a plan change to restrict the activity that can occur within the areas known to be likely to deform following fault rupture.

It also meets the objective 13.3.1 within the Westland District Plan:

“Rules for the avoidance and mitigation of natural hazards have been incorporated in the District Plan given that severe hazards pose a significant threat to the built resource and infrastructure of the District and people and communities.”

- 6.11 It is not considered efficient to delay any response to fault rupture hazard until additional further information is provided on other hazards present in Franz Josef. The plan change proceeds to identify and restrict activity within an area of defined fault rupture hazard risk, rather than to identify an area of Franz Josef that is free from any hazard. Areas subject to rezoning within the past ten years were subject to specific hazard reports, and Council staff continue to work with the West Coast Regional Council to respond to any further hazard information that is provided in relation to flood hazard and landslide risk. Council staff are also supportive of a proposed resilience study that is to commence in Franz Josef. These processes are able to occur in parallel to, rather than instead of, the proposed plan change.
- 6.12 Some submitters may see economic advantages in having restrictions removed on the further development of affected properties in Franz Josef. The withdrawal of Plan Change 7 would allow for the development of new activities and expansion of businesses within the area of identified hazard. However, any building consent application would be required to demonstrate that the requirements of the Building Code and Building Act were able to be met.
- 6.13 Withdrawing the plan change would suggest that Council no longer sees Plan Change 7 as appropriate, despite having not heard all submissions and planning evidence. It is recommended that at this stage the plan change should be tested through the hearings process as provided for by the Resource Management Act 1991.

Decline extension

- 6.14 As outlined above, if Council was of the view that it did not wish to proceed with a plan change it would be a clearer approach to withdraw it. If Council was of the view that it did not want to communicate a lack of support for the plan change, but was concerned with the amount of time that had elapsed following the closure of submissions, it could choose to decline the extension. This would require Council staff to re-notify the plan change and the two year period in which to make a decision will recommence. The plan change notification process requires notice within the newspapers, and letters to all directly affected parties within the District. New submissions

would be required to be made by any submitter that wishes to remain involved in the process, and these submissions will be required to be summarised and re-notified for further submissions to be made. This is not considered to be an efficient approach.

- 6.15 The benefit of re-notification of the plan change would be that new residents of Westland District within the last two years who had not been able to be involved in the process previously would have the opportunity to make a submission. It could also allow submitters to reconsider their stance on the issue, or provide Council with further information within their submission.

7.0 PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS

- 7.1 It is recommended that Council approves the continuation of Plan Change 7. This allows the plan change to go to a hearing, where commissioners can consider the submissions and whether to approve the plan change, without requiring all submitters to restate their positions and incurring the costs of re-notification.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council resolves that the timeframe for issuing a decision on Plan Change 7 be extended under Section 37 of the Resource Management Act to 24 August 2016.

Rebecca Beaumont
District Planner

Appendix 1: Proposed Plan Change 7 Wording

WESTLAND DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 7: Managing Fault Rupture Risk in Westland



Amendments to the Plan

The following section outlines the proposed alterations or additions to the Westland District Plan.

- Add additional wording into Policy 4.14 Explanation, page 99

The Alpine Fault is located within Westland and there is significant risk posed by an Alpine Fault earthquake which has a probability of occurrence, calculated at 20% over the next 30 years (Langridge, RM; Beban, JG 2011).

- Amend Rule 5.6.2.2 B, (Page 153) Controlled Activities in the Rural Zone to include reference to the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone and the Franz Josef/ Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone. New wording is underlined.

"The establishment of new buildings for the purposes of any residential activities except in

- the Waiho River General Flood Hazard Area as shown on Planning Map 14A,
- the Franz Josef/Waiiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone; or
- within the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone.

Applications may be considered without the need to obtain the written approval of affected persons or publicly notify the application. The matters over which control is reserved are:

- Add new section 5.8 General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone and 5.9 Franz Josef / Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone (detailed on following pages).

5.8 General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

5.8.1 Description

The General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone is an area of between 20 and 200 metres wide located on either side of the Alpine Fault as it runs through the length of Westland District. This zone is the area that is predicted to be seriously affected by fault rupture during an earthquake on the Alpine Fault.

The zone has been created and mapped by the Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences (GNS) utilising data from a number of sources. The width of this zone depends firstly on the type of fault at any given point and therefore its performance during an earthquake event, and secondly, variations in the accuracy of data available at any particular location.

GNS predict the probability of an Alpine Fault earthquake event, with fault rupture to the surface, occurring is 20% within the next 30 years. Along the fault rupture it is estimated that there will be approximately 8-9 metres of horizontal displacement (to the north) on the west (Australian plate) side, and 1-2 metres vertical uplift on the east (Pacific Plate) side. As land deformation will be greater on the vertical lift or "hanging wall" side of the fault rupture, the Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone is wider on the east (Pacific Plate) side.

In order to manage the risk to human life and reduce effects on the long term recovery of the Westland District from an Alpine Fault earthquake event, it is necessary to restrict the types of activities that can occur within areas susceptible to fault rupture. However, in recognition of the fact that in some areas the location of the fault is not well defined, landowners are given the opportunity to obtain further technical advice regarding the fault location on specific sites. If the further report identifies a narrower area of predicted fault rupture, then this may be approved through consent. Subdivision, commercial activities, and dwellings are discouraged in the General Fault Rupture Zone due to the increased hazard risk and the lack of available mitigation measures.

5.8.2 Zones

5.8.2.1 General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

A. Permitted Activities

Any agricultural or forestry activity, subject to:

- (1) Compliance with the standards for permitted activities in the Rural Policy Unit rules 5.6.2.2 and set out in Table 5.7;
- (2) Compliance with the general rules in Part 8;
- (3) Any buildings that are not used for residential purposes, subject to:
 - (a) The provision of a report to Council from a suitably qualified person in geology or geotechnical engineering with specialisation in earthquake risk assessment that :
 - i. Records the survey and mapping of the site to identify and indicate as accurately as possible the location of the surface position of the plane of any active fault.
 - ii. Establishes the area that is likely to be subject to fault rupture and includes any buffers for uncertainty and establishes that the proposed building is located entirely outside of this area.
 - (b) Compliance with all other rules in Part 5.6.2.2A, 5.7 and Part 8 of the Plan.

B. Controlled Activities

- The establishment of new buildings for the purposes of any residential activities that are accompanied by:
 - a) A report from a suitably qualified person in geology or geotechnical engineering with specialisation in earthquake risk assessment that :
 - i. records the survey and mapping of the site to identify and indicate as accurately as possible the location of the surface position of the plane of any active fault.
 - ii. Establishes the area that is likely to be subject to fault rupture and includes any buffers for uncertainty and establishes that the proposed building is located entirely outside of this area.

Applications may be considered without the need to obtain the written approval of affected persons or publicly notify the application. The matters over which control is reserved are:

- financial contributions relating to the provision of potable water and roading
- location of access points
- method of effluent disposal
- distance from existing activities which may have nuisance effects
- visual and aesthetic values

C. Non complying activity

Any new building, building extension or alteration of an activity to increase the scale of effects of an activity within a building located within the Fault Rupture Avoidance zone.

Explanation

Through restricting the use of land subject to fault rupture, Council is managing natural hazard risk and providing for the health and safety of the residents and visitors to Westland.

Farming activities may occur without consent, however any building, including farm sheds require a consent as these buildings can be significant investments in the infrastructure of a farm and will have significant economic effects if destroyed by fault rupture. This will adversely affect Westland's recovery from an Alpine Fault Earthquake.

Council acknowledges that the detail and accuracy of the underlying information that formed the Fault Avoidance Zone was varied, so in situations where the fault is not well defined, a further report can be presented that provides additional detail into the location of the fault on the specific site, and the risk of fault rupture. This will allow the margins of error to be reduced and may allow the development to proceed without consent.

Development of new buildings within the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone that are not established through further study to be outside of fault rupture risk are non-complying and are unlikely to be approved.

5.9 Franz Josef / Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

5.9.1 Description

The Alpine Fault passes through the township of Franz Josef/Waiiau and subsequently the town is subject to significant risk from fault rupture. A detailed study has been undertaken to map the location of the Alpine Fault through Franz Josef/Waiiau and the surrounding area utilising LiDAR imagery and RTK GPS mapping. Within this area, the fault is considered "well defined" in this location and it is unlikely that further study would reduce the area of land identified as subject to fault rupture risk any further than that set out in the 2011 GNS report. Developments and increases or alterations to activities within this area are heavily restricted in order to ensure the health and safety of residents and visitors.

5.9.2 Zones

5.9.2.1 Franz Josef / Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

A. Permitted Activities

Any commercial or residential activity, subject to:

- (1) No buildings other than temporary buildings are permitted in association with these activities;
- (2) Compliance with the standards for permitted activities in the Tourist Policy Unit or Franz Alpine Resort;
- (3) Compliance with the general rules in Part 8;

B Non complying activities

The construction of any new building, or extension of any existing building, or change or increase in an activity within a building on site within the Franz Josef Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

5.9.3 Explanation

Existing use rights under Section 10 of the Resource Management Act are not impinged by the above rules.

The location of the fault line within Franz Josef/ Waiau is well defined and therefore there is no opportunity for additional information to be provided in order to reduce the margin of error of the predicted rupture risk area.

Ancillary commercial and residential activities that do not require buildings are permitted. This allows activities such as carparking and gardens to occur without consent however any structures will be unlikely to be approved due to the risk to human safety.

- Make the following alterations and additions to the subdivision section (Part 7.3 of the Plan, from page 182). New wording is underlined.

7.3.3 Discretionary Activities

Any subdivision which complies with the rules for discretionary activities in Table 7.1. All subdivision in the Waiho River General Flood Hazard Area as defined on Planning Map 14A. Any subdivision that is partially located within the Franz Josef/Waiiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone or the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone.

7.3.4 Non-complying Activities

Any subdivision which is not a permitted, controlled or discretionary activity. All subdivision in the Waiho River Severe Flood Hazard Zone as defined on Planning Map 14A. Any Subdivision of land that is entirely located within either the Franz Josef/Waiiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone or the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone.

7.6 Assessment of Discretionary Subdivision

- When a proposed subdivision includes land partially within the Franz Josef/Waiiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone, or the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone, whether a report has been provided from a suitably qualified person in geology or geotechnical engineering with experience in earthquake assessment to demonstrate that any buildings are located outside of the relevant fault rupture avoidance zone, whether access can be achieved and if ground topography will cause additional adverse effects during fault rupture, Whether any mechanisms have been volunteered to prevent development within the Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone.

- Insert the following definitions into Part 9: Definitions section of the Plan.

Franz Josef/Waiiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone: means the area encompassing the active fault system within Franz Josef/ Waiiau and suggested to be subject to elevated risk of a fault rupture hazard. This section of the Alpine Fault has been accurately

determined utilising LIDAR and GPS mapping. Shown on the planning maps as Franz Josef/ Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone: means the area encompassing active fault systems in the District and suggested to be subject to elevated risk of a fault rupture hazard. Shown on the planning maps as General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone

- Replace the existing planning maps with new maps (shown on following pages) into Part 10 Appendices indicating the General Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone within the Westland District, and the Franz Josef/ Waiau Fault Rupture Avoidance Zone within Franz Josef/Waiau and the surrounding area.

Report



DATE: 24 July 2014

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Group Manager: District Assets

RSA WORKING GROUP AND REQUEST TO BUILD A NEW WAR MEMORIAL

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to build a new war memorial building at war memorial site on Sewell Street and disestablish the RSA Working Group.
- 1.2 These issues arise as a direct result of the RSA Working Group agreeing to propose a new purpose built facility at the current site replacing the current damaged building after its demolition.
- 1.3 Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision set out in the Long Term Plan 2012-22. The matters raised in this report relate to those elements of the vision identified in the following table.

Vision's Objectives	Achieved By
Involving the community and stakeholders	Working constructively with the local community to assess its recreational needs via the RSA working group.
Having top class infrastructure for all communities	Considering replacing the existing RSA building to ensure infrastructure meets current standards.

- 1.4 This report concludes recommending that Council approves the construction of a new building on the current Sewell Street site incurring no cost to the ratepayers. Also that the working group be disestablished.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A detailed report on Hokitika RSA Building was included on the December 2013 Council meeting agenda.
- 2.4 Following the meeting, Council resolved that “Council establishes a working party to work with the Hokitika RSA on the future of the building and land”.
- 2.2 The formed group met several times since Dec 2013 to discuss the options around a few facility and a further report requesting the demolition of building was included on the February 2013 Council meeting agenda.
- 2.3 Following the meeting Council resolved that “Council approve demolishing the RSA building in Sewell Street, Hokitika at an estimated cost of \$24,950 (exc. GST) and this project be included in the 2014-15 Draft Annual Plan.”
- 2.4 The Annual Plan is now adopted and the demolition project is approved. The project will be planned in consultation with the members of Hokitika RSA in due course.

3.0 CURRENT SITUATION

- 3.1 The purpose of the working group formed as a result of Council resolution in December 2013 was to work with Hokitika RSA on the future of the building and land.
- 3.2 This purpose is met with the group recommending the demolition of building, persevering the current War Memorial status of land and now endorsing the proposal to build a new facility at the same site on Sewell Street.
- 3.3 A request for approval to build a new memorial building at the site from Hokitika RSA has been received and is attached in Appendix A.
- 3.4 Hokitika RSA proposes to build this new purpose build facility at no cost to ratepayers and have undertaken an extensive fund raising program. They intend to apply for grants to various organisations including New Zealand Lotteries Commission and MDI.
- 3.5 A letter of approval is required from Council as a land owner.

4.0 OPTIONS

- 4.1 Option 1: Accept the request to build and disestablish the group

- 4.2 Option 2: Accept the request to build and not disestablish the group
- 4.3 Option 3: Decline the request to build and not disestablish the group

5.0 SIGNIFICANCE AND CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The construction of a new facility is replacing the current building and there is no change of current level of service and no costs are involved for Westland ratepayers. As such the matter is considered to be of low significance in accordance with Council's Policy on Significance
- 5.2 The working group was established to ensure Hokitika RSA are fully involved to decide on the future of the land and the current building. No public consultation is required.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS (INCLUDING FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS)

- 6.1 Option 1: Accept the request to build and disestablish the group

The working group has assessed all the possible solutions. Hokitika RSA group prefers to have a new building at the same site replacing the current building after its demolition.

The new building proposed is a smaller footprint as compared to the current building. Hokitika RSA is fund raising to build this facility. The building will be vested as a Council asset, though Hokitika RSA undertakes to fund the future maintenance of this building.

The working has met its purpose as explained in section 3.0 of this report. Council will continue to provide project management support for this construction project.

This is the **preferred** option. There are no on-going financial implications with this option other than staff time on project support.

- 6.2 Option 2: Accept the request to build and not disestablish the group

Along with the approval for a new building Council has the option to continue with the current working group. However the Council will need to identify the need and purpose of this group to exist any further from this point.

Council staff has extended project management support for building of this new facility. This is in line with any other community project proposed

around the district. Continuing with the current group and its current membership will be un-necessary.

There will be staff costs involved for their time on the group and project management support. This is **not** a preferred option.

6.3 Option 3: Decline the request to build and not disestablish the group

Council may choose this option which means that the working group continues to exist and assess further possible options other than building a new building for Hokitika RSA at the current war memorial site.

As indicated earlier Hokitika RSA has ruled out all other options and choosing this option will deliver no different result other than option 1. Continuing with the group will mean further staff time in costs with no deliverable.

This is **not** a preferred option.

7.0 PREFERRED OPTION(S) AND REASONS

7.1 Option 1 is the preferred option.

7.2 This provides Hokitika RSA with their desire to be present on the current war memorial site.

7.3 There is no change to current level of service

7.4 There are no capital costs and no financial implication for ratepayers.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

C) **THAT** Council gives approval to Hokitika RSA to build a new facility at the War Memorial site on Sewell Street at no cost to Westland ratepayers, and

D) **THAT** Council resolves to disestablish the current working group and acknowledges that the group has met its purpose, and

E) **THAT** a memorandum of understanding be developed with Hokitika RSA for the future maintenance of this new facility to be responsibility of Hokitika RSA.

Vivek Goel

Group Manager: District Assets

80613

Returned Services Association

Incorporated

HOKITIKA - WESTLAND
BRANCH
War Memorial Hall
22 Sewell Street
Telephone (03) 755 6168



All correspondence to be
addressed to
The Secretary
PO Box 31
HOKITIKA

CE	Mayor	GM PCV	GM DA	GM CS	EA	
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

NOTE: Emailed to Councillors 27/6/14

Mayor and Councilors Westland District Council
Weid Street
Hokitika

War Memorial Reserve

The Hokitika Westland Returned and Services Association wish to formally apply to reuse the War Memorial land to rebuild.

As you are aware the working group has progressed to the stage, where we all agree to rebuild the War Memorial Building on existing reserve.

Can you please supply us with a formal letter that confirms the above, this letter will also be used as part of the required information we need to support funding applications.

We would appreciate a prompt reply

In due course we will expect Council and RSA to work together on a formal occupation right.

Yours faithfully

Lyall Delore

CC Tanya Winter CEO