

Submission Number	Name	Submission Type	Summary of Submission	Staff Comment
1	Ian Simmons	Roads	<p>The Marlborough Area of the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association wish to make the following submission for consideration in the 2020/2021 Annual Plan.</p> <p>We would ask consideration be given in the 2020/21 annual budget to forming a cycle and pedestrian access to the current bike link at the railway end of Mill Road. As we now have the safety of the new path on Old Beach Road to Mill Road for our members</p> <p>We feel if access to the bike link at Mill Road was considered it would ensure our members and the Kaikoura ratepayers a safe journey to and from the beach and town centre. Subject to the NZMCA National Boards approval consideration may be given to making a contribution towards the towards the cost of this crossing.</p>	Application has already been made to government for funding to establish such a link as part of the 'Active Travel Enhancement' shovel ready project.
2	Federated Farmers	Rates	Call to contain Rates and contain consultation processes.	Noting that this submission was written immediately prior to the level 4 lockdown, and is generic to all local authorities across NZ, we thank Federated Farmers for their submission and assure them that every effort has been made to keep rates increases to a minimum. Our original targeted 10% increase from the 3 Year Plan has been reduced to 4.6% in the draft Annual Plan.
3	John and Tina Peters, NZMCA members and Motorhome owners	Fees and Charges	<p>Hi, I am writing this letter to prompt the councils and government to take action over our very precious camping life in New Zealand. We have lost our way with respect to the wonderful life style that we once had in the family camping holidays. To put it simply the camp grounds are far too expensive for the general campers and particularly for larger families.</p> <p>Two strong recommendations from me :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Councils/Government review the rating system for campgrounds so that they pay minimum or no rates as a public service to the district. 2. Campground owners study the market and reduce their charges to a reasonable amount once rates have been reduced. If they cut their charges they would attract more people in to their camps. It is better to have people coming in at a reduced price than none at all. 	Reviewing rates for campgrounds in isolation from other accommodation providers is not recommended. Campgrounds are commercial ventures whose rates contribute to marketing the district to attract visitors, to provide public toilets and rubbish bins, as well as contributing to roads, footpaths, playgrounds, dog control and everyday Council services. Under the Local Government Rating Act, the only way to provide any rates relief to campgrounds in isolation from any other sector would be to adopt a rates remission policy specific to these properties, and this would be inequitable to every other property in the district.
4	Bill	Rubbish and Recycling	Option 4 is our preferred choice. In the annual plan draft, you make the point, that recycling doesn't work, financially or practically. Costs too much. You pay to collect & separate, then dump it anyway.(common sense gone out the window).We also need a proper rubbish collection.	Noted
4	Bill	Clarence Valley Access	If it wasn't cost prohibitive, option 1 would have been our choice this ,leaves option 2 as the next in line.	Noted, aligns with proposed option. It is appreciated that if option 1 had been similar in cost to option 2 that it would have been preferable.
5	William Lonsdale	Clarence Valley Access	I chose this option because the bridge is more likely to be built if largely funded by Government i.e. NZTA. I live on Waiautoa Rd, above the old bridge. The existing access to the valley has several hazards, is dangerous and unsustainable in the long term. The bridge needs to be replaced as soon as possible hence I have chosen option 2 as with funds from central Government the bridge is more likely to be built sooner than later.	Noted, aligns with proposed option
6	Lesa Bdo	Rubbish and Recycling	Its a small town 4000 people, better recycling at IWK and at other ports and allocation of excess funds to necessary projects i.e. Clarence Bridge repair.	Not clear what the message of this submission is.
6	Lesa Bdo	Clarence Valley Access	I would like the bridge to go ahead so the houses and land in The Upper Clarence Area that are in isolation and in very difficult and different circumstances to the rest of the district are easily accessible with no gates but the proper council road that we have enjoyed for many years prior to the earthquake. It appears from the options listed that this is the best way for the bridge to go ahead.	Noted, aligns with proposed option
6	Lesa Bdo	Aquatic Centre	The Rata Foundation is still a loan and the higher interest rate will affect residents long term.	Aquatic Centre. Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Agree higher interest rate would affect ratepayers more. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required
7	Jacqui Hamilton	Clarence Valley Access	This option makes fiscal sense. It will place less burden on ratepayers yet improve the lives of those of us who live up the Clarence Valley and have had our lives impacted severely by the lack of reliable access.	Noted, aligns with proposed option
8	Murray Harford	Rubbish and Recycling	If you take away the local recycling service people will dump rubbish anywhere and farmers will go back to the "old rubbish hole" on the farm	There is a need to ensure that some form of service for disposal of waste materials (as either refuse or recycling) is available, particularly for urban residents. Evidence suggests that many rural residents are already continuing to dispose of waste on their properties despite the existing availability of Council services.

8	Murray Harford	Aquatic Centre	I think with the current financial situation of the Kaikoura Council that you should even be considering building an Aquatic Center.	Aquatic Centre Note comments favouring neither Aquatic Centre option. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required. Re not building a Centre at all – other than the \$1million Council funding, plus operational costs agreed in 2019, the rest of the funding for the Trust to proceed, has now been obtained.
8	Murray Harford	Sustainability	I think the Councillors should be having a serious look at the Council and its sustainability and move to join Marlborough. I believe the whole area would be better off and take a look at how much Marlborough's Rate rise is.	Sustainability The best estimate of the future financial demands on KDC will be seen in the Long Term Plan next year. That together with further work currently being undertaken as part of the Financial Corporate Sustainability (FCS) project around efficiencies and processes for improved corporate sustainability, will provide Council with a good view of future demands. Together the 2 aspects will assist with an assessment of the sustainability of rate levels for Kaikoura ratepayers going forwards. Re Marlborough's rates, each Council's rates percentage increases are only a part of comparative information, and the circumstances applicable to each need to be considered – e.g. the effect of the Kaikoura Earthquake on Kaikoura
9	Colin Nimmo	Fees and Charges	Rates becoming a big percentage of farming costs for very little value. KK businesses are going to struggle with lack of tourists so every one is worried about rates. KDC needs to find other ways to fund the tourist facility in the district. The main tourist activity is from the harbour. The harbour has had more Govt and KDS money spent on it than most places with very little return to the KDC. As I have said before there needs to be a per head charge for all tourist activity out of the Harbour. Why should the users of the airport be charged on a per head basis and the Harbour not? The money should be managed by a board and used only for tourist related facilities. At \$5 per head that could be over a \$1 Mill. Now is the time to set this up.	Response: Applying a charge per person could be problematic in that it would either rely upon the honesty of the operators involved, or require some form of headcount at the slipway and marina (probably a warden based at the site). Cruise ship fees have been set per passenger capacity per vessel per visit (for example a ship that can accommodate 200 passengers would pay 200 x \$5 regardless of actual passenger numbers on board). Potentially the council could use a similar fee structure for tourism-related operators using the harbour, such as Whale Watch, Encounter Kaikoura, and each of the various fishing charters etc. This is a significant change to the current fee structure but this is a good opportunity to start the conversation as part of the Long Term Plan process, and reflects the observations made by Morrison Low to the Financial and Corporate Sustainability project. To clarify, airport fees are by landing rather than by headcount, but this is still a major departure from the generic annual slipway fee currently applied to the harbour operators.
10	Kevin Cole	Rubbish and Recycling	Kaikoura must recycle as much as possible. The cost is secondary	Whilst it is appreciated that some people value the waste minimisation ethos, the associated cost efficiency has to be considered.
10	Kevin Cole	Clarence Valley Access	Least Cost to get small community back up and running	Noted, aligns with proposed option
10	Kevin Cole	Aquatic Centre	Kaikoura needs the centre. Rate payer cost reduced.	
11	Kevin Cole	District Plan	Kaikoura Flats The submission sees the expansion of the Kaikoura township into the Kaikoura Flats over time. It raises concerns that commercial and industrial activities are creating detrimental effects on the Kaikoura Flats. Conflicts are arising between the main activities on the Kaikoura Flats being farming, domestic, commercial and industrial. Kaikoura urgently needs an industrial park.	The Kaikoura Flats have traditionally be used for farming and horticultural activities. The 1989 Kaikoura Country District Scheme (Town and Country Planning Act) provided for both of these activities specifically. This zoning provides for range of activities including intensive farming in the Rural G (General) and Rural H (Horticultural). The Town and Country Planning Act was a very prescriptive approach, this related in a number of problems arising. In 1991 the Resource Management Act (RMA) was enacted. The RMA is the main piece of legislation that sets out how we should manage our environment. It is based on the principle of sustainable management. This involves considering effects of activities on the environment now and in the future when making resource management decisions. This change to an effects based approach relies on ensuring that effects can be avoided remedied or mitigated. The Kaikoura District Plan was made operative in 2008 and is the District's first Plan under the RMA and intended future use. Council is now reviewing the Natural Hazards Chapter of the District Plan. Over time other chapters, including the rural zone will be reviewed. The natural hazards information is showing that parts of the flats are subject to both potential flooding and liquefaction. The challenges of building on the flats have been reinforced by the November 2016 Earthquake. A recent report to Government recommended reform of the RMA - currently staff are creating a road map for reviewing the District Plan to inform the Long Term Plan. This roadmap will now need to take account of significant legislative changes.

12	Kevin Cole	District Plan	Kaikoura needs an Industrial Park to prevent legacy issues for future generations	Council has previously considered three broad areas Kowhai Ford Area, Old Beach Road Area and Cr Inland Rd and SH1 for the development of a business park (light industry). The creation of a business park would assist in reducing the approach which presently is occurring on the Kaikoura flats. In 2014 a Council workshop was undertaken and the decision made by Council to focus on Cr Inland Rd and SH1 – given railway access and good roading network etc. At this time Council was willing to provide support to this concept but was unwilling to set aside funding to enable the development or rezoning occur at the cost of the ratepayer. Even without physical works on site a simple rezoning would exceed \$100,000.00. Any budget decision on rezoning would need to be made by Council. Council staff understands that the owner of the land intended for the business park intend to start construction in Spring 2020. The proposed roadmap for reviewing the District Plan will need to include consideration for prioritising a business/industrial area.
13	Kevin Cole	Roads	NCTIR - clean up	Noted - see comments on flats roads submission by Kevin Cole
14	Kevin Cole	District Plan	Downers Yard in Kowhai Ford Road Downers should have not been given consent and the site needs to move	This matter is more a resource consent matter than an Annual Plan matter and has been passed on to the planning team as a complaint and will be addressed separately.
15	Kevin Cole	Roads	Kaikoura Flats - Roads	There is a need to better align the expectations of KDC and NZTA regarding the remedial work to be done to the flats roads in response to wear and tear caused by NCTIR vehicles. Data is currently being collected on changes in road condition to support associated discussion with NZTA.
16	ALAN GULLEFORD	Rubbish and Recycling	Keeps town tidy and sanitary, if residents buy-in and do their part.	Noted. Supports retaining status quo services.
16	ALAN GULLEFORD	Clarence Valley Access	Affordable and sensible	Noted, aligns with proposed option
16	ALAN GULLEFORD	Aquatic Centre	Rata loan not taken is best option	Aquatic Centre. Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required
16	ALAN GULLEFORD	Wakatu Quay	Whakatu Wharf and South Bay Marina development The wharf should aim to become a vibrant tourist hub, but it must be self-sustaining. Leaving it un-touched detracts from our environmental aims and lowers the quality of the Kaikoura experience for visitors. South Bay can be developed out of recognition which could be OK, but the access road and foot-way needs to be an important part of that improvement.	Submission generally supportive of current directions of Provincial Growth Fund (PGF) projects. Improvement of pedestrian access to South Bay is part of the 'Active Travel Enhancement' shovel ready project for which KDC has made application to government.
16	ALAN GULLEFORD	Rebuild	Horizontal Infrastructure It seems to me as a resident, that a sensible plan has been developed.	Noted
16	ALAN GULLEFORD	Operations	Operations Financial Management that has been proposed seems prudent and well thought out. In my opinion, our Council is serving us well through an absolutely turbulent and confrontational time. Thank you all.	Operations. Noted supportive comments on current financial management and Council
17	Peter Hamilton	Clarence Valley Access	Option 2 Clarence Valley is an important public recreational place for all New Zealanders. NZTA should help fund this. We want our beautiful back country to be available to people for hunting and other recreational uses. Without access the game populations and pest populations get out of hand. Also there are significant tramping and climbing opportunities in this beautiful region of Dept of Conservation land. Access IS important for the betterment of the whole country and the health and wellbeing of its citizens.	Noted, aligns with proposed option

18	Cheryl Hodson	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>No option listed that includes a fortnightly rubbish & recycling collection, which over 1000 locals and workers in Kaikoura signed.</p> <p>Why is every proposed option more expensive than option 1, when so little is recycling and so few items to sort? Tender the rubbish and Recycling services to Blenheim or Christchurch , The present service is not cost effective. Reduce staff at IWK and stop Tuesday training/moving days.</p> <p>Reduce days open to the public and there would be no requirement to pay staff 7 days per week.</p>	<p>The suggested option that included both existing recycling services and a refuse collection was not presented as it would have a cost substantially higher than what is currently paid. The recent reduction of the range of materials accepted for recycling is not expected to have substantially reduced the overall cost of providing recycling services. There are still relatively significant fixed costs associated with it and other waste minimisation activities conducted by IWK, and any such reduction would not fully offset other increases in the cost of service that had been previously indicated to Council by IWK, which reflected both increased costs and reduced revenues for that organisation. It is suspected that many people signed the petition on having appreciated the refuse collections provided during COVID19 level 4, but without understanding the associated cost implications. The question of whether current services are cost effective can probably only be answered through an open procurement process, which may occur in the later stages of the current review process. Reduction of the days on which the recycling centre is open was an element of the 'low cost' options 2 and 3, and there is potential for reduced centre hours to be further explored under other options.</p>
18	Cheryl Hodson	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Clarence riverbed floods often for weeks closing the road. There is already a road on the left side of river.</p>	<p>Whilst very high river levels could result in temporary closure of the ford over the old river channel, the frequency of this is expected to be low, and that frequency could potentially be further reduced by construction of a low dam structure upstream. The level of access interruption associated with closure of the ford is in accordance with NZTA's expectations for a road with the levels of vehicle use that are present. Substantial works would be required to reinstate and protect the existing road on the left side of the river that connected to the original bridge site, that contributes to making Option 1 both more expensive and prone to risk than the proposed Option 2.</p>
18	Cheryl Hodson	Aquatic Centre	<p>Appears to be cheaper for ratepayers but where is the council grant coming from? Is this from 4.63% increase in rates?</p>	<p>If the grant did go ahead then yes some of its cost would be part of the rates increase; both this year and for the future as well. The grant is made from funds borrowed by Council.</p>
19	Ralph Hogan	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Let us not rubbish the Zero Waste ethos of Kaikoura by completely eliminating incentives. The ideology behind Council not picking up your rubbish at your door has been, in part, to incentivise individuals to be cognizant of their rubbish production and take individual responsibility for that rubbish.</p> <p>For all of you that signed a petition to have me pay for picking up and burying your rubbish through my rates, is it right for you to have those of us that take the extra effort to produce much less rubbish pay for your rubbish? If you are going to produce unlimited bags of rubbish, and you want them picked up then you need to pay the actual cost of burying those bags plus the cost of picking them up. And I will happily pay for mine.</p> <p>Yes, there is a reduced market for recyclables but there are many ways to reduce rubbish production and we should pursue those either on an individual level or through legislative advocacy. We should continue to recycle items that can be recycled even if there is a cost to doing so as long as that cost is less than landfilling. That is still better than putting it in the ground. We should continue to reward desirable behaviour and charge for undesirable behaviour. Of course, we may never have gotten to absolute Zero waste but we don't need to throw up our hands and abandon that Kaikoura ethos entirely.</p> <p>Rubbish and Recycling Transparency and Funding Before Council or the community can make informed choices on rubbish and recycling finances, we need the costings. Until these costings are laid on the table we should continue with the status quo. There must be complete transparency regarding the immediate dollar cost of putting the rubbish in the ground as well as the net dollar cost or savings of recycling each of the various items that can still be recycled.</p> <p>Funding rubbish collection and disposal If it is desirable for individuals to take responsibility for reducing their rubbish, then they should pay for the costs associated with getting rid of the rubbish they produce or attract. If the District is going to pick up rubbish at premises it should charge those premises all costs associated.</p> <p>Funding for continued recycling If it is desirable to keep some material out of the ground by way of recycling, it will be more effective to have an</p>	<p>The concept of not providing an urban kerbside refuse collection to incentivise waste minimisation is sound, and the community and Council was brave to adopt an approach that is not believed to have been employed elsewhere in NZ. Whilst the petition did not clearly define exactly what people were indicating support for, it is suspected that it may have believed that it was for a kerbside refuse collection service without user pays charges similar to that provided under COVID-19 Level 4. If that was the case then those people were indicating support for an approach that was strongly at odds with the Zero Waste ethos, and such an approach has not been suggested by Council, with refuse disposal being suggested as an activity for which 'user pays' principles should be strictly applied. The submitters comment that 'We should continue to recycle items that can be recycled even if there is a cost to doing so as long as that cost is less than landfilling' is wholeheartedly agreed with. It has perhaps been unclear that where in the consultation document reference has been made to 'profitable' recycling, what was meant is that such recycling has a lower cost than landfill disposal. The issue regarding costs is also agreed with; reliable figures - preferably from real offers of service - are necessary before any significant changes are seriously considered. Also agree with the need for continuing advocacy for enablement of waste reduction at source.</p>
19	Ralph Hogan	Clarence Valley Access	<p>\$19 million is NOT an option</p>	<p>Noted. Not in conflict with proposed direction.</p>

19	Ralph Hogan	Rates	<p>Our high rates.</p> <p>It is noted and appreciated that the proposed rate increase has been reduced to 4.6% but it could go further. Several years ago a previous Council used a nationally accepted formula to calculate the infrastructure cost of development per new parcel created to charge Development Fees. There was a notion that the individual that benefitted from that development should pay for it. The Council of the day decided to cut that amount in half for the developer to pay and then took it a step further and forgave all that cost for any developer of fewer than 10 parcels. That cost did not disappear. It has been borne by all the ratepayers including those that get zero benefit from those private new parcels. It is time to charge each additional parcel created for those costs...all of them. This will eliminate urban creep without mitigation. Please put this program back on the table possibly with the long term plan.</p>	<p>Additional Submission Rates</p> <p>Reviewing the development contributions policy is recommended as part of the Long Term Plan work. There have been an estimated 32 new lots created in the period since 1 July 2015, and development contributions have been calculated at \$6,804 + GST per lot, which is over \$217k in development contribution revenue that has not been collected over the last five years due to these subdivisions falling below the 10-lot threshold. We note the threshold was a conscious policy decision from the Council of the day in 2015 to enable small developments to proceed and to only take contributions from those subdivisions which were large enough to genuinely create additional demand on Council services. The threshold was introduced in response to stagnating growth and feedback from consent applicants that the cost of development contributions was prohibitive and meant they would not proceed with their subdivision. The result of having the threshold in place is there are more rateable properties on the rates database, and therefore more rates collected from these new lots. The rates revenue from these properties would cover the lost contributions revenue within 4 years per new lot (assuming \$1,701 + GST in rates per new lot).</p>
20	Barry Dunnett	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>I attended the meeting at the Memorial Hall and learnt that that there are many options within the options. Not just the 4. It sucks that recycling is SO limited. If a truck can do kerbside metal or cardboard it could do occasional kerbside rubbish.</p> <p>Council has an obligation to push for plastic packaging limitation from retail outlets along with IWK, who should have been better represented at the meeting, as they are a key to this issue.</p> <p>Council before making decisions about rubbish collection, needs to assess the WHOLE environmental costs. Hundreds of dump visits by the public equals huge fossil fuel use compared to kerbside collections.</p> <p>Would suggest no dump shop, but transfer goods to OP shop, which does a wonderful job with volunteers at no wage cost to Council.</p> <p>I hate to comment on job losses, but if Council are suggesting big cuts to services then far less staff are needed. I would like to see a continuation of greenwaste composting, even though the product is of a poor standard (contains far too much plastic waste), compared to quality products (ITM compost compare).</p> <p>Council/IWK should restore recycling as soon as it becomes possible.</p> <p>Has composting of paper with green waste been considered to at least help recycle this product?</p>	<p>Need for advocacy of at source waste reduction aligns with previous Council discussions, though difficult to give effect at local level, needs government direction. Comments on possible revision of re-use shop, continuing use of composing align with proposed Option 3. Comment made on fossil fuel efficiency of kerbside collection is worthy of further consideration.</p>
20	Barry Dunnett	Clarence Valley Access	<p>An easy apparent choice, although from 50 years outdoor experience of this part of the Clarence, my preferred choice would have been a concrete ford over the Wharekeiri Stream. I do not believe the difficulties portrayed re unstable sections of southern road access and, although it is not mentioned in the options, would I be correct in assuming Council will STILL maintain the southern access route??</p> <p>The southern access route has been a semi or maintained route for many decades (100?). Heavy machinery has always been taken in via this route. Despite the assessment mentioned at the meeting that the Clarence has a tiny chance of reverting to its south channel, let's wait and see about that one!</p> <p>I assume some of the costing will be to armour off the south channel from that happening.</p>	<p>Comments noted, but KDC has not historically maintained Southern Access Route beyond the Waipapa ford, and there is not currently any intention to do so after the new bridge is established. No works are proposed that would further reduce the low probability of the Clarence River reverting to its old channel, as huge works would be needed to prevent this in a flood event of the massive scale that would be needed to cause such a reversion.</p>
20	Barry Dunnett	Aquatic Centre	<p>The town's top priority project.</p> <p>It would have been nice for more acknowledgement of the Trust which is overseeing this project rather than trumping (dare I mention that name) Council as leaders of the project.</p> <p>By whatever means (shovel ready project? Surplus staff from IWK?), the area for the pool should be being planted and landscaped THIS WINTER to beautify it as well as screening the site off from the ugly dump--ling.</p>	<p>Aquatic Centre</p> <p>Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required. Agree the Trust has done well. The options presented were in respect of the options for Council (and ratepayers) in funding \$1- \$1.5million of grants plus annual operating costs for the Trust. The plans for the construction of the Centre includes landscaping</p>
20	Barry Dunnett	Communications	<p>Can we have a prophecy which doesn't talk about the most important thing in the world is the people, the people, the people.</p> <p>It is inappropriate in 2020 to be focusing on humans when we are doing so much to damage our planet.</p> <p>Let's have some words like "Healthy People in a Healthy Environment".</p>	<p>Communications Response.</p> <p>Thank you for your response. We have noted your suggestion and will put it forward as a consideration for the Long Term Plan 2021-2031</p>
21	Justine Schroder	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>The rubbish and recycling industry is changing at an alarming rate. It wasn't long ago when I was proud of the amount of recycling I had and how low my rubbish appeared... recycling supposedly being dealt with aboard! With China refusing our recycling it became apparent we were all paying lip service to this industry.... we cannot send our rubbish recycling away these days.... we have to learn to adapt and educate ourselves with how to dispose of our rubbish correctly. There is very little we can recycle.. but what we can we should do our utmost to do.... User pays in my books because that means we learn and respect rubbish... we take responsibility for the rubbish we produce and what we do with it. We need to not only look at ow our food is packaged, but online goods, toys, homeware.... the list is endless.</p> <p>Education is key, teaching our youth the next generation how to respect and be responsible for our own rubbish we create all the while adapting to a better world for the future.</p>	<p>Submission generally aligns with previously indicated directions of Council. Importance of education highlighted.</p>

21	Justine Schroder	Clarence Valley Access	<p>This is a no brainer... If NZTA are willing to put forward 95% of the cost towards a new bridge for the rate payers across the Clarence then this is the way to go...</p> <p>However, I am surprised at the amount of annual maintenance it costs to keep the bridge and road safe... this charge affects all of us for an extremely small rate payer base. I am just asking the question so please don't knock my thoughts but is there another way around this perhaps the affected rate payers have massively reduced rates and no bridge? Have ford access across one section and I'm sure other means other than a bridge can be utilized for the main river section? has this even been put to the residents?</p>	<p>The annual maintenance cost is uncertain, and is likely to be variable, but in the long term the costs of maintaining and renewing \$10 million plus of works will not be insubstantial. Alternative options including potential purchase of affected properties have been previously considered but found to be disadvantageous or impractical. Option of financially compensating affected ratepayers for reduced level of service would raise significant issues of fairness for other ratepayers, though it is recognised that similar issues are arguably also present with Option 2 - having all district ratepayers meeting substantial costs that benefit only a small group. Such inability to accurately target cost to beneficiaries is however a fundamental challenge in the rating system.</p>
21	Justine Schroder	Aquatic Centre	<p>Due to the recent announcement of funding from the provincial growth fund last week... neither option counts....</p> <p>The Aquatic centre is good to start thanks to all the hard work and submissions and grants to the government and organisations... however this centre will need in the future funds to grow and develop it, there are areas which the fundraising group will be funding for and its annual upkeep and maintenance will forever be on the radar so the aquatic centre must continue to be on the councils radar and for all concerned to work together to continue to provide and bring to kaikoura finally a world class pool.</p>	<p>Aquatic Centre</p> <p>Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required. We agree the good work done on submissions and grants to date has put the project in this position. We will continue to work with the Trust, as well as continuing with the Council financial support.</p>
21	Justine Schroder	Rates	<p>As a rural rate payer that faces large annual rates per year the ever increasing rates bill is always an issue I am keen to bring up at each annual plan hearing.</p> <p>As we know our rates are determined by our QV. Whilst some may contest having a large QV means you should be able to afford a large rates bill, most would disagree with this statement and we often find the rural sector unfairly lumbered with a disproportionately high annual rates bill which only ever go up. I notice with the proposed plan the highest increase to weekly rates is the large farms of the district and so therefore, to assist with ensuring there is more fairness across the board I am asking that council look at the rural rates differential once more and am asking for an 80% differential rate please to help increase the fairness across all ratepayers.</p>	<p>The Council has worked hard to limit the rates increase, particularly in light of the impacts of Covid-19 on our local economy. The suggestion to change the rural rate differential is not recommended at this point in time, because the change would be made without consultation (and therefore subject to legal challenge), and changes to the differential should be made in the context of a full rating system review, because applying the differential would only mean other (non-rural) properties have to pay more (i.e. it would be unfair across all ratepayers). There are many different ways people look at rates increases. For example despite the higher percentage increase for large rural compared with large commercial - the commercial rates are much a higher cost, despite having less CV than the rural comparator. We note that in percentage terms the category which have borne the greatest rates increases since the earthquake have been residential/urban</p>
22	Kevin Cole	District Plan	<p>KINGSTOWN A FIFTY YEAR DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL FOR KAIKOURA</p> <p>Background - positive Kaikoura has assets = the bay, mountains, Mt Lyford Ski Resort, location (relative to other South Island towns), new civic building (council, library and museum), sufficient distance from QT, earthquake infrastructure repairs and upgrades.</p> <p>Background - negative The KK earthquake repairs are largely returning the town to its previous state and size, just considerably tidied up. The sports hub left 'the table' and became just an outdoor swimming pool. KDC is not viable, the Kaikoura rate paying base is too small Kaikoura is land-locked by the sea, railway line, rural farm land surrounding the township. Kaikoura's (historic) eco-credentials are fading away - giving up Earth Check certification? CHCH is finally evolving into an amazing modern city, which will impact Kaikoura. Positively via more people in the region but much more negatively, because: people will want to get to CHCH rather than pause in Kaikoura, negative impact on population.</p> <p>KEVIN COLE VISION: Kaikoura has the potential to become a smaller version of Queenstown, but with a crucially modern eco-slant and the potential for tourist railway expansion and a cruise ship port Kingstown = a 'new town' (or region) encircling Kaikoura and South Bay. Kingstown takes in a sweeping arc from the Kahutara River (peketa), behind the Kaikoura township, includes the Kaikoura Flats and Mt Fyffe, to the Hapuku River.</p> <p>Railway Line:</p>	<p>The use of existing railway infrastructure is supported, and Council staff continue to work with KiwiRail to develop relationships which will benefit both Kaikōura and Kiwi Rail. Development of new railway tracks is however beyond the reach of KDC. A University of Otago Student Study in in 2004 looked at the relocation of the railway line, relocation costs were considered to be “\$1 million per kilometre of line of “relatively easy terrain.” Such costs will place development beyond the ability of ratepayers. Councillors have previously worked with Marlborough Stream to look at the redevelopment of the turntable, some refreshing in this space may be required.</p> <p>Many of the other suggestions in the submission would be better addressed by the commercial market than by the ratepayer, Council has limited funding and ratepayers are pushing for KDC to keep to core issues.</p>
23	Y Stone	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>None - Because I feel we are being taken back 30 years we were once world leaders in green globe and now its not even considered. Also I wonder if you should think tendering out for this.</p>	<p>An open procurement process would be helpful to address the question of whether good value is being obtained</p>
24	Brenda Milne	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Wheellie-bins one for litter and one green and another for recycling if possible is the answer - fortnightly pickups to keep costs down. This is effective elsewhere in NZ. Would stop the \$4.50 charge on black bags and plastic use in environment and would help prevent random dumping around Kaikoura in general. Black bag charge is excessive hence the public dumping waste anywhere.</p>	<p>The reference to stopping the charge on black bags suggests that this is a proposal for refuse and recycling services to be fully funded from rates without a user pays component. Such an approach is considered inappropriate as it is likely to encourage waste generation, increase costs, and be unfair.</p>

24	Brenda Milne	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Kaikoura urban rate payers should not have to meet the cost of this through their rates. NZTA, government need to contribute heavily to fix this issue.</p>	<p>Government has been extremely generous regarding capital costs. Whilst imposition of future associated maintenance and renewal costs on all district ratepayers, including those in Kaikoura urban may seem unfair, it is a consequence of a rating system where costs cannot be comprehensively and accurately allocated to associated beneficiaries. Both urban and rural ratepayers need to accept the reality of this situation, and that some degree of cross subsidisation is unavoidable.</p>
24	Brenda Milne	Aquatic Centre	<p>Option belle choice to keep costs (the proposed new street lighting for Kaikoura should be put on hold and money for lighting could go straight onto the pool aquatic center) Lighting for streets should be postponed as they are not urgent.</p>	<p>Aquatic Centre Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Agree higher interest rate would affect ratepayers more. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required. Note the street lighting takes advantage of an 81% government subsidy (through NZTA)</p>
25	Lesley Bocker	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Rubbish and recycling: Option Four is my preferred option as a starting point Based on the information put forward in the Consultation Document and Draft Annual Plan 2020/2021, the continuity of our current waste management system is not possible. The 4 options put forward make interesting reading. Key Points: 1. The reality of recycling waste is not what it seems, with the value in monetary terms being questionable. Our community have embraced our recycling processes, thinking we were making a difference, but the new reality is that this is not so. We cannot support a system that is costing money and not achieving the outcomes we expected. BUT - the ethos and passion for reducing waste must still be frontal in our community and personal thinking, to strive to reduce waste in the bigger picture. How do we do this? The responsibility of reducing waste feels like it rests disproportionately with the end consumer. Increasing responsibility needs to be taken at the manufacturing level so that the producers think more innovatively about dealing with the re-use and reduction of packaging. A couple of ideas ... Beverage companies introduce a scheme where they buy back glass bottles for reuse. Implementing container refilling at POS in supermarkets and outlets 2. We must have a kerbside refuse collection, particularly now more than ever, as less of our waste is recyclable. This should be funded by rates revenue, not user pay funded. It could cover the collection of one black bag a week. Anything more than this could be user pays. It makes no sense that we all use our vehicles to go to the site taking our rubbish in individual vehicles, when weekly collection could be the more efficient and cost-effective system. Most importantly, we need this service for our elderly residents. 3. It is upsetting to read that our current disposal charges at the Kaikoura Landfill are high, relative to most other landfills and that this higher level of charging goes ((mainly to support other waste diversion activities such as recycling ... " What?? Our excessive charges go to support recycling, which markets now are diminishing or are costly and do not return a positive cashflow? 😞 4. Services at the current Centre must be reduced, with the savings made due to the removal of much recycling,</p>	<p>Submission appears to generally align with the thinking of Council, with the exception of a having a rates funded refuse collection for 1 bag per week. Suggestion of KDC establishing a new local landfill in the future is not considered realistic on economic grounds. Capital costs would be high (in addition to closure costs for old landfill) with insufficient waste quantities to generate sufficient revenue to yield low unit costs.</p>
25	Lesley Bocker	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Option 2 Purely on cost only. Not enough information is provided in the consultation document regarding the pros and cons of each option.</p>	<p>Because of the high level of NZTA subsidy for Option 2 only, providing detailed information on a range of other options was not considered worthwhile.</p>
25	Lesley Bocker	Aquatic Centre	<p>Option 1 - It's sensible!</p>	<p>Aquatic Centre Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required.</p>
26	Chris Wilson - East Coast Community Organisation (ECCO)	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Rubbish and Recycling (4 options presented) As a rural community with no waste collection at present and given most of "recycling" going to landfill anyway we see no reason for the ratepayers or IWK to continue to subsidise waste and recycling operations. This should all be done on a user pays basis with urban properties having a waste collection service if they are prepared to pay for it and rural properties looking after themselves. If recycling can break even or better (e.g. aluminium cans) then this could be collected at the same time as general waste in the urban area.</p>	<p>Not considered realistic for rural ratepayers not to make some level of contribution towards solid waste services. There is a cost to ensuring that services are available, even if not used, and some rural ratepayers - particularly those nearer to Kaikōura do use these services.</p>
26	Chris Wilson - East Coast Community Organisation	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Option 2 is the only way forward in order to secure NZTA funding, provide safe access and avoid the need to upgrade and maintain the southern access route (which would be at full cost to KDC)</p>	<p>Noted, aligns with proposed option</p>
26	Chris Wilson - East Coast Community Organisation	Aquatic Centre	<p>Pool (2 options presented) The way forward for the pool should be the one which presents the lowest investment and ongoing support costs to the rural ratepayers, most of whom make no use of such a facility</p>	<p>Note no indication of a choice of either Option 1 or 2. In terms of pools, and for example libraries these are part of the Universal Annual General Charge. This is consistent, for example with Marlborough District Council (where the pools are in Picton and Blenheim, with a smaller pool in Awatere)</p>

26	Chris Wilson - East Coast Community Organisation (ECCO)	Community Facilities	<p>East Coast Water Scheme</p> <p>A separate submission was made to Council on Wednesday 29 July where it was pointed out that the scheme was being significantly overcharged for “overheads and internal charges” by KDC; and this was robbing the scheme of funds which would otherwise be available for repairs, maintenance and upgrades. We again ask the Councillors to ensure that this is corrected.</p>	Under consideration, to be a subject of a full report to Council.
26	Chris Wilson - East Coast Community Organisation (ECCO)	Rates	<p>Rates</p> <p>Although we appreciate the efforts being made to mitigate the impact of rates rises in a time of financial uncertainty, we feel the council has not gone far enough in this respect and should look for further costs savings/deferrals. If Marlborough can live with a rate increase of 1.88% and even Auckland can keep its increase to 3.5%; then Kaikoura council needs to seriously rethink having an increase as high as 4.6%. Furthermore, the inequality of rate rises between commercial and rural/farming remain unaddressed despite the many submissions we have made on this point; with commercial having the benefit of rates rises limited to 2.5%/2.6% while farms have to suffer increases of 5.6% and rural residential 6.1%. Yet again we see the council favouring the commercial sector. We urge the Councillors to intervene on both these points</p>	We note the appreciation of the efforts to reduce rates from those in the 3 Year Plan, with the average of 10% being reduced to 4.6%. Comparisons of the 2020/21 rates increases between Councils post-COVID are fraught - as there are many different circumstances involved, including for Kaikoura the effect of the earthquake, and the planned 3 years of higher rates increases. Hence a reduction from 10% to 4.6% is significant. We believe the Council are very conscious of the effects of rates increases on different categories - assisted by rural Councillors and their involvement in the production of the draft Annual Plan. As part of the Annual Plan process Council has sought a report from staff relating to the rates paid, and some of the costs attributable to, areas within the District. This is on track.
26	Chris Wilson - East Coast Community Organisation (ECCO)	Sustainability	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>As a final point we again ask Councillors to consider the viability of Council given the fragility of its finances, lack of reserves and dependence on borrowing to support day to day operations; and the lack of clearly identified solutions to future sustainability.</p>	As been previously reported, the upcoming Long Term Plan will provide the opportunity to see, for the first time since the earthquakes, the projections for Council's future financial requirements. Currently the Council's financial position is much improved from that projected in the 3 year plan. This includes lower borrowing, now representing long term investments rather than the short term intentions of some post-quake borrowing put in place to assist with the uncertainty, rather than applying to rates. Kaikōura's mix of rates and borrowing is now similar to that of other Councils. We note the FCS sustainability issue was with the financial ability/sustainability of future rates on ratepayers themselves - clearly Council is able to rate for costs - the question posed was whether ratepayers would, in future, be able to afford their rates payments.
27 and 28	Sabrina Luecht & Ailsa Howard	Environment	<p>Submitters: Sabrina Luecht & Ailsa Howard</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Kaikōura is a biodiversity hotspot and relies on its environment for tourism, and the employment the tourism industry brings. Native wildlife and the environment, which largely underpin the Kaikōura economy, must be valued and protected adequately, safeguarding the region's tourism framework. If we do not have the foundation of a functioning intact ecosystem, then council cannot stand by its 'ecologically exemplary' vision.</p> <p>In this submission we urge council to adopt a Cat Bylaw to regulate and manage owned and unowned cats in the Kaikōura district.</p>	The control of cats within Kaikoura sits with a range of organisations including Ecan and DOC. Rather than seek funding for the creation of a bylaw which can create division within the community it would be more appropriate to develop a stepped approach to the problem. This could include a Community Workgroup, Strategy Development, Educational Team and if needed then a bylaw. The development of a Community Workgroup may be better driven externally and supported by Council.

29	Janelle White	Community Facilities	I support the redevelopment of the existing Kaikoura Marine Centre & Aquarium at Wakatu Quay. The Aquarium has been set up as a not-for-profit trust for the benefit of the Kaikoura Community with a strong focus on education, research, and sustainability.	The Wakatu Redevelopment currently does not include a proposal for an aquarium. A feasibility study concluded that it was not a viable proposition for a Provincial Growth Fund application.
30	Kd Scattergood	Aquatic Centre	I think the Council should loan enough money to the centre to build and cover this year. Won't be any cheaper than now. Lets get swimming! Given the new funds from the central government and the historically low cost of borrowing money, I submit that Council used loans to enclose the pool during the construction of the initial construction phase instead of waiting. This will give the community maximum benefit from the investment, and give mothers and retirees one more place to gather in the winter.	Aquatic Centre Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required and there will be enough to build the Centre now.
30	Kd Scattergood	Fees and Charges	<p>Dog Registration Fees \$80 per dog esp with an additional \$40 fee for more than 2 dogs in the residential area may cause hardship to people newly unemployed who had dogs before their job loss or those on a fixed budget. Propose either a rebate or reduction to the unwaged or a to those who do not need to use the services over the year.</p> <p>The licencing of outdoor cats could help reduce the overall cost. Cat owner could receive a discount for putting bird protection measures on their pets. This would allow easier identification of feral cats, be more inline with the Canterbury Regional Plan Pest control strategies and help mitigate the damage they do to the environment.</p> <p>Building Control Fees From proposed plan: Building Control Fees The following building control fees are a deposit only. They include processing times and inspections. The fees are not determined until all processing is complete, then an invoice may be produced, and any extra fees will be required to be paid before the consent is issued.</p> <p>The word deposit would imply that there may be refunds as well but does not lay out when the refund would be given.</p> <p>Food Control Plan Given the pressure businesses will be under in the next year, is there a way to reduce the cost of renewal of these plans. The aim of the National Food Safety program was a reduction in fees.</p> <p>Library Fiction Rental Given the expected rates of un or under employment due to Covid, could we either have a: A reduction in rental fee rates A unwaged rental fee or A one year without fees.</p>	Fees for Dog Registration Fees : Proposed system of rebates or reductions difficult to administer. Food Control Plan Costs: Consideration might be given to reducing charges is associated costs fall. Without cost reductions lowering user pays fees just transfers costs elsewhere.

Uniform Annual General Charge/Rating Unit

Uniform Annual General Charge This shall be a fixed amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit, for all rateable land within the District.

Separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit A "separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit" is defined as:

- Any portion of a rating unit used or inhabited by any person, other than the ratepayer or member of the ratepayer's household, having a right to use or inhabit that portion by virtue of a tenancy, lease, license or other agreement, or

- Any part or parts of a rating unit that is/are used or occupied by the ratepayer for more than one single use.

For clarification, this means that each flat within a block of flats, or each shop within a block of shops, for example, would be rated a uniform annual general charge. The same would apply to a farm with more than one dwelling (i.e. worker accommodation), or a residential property with a separate fully self-contained unit available for visitor accommodation. The separately inhabited part of a rating unit may be part of a larger structure containing multiple parts but is separate by virtue of being self-contained and having separate external access.

My husband and I own a small brewery on our land. This means we are subject to two sets of any rate that is charged using a rating unit., so we pay a second set of the following additional charges (rural residential)

Per rating unit:

\$589.39 per annual general change

\$40.00 earthquake levy

\$84.05 civic centre

The submitter has received detailed explanation in the past, of why they are rated as two separately used parts. The reasons include the separate business entity in operation (therefore not a member of the ratepayers household), and the fact that the business operation is clearly identifiable and access to it is separate from the house. The updated wording to the definition in 2017/2018 did not change how the rates were applied for this or any other properties, but was simply for clarification purposes.

Notwithstanding this, it is recommended that the Council review its definition of the Separately Used or Inhabited Part (SUIP), as part of its preparation of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031. As part of that review, it is also recommended that the Council consider the option of applying rates per rating unit for some of its targeted rates.

To answer the submitters queries, under the Council's current rating policies the following scenario's apply:

Where people rent out their house or bach as a holiday home, the property is still one SUIP because structurally it is only one dwelling (not two). These properties are charged the visitor accommodation charge.

Some Bed & Breakfasts are structurally identifiable as having a manager's house plus one (or more) separate and self-contained studio-style units with their own separate access, their own bathroom and cooking facilities. They are charged for each SUIP (the managers house plus each of the studio units), and they are also charged the visitor accommodation charge.

Home-based businesses are only rated as separate parts if the business part of the property is structurally identifiable and separate from the house (e.g. in an outbuilding or on a different floor level with separate access from the main house). For example a tradesman such as a plumber who does his accounts from a computer in a spare bedroom/office will not be charged per SUIP, but a two-storey house with a shop or business operating from the ground floor and public access into that shop space will be subject to two SUIPs (one for the house, one for the shop).

31

Ailsa Howard

Rubbish and Recycling

I haven't chosen an option. One concern I had was that Jackie of Innovative Waste queried the potential relative costings saying that the were indicative of estimates made sometime in the past and do not relate to the present situations.

We need genuine and current data to choose a way forward.

I understand that difficult decisions need to be made in the area of how Council commits to spending.

I support the user-pay option of self delivery of rubbish to the resource centre and a payment to dump it. (user pays).

I will recycle everything where that is possible, and will bring recyclables to the dump if they are not picked up at the gate.

I believe it is important that the conversation for recycling still remains high in our community, and that those who sell products that result in rubbish being sent to landfill are continually challenged and encouraged to step up and provide our community with lower waste package options, particularly around food items. Perhaps a community group is required to be the recycling eyes and ears for our community.

The need for reliable costs is recognised, and an open procurement process may be required to obtain these at a later stage. Advocating for waste reduction at source agreed to be important going forward.

31

Ailsa Howard

Governance and Staffing

A vote of thanks for all the work you carry out as Councillors and Council Employees. I would particularly like to forward my thanks for the addressing of vegetation removal at the exit of Maui St, making it much safer for all who use this route regularly.

The comment is much appreciated by the staff concerned.

32	Peter Turner	Community Facilities	<p>Our club was registered as an Incorporated Society in 2018. The Kaikoura area has been without cricket for 15 years or more since the other smaller neighbouring districts failed to enter into the Hurunui competition. The length of time since then has left our facilities very much out of date and run down. Our home venue is shared with other community sports and events which has created the need for continual maintenance to be performed to keep the outfield and pitch up to standard and in a playable state.</p> <p>We are a sporting club which has re-established its self in this district. We have built up a strong membership base since the earthquake and built a good reputation within our district. We have held successful youth cricket events and our senior team has also just recently entered into the Blenheim competition. The club has also run numerous fundraiser events and has an excellent plan in place to advance cricket here in Kaikoura. Then came along Covid-19 which has thrown us a curve ball. Check out our Facebook page to see evidence of the clubs fantastic efforts, during such a challenging period of time.</p> <p>We have invested in an expensive mower and want to resurface the wicket at South Bay Oval. The most scenic/beautiful ground on the planet. We also plan to build some nets and invest further into the junior players who are extremely keen and passionate about the sport. The club has promoted junior cricket within 3 primary schools, interest for junior cricket is high. To ensure a sustainable club, we need a thriving junior cricket branch, and club facilities need to be safe and in a good state in order to progress.</p> <p>We have built the club up over the last three years from nothing and are hopeful that we could secure some funding, now that we are more established. We appreciate the consideration given to our cause.</p>	The submitter has not specified any specific item for which funding is sought. We understand from the public meetings it may be contribution towards the cricket wicket itself in the order of \$6000.
33	Ted Howard	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>I don't understand what is being suggested.</p> <p>It seems clear to me that our landfill is filling rapidly and we will have to soon start sending material to Kate Valley. Operating recycling and recovery at as high a level as possible would seem to be a good idea.</p> <p>Keeping the ethic of environmental responsibility for as reasonable a cost as possible, would seem to be an essential part of having Kaikoura as a high value ecotourist destination; as well as being a good thing for the long term health of all of us and the ecosystems we rely on.</p> <p>And on the broader scale, we (as humanity) need to develop recycling technologies, and that is beyond the capacity of Kaikoura, and we can be part of insisting upon it at higher levels - through government to the UN and internationally. And that has to be part of wider and deeper reform of the entire financial system, to make it sustainable in the presence of advanced automation (our existing systems are not - and once again that is beyond the direct capacity of Kaikoura to influence, and we can be part of a general groundswell of opinion demanding that those with the capacity to make it happen do so - and soon).</p> <p>If I understand correctly, that points towards my support for option 1 (and it is really much more than that).</p>	In constructing the draft Annual Plan Council was very conscious that in reducing rates to account for the effect of COVID-19- they were very unlikely to be able to fund external "bids"such as this.
33	Ted Howard	Clarence Valley Access	Option 2 No Brainer.	
33	Ted Howard	Aquatic Centre	Option 1 Just simple logic - why pay money that you don't have to, that benefits only the holders of capital at the expense of ordinary ratepayers.	Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required and there will be enough to build the Centre now.

33	Ted Howard	Governance and Staffing	<p>I fully align with the councils focus on getting the best possible infrastructure value for money in this most unusual context.</p> <p>At this time of already deep distress and uncertainty when council staff need to be on their best game to be able to work with community members who are in deep distress and far from their best game, it makes no sense to put council employees under any threat of job insecurity.</p> <p>Being a council employee is generally a thankless task at the best of times, and often approaching hellish at times like we are in and have been in for 3 years.</p> <p>Giving council employees the security they need to be able to do the very difficult tasks they often have to do seems to me to be a necessary high priority. That applies to CEO and all below.</p> <p>We should not underestimate the value of institutional knowledge, and the long term costs of losing it.</p>	<p>While we note your comments, Council provided a clear direction to the CEO and ELT. Lessening the rates burden was the overriding consideration for Council and the CEO was tasked with considering if there were activities that could be reduced in scale or eliminated. Decisions made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A short term focus on recovery from the impacts of COVID obviating the need for a need for Economic Development • Post-earthquake rebuild will be completed in September 2020. KDC is now much closer to a business as usual status reducing the workload for communications and necessitating a reduction in headcount • Council has moved on from the higher resource demand post-earthquake environment. ☐ <p>These changes have reduced payroll costs but are resultant from changed needs post earthquake and post COVID-19. Council strives to be a good employer and does consider the wellbeing of its staff are important (including any affected employees).</p>
33	Ted Howard	Water Services	<p>Delivery of Water Services: Strongly advise council to consider section 17A(3)(b) of LGA 2002 before expending serious effort or cost on review.</p>	<p>With the recent central government announcements on the national review of water services there is considered to be no value in KDC undertaking a S17a review in respect of its services in that field.</p>
33	Ted Howard	Communications	<p>I have deep concerns about the way in which social media algorithms that are optimising simply for attention on pages are feeding people what they want to hear rather than giving them a real spectrum of the genuine diversity that exists; and this is leading to ever increasing polarisation and distrust in our community, rather than developing a shared understanding and respect for diversity. I praise the council and staff for their work to counter this trend, particularly in respect of tikanga Maori, and in respect of the wider social diversity we have in our community, our nation and our planet.</p>	<p>We thank the submitter for the supportive comments</p>
34	Anne Duncan	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Kaikoura township does not require a weekly service. Fortnightly would be better as we don't have enough recycling to put out weekly</p>	<p>This is a sensible suggestion, though the savings associated may not be very large as the quantity of material to be processed will remain the same.</p>
35	Colin Nimmo	Community Facilities	<p>KDC needs to support the use of council facilities. I have read KDC is going to have a reduced rental for the pool grounds very good what about the South Bay Recreational reserve [trotting grounds] where the rent keeps going up with less and less work being done to maintain the facilities. For the A&P Assn our costs keep going up, rent to the trotting because their rent goes up, building consent for a Marquee, traffic management plan then have this plan changed 2 days before the show to something unworkable. There needs to be all the help possible for events like the A&P show to continue not unnecessary costs being lumped onto them. Also the Fernleigh Water scheme cost of getting it to the almost impossible standard for drinking water when 90% of it is stock water is not cost effective household treatment would be more effective.</p>	<p>Consideration currently being given to possible household treatment of water on rural 'stock water' scheme</p>
36	Edwin Douglass	Clarence Valley Access	<p>(i) The cost of maintaining the Southern Access route (SAR) within 3 years (at 100% rate payer cost) is greater than the 5 % participation of the Option 2 funded at 95 % by NZTA (ii) the economic impact to the KDC of not providing access to the Clarence river valley s approximately 1-2 % of the Kaikoura district Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Ref. Economic impact report provided to the rebuild team) and (iii) Kiwood Ltd management is committed to multi-generational sustainable forestry development of Glen Alton Forest property and modest growth of further investment given adequate access to be able to commercially exploit such forest asset and property.</p>	<p>Noted, aligns with proposed option</p>
37	Ruth Humphries	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Option 2 There are no other viable options presented.</p>	<p>Noted, aligns with proposed option</p>
38	Mike Lennard	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Option 2 This is the only viable option.</p>	<p>Noted, aligns with proposed option</p>

39	Steve & Shirley Millard	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Rubbish and Recycling - As a rural community with no waste collection at present and given most of "recycling" going to landfill anyway we see no reason for the ratepayers or IWK to continue to subsidise waste and recycling operations. This should all be done on a user pays basis with urban properties having a waste collection service if they are prepared to pay for it and rural properties looking after themselves. If recycling can break even or better (e.g. aluminium cans) then this could be collected at the same time as general waste in the urban area</p>	<p>Not considered realistic for rural ratepayers not to make some level of contribution towards solid waste services. There is a cost to ensuring that services are available, even if not used, and some rural ratepayers - particularly those nearer to Kaikōura do use the services.</p>
39	Steve & Shirley Millard	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Clarence Valley Access</p> <p>We are surprised that, at the residents' meetings, attendees have been told by Council staff/BECA that Option 1 was not possible, and now surprisingly it's being touted in the Draft Annual Plan as an option. ??</p> <p>Issues that Valley residents encounter include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. access is weather-dependent and not 24/7 safe. Since the earthquake we have been fortunate to have access via the SAR into and out of the Valley, however it has always been weather dependent, and despite the best attempts of Engineering staff and contractors it is still not stable; to this day there is a section of road slipping away. Daily lives and plans for those in the valley are dictated by the weather; this doesn't sound that important, but it can, and has been detrimental to our health, mental and social wellbeing. 2. If a bridge is not built Council /ratepayers will be liable for the costs of maintenance of not just the Clarence Valley Road, but also the SAR access which will be ongoing for all Kaikoura District ratepayers. 3. The valuation of those properties on the southern side of river have decreased; a bridge would help these values increase again. 4. Residents also have the added expense of on-going high maintenance on vehicles since the earthquake mostly caused by fording the water crossings. 5. The landowners have problems engaging tradespeople and transport companies into the valley due to weather events, and their reluctance to cross the river and use the narrow track; this is very frustrating and again, this can, and has been timely and expensive for the residents to continue with their day to day lives, both working and personal. <p>Personally, when we bought our farm, we had good access; had this not been the case, we would not have even looked at the place.</p> <p>If Council didn't want people living up the valley, it should not have approved the subdivision of Glen Alton, however subdivisions were approved and Council has obligations to those property owners.</p>	<p>Option 1 is only being presented as an 'option' because KDC is required to consult on the Clarence Valley Access, and for it to be a consultation more than one option has to be presented, even if one of those options (1) is largely impractical. The submission otherwise appears to be supportive of proposed Option 2.</p>
39	Steve & Shirley Millard	Rates	<p>Proposed Rates Increase:</p> <p>While Council has made efforts to reduce the proposed rates due to the uncertain financial future, we still see the rural community being hit again with the largest increase in rates – a predicted average increase of 4.6%. Council seems to be oblivious to the inequality of rates rises between commercial and farming, and we feel this seriously needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The rural community in reality get very little 'rural bang for their buck' and the inequality of rate rises between commercial and rural/farming remains unaddressed; we urge the Councillors to intervene on both these points</p> <p>We also support the submission submitted by ECCO.</p>	<p>We note the appreciation of the efforts to reduce rates from those in the 3 Year Plan, with the average of 10% being reduced to 4.6%. We believe the Council are very conscious of the effects of rates increases on different categories - assisted by rural Councillors and their involvement in the production of the draft Annual Plan. As part of the Annual Plan process Council has sought a report from staff relating to the rates paid, and some of the costs attributable to, areas within the District. This is on track. There are many different ways people look at rates increases. For example despite the higher percentage increase for large rural compared with large commercial - the commercial rates are much higher cost, despite having less CV than the rural comparator. We note that in percentage terms the category which have borne the greatest rates increases since the earthquake have been residential/urban.</p>
40	Warwick Brown	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Hello, We think the preferred option for the replacement Glen Alton bridge is not the logical option to mitigate the downstream effects of the new channel. Replace bridge near old site, dig out old channel and put the river back. This is doable and would save millions of dollars in ongoing down stream protection work. We also think if the project was tendered to a design/builder both location and price would be different.</p> <p>The preferred option presumably means the southern access road will need to be kept open at full cost to the KDC.. Or are upper valley residents just going to be left with no access when the Clarence is high? (last year an estimated 30 days potentially significantly more in NW years or big snow events)</p> <p>The SAR negatively impacts our farm and ability to farm it. (animals killed and injured, gates left open, misthored calves and lambs. . We have also witnessed(and experienced) many near misses with vehicles. For us, upstream residents and public safety we would like to see a new bridge built asap.</p>	<p>The technical assessment is that Option 2 has substantially lower and ongoing costs and risks than re-establishing the bridge at its original site, even without attempting to re-establish flow in the old channel. The frequency at which the ford across the old river channel is impassable can be reduced by construction of a low upstream dam. The level of traffic on the road is sufficiently low for intermittent lack of access to meet NZTA operating standards, and neither NZTA or KDC intends to support continuing maintenance of the upper section of the Southern Access Route after the bridge is constructed.</p>
41	Murray Busbridge (Jelldale Limited)	Clarence Valley Access	<p>Option 2</p> <p>Cost differential to get project approved.</p>	<p>Noted, aligns with proposed option</p>

42	Jody Weir		<p>Rubbish and Recycling Option 2 Increased Cost (Recycling Only Available at the IWK Recovery Centre (No Collection Service) Clarence Valley Access Option 2 (Preferred - 5% Council Funded/95% External NZTA funded) Aquatic Centre Option 1 (Preferred - increase Council grant at lower interest rate) No further information supplied</p>	Rubbish and Recycling - submitter refers to Option 2, but the words appear to describe Option 4.
43	John Murray	Clarence Valley Access	<p>I have lived and farmed along side this river for a considerable number of years and would like to make a few comments. How safe is this new bridge with it being built on a fault line? Is the protection work down stream 1.5 kl to Murphy's Bluff resilient enough to protect your County Road. Has any funding been budgeted for protection work down stream from Corner Hill as since the earthquake this lower section of the County Road has also been damaged by the Clarence breaking its banks. Whose responsibility is the County Road if the protection work fails? Have the Council budgeted for the damage that 12000 logging truck movements will have on their County Road over the harvest ing period in the near future. Six cattle stops will be the first to succumb. There is a very simple and obvious solution regarding the logging issue and this is to grade a new Road down the riverbed and join the Waipapa Road which has heavy truck capability. No hills,cattle stops,and much less maintenance. Finally I just need to remind you all that this was never the affected landowners and ratepayers first option. Their option was to reinstate the river back into its original channel</p>	<p>Design features are being incorporated in the bridge to reduce damage in the event of an earthquake, but the probability of further major movement on this fault in the near future is considered to be very low. Works to protect the road from the river will be conducted but there is never absolute certainty that an extreme event would not overwhelm this protection. Responsibility for maintaining the road will remain with KDC, but with the expectation that NZTA will provide substantial financial assistance towards repair works necessitude by such an event. Council has not at this time budgeted for future abnormal damage to roads in the area caused by logging trucks, and the district (with support from NZTA) will have to absorb those costs if they arise. Grading a road for logging trucks down the river bed, if consented, could be a good solution from Council's perspective, but KDC has no ability to require this to be done. Logging trucks like other vehicles (provided they do not exceed permitted weight limits) have rights to use public roads. It is appreciated that Option 1 would have been preferred by many parties, and would probably have been favoured by Council if it had a cost similar to Option 2.</p>
44	ELISHA YOUNG-EBERT	Rates	<p>Reduction of rates increase NCF is aware the Covid-19 Level 4 restrictions bore out significant economic consequences for the Kaikōura district, compounding existing challenges the district has experienced following the 2016 earthquake. We were pleased to receive media reports that the tourist and accommodation sectors in the district, widely regarded as its lifeblood, have shown some positive signs of recovery as the restrictions lifted. That said, the local economy remains fragile and it will take considerable time to recover to pre-Covid-19 levels. This would have a direct impact on the district ratepayers' ability to meet any increase in rates. In this context, we support the Council's proposal to reduce the average rates increase from the 10 per cent forecast in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan to 4.6 per cent. We also support the Council's relief package that includes extending the timeframes rates payments, halving the penalty rate for late payments and maximising access to the Mayoral Earthquake Relief Fund as much as it could. However, we note that the average rates for farms will be higher, in the vicinity of 5.56 and 5.59 per cent, according to the schedule of example properties set out in the consultation document. Rates increases of this size are concerning given the likely impact on farm incomes resulting from lower commodity prices forecast arising from the poor state of the global economy. NCF suggests the Council may wish to consider one other option: review the rates differential and reduce the level of rural general rates from 90 per cent to 80 per cent. Recommendation NCF supports the Council's efforts to reduce the average rates increase but recommends the Council also explores reducing the rural rates differential. Please note: we wish to present at a hearing.</p>	<p>We note the appreciation of the efforts to reduce rates from those in the 3 Year Plan, with the average of 10% being reduced to 4.6%. We believe the Council are very conscious of the effects of rates increases on different categories - assisted by rural Councillors and their involvement in the production of the draft Annual Plan. As part of the Annual Plan process Council has sought a report from staff relating to the rates paid, and some of the costs attributable to, areas within the District. This is on track. There are many different ways people look at rates increases. For example despite the higher percentage increase for large rural compared with large commercial - the commercial rates are much higher cost, despite having less CV than the rural comparator. We note that in percentage terms the category which have borne the greatest rates increases since the earthquake have been residential/urban. The suggestion to change the rural rate differential is not recommended at this point in time, because the change would be made without consultation (and therefore subject to legal challenge), and changes to the differential should be made in the context of a full rating system review, because applying the differential would only mean other (non-rural) properties have to pay more (i.e. it would be unfair across all ratepayers). Their are many different ways people look at rates increases. For example despite the higher percentage increase for large rural compared with large commercial - the commercial rates are much higher cost, despite having less CV than the rural.</p>

45	Marz Simpson	Community Facilities	<p>Submission to have a Permanent Wheelchair Accessible Public Toilet in Churchill Park, near the playground.</p> <p>Over the past three summers, The Kaikoura Mayoral Fund, SKIP and mostly NZ Red Cross have funded a portaloos toilet at Churchill Park. This has made the park and playground a lot more useable for people going to the park. The funding from Red Cross will end in April and the portaloos will be removed, this funding will not be available again.</p> <p>Having a toilet in the park benefits many groups, these include: Parents taking one or more small children to the playground; they don't have to take all the children away from the park when one of them needs to use the toilet (or having to let them pee in the park because there is no nearby alternative). Pregnant mums and people with bladder or health issues who normally avoid going to places that don't have easy access to a toilet. These people can enjoy exercising longer knowing there is a toilet on route, or go to the playground with their grandchildren. Adults and children in wheelchairs. The Health Centre don't want people who don't have an appointment using the toilets in the hospital to stop the spread of infections. There are no public toilets above sea level in case of an emergency.</p> <p>We would like the Council to consider providing a single unisex wheelchair accessible permanent toilet near the playground for the residents of Kaikoura.</p>	<p>Given other substantial pressures on Council costs, including the need to address outstanding maintenance on other Council facilities, KDC operations staff do not believe that it would be financially prudent to assume the capital and operational costs needed to provide an additional toilet at this location.</p>
46	Sue & Chid Murray	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>It absolutely appalls us to think that as a district we are being encouraged to dig a hole on our farms again and bury our rubbish. We spent many years lobbying to close a community dump beside the river and introduce the collection of recycling and to think that you are considering stopping this now (One of the few services we get for our rates in this area) because it is uneconomic and goes in the landfill anyway, is unacceptable. Surely for the more remote collection points in the district, where the ratepayers receive the least from their rating input, you could continue this service. We fear that the rural residential will find a remote place to dump rubbish and it will end up everywhere over time, as we know people will not drive 70kms to drop off a rubbish bag nor will they keep it on site for any length of time.</p>	<p>KDC is not encouraging on-site disposal of refuse, but recognises that evidence indicates that this practice is already widespread in the rural area. That Council has been collecting recycling - but not refuse - from rural centres has already left rural residents with the need to transport that refuse to the recycling center in Kaikōura if they do not wish to dispose of it on their own properties. As such if they are needing to visit the recycling centre anyway, it is believed that it would be sensible for them to deposit recycling at the same time. It is unfortunate that some of the rural recycling centres that have been operated have been badly abused by users, who have left large amounts of refuse there in addition to recycling. This was not the purpose of those centres and has resulted in substantially increased costs to manage that material.</p>
46	Sue & Chid Murray	Clarence Valley Access	<p>We can see the advantages of taking up option 2 with NZTA funding and therefore not having the ongoing access issues of the southern road and river crossings – however we are extremely unconvinced that this amount of money should ever be spent for the very few and small ratepaying base when there is absolutely no guarantee that the Bridge and riverbed crossings will always stay intact on the Mighty Clarence River in flood. We are unaware of whose responsibility maintenance costs will be should an event cause massive damage but feel this must be considered before accepting the security of the funding. This is of no benefit to any other ratepayer other than those that live and play there, and we think it needs serious consideration if every ratepayer is expected to contribute in any way in the future.</p>	<p>At present it is expected that the cost of ongoing maintenance and eventual renewal of the bridge would be funded in the same way as similar works on other local roads, which is through a rate levied on all ratepayers. Whilst it is appreciated that that such an unmatched distribution of cost and benefit may be perceived as being unfair, the methods of funding that are available to councils cannot ensure that what ratepayers pay in all cases fairly reflects the particular benefits that they receive.</p>
46	Sue & Chid Murray	Aquatic Centre	<p>I am in favor of a pool complex for the district but not at the expense of all ratepayers. This northern end of the rating base will make absolutely no use of this facility, so it needs to be user pays and at no extra cost to the rural ratepayer.</p>	<p>Similar comments apply to those made to this submitter in response to their issue regarding the Clarence bridge</p>
46	Sue & Chid Murray	Rates	<p>RATES AGAIN, this is unacceptable. We know you are trying to mitigate the impact of Covid-19 but The KKDC rates increase overall of 4.6% is still unacceptable especially as we are aware that councils like the Marlborough District Council have an increase of 1.88% and Auckland 3.5%. More importantly the rural/farming sector is facing the inequality of a rate rise of 5.6% and 6.1% verses commercial at 2.6%. You mentioned at one of the meetings that this was because of the impact of Covid-19. Everyone including the rural sector has been hit by Covid-19. It seems this inequality has been ongoing for a few years and after repeated questioning, remains unaddressed.</p>	<p>We appreciate the acknowledgement or efforts to reduce rates increases from those in the 3 Year Plan, with the average of 10% being reduced to 4.6%. Comparisons of the 2020/21 rates increases between Councils post-COVID are fraught - as there are many different circumstances involved, including for Kaikōura the effect of the earthquake, and the planned 3 years of higher rates increases. Hence a reduction from 10% to 4.6% is significant. We believe the Council are very conscious of the effects of rates increases on different categories - assisted by rural Councillors and their involvement on the production of the draft Annual Plan. As part of the Annual Plan process Council has sought a report from staff relating to the rates paid, and some of the costs attributable to, areas within the District. This is on track. There are many different ways people look at rates increases. For example despite the higher percentage increase for large rural compared with large commercial - the commercial rates are much higher cost, despite having less CV than the rural comparator. We note that in percentage terms the category which have borne the greatest rates increases since the earthquake have been residential/urban.</p>

46	Sue & Chid Murray	Governance and Staffing	<p>STAFFING LEVELS</p> <p>We also urge that if you say Staffing Levels cannot be pruned, and considering that in the year 2018-2021 3 yr plan, I think I am correct in stating - there were cost increases in the CEO Office up from 242k to 618k, the Communications team 0 - 121k and Economic Development 0 - 180K (probably earthquake related) then we do hope it has been well investigated to this day as these are huge increases when you are struggling.</p> <p>Also, many council members around the country, and politicians, have taken pay cuts to acknowledge that there are people and businesses out there hurting. Has this been discussed and/or implemented?.</p>	<p>Recent changes have occurred - reducing staff levels, including in areas referred to by the submitter. The national legislation applied to mayor's and Councillors who earned more than \$100,000 per year. None of the Kaikōura Councillors or the Mayor earn this. Mayors and Councillors are not able to voluntarily reduce their payments - this must be done by legislation</p>
46	Sue & Chid Murray	Sustainability	<p>Again, we ask you as Councillors, to really consider the future sustainability of the Kaikoura District Council. We cannot as ratepayers, keep on with massive increases in rates when the fragile state of the finances, lack of reserves, massive borrowings and a clear pathway of solutions give us NO confidence of the sustainability in the future.</p>	<p>As been previously reported, the upcoming Long Term Plan will provide the opportunity to see, for the first time since the earthquakes, the projections for Council's future financial requirements. Currently the Council's financial position is much improved from that projected in the 3 year plan. This includes lower borrowing, now representing long term investments rather than the short term intentions of some post-quake borrowing put in place to assist with the uncertainty, rather than applying to rates. Kaikoura's mix of rates and borrowing is now similar to that of other Councils. We note the FCS sustainability issue was with the financial ability/sustainability of future rates on ratepayers themselves - clearly Council is able to rate for costs - the question posed was whether ratepayers would, in future, be able to afford their rates payments.</p>
46	Sue & Chid Murray	Community Facilities	<p>On behalf of the Kekerengu Community Centre Inc - KKCI I would like to thank you for submitting a proposal for our Community Hall of \$100,000 funding from the Governments Shovel Ready Project.</p> <p>Funding from our application to the Rata Foundation and your application to the Government Shovel Ready Project would cover the upgrade adequately should we both be successful, however if this is not the case, then could you please include us in your 3yr plan for at least some contribution as if the Hall slips further into its state of disrepair - What will happen to the social fabric of our community. We have nothing else!</p>	<p>We acknowledge your thanks for Council supporting the funding applications.</p>
47	Darlene Morgan	Governance and Staffing	<p>Community Satisfaction – Is Council willing to raise the bar to aim and strive for higher community satisfaction?</p> <p>Consultation – Is Council willing to be more open in its consultation processes and willing to hear what the community has to say on a wider range of issues, particularly coming into another Long Term Plan process.</p> <p>Staffing Levels/Personnel – Will Council consider creating a Personnel policy to better manage the CEOs spending on staffing costs and to protect it from any potential employment related issues?</p> <p>Transparency and Accountability – Will Council be more transparent in future communications and can it account for the \$1M difference in the 2020/21 budget vs the planned staffing spend?</p> <p>Economic Development – Will Council bring its focus to work on supporting local businesses rather than chasing after government funding for more 'projects'?</p>	<p>Staff would like further increases in satisfaction levels. The Long Term Plan will include community engagement and consultation. We do not understand what the submitter is suggesting regarding Staffing levels/personnel. Personnel cost were within budget for 2019/20 and a current staff reduction will reduce those costs further, albeit at the expense of having capacity to take on unexpected demands of accelerate activities. We believe Council messaging and actions have been on supporting local businesses, whilst also obtaining external funding where it is seen as beneficial to Kaikōura and its ratepayers.</p>
48	Future Kaikoura	Rates	<p>Lower Rates Increase</p> <p>Whilst over 50% of respondents supported a reduction in rates, there is concern regarding the delivery of core services, particularly roading, where there is dissatisfaction with the current level of service.</p> <p>Rates breakdown: How would rate payers prefer to see their money spent? Responding businesses generally support expenditure levels on assets and infrastructure, community and customer services and policy and district planning. The group does not agree with the amount of money being allocated to leadership and governance. We suggest that Council looks at its budget in this area and look to repurpose money to core services like roading.</p>	<p>We note the businesses' support for the reduced rates increase. Noted the various comments re roading and footpaths and a focus on core services - albeit in our experience what people consider to be core services differ.</p>

48	Future Kaikoura	Operations	<p>Loan Funding of Operations: 80% of the group do not support loan funding of operational costs. This is not considered to be a sustainable method of operating.</p> <p>Economic Development – Short or long term focus? There is support for a focus on the short to medium term whilst maintaining a long term focus for economic development work. There is a need for balance. Big picture focus should be a part of any planning. A long term strategy provides greater credibility when applying for funding.</p> <p>Economic Advisory Group: Whilst there is 62% support for an Economic Advisory Group, it appears that this is based on people wanting this function to be separate from Council with action based outcomes and local people making the decisions.</p> <p>Domestic Marketing Loan Funding: It is clear there is limited support for loan funding a domestic marketing campaign. There is a belief that Destination Kaikōura is already funded to provide this service. It is recommended Council look at the current key performance indicators for Destination Kaikōura and adjust them to align with the needs in the current climate.</p>	The temporary funding including operational costs put in place to smooth and lessen rates in creases post-quake have now effectively ceased - the forward borrowing is in respect of assets and their improvement. Borrowing is also less than anticipated. Note comments re economic development and the support for the current post COVID immediate focus. There is not an Economic Advisory Group and there was no proposal that Council's economic development be managed by such a group - perhaps this refers to the Kaikōura Economic Recovery Governance Group set up post Covid. This is separate from Council and comprises local people - although Council supported. The recent additional Government funding for Destination Kaikōura is welcome news for Kaikōura. We will be discussing terms of increased funding with them.
48	Future Kaikoura	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>43% of businesses support the status quo however, the results show that further consultation is required. Relationship, roles and funding between Council and Innovative Waste needs to better communicated. Reducing of waste being brought into Kaikoura Collaboration and education are key to reducing waste going forward. A reduction of waste being brought into Kaikōura needs to be addressed across the community.</p>	Noted (plus we note the survey question did not give a cost comparison of the options)
48	Future Kaikoura	Environment	<p>Earthcheck Only 44% of business support not paying to be part of Earthcheck. This appears to be based on the lack of leadership and action taken to ensure we are achieving and exceeding measures, rather than on not supporting Earthcheck itself. There has been no focus on this post earthquake.</p> <p>56% do not agree or are unsure about Earthcheck being stopped. This, along with the comments, highlight that businesses have a passion for retaining environment sustainability and measuring it.</p>	We note the support for Council's decision to stop Earthcheck certification.
48	Future Kaikoura	Aquatic Centre	<p>Funding for the Pool: 56% of businesses support the extra funding for the pool over a loan from the Rata Foundation. However, now that there is government funding, is this required or necessary? Is there an option to fast-track the pool through to the next stage? Options for the Lions pool The variety of suggestions put forward highlights the need for a long term plan for developing Kaikōura. Council needs to involve the entire business community in this process.</p>	<p>Aquatic Centre Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required. We understand original estimates of the capital cost for enclosing the pool were \$2million – plus a critical cost would then be substantial annual operating costs which would potentially fall to ratepayers. Lions Pool - Council discussions have been to work with the community as part of the Long Term Plan re options for this site</p>
48	Future Kaikoura	Communications	<p>75% of businesses do not support this much money being spent on communications. The comments highlight the need for Council to highlight what work is being undertaken in this area and have a clear set of communicated key performance indicators. Communications: Too much or Too Little? The results and comments indicate that Council should review its communication strategy to provide more detailed, relevant communication. Council needs to take on board more feedback from business as currently they do not feel like they are being heard. Preferred method of Communication: Email is the preferred method of communication. Community meetings was the second choice, however, this has been a mode of communication that council has shied away from since the earthquake. The results highlight the desire for more face to face conversations rather than Facebook and newspapers. The lowest ranking method of communication was hardcopy newsletters, which is potentially the higher cost method of communication that council currently undertakes.</p>	Note comments re communications. Recent staffing change proposals have been in this area.
48	Future Kaikoura	District Plan	<p>Natural Hazards: 41% of businesses feel that this work should not be deferred. There is a need for Council to communicate the effects of changes to the Natural Hazards section of the Draft Plan. What effect will changes to this section or deferral of this work have on future investment in the district? This is due to 28% of businesses being unsure about whether or not it should be deferred.</p>	There are no Council Plans to defer the Natural Hazards work. It has had some delays as key stakeholders were involved and expert reports obtained.
48	Future Kaikoura	Clarence Valley Access	Based from survey results and comments, further information needs to be provided about this project and further consultation needs to be undertaken. There is a lack of understanding around the ongoing operational costs and what these are.	Consultation detail with the broader community has been limited because only Option 2 is considered practically achievable because of the generous funding offered by NZTA for that option alone.
48	Future Kaikoura	Environment	<p>Values of Kaikoura: Our natural environment is the thing that businesses value most. Council needs to develop plans and policies which are focused on enhancing, protecting and reducing our impact on our natural environment. Environmental sustainability should play a much larger role with Kaikōura District Council focus, as is the core value of the community.</p>	Noted

49	Kaikoura Youth Council	Roads	<p>Beach Road: 93.5% of children we asked (127 in total), bike down Beach Road, either on the pavement or the road. For those that biked on the pavement, typical reasons for that choice included traffic, safety, and the fear of being run over. There were however quite a few who said they bike on the road and stated that it was illegal to bike on the pavements. The Youth Council is concerned at the significant number of youth who quoted safety concerns and would like the Council to lobby for cycle lanes down Beach Road.</p> <p>Walkways: 82.1 % of the children we asked, believe that some walkways in our community should be better lit - including Mt Fyffe Rd, Beach Rd, South Bay, The Esplanade, and the zig zag path above Torquay Street. The youth council approves of the changeover to more bird friendly lighting and asks the Council to look at the lighting in the specified areas to see if it can be improved, when the lighting is revamped.</p> <p>State Highway 1 Road Works: Youth have commented that the current road works on State Highway 1 North and South, are impacting negatively on school life - school busses are often delayed, leading to lateness in the mornings. The Youth Council understands this is not a council issue but wanted to share the knowledge of this impact.</p>	Beach Road:- The expressed concerns regarding the safety of Beach Road are considered valid, and that further engagement with NZTA is required to explore potential solutions. Walkways: The desirability of improving walkways is acknowledged and an application for over \$2million of funding for such works has been made through the central government 'Shovel Ready' scheme.
49	Kaikoura Youth Council	Communications	<p>WIFI : Youth would like to see more, and better quality, free WIFI around town - when fibre becomes available, it would be good to see this reflected in the free Wi-Fi___33 as at the moment it is patchy.</p>	Following completion of the Chorus rollout we should review this area
49	Kaikoura Youth Council	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>Waste: 88.3% of the youth we surveyed said that, despite the high cost, they are strong supporters of recycling in Kaikoura. Nearly all of those who stated this quoted as their reasoning that "it is good for the environment". Some of our senior members of Youth Council have also been doing some research on recycling within school and the conclusions drawn are that although in theory youth are strongly behind the idea of recycling , there are some factors impacting on this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The recent stories of recycling ending up in landfills means youth are thinking "what's the point?" 2. The difficulty of knowing what can and can't be recycled means it is complicated. 3. The whole concept of waste and pollution seems too big for young people to impact on. <p>Taking this feedback into account we think that it would be good to have some clear guidance on some local waste reduction strategies that could be targeted at youth - things that do make a difference. Youth Council would like to be part of an ongoing conversation about waste and reduction of waste.</p>	Involving the Youth Council in the discussion of waste management options would probably be worthwhile, to assist all parties understand the bigger picture
49	Kaikoura Youth Council	Community Facilities	<p>Gooches Beach Skate Ramp: Based on the results of the survey, we have decided not to continue maintaining the Gooch's beach skate ramp, due to lack of usage and high costs.</p> <p>Scout Hall: We are very excited about the Scout Hall revamp, and eager to be involved in its progress. We see the toilet facilities as needing the most urgent attention, along with the rest close behind. We would request that as part of the design, a dedicated youth space could be built in. We are willing to approach funders for this if more funds are needed.</p>	Again would appear worthwhile to involve Youth Council in discussion
50	Maureen Keogan	Rubbish and Recycling	I don't choose any of these options. Suggest you get further options from people who are more logical, with loads of common sense. Stop paying for advisors big money who really are out of touch with the common people. Who knows you may just end up with retired farmers and holiday homes here and that is all in Kaikoura. You just can't keep screwing the rate payers. Remember when you were kids you had to save up to buy what you wanted.	
50	Maureen Keogan	Aquatic Centre	<p>Option 1 (Preferred - increase Council grant at lower interest rate) Really save your pennies until you can afford it</p>	<p>Aquatic Centre Noted support of Preferred Option 1. Agree higher interest rate would affect ratepayers more. Note with recent Govt funding announcement likely the \$500k will no longer be required</p>
51	ECAN (Adrienne Lomax, Regional Leadership and Policy)	Environment/District Plan	<p>Canterbury Regional Forums Canterbury Water Management Strategy Supporting the community District Plan Review: Natural Hazards Chapter</p>	Regional Forums noted with a suggestion that Council thanks ECAN for its recent use of remote regional meetings due to COVID - and encourages more, a meetings in Christchurch or Selwtn require a full day for any Kaikoura staff member attending. Note other points and encourage further collaboration especially Jobs for nature applications that ECAN have made and offer council's wish and willingness to be actively involved in those rather than solely ECAN.

52	Jacki Remihana	Rubbish and Recycling	<p>IWK would like to take this opportunity to thank Councillors for your support in the 2019/20 year.</p> <p>IWK is a CCO of KDC and we have been disheartened at the lack of partnership principles applied in relation to the consultation document and the options that were presented to Councillors.</p> <p>In response to your Annual Plan and call for submissions, IWK would like to submit on the following in regard to Rubbish & Recycling Services</p> <p>Education</p> <p>IWK ask that KDC consider a partnership with IWK in educational activities delivery including seeking and application for funding.</p> <p>Foodwaste</p> <p>IWK would ask that KDC consider adoption of the Foodwaste collection service to protect the landfill and environment from methane gas and encourage the reduction of food wastage through educational activities.</p> <p>Landfill</p> <p>IWK encourage KDC to continue to plan for the closure of the landfill and the building of a transfer facility.</p> <p>Street Bins</p> <p>IWK encourage KDC to uplift the Tourism Infrastructure Fund TIF funding and work with IWK on the installation of the bins throughout the Kaikōura Community/District.</p> <p>Service</p> <p>IWK encourage KDC to work in partnership with IWK to provide a comprehensive cost-effective recycling and waste service to the Kaikoura Community.</p> <p>Recycling</p> <p>IWK urge KDC to refrain from landfilling viable recyclables.</p>	Ample opportunity exists to explore further options.
53	Nigel Muir	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As discussed Sport Tasman has a unique opportunity to do more work for Kaikoura's rangatahi in the year ahead following our selection by Sport New Zealand one of two regions for a national pilot programmes around engaging rangatahi with active recreation. My proposal for the Kaikoura District Council is that we make Kaikoura a region as part of this pilot. This programme would be unique to the Youth of Kaikoura and they would be heavily involved in developing it. The document in the attached link below gives a little more detail about similar partnership programmes we are currently developing in Marlborough, Tasman and Buller. (please see attached to full agenda)... https://my.visme.co/view/907y9onm-d3o26vxjxox3lgxw Sport Tasman would be really delighted if we could also extend this pilot initiative to Kaikoura. To do this I would be looking for a \$15k youth grant for the year ahead that Sport Tasman would also fund match with \$15k to provide a \$30k programme for Kaikoura's rangatahi. (We could possibly consider a \$10k/\$10k for a more diluted \$20k programme if this was more realistic in the current environment) 	At first glance the example programmes appear to involve (rightly) high schools. Suggest any consideration would need to involve the High School. No current budget for this (unable to comment further without better understanding of the numbers of rangatahi and more re the programme)
54	Graham Moody	Rubbish and Recycling	RUBBISH: Option 1 Status Quo - this option should be maintained until the WMMP has been implemented.	Support for Option 1 (until Waste Minimisation Management Plan is implemented) noted
54	Graham Moody	Clarence Valley Access	Option 2 with less cost and maintenance by KDC. This option is provisional as long as it is the residents preferred option.	Option 2 Support noted - with submitter's note that it is the residents' preferred option
54	Graham Moody	Aquatic Centre	Option 1 is preferred.	Option 1 Support noted